
SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 70

February, 1996

Reviews VI

by

David Utz, Xinru Liu, Taylor Carman, Bryan Van Nordan, and the Editor

Victor H. Mair, Editor

Sino-Platonic Papers

Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA

vmair@sas.upenn.edu

www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series edited by Victor H. Mair. The purpose of the series is to make available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including Romanized Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

The only style-sheet we honor is that of consistency. Where possible, we prefer the usages of the *Journal of Asian Studies*. Sinographs (*hanzi*, also called tetragraphs [*fangkuaizi*]) and other unusual symbols should be kept to an absolute minimum. *Sino-Platonic Papers* emphasizes substance over form.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered. Manuscripts should be double-spaced with wide margins and submitted in duplicate. A set of "Instructions for Authors" may be obtained by contacting the editor.

Ideally, the final draft should be a neat, clear camera-ready copy with high black-and-white contrast.

Sino-Platonic Papers is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to two or three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan.

N.B.: Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* has been published electronically on the Web. Issues from no. 1 to no. 170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web at www.sino-platonic.org.

Table of Contents

Review Article by David A. Utz of Ádám Molnár, *Weather-Magic in Inner Asia*. With an Appendix, "Alttürkische fragmente über den Regenstein," by P. Zieme. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series, 158. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1994.

Graham Parkes, ed., *Heidegger and Asian Thought*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987. Reviewed by Taylor Carman and Bryan Van Norden.

Beijing Daxue Nanya Yanjiusuo [Peking University Institute for South Asian Studies], ed. *Zhongguo zaiji zhong Nanya shiliao huibian (Collection of South Asian Historical Materials from Chinese Sources)*. 2 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1995. Reviewed by Xinru Liu.

~~~~~

N.B.: The following 23 reviews are by the editor of *Sino-Platonic Papers*.

Ronald E. Emmerick and Edwin G. Pulleyblank. *A Chinese Text in Central Asian Brahmi Script: New Evidence for the Pronunciation of Late Middle Chinese and Khotanese*. Serie Orientale Roma, LXIX. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1993.

YIN Binyong and SU Peicheng, eds. *Kexuede pingjia Hanyu hanzi [Scientifically Appraise Sinitic and Sinographs]*. Zhongguo yuwen xiandaihua congshu (Chinese Language Modernization Series), 1. Peking: Huayu Jiaoxue Chubanshe (Sinolingua), 1994.

WU Chang'an. *Wenzi de toushi -- Hanzi lunheng [A Perspective on Culture -- Balanced Discussions on the Sinographs]*. Wenhua Yuyanxue Congshu [Cultural Linguistics Series]. N.p. (Changchun?): Jilin Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 1995.

ZHOU Shilie, comp. *Tongxingci cidian [Dictionary of Homographs]*. Peking: Zhongguo Guoji Guangbo Chubanshe, 1995. (Reviewed twice from different perspectives in the same issue.)

KANG Yin. *Wenzi Yuanliu Qianshi (The Origin and Development of Chinese Ideographs) (sic)*. N.p.: Guoji Wenhua Chubanshe, 1992.

DUAN Kailian. *Zhongguo minjian fangyan cidian [A Dictionary of Chinese Folk Topolectisms]*. Haikou: Nanhai chuban gongsi, 1994.

CHANG Xizhen, comp. *Beiping tuhua [Peking Colloquialisms]*. Taipei: Shenge Shiye Youxian Gongsì Chubanshe, 1990.

ZHANG Xunru. *Beiping yinxi xiaoche bian [A Compilation of Words with "er" Suffix in Pekingese]*. Taipei: Taiwan Kaiming, 1991; 2nd Taiwan ed.; 1956, first Taiwan ed.

LI Sijing. *Hanyu "er" [ㄝ] yin shi yanjiu [Studies on the History of the "er" {ㄝ} Sound in Sinitic]*. Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu, 1994.

Erdengtai, Wuyundalai, and Asalat. *Menggu mishi cihui xuanshi [Selected Explanations of Lexical Items in The Secret History of the Mongols]*. Mengguzu lishi congshu [Series on the History of the Mongolian People]. Hohhot: Neimenggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1980; 1991 rpt.

Matthews, Stephen and Virginia Yip. *Cantonese: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge Grammars. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Killingley, Siew-Yue. *Cantonese*. Languages of the World / Materials 06. München-Newcastle: Lincom Europa, 1993.

ZHONG Jingwen, chief ed. *Yuhai (An Encyclopedia of Chinese Folk Language)*, Vol. 1: *Mimiyu (Chinese Secret Language)*. Vol. editors ZHENG Shuoren and CHEN Qi. Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi Chubanshe, 1994.

Harrell, Stevan, ed. *Cultural Encounters on China's Ethnic Frontiers*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1995.

Woo, Henry K. H. *The Making of a New Chinese Mind: Intellectuality and the Future of China*. Hong Kong: China Foundation, 1993.

Miller, Lucien, ed. *South of the Clouds: Tales from Yunnan*. Translated by GUO Xu, Lucien Miller, and XU Kun. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1994.

Hoizey, Dominique and Marie-Joseph Hoizey. *A History of Chinese Medicine*. Tr. by Paul Bailey. Vancouver: UBC Press; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.

Crystal, David. *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. London: Penguin, 1992, 1994.

Day, Gordon M. *Western Abenaki Dictionary*. Vol. 1: Abenaki-English. Vol. 2: English-Abenaki. Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service, Papers 128 and 129. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1994-95.

Hassrick, Peter H. *The Frederic Remington Studio*. Cody, Wyoming: Buffalo Bill Historical Center, in association with University of Washington Press (Seattle, London), 1994.

Jonaitis, Aldona, ed. *Chiefly Feasts: The Enduring Kwakiutl Potlatch*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press; New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1991.

Jerry L. Norman and W. South Coblin. "A New Approach to Chinese Historical Linguistics." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 115.4 (1995), 576-584.

~~~~~

Bits and Pieces

Letter concerning An Zhimin's views on the origins of bronze metallurgy in China.

"Yet again on Tibet." This is one in a continuing series of discussions with Edwin G. Pulleyblank, W. South Coblin, and others on the origins of the name "Tibet".

Reviews VI

Review article by David A. Utz.

Ádám Molnár. *Weather-Magic in Inner Asia*. With an Appendix, "Alttürkische Fragmente über den Regenstein," by P. Zieme. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series, 158. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1994. xv + 169 pages; appendix, bibliography, maps.

Already by the middle of the 19th century the widespread practice among Turkic and Mongol ethnic groups of using a special stone or stones to cause changes in the weather, especially to produce an array of 'bad' weather conditions (*e.g.*, rain, wind, cold, snow, fog) had attracted the attention of the European scholarly community. Accounts in various Islamic historical, geographical, and mineralogical works concerning the origin and use of 'rainstones' had been discussed by Étienne Quatremère and Jozef v. Hammer-Purgstall,¹ and the scientific travelers Peter Simon Pallas and Benjamin Bergmann had reported on the practice of weather-magic among the contemporary Kalmucks in Russia in the latter part of the 18th century.² Finally, Joseph M de Guignes had drawn attention to the fact that Chinese sources report the practice of weather-magic among the Hsiung-nu.³ In the intervening years various scholars continued to study one particular aspect of this subject or another: A major event was the discovery at Tun-huang by Paul Pelliot and M.A. Stein of a Sogdian text which describes in detail the various stones which one needs and the various preparations and rituals which one must execute to produce (1) rain and (2) fair weather.⁴ However, until the present, no scholar has undertaken a systematic and comprehensive study of the entire subject. *Weather-Magic in Inner Asia*, by Ádám Molnár, represents such a first effort.

By examining the entire subject in as comprehensive a fashion as possible, Dr. Molnár has made a number of important substantive contributions which advance our knowledge and settle some issues which had remained confusing. He has also proposed some intriguing theories which offer the possibility of interesting insights into issues beyond the scope of weather-magic. One of these is his suggestion that the *yadčī*, or weather-magic practitioner, may have had some **official** position within Turkic society, an institutionalized relationship to secular power because of his ability to use the 'meteorological weapon.'⁵ If this theory is correct, it would help to place in its proper context the unusual **official** position which the Buddhist monk Dharmakṣema held at the court of (the Northern Liang ruler) Chü-ch'ü Mêng-sun, and to underscore an aspect of the institutional continuity that may have existed between Turkic society and the societies of the

Hsiung-nu and Hsien-pei ethnic groups which preceded it historically in Inner Asia. Dharmakṣema is important in the history of Buddhism in China primarily because of his activity translating the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra and other Indian Buddhist texts into Chinese.⁶ However, for the non-Sinitic rulers of northern China who were his contemporaries, such as Chü-ch'ü Mêng-sun and the (Northern) Wei ruler T'ai-wu ti, his primary importance and reputation was for his ability to employ dhāraṇīs for thaumaturgical purposes. In **this** capacity Dharmakṣema served Chü-ch'ü Mêng-sun as an advisor and integral part of the latter's security apparatus.⁷ Both Dharmakṣema's biography in the Kao sêng chuan and the narrative account of the Northern Liang and (Northern) Wei dynasties preserved in the Wei shu and Shih-liu kuo ch'un-ch'iu describe in detail the altercation that developed between T'ai-wu ti and "his vassal" Chü-ch'ü Mêng-sun because of the latter's refusal to accede to the former's summons to dispatch Dharmakṣema to the Wei court.⁸ The strategic advantage, in the mind of Chü-ch'ü Mêng-sun, which Dharmakṣema represented was so great that Chü-ch'ü Mêng-sun had Dharmakṣema killed rather than allow him to escape or be captured by his enemy, T'ai-wu ti. Although the origin of the ruling elites of these non-Sinitic states in North China was probably **not** Turkic, their social and institutional background most likely shared some indirect continuity with later Turkic societies. This particular episode (*i.e.*, Dharmakṣema's career as a thaumaturge at the Northern Liang court) points to the regular existence of **official** thaumaturges within the organization of these polities, and it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the official position of the yadǎi in Turkic society, the institutionalized relation of the yadǎi to secular power, reflects an historical continuity with the official position of thaumaturges (Buddhist, or otherwise) within the Hsiung-nu or Hsien-pei political culture that factored into the formation of these non-Sinitic states in North China during the 4th-5th centuries C.E. In **both** cases **strategic** and **security** considerations justified such official relationships.

A major contribution of Dr. Molnár's work is to have assembled from the accounts of travelers and missionaries what is known about the more recent (18th-20th centuries) beliefs and practices of various Turkic and Mongol groups concerning weather-magic.⁹ From this material certain parallels can be seen between these accounts and some passages of the Sogdian text P3: Some of these parallels have been noted by Dr. Molnár, but a number of others have not. These parallels contribute to clarify the proper (ethnographic) context of these passages in the Sogdian text. In this connection, it may be useful to quote one such long passage, to which Dr. Molnár refers at a number of points throughout his study:¹⁰

If it begins to rain little by little, then the *jaš*-practicing man must mount a dappled horse,¹¹ and he should take the bridle (in his) hands, and he should urge (the horse to gallop) seven times from the east and seven times from the west, and he should call (out) three times very strongly and forcefully in a loud voice. He should hang a feather of the vulture and the *ttr'w*¹² under the bridle. He should bray *crpywŋn*,¹³ and the *jaš*-practicing man should smear *crpywŋn* on (his) face. And if it begins to rain, but it refuses to rain hard, then he should put on the hide of a wolf, and he should circumambulate the tent seven times, and he should howl loudly in the voice of a wolf. And if it refuses to rain hard, then he should take one snake, and he should hang it upside down. From one direction he should tie the wildcat of (the) forest. Also he should tie the frog near the water, and he should tie the horse¹⁴ from one side. Furthermore he should tie his own wolf's hide from one side, and he should tie the bird from one side, (and) he should tie a dog from one side so that these so many living beings may fear (each other), the one from the second (and) one from another. Then afterwards there (will) be a heavy rain.

Already Dr. Molnár has drawn attention to the parallel between the part of this passage which describes the need for the “*jaš*-practicing man” to mount and ride a “dappled horse [rxš-]” and the practices of a number of relatively contemporary groups, especially in the Hsin-chiang (Sinkiang) region.¹⁵ In particular the *yadačī-kitābs*¹⁶ which S. É. Malov collected from this region prescribe the saddling (and mounting) of one or more horses which are variously black, dappled, dappled-white, or white; and G. Jarring has reported that mounting a horse and urging it to a gallop is a component of weather-magic rituals in Hsin-chiang.¹⁷

Although Dr. Molnár has discussed this particular passage in the Sogdian text in support of his conclusion that a “dark-colored horse” was a central component of Inner Asian weather-magic,¹⁸ the most magically significant animal in this passage is **not** the horse, but the **wolf**, which the *jaš*-practicing man must impersonate. The importance of the wolf in Inner Asian weather magic is reflected in the belief among the Yakuts that the most powerful of bezoars for use in weather-magic is that found in the intestines of wolves.¹⁹ Another interesting parallel, which Dr. Molnár has also noted, is the ritual among the Turkmens of (northern) Iraq called *köse geldi*, in which a youth impersonates an “ass’s foal” (or perhaps a dark-colored horse), hopping and jumping in a ritual fashion.²⁰

In an analogous way the Yas-practicing man must impersonate the wolf, howling and circumambulating the ritual tent.

At another point in the Sogdian ritual (chronologically **previous** to the action described above) the Yas-practicing man must kneel and recite a particular prayer addressed to the **Wind**, the “scent-bearing red-adorned son of the Supreme God [’ššy].”²¹ The central role of the Wind in the action of the Sogdian ritual finds parallels in the ethnographic material which Dr. Molnár has presented, especially concerning groups such as the Buriats, Yakuts, and (Southern) Altaian Turks who live in the Siberian forests, **not** in the more arid (steppe or “basin and range”) regions of Inner Asia. Among the (Southern) Altaian Turks the d’ada-taš [“rainstone”] is a stone which occurs naturally, especially on rocks which have been exposed to constant wind.²² The Yakuts believe that the special properties of the sata [“magic stone”] include causing the wind to blow.²³ It is among the Buriats that perhaps the most striking parallel with the Sogdian prayer is to be found: According to the Buriats the Zada Sagan Tengeri [“Zada White God”] commands the zada-wind to bring zada, or “bad weather” (rain or snow). A strong wind always precedes the rain or snow. Sometimes the Zada Sagan Tengeri is called Zada Ulan Tengeri, “Zada **Red** God.”²⁴ Here one can see the parallel with the Sogdian view that the Wind, which is the “red-adorned” [krm’yr py’tk] son of the Supreme God, is the agent which brings the rain.

Another interesting parallel is provided by the Monguors living along the Yellow River in North China, who perform a rain-making ritual in a Buddhist cave-shrine.²⁵ In this ritual images of lung-wang, or Nāgarāja [the “Dragon King”], are placed next to springs in the cave-shrine. The role of the Nāgarāja, and nāgas more generally, find a parallel in the Sogdian rain-making ritual described in the P3 text. As part of the preparations which precede the ritual proper, the Yas-practicing man must paint various nāgas which are differentiated by possessing the heads of different creatures.²⁶ More importantly, the efficacy of the ritual is **ultimately** dependent upon an oath which Mahākāla and the Nāgas swore: “This preparation which I have just explained, when it is all completely done, then the Nāgas must come there together with the Wind so that they should make rain and dew there in that place.”²⁷ On the other hand Dr. Molnár’s assertion in his discussion of “Frogs and Snakes” that “the Nāgas are also mentioned in a Lamaist Kalmuck weather-magic rite recounted by Pallas” has **no** basis in fact: Even though the author has previously quoted *verbatim* the entirety of Peter Simon Pallas’ description of the use of certain dhāraṇīs among the Kalmucks for the invocation of certain (transcendent) Buddhas [burxans] (and one bodhisattva) to bring about different weather conditions, he has provided no reference for this particular assertion.²⁸ Although the dhāraṇī addressed to Ratnasambhava burxan to bring cool air [Um naga jöh jagi ssoocha!] includes the

expression naga, this hardly represents a specific mention of a nāga, but rather only part of the string of nonsense vocables constituting a dhāraṇī-invocation to Ratnasambhava.²⁹

Finally, in the ethnographic material which Dr. Molnár has discussed there are some descriptions of **special properties** attributed to “rainstones” or “magic stones” which are extremely reminiscent of passages in the P3 Sogdian text which describe the particular powers and characteristics of those nine stones which the jaṣ-practicing man needs in order to perform the ritual. Among the Uzbeks there is a yada-stone which is not used for rain-making but still has the properties that (1) anyone who is wearing such a stone is invincible in battle, and (2) the stings of serpents and scorpions can be cured by placing such a stone on the wound.³⁰ These two properties are identical, or at least analogous, to those of the fourth and sixth stones in the P3 text, respectively. The principal power of the fourth stone is to insure that one will be victorious over ones adversaries, especially in (legal) disputes,³¹ and the principal power of the sixth stone is as an antidote [p'tz'r'k] for venomous bites of snakes, scorpions, spiders, and other insects.³² The Yakuts recognize that satas, or “magic stones,” are of different kinds according to their origin and their various properties. The sata-bezoar which comes from the heart of a mare will, among other things, protect its possessor from any shaman's curse, and the “eagle-sata” brings its owner good luck in all efforts: It is sometimes called d'ol taaha, “stone of luck.”³³ In the P3 text the power of the second stone is described thus:³⁴

If he should keep it in the house, then wealth (will) never be lacking for him, and also another man (will) never be able to **practice sorcery** against his house. And if he should keep it on (his) person, then he (will) become dear to everyone. And it has other further power of many kinds such that its power cannot be very easily explained. It is called a **self-fortunate stone** [xwtypnrxwntk snk].

Also preceding the description of the first stone, the extant manuscript of the text begins abruptly: “. . . and it is called a **lucky stone** [prnxwntk snk].”³⁵ These passages in the Sogdian text, and the attribute prnxwntk, “lucky or fortunate,” are clearly parallel to the descriptions of at least two kinds of Yakut satas which Dr. Molnár has discussed.

Another important accomplishment of Dr. Molnár's study is to have collected almost all of the important historical records concerning rainstones and their actual use in the practice of weather-magic.³⁶ Most of these historical records are found in Arabic, Persian, and Islamic Turkic sources. The most significant contribution which the author

has made in his discussion of these numerous Islamic sources is to demonstrate clearly that all of the accounts in earlier Arabic and Persian books concerning the origin of the rainstone of the Turks are based ultimately on five (5) basic traditions.³⁷ These traditions are (1) the origin of the rainstone with the prophet Noah, and the subsequent rivalry of the sons of Japheth for its possession, (2) the origin of the rainstone from the mountains of the east (among the troglodytes), (3) the rainstone(s) in the mountain pass (or valley) in the land of the Qarluqs, (4) the narrative of the Sāmānid amīr Ismā‘īl b. Aḥmad, and (5) the account of Tamīm b. Baḥr concerning his journey to the capital of the Uighurs. In his analysis the author has argued that four of these traditions clearly associate the rainstone with a particular Turk group (the Qarluqs), and this significant fact is a major basis for his later “geographical argument” concerning the specific area of Inner Asia in which the origin of rainstone-magic can be localized. However, the significance which he derives from his analysis of early Islamic accounts concerning the Qarluqs and the origins of “rainstone-magic” may have more to do with the perception of the Qarluqs among early Muslims as the quintessential Turks, because the Qarluqs were the first important Turk group to systematically convert to Islam, and become an integral component of the “Community of Submission (*‘Ummatu’l-islām*).”³⁸ Because of this state of affairs, Islamic writers would naturally be better informed about the Qarluq Turks, even if what they reported was equally true of other Turk groups. After all, the (anonymous) Syriac account of how Elias, the Christian metropolitan of Marv, successfully converted a local Turkic ruler proves that the (western) Turks, who were in some sense the predecessors of the Qarluqs, were practitioners of this sort of Inner Asian weather-magic.³⁹

In his discussion of how the various Islamic sources are ultimately based on five basic traditions, the author seems to have omitted the section on the “Rainstone” [ḥajaru’l-matar] which is found in the ‘Aḥḥā’ibu’l-maxlūqāt of Zakariyyā b. Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī, although it is clear from his bibliography and from a passage in his exposition of his “linguistic argument” that he must know this account.⁴⁰ The very complexity of the manuscript tradition of this text, especially as it has come to be reflected in the substantial variations in the passage concerning the “rainstone,” illustrates extremely well the very process by which different composite recensions of a text have built up from some basic units, such as the basic tradition concerning the rainstone(s) in the mountain pass in the land of the Turks (or Qarluqs).⁴¹ One of the (three) basic manuscript traditions of this text has included an interesting eye-witness account of the use of rainstones, apparently also at the Khwārezmshāh court, like the accounts preserved by the mineralogists Aḥmad b. Yūsuf at-Tifāṣī and Baylak b. Muḥammad al-Qibṣāqī.⁴² This account is important because it has apparently preserved, albeit in a corrupt orthography in the extant manuscript tradition, the

Khakani Turkic term yāt.⁴³ This would represent an attestation of a technical term which is otherwise known only from the Dīwānu'l-luṡātī't-turk of Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī. This form *yāt [spelled *yt] which occurs in one manuscript tradition of al-Qazwīnī's work is important for the author's "linguistic argument," especially his view of the unequivocal length of the vocalism of this Khakani term.⁴⁴

Dr. Molnár has also endeavored to collect all records about actual historical incidents in which weather-magic was performed, and has concluded this discussion of "Historical Records" with a very interesting discussion of the reduction of knowledge concerning weather-magic to a purely literary tradition in Ottoman books.⁴⁵ While the author's inventory of historical events is (almost) complete, some additional remarks about Persian sources are in order.⁴⁶ First of all, the author has become confused about the word jadalamīšī which occurs twice in Rašīdu'd-dīn's Ǧāmi'u't-Tawārīx, and which he insists on citing variously as jadamīšī or jadāmīšī.⁴⁷ The Persian text gives two variant orthographies: ǧd'myšy and ǧd'lmyšy.⁴⁸ This word has been analyzed and explained by Minobu Honda in his study of the Mongol-Turkic terms with suffix -mīšī which are found in Persian sources.⁴⁹ The correct reading is based on recognizing that the word contains the Mongolian denominative verb jadala-, "to perform ǧada, or 'rain-magic'." In his discussion of the Battle of Kōiten in which the Naimans tried (unsuccessfully) to use weather-magic against the army of Čingīz Xān and his allies, the author has not discussed any of the Islamic accounts of this event found in the Ǧāmi'u't-Tawārīx, the Zafarnāma of Ḥamdu'llāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī, or Mīrxwānd's Ta'rīx-i Rawḡatu's-Ṣafā, although he has indirectly alluded to Rašīdu'd-dīn's account in quoting Rašīdu'd-dīn's explanation of jadalamīšī.⁵⁰ In his discussion of the "Battle of the Mire" [ǧang-i lāy], in which Jata, one of Timur's early foes in Central Asia, resorted to weather-magic as a stratagem, the author has quoted the English translation of Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥaydar's Ta'rīx-i Rašīdī instead of the earlier Persian text of the Zafarnāma of Šarafu'd-dīn 'Alī Yazdī upon which this particular passage of the Ta'rīx-i Rašīdī is no doubt completely based.⁵¹ Again, in his discussion of an episode during the march of Sulṡān Abū Sa'īd and Abu'l-Xayr Xān from Tāškent towards Samarqand in A.H. 855, the author has quoted a monograph by V.V. Bartol'd on Uluṡ Beg and not the actual Persian account in the Matla'-i Sa'dayn wa Maǧma'-i Baḥrayn of Kamālu'd-dīn 'Abdu'r-Razzāq as-Samarqandī upon which Bartol'd has based himself.⁵² Finally, in his discussion of the account which is found in the Ta'rīx-i Rawḡatu's-Ṣafā concerning Japheth and the origin of the rainstone, the author has not cited any Persian text, nor has he mentioned the work of Xwāndamīr, the Ḥabību's-Siyar, which is a little more specific than the Rawḡatu's-Ṣafā in what it says concerning

the names for the “rainstone” among various “nationalities:” “The Arabs call it ḥaṣṣaru’l-matar, the ‘Aḡamiyān [*i.e.*, Iranians] call it sang-i yada, and the Turks call it ḡada-tāṣ.”⁵³

In addition to Islamic sources, Dr. Molnár has collected non-Islamic sources to complete his inventory of historical records. These include the passage from an anonymous Syriac chronicle concerning Elias, the Christian metropolitan of Marv (already mentioned),⁵⁴ two passages from Mongolian sources (*Secret History* and *Altan Tobči*),⁵⁵ and a complete census of Old Uighur Turkic texts concerning yad: This is supplemented by an appendix to the present work by Peter Zieme, “Altürkische Fragmente über den Regenstein,” which includes two hitherto unpublished Old Uighur Turkic fragmentary texts from Turfan concerning yad, as well as a very useful overview of all of the attested Old Turkic technical vocabulary derived from the term yad.⁵⁶ The author has also discussed, or at least alluded to, most of the important Chinese sources relevant to Inner Asian weather-magic.⁵⁷ The only serious omission is a passage from the biography of the Buddhist thaumaturge Fo-t’u-têng, found in the *Kao sêng chuan*, which describes the invocation or conjuring of “dragons” (lung), *i.e.*, nāgas, to bring rain.⁵⁸ This is relevant to Dr. Molnár’s discussion of a particular passage in two Old Uighur Turkic Buddhist confessional texts, in which he has tried to argue that luu (or lō) öntürgüči yadči means “weather-magicians who raise snakes,” when, in fact, it really means exactly what it says, literally: “the yad-practitioner who causes lung (“dragon(s)”) to rise (up).”⁵⁹ The author’s consistent efforts to confuse nāgas and snakes as much as possible has also been one of a number of factors which have hampered his ability to understand the proper (historical, geographical, and religious/scientific) context of the Sogdian text P3, another important historical record which he has systematically incorporated into the different components of his argument, albeit with only limited success.⁶⁰ In particular, his assertion that this text has “an Indian background” is basically incorrect.⁶¹

In the remaining sections of Dr. Molnár’s study he has discussed a number of general topics: (1) Water, (2) Frogs and Snakes, (3) the Dark-colored Horse, (4) the Rainstone, (5) the Ritual, (6) the Functional Aspect (of the use of rainstones), (7) the Geographical Argument (and the early history of rainstones in Inner Asia), and (8) the Linguistic Argument.⁶² The subject of the dark-colored horse in Inner Asian weather-magic has already been raised in connection with the discussion of Dr. Molnár’s treatment of relevant ethnographic data. However, if the word ’st’wr means “horse” in the Sogdian text P3,⁶³ then the **primary** significance of the dark-colored horse for the Sogdian ritual would **not** be in mounting and riding a “dappled” [rxš-] horse, but rather in one of the ritual procedures to produce fair weather, for which one needs the (complete) head [pts’r’k] of “another **black** horse.”⁶⁴

Among the remaining topics, Dr. Molnár's discussion of the **rainstone** is perhaps the most interesting and convincing.⁶⁵ In particular, he has clearly shown that the practice of weather-magic using rainstones is an activity which the Mongols borrowed from the Turks only during the 13th century C.E., and that, while both bezoars and naturally occurring stones or minerals may be used for weather-magic in Inner Asia, the use of bezoars is a Mongol innovation in this practice.⁶⁶ If Turkic groups use bezoars, this is due to Mongol influence. This is especially clear in the case of Turkic groups who have borrowed the Mongol technical term *ṽada*, and who recognize that "rainstone" may be either mineral or bezoar. Dr. Molnár has provided two excellent maps [Maps 3 and 4] which "show that the use of bezoars and the occurrence of the Mongol loan word *ṽada* (i.e., in Turkic languages) roughly coincide."⁶⁷ Obviously, the word *ṽada* was gradually borrowed by some Turkic communities along with the new (Mongol) technological innovation.

In his discussion of the **rite**, Dr. Molnár has been able to utilize the Islamic and other Turkic sources, especially the two hitherto unpublished Old Uighur Turkic fragments from Turfan which Peter Zieme has included in an "Appendix" to this volume, to show that common features of Turkic weather-magic have included (1) the immersion of stones or a stone in water (or the washing of the stones) and (2) the rubbing of the stones together (or contact of the stones).⁶⁸ He has also been able to convincingly argue in his discussion of the **functional aspect** of the use of rainstones that the principal function of their traditional use among **all** groups (Hsiung-nu, Turk, and Mongol) living in the steppe or "basin and range" part of Inner Asia has been as a sort of meteorological weapon.⁶⁹ This is clear from almost all of the actual historical incidents when weather-magic using stones was practiced. In the Sogdian text the function is very different: It is to produce rain for agrarian purposes in an agrarian community. This is clear when the *ṽaṣ*-practicing man prays to the Wind "so planting may take place, and all the plants and medicinal vegetation may grow so that the whole *gotra*-nation may have pure food. . . ."⁷⁰ For this reason the **functional aspect** of the Sogdian ritual is closest to that of the ritual reported among the Monguors of North China (to relieve drought), or to the account of Fo-t'u-têng's rain-making at the court of the Hsiung-nu *Shih* family during the mid-4th century C.E., again in North China.⁷¹

Unfortunately, Dr. Molnár's discussions of the remaining three topics [Frogs and Snakes, Geographical Argument and Early History, Linguistic Argument] are not very convincing at all, and to a certain extent completely erroneous.⁷² Although the *Ṛgveda* "Frog Hymn" [VII.103] is clearly intended to be chanted as part of a rain-magic ritual, the topic of frogs has no special relationship or relevance to the specific discussion of weather-

magic in Inner Asia, the subject to which Dr. Molnár has confined his study.⁷³ The “frog” (ywkt) which he has discovered in the Sogdian P3 text and to which he refers is **not** a frog but the chemical sulphur.⁷⁴ The only real frog who puts in an appearance in the Sogdian ritual is one which Dr. Molnár has not mentioned in his discussion of frogs: This is the cyz- which is one of the creatures which the jaš-practicing man must tie (down) so that they may “fear” each other.⁷⁵ The same passage also mentions the only snake (kyrm-) in the ritual part of the Sogdian text. Dr. Molnár has correctly recognized that tying the snake upside down has an exact parallel in Aḥmad b. Yūsuf at-Tifāšī’s account of the use of rainstones at the court of the Khwārezmshāh ‘Alā’u’d-dīn Muḥammad.⁷⁶ The nāgas (n’kt) in the Sogdian text are **not** snakes (kyrm-), but “dragons” or fabulous creatures which may have the heads of different animals. This is described in the Sogdian text’s instructions concerning one of the paintings which the jaš-practicing man must execute in preparation for the ritual.⁷⁷ These nāgas with heads of different creatures have been depicted in extant Sogdian paintings.⁷⁸ That the Sogdian word n’k is not the same as kyrm- is also clear from a Manichaean Sogdian calendrical text in which n’k translates Chinese lung (“dragon”) in the twelve-year animal cycle of the Chinese calendar.⁷⁹

Nor does the passage about tying a snake upside down as part of a ritual at the court of the Turk Khwārezmshāh have anything to do with the Old Uighur Turkic phrase luu (or lō) öntürgüči yadči which occurs in two Buddhist confessional texts.⁸⁰ As already mentioned, this phrase means “a yad-practitioner who causes dragons (lung) to rise (up).” This is clear from a Buddhist Chinese parallel text in which the tenth of twelve (12) bad professions is chou lung (“conjure dragons (lung)”). The twelve bad professions in the two lists (Uighur and Chinese) **completely** correspond except that the Uighur ačakram yīlan ölürgüči (“one who kills ačakram-snakes”) is in Chinese tso tsê or “(to be) a thief.”⁸¹ Moreover, there is no actual evidence for the ritual use of snakes by the Uighur yadči, which would be implied by Dr. Molnár’s interpretation of the Uighur phrase to mean “the weather-magician who causes snakes to rise.”⁸² The view that the Uighur word luu (or lō)⁸³ in the phrase luu öntürgüči yadči really does literally mean “dragons” (lung) or “nāgas” is supported by an interesting passage in the biography of the Buddhist thaumaturge Fo-t’u-têng, who became a court functionary of the non-Sinitic Shih family of the Later Chao dynasty in North China:⁸⁴

Then again [there was] a long drought, from the first month until the sixth month. Hu sent the Crown Prince to Fu-k’ou west of Lin-chang to pray for rain. [After] a long time, [there was] still no [rain]fall. Hu ordered Têng himself to go. Immediately, two white dragons descended upon the

(ancestral) shrine. That day [there was] a heavy rain [over] an area several thousand li [square]. That year [there was] a great harvest.

The unambiguous mention of pai lung êrh t'ou, “white dragons, two of them,” in the course of the narrative, and the fact that their descent is followed upon by heavy rain, makes it clear that the chou lung, “conjuring dragons,” to which the Shih êrh o lü-i of the Ta-ming san-tsang fa-shu is referring is an activity associated with rain-making, the profession of the yadči.

In conclusion, there is absolutely **no** basis for Dr. Molnár’s assertion that **snakes** are an Iranian component in Inner Asian weather-magic.⁸⁵ The nāgas in Sogdian culture are ultimately of Indian origin. That the nāgas in the Sogdian P3 text represent an Indian influence can be seen from comparative examples such as the (Tantric) Buddhist Mahāmeghasūtra in which nāgas are featured prominently.⁸⁶ The one snake (kyrm-) in the Sogdian ritual is only one of several creatures which must be secured. Of the animals in this passage the most significant seems to be the **wolf**, not the snake.

The most unconvincing section of Dr. Molnár’s study is what he calls the “Linguistic Argument.” In 1963 Gerhard Doerfer published an extremely lucid discussion of the various attested terms for weather-magic in Turkic, Mongol, and Sogdian languages, and a thorough analysis of their historical relationship.⁸⁷ As a result of this analysis, he postulated, as a proto-form for all other attested forms (including Sogdian cδ-), a “Frühtürkisch” form *jadā.⁸⁸ In the process he demonstrated that the Turkic and Mongol forms are historically divisible into those which are monosyllabic and those which are disyllabic. Although Dr. Molnár has followed Doerfer’s general (monosyllabic/disyllabic) scheme in his comprehensive inventory of attested forms, he has not adopted Doerfer’s proto-form *jadā. Instead, he has postulated a different proto-form [“Ancient Turkic” *yādā] without any explanation for rejecting Doerfer’s proto-form, or any more direct discussion of Doerfer’s analysis.⁸⁹ Moreover, he has consistently insisted that “Ancient Turkic” *yādā, Old Turkic *yād, and Khakani Turkic yāt contain a long vowel /ā/ without providing any clear justification for such a vowel, where, in fact, there is no evidence to support such a distinction.⁹⁰

Moreover, Dr. Molnár has tried to revive H. Vámbéry’s theory of the Iranian origin of yad by proposing an Iranian etymology for Ancient Turkic *yādā, the proto-form which he has proposed for all the attested Turkic and Mongol terms for this variety of weather-magic.⁹¹ The basis for this etymology is the hypothetical development of Old Iranian *yātu-, “(male) magician, or sorcerer,” in some Iranian Saka language. In his argument for such an Iranian etymology, he has been influenced by what he imagines

would have been the phonological development of Old Iranian *yātu- in the Khotanese Saka language, the best attested of those Iranian languages which can be reasonably associated historically with Saka communities.⁹² In the Khotanese Saka language Old Iranian *yātu- would have developed ultimately into Khotanese *ṣādūa- [spelled *gyātua-] through the following series of stages:

*yātu- > *yātuka- > *ṣāduka- > *ṣādūa-⁹³

Depending upon the point in time when Turkic *yādā would have theoretically been borrowed, it would certainly have had to reflect the labial vowel of the Iranian stem, and perhaps also a final guttural consonant.⁹⁴ The change from forms such as *ṣāduka- to forms such as *ṣādūa- would have taken place **no earlier** than the middle of the 4th century C.E.⁹⁵ However, neither Ancient Turkic *yādā, nor any of the attested Turkic or Mongol forms which all derive ultimately from *yādā, reveal any evidence of a final labial vowel or guttural consonant, and one can conclude that Dr. Molnár's proposed etymology cannot be correct.

There is also a serious semantic disparity between *yātu-, a male **person** (in contrast to a female *parikā-, "witch, sorceress") who specializes in a type of activity which is unambiguously harmful (as in the case of Sogdian y'twkn̄yh in the P3 Sogdian text) and terms such as yad, yat, or ṣada, which denote an **activity** (not a person) which is neutral, either harmful or beneficial depending on one's point of view.⁹⁶ This is illustrated in the P3 Sogdian text where the difference is clearly distinguished by the usage of both y'twkn̄yh and cē.⁹⁷ In conclusion there is no convincing evidence to support Dr. Molnár's theory of the Iranian origin of Turkic weather-magic.⁹⁸

¹ Étienne Quatremère (ed. and tr.), *Raschid-eldin: Histoire des Mongols de la Perse* (Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1968), pp. 428-35; [Jozef] v. Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der goldenen Horde in Kiptschak, das ist: der Mongolen in Russland* (Pesth: C.A. Hartleben, 1840), p. 15, note 1, pp. 206-07, 435-38.

² Peter Simon Pallas, *Sammlungen historischer Nachrichten über die mongolischen Völkerschaften*, Part 2 (St. Petersburg: Kayserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1776-1801), pp. 348-50; Benjamin Bergmann, *Nomadische Streifereien unter den Kalmüken in den Jahren 1802 und 1803*, Part 3 (Riga: Hartmann, 1804), pp. 181-84.

³ [Joseph] M de Guignes, *Histoire générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mongols, et des autres Tartares occidentaux, etc.*, Volume 1, Part 2 (Paris: Desaint et Saillant, 1756), p. 296.

4 In his discussion of this text [Molnár, *Weather-Magic in Inner Asia*, pp. 29-34], Dr. Molnár has failed to note the role of Paul Pelliot, who was the first of these two scholars to travel to Tun-huang and examine the manuscripts of the famous cave library in which this and other Sogdian texts were discovered. Of the four surviving *pothi*-leaves of this Sogdian text, three were recovered by Pelliot and are in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. The fourth leaf was recovered by Stein and is in the British Library in London: Its text continues immediately after that of the first three leaves in Paris. The bibliographical information which Dr. Molnár has provided [notes 68-73] contains some mistakes and omissions: First of all Reichelt 1931 [note 68] should be Reichelt 1928, and the entry for Reichelt 1931 which is found in the "Bibliography" at the end of the volume should be replaced with Hans Reichelt, *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums*, Part 1: *Die buddhistischen Texte* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1928). In addition to the facsimile reproduction of the one *pothi*-leaf in the Stein collection, facsimile reproductions of the three *pothi*-leaves in the Pelliot collection are to be found in Émile Benveniste (ed.), *Codices Sogdiani: Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale (Mission Pelliot)* [Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris, 3] (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munsgaard, 1940), Plates 154-58. In addition to the facsimile reproduction, M. A. Stein has included a description of the manuscript Ch. 0093.b (*i.e.*, the *pothi*-leaf in the Stein collection) in *Serindia: Detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China*, Volume 2: *Text* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921), p. 924.

In 1940 Émile Benveniste provided not only a re-edition and re-translation of the *pothi*-leaf which Reichelt published in 1928, but also an *editio princeps* and translation of the three Pelliot *pothi*-leaves, in *Textes sogdiens, édités, traduits, et commentés* [Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale: série in-quarto, 3] (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1940), pp. 59-73 (text and translation), 193-200 (commentary), 281 (additions and corrections), although Robert Gauthiot had already quoted some forms from this text in Émile Benveniste, *Essai de Grammaire sogdienne*, Part 2: *Morphologie, Syntaxe et Glossaire* [Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale: série petit in-octavo, 3] (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1929), pp. 40-41. In a number of articles W.B. Henning offered additions and corrections to the edition and translation of Benveniste. In addition to those citations which Dr. Molnár has included [notes 68-69], one should add " 'Sulphur' in Sogdian" [W.B. Henning, *Selected Papers*, Volume 2 [Acta Iranica, 15] (Tehran-Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1977), p. 69], and "Two Central Asian Words" [*Selected Papers*, Volume 2, pp. 259-71], especially the discussion of "damask" [pp. 259-66]. Although Dr. Molnár has listed the latter article in his "Bibliography," he has not cited it, nor provided it with any further annotation. The two references to Henning's articles which he does include [notes 68-69] can be

supplemented: For Henning 1945 one should add p. 482, note 3; and for Henning 1946 one should add the "Misprints and Minor Points" for P3 on p. 735. Finally, Nicholas Sims-Williams re-examined the manuscript leaves of this text in "The Sogdian Fragments of the British Library," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 18 (1976): 46. In this context it must be pointed out that Sims-Williams' reading n'mt (line 170) must be a misprint for the correct reading n'mt, which is clearly visible in the facsimile reproduction.

Finally, one should add in passing that "lines 1-122" [note 70] should read "lines 1-123," and "lines 123-304" [note 71] should read "lines 124-304."

⁵ Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 146. This particular theory is suggested in the last of the five (5) sections or discrete topics into which Dr. Molnár has divided his study: "Weather-Magic and Its Practitioners in Society," pp. 143-46.

⁶ Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 88, 114; Robert Shih (tr.), *Biographies des moines éminents (Kao seng tchouan) de Houei-kiao*, Part 1: *Biographies des premiers traducteurs* [Bibliothèque du Muséon, 54] (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1968), pp. 100-01.

⁷ O. Franke, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, Volume 2: *Der Konfuzianische Staat I: Der Aufstieg zur Weltmacht* (Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1936), p. 196, Volume 3: *Anmerkungen, Ergänzungen, und Berichtigungen zu Band I und II, Sach- und Namen-Verzeichnis* (Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1937), p. 297.

⁸ *Ibid.*; Robert Shih (tr.), *op. cit.*, pp. 102-04.

⁹ These accounts are discussed in the second section, "Recent Turkic and Mongolian Beliefs," pp. 70-103. Two works of Iakinf (1826, 1829), which are cited in notes 182 and 226, respectively, have been omitted from the bibliography at the end of Molnár's study. In note 183 there is a reference to the "81th [sic] verse" of the Qur'ān, which should be "81st sūra (a sūra is composed of individual verses, or āyāt)." Finally, it is not clear to what the superscript "55" on page 86 refers.

¹⁰ The Sogdian text of this passage is reproduced in Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, pp. 69-71 (lines 230-259).

¹¹ The Sogdian word is rxš-, the meaning of which is derived from the cognate New Persian raxš, "a mixture of red and white; a dappled, or mottled-colored horse; name of the horse of the Iranian hero Rustam." In the Sogdian "Rustam Fragment," rxš- is also the name of Rustam's horse [Sims-Williams, "Sogdian Fragments of the British Library," pp. 54-61].

¹² Benveniste has translated the Sogdian word ttr'w as "faisan" (*i.e.*, 'pheasant') [*Textes sogdiens*, pp. 70, 273]. However, although it is clear from the context that ttr'w is

some sort of bird, it is not clear which bird it may be, nor why Benveniste has selected "faisan."

13 The exact meaning of the word crpywōn is not clear. However, it is clearly parallel in construction to the word β'rywōn [Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, p. 67 (line 172)], which occurs, together with crpywōn, in a list of the nine ('chemical') ingredients which are to be compounded into a "drug" (rwrt). The first element, crp-, is probably cognate with New Persian čarb, "fat."

14 The meaning in this text of the Sogdian word 'st'wr, "horse," is based partly on context, and partly on comparison with cognate Middle Persian terms. The context requires the name of a specific animal, parallel with frog, bird, dog, and wolf, etc. In Middle Persian stōr means "horse," or "mount;" stōrbān is a "groom" or "equestrian;" stōrgāh is a "stable" [D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 77; H. S. Nyberg, *A Manual of Pahlavi: Part II: Glossary* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974), p. 181.].

15 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-26. In referring to the Sogdian text, Molnár misquotes the expression čy-kr'y mrt'y as cōw-kr'y mrt'y [p. 124] and cōw kr'y mrt'y [p. 125].

16 These works represent a genre which is, of course, analogous to the Sogdian text P3.

17 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-88.

18 *Supra* note 15.

19 Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

20 *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 125.

21 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, pp. 68-69 (lines 203-19). The term 'ššy has been discussed by N. Sims-Williams, "Indian Elements in Parthian and Sogdian," in K. Röhrborn and W. Veenker (eds.), *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983), pp. 138-39.

22 Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

23 *Ibid.*, pp. 94-96.

24 *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 102.

26 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, p. 65 (lines 128-43).

27 *Ibid.*, p. 69 (lines 221-25).

28 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 123, 99-101. In quoting Pallas' report, Molnár has foreshortened the final dhāranī [p. 100]: Um ghom dam pat pūngh ssocha should read Um ghom ghom dam dam pat pat pūngh pūngh ssoocha. Also, in one case the name Chondschin has been misprinted as Chonschin, and it would appear that an "umlaut" has been omitted: Um jadda nagara . . . should read Um jād̄da nagara . . .

- 29 Pallas, *op. cit.*, p. 349.
- 30 Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
- 31 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, pp. 61-62 (lines 50-58).
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 63 (lines 81-88).
- 33 Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
- 34 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, p. 60 (lines 21-30).
- 35 *Ibid.*, p. 59 (line 1).
- 36 These historical records are discussed in the first section, "Weather-magic in Historical Records," pp. 1-69.
- 37 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-29.
- 38 O. Pritsak, "Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morganländischen Gesellschaft* 101(1951): 278-79, 287-99; P. B. Golden, "The Karakhanids and Early Islam," in D. Sinor (ed.), *Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 354-61.
- 39 I. Guidi (ed. and tr.), *Chronica Minora, I* [Corpus scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium: Scriptores Syri, 1-2] (Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO/Durbecq, 1955-60), vol. 1, pp. 28-29, vol. 2, pp. 34-35.
- 40 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 112, 168. The section reproduced under the entry ḥajaru'l-matar in different printed editions of both the Arabic text of the 'Aǧā'ib and its Persian translation vary in length. The longest and most comprehensive Arabic text, which is a composite of the different manuscript traditions [J. Ruska, "Kazwīnīstudien," *Der Islam* 4(1913): 14-20], is the one in F. Wüstenfeld (ed.), *Zakarija Ben Muhammed Ben Mahmud el-Cazwini's Kosmographie, Part 1: Die Wunder der Schöpfung* (Wiesbaden: Dr. Martin Sändig, 1967), p. 221.
- 41 The complexity of the manuscript tradition of this particular passage has been meticulously analyzed by J. Ruska, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-33.
- 42 Wüstenfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 221; Ruska, *op. cit.*, 18-19, 23; M. F. Köprülü Zade, "Une institution magique chez les anciens Turcs: Yat," in *Actes du congrès internationale d'histoire des religions* (Paris: Librairie ancienne honoré Champion, 1925), vol. 2, pp. 446-47; Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-43.
- 43 This suggestion was made first by Köprülü Zade, *op. cit.*, pp. 447-48, and independently by Peter Zieme in a conversation which we had in Tokyo in May, or June, 1990. The manuscript tradition has bt [Ruska, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19].
- 44 Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 107.
- 45 *Supra* note 36. The latter discussion is on pp. 60-69.

46 The main omission from this inventory is one of the events reported by Bābar in the *Bābarnāma*, his autobiographical memoir [N. Ilminski (ed.), *Baber-nameh diagataice ad fidem codicis Petropolitani* (Cazani, 1857), p. 470]. In quoting Ilminski's edition of the Chaghatay text of the *Bābarnāma* [p. 53], Molnár has omitted the suffix *nī* from one passage (quščiliq vā yadačiliq hām bilür idi should read quščiliq vā yadačiliqnī hām bilür idi) and omitted a syllable from another passage (yadačilargā buyurmiz kim yada qilgaylar should read yadačilargā buyururmiz kim yada qilgaylar). Finally, note 119 refers to Roemer 1986, p. 236. However, the bibliographical entry gives this work only a page range, "pp. 189-35 [*sic!*]."

47 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 47, 50. In note 103 [p. 48] Ali-zade (ed.) 1980, pp. 64-65 should be Ali-zade (ed.) 1980, pp. 64-67. In note 108 [p. 50] the Persian verb *mī-khwāhand* no doubt should read *mī-khwānand*. Molnár also has become confused about reports in Persian historiographical works concerning the nature of this 13th century weather-magic ritual [p. 49]. Juwaynī does not report any information about the actual ritual procedure. This information is provided by the two accounts of Rašidu'd-dīn [*infra* note 48].

48 Rašidu'd-dīn Faḍlu'llāh, *Jāmi'u't-Tawārīx*, edited by B. Karīmī, 2 vols. (Tehran: Iqbāl, 1959), vol. 1, pp. 279, 457. 'Abdu'l-karīm 'Alizāda [Rašidu'd-dīn Faḍlu'llāh, *Jāmi'u't-Tawārīx*: Volume 2, Part 1 (Moscow: Idāra-yi intišārāt-i dāniš, 1980), p. 65], in editing the narrative of Tolui's campaign against the Jürchen, has selected *yjd'myšy* from among a number of manuscript variants; however, this form is more corrupt than Karīmī's *j'd'myšy* [p. 457].

49 M. Honda, "Jūsan-yonseiki no Perushiago bunken ni mietaru Mongoru-Torukogo '–mīši' naru gobi o yūsuru jutsugo [On Mongol-Turkic terms with the suffix '–mīši' in Persian sources of the 13th and 14th centuries]," *Yurashia bunka kenkyū* 1(1965): 111-12.

50 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-45, 49-50; Rašidu'd-dīn, *op. cit.*, pp. 278-79; Ḥamdu'llāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī, *Zafarnāma* (Unpublished Persian manuscript in the British Library, Or. 2833 [= Rieu, *Supplement*, No. 263]), folio 472b; Muḥammad b. Xwāwandšāh Mīrxwānd, *Ta'rīx-i Rawḍatu's-Ṣafā*, 10 vols. (Tehran: Markazī-yi Xayyām Pīrūz, 1959-60), vol. 5, pp. 35-36. In a separate study, I plan to discuss this interesting passage in the *Rawḍatu's-Ṣafā* which contains (1) the unusual technical term *yadūjiyān* [*sic!*] (probably a corruption of Mongolian *yadači*) and (2) a verse quotation from a *Zafarnāma*. Although the meter of Qazwīnī's poem and Mīrxwānd's verses is the same (*mutaqārib*), Mīrxwānd has not exactly quoted Qazwīnī's text. Nevertheless, there would seem to be a connection between the two compositions.

⁵¹ Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52; Šarafu'd-dīn 'Alī Yazdī, *Ẓafarnāma*, edited by M. 'Abbāsī, 2 vols. (Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, 1957), vol. 1, p. 78. In his paraphrase of this passage in *Rawḍatu's-Ṣafā'*, Mīrxwān has changed Yazdī's (Mongolian) term *yāda* to (Chaghatay Turkic) *yada*, and has avoided altogether Yazdī's compound verb *yāda kardand* [*op. cit.*, vol. 6, p. 32], presumably because he did not understand these words. Molnár [*op. cit.*, p. 59] has drawn attention to a parallel situation where Abu'l-*yāzī* Bahādur Xān, in a paraphrase of Rašīdu'd-dīn's account of Tolui's campaign against the Jürchen in the *Ǧāmi'u't-Tawārīx* [J. J. P. Desmaisons (ed. and tr.), *Histoire des Mogols et des Tartares, par Aboul-Ghazi Béhadour Khan*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: Academie impériale des sciences, 1871-74), vol. 1 (*Texte*), p. 138, vol. 2 (*Traduction*), p. 147], has changed Rašīdu'd-dīn's term **yadalamīši* to *yada qīl-*, again presumably due to a lack of understanding of what the term meant, not necessarily, as Molnár suggests, because he had some special familiarity with *yadačīlīq* (although that may also have been the case). In any event Abu'l-*yāzī* didn't need this personal familiarity in order to successfully evade the difficult wording of Rašīdu'd-dīn's text.

⁵² Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53; Kamālu'd-dīn 'Abdu'r-Razzāq as-Samarqandī, *Maṭla'-i sa'dayn wa maǧma'-i baḥrayn*, edited by M. Šafī', 4 vols. (Lahore: Kitābxāna-yi Gīlānī, 1941-49), vol. 2, pp. 1019-20; V. V. Bartol'd, *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, Volume 2: *Ulugh-Beg* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 167.

⁵³ Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 55; Ġiyāsu'd-dīn b. Humāmu'd-dīn Xwāndamīr, *Ta'rīx-i Ḥabību's-Siyar*, 4 vols. (Tehran: Kitābxāna-yi Xayyām, 1954), vol. 3, p. 5.

⁵⁴ *Supra* note 39.

⁵⁵ Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-45, 50.

⁵⁶ P. Zieme, "Altürkische Fragmente über den Regenstein," in A. Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-151.

⁵⁷ Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 50. In addition to the article on "rain-magic" in Yang Yü's *Shan-chü hsin-hua*, Herbert Franke has also referred to the better known parallel passage in Chapter 4 of T'ao Tsung-i's *Ch'o-keng lu* which probably depends upon the *Shan-chü hsin-hua* as its source [H. Franke, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Chinas unter der Mongolenherrschaft: Das Shan-kü sin-hua des Yang Yü* [Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 32.2] (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1956), pp. 4-5, 97n.4]. I would like to thank both Victor Mair and Wayne Schlepp for bringing the *Ch'o-keng lu* passage to my attention.

⁵⁸ Hui-chiao, "Kao sêng chuan," in J. Takakusu, K. Watanabe, and G. Ono (eds.), *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, 85 vols. (Tokyo: Society for the Publication of the Taishō

Edition of the Tripitaka, 1924-32), vol. 50, p. 385b12-15; A. F. Wright (tr.), "Fo-t'u-têng: A Biography," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11.3-4 (1948): 353.

59 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-23. See my discussion of this issue *infra*.

60 Dr. Molnár has also become confused about frogs, as well [*infra*].

61 I have discussed some aspects of the complex syncretistic background of this text in a separate paper, "A Sogdian Thaumaturgical Text from Dunhuang and the Origins of Inner Asian Weather Magic," which will appear in the series, Toronto Studies in Central and Inner Asia, edited by Michael Gervers and Wayne Schlepp. I hope to address the issue of the "Indian background" in another study on the religious and scientific background of the text.

62 These topics are discussed in the fourth section, "Types of Weather-magic in Inner Asia and Their History," pp. 117-142, and the third section, "The Linguistic Argument," pp. 104-116, respectively.

63 *Supra* note 14.

64 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, pp. 72-73 (lines 281-300). One must cook this black horse's head and, then, place eight lumps, composed of the marrow from a sheep's shoulder blade mixed together with four arcane poisons, into the four respective orifices of the horse's head. The four poisons are (white) hellebore, mūṣaka, śṛṅgī, and wṛ/x'γ, the last of unknown identity, though presumably another poisonous plant, parallel to the first three.

65 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-34. What Dr. Molnár has to say about the wide-spread importance of **water** in ritual activity which is intended to bring rain is also, of course, completely convincing, although perhaps not too surprising.

66 *Ibid.*, pp. 43-50, 128-31.

67 *Ibid.*, p. 131.

68 *Ibid.*, pp. 134-37; Zieme, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-49. In addition to following Benveniste and assuming that ttr'w means "pheasant" [*supra* note 12], Dr. Molnár has confused the order of events in the Sogdian ritual: The oṣy-kr'y mṛty does **not** mount the rxš-, or "dappled horse," in order "to call upon the wind" [Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 136]. As already noted, the prayer to the Wind [*supra* note 21; *infra* note 70] **precedes** this part of the ritual [*supra* note 10].

69 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-39.

70 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, p. 69 (lines 213-17).

71 *Ibid.*, p. 102. See the discussion of the Buddhist thaumaturge Fo-t'u-têng [*infra*].

72 Dr. Molnár's discussion of the second of these topics, the "Geographical Argument and the Early History of Rainstones in Inner Asia," is discussed in some detail in my

separate study, "A Sogdian Thaumaturgical Text from Dunhuang and the Origins of Inner Asian Weather Magic" [*supra* note 61].

73 The best modern translation and annotated commentary of the "Frog Hymn" of the *R̥gveda* [VII.103] is that of Walter H. Maurer in *Pinnacles of India's Past: Selections from the R̥gveda* [University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia, 2] (Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1986), pp. 208-11.

74 W. B. Henning, " 'Sulphur' in Sogdian," p. 69; "The Sogdian Texts of Paris," in *Selected Papers*, Volume 2 [Acta Iranica, 15] (Tehran-Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1977), p. 247.

75 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, pp. 70-71 (lines 250-51, 255-57).

76 *Ibid.*, p. 70 (lines 247-48); Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

77 *Supra* note 26.

78 A. M. Belenizki [Belenitskii], *Mittelasien: Kunst der Sogden* (Leipzig: VEB E. A. Seemann, 1980), plates 4, 55. I would like to thank Aleksandr Naymark, Indiana University, for this reference, and for drawing my attention to the fact that the sort of *nāgas* which are described in the Sogdian text P3 are actually to be found in Sogdian paintings from Sogdiana.

79 F. W. K. Müller, "Die 'persischen' Kalenderausdrücke im chinesischen Tripiṭaka," *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Classe (1907): 460-64.

80 F. W. K. Müller (ed. and tr.), *Uigurica II* [Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1910, Philosophisch-historische Classe, 3] (Berlin: Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1910), p. 84 (line 12); W. Bang and A. v. Gabain (eds. and trs.), "Türkische Turfantexte IV: Ein neues uigurisches Sündenbekenntnis," *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Classe (1930): 438-39 (line 60).

81 Kōkyō shoin, "Ta ming san-tsang fa-shu," in *Dai Nihon kōtei Daizōkyō*, 420 vols. (Tokyo: Kōkyō shoin, 1881-85), vol. 380, pp. 99v.-100r.; Müller, *Uigurica II*, pp. 84-85; Bang and v. Gabain, *op. cit.*, pp. 438-39, 447. The only other substantive discrepancy between these two lists is the **order** in which the bad activities or professions are listed.

82 Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 122. The evidence of Old Uighur texts concerning Uighur ritual activities associated with the *yadčī* are discussed by Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 137, and Zieme, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-49.

83 J. R. Hamilton has discussed the proper transcription of this Chinese loan-word in Uighur Turkic in *Le conte bouddhique du bon et du mauvais prince en version ouïgoure* [Manuscripts ouïgours de Touen-Houang, 3] (Paris: Klincksieck, 1971), p. 70.

84 *Supra* note 58.

85 Molnár, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

86 C. Bendall (ed. and tr.), "The Megha-sūtra," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1880): 286-311.

87 G. Doerfer, *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: Volume 1: Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1963), pp. 286-89.

88 *Ibid.*, p. 289.

89 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-113.

90 *Ibid.*, pp. 107, 113. The only evidence which points to a long vowel length is the orthography of Khakani and Middle Turkic forms in documents in Arabic script (y't, y'tjy (Khakani) and y'y, y'ycy (Middle Turkic), respectively). However, the orthography of the vowels of Turkic languages which are written in Arabic script must have been variable at a time before orthographic norms became set. While Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī, Ǧuwaynī, and the *Sanglax* of Muḥammad Maḥdī Xān have forms with *aleph* [Maḥmūd Ibnu'l-ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Kāšgarī, *Kitābu Dīwāni Luǧātī't-Turk*, edited by K. Rifat, 3 vols. (Istanbul: Maṭba'a-yi 'Āmira, 1917-19), vol. 3, pp. 119, 227; 'Alā'u'd-dīn 'Aṭā Malik Ǧuwaynī, *The Ta'riḫ-i-Jahān-gushā of 'Alā'u'd-dīn 'Aṭā Malik-i-Juwaynī*, edited by M. M. Qazwīnī, Part 1 ["E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series, 16] (Leiden: E. J. Brill/London: Luzac, 1912), pp. 152-53; Muḥammad Maḥdī Xān, *Sanglax: A Persian Guide to the Turkish Language*, edited by G. Clauson (London: Luzac, 1960), folios 340v. (line 26), 341r. (line 5)], al-Qazwīnī seems to attest a Khakani form spelled yt [*supra* notes 42 and 43], and Chaghatay has variant forms of yada, with or without *aleph* [W. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*, 4 vols. (The Hague: Mouton, 1960), vol. 3, p. 207]. The indiscriminate use of *aleph* can also be observed in the orthography of *ǰadalamīšī in Rašīdu'd-dīn's Ǧāmi'u't-tawārīḫ [*supra* notes 48 and 49].

91 Molnár, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-14.

92 *Ibid.* The association of the Middle Iranian language of Khotan with the Sakas was first established by H. Lüders, "Die Śakas und die 'nordarische' Sprache," *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe* (1913): 406-27.

93 R. E. Emmerick, "Khotanese and Tumshuqese," in R. Schmitt (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum* (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1989), pp. 213-14; *Saka*

Grammatical Studies [London Oriental Series, 20] (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 322-25.

⁹⁴ The nominative singular of *ǰādua- would have been *ǰādū. All case forms of this declension feature a labial vowel [Emmerick, *Saka Grammatical Studies*, pp. 322-25].

⁹⁵ The exact point in time when the guttural consonant of this class of nominal and adjectival stems was lost in Khotanese is not known. However, examples of loan-words which were borrowed from Sanskrit and subsequently underwent the same phonetic development (loss of intervocalic guttural /k/), such as anulomia-, “conformable,” which was borrowed by Khotanese from Sanskrit anulomika- [R. E. Emmerick, “The Ten New Folios of Khotanese,” *Asia Major* (n.s.) 13.1-2 (1967): 5, 18, 25; *The Book of Zambasta: A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism* [London Oriental Series, 21] (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 38-39, 110-11], prove that the *terminus post quem* for this linguistic change must be the beginning of the massive borrowing of (Buddhist) Sanskrit (technical) vocabulary into Khotanese. Most likely, this corresponded with the widespread advent of Sarvāstivādin missionary activity in Eastern Iran (Marv), Central Asia, and China, which can be dated to the second half of the 4th century C.E. [D. A. Utz, “Aršak, Parthian Buddhists, and ‘Iranian’ Buddhism” (Unpublished paper presented at the conference, “Buddhism Across Boundaries: The Sources of Chinese Buddhism,” Hsi Lai University [January 3-6, 1993]); Ch’en, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81, 101-02]. Therefore, the change of hypothetical *ǰāduka- > *ǰādua- would not have taken place before the middle of the 4th century C.E.

⁹⁶ Ch. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961), pp. 1283-84. Bartholomae cites only one passage in which Avestan yātav- means “Zauberei,” as opposed to “Zauberer.” However, this must be an anomaly. The continuation of Old Iranian *yātu- in Middle Iranian languages (Middle Persian and Sogdian) means “sorcerer, magician” (Middle Persian ǰādūg [D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 46] and Sogdian y’twq [F. W. K. Müller and W. Lentz (eds. and trs.), “Soghdische Texte II,” *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Classe (1934): 601], y’twkh [Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, p. 277]), not “sorcery, magic” (which are Middle Persian ǰādūgīh [MacKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 46] and Sogdian y’twknhyh [Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, p. 277]). Molnár’s Sogdian y’twk, “magic,” [p. 113] does not exist. Even in the pre-modern period New Persian ǰādū still refers to the person, not the activity (ǰādū’ī) [Qazwīnī, *Zafarnāma*, folio 472b]. Molnár’s exposition of his “linguistic argument” suffers not only from serious misconceptions concerning Iranian linguistic forms, but also from an unusually large number of careless mistakes of detail, which cannot be enumerated

in a short space. However, his discussion of “Indo-Iranian yātuka” [pp. 114, 140] requires some special attention. First of all, *yātuka- is not an Indo-Iranian stem, but a hypothetical proto-Middle Iranian stem, as in the hypothetical proto-Khotanese series previously discussed. On page 114 Molnár has written: “Benveniste already recognized that though ṣy° means ‘charme magique’, on phonetic grounds it could not be explained as a continuation of *Ilr. yātuka*, which otherwise occurs in the same text several times in the expected form as *y’twk*.” In point of fact, the two references which Molnár provides to *Textes sogdiens* (notes 317 and 318) indicate no such thing, and this entire statement is completely nonsensical.

97 Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, pp. 60 (line 24), 65 (line 123), 69 (line 231), 70 (line 240).

98 In my paper, “A Sogdian Thaumaturgical Text from Dunhuang and the Origins of Inner Asian Weather Magic” [*supra* note 61], I propose an alternative non-Turkic origin which, I think, poses fewer objections.

§§§

Being-in-the-Way

A Review of *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, Graham Parkes, ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 282 pages (paperback 1990)

Taylor Carman
Barnard College

Bryan Van Norden
Vassar College

1 Introduction

Some time following the publication of his 1927 magnum opus, *Being and Time*, Heidegger grew more and more inclined to the kind of historicism that regards philosophy itself as “its own time comprehended in thought,” as Hegel put it.¹ Unlike Hegel, though, Heidegger saw the history of philosophy not as the progressive self-realization of spirit, but as Western civilization’s ever-deepening forgetfulness or oblivion of being. For Heidegger, the history of metaphysics amounts to a history of eclipses or withdrawals of being behind various explicit interpretations of the nature of entities. The understanding of being that currently reigns in modern industrialized society, though still tacitly, is a technological interpretation of entities as pure resource material (*Bestand*), available on demand for manipulation and exploitation, but inconspicuous in its very accessibility. Heidegger regarded this technological understanding of being as at once the most dangerous and the most decisive epoch in the history of metaphysics, for the sheer immanence of things made increasingly available by technological means tends to obscure the fact that we live with an interpretation of being at all; however, in so doing, it also promises the possibility of our coming to realize that we do.

Given this interpretation of Western philosophy, it is understandable that Heidegger would occasionally entertain the notion that intellectual traditions in the East might afford some hint of what awaits us once we step outside the circle of metaphysics and the technological understanding of being. In what was perhaps his most enthusiastic moment, upon reading a book by D. T. Suzuki, Heidegger is reported to have said, “If I understand this man correctly, this is what I have been trying to say in all my writings.”² On another

¹ G. W. F. Hegel, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1970), 26.

² See W. Barrett, “Zen for the West,” in *Zen Buddhism: Selected Writings of D.T. Suzuki*, W. Barrett, ed. (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956), xi.

occasion, in the summer of 1946, Heidegger undertook a collaborative translation of the *Tao Te Ching* with a Chinese scholar, Paul Shih-yi Hsiao, who recounts the story in his contribution to the present volume of essays. As it turned out, Hsiao and Heidegger had settled on renderings of only eight of the 81 chapters by the end of the summer, after which Hsiao politely withdrew from the project. He reports feeling “a slight anxiety” (98) about how far Heidegger was departing from the text, something he is famous for doing in his readings of Western philosophers too.³ Heidegger’s conversations and seminars contain other passing references to Taoist texts, and one of his most famous works, *On the Way to Language*, begins with “A Dialogue on Language (between a Japanese and an Inquirer).”⁴

These interesting but inconclusive incidents were the inspiration for a symposium on “Heidegger and Eastern Thought,” held in 1969 at the University of Hawaii, and they are the motivation of the present volume edited by Graham Parkes. Tellingly, however, one of Heidegger’s last and most interesting remarks about the relation between Eastern and Western thought does not appear in the book at all. In his famous 1966 interview with the German magazine, *Der Spiegel*, Heidegger said:

I am convinced that a change can only be prepared from the same place in the world where the modern technological world originated. It cannot come about by the adoption of Zen Buddhism or other Eastern experiences of the world. The help of the European tradition and a new appropriation of that tradition are needed for a change in thinking. Thinking will only be transformed by a thinking that has the same origin and destiny. [The technological world] ... must be superseded (*aufgehoben*) in the Hegelian sense, not removed, superseded, but not by human beings alone.⁵

Far more than any of the foregoing texts, we want to suggest, this is the passage that represents Heidegger’s most deeply felt and most carefully considered assessment of the predicament of Western philosophy vis-à-vis Asian thought.

It is not insignificant that Heidegger was fascinated with Taoist and Zen thinking. On the other hand, Heidegger had and maintained a highly internal interpretation of the tradition to which he himself belonged, and his interest in things Eastern rather pales in

³ Unmarked page references in the text are to the book under review.

⁴ Heidegger, *On the Way to Language*, P. D. Hertz, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1971). Hereafter *OWL*.

⁵ In *Martin Heidegger and National Socialism: Questions and Answers*, G. Neske and E. Kettering, eds., L. Harries, trans. (New York: Paragon House, 1990), 62-63 (translation modified).

comparison with his immersion in things Western. Heidegger claims to describe and interpret what he calls the “history of being” only in metaphysical cultures that have articulated a unified, or even totalizing conception of what it means to be. It is unfortunate, then, that the authors featured in *Heidegger and Asian Thought* seem to elide or ignore the pervasively Western orientation of Heidegger’s philosophy, not to mention his own evident skepticism concerning the prospects of any synthesis of Asian and European thought. Moreover, the book’s contributors seem to us to underestimate the difficulties facing such comparative scholarship at the outset, and the book suffers as a result.

Heidegger frequently expressed doubts about whether thinkers in very different cultures were really in a position to understand one another. Indeed he voiced his doubts to the organizers of the Honolulu conference itself (12-13).⁶ Nevertheless Parkes’ introduction and nearly all the essays that follow, including his own, sidestep a number of basic methodological problems. Parkes avers that “comparative philosophy is most fruitful between unconnected philosophies” (2), only to retreat in a brief interlude later in the book to the much less daring observation that although “the Western and East Asian houses of Being are set apart,” nonetheless “one can, with time and effort, come to feel at home in another house” (216). But while the first proposition is dubious, the second is trivial. Much of the book seems to rest on the assumption that “overcoming metaphysics” must go hand-in-hand with a closer approximation to Eastern philosophical sensibilities. But there is scant evidence that Heidegger himself ever thought so. In fact, in the passage from the *Spiegel* interview quoted above he denies it explicitly. The prospect of “superseding” our current technological understanding of being holds no promise whatever that Western post-metaphysical thinking will bear any resemblance to cultural traditions that were to all appearances never metaphysical or technological to begin with.

Finally, the ambitious title of the anthology itself betrays a lack of focus. “Asian thought” is a broad category indeed, covering the intellectual histories of several great traditions in India, China, and Japan, not to mention others that the book neglects entirely. While the authors in the volume are generally careful to limit their discussions to either Indian, Chinese, or Japanese contexts, they show less care in distinguishing among thinkers and concepts internal to any one of them. And yet there is significant variety and discord within those traditions. Chu Hsi (1130-1200) does not simply recapitulate the thought of Mencius (4th century B.C.), and in spite of their many similarities the *Chuang-tzu* (c. 300 B.C.) and the *Tao Te Ching* are subtly yet crucially different. Finally, Zen and Ch’an Buddhism were influenced by but not identical with the early Taoist tradition. Any

⁶ See also “A Dialogue on Language,” in *OWL*, 3.

paths the authors purport to find or forge between Heidegger and the East would look far more passable if the points on their map had been more precisely drawn from the outset.

Having said this, one cannot but be struck by certain parallels between Heidegger and the early Taoist tradition. According to Otto Pöggeler's article — one of the anthology's best — Heidegger himself confided that, notwithstanding his interaction with Japanese scholars over the years, he "had learned more from Chinese" (50). It is undoubtedly Taoism that promises the most significant points of contact with Heidegger's anti-mentalist, anti-subjectivist conception of human existence and practice. Other essays in the volume that touch on this potentially fruitful philosophical affinity unfortunately fail to shed much light on it.

Before making a few remarks on the subject ourselves, however, we shall begin by discussing two other groups of essays in the book. The collection itself bites off a bit more than it can chew, so our survey will be admittedly selective. On the one hand there are several articles that treat of the Japanese reception of Heidegger's philosophy, either historically or systematically. On the other hand there are the more speculative articles that attempt — with varying degrees of implausibility — to use Heideggerian and Asian texts as vehicles to lead us out of the maze of Western philosophy altogether. To conclude, we shall return to the relation between Heideggerian and Taoist themes, and the question concerning what unites and divides them.

2 Heidegger, the Japanese, and metaphysics

In his "Reflections on Two Addresses by Martin Heidegger," Keiji Nishitani comments eloquently on the impossibility of mediating between traditions as removed from one another as Buddhism and Christianity on the basis of either pure conceptuality or religious dogma, alternatives that tend to be, respectively, either misleadingly transparent or in principle opaque. Nishitani advocates instead moving to "some deeper plane," where man "is thoroughly bare" (146):

in the innermost kernel of man's mind ... through candid self-exposure to the deep complexities of the actual world ... That would mean, in truth, to delve into the basis of existence itself through and through until we reach the hidden source (147).

Nishitani has put his finger on an interesting parallel between the image of Christ as "the son of man" and the Buddha's exhortation to "transcend all attachments." And these themes

resonate with some of Heidegger's own talk of anxiety and man's essential homelessness in the world.

But it is at this point that one wants to know more specifically what the deeper plane, the innermost kernel, and the "bare man" amount to. Such formulations could be genuinely Heideggerian only with the added claim that there are no bare facts about human beings beneath our clothing of self-interpretation, and that human beings are in one sense "at home" in the world precisely by carrying on that — albeit groundless — self-interpretive activity. Since Nishitani does not articulate this point explicitly, he has difficulty locating the relevance of Heidegger's philosophy outside the context of the confrontation between Christianity and Buddhism. The point is crucial, however, since Heidegger was adamant about sharply distinguishing philosophy from religion, or ontology from what he called "onto-theology."

Yasuo Yuasa offers a very interesting history of "The Encounter of Modern Japanese Philosophy with Heidegger." The article covers more material than we can discuss here, but there is one point that deserves special notice. Western readers brought up in the European philosophical tradition are typically struck by the way in which Heidegger tried to break out of the individualism inherent in Cartesian-Kantian epistemology. Rather than attempt to justify the knowledge claims of an isolated subject, Heidegger describes the way in which knowledge itself is founded on social practices carried out in a shared world constituted by anonymous public norms. Whether one views these innovations as compelling or implausible, the contrast to the subjectivist tradition is clear.

It is fascinating, then, that Kiyoshi Miki and Tetsurō Watsuji, students of German philosophy and original thinkers in their own right, both found *Being and Time* disturbingly egocentric. One is stunned to read that in his 1930 essay on "Heidegger's Ontology,"

Miki goes on to criticize Heidegger by contending that his philosophy cannot be "contemporary" because his [notion of] *Dasein* remains in the standpoint of individual subjective life without a social aspect (160).

Miki also criticized Heidegger for straying "from that which is Greek to what is originally Christian." One gathers from Yuasa's account that what Miki often took to be Heidegger's position was in fact Kierkegaard's. Yuasa says convincingly that "The discrepancy between Heidegger's and Miki's concerns is clearly manifest" (*ibid.*), and that in the case of his own original contributions to the philosophy of history, "the sophisticated terminologies favored in German philosophy obscure Miki's intent" (164).

Watsuji, too, concluded that Heidegger's "*Dasein* was the *Dasein* of the individual only. He treated human existence in the world as being the existence of an individual (*hito*). ... he did not advance beyond an abstraction of a single aspect (167)."⁷ According to Watsuji, Yuasa tells us,

Heidegger treated the mode of being-in-the-world only from the aspect of temporality and took lightly the aspect of spatiality. ... *Dasein* is grasped with an emphasis on its individuality and without sufficiently considering the social relationship between the self and others (169).

That Heidegger placed too much emphasis on time at the expense of space is an intriguing if somewhat inchoate idea, and Yuasa's own discussion makes it seem at least plausible. Yuasa is right to point out, however, that as a criticism it is undermined by much of Heidegger's later work, according to which the technological understanding of being levels the distinction between nearness and farness (television being one of Heidegger's favorite examples). As Yuasa correctly observes, Watsuji's own philosophical concern with the phenomena of climate and geography has much more in common with the *Annales* historians than with Heidegger. In the end, as in the case of Miki, "his system differs completely in substance from Heidegger's thought, in spite of the fact that he employs a seemingly Heideggerian terminology" (169). These cases, then, seem to confirm Heidegger's suspicion that Japanese thinkers might lose their voice in the foreign idiom of German philosophy, his own especially.

In "A Dialogue on Language," Heidegger tempers his notion of "overcoming metaphysics" by characterizing it as "neither a destruction nor even a denial of metaphysics. To intend anything else would be childish presumption and a demeaning of history."⁸ It is an unfortunate habit of some scholars of European philosophy that they often underestimate their attachment to the intellectual history from which they would like to declare independence. But as Heidegger himself suggests, if overcoming a tradition is possible at all, one must remain peculiarly indebted to the tradition into which one is originally thrown. As we have said, it is a general weakness of the present anthology that it underestimates the weight, perhaps the impenetrability, of tradition. The contributions of Graham Parkes, Joan Stambaugh, and David Levin are particularly ambivalent about the metaphysical

⁷ From a quoted passage of Watsuji's *Climate and Culture: A Philosophical Study*, Geoffrey Bownas, trans. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), preface.

⁸ *OWL*, 20.

tradition as it bears upon Heidegger's thinking, and of the peculiar way in which Heidegger venerated that tradition while at once criticizing it to the core.

The volume might strike some readers as overwhelmingly Heideggerian in style and content, but this is rather a misleading appearance. The true inspiration behind the philosophical content of many of the essays is not Heidegger but Derrida, whose name is hardly mentioned. Many of the authors habitually conflate Heidegger's *Destruktion* of ontology with Derrida's concept of deconstruction, which is significantly different.⁹ For whereas Heidegger early on sought simply to "destroy" traditional ontology by tracing familiar metaphysical notions back to practical, existential contexts, Derrida attempts to show all texts, and *a fortiori* all metaphysical discourse, to be in principle indeterminate, undecidable, and self-undermining.¹⁰

3 Heidegger and the Taoists

Finally, we would like to explore very briefly a few of the most promising connections that might obtain between Heidegger and the Taoists, Chuang-tzu and Lao-tzu. Otto Pöggeler's essay, though it often wanders well off the subject, offers the most substantial textual support for the various possible influences and analogies.

In chapter 17 of the *Chuang-tzu*, Chuang-tzu remarks on the happiness of some fish he sees swimming in a river. His companion Hui Shih puts forward a challenge: "You are not a fish. Whence do you know that the fish are happy?" Chuang-tzu replies, famously, "You aren't me, whence do you know that I don't know the fish are happy?"¹¹ Heidegger is known to have been fond of this passage and to have read aloud from it in 1930 during a discussion of intersubjectivity and empathy (Pöggeler, 52). It is easier to see what divides Heidegger and Chuang-tzu than what unites them, however, since, as Pöggeler says, the moral of the story has to do with "the universal sympathy which joins together all the

⁹ Cf. Jung, 217, 237, and Levin, 256.

¹⁰ For a discussion of the similarities and (perhaps more important) differences between Derrida and the Taoist Chuang-tzu, see Mark Berkson, "Language: The Guest of Reality -- Zhuangzi and Derrida on Language, Reality, and Skillfulness," in Paul Kjellberg and Philip J. Ivanhoe, eds., *Essays on Skepticism, Relativism, and Ethics in the Zhuangzi* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1996), 97-126.

¹¹ *Chuang-tzu: The Inner Chapters*, A. C. Graham, ed. and trans. (Boston: Unwin Paperbacks, 1986), 123.

things of nature — such as men and fishes” (53). For Heidegger, on the contrary, other living creatures are “separated from our ek-sistent essence by an abyss.”¹²

Or consider chapter 11 of the *Lao-tzu*.¹³

Clay is molded to make a pot
In its emptiness [lit., nothing]
Is the usefulness of the pot.¹⁴

In what might appear to be a strikingly analogous passage, Heidegger describes a jug as a paradigmatic “thing,” that is, an artifact that holds human practices together and makes them intelligible. He writes:

When we fill the jug, the pouring that fills it flows into the empty jug. The emptiness, the void, is what does the vessel’s holding. The empty space, this nothing of the jug, is what the jug is as the holding vessel. ... But if the holding is done by the jug’s void, then the potter who forms sides and bottom on his wheel does not, strictly speaking, make the jug. He only shapes the clay. No — he shapes the void. ... The vessel’s thingness does not lie at all in the material of which it consists, but in the void that holds.¹⁵

The point of this passage is that we cannot understand what a “thing” is, in Heidegger’s special sense of the word, by means of a mental representation of the object as “occurrent” (*vorhanden*), that is, as a substance with properties. Heidegger may be alluding to Lao-tzu here, but the fact that he chooses the jug as an example is not essential to his point. The jug merely provides a vivid illustration of a general point about the role of focal practices in human understanding. The *Tao Te Ching*, by contrast, shows almost no philosophical interest in the relationship between mental representation and understanding. The notion that the potter merely “shapes the void,” however, draws attention to the peculiar passivity that Heidegger takes to be essential to human productivity in general. The importance of passivity is indeed a Taoist theme as well, and this parallel warrants further study.

¹² Heidegger, “Letter on Humanism,” in *Basic Writings*, D. F. Krell (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 206.

¹³ Cf. Pöggeler, 61, and Parkes, 120-121.

¹⁴ Translations from the *Tao Te Ching* are by Bryan Van Norden.

¹⁵ Heidegger, “The Thing,” in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, A. Hofstadter, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 169.

Chapter 15 of the *Lao-tzu* is of particular interest since, upon Heidegger's request, his would-be co-translator, Paul Shih-yi Hsiao, wrote out two of its lines as a gift of decorative calligraphy (cf. 100, 102-3). The lines read, literally:

Who is able to settle the turbid [so that] it gradually becomes clear?

Who is able to stimulate the peaceful [so that] it gradually comes alive?¹⁶

With Hsiao's assistance, Heidegger translated these lines as follows:

Wer kann still sein and aus der Stille durch sie auf den Weg bringen (be-wegen)
etwas so, daß es zum Erscheinen kommt?

Wer vermag es, stillend etwas so ins Sein zu bringen?

(Who can be still and out of the stillness, through it, bring (move) something along
the way so that it becomes manifest?

Who is able, through stillness, to bring something into being?)

In the first line, Heidegger's phrase, "bring (move) something along the way," is entirely his own interpolation, and he has replaced "clear" with "manifestation" or "appearance" (*Erscheinen*). The fluid metaphor that is invoked by the word "turbid" (*cho*) is thereby dropped altogether. In the second line Heidegger replaces "alive" with "being," which again reflects his own ontological concerns and perhaps a desire to avoid connotations of vitalism or *Lebensphilosophie*. The nearest point of contact between Heidegger and the *Tao Te Ching* in all this is undoubtedly the term *tao* itself. This is why, in spite of the lack of textual justification, Heidegger inserts *Weg* and *be-wegen* into the first line.

Finally, it is useful to consider Heidegger's apparent fondness for chapter 18: "When the great *tao* falls into disuse, there are humanheartedness and righteousness" (75). According to the *Tao Te Ching*, the true *tao* is not to be identified with righteousness in the

¹⁶ This translation deletes the character *chui* in order to restore the parallelism of the two sentences. The Ma-wang-tui manuscripts (to which Heidegger did not have access) have an interestingly different version: "If one settles the turbid it gradually becomes clear. If one stimulates the peaceful it gradually comes alive." These have a somewhat more prosaic tone. Robert Henricks translates the second sentence from the Ma-wang-tui text as, "If you bring something to rest *in order to* move it, it gradually comes alive," which is syntactically possible and rather more interesting. See Henricks, trans., *Lao-tzu: Te-Tao Ching* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1989), 216, emphasis added.

sense of self-conscious cultivation of ethical correctness or ritual.¹⁷ Equally, for Heidegger, human understanding and practice are essentially situational and context-dependent, always outrunning abstract principles purporting to apply generalized conceptions of human nature or moral goodness to all situations, in all settings.

This opposition between the *tao* and moral correctness raises what is perhaps the most conspicuous theme common to Heideggerians, Taoists, and even Confucians, namely, craftsmanship as a paradigm of authentic human activity. A craftsman does not rely on rules, representations, or deliberate intentions in carrying out skilled action. To use Heidegger's own example from *Being and Time*, one does not confront a hammer as a bare object with properties but rather as equipment already familiar and integrated into one's practical activities. Very similar craftsmanship metaphors are to be found throughout Taoist and Confucian texts.

As Pöggeler points out in this connection, however, "In the far East Lao-tzu is not Confucius" (75). Confucians generally maintain that ritual and ethics are crucial to human cultivation. Hsün-tzu, moreover, believed that ethical perfection can only be the result of years of ritual practice, reading canonical literature and studying under a teacher. Taoists like Lao-tzu, by contrast, emphasize the return to a state of simplicity before the development of ritual. One is reminded of the early Heidegger: ethics, understood as the formulation of general rules of conduct or character, goes against the grain of authentic action precisely because of its insistence upon self-consciousness, as opposed to intuition and skill.

Chuang-tzu goes further in this direction than Heidegger, however, since he seems to advocate unselfconscious craft-activity as an end in itself. For him, enlightenment consists in overcoming reflectivity altogether. Sages achieving this condition, while not concerned with bettering the world, are at any rate harmless; they injure no one while carving ox carcasses, catching cicadas, or swimming down waterfalls.¹⁸ Heidegger, by contrast, places no special premium on harmlessness or tranquility. Authentic action, for him, does not aim at achieving an indifferent attitude toward death, but rather an active acceptance of finitude and the anxiety attending it. Contrary to the tenor of much Asian thought, Heidegger's philosophy almost never envisages an equalization or homogenization of

¹⁷ For more on this point, and on the *Tao Te Ching* in general, see Philip J. Ivanhoe and Mark Csikszentmihalyi, eds., *Essays on Religious and Philosophical Aspects of the Laozi* (forthcoming).

¹⁸ On this point, see Philip J. Ivanhoe, "Zhuangzi on Skepticism, Skill and the Ineffable Tao," *Journal of the American Academy of Religions* 61:4 (1993), 639-654, and Bryan W. Van Norden, "Competing Interpretations of the Inner Chapters," *Philosophy East and West*, 46:2 (April 1996), 247-268.

anxiety-causing oppositions, for example between human beings and the world of things, or between life and death. If Heidegger undermines such dualisms on a metaphysical level, it is only by way of preserving many of their dramatic implications in existential contexts.

3 Conclusion

The goal of encouraging greater philosophical dialogue between East and West is very worthwhile. Indeed, it is arguably an essential goal at this juncture in world history. Furthermore, many mainstream philosophers have been less than enthusiastic in promoting this goal.¹⁹ This leaves those of us who wish to encourage the study of non-Western and comparative philosophy a difficult but important task. However, as the volume we have reviewed demonstrates, we must be careful not to jump to glib conclusions about the similarities and differences between Western and non-Western philosophy. As the old proverb says, "We must not mistake the beating of our own heart for the sound of approaching hoofbeats."

§§§

Beijing Daxue Nanya Yanjiusuo [Peking University Institute for South Asian Studies], ed. *Zhongguo zaiji zhong Nanya shiliao huibian* (*Collection of South Asian Historical Materials from Chinese Sources*). 2 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1995. 5 + 2 + 3 + 1,240 pages.

¹⁹ On these points, see the letter to the editor by Bryan W. Van Norden in the *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, November 1996.

Indian historians have long been annoyed by the scarcity of written historical materials. Foreign accounts, especially Chinese texts, have become important supplementary sources for the study of Indian history. However, scholars who wish to search out such materials face great difficulties. Classical Chinese is not an easy language, and classical Chinese literature is a vast ocean. Therefore, only the few famous Chinese works which have been translated into English, such as the book by Xuanzang, have been available to historians of pre-modern India. Consequently, a recent work compiled by the Peking University Institute for South Asian Studies under the editorship of Geng Yinzheng and published by the Shanghai Classical Chinese Publisher (Guji Chubanshe) is good news for historians. This is a collection of information from many different kinds of literature, excluding the few major well-known works. Because Chinese and South Asian peoples had frequent interactions during the last two thousand years, references to South Asian countries and peoples exist in many different kinds of Chinese literature -- official histories, histories written by private authors, anecdotes; literary writings including prose, poetry, fiction and folklore; writings on science and technology, including medicine and botany; writings about fine arts, including music, dance and other performing arts, and descriptions of paintings and sculptures; writings on geography, including maps and tourist accounts; most important, Buddhist literature and accounts about Buddhism. The present collection includes pieces of information from all the above mentioned types of Chinese sources, thus it must be considered the most comprehensive collection so far.

This 1,240 page book is divided into two volumes. The items are arranged chronologically. The first volume includes sources dated from the Han Dynasties (206 B.C. - A.D. 220) to the Five Dynasties (A.D. 907 - 960); the second volume includes sources from the Song Dynasty (960 - 1279) to 1840. The compilers of this collection promise two more volumes. The third volume will include sources after 1840, and the fourth will search out information from inscriptions. Within the framework of one dynasty or one historical period, the items are arranged by source works, often starting with official histories, followed by various other types of texts. To help the reader locate place names and personal names, the compilers provide two indexes, which make the present work far superior to other collections of Chinese sources. The indexes would have been more more efficient and easy to use, however, if they had been arranged according to Pinyin romanization rather than according to the time-consuming and confusing method of total stroke counts of head characters subdivided by the types of initial strokes.

In spite of relative success in searching out information about South Asia, the collection is still not complete. The compilers deliberately excluded a kind of information

which might be interesting to historians. That is the information about “magic, causality and retribution, and other superstitions.” (p.3) “Superstitious behavior” may seem senseless for a modern rational mind, but it certainly tells historians about the religious life of ancient peoples. Actually, there are quite a few references to Indian religious figures performing rituals or sorcery in Chinese literature. Had this kind of story been included in the collection, surely another volume would have had to be added.

Meanwhile, the existing two volumes already raise many questions for scholars. First of all, the compiler-editors do not provide notes for place names, because “the historical geography of South Asia is another special field.” (p.4) In spite of numerous publications in this field, many South Asian place names in Chinese texts still cannot be identified for certain. Thus the compilers consider that it is better to leave questions open rather than to misguide the reader.

Therefore, scholars who wish to take advantage of this collection will confront the tremendous challenge of identifying place names transcribed in ancient Chinese with actual places in South Asia. The language in which the place names are recorded is also a great challenge in and of itself. Although one may say that all the records in question are quoted in Classical Chinese, the literary works in the collection were written in different periods and in different genres. Transcriptions of proper names and translations of concepts change with time. In fact, in order to help most scholars outside China benefit from the collection, an edited English translation is necessary. At the same time, all of us who know the value of the collection also understand that the translation is too huge a project to be accomplished by a single scholar. Nevertheless, with all the precious historical materials in it, a joint project of translation by scholars from different countries might be worthwhile.

Xinru Liu
Institute of World History
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

Note: the next 23 reviews below are by the editor.

Ronald E. Emmerick and Edwin G. Pulleyblank. *A Chinese Text in Central Asian Brahmi Script: New Evidence for the Pronunciation of Late Middle Chinese and Khotanese*. Serie Orientale Roma, LXIX. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1993. 80 pages + 8 plates.

In this small volume, the authors go over a famous Tun-huang manuscript that has been studied repeatedly during the past sixty odd years since 1937 when F. W. Thomas first published it. The manuscript consists of invocation prayers of the *Vajracchedikâ-sûtra*. Since the matching Chinese text has also been discovered by Walter Simon (announced in 1958), scholars have been afforded the rare opportunity of a close comparison of the phonology of mid- to late-10th-century Khotanese and Kansu Corridor Sinitic. Other scholars who have made outstanding contributions to the study of the Brahmi manuscript are H. W. Bailey, S. Mizutani, B. Csongor, and -- most recently and notably -- T. Takata, with whom the authors take issue on numerous key points.

The volume consists of a transcription of the Brahmi text with corresponding Chinese characters, a translation of the text arrived at with the assistance of L. Hurvitz, a Chinese-Brahmi index, a discussion of words of Indian origin, a lengthy disquisition on the values of the Brahmi letters in Khotanese and their equivalents in Late Middle Sinitic, the representation of finals classified by rhyme groups, discussion of an earlier Chinese loanword in Khotanese, summary of the proposed Late Khotanese values of the Brahmi letters, and an appendix on T. Takata's study of alphabetic transcriptions of Chinese from Dunhuang, a brief but serviceable bibliography, a Brahmi-Chinese index, and photographic plates of the Brahmi manuscript. One might have appreciated more information about the contents of the manuscript and the use to which it was put in religious practice, but Pulleyblank's obsession with phonology has ensured that none of that is touched upon in the book.

In a nutshell, the main thrust of the present work, which sets it off from all previous investigations of the manuscript, is the obvious attempt it makes to justify Edwin Pulleyblank's reconstructions of Late Middle Sinitic. In the process, Pulleyblank appears to have convinced his colleague, Ronald Emmerick, to revise his (and the field's) understanding of Late Khotanese phonology to make it seem more like Pulleyblank's brand of Late Middle Chinese. If anything, one might have expected the opposite, namely that the Khotanese Brahmi transcription should have helped us Sinologists to make more precise our reconstructions of Late Middle Sinitic. Because we know fairly well the phonetic (if not always the phonemic) sound values of the Khotanese Brahmi alphabet, whereas trying to determine the sound values of Chinese characters through internal

reconstruction is highly problematic, it seems strange (if not perverse) to employ the latter to specify the former. Pulleyblank, however, has supreme confidence in his ability to extract from the *Qieyun* (*Tonic Rhymes*) the precise phonetic values of the Chinese characters. Yet the entire *Qieyun* system may be an artificial construct, a compromise designed to accommodate several Sinitic dialects / languages, and not a specific and accurate representation of any single language at the time when it was codified. On the other hand, it certainly does not represent *all* of the Sinitic languages operative circa 600 CE when it was compiled; much less can it serve as a reliable guide to the reconstruction of 10th-century Sinitic languages.

Pulleyblank's quarrel with Takata has to do with the latter's supposition that the Brahmi transcription reflects a northwest variety of Sinitic, whereas Pulleyblank believes that it is closer to standard Chinese of the 10th century (i.e., a type of Chinese that is compatible with his view of the *Qieyun*). While Pulleyblank's motivation is obvious (viz., to justify his *Qieyun*-based reconstructions), one would more naturally expect that a Khotanese Brahmi transcription that was found at Dunhuang would be based upon the local pronunciation rather than that of the Central Plains.

Pulleyblank also tries to sweep under the rug Shao Rongfen's masterful article on loan graphs in Dunhuang *bianwen*. From this article, we can deduce the sound classes of the northwest dialects. It is absolutely clear from Shao's data that the so-called *sheshang* initials and the palatal (i.e., *zhaosan*) initials had merged in the northwest dialects of late medieval Shazhou (or, following Takata, Hexi) times and that the *zhao'er* series was still independent, all contradicting the setup in Pulleyblank's Late Middle Chinese. Whatever the validity of this Late Middle Chinese, the northwest dialects cannot have been of that type, regardless of what actual phonetic values one thinks the sound classes had. Pulleyblank tries to shift the reader's attention by starting out his discussion with the problem of how to interpret the Tibetan transcriptions of this period, but this is a diversionary tactic. It is necessary to confront Shao's material directly. Since Pulleyblank seems unwilling to do so, he also mistakenly insists that the *yu* ("fish") rhyme (Karlgren's *-jwo*) was unrounded in the early northwest, yet South Coblin and Seishi Karashima, who have both carefully examined Shao's data, independently arrived at the conclusion that the final was rounded.

Such are the difficulties into which one falls when one puts models ahead of actual data.

YIN Binyong and SU Peicheng, eds. *Kexuede pingjia Hanyu hanzi [Scientifically Appraise Sinitic and Sinographs]*. Zhongguo yuwen xiandaihua congshu (Chinese Language Modernization Series), 1. Peking: Huayu Jiaoxue Chubanshe (Sinolingua), 1994. ii + 4 + 247 pages.

The front cover design of this book separates each syllable of the title as follows: KE XUE DE PING JIA HAN YU HAN ZI. Since it was written and compiled by people who are familiar with Pinyin romanization and its proper orthography, this is a most annoying and embarrassing way to present their work to the world. Aside from this horrendous error on its cover, however, the volume is a successful broadside against the flashy and ubiquitous publications of XU Dejiang, YUAN Xiaoyuan, AN Zijie, and the other well-heeled members of the influential lobby which nonsensically claim that Chinese characters are superior to alphabetical scripts, that Chinese linguistics is superior to Western linguistics, that Sinitic and the sinographs are more "scientific" than Western languages and scripts, that the 21st century will belong to Sinitic and to the sinographs, and so forth.

The book's own abstract reads as follows:

This book is a collection of essays written both in China and abroad over the last decade researching and discussing Chinese language and Chinese characters from the different perspectives of linguistics, writing systems, psychology, education, and information theory. These essays examine Chinese language and Chinese characters scientifically and objectively, while at the same time criticising some currently popular but erroneous views on this subject.

The English "Table of Contents" is as follows:

1. LÜ Shuxiang, "Thoughts on Character Writing Errors"
2. ZHANG Zhigong, "The Need for Further, Multifaceted Research on Chinese Characters"
3. ZHOU Youguang, "The Technical and Artistic Nature of Chinese Characters"
4. WEN Wu, "Some Fundamental Questions Concerning the Evaluation of Chinese Characters"

5. NIE Hongyin, "The Present and Future of Chinese Characters in Terms of the Historical Development of Writing Systems"
6. XING Gongwan, "Chinese Characters Have No 'Distinctive Function'"
7. JIANG Zhongren, "Mystical Chinese Characters and Mystical Theories"
8. WU Tieping, "Can the Center of World Research on World Language Writing Systems Shift over to China?"
9. SU Peicheng, "Dissecting 'On the Scientific Nature of Chinese Language and Chinese Characters'"
10. REN Zhen, "The 'Brevity' of Chinese Characters Is an Illusion"
11. WANG Kaiyang, "Doubts About the Superiority of Chinese Characters"
12. WU Zhenguo, "Comments on 'The Superiority of Chinese Characters'"
13. CHEN Manhua, "Doubts after Reading 'Doubts'"
14. WANG Kaiyang, "On the Bases, Methods, and Quality of Research on Chinese Characters"
15. ZHENG Linxi, "Chinese Characters Have No 'Scientific Nature': They Can Only Be Studied Scientifically"
16. PENG Shukai, "The Scientific Nature of Chinese Characters Must Be Scientifically Proven"
17. YIN Huanxian, "A Discussion of the So-called 'Meaning Transparency' of Chinese Characters"
18. JIANG Zhongren, "The First Lesson"
19. YIN Binyong, "Research on the Rates of Retainability of Chinese Characters"
20. GAO Jiaying, "A Tentative Discussion of Reading Speeds of Chinese Characters and Alphabetic Writing"
21. SUN Jianyi, "Speaking of 'The Compoundability of Chinese Characters'"
22. FAN Keyu, "A Discussion of 'New Compound Words from Familiar Characters' in Terms of the Relationship between Whole-word Meaning and Morpheme Meaning"
23. ZHANG Liqing and Paul Rozin, "Letters Concerning Professor Rozin's Reading Experiment"
24. ZHENG Linxi, "Some Evidence that 'Chinese Characters Are Easy to Learn and Easy to Use' Do Not Match the Facts"

25. ZENG Zhilang (Ovid Tseng), "Reading Chinese Characters and the Composition of Brain Functions"
26. YIN Binyong, "'Redundancy' and the Evaluation of Writing Systems"
27. FENG Zhiwei, "The Greater Information Content of Chinese Characters Is Not Advantageous in Information Processing"
28. YIN Binyong, "'Chinese Character Culture' Makes One Confused"

This substantial collection of 28 essays is a strong but reasoned indictment against the nationalistic and emotional assertions of the Chinese character enthusiasts who purchase access to China's politicians and mass media. Because they have power and wealth, the character enthusiasts have been able, during the last couple of decades, to bring research on language and script reform in China to a virtual halt. This is, of course, a tragedy for China, because it means that serious problems in education and information processing are simply not being faced. The authors of the volume under review keenly feel the urgency to confront the irrationality of the character enthusiasts. Although they are essentially without funding and lack influence with the government, they continue to speak out as best they can to ensure that the most egregious and outrageous assertions of the character enthusiasts do not go unchallenged, which would be much to the detriment of China.

WU Chang'an. *Wenzi de toushi -- Hanzi lunheng [A Perspective on Culture -- Balanced Discussions on the Sinographs]*. Wenhua Yuyanxue Congshu [Cultural Linguistics Series]. N.p. (Changchun?): Jilin Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 1995. 4 + 2 + 229 pages.

This is a general survey of the importance of sinographs for the transmission and preservation of Chinese culture. It has a strong historical component and devotes a great deal of attention to more or less obscure characters to illustrate Chinese customs and beliefs. While the author of this book, like the general editor -- SHEN Xiaolong (actually an open adherent of the Xu-Yuan-An character enthusiast camp [see the previous review]) -- of the series to which it belongs, displays an obvious affection for the characters, he makes a pretense of impartiality. Thus, in the section of his book which deals with the good and bad of the sinographs, he comes to four conclusions: 1. although the sinographs are easier to recognize than alphabetical writing, their meaning and pronunciation are invariably imprecise; 2. the sinographs are hard to write; 3. the sinographs are hard to remember; 4. the sinographs have both advantages and disadvantages when it comes to "automation" (i.e., information processing).

The author's overall conclusions are similarly measured and balanced. Surprisingly, he states that, after the analysis presented in his book and considering that we have entered the computer age, the drawbacks of the characters are greater than their advantages. Consequently, he continues, the language reform efforts of the past century are completely understandable, and one can sympathize with those who are anxious to get rid of the characters. Yet, he cautions that fundamental notions of Chinese culture and psychology are so wrapped up with the characters that it would be dangerous to do so. Instead, he predicts that the future fate of the characters will be determined by the following processes: 1. the proliferation of personal computers will make it easier to compose and manipulate characters which are so hard to write by hand; 2. the creation of a set of phonetic symbols suitable for Sinitic languages will coexist with the characters for a long period of time and then gradually replace them; 3. as an intermediary stage before the final adoption of a phonetic script, the number of total characters permitted should be restricted to less than 4,000; 4. if the characters are permitted to proliferate according to the principle of seeking more and more distinctions in the writing system instead of seeking for more efficient ways to express thoughts clearly with a limited number of symbols, they will become increasingly more time consuming and this could cause serious complications for the Chinese nation.

Considering the way things are proceeding in China at this very moment, the Chinese people do not have the luxury of letting the script evolve by itself. Unless enlightened citizens or bureaucrats take action, sinographic information processing of all sorts will become increasingly chaotic and inefficient in comparison with alphabetic information processing. Ultimately, this will result in more and more people adopting English for purposes of communication in business, science, education, and many other realms of social and intellectual life. Already, English is slowly displacing Chinese in startling ways (as the language of commerce, in schools and universities, and so forth). Having devoted more than two decades of my life to promoting a functional alphabetical script for China, I am presently pessimistic that the Chinese people possess the will to reverse the current trend by taking their linguistic fate into their own hands and adopting a workable alphabetic script for Sinitic languages. My current estimation is that, clinging to the characters out of habit and love, they will simply let things take their own course. Considering the rapid advances in electronic information processing in countries that use alphabetical scripts and the obvious inability for China to keep up with them so long as no changes (limiting, simplifying, phoneticizing, etc.) are made to the script, within one or two generations Chinese characters may well be naturally restricted more or less to classical studies and calligraphy.

ZHOU Shilie, comp. *Tongxingci cidian [Dictionary of Homographs]*. Peking: Zhongguo Guoji Guangbo Chubanshe, 1995. 9 + 44 + 441 pages.

Review #1

This dictionary collects groups of words, whether monosyllabic or polysyllabic, that have different meanings, different usages, and often different pronunciations, but that are written with the same characters (cf. English "tear," "bow," "can," "ring," "spring," etc.). The compiler has brought together 1,792 groups consisting of a total of 3,931 entries. The groups are arranged according to the 189 radicals of the *Xiandai Hanyu Cidian [Dictionary of Modern Sinitic]*. Fortunately, there is also an alphabetical index of all entries at the front of the book, so it makes entries relatively easy to locate.

The entries all have pinyin romanizations, indicate parts of speech, and occasionally offer example sentences. Premodern homographs include quotations from classical sources. We should note that the number of homographs has increased tremendously with the simplification of characters (e.g., *mian4* ["face"] and *mian4* ["flour"] formerly were written with separate graphs, but they are now both written with the graph for "face").

A serious drawback of this dictionary is that it does not identify to which topolects certain usages belong, only that they are topolectical.

The appendix is a handy list of the various types of homographs, e.g., I. Differences in sound: 1. different initials; 2. different finals; 3. different tones; 4. initials and finals both different; 5. initials and tones both different; 6. finals and tones both different; 7. initials, finals, and tones all different; 8. differences in accent or stress; 9. presence or absence of retroflex *-er* suffix. II. Grammatical differences: 1. boundedness and unboundedness of construction; 2. differences in grammatical form; 3. differences in parts of speech and functions; 4. differences in the grammatical form and in the boundedness and unboundedness of the construction; 5. differences in the boundedness and unboundedness of the construction and in the parts of speech; 6. differences in the forms of the construction and in the parts of speech; 7. differences in the boundedness and unboundedness, in the grammatical forms, and in the parts of speech. III. Differences in style, diction, or usage: 1. differences between spoken and written language; 2. differences between documentary language and common language; 3. differences between scientific or technical language and common language; 4. differences between political and common usage; 5. differences between literary and common language; 6. multiple stylistic

differences. IV. Etymological differences: 1. development of different meanings from a single root; 2. topolectal distinctions; 3. distinctions between modern and ancient usages; 4. differences involving transcribed borrowings from foreign languages; 5. differences in usage due to specialized fields; 6. differences resulting from numerical abbreviations; 7. differences resulting from other types of abbreviations; 8. differences resulting from alternative names; 9. differences resulting from the collapsing of characters through simplification; 10. differences arising from special terminology such as astronomy, calendrical science, music, feudal titles; divination, etc. V. Combinations of the above categories: 1. phonological and grammatical differences; 2. phonological and stylistic differences; 3. phonological and etymological differences; 4. grammatical and stylistic differences; 5. grammatical and etymological differences; 6. stylistic and etymological differences; 7. multiple differences

Review #2

This is a handy compilation of groups of terms and phrases that are written with exactly the same sinographs but which have different meanings and may have quite different grammatical properties. Some of the items in the various groups may have the same pronunciation as each other, although even if they do share the same basic pronunciation, they often are differently "bounded", i.e., one of the items in a given group may be tightly bounded, while another may admit the insertion of other elements between its constituent syllables. The latter type are marked in this dictionary by a double slash (/). Stress, rhythm, and accent, which sometimes do play a role in distinguishing between such homographs when spoken, are not indicated by the notations employed in this dictionary. As one might expect, most of the entries are bisyllabic, but there are also quite a few monosyllabic groups. All together there are 1,792 groups of homographs amounting to a total of 3,931 entries. It is obvious that the vast majority of groups consist of two items, but there are some with three or more items.

Each entry in the dictionary starts with the sinographs(s) with which it is written, followed by the pinyin romanization for the expression. Then come the various definitions which are preceded by designation of grammatical part of speech and, if necessary, a notation regarding usage (literary, topolectal). Illustrative sentences, from both modern and pre-modern sources, are provided when deemed appropriate for a clearer understanding of the items in context. No attempt is made to restore the original pronunciation or spelling of loanwords in their source languages; only the Mandarin pronunciations are given. The same is true of topolectal expressions.

The main arrangement of the dictionary is according to the 189 radicals of the *Xiandai Hanyu cidian* [*Dictionary of Modern Sinitic*] (all characters are simplified). Since there are no breaks between radicals and no indication of which radicals are on which pages, it is somewhat inconvenient to try find entries directly through the main body of the dictionary. The first index at the front of the dictionary is also a listing of all groups in the dictionary by radicals. Inasmuch as there are clear breaks between each radical and the various radicals are clearly indicated at the beginning of each section of this index, it is easier to use than the main body of the dictionary. However, the 23 pages of the radical index would be totally superfluous had the compiler been thoughtful enough to separate and clearly mark the different radicals in the main body of dictionary. Fortunately, there is a second index of all entries, this one arranged according to their pronunciation in pinyin. Naturally, most users will turn to this index first, so it would have been preferable for the compiler to have made it the order of the main body of his dictionary.

One who familiarizes himself with this dictionary may well come away wondering which problem is greater: the large number of homographs in sinographic writing or the alleged preponderance of homophones in romanized texts. A careful comparison of the two problems might reveal some interesting features of Sinitic writing in general and could well lead to more rational policies concerning script reform in China than those which are currently in force.

KANG Yin. *Wenzi Yuanliu Qianshi* (*The Origin and Development of Chinese Ideographs*) (*sic*). N.p.: Guoji Wenhua Chubanshe, 1992. 2 + 4 + 6 + 6 + 522 + 10 pages.

If anyone should desire *prima facie* evidence of the shallowness of most treatments of the sinographic script that are carried out in China, she need only turn to this book, the actual title of which is closer to *Superficial Explanations of the Development of Script* than to the English title provided by the publisher. And, to be sure, they are superficial!

The author must be a frustrated artist. First of all, he wrote the entire large book with a brush in pseudo thread-bound format. For about one quarter to one third of the graphs explained, he provides wildly imaginative drawings of what he perceives the objects or "stories" behind them to be. Many of the drawings are so gross that one can barely stand to look at them (e.g., the series on pp. 361-363 where eyes are being poked with various sharp instruments). Either our author has a sadistic mind or Shang society was permeated with hideous violence and torture (see, for some examples, pp. 337-350). Other drawings in the book, however, are so silly that one cannot help but laugh (p. 223 has a

big cockroach being roasted in elaborate flames, p. 272 has a naked man inside a cave-like space within a quaint mountain).

The drawings are bad enough, but the explanations are even worse. The author allows himself to ramble on, often incoherently and without any concern for intelligible syntax, in an unsystematic fashion. Trying to read through his explanations, to put it mildly, is a frustrating experience if one is seeking cogent analysis. To the author's credit, he sometimes does attempt to link the graphs to archeological finds or to passages from the classics such as *Zhou li* [*Zhou Rituals*], but his references are so imprecise as to be nearly useless. Also in the author's favor is his willingness to go directly to the earliest forms of the graphs without wasting too much energy on the *Shuo wen jie zi* [*Explanations of Simple and Compound Graphs*] (he does give Xu Shen his due, but is not utterly beholden to his every word) and other Han or later works. On the other hand, he gives the impression of operating more or less in a scholarly vacuum, as though he were the only one ever to have explicated the graphs.

Do not spend good money to buy this inferior, though impressively packaged, book. It is unreliable, idiosyncratic, and ahistorical. Essentially, *Wenzi Yuanliu Qianshi* is a self-indulgent figment of the author's imagination. Consequently, it does not matter that it is poorly organized and has an unfriendly index. Nobody will want to look things up in it anyway.

DUAN Kailian. *Zhongguo minjian fangyan cidian* [*A Dictionary of Chinese Folk Topolecticisms*]. Haikou: Nanhai chuban gongsi, 1994. 24 + 763 pages.

I purchased this dictionary with great expectations, but they were soon dashed to pieces. This is a large book with around 13,000 entries. Most unfortunately, all pronunciations are given in Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM). This lamentable practice in topolect research in China vitiates the work to such a degree that one is reluctant to consult it. It is surpassing strange for the compiler to assert (p. 67a) that Cantonese speakers say *chéngzi* for "vat". Conversely, the first of the two Cantonese morphemes in this expression does not exist in MSM, so one wonders about the validity of the MSM reading *cheng*. It is difficult to fathom what could possibly be going on in the minds of Chinese linguists when they assign MSM readings to non-MSM expressions that may have very different pronunciations when actually spoken by the people who use them. It would be one thing if linguists provided MSM pronunciations for comparative purposes or for ease in looking up terms in alphabetically arranged reference works but also provided

transcriptions of the actual pronunciations. The fact that the problem of the disparity between MSM and topolectal pronunciations is not even raised causes one to despair for the state of linguistics in China.

Another great drawback of the dictionary under review is that all of its entries are drawn from written literature (newspapers, magazines, stories, novels, etc.). Since all of the works utilized are basically written in Mandarin with only a smattering of topolecticisms, such a procedure can hardly afford an accurate indication of the most frequent terms actually used in the speech of the various languages in question. One supposes, however, that the compiler has no interest in these languages themselves, but only in the topolectal expressions deriving from them that have worked their way into the national language.

Indeed, this dictionary does not really offer an impartial selection of topolectal words and phrases from all of the Sinitic languages of China. This can be seen from the fact that probably over three fourths (a rough estimate) of all its entries are from the Mandarin topolects and, of these, a good half or more are from Pekingese and most of the remainder are from somewhere else in the north. The result of the author's selection process is that what we have before us is fundamentally a collection of northern Mandarin topolectal expressions with a sprinkling of expressions from other parts of the country for flavor.

The dictionary entries are designated as coming from one of the following seven topolect areas ("topolect areas" in normal linguistic parlance would be referred to as "branches"):

1. Northern (or Mandarin) topolects. They are subdivided into

- a. Northern speech: Hebei (Peking), Northeast (Shenyang), Shandong (Jinan), Henan (Kaifeng), and parts of Inner Mongolia.
- b. Northwest speech: Shanxi (Taiyuan), Shaanxi-Gansu-Ningxia (Xi'an), Qinghai and parts of Inner Mongolia.
- c. Southwest speech: Sichuan (Chengdu), Yunnan (Kunming), Guizhou (Guiyang), northwest Guangxi (Guilin), and western Hunan.
- d. Yangtze-Huai speech (i.e., lower Yangtze speech): Anhui (Hefei), Jiangsu (Nanking, northern Jiangsu), Jiangxi (Jiujiang), and areas north of the Yangtze (except for Xuzhou and Bengbu), and areas south of the Yangtze along the upper Zhenjiang.

2. Wu topolects. They are subdivided into northern and southern sub-topolects, the southern including Zhejiang (Wenzhou), the northern including Jiangsu (Suzhou). The representative speech of the Wu topolects is Shanghainese.
3. Cantonese topolects. These include the central and southwest parts of Guangdong province and the southern part of Guangxi province, together with Hong Kong and Macao, with Canton taken as the representative speech.
4. Xiang (Hunanese) topolects. The speech of Changsha is taken as representative.
5. Gan (Jiangxi) topolects. The speech of Nanchang is taken as representative.
6. Min topolects. They are subdivided into eastern and southern sub-topolects, the eastern including part of Fujian (Fuzhou) and the southern including another part of Fujian (Amoy), Guangdong (Chaozhou), plus the Qiongzhou speech of Hainan Province and Taiwanese.
7. Hakka topolect, with Mei County of Guangdong Province as representative.

Most of the entries include sample sentences and many of these are quotations taken from contemporary sources. In some cases there are also illustrative quotations from Ming and Qing literature. A small proportion of the entries list synonyms with notations of the various cities where they are used.

The main arrangement of the dictionary is by head characters. The order of the head characters is also given in an index at the front of the dictionary. At the back of the dictionary is a complete listing of all entries by total stroke count of the successive characters with which they are written.

The following are three more in our long-continuing series of reviews of reference tools for the study of Pekingese.

CHANG Xizhen, comp. *Beiping tuhua [Peking Colloquialisms]*. Taipei: Shenge Shiye Youxian Gongsi Chubanshe, 1990. 5 + 209 pages.

Such a motley assortment of colloquialisms is difficult to imagine. Although the book consists of entries with accompanying definitions, the organization is so poor that it is impossible to use as a dictionary because one simply cannot look things up with any efficiency. All that one can do is browse through the book casually.

The first section of the book is divided up into nouns (occupations, terms of address, parts of the body, foods, architectural elements, etc.), adjectives, verbs, and

special categories (e.g., expressions relating to weddings, expressions concerning festivals; expressions beginning with *yang* ["foreign"], expressions relating to drama and opera, etc.).

The next section consists of various categories of witticisms known as *qiaopihua*. Then follows a section of Peking "children's songs (*erge*), most of which are inane and pointless. They are divided into those "with tunes" (the longer group) and those "without tunes" -- although neither have tunes indicated in the book.

The appendices include discussions of particularly odd terms, customs and taboos, excrement, sayings, proverbs, teashops, Peking duck, entertainments, and so forth.

In sum, this is a grab bag full of the author's dim memories of a long-lost time. Nostalgia alone is not enough to build a useful dictionary upon.

ZHANG Xunru. *Beiping yinxi xiaoche bian* [A Compilation of Words with "er" Suffix in Pekingese]. Taipei: Taiwan Kaiming, 1991; 2nd Taiwan ed.; 1956, first Taiwan ed. 38 + 126 + 34 pages.

The draft of this little book was completed in June, 1949. The book originally bore a 13 page preface, but He Rong, the Taiwan editor, deemed it to be of no value and so removed it. As the book now exists, it begins with a 15 page article on the functions of the retroflex *er* that is neither very systematic nor illuminating. It closes with a 34 page article on the rhyming categories of Pekingese, especially in the light of the *Zhongyuan yin yun* [The Sounds and Rhymes // Initials and Finals of the Central Plains].

The meat of the book, however, is a collection of over 3,000 terms ending with the retroflex *-er* suffix in Peking colloquial language. Since these terms were all culled from written sources (viz., five vernacular novels including *Honglou meng* [Dream of Red Towers] and *Ernü yingxiong zhuan* [Heroic Young Men and Women], the *Jingshi fang xiang zhi* [Gazetteer of the Wards and Alleys of the Capital], and over two hundred popular ditties), it can hardly be said that these terms represent the full extent of the usage of retroflex *-er* in spoken language. The reason for this is that many of the most colloquial terms in the various Sinitic topolects, including Pekingese, cannot be written in the sinographs.

The entries are divided up in groups of identical syllables, thus *bal*, *barl*, *baal*, *ball*, *bal*, *parl*, *pall*, etc., as spelled first in Bopomofo, then in National Romanization (GR). After the syllabic headings come the rhyme categories. Since this is how the entries are arranged and there are no indices, finding a specific term can be both time-consuming and

frustrating. Following the rhyme category come examples of the combination of the syllable in question with other syllables to form polysyllabic words which are defined or provided with quoted illustrative sentences.

There are no great discoveries or insights in this collection of terms, but it is instructive to see how pervasive the retroflex *-er* is in Pekingese and how its existence greatly increased the ease of rhyming in that language.

LI Sijing. *Hanyu "er" [ʔ] yin shi yanjiu [Studies on the History of the "er" { ʔ } Sound in Sinitic]*. Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu, 1994. 163 + 4 + 2 + 4 pages.

This is the revised and enlarged Taiwan edition of the thorough study on the so-called *erhuayin/yun* ("suffixation of nonsyllabic *r*") first reviewed in these pages over eight years ago (see *Sino-Platonic Papers*, 14 [December, 1989], B17-B20). Only minor, cosmetic changes have been made in this edition, so all of the merits and defects of the first edition remain. The need to assess Li Sijing's findings in terms of possible Altaicization remains.

Erdengtai, Wuyundalai, and Asalatu. *Menggu mishi cihui xuanshi [Selected Explanations of Lexical Items in The Secret History of the Mongols]*. Mengguzu lishi congshu [Series on the History of the Mongolian People]. Hohhot: Neimenggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1980; 1991 rpt. 6 + 324 pages.

First, an apology that I do not know how to spell the names of the authors properly but only through inaccurate sinographic syllabic transcription.

It is heartening that this volume has gone into a second edition of 3,300 copies (the same amount as the first edition). It would appear that there are a few people in China who are seriously interested in *The Secret History of the Mongols*, and rightfully so. *The Secret History of the Mongols* is a treasure trove of linguistic, ethnographic, and historical information about a nomadic people who expanded the boundaries of China to hitherto unparalleled lengths, exercised sovereignty over almost the whole of Asia, and knocked menacingly at the doors of Europe. If one really wants to understand China, to know the heart and soul of China, one must read deeply in *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Unfortunately, far too many students of Chinese civilization totally ignore works such as

The Secret History of the Mongols and other works which reveal fascinating glimpses of the "minority peoples" who ruled over and were absorbed into the Chinese polity.

The items selected for explanation in this lexicon may be classed as belonging to one of the following eight types: 1. ancient terms; 2. words whose pronunciation during the Yuan period is different from their modern pronunciation; 3. those having a different morphology from modern terms; 4. terms having a completely or partially different meaning from what they have in modern Mongolian; 5. words having special connotations; 6. phrases, clauses, sayings, and proverbs having special connotations; 7. toponyms and other proper nouns that have special significance for the history of the Mongols; 8. words that are misconstrued in the interlinear Chinese translations.

Preceding the lexicon (pp. 85-321) are three chapters on the phonology, morphology, and Turkic terms of *The Secret History of the Mongols*. The lexicon itself is arranged alphabetically by the head characters of the sinographic transcriptions of the Mongol terms. Each entry includes the sinographic transcription, then the romanization of the actual Mongolian expression (**not**, fortunately, of the syllabic Chinese transcription), the same expression in Mongolian script, followed by citations to the text and concise definitions in Chinese. The entries conclude with discussions of the historical and geographical significance of the selected expressions and may also touch upon various linguistic matters.

One is grateful for this and similar works, but sad that they are so few and that so little is known about the countless contemporary and past languages of China, both Sinitic and non-Sinitic ones.

Matthews, Stephen and Virginia Yip. *Cantonese: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge Grammars. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. xvi + 429 pages.

In the mind of the average American, all Chinese speak the same language, but only with different accents and a few special terms, similar to the differences among English as spoken in Texas, Alabama, Ohio, Boston, and England. To the average Chinese who has travelled around his own country a little, the huge gulf separating the numerous varieties of spoken Sinitic is well known, because they find it impossible to communicate with people from other regions than their own. Yet, when pressed, the typical Chinese response to the question of how different the various Sinitic *fangyan* ("topolects") are will be that they are "about the same" (*chabuduo*), the only significant difference being pronunciation. Thus, all the Sinitic *fangyan* are allegedly mutually intelligible when written down.

Both the typical American view and the typical Chinese view of the Sinitic *fangyan* are grossly mistaken, of course, and both are due to a kind of politico-cultural brainwashing which falsely reasons thus: there is only one language in China and all literate Chinese can read it when it is written down > this is what keeps China together as a nation > if the various unintelligible *fangyan* were permitted to be called "languages" or if they were written down, then China would break up into many different countries like Europe. Such a formulation is an insult to the intelligence, but I have heard it shouted angrily at me scores of times by indignant Chinese citizens when I point out that, by the standards applied to linguistic groups elsewhere, there are many Sinitic languages in China but essentially only two have ever been written down with characters: Mandarin (the *koiné*) and Literary Sinitic (also known as Classical Chinese).

Thus, it is with great rejoicing that I introduce this grammar of Cantonese, for it consciously liberates Cantonese language from Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM), Literary Sinitic (LS), and the sinographs. There is not a single Chinese character in this entire, large grammar! Hallelujah! That is how it should be. It is impossible to write an accurate grammar of any of the non-MSM, non-LS varieties of Sinitic if one insists on assigning sinographs to all of their elements.

The words (pp. 1-2) of the authors are instructive in this regard:

One reason why grammars of Cantonese are not available in English is that Cantonese is essentially a spoken language. Grammars -- as opposed to phrase-books -- traditionally take the written form of a language as the standard to be described. To the extent that Cantonese is written down at all, it is heavily affected by standard written Chinese, which is based on Mandarin; as a result, there is no clear distinction between what is 'Cantonese' and what is 'Mandarin'..., rendering a grammar of written Cantonese impracticable. In the descriptive approach to linguistics on which this book is based, the spoken form of any language is taken to be primary, the written form derivative; we thus reject any notion of the superiority of written language and the devaluation of spoken Cantonese which all too often results from such attitudes. In addition, there is a pedagogical consideration: to learn or teach both spoken and written Chinese simultaneously is doubly taxing, in that the burden of learning an entirely unfamiliar language is multiplied by the characters, which relate at best indirectly to pronunciation. To learn the spoken language alone, using a romanized orthography, is a much more practicable option; successful

students can then tackle the written language if they wish or need to do so. For all these reasons, we largely ignore the written language and use the Yale romanization system as an alphabetic representation of the spoken language.

Wiser words were never spoken by Chinese language teachers. Alas! Matthews and Yip are in such a miniscule minority. As a consequence, most learners of Sinitic languages suffer horribly, progress slowly, and command their material poorly -- all because they are enslaved to the sinographs.

The differences between Cantonese and MSM are tremendous. Let us just take aspect markers, where for the perfective MSM has *-le* while Cantonese has VERB-*jó*, for the experiential MSM has VERB-*guò* and Cantonese has VERB-*gwo*, for the progressive MSM has *zài* VERB and Cantonese has VERB-*gán*, for the continuous MSM has VERB-*zhe* and Cantonese has VERB-*jyuh*, for the delimitative MSM has VERB-*yi*-VERB and Cantonese has VERB-*háh*, and for the habitual MSM lacks a specialized marker while Cantonese has VERB-*hoi*. When it comes to sentence particles, the discrepancy between Cantonese and MSM is even more marked, with the former having thirty basic forms which play an exceedingly important role in the language, while the latter has only seven that are of limited significance.

As China democratizes, the applications of the non-MSM Sinitic languages will grow. We have already seen the radical shift in the MSM-Taiwanese relationship in Taiwan during the last decade. The same will happen on the mainland, unless there is another heavy-handed military crackdown like Tiananmen in 1989. Shanghainese will extend its sway as the language of China's commercial, intellectual, and industrial dynamo. And there is good evidence that Cantonese will likewise flourish:

Within China, the role of Cantonese is increasing. Far from being replaced by Mandarin, it enjoys growing prestige as a result of the rapid economic development of the southern coastal districts led by Guangdong province. Students in major cities all over China are learning Cantonese in order to do business with Hongkong and Guangdong: Cantonese is said to be 'heading north' (*bak séuhng*). (pp. 2-3)

I have noticed this phenomenon, which is also referred to as the "Hong Kong" wind (*gangfeng*) blowing north, in such pervasive Cantoneseisms as *jiasi* for "furniture" which

is written with two characters that would have been totally unknown to 99% of the Chinese population ten years ago.

We may thank our lucky stars for this wonderful book. If only we had comparable descriptive grammars for all of the major Sinitic languages (those of Taiwan, Amoy, Shanghai, Suzhou, Chengdu, Lanzhou, and so on)!

Killingley, Siew-Yue. *Cantonese*. Languages of the World / Materials 06. München-Newcastle: Lincom Europa, 1993. ii + 50 pages.

While this volume is much smaller than the grammar reviewed just above, it offers a complete description of the main features of Cantonese: phoneme inventory, morphology, and syntax. What it lacks in size, it makes up for in astuteness, of which I here quote some rather lengthy samples from the author's discussion of four problems in the study of General Cantonese (and, indeed, in the study of any Sinitic morphology) that are due to "the fact that Chinese is written with characters which in their citation forms are always attributed with a lexical meaning":

First of all, certain disyllabic words were once probably dimorphemic and polymorphemic, but because of a kind of semantic 'fossilization' in the history of the Chinese language, we do not nowadays universally identify the individual syllables of words with separate meanings, and indeed to do so would be absurd as the resultant 'meaning' could be a nonsensical one. Often, the whole disyllabic or polysyllabic word is identified with one area of meaning. For example, etymologically, *silman5* 'elegant, well-bred' is made up of a bound form 'this, there, any' and a noun root 'poetry' [--> 'literature'], but because the sum of these two 'meanings' would not now yield the resultant meaning 'elegant', it would be better to treat each syllable as meaningless and the whole as a monomorphemic word.

The second problem is directly related to the writing system, and although it is more exclusively Chinese in nature, it also exists to a lesser extent in other languages. It centres on the fact that certain polysyllabic syllables cannot have had any individual meanings for every syllable, but the writing system, not being alphabetic, makes it possible for each character to be forced into a 'meaning' mould if necessary although all that

is required is a sound. For example, in the adverb yi5gaa1 'now', the first syllable is written with the same character 而 as the literary form of 'yet' while the second syllable is written with the character 家 for 'family'. To insist that the 'real meaning' of yi5gaa1 is 'yet family' would be to give a false picture of the language....

The third problem is that of the 'loan-character'.... It is also related to the writing system of Chinese and it illustrates incidentally the complex relationships between the character and the word. In the history of Chinese writing, whenever an abstract idea was difficult to indicate by a pictograph, a character for a homonymous word with a picturable meaning was 'borrowed'. At a later stage, it became convenient to differentiate between two such characters by adding an additional element to reflect graphically their difference in meaning.... Characters thus became more and more overdifferentiated in order to appear more logical..., and schoolmasters and others helped to create larger and more complicated characters. Thus the lexicographer's differentiation between characters, morphemes and words would not readily reflect the ordinary speaker's view of the language....

The fourth problem is a tendency among writers to still think of Cantonese as a monosyllabic language without inflections. This used to be thought of Chinese in general but opinion has now changed with regard to Mandarin as a result of various challenges to received theory about the nature of ancient and modern Chinese morphology. For example, Karlgren (1920) helped to reshape thinking on the subject when he suggested that Proto-Chinese, which he called a 'langue flexionelle', contained many disyllabic words and had implicit case marking in both nouns and pronouns. Karlgren's study claimed that Proto-Chinese had three cases -- the nominative, accusative and genitive. Likewise, Chao (1968), though inaccurate in his analysis of the relationship between word and character, was a pioneer in establishing Mandarin as a disyllabic and polysyllabic language. Cantonese studies still lag behind in this respect. Writers recognize bound forms in Cantonese but do not distinguish clearly between the different kinds of morphological and semantic bondage. They prefer to use terms like *bound form*, *particle*, and even those who cite examples like verb + aspect and refer to affixation do so with spaces between what are in fact a lexical form and its inflection.... The monosyllabic myth has been transferred over the years from Chinese in general to Cantonese in

particular, and is even cited as a difficulty faced by Cantonese speakers learning Mandarin....

Here and elsewhere, Killingley has more to say about the complex relationships between character, syllable, morpheme, and word, approvingly citing John DeFrancis against the prevailing notion which views Chinese orthography as being exclusively morpheme-based. All of this gives hope that one day we may witness similar lucidity among linguists who describe and analyze other Sinitic languages than Cantonese. The monosyllabic myth is a hideous artifact of the writing system and should be dispelled in scientific analyses of the various Sinitic dialects and languages.

ZHONG Jingwen, chief ed. *Yuhai (An Encyclopedia of Chinese Folk Language)*, Vol. 1: *Mimiyu (Chinese Secret Language)*. Vol. editors ZHENG Shuoren and CHEN Qi. Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi Chubanshe, 1994. 2 + 2 + 15 + 739 pages.

The 22,000 entries in this dictionary stem mostly from the late Qing and early Republican periods, but reach back as early as the Song and up to the present time. If one comes across thieves' cant and prostitutes' argot that one does not comprehend, it is possible that it may be explained in this unusual dictionary. A large proportion of the items stem from Shanghai, but others come from Sichuan, Canton, Peking, and elsewhere.

Two related drawbacks of the dictionary are that, except in extremely rare instances, it does not give any indication of pronunciation and that it is arranged by order of the total strokes of the initial characters. Were it not for the alphabetical index of head characters at the back of the book, it would be a very slow and frustrating task to find a particular item one is searching for.

Nearly all of the entries would be completely impenetrable without explanation. For example, *namowen*, a Shanghai pidgin version of English "number one", means "boss" and, in the Qing period, *xian feisi mei* ("all *feisi* [face] sister") referred to prostitutes who served foreigners. A more current Shanghai expression popular among youth is *diliduluo* which indicates the internationally famous Adidas brand, but it can also refer to someone who is unreliable. In Canton, *weitaming M* ("vitamin M") signified "money".

Practically any kind of depravity or criminal behavior one can imagine is reflected in the language described in this dictionary. Reading through it is a fascinating exercise in the most arcane circumlocution and slang.

Harrell, Stevan, ed. *Cultural Encounters on China's Ethnic Frontiers*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1995. viii + 379 pages.

This collection of ten substantial chapters touches upon a very sensitive subject: China's internal imperialism against its own "minority" peoples. In a benign sense, this is passed off as a "civilizing project" (the latter term is a strange usage coined by Edward Said which occurs repeatedly -- almost like a code word -- in the book). The editor sets the tone in his introduction with recourse to Gramscian "hegemony" and mention of "colonial discourse," but he strives nonetheless for a balanced and critical approach that makes genuine progress despite ideological presuppositions on all sides. It is refreshing, to say the least, to consider the colonized as colonizers in their own land.

The authors and the titles of their papers are as follows:

Charles F. McKhann, "The Naxi and the Nationalities Question"

Stevan Harrell, "The History of the History of the Yi"

Norma Diamond, "Defining the Miao: Ming, Qing, and Contemporary Views"

Ralph A. Litzinger, "Making Histories: Contending Conceptions of the Yao Past"

Margaret Byrne Swain, "Père Vial and the Gni-p'a: Orientalist Scholarship and the Christian Project"

Shelley Rigger, "Voices of Manchu Identity, 1635-1935"

Siu-woo Cheung, "Millenarianism, Christian Movements, and Ethnic Change among the Miao in Southwest China"

Almaz Khan, "Chinggis Khan: From Imperial Ancestor to Ethnic Hero"

Wurlig Borchigud, "The Impact of Urban Ethnic Education on Modern Mongolian Ethnicity, 1949-1966"

Shih-chung Hsieh, "On the Dynamics of Tai / Dai-lue Ethnicity"

There is a certain disproportion to the volume in that seven of the chapters deal with southwestern peoples, two with Mongols, and one with Manchus. There is almost no mention of peripheral peoples in the west, the southeast, or elsewhere.

The volume is carefully edited, with a clear attempt to have the various authors reference relevant points in other essays in the volumes. A glossary of Chinese characters for key names, terms, and phrases in the book is provided, as is an analytical index.

Woo, Henry K. H. *The Making of a New Chinese Mind: Intellectuality and the Future of China*. Hong Kong: China Foundation, 1993. vii + 221 pages.

Henry K. H. Woo is an economist. He thinks like an economist, tackles problems like an economist, and writes like an economist. This book is a good example of what happens when a 20th-century economist is turned loose on traditional Chinese culture and society: he sees things that Sinologists do not see -- and dares to say them. Perhaps the best thing to do is let the author speak for himself, so audacious and unaccustomed are his words:

At the risk of over-simplification, one might say that the history of Chinese thought was dominated by epistemic archetypes of a loose kind. The theories of Yin and Yang and of the Five Elements, which constituted the core of the ontologies of Confucianism and Taoism, separately and jointly (upon a grand metaphysical synthesis of these two schools during the Former Han Dynasty) dominated much of Chinese thought. Typical of an epistemic archetype, they provided explanations or pseudo-explanations of a wide range of phenomena, and the heuristics to the formulation and solution of problems. The "explanatory" power of these theories is so encompassing that no occurrence could fail to be interpreted by resorting to the interplay between the forces of Yin and Yang or to the dynamic interactions governing the Five Elements. Since complementary and contradictory relationships are both allowed in the frameworks of Yin and Yang and the Five Elements, any part of reality can be explained, to the extent that anomalies are theoretically ruled out, especially since ad hoc and ex post explanations are generally tolerated by Chinese theorists. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to conceive of any fact that can

conclusively refute the theories in question, or even come close to discrediting them. Of course, being able to explain everything, including contradictions, these "tautological" theories turn out to explain nothing important. Notwithstanding their hollowness, no competing frameworks with more robust or rigorous methodologies existed in the Chinese intellectual tradition, except perhaps the Buddhist ontology, which although far more rigorous, is equally speculative and remote from the world of facts. Even if the ontologies of Confucianism and Taoism were eventually divorced from their moral and political base and were to become subjects of objective discourse, it would still be difficult for facts alone, in particular isolated and raw facts, to discredit the respective metaphysical frameworks. (p. 113)

And, especially pertinent for readers of *Sino-Platonic Papers* are passages such as the following:

**Was the Written Chinese Language
a Barrier to Scientific Development?**

I suspect that the signs adopted by a particular language may significantly affect the potential for cognitive and intellectual development of its users. By extension, and together with certain idiosyncratic properties of Chinese syntax, I believe that the peculiarities of the Chinese language have serious ramifications for China's intellectual development in general and its scientific development in particular (compare Derk Bodde, *Chinese Thought, Society and Science* [Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991]). For example, the pictographic element of the Chinese character may have a distractive effect on the attention of a cognizing agent, by way of suggesting or conjuring images that are neither relevant nor important to the understanding or the use of a word or proposition. The lack of a root system means that conceptual condensation, instrumental to creative thinking by way of economising the limited attention span of the cognizing agent, is severely limited. The top-down and right-left arrangement of a Chinese sentence, together with the equal spacing between the rows, for example, may affect the efficiency with which a Chinese sentence is processed, although the interrelations are by no means obvious. The

looseness of the syntactic rules of the Classical Chinese language must mean that it lacks the precision to capture and to differentiate fine aspects of reality without ambiguity. This is well exemplified by the fact that a large proportion of Chinese words serve in different contexts as different parts of speech and also by the fact that rules governing the position of words are typically not well defined. Quantifiers, too, seem to be imprecise and not commonly applied (see Bodde, 1991).

Probably the most intriguing characteristic of the Classical Chinese language is its absence of punctuation of different kinds. Given that this convention had a long history and that the inconvenience caused had been long tolerated, one might perhaps be inclined to infer that the Chinese were probably not very concerned about the clarity of ideas or that they gave little premium to efficiency in the processing of ideas. What led to such a lack of concern for clarity is another interesting question. It might have to do with the Chinese emphasis on stylistic balance at the expense of realism of description and might also have to do with Chinese analogical thinking. Or perhaps one might conjecture that the causal direction also worked in the opposite direction. Whichever the case may be, Classical Chinese is, in many ways, incompatible with the properties of a scientific language, which characteristically and uncompromisingly demands clarity, precision, efficiency in the processing of ideas, convenience in condensing complex concepts and so on.

This list of "defects" constitutes only a crude and speculative outline. To have a more accurate appraisal of the "defects" of the Chinese language and its inhibitive effects on intellectual development or scientific creativity would require extensive research employing theories and techniques developed in a variety of disciplines, for example, linguistics and cognitive science. Clearly some of this research would be complex in character and new theories may have to be developed to assist in the appraisal. But it would be important research because its findings would throw light on the question as to whether or not the Chinese language has adequate potential for scientific and intellectual development, a critical question that will have profound ramifications for the future of the Chinese civilisation. Indeed, such cognitive and linguistic studies will throw light not only upon the potential of the Chinese language as an intellectual tool,

but will also help us to understand the Chinese mind and its properties.
(pp. 120-121)

For Woo, investigations of such matters are not merely academic exercises: they have about them a sense of urgency, for upon them depends the future health -- and perhaps even survival -- of Chinese civilization. Although this is not an especially big book, its scope is large, covering in Part One such topics as China's ability to compete in the emerging Global Economy of the 21st century, in Part Two such topics as China's past technological and economic achievements, in Part Three the questions of China's failure to generate scientific and industrial revolutions, and in Part Four such complex issues as biological versus cultural evolution, a probing and perceptive analysis of the lost-opportunities of the May Fourth Movement, and a plea for the vitalization of the intellect in China.

What would have driven a successful Hong Kong economist to spend time researching and writing a work of intellectual history such as this one? Woo himself spells out his motivations in the very first paragraph of the book:

The purpose of this book is to call for an immediate renewal of intellectual investment in the understanding of China's past. Such an investment is urgently needed to help China to overcome its past and to meet the challenges of the 21st century. The reasons behind this project are manifold. In the first place, the nature of global competition in the forthcoming century indicates that the creativity and adaptive openness of members of a nation will become the hallmark as well as the determining factors of the competitive performance of that nation. The key to attaining a high level of competitive advantage lies in the vigorous promotion of human capital and, in the case of China, in the broader mission of resurrecting... the intellectuality of the majority of its people. (page v)

Much of this book is highly theoretical and is couched in the language of advanced economics, so it may be a bit hard going for the non-initiate. But the author has done his homework. He is well-versed in the history of Chinese science and technology; a glance at the bibliography shows that he is up to date on the best scholarship in that field, as well as in logic and epistemology. His English is smooth and felicitous. For someone who is willing to listen with an open mind, it may also be highly convincing -- and disturbing. Perhaps, if it is disturbing enough, action will be taken and changes will be made. That is

certainly the goal of the author, who aims at nothing less than a complete overhaul of Chinese ways of thinking and doing.

Miller, Lucien, ed. *South of the Clouds: Tales from Yunnan*. Translated by GUO Xu, Lucien Miller, and XU Kun. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1994. xiii + 328 pages.

This is a collection of fifty-four tales representing all twenty-five of Yunnan Province's officially designated ethnic minorities. They have been drawn from forty volumes compiled by Chinese folklorists. The variety of tales included is wide: creation myths, romances, historical legends, tales explaining natural phenomena, ghost stories, and festival tales. The editor and his associates are to be commended for providing good examples of the diverse folk traditions of Southwest China. Also appreciated is the insightful and informative general introduction by Lucien Miller which consists of a sketch of Yunnan, data concerning its unusually large number of so-called "national minorities", a capsule discussion of modern folklore studies in China, frank accounts of textual issues and translation strategies, and thoughts on theoretical issues concerning oral and folk literature. In the general introduction are to be found some extremely perceptive comments, such as the following (p. 9): "There is no such thing as a purely Han person -- most Chinese have minority origins or mixed ethnic ancestries, even though they may be unaware of the fact, and commonly consider themselves Han." There is, furthermore, a second introduction, this one by XU Kun and devoted more specifically to Yunnan national minority folk literature and containing sections on different types of myths, legends, and tales, plus more comments on the methods of collecting, recording, translating, and redacting employed in this book. Here some serious problems arise; I shall return to them in the following paragraph. The book includes as well a useful appendix on the various traditional Yunnan ethnic minority cultures, a glossary of Chinese characters, a bibliography, and an index. The tales are arranged thematically, with notes on sources, storytellers, translators, recorders, and redactors, plus area of distribution and explanations of special terms and names occurring in the tales. By the normal standards applied to translated tales from China, *South of the Clouds* would be regarded as an outstanding contribution to folklore studies for that country. However, due to a keen sense that Chinese local cultures are fast disappearing under the onslaught of television and the encroaching tentacles of the national and international economy, in this review I shall apply

extraordinarily rigorous criteria in an attempt to establish a higher level of scholarship for future studies in this area.

I shall begin by quoting from Xu Kun's own description (p. 53) of the methods of translating employed by him and his colleagues:

In the process of making faithful recordings of the oral materials, another question that arose was how to translate accurately into Chinese. The method we adopted was to find an intellectual or cultural worker who was a member of the minority, who was proficient in the minority language, and whose level of Chinese was comparatively high, and then ask that person to assume the responsibility of translation. If a particular national minority had its own written script, the translator would first use the nationality's language to record the piece. Then, **word by word and line by line, this written record would be compared alongside one made by still another person whose job it was to record the piece in Chinese.** [Emphasis added; how is this possible?] From this comparison, the Chinese translation would be made. If a nationality did not have a written language, the translator could make an oral translation into Chinese only, following the words in the original spoken language, and thus make an accurate record. [Why not transcribe into IPA or other functional romanization? Once translated into Chinese, how "accurate" could the record be?]

It is clear that all of the tales in this volume were filtered through Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) renditions arrived at by this convoluted and dubious procedure. Their authenticity is thus seriously vitiated and sadly compromised. Xu Kun also admits (p. 54) that "things that are unhealthy or unsound are deleted or changed." This admission further undermines the confidence of the reader in the authenticity of this collection.

Perhaps the saddest thing of all about the method of collecting, "translating," editing, and redacting employed in this volume, however, is that even the presumably native speakers of the languages involved have become so Sinicized that virtually all of them have taken Han names. As I have myself witnessed in travelling through China, the local intellectuals who constantly deal with Han people are usually the least well qualified to represent their own cultures accurately and they themselves are responsible for a large part of the dilution of authenticity. Very few Chinese folklorists take the time to learn any so-called "minority languages". This is a deplorable attitude, yet they boldly declare that they

are recording the tales accurately. I have met Chinese linguists who study, for example, the phonology of "minority languages" and write treatises on them without even knowing the names of the languages they are supposedly describing. If Chinese fieldworkers are unwilling or incapable of learning the necessary languages, then we must train our own students to go out into the field and make accurate records. This is a matter of the greatest urgency because so much precious data is being irrevocably lost.

Another defect in the mode of presentation is the failure of the redactors to separate their own comments from the legends of the peoples that they are allegedly conveying. It is jarring to hear repeatedly such phrases as "The Yao tell a beautiful, touching legend about the origin of this event." Surely no Yao storyteller would ever say any such thing. It is particularly irritating to read such comments after one is already several paragraphs into the story. One resents, over and over again, such reminders that the collectors have made little attempt to separate their own observations from those of the peoples who originally told them these tales.

The blatant and unnecessary intrusion of Chinese into these tales is jarring. For example, it is strange to hear a character in a Bouyei legend referred to repeatedly as "Tian Wang". Since Tian Wang is obviously the translation of some Bouyei term, it would be far preferable and effective (even granting the limitations of the MSM filter system), to transfer the term into English "Prince of Heaven" wherever it occurs.

Even onomatopoeia is inappropriately rendered in Mandarin (e.g., on p. 153 rustling of leaves is *hua-hua*, a swishing sound is *sha-sha*, and so forth). It is very unlikely that the so-called Kucong (a group of Lahus) who tell the story from which these words are taken would have said anything resembling these Mandarinisms. Indeed, when we read the note on this group (pp. 279-280), it becomes evident that apparently nobody involved in the compilation of this book knows for certain what sort of language they speak! Yet the editors use the ostensible transcription *binbai* (another obvious Mandarinism) throughout the story and define it as "A common word in the Kucong language meaning 'old woman'."

Yet another disappointing feature of the book is the inconsistent glossing of names, sometimes even within the same sentence, e.g., on p. 260: "We are seven princes of the Huagou [Spotted Dog] people of Pearl-Sky [Zhutian] Mountain!" In the first instance, "Spotted Dog" is given in brackets as a translation of Huagou and in the second Zhutian is given in brackets as the presumably original sound of the word for "Pearl-Sky." In fact, neither Huagou nor Zhutian have any validity as representative of the Dai words they are supposedly translated from. If those Dai words are not known, far better just to give the English translations than the deceptive MSM transcriptions.

It grates to hear people called "Zhatuoye", "Yongxi", "Mubupa", and so forth when one suspects that these are Hanisms. Isn't there some way fieldworkers can determine what the various peoples of Yunnan style themselves? Throughout the collection, most personal and place names as well as technical terms are given in MSM. Written Sinitic is probably the **least** suitable language on earth for recording the folktales of other peoples because there is no accurate or consistent method for notating the sounds of names, terms, onomatopoeic words, etc.

Even when the editors do happen to know the original name of a character, they sometimes ruin it by glossing the name in MSM. For example, on p. 68, the name of the Jino ancestress Apierer is followed by the totally irrelevant MSM monstrosity Api'e'e.

The difficulties with the mode of presentation in this volume are by no means purely linguistic. For instance, when we are told in a Zhuang myth that Taoist priests are enjoined to chant scriptures (p. 140), can we be sure that this is an authentic reflection of Zhuang religious practice?

Even such colorful expressions as "Our hearts are skipping beats in our breasts now, like little panic-stricken deer jumping about!" (p. 261), supposedly a Dai expression because it occurs in a translated Dai tale, are suspect since the same image exists in Mandarin and the somewhat awkward phraseology has a Sinitic ring to it. Nonetheless, the editor is to be given credit for making an honest effort to be authentic and accurate. Hence he writes Sipsong Panna instead of the grotesque Xishuang Banna. And one is infinitely grateful when one encounters in this collection the occasional native term, such as the Drung word *blang* ("spirit, ghost, monster") instead of the constant, grotesque MSMisms. If only more such authentic materials were provided!

One pronounced feature of the tales in this book is their obsession with bodily functions. The scatological vocabulary is so prominent ("shit" is one of the favorite words in the book) that one wonders whether it may be partly a function of editorial selection and translator's preference.

It is often not clear who did the actual translations from the original languages involved. Since only the collector and redactor are frequently named and sometimes they are only Han, one suspects that no one involved in the recording and translating of the tales is familiar with the source languages. If this is so, then one is left mystified at how the tales could have been wrenched into MSM before rendered into English.

It is regrettable that little effort has been made to compare the tales collected in this volume with the folk literature of Thailand, Burma, and Assam. Dragon kings appear in some of these tales and it is obvious that they are related to South Asian *nāgas*, yet no mention of this important parallel is made. Likewise, the cosmic man Pangu occurs in

these tales a couple of times. This is a relatively late myth in China and is ultimately derived from the Vedic myth of Puruṣa. I provided the editor with extensive documentation of northeast India folk literature, but none of it is to be found in *South of the Clouds*. Perhaps the editor is saving this material for a future scholarly treatment of Yunnan folk literature. If so, he should also point out the connections to Chinese myth and legend. For example, in a Zhuang myth, Fuyi and his sister get married and populate the world (pp. 148-149; there are other similar stories in this collection). Surely this is related to the Chinese myth about Fuxi and Nüwa. While we cannot be certain without further research in which direction the myth travelled, it would be of enormous benefit to comparative mythologists to point out such similarities. Similarly, gourd myths are extremely significant among people living in southwest China and surrounding regions, yet their importance is not brought to the surface in this collection. The Jino myth about Apierer on pp. 68-73 tells how their ancestors and, to be sure, all the people of the world, were born from a gourd. Likewise, the Lisu myth on pp. 78-80 relates the story of brother and sister progenitors of the human race who escape from the primeval flood by floating in a huge gourd. Ditto for a Zhuang myth recounted on pp. 146-148. Some acknowledgement of the areal significance of gourd myths needs to be made. (Cf. Victor H. Mair, "Southern Bottle-Gourd (*hu-lu*) Myths in China and Their Appropriation by Taoism," in *Chung-kuo shen-hua yü ch'uan-shuo hsüeh-shu yen-t'ao-hui* [*Proceedings of the Conference on Chinese Myth and Legend*], Han-hsüeh yen-chiu chung-hsin ts'ung-k'an [Center for Chinese Studies Research Series], No. 5. Vol. 1 of 2 [Taipei: Han-hsüeh yen-chiu chung-hsin, 1996], pp. 185-228).

Several of the myths recounted in this collection have heroes who shoot down extra suns or moons that appear in the sky and thus save the earth from calamity. This, of course, immediately reminds one of the Chinese myth about the archer, Houyi, shooting down the ten suns that were scorching the land. A thorough analysis of such parallels would, I believe, show that the sources of many "Han" legends, myths, and customs are to be found in such non-Sinitic tales. The same is true of customs such as divining with two tortoise shells (the answer depends on whether they land up or down) which reminds one of the "Han" people throwing "wooden fish" divining blocks and technology such as the crossbow, for which the very word in Sinitic has been shown by Jerry Norman and Tsu-Lin Mei to have been borrowed from Austro-Asiatic.

As mentioned in the first paragraph of this review, the Appendix, "Traditional Yunnan Ethnic Minority Cultures", is a useful first place to turn for information about the different peoples of the province but, for more precise and detailed information, one must still consult other sources such as the various handbooks published by Human Relations

Area Files or James S. Olson's excellent new *An Ethnohistorical Dictionary of China* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 1998).

As is customary, the editors speak of transliterations, but there can be no such thing involving Chinese characters since they are not **letters**. Rather, the romanization of Chinese should technically be designated as transcription.

The following are some notes on *South of the Clouds* made by graduate students who read it in a seminar at the University of Pennsylvania:

1. Reflexivity

Completely misses the current theoretical thread in anthropology / folklore regarding authority of narrative voice of Westerners who write about other cultures.

2. Performative context

Decontextualized materials are flattened out, meaningless. This is a sort of "Grimm's fairytales" of Yunnan, a de-politicized romantic text and therefore a sentimentalized one. Isn't there enough of that going on in Yunnan as it is?

3. Homogenization of cultures

See p. x of preface: Miller's collaborators are "natives of Yunnan, fluent in Yunnanese dialect." If only there were but one dialect in Yunnan.

4. Presents material as narrative text

See Tedlock, and all of ethnomusicology!

5. He writes interesting stuff about national identity and its fluidity, though it would be helpful if it were fleshed out here a little more instead of referring us to other articles. However, Miller undercuts his own point by presenting all of these multifarious voices as one homogeneous voice, and furthermore, via two translations. Construction of national identity doesn't happen in a vacuum, and Yunnan is a highly contested region, both internally and across national borders with Burma, Laos, Tibet, etc. There is a discourse of power at work that may well be showing up in these narratives! Instead of exploring this further, he seems to be siding with

those who'd prefer to fluff over the distinctions (that is, the Han government), if only by default.

6. Translation

What is a double translation a translation of? Would anyone translating textual materials dare to present a book like this, or is it all right here because this is "only oral literature"? Without the original texts (not the Chinese texts, but the "minority" tales), how can we possibly evaluate what Miller is presenting as authentic? Certainly his texts are a lot more raunchy than others translated into English by the Chinese government (e.g., Foreign Language Press publications like *Dai Folk Legends*). But these tales are presented in such isolation from context that we can't tell if they're representative in any way of the larger corpus out there in Yunnan. For all we know, the Chinese folklorists may have been getting a lot of dirty stories because the storytellers were trying to embarrass them (see Mills' *Rhetoric & Politics!*).

7. Bibliography

There is nothing from folklore and anthropology outside of his own discipline, including really major relevant works like Bauman; no sociolinguistics, no performance studies, etc. Virtually nothing from these disciplines at all since the 1970s, which explains point #1 above.

So what is the audience for this book? What was he hoping this book would accomplish? It's unclear who this is aimed at: Sinologists? folklorists? people who collect stories for kids' books?

Considering all of its liabilities, what possible usefulness does a book like this have? *South of the Clouds* does provide vague outlines of story types, and this is useful for classifying and comparing the tales collected in it. Also, despite the drawbacks of the methods employed for collecting, recording, translating, and redacting the tales **in Chinese**, the editor has done his best with the questionable materials provided by his Chinese colleagues. It is evident that the editor, through his own conscientiousness, has striven to compensate for and even to transcend the limitations of the Chinese filtering process as much as possible. Thus we receive tantalizing glimpses of Yunnan ethnic lore, but it is as though we are seeing things through a glass darkly.

In sum, although I have been uncustomarily severe in this review, I wish to reiterate that -- by the usual yardsticks applied to works of this sort -- *South of the Clouds* is actually far above average in quality. It is only out of respect for what the book has achieved and out of a desire for still greater achievements in the future that I applied these unusually stringent tests. If I had not thought that the issues raised by *South of the Clouds* were of great importance, I would not have devoted such a lengthy review to it.

Hoizey, Dominique and Marie-Joseph Hoizey. *A History of Chinese Medicine*. Tr. by Paul Bailey. Vancouver: UBC Press; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993. ix + 205 pages.

A rather naive and gullible account of the development of Chinese medicine, this small (but expensive -- \$39.95) volume begins with myth and Yuanmou Man (1,700,000 years ago -- was there a China then? was there medicine then?). The awkwardness of the treatment is due to the fact that the main author, Dominique Hoizey, who is a "sinologist, literary translator, and Professor of Chinese" at the University of Reims, France, cobbled this book together from about a dozen Chinese works. The role of Marie-Joseph Hoizey, a Professor of Pharmacology at the same university, was simply to provide a modicum of technical advice. The uncritical nature of the presentation is compounded by the fact that the book had to undergo a second translation from French into English by Paul Bailey, a lecturer in Chinese and Japanese history at the University of Edinburgh. The shallow level of the scholarship is underscored by the pseudo-woodcut illustrations and comic strips at the back of the book. If you want to know what the PRC line on the history of medicine in China is, you can find it here in an unadulterated fashion. But if you want thoughtful analysis and interpretation of the history of Chinese medicine, there is no need even to open the covers of this work because it is totally lacking in them.

As a sample of the childish level of this work, Huatuo (c. 110-c. 207) is presented as a physician of the people who is extremely important for the evolution of Chinese medicine. There is no mention of the fact that his techniques were closely linked to the Indian Ayurvedic tradition (see Victor H. Mair, ed., *The Columbia Anthology of Traditional Chinese Medicine* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1994], p. 688 note 1) or that Confucian-minded scholars as late as the 12th century were still denouncing him roundly for indulging in what they viewed as impossible hocus-pocus (Mair, *ibid.*, p. 697).

It is a pity that so much of our knowledge of China's past, even that offered up by professors of Chinese literature and self-proclaimed Sinologists, cannot get beyond the puerile level of *A History of Chinese Medicine* by Hoizey and Hoizey.

Crystal, David. *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. London: Penguin, 1992, 1994. 428 pages.

This is a remarkably handy and open-minded reference tool. Despite its relatively small size it is also surprisingly comprehensive. Here is its entry for Nostratic:

A proposed super-family of European and Asiatic languages, including Afro-Asiatic, Indo-European, Dravidian, Uralic, Altaic, and Kartvelian (south Caucasian) families. Originally suggested in 1903 by the Danish linguist Holger Pedersen, the notion attracted renewed interest in the 1980s, especially among Soviet linguists.

The author's amazingly good common sense is displayed in his entry on Chinese, of which I here quote the first portion:

A group of languages (traditionally called 'dialects') forming the Sinitic branch of the Sino-Tibetan language family, spoken by c. 1,000 million people in China and Taiwan, and in many countries of the Far East, especially Malaysia, Hong Kong, Thailand, and Singapore, and through immigration all over the world, notably in the USA. It has official status in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao. Because there has long been a single method for writing Chinese, and a common literary and cultural history throughout China, a tradition has grown up of referring to the eight main varieties of speech in China as 'dialects', though they are mutually unintelligible, and thus best thought of as different languages.

While this description is not entirely free of certain small defects, it is better than that of almost every Sinologist and Chinese linguist. This is a sad commentary on the state of the field in Chinese Studies.

Day, Gordon M. *Western Abenaki Dictionary*. Vol. 1: Abenaki-English. Vol. 2: English-Abenaki. Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service, Papers 128 and 129. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1994-95. lxxi + 538 pages; lxvii + 460 pages.

The author devoted nearly 40 years of his life to the compilation of these two volumes. They are, as he put it, "a labour of love" designed to record a language that he feared might "soon be spoken no more".

This is a dictionary of Western Abenaki as spoken in the last half of the twentieth century. A language of the Algonquian family, Western Abenaki is so named to distinguish it from Penobscot and the extinct Eastern Abenaki dialects of what is now the state of Maine. The Western Abenakis, whose homes are Odanak, Quebec and the Missiquoi Bay region of Lake Champlain, have been known to English writers as the Saint Francis Indians from their location on the Saint Francis River and the name of their mission, Saint François de Sales.

We may note that Dr. Day's English-Abenaki dictionary is not simply the reverse of his Abenaki-English dictionary. Instead, it has its own organizational principles which bring out interesting features of the Abenaki lexicon. For example, under "approach", we find listed 34 Abenaki words that have the following galaxy of specific meanings: approach, come on foot, approach traveling, come to, reach someplace, make him approach, make him come back, people show up, people approach (indefinite numbers of actors), go near to it, work near something, go near, arrive, approach swimming, approach traveling, be coming, approach dragging, approach paddling, approach with a cry, come speaking, approach crawling, come crawling, approach flying, come rapidly, approach carrying someone, it approaches floating, it comes blowing, a wind approaches, it approaches with waves, he/it approaches, he/it comes towards me/us, someone approaches, he approaches flying (probably a reference to a male bird which comes ahead to prepare the nest), the family name Wzôkhilain, he who approaches dragging, (he) approaches dragging, he who approaches, he approaches, appears, the one who comes, he approaches walking, approaching, coming, it is approaching, he is coming. Only someone who is thoroughly familiar with a language and sensitive to its nuances could assemble such a large group of more or less semantically related words in this fashion. Furthermore, this approach enables the reader to gain a vivid sense of the genius of the Abenaki language. Reading through this dictionary, one almost begins to feel that one can think like an Abenaki person.

One thing that impresses me about the Abenaki language is that its words tend to be very long. Thus, for "mirror" we have *pipinawjakôgan*, for the locative of "mill" we have *dagwahôganizek*, for "foolishness" we have *giwhlowidahôzwôgan*, and so forth. Quite unlike English or Chinese, I found almost no monosyllabic words in Abenaki.

Another particular item which interests me is the word for "totem" (the English word is actually derived from the Algonquian), which I have long held may be distantly related to the Sinitic word *taotie* (the so-called "glutton" image that is so ubiquitous on ancient Chinese bronze vessels). The Abenaki form (meaning "animal ancestor, totem") is *-doodam* dependent noun, plural *-doodamak*, locative *doodamek*. Note that this term does not occur independently, but only as the latter element in combinations.

Both volumes begin with the following introductory sections: a description of the Western Abenaki language, variations among different speakers, loan words, a pronunciation guide, orthography, guide to the entries, explanation of grammatical terms, abbreviations, and a very helpful list of roots.

For anyone who is interested in studying an Algonquian language, this is an excellent reference work.

Hassrick, Peter H. *The Frederic Remington Studio*. Cody, Wyoming: Buffalo Bill Historical Center, in association with University of Washington Press (Seattle, London), 1994. 62 pages.

Frederic Remington was a giant in the land. For a man who spent most of his time and did most of his painting in New Rochelle, New York, it is astonishing that Remington was able to capture the spirit of the Wild West with such fidelity and energy. Every time I look at a painting or sculpture by Remington, especially an original (but even in reproductions), I experience a transcendent chill. This man was a genius.

The volume under review is a second edition of the catalog that was published in conjunction with the opening of the reconstructed Remington Studio at the Buffalo Bill Historical Center in Cody, Wyoming in 1981. This brief review is a tribute to the artist and to those who possessed the vision and generosity to make the reconstruction of his studio a reality.

Looking at Remington's palette and viewing his painting of *Radisson and Grosseillers* (1906) on his easel, his dozens of brushes in a rough jar, I am transported into the spiritual aura of the man. Ineluctably, I fall into a meditative inner discourse on human potential. Then I am blinded by the realization that every painting and every statue executed

by Remington depicts heroism and dignity -- be they of Indians, hunters, trappers, cowboys, or soldiers. Remington was a strongly built man, yet his touch was as sensitive as that of any artist who ever lived.

This small catalog is to me a gift from the gods because, by showing his art work in warm settings and by juxtaposing them with photographs of Remington at work, it brings the man back to life. Now when I marvel at his supernatural art, I know the measure of the man.

Jonaitis, Aldona, ed. *Chiefly Feasts: The Enduring Kwakiutl Potlatch*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press; New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1991. 300 pages.

This is the catalog of a magnificent exhibition held at the following venues: American Museum of Natural History (New York), October-February, 1992; Royal British Columbia Museum (Victoria), June-November, 1992; California Academy of Sciences (San Francisco), January-August, 1993; National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution (Washington DC), October, 1993-March, 1994; Seattle Art Museum, May-September, 1994. But this handsome volume is much more than an exhibition catalog, for in addition to 132 beautiful color photographs of the objects in the exhibition by Lynton Gardiner, it also includes 86 duotone period photographs that evoke the ambience in which the objects were originally created and used, plus half a dozen substantial essays by competent authorities. The essays are the following: "Chiefly Feasts: The Creation of an Exhibition" by Aldona Jonaitis; "Streams of Property, Armor of Wealth: The Traditional Kwakiutl Potlatch" by Wayne Suttles; "The History of the Kwakiutl Potlatch" by Douglas Cole; "George Hunt, Collector of Indian Specimens" by Ira Jacknis; "The Contemporary Potlatch" by Gloria Cranmer Webster; and "Postscript: The Treasures of Siwidi" by Judith Ostrowitz. Most of the objects are expertly described by Stacy Alyn Marcus and Judith Ostrowitz, while Peter L. Macnair contributed special editorial assistance.

I have long been interested in the Northwest American Indians for many years because of the Northeast Asian echoes in their art, society, language, and physical anthropology. The conspicuous consumption of the potlatch (Chinook, from Nootka *patshatl* ["giving, gift"]) and its adaptive continuation in modern times (Hudson's Bay blanket potlatches, flour potlatches, etc.) has long intrigued me as a social mechanism for gaining power and influence. The transformative impact of Franz Boas's studies of the

language and culture of the Kwakiutl upon American anthropology have also fascinated me. The volume under review is a valuable and reliable source of information on all of these subjects. The bibliography on pp. 289-295 provides additional references for those who wish to explore them further.

Jerry L. Norman and W. South Coblin. "A New Approach to Chinese Historical Linguistics." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 115.4 (1995), 576-584.

This landmark article is a clarion call to reject the moribund, abstract *ch'ieh-yün* and *shih-ching* "systems" in favor of focusing on the real Sinitic **languages**. It is a tragedy, however, that the authors persist in referring to the daughter languages of the Sinitic branch as "dialects," for that only perpetuates the very *bête noire* of Sinitic linguistics that has plagued the subject throughout the last century, viz., that there is a single, monolithic "Chinese" language. Only fear keeps them from recognizing that *fang-yen* are not always dialects; often they are languages and sometimes they are sub-dialects.

On p. 581b (near the top) the authors themselves explicitly state that modern Sinitic dialects are often not mutually intelligible. That they are at least subconsciously aware of the serious classificatory and nomenclatural problems is obvious by the way they dance around the forbidden word "languages" in favor of the unforbidden "forms" or "entities." The odd and inexplicit quality of these sanitized euphemisms is tantamount to an admission that the authors are not saying what they really believe. They seem to be using these imprecise terms just to stay out of trouble with the thought police. Clearly, the authors are uncomfortable with "dialects." Why not just come out and face reality squarely? Why this gross disparity between the way we treat Sinitic languages and the way we treat, say, Germanic or Italic or Balto-Slavic? Why should we adhere to one standard for Indic (or Semitic or Bodic, for that matter) and yet be compelled to accept another standard only for Sinitic? Near the end of their article, the authors do finally talk about "dialect groupings," and that is tantalizing because it reveals how close they are to admitting that the major Sinitic varieties of speech truly are separate languages.

It is precisely this obfuscation -- the avoidance of calling languages in China what they really are -- that leads to the faulty logic of the Karlgenian and neo-Karlgrenian views and which, still worse, prevents the development of a genuine comparative historical linguistics for Sinitic. For me that is, indeed, a tragedy.

The continuing sorry state of the field of Sinitic historical linguistics is due, in large part, to politically motivated ukases proclaimed by the cultural czars of a bankrupt regime. As independent scientists with our own sense of integrity and obligations to pursue the truth, we should not feel obliged to subscribe to these irrational orders. I know as well as anyone (perhaps better than anyone) that it gets you into trouble with irascible people when you state baldly that Cantonese and Shanghainese and Amoyese are separate languages. But, pardon my forthrightness, that is exactly what they are. No one is going to prevent me from saying that for Sinitic languages when I say something similar for Indic languages virtually every day. Think of the dissonance that would plague my poor brain if I forced myself to do so. Should someone attempt to prevent me by threat of force from stating that Cantonese and Mandarin are separate languages, they are brutalizing the objectivity-searching function of my mind. I will not bend to such dictators because I am not beholden to them.

Both Norman and Coblin know my "topolects" paper well. So I am very disappointed about the "dialect" business in their article. They could have avoided sticking their own necks out too far simply by acknowledging that a serious problem exists in the terminology for the study of Sinitic languages. Instead, they just swallow the poison pill by lamely mentioning at the outset that *fang-yen* are "usually referred to as 'dialects' in the West." Yes, they are "usually referred to as 'dialects' in the West," but that usage is dead wrong. Once you swallow that poison pill, you end up being terribly, if not fatally, confused.

As for all the rest (e.g., bringing grammar, lexicon, etc. -- not just a very slippery phonology -- into critical consideration), my heartiest concurrence and congratulations to Norman and Coblin! Hallelujah, above all, for the skepticism they evince (p. 583a bottom) about the characters as accurate and adequate reflections of the real languages.

§§§

Bits and Pieces

Note: The concluding section of this review issue consists of miscellaneous scholarly notes and sundry information. Within the next two or three years, we hope to realize our longstanding aim of inaugurating a separate series of short scholarly notes within *Sino-Platonic Papers*, similar to these review issues which are now up to number VI. Readers are cordially invited to submit brief communications (three pages or less) on any subject of their choosing that falls within the usual framework of *Sino-Platonic Papers*. In the meantime, we will continue to issue occasional "Bits and Pieces" as attachments to the end of our review issues. Naturally, we also welcome reviews from readers.

The following letter was distributed widely to colleagues in North America because the editor believes that An Zhimin's article, which it discusses, is a milestone in the history of scholarship on Early China in the People's Republic. After the publication of An's article, the intellectual climate for the unfettered examination of pre-Qin China rapidly improved. This has had a salubrious effect upon research dealing with other periods of Chinese history and, amazingly, has even shamed some doctrinaire politicians and bureaucrats into liberalizing their policies slightly. Professor An deserves our highest commendations for the brave stand that he made when he wrote and published his article on early bronze metallurgy in China.

22/V/95

Dear Friends,

I am writing to call your attention to an extremely important article that appeared recently in China:

AN Zhimin. "Shilun Zhongguo de Zaoqi Tongqi [A Tentative Discussion on China's Early Copper/Bronze]." *Kaogu [Archeology]*, 12 (1993), 1110-1119.

Professor AN is arguably China's leading living archeologist for the Bronze Age. He is also well known for his familiarity with the archaeology of Central Asia for that period (he has written several chapters for the UNESCO *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*).

Basically, this article is a **critical** survey of all the known evidence for early copper/bronze metallurgy in China. AN begins his survey with this telling statement: "Copper/Bronze in China appears relatively late; this is an objective fact." (p. 1110) AN rejects the idea that there was any real copper/bronze-making going on in China during the Late Neolithic (Yangshao [4400-2500 BCE; located in the middle reaches of the Yellow River], Majiayao [3400-2000 B.C.E.; upper reaches of the Yellow River], Dawenkou [3700-

2200 B.C.E.; lower reaches of the Yellow River], and Hongshan [3900-2500 B.C.E.; eastern part of Inner Mongolia and western part of Liaoning/Manchuria]). Some of the evidence that has been adduced for the Longshan Culture (2400-1700 B.C.E.; middle and lower reaches of the Yellow River) he finds to be suspicious, but AN accepts that by the later part of this period the use of copper is fairly widespread and there may be a bit of bronze, though the culture as a whole still clearly belongs to the Late Neolithic, not to a full-fledged Bronze Age.

Moving into the Qijia Culture (2000-1600 B.C.E., located along the upper reaches of the Yellow River in Gansu and Qinghai/Kokonor provinces), AN makes some significant observations. He notes that there was a "**sudden phenomenon** [emphasis added] in which bronze objects appear in great number and widespread distribution" during this culture. (p. 1113) Most of these objects, however, are still small and most are composed primarily of copper with only small amounts of tin. He concludes this section with the following sentence: "Examining Qijia Culture from its place in chronology and its geographic position, perhaps it was the first to come in contact with the use and development of copper/bronze, and even the production of the copper/bronze implements of the Longshan Culture ought to be considered as inextricably linked with it." (p. 1113)

Erlitou Culture (1600-1300 B.C.E.), often touted as the historical Xia Dynasty, lies in the middle reaches of the Yellow River. It was a successor to Longshan Culture and was involved in the formation of the historical Shang Dynasty. AN documents that, with Erlitou, the proportion of bronze artifacts becomes greater than that of copper ones. In terms of archeological culture, AN says that it is best **not** to refer to Erlitou as the Xia Dynasty. (p. 1114) AN remains skeptical of the historical existence of the legendary Xia Dynasty and says that there simply is not yet sufficient concrete archeological evidence to substantiate it. (pp. 1115-1116)

Now, although I really do not have time for this on the eve of my hurried-harried departure for Kazakhstan and Uyghurstan, I shall translate portions of AN's conclusion. (from p. 1117) I am doing so because I believe they are of such extraordinary consequence that all scholars of Early China and bronze metallurgy worldwide should be made aware of them.

The appearance of early copper/bronze implements in China was comparatively late; at least there were still no copper/bronze implements produced during the Neolithic five or six thousand years ago. The [putative] white brass and yellow brass of the Yangshao Culture as well as the [putative] bronze of the Majiayao Culture all possess advanced

characteristics and could not possibly occur in the early stages of metallurgical history, thus they should be considered suspicious.

Copper/bronze implements are still rarely encountered during Longshan Culture....

I'm fast running out of time. The entire conclusion deserves translation and dissemination (e.g., his doubts about a chalcolithic in China, etc.), but I simply do not have a minute to spare. The gist of AN's conclusions, though, have been highlighted in my summary of the article above, though not so forcefully as AN presents his own arguments in them. Nonetheless, his closing statements cannot be ignored, so I must translate them no matter what.

...How, then, did early copper/bronze implements originate [in China]? This is a puzzle that has not yet been solved. However, the origins of copper/bronze implements quite possibly came into China through the prehistoric "Silk Road," such as through Qijia Culture which is located in the remote northwestern regions where the development of early copper/bronze implements was far greater than in the Central Plains. This is possibly due to its first having come in contact with the use of copper/bronze implements and may have influenced Longshan Culture. By no means were foreign elements rejected in the cultural exchange of antiquity; at least the sudden appearance of early copper/bronze implements is a typical example [of this]. Of course, this is still a hypothesis and deeper investigations are necessary in our current and future work.

The content of AN Zhimin's remarks, astonishing though they are, is not particularly newsworthy. My esteemed colleague, Professor James Muhly, has been saying the same sort of thing for well over a decade. What is extraordinary about AN's remarks is that it was **he** who made them and that he made them in the pages of *Kaogu*. (I think the mummies of the Tarim Basin are having an effect. N.B.: the earliest are dated to around 2000; there are definite links to the distant northwest of the Eurasian landmass; they had bronze; etc.)

When I informed Professor K. C. Chang about this article in February during a lecture trip to Harvard, he gasped with incredulity. After a pause that seemed like an eternity, K. C. asked, "Did AN Zhimin **really** write that?" "Yes," I replied. Another long pause, and then K. C. slowly uttered a sentence that I shall never forget for the rest of my life, "He's a great man." "Why?" I asked. "Because he can change his mind," answered K. C. I was stunned.

Now I really must go. Have a happy and healthy summer! With all best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

Victor H. Mair
Professor

Telefax: 215-898-0933
Telephone: 215-898-8432

P.S.: Attached is the dissertation proposal of Jianjun Mei who will probably be coming to Penn as one of my research associates on the mummies project during the latter part of the spring semester (1996). He will attend the international conference on the Tarim Basin mummies (April 19-21, 1996) to be held in the University Museum and present a paper on his work. I should also mention that SHUI Tao (Nanking University) has written a dissertation (in Chinese) that examines bronze usage in prehistoric Xinjiang, but Mei's dissertation will be in English and will go beyond Shui's.

P.P.S.: Many thanks to Bob Bagley for sending me a copy of the AN Zhimin article.

Yet again on Tibet

For years, there has been carried out in the review issues of this series and in diverse scholarly journals a lively debate on the correct pronunciation of the old Chinese name for Tibet. Among the participants are James R. Hamilton, Edwin G. Pulleyblank, W. South Coblin, and Victor H. Mair. Should we read the two characters 吐蕃 used to write the Chinese transcription as T'u-po or as T'u-fan? And does this Chinese transcription have anything to do with the native Tibetan name *stod-bod* ("Upper Bod [i.e., Upper Tibet]", now pronounced roughly as Töbö), as Mair has asserted in various publications (see *SPP* 46, p. 151 for some references)? Below, Mair (the editor of this series) adduces additional evidence in support of his position that the two characters in question should be read as T'u-po in Modern Standard Mandarin and that the Chinese transcription is most likely derived from the Tibetan name *stod-bod*. Responses from professors Hamilton, Pulleyblank, Coblin, and others are welcome.

1. In the *Memoir of the Pilgrimage to the Five Regions of India* by the Korean monk Hye-ch'o (en route c. 724-c. 728), discovered by Paul Pelliot at Tun-huang in 1908, the expression "T'u-po/fan-kuo" (alternating with "T'u-po/fan"!) is used in reference to Tibet. This indicates that T'u-po/fan was already stabilized as the Chinese transcription for Tibet at least by the early part of the eighth century. See Han-sung Yang, Yün-hua Jan, Shotaro

Iida, and Laurence W. Preston, ed., tr., and annot., *The Hye Ch'o Diary: Memoir of the Pilgrimage to the Five Regions of India*, Religions of Asia Series, 2 (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press and Seoul: Po Chin Chai, n.d.), pp. 89 (3b).6, 93 (4b).12, 95 (5a).1 (twice), 11.

2. In the *Hsin T'ang shu* (*New T'ang History*), scroll 216A, page 1a, we read the following: "Phonetically 蕃 and 發 (Modern Standard Mandarin *fa*; Early Middle Sinitic **puat*) resemble each other, that is why their descendants call themselves Tubo." This formulation would not make any sense if we read 蕃 simply as *fan* with a nasal ending in Modern Standard Mandarin. The sentence clearly states that the sound of 蕃 was considered by the author of this section of the *New T'ang History* to be like that of 發. This means that it is incorrect to read 蕃 as *fan* when it refers to the Tibetans, since 發 has no pronunciation that remotely resembles *fan*, although it does significantly have the alternate Modern Standard Mandarin pronunciation *po*(!!).

3. In chapter 19 of the *Kuang hung-ming chi* [*Enlarged Collection for the Expansion of Illumination*] 廣弘明集, we find the title *Po-jo-po-lo-mi san-hui ching* [*Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra of the Three Types of Wisdom*] 波若波羅密三慧經 where the first syllable of the Chinese transcription is written with a character that is manifestly intended to be read as *po* (without a final nasal in Middle Sinitic), whereas that syllable of the word *prajñāpāramitā* is normally transcribed with the character 般 whose usual pronunciation is *pan* (and is often misread as such by sinographocentric individuals even in this transcription from Sanskrit) but which is granted by persons less fixated on and constrained by the sinographs themselves to have the special reading *po* in such circumstances. This would seem to constitute further proof that some characters in Middle Sinitic had a bifurcated phonological quality that shows up in Modern Standard Mandarin as *-an* and *-o*.

4. The use of *stod* ("upper" -- pronounced *tō*) as an adjectival prefix before an ethnonym to signify a mountainous hinterland associated with a certain people occurs in Old Tibetan documents concerning Eastern Central Asia. See F. W. Thomas, "Tibetan Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan. V," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1931), 807-836.

5. Chang Yi-sun, chief ed., *Han-Tsang ta tz'u-tien* [*Unabridged Sinitic-Tibetan Dictionary*], 2 vols. (Peking: Min-tsu ch'u-pan-she, 1993), pp. 1113-1114 lists numerous

entries where *stod* means "upper" and often "western". In general geographical terms, *stod* is said to signify the high, cold region west of Lhasa and on beyond Shigatse.

6. In colophons of Old Uyghur Buddhist texts translated from Tibetan, Tibet is consistently referred to as *twypwt* (= *töpöt*). This corresponds to the name for Tibet in the earlier Orkhon (9th century) runic Turkic inscriptions, namely *tüpüt* (or *töpöt*). (My thanks to the great Turkologist, Peter Zieme, for this information [personal communication, August 9, 1995]). This is most likely to be the transcription of the Tibetans' own name for Tibet, namely "Upper (*stod* [pronounced *tö*]) Bod (pronounced *bö*)," in contrast to the relatively more lowlying areas of the Bod people who lived in what is now Kokonor (Ch'inghai) and Kansu.

7. Wang Ching-ju equates Chinese T'u-po (Tibet; the two Chinese graphs are now commonly misread in Modern Standard Mandarin as T'u-fan) with Old Turkic *tüpüt* (Tibet) found in two inscriptions in runic script that were discovered in the Orkhon region, the Kül-Tegin stele (dated 732 CE) and the Bilgä Qaghan stele (dated 735 CE). See his "Arsi and Yen-ch'i, Tokhri and Yüeh-shih [*sic*]," *Monumenta Serica*, 9.6 (1944), 81 (of 81-91); fn. 1 gives references for the original publications of the inscriptions by V. Thomsen.

8. Pelliot Tun-huang ms P2762 (P.t. 1263) verso, a Sino-Tibetan vocabulary dating to the latter part of the 9th century, has in line 7 *bod* transcribed as 特蕃 and in l. 8 the same name transcribed as 吐蕃. Thus we have two different versions of the Chinese name for the Tibetans in two successive lines. It would appear from its variant orthographical form that at least the first syllable of the Chinese name is a transcription, probably of some identifying or limiting characteristic of the people (or, more exactly, their country) in question. As I have previously pointed out, this is most likely *stod* ("upper" [pronounced *tö*]), in reference to the geographical position of the dominant group among them. The second syllable, *po* (< **pua[n/t]*), however, is consistent with and most likely derives from an early transcription of the Tibetans' own ethnonym, Bod, which in turn may be related to the name of their indigenous religion ("Bon"). Incidentally, in line 7 of this same manuscript, we find 胡 = *sog-po* which would seem to indicate that, at least during this period of history, *hu* was associated primarily with Sogdians (i.e., Middle Iranians from Central Asia). Of course, the term was used loosely by the Chinese throughout history to refer to a wide variety of Central Asian and Inner Asian peoples, but during the 9th century the Sogdians would seem to have been the primary referent.

9. In P2782, a Tibetan letter written in Khotanese script, we find *bod* (Tibet) transcribed as *patta* [pɹ̥]. This is consonant with our hypothetical, non-*Ch'ieh-yün*-bound reconstruction of 蕃 as ambiguously **pua*[n/t].

10. A Tibetan stele inscription of the year 812 by Btsan pokhri lde srong brtsan refers to a region of Tibet as *stod* ("upper") in distinction to *gtsang* (or *rtsang*), another part of the country which probably took its name from the *Yarutsangpo* River and which is now used in Modern Standard Mandarin to refer to the whole country and its people.

11. A Tibetan stele inscription dating to between 815 and 836 refers to a Lcangbur River of the Stod region of Tibet west of Lhasa. The same river is mentioned as belonging to the Stod region in an entry of a Tibetan historical work from Tun-huang pertaining to the year 751. This demonstrates that Tibetans as far away as Tun-huang were aware of the high region west of Lhasa as being styled Stod. Similarly, the people of this region were called *stod-pa*, a type of song-and-dance characteristic of this region was called *stod-gzhas*, and so forth. There can no longer be any doubt that, during the medieval period, *stod-* ("upper, western") was a productive prefix referring to the area west of Lhasa and beyond Shigatse.

Most of the information in the preceding two paragraphs is drawn from WANG Yao, *T'u-po chin-shih lu* (*A Collection of Inscriptions on Bronzes and Stone Tablets* [sic]) (Peking: Wen-wu ch'u-pan-she, 1982), pp. 119-128 and pp. 171-181.

12. In addition to all of the other placenames with the prefix *stod-* that I have cited above and in my previous articles, the same prefix also occurs in the placename Stod-lung which was a place located significantly in the neighborhood of Lhasa. This name existed already at least by the middle of the 11th century. See WANG Furen and SUO Wenqing, *Highlights of Tibetan History* (Peking: New World, 1984), p. 53.

13. Note that one always goes "up" (*jōkyō* 上 京) to Tokyo regardless of the physical direction from which one is coming. The Tibetans outside of the Lhasa area had a similar orientation to their capital district. What is more, Lhasa and its surroundings are actually higher in altitude than most places where Tibetans dwelled. As we have shown in previous installments of this debate, the Tibetans in Central Asia (outside of what we now consider to be Tibet proper) also referred to important centers as *stod-* ("upper").

14. A section of a Mongolian-Chinese bilingual edict inscribed on a stele preserved at Shao-lin ssu (in Honan province) and referring to events of the year 1253 names the

Tibetans in Mongolian as Töbün and in Chinese as Hsi-po/fan 西蕃 ("Western Po/fan"). With this we may compare TBT and TWBWT in Persian sources from around the same time, Tubbat / Tibbat / Tubbit in Arabic sources, and T'u-po/fan 吐蕃, T'u-po/fan 土蕃, Hsi-po/fan 西蕃, T'u-po 土鉢, T'u-po 土淡, T'u-po-ssu 土播思, and T'ieh-pu-te 鐵不得 in Chinese sources from around the same time. The pronunciation of the first three of the Chinese transcriptions in the previous sentence and that in the Mongolian-Chinese bilingual inscription may be ambiguous, but there can be no doubt whatsoever that the latter four transcriptions are attempts to render in Chinese characters the same sounds as those of the Mongolian, Persian, and Arabic. We might have expected the more usual Töböd or Tübüd in Mongolian but that is used to indicate the plural form, whereas the singular Töbün is employed instead to match the singular form of the name Uighur just before it and the singular form of the name Tangghu just after it in the inscription. The last two Chinese transcriptions seem to indicate a softly expressed dental or alveolar final. We may also note that the famous trilingual (Uyghur, Sogdian, and Chinese) inscription at Qarabalgasun (upper Orkhon Valley) dated to c. 820 refers to the Tibetans in Sogdian as *twp'yt* and in Chinese as T'u-po 吐蕃, and we have already seen that Orkhon Turkic inscriptions transcribe the name of the Tibetans as Töpöt / Tüpüt / Töpüt. Tüpüt is also used to refer to Tibet in the celebrated early (11th c.) Old Turkic dictionary entitled *Dīvān Lughāt* compiled by al-Kāshgarī (I.19, 355) and in the Uyghur *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* (ed., Malov, 30g; Rachmati, SPAW [1932], 115). Finally, in section 260 of the *Secret History of the Mongols*, the name of the Tibetans is transcribed quite elaborately and explicitly as T'uo-po-tu-ti 脫乎都惕 (obviously an earnest attempt to render the plural form Töbödüd) with the Chinese gloss Hsi-fan-mei 西番每 (where the *-mei* suffix is a Yüan period Mandarin vernacular plural suffix). Given that so many different medieval languages (Sogdian, Old Turkic, Persian, Arabic, and Mongolian) all had roughly the same name for the Tibet, it would seem reasonable to assume that they were all basing their transcriptions on the same name which the Tibetans had for their own country. This must have sounded to the Sogdians, Turks, Persians, Arabs, and Mongolians something like Tö[d]bö[d]. The only clear Old Tibetan candidate for a name pronounced in such a fashion is *stod-bod*. Since Tibet was referred to as 吐 / 土蕃 / 蕃 in medieval Chinese texts from around the same period as the Sogdian, Old Turkic, Persian, Arabic, and Mongolian sources cited above, we are compelled to conclude that the Chinese, like virtually everyone else at the time, were attempting with this transcription to convey the same sounds of the same self-designation of the Tibetans. Therefore, if we wish to be historically accurate, we should reject the reading T'u-fan in favor of T'u-po. To insist on reading 吐 / 土蕃 / 蕃 as T'u-fan in the face of such massive historical, philological, and phonological

evidence as that which has been presented here and in the author's previous papers on this subject is to admit that one subscribes to the hobgoblinesque dictum that *Ch'ieh-yün*-dictated character readings are more important than words, a proposition that the editor of this series believes is indefensible and is diametrically opposed to linguistic reality.

For much of the data in the previous paragraph, see J. Nakamura and T. Matsukawa, "A Newly Discovered Inscription of Mongolian-Chinese Edicts from *Shao-lin si* [*sic*] Temple" (in Japanese), *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*, 8 (1993), 1-92 (especially p. 68). I am also grateful to Takata Tokio for several references cited in the preceding paragraph.

15. The same *stod*- prefix appears to have been transcribed in the names *tuo-pa* 土巴 and *tui-pa* 土巴, both of which refer to locations in the same general region of Tibet as placenames beginning with *stod*-.

16. An article in *Hsin-chiang she-hui k'e-hsüeh* [*Hsin-chiang Social Sciences*], 3 (1982) by Abayev provides lends support to the reading T'u-po rather than T'u-fan.

17. The group of Western Tibetan dialects consists of two subgroups. The first is that of Mnga'.ris or **Stod.skad** ("Upper [Tibet] speech"), while the second group consists of transitional dialects from central ones to those of the extreme west of Tibet and includes the Spiti dialect. Cf. the special form of speech called 'Brog.skad ("nomad dialect") among the South Tibetan dialects.

The editor rests his case until the next installment of this series.

Since June 2006, all new issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* have been published electronically on the Web and are accessible to readers at no charge. Back issues are also being released periodically in e-editions, also free. For a complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, with links to free issues, visit the *SPP* Web site.

www.sino-platonic.org