SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 31 October, 1991

Reviews (III)

by
various authors

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public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished.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. Contributors who prepare acceptable camera-ready copy will be provided with 25 free copies of the printed work. All others will receive 5 copies.

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* will be 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.

Contents

Feature Reviews

Oracle Shell and Bone Inscriptions (OSBIs)

Proto-Language and Culture

Language and Script

Miscellaneous

Feature Reviews

Jonathan N. Lipman and Stevan Harrell, eds. *Violence in China: Essays in Culture and Counterculture*. SUNY series in Chinese Local Studies. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990. x + 249 pages.

This book began its life at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies in 1985 in a panel whose topic was "Violence in Chinese Culture." With some deletions of papers presented there and some additions solicited by the editors, the final volume consists of eight essays on various aspects of violence in China from the third century of the common era on, but for the most part manifesting themselves in the last two hundred years. Frederick Brandauer's contribution "Violence and Buddhist Idealism in the *Xiyou* Novels" is the only exploration of the topic as it appears in literature: all others treat violence from a historical or a social science perspective.

Under these circumstances of generation, it is hardly surprising that certain elements or aspects of violence and violent behavior among the Chinese are described and discussed in admirable detail and with considerable sophistication, whereas others are ignored completely or accorded only passing mention. The individual authors also display different levels of ability or desire to underpin their analyses with a general theory of violence, although they mostly accept Stevan Harrell's formulation, which I will discuss below. Yet, overall, this book is a welcome and valuable addition to the growing number of books and articles in Western languages devoted to the disorderly side of Chinese culture, to warfare and to forms of behavior and values not approved or sanctioned by the political or social elite.

In this review, I will concentrate my attention on Harrell's "Introduction" (chapter one). He raises important theoretical issues and attempts to create a typology of violence in China, in addition to locating each of the following essays in his scheme. He begins by defining violence (violent behavior) as "the use of physical force against persons" (p. 1), a minimalist definition, and maintaining that it presupposes "two conditions: there must be a conflict, and there must be a motivation to settle that conflict by force." He proceeds to classify violence in society into two types, vertical violence and horizontal violence. The former can either originate from above, where those in positions of power and authority forcibly restrict efforts from those below to change the current power relations or to remove them from power altogether, or originate from below, where inferiors try to effect such change by physical means. Horizontal violence, he argues, "involves disputes between equals over economic resources or political power" (p. 2). He then proceeds to enumerate where such conflicts in traditional and modern Chinese society occur: within the family, in local society, among ethnic groups, between classes, violent actions perpetrated by sectarians, among contenders for political power at the regional or national level, and the use of force by the government to punish criminals and suppress military threats, from whatever source, to its rule and its claims to legitimacy.

With regard to the motivations for people to engage in volence, Harrell posits three situations. The first is where individuals have been insufficiently enculturated in the social norms of non-violence so that the emotions of anger and hatred overwhelm any and all inhibitions the individual has developed against expressing them physically. Next, there are countercultures, specific groups within society, that openly socialize their members into alternative values, in this case encourage them to act violently in certain circumstances. Thirdly, even orthodox Confucianism advocated the use of force as a moral imperative in certain situations -- it was therefore not entirely consistent in its rejection of violence.

While this scheme has the virtue of being simple, its implicit rejection of other theories concerning the nature of violence and of social organization, its failure to take into consideration native Chinese views of the phenomenon, and its objectification or reification

of the vertical and horizontal axes of violent behavior, leave this particular reader somewhat uneasy.

With regard to the definition of "violence" itself, while it is true that the term usually encompasses injury to another person by means of physical force, it also implies a great emotional outburst on the part of the perpetrator of the deed and a consequent negative evaluation of the act of aggression by other members of the participants' group or community or by society as a whole (Archer and Browne 1989; Siann 1985). The two terms "violence" and "aggression" are, or course, intimately related, with "aggression" being the broader of the two in general usage. Following Archer and Browne, we may say that actions which are labelled "aggressive" are typically characterized by three factors: intent -- the aim is to harm another either physically or psychologically, or by depriving that other of needed or desired resources; the actual performance of the deed, which is not infrequently preceded or accompanied by hostile verbal or symbolic acts; and the emotional state of the aggressor, usually that of anger, but sometimes shading off to irritation and annoyance. Some acts of aggression or violence are, of course, carried out "in cold blood." Chinese military theorists (Yates 1988) advocated the equivalent of the Romans' "decimation" of their troops -- the execution of every tenth soldier after a defeat to warn the survivors not to fail again. Clearly judicial executions both in China and in the West were and are carried out with little or no emotional involvement by the responsible authorities.

To focus solely on the act of violence itself, therefore, the actual commission of the injury, is to ignore the complexities of this form of human behavior. To be fair to Harrell and the other contributors to this book, I should say that most, if not all, of them discuss the issue of aggression in its broader context, rather than just violence by itself. Nevertheless, Harrell and his co-authors do not sufficiently analyze the matter of the moral attitudes towards the use of force by society as a whole (Richard Madsen's "The Politics of Revenge in Rural China During the Cultural Revolution," chapter seven, is a notable exception), contenting themselves rather to trot out the tired platitude that Confucian ideology, and thus the orthodox culture, generally deplored violence in all its forms.

Now the book explicitly covers violence from the third century of the common era down to the Cultural Revolution and beyond: Confucian ideology certainly did not dominate Chinese society throughout this time period nor is it true that it did not change quite radically over the course of the centuries. While it is legitimate and appropriate to try to generalize about the forms and nature of violence through Chinese history, the effort is somewhat vitiated, in my opinion, when a bogus dichotomy is established between the glorification of, and infatuation with, martial exploits, heroism, and violence at the level of popular and/or heterodox cultures (what Harrell and others call "countercultures," cf. Yinger 1960), and the honoring of the value of (social) harmony and nonviolence at the level of orthodox or elite culture.

Although Harrell does mention in one paragraph that Confucian ideology is sometimes ambivalent about nonviolence, the situation was really much more complex than he implies. For example, the fascinating relationship between *wen* and *wu* argued over by philosophers and military strategists in China for the last two thousand five hundred years is not even mentioned once, as far as I can determine, and not even the most idealistic philosopher was unaware of the realities of Chinese daily life and of practical political imperatives.

Thus too often the authors in this volume attempt to create the straw dog of opposition between the (orthodox) culture and the (heterodox/popular) counterculture. There is much of value in the ethnographic accounts of violence or aggression in the "countercultures," but precious little on its manifestation in the culture itself.

Perhaps what I am asking for is an indication somewhere in the text of this book of where the normative culture existed, who propagated it, which children were socialized into it, and how it changed over time. I raise this problem for the following reason. It is that in the noble and entirely appropriate desire to examine groups at the lower levels of society, to

explore the religious beliefs and practices of the common man, of the dispossessed, of women, of sectarians, scholars seem to have been blinded by some strands of the ideology of the texts describing the ideas of the elite and have assumed that they represent the real beliefs and behaviors of the literati class as a whole over the centuries. They have assumed that these literati upheld a "culture" that was unitary and different from, or opposed to, the culture of their mothers, wives, relatives, friends, and acquaintances. It hardly seems possible, and even less so when we read the accounts of nineteenth century, albeit rather jaundiced, observers. Such a one was Arthur H. Smith, who remarks in the course of his famous *Village Life in China* (Chapter 20),

> No adequate understanding of the life of the Chinese is possible without some comprehension of the place therein of the bully, and conversely it might also be said that a just apprehension of the character and function of the Chinese bully is equivalent to a comprehension of Chinese society.... (p. 158)
>
> The most expert of all this dreaded class is the bully who is also a literary man, perhaps a *hsiu-ts'ai*, or Bachelor of Arts, and who thus has a special prestige of his own, securing him a hearing where others would fail of it, guaranteeing him immunity from beating in open court, to which others are liable, and enabling him to prepare accusations for himself or others, and to be certain of the bearing of these documents upon the case in hand....
>
> Any Chinese bully is greatly to be feared, but none is so formidable as the literary bully. (p. 165)

We can read about the violent depredations, in earlier times, of such a cultured and sophisticated literatus as the painter Tung Ch'i-ch'ang, whose actions against his neighbors and tenants induced them to riot and burn his house down.

Are we to explain this type of phenomenon only in terms of the lack of enculturation in the norms of Confucianism, as Harrell suggests, or is the dominant culture more complex than is painted in this volume? I believe the latter is the case, and, as more and more detailed studies of aggression in Chinese society become available, the more necessary will it be to provide an adequate understanding of dominant, Confucian culture, if such a thing ever existed, and to integrate "popular" and "elite" cultures and countercultures into one total Chinese culture.

Next, I am not convinced by Harrell's assertion that a pre-existing conflict is a pre-condition for the exercise of violence, unless "conflict" is interpreted in a very general way. Surely not all the women and female children, admirably surveyed by Christina Gilmartin ("Violence against Women in Contemporary China," chapter eight) who were beaten or killed by their menfolk, were actively competing for dominance or even parity in the relationship. They were rather the innocent victims of their males' sense of inadequacy and frustration, perhaps generated by pressures beyond their control or by internal psychic forces. In fact, they could be considered, at least in some cases, surrogate victims for their males' aggressive tendencies (cf. Girard 1977). Indeed, violence can be initiated by an individual or a group out of fear that their desires may be denied or inadequately satisfied, quite apart from that violence which is generated pathologically. There can be tensions or potential tensions in a relationship prior to the onset of violence, but not necessarily conflict, although, of course, in many cases those tensions and rivalries may have built up over many years, as Harrell describes in his fieldwork in Ploughshare Village (1982).

Finally, I find the list of sites where conflicts occur in Chinese society somewhat amorphous, for Harrell lumps together categories of people and institutions (families, local society, classes, ethnic groups, sectarians, contenders for political power, the government)

into a list that supposedly is constituent of, or largely constituent of, Chinese society as a whole. As Bates and Peacock argue (1989:565),

> [N]o category, no matter how concretely defined (i.e. grounded in empirical observation), can ever be used as if it were an operating part or unit in the structure of society. It is our contention that such use of a category amounts to confusing imaginary, abstractly defined concepts that refer to entirely mental phenomena resulting from an act of classification, with concepts that refer to observable phenomena which have objective rather than subjective referents.

Especially problematic is the inclusion of the government in the list, for there is a whole school of thought that maintains, in Max Weber's words, that the state is "a human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory" (quoted in Lewis 1990:1). It is for this reason that I believe it is essential in the definition of violence to distinguish the legitimate use of physical force on persons from the *illegitimate* use of physical force on them. If we do so, we will perhaps be closer to understanding the relationship in China between the normative culture and its members and representatives and the countercultures and subcultures and their denizens so ably described in this book. And through the study of group boundaries in society we will be closer to understanding why violence is employed by Chinese in certain circumstances. Thus I am unhappy with Harrell's "vertical" axis.

I am also unhappy with the "horizontal" one. It seems to me that the essays in this volume amply demonstrate that individuals and groups in China often came to blows because they had differential access to strategic resources. Even lineages that fought feuds (Harry J. Lamley, "Lineage Feuding in Southern Fujian and Eastern Guangdong under Qing Rule," chapter two) were highly differentiated internally, as presumably were also the groups of Hui and the Sufi orders discussed by Jonathan Lipman ("Ethnic Violence in Modern China: Hans and Huis in Gansu, 1781-1929," chapter three). The actual murderous assaults were carried out by relatively few members, mostly young, often poor, adults who were directed by seniors, themselves at least partially enculturated into elite orthodoxy (this latter point may be less true of the Hui). Furthermore, though the youth had their own personal reasons for engaging in violence, there must have been some element of mob psychology that drove them to their actions. It is hard to see that such slaughter could have been perpetrated over the years without the members of the groups involved having de-individuated themselves and their opponents (Scherer, Abeles, Fischer 1975:153-84). So when case studies are examined in detail, there are not very many equals, or, as the saying goes, some are more equal than others, and the horizontal axis is somewhat shaky.

Despite these strictures on Harrell's introduction, I must say that I found all of the essays in this book stimulating, enlightening, and mostly persuasive. The study of the violent aspect of Chinese behavior is becoming increasingly sophisticated as the years go by and the present volume is a valuable contribution to the ongoing debate. It will be particularly useful as a summary of recent research in such fields as sectarianism (Richard Shek's "Sectarian Eschatology and Violence," chapter four) and Cultural Revolution studies (Madsen's essay and Anne Thurston's "Urban Violence during the Cultural Revolution: Who Is to Blame?," chapter six).

I thoroughly recommend this book.

References

Archer, John, and Kevin Browne, eds.
1989 *Human Aggression: Naturalistic Approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bates, Frederick L. and Walter Gillis Peacock
1989 "Conceptualizing Social Structure: The Misuse of Classification in Structural Modeling," *American Sociological Review* 54: 565-77.

Girard, René
1977 *Violence and the Sacred.* Translated by Patrick Gregory. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harrell, Stevan
1982 *Ploughshare Village: Culture and Context in Taiwan.* Seattle and Washington: University of Washington Press.

Lewis, Mark Edward
1990 *Sanctioned Violence in Early China.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Scherer, Klaus R., Ronald P. Abeles, and Claude S. Fischer
1975 *Human Aggression and Conflict: Interdisciplinary Perspectives.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Siann, Gerda
1985 *Accounting for Aggression: Perspectives on Aggression and Violence.* Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Smith, Arthur H.
1970 (1899) *Village Life in China.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Yates, Robin D. S.
1988 "New Light on Ancient Military Texts: The Development of Military Specialization in Warring States China," *T'oung Pao* 74.4-5: 212-48.

Yinger, J. Milton
1960 "Contraculture and Subculture," *American Sociological Review* 25.5: 625-35.

Reviewed by Robin D. S. Yates
Dartmouth College

All of the following reviews are by the editor.

Mark Edward Lewis. *Sanctioned Violence in Early China.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990. viii + 374 pages.

> This book provides new insight into the creation of the Chinese empire by examining the changing forms of permitted violence -- warfare, hunting, sacrifice, punishments, and vengeance. It analyzes the interlinked evolution of these violent practices to reveal changes in the nature of political authority, in the basic units of social organization, and in the fundamental commitments of the ruling elite. The work offers a new interpretation of the changes that underlay the transformation of the Chinese polity from a league of city states dominated by aristocratic lineages to a unified, territorial state

> controlled by a supreme autocrat and his agents. In addition, it shows how a new pattern of violence was rationalized and how the Chinese of the period incorporated their ideas about violence into the myths and proto-scientific theories that provided historical and natural prototypes for the imperial state.
>
> (from the back cover)

Another excellent work of Sinological scholarship from SUNY Press, a volume in the Series on Chinese Philosophy and Culture, this is a study of an important but, for obvious reasons, hitherto scrupulously shunned subject. The emblem of the book, and the focus of much of its meaty discussion, is the semizoomorphic Chiyou. Perhaps the mythicization of the Miao (i.e., Hmong) people, the ambivalent Chiyou was both the savage enemy of the Yellow Emperor and his terrifying servant or minister (even, at times, his double). By vanquishing Chiyou, the Yellow Emperor tamed martial prowess for the purpose of the maintenance of civilization.

Relying heavily on the *Zuo zhuan*, *Sanctioned Violence* is a multidisciplinary attempt to come to grips with the rise of mass infantry armies in China during the fourth and third centuries BCE. The author skillfully refers to a wide variety of primary literary, historical, and archeological materials to buttress his claim about the changing role of physical violence in the reorganization of the state during the Warring States period. While not averse to citing examples from other civilizations for comparative purposes, he is nonetheless a bit shy about seeking useful data outside of China to illuminate developments there. Indeed, he ironically takes Chinese scholars to task for being "too obsessed with the Greek model to come to terms with the Chinese case." (p. 267 n.146). The methodological breadth of approach will makes this study of value to the student of China who has an interest in political science, history of science, religion, and other sub-fields. But it is unlikely that many outside of the China field will become familiar with this work because of its specialized nature. That is unfortunate, because much of what the author has to say holds significance for events elsewhere in antiquity.

The author's philological acumen is generally high and his translations reliable. He has little to say explicitly about language but does comment perceptively about Xun Tzu's concept of names (words) as bonds (fixing their meanings). (p. 72)

The extensive bibliography (pp. 327-361) consists of an impressive collection of relevant original sources and an astonishing array of the best scholarship in Chinese, Japanese, and Western languages, including many references of which I was previously completely unaware, such as Peter Boodburg's 1930 Berkeley dissertation on the *Dialogues of Li, Duke of Wei*.

Sanctioned Violence is a carefully crafted monograph, one that merits repeated mining and serious reflection by anyone concerned with the history of the Warring States period or with military might in China.

QIAN Wen-yuan. *The Great Inertia: Scientific Stagnation in Traditional China*. London: Croom Helm, 1985. xii + 155 pages.

This little book will undoubtedly be swiftly consigned to the dustbin of obscurity. Indeed, it may well already have achieved that dubious status, just a few short years after its publication. The copy in my university library was "lost" almost as soon as it appeared on the shelves, and I have had difficulty locating it in other major university libraries, not to mention smaller public or private collections. Furthermore, I am not aware of any historian of China currently teaching who requires his students to read the book or even familiarize themselves with its main theses, which are both controversial and worthy of consideration. It would seem that the word has gone out from the citadels of academic orthodoxy -- "this is a bad book and should be forgotten as quickly as possible." If such really be the case, I

believe that it is a terrible tragedy for scholarship but, even more so, for China. Contained within this small volume are powerful truths, unpopular and unpalatable though they may be, that cut straight through a host of pious obfuscations to the heart of the conundrum posed nearly seventy years ago by the greatest Chinese philosopher of the twentieth century, Feng You-lan, when he asked "why China has no science."

Anyone familiar with the work of Joseph Needham, the preeminent authority on the history of Chinese technology, will immediately recognize the title of Qian's book as a response to the Briton's 1969 work entitled *The Grand Titration*. In a larger sense, however, Qian attempts to reply to all Western historians who assert that traditional Chinese science was in no way inferior to that of the West. How ironic that a passionately patriotic Chinese scientist would so resent being told by foreign scholars that his motherland actually surpassed the West in premodern times!

Naturally, few Western sinologists have leapt to Qian's defense. It is interesting to observe, however, that John King Fairbank consented to write a preface for Qian's enormously provocative book. Because it describes well the contents of *The Great Inertia*, the vital issues involved, and the unusual background of the author, I quote here Fairbank's preface entire:

> Because of the author's unique abilities, this is a seminal book of the rare sort that ignites intellectual firestorms. We can see its significance only in the context of the great work by Joseph Needham that called it forth. But first we must put both the Needham Restoration and the Qian Reformation in historical perspective.
>
> The flow of scientific technology outward from Europe has now penetrated all national cultures. The forces of technology and culture today buffet all peoples. Technology, being international, acts upon culture, which is national, to shape each people's modern way of life. In this process China has been laggard. The largest nation with the most persistent and distinctive culture has assimilated modern technology least effectively. It is still one of the poorest countries *per capita*.
>
> The Needham Restoration has heightened this paradox by showing China's early technological superiority to Europe. The massive tomes of *Science and Civili[s]ation in China* have brought to light more and more of China's extraordinary achievements in observation of nature and development of material technology. Needham and his Chinese co-workers have restored to the Chinese people the record of their pioneer accomplishments in making chinaware and cast iron, paper and printed books, lock gates and the sternpost rudder, gunpowder, the compass and a host of other devices and inventions. Yet if China advanced so far so early, why did it fall behind in modern times? This paradox has haunted a whole generation of modern Chinese patriots and of historians of science.
>
> The Qian Reformation launched in this book, *The Great Inertia*, attacks the paradox forthrightly in two ways, by asserting that (1) the Needham Restoration has in some respects claimed too much and yet (2) it has encompassed too little of China's history. The first assertion is made in Chapter 2 (Essay One) below on the level of specific phenomena, in Chapter 3 (Essay Two) on the level of historical factors and in Chapter 4 (Essay Three) on the level of philosophy of science.
>
> The second assertion is made in Chapter 1 (an Introduction), which argues that China's 'intolerant politico-ideological environment' inhibited the establishment of science as an autonomous social institution; and the resulting domination of thought by political authority, a purely negative factor, is not given proper weight in the Needham Restoration. In other words, Joseph Needham's magnificent feat of surveying and discovering

the Chinese record in the various disciplines of science has understandably stopped short of encompassing the whole of Chinese society. The Needham volumes deal with the technology of government only in passing, yet many historians now see the all-powerful Chinese state as the greatest of all China's technological-social achievements. For example, the Legalist technique of popular self-policing by mutual surveillance under the doctrine of collective responsibility, like the Confucian arrangement for each scholar's self-indoctrination in the classical teaching of social order through his arduous preparation for civil service examinations, are only two of the Chinese inventions in political technology. In sum, they perfected government by bureaucracy.

The early Chinese success in the organisation of their state and society all across the board -- economically, politically, socially and culturally -- accompanied the efflorescence of material technology and invention that Dr Needham and his colleagues justly celebrate. All these achievements came along together. But in the process the growth of science as a social institution was smothered by the predominant growth of the state power. Chinese creativity in social and political engineering rivalled their inventiveness in material technology, but as the great institutions of autocracy and bureaucracy became deeply established, they stifled creativity. Modern revolutionists finally had to attack the Eight Legged Essay of the Ming-Ch'ing examination system as hobbling men's minds just as clearly as footbinding hobbled Chinese women. China's early prowess in organisation had strangled her capacity for growth.

This I think is the truth to which Qian Wenyuan's Reformation leads us. As a Chinese intellectual of the Maoist era, he sees China's tardiness in the assimilation of modern science as an aspect of the whole social process. He lacks both the sentimentality of foreign benefactors and the zeal of latter-day missionaries-in-reverse. He is conscious mainly of his patriotism and of the scholar's function to seek the truth. The power of the Chinese state has been made all too evident to him.

Wen-yuan Qian (Ch'ien) was born in 1936 and in 1959 finished a five-year Soviet-type training at Peking University in theoretical physics. He then spent 21 years teaching at Zhejiang (Chekiang) University in Hangchow. There he taught theoretical physics from 1959 to 1966 and after the Cultural Revolution from 1977 to 1980, whereupon he came to Northwestern University. There, after a short time in the Physics Department, he transferred to the History Department and in 1983 received his MA in history. He now holds a three-year Distinguished Department of History Fellowship for PhD work at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

During the long decade of the Cultural Revolution 1966-76, Qian tells us that 'at the cost of extreme personal agony, I learned what communist totalitarianism means', yet he says he did not waste his time and was able to develop his command of English. An outsider untouched by the revolution can only marvel at this man's accomplishment in making his way from China to America and intellectually from physics to the history of science. On the one occasion when I met Mr Qian he seemed to me thoroughly objective and remarkably unaggressive, yet his mind has been prepared by long academic training and by intensely personal experience to deal succinctly with large issues of history. The reader will soon see that this Preface has by no means encompassed the range of Qian's thinking, any more than I can comprehend all the dazzling detail of Joseph Needham's masterwork. My suggestion that in the study of China's history

the state power is the frontier most in need of exploration, is only one angle of approach. William Monter's Foreword puts it in a broader context.

Monter, who is an European historian, was one of Qian's teachers at Northwestern University. I quote here the opening portion of his forward for the comparative context in which it phrases Qian's work:

> Readers need to know three things about the author of *The Great Inertia*. Wen-yuan Qian is a physicist who admires the taut beauty of his discipline; he is a deeply patriotic Chinese; and he possesses a stubbornly independent turn of mind ('incurably bourgeois', in the Maoist idiom). Every sentence of his work reflects at least one of these aspects, and many combine all three. Only a man endowed with unusually tenacious idealism would undertake a major enterprise in a new discipline in middle age, written in a foreign language; only someone with unusual originality of mind could have given it the shape he has. The result is a serious work of comparative macro-history, an overview of the non-development of science in China seen against the background of European science, and occasionally Japanese technology.
>
> Across its path lies the voluminous work of Joseph Needham, the principal expositor of traditional Chinese science to the larger audience of English-reading non-experts -- to which I belong. Qian's perspectives, both as a physicist and as a Chinese, inform a critique which challenges some of Needham's fundamental assumptions and thus becomes the prolegomenon to a different history of traditional Chinese science. If you begin with the physical rather than the biological branches of science, and if your point of departure is the present-day 'neo-colonial' or 'third-world' state of Chinese science instead of the technological precocity of China a thousand or more years ago, then Qian rather than Needham provides the better historical guide for the neophyte.
>
> But, as a culture-bound European historian, my principal concern with Qian's work lies in its assumptions about, and implications for, the history of European science. If it remains true that the only world-historical scientific revolution occurred in Europe about three centuries ago, *and* if Qian is correct in his assumption that 'software decides', then exactly what types of non-scientific 'software' accompanied, facilitated, or at any rate failed to prevent the emergence of a recognisably 'modern' science by the time of Newton?
>
> Cultural pluralism, says Qian. Considering that the human mass of China and Europe (including western Russia) approximately balanced each other, the most important contrast he sees is between the politically and culturally unified Chinese empire, held together by a Confucian ideology administered by a bureaucracy equipped with a superb rote memory of classical texts – and the multiple divisions of Europe, where the loyalties of intellectuals were split between church and state, between state and state, and (after Luther) between church and church. In China a capricious, free-will 'Son of Heaven' presided over an irregular natural world, but human affairs were usually well-ordered; in Christendom, a watchmaker-God regulated Nature while human affairs swirled in a disorderly cauldron.

My own interest in what Qian has to say was piqued when I discovered that he is one of the only historians of science I know who seriously takes into account the role of China's unique script in the development of Chinese science.

Qian's first comments on writing systems occur in his "Explanations and Acknowledgements":

> All Chinese names, except for very familiar ones like Confucius and Mencius, are spelled with the new system of Romanisation, 'pin-yin'. This rule covers all quoted passages, except when I could not guess the original Han characters. I use the 'pin-yin' system simply because I am familiar with it, and because my name is now officially spelled as it appears here; I know that 'Qian' looks and hence sounds strange to native speakers of English. I think, historically speaking, that this system (which is good, but with a few exceptions, notably q, x, and c) reminds us of the fact that it was designed when mainland China was very much separated from the rest of the world. (p. 4)

Qian's penchant for insightful comment is revealed in something so prosaic as his justification for choosing a particular romanization. But he probes more deeply toward the root of the problem in the body of the book when he writes:

> The inertia topic must have been in my mind for a long time, if intuitively. All my life I have been taught that China stands among the longest and most civilised cultures; yet all my life I have been aware (and ashamed) of China's inferiority in terms of economy, **popular literacy**, scientific performance, military power, and political enlightenment. **All my life I have resented wasting hour after hour to master a decent calligraphy, because I was aware that such formal exercises do not produce the substantive knowledge that is so desperately needed to rescue China.** For a few decades I was enthusiastic about the Romanisation -- 'pin-yin' -- of the old Han characters, because I once believed that that reform might serve as a short cut to raise the cultural level of the people. ... All my life I have been distressed by the knowledge that my ancestors were so preposterous as to insist on a set of cruel standards for females (Neo-Confucian 'chastity' since the thirteenth century, binding feet for over a millennium).... (p. 84, emphasis added)

Still more apposite are Qian's remarks when he confronts Needham directly:

> As we have indicated before, by and large China has been a country of poor peasants; her average cultural achievements have, in fact, been limited. It is widely acknowledged that general poverty, **a very difficult writing system**, and the all-pervasive politico-ideological controls share the responsibility in this regard. **The Han characters, that is the 'square words', which serve as the major conveyance of Chinese civilisation, are evidently deficient: they are too cumbersome a tool. Consequently, intellectual performance facilitated by this writing system, in terms of net output, has been substantially reduced.** Needham put forward a hypothetical statement:
>
> > It may not be too much to say that had the environmental conditions been reversed as between Euro-America and China, all else would have been reversed too.... Westerners would have to learn the ideographic script just as the Chinese

> now have to learn alphabetic languages because the bulk of modern scientific literature is written in them.
>
> In view of the point I have just expounded -- that the net output of a tool is inversely proportional to its clumsiness, and taking into account the essential difference in the two systems of writing, one is tempted to offer an almost reversed hypothetical statement: **Had the writing systems been reversed between Europe and China, Westerners would have had to learn science and technology from China as the Chinese now have to learn science and technology from Westerners.** (p. 95, emphasis added)

It is significant that Qian footnotes his comment about the tetragraphs as being "too cumbersome a tool" to a letter written by Einstein to J.E. Sweitzer.

While Qian ultimately rejects the archaic and clumsy sinographic script as the primary cause for China's backwardness in science, he is perceptive enough to identify it as an important factor. My own opinion on the matter is that the repressive politico-ideological institutional structure of the Chinese imperial regime and the tetragraphic writing system were intimately interlinked. Without the one, the other could not have existed as long as it did.

The renowned astrophysist and champion of democracy in China, Fang Lizhi, recently spoke at the University of Pennsylvania. In his lecture, he asserted that theoretical science in China now lags only a couple of months to a couple of years behind the West, depending on the field. It is only in applied science, according to Fang, that China is decades behind the advanced countries. I am suspicious of this formulation and suspect that the genuine assimilation of the abstract theoretical scientific principles into the mind of China (by which I mean the sinographically limited mind) has much further to go to catch up with the West than does the practical sphere of technology where China has always excelled. It is one thing to invent nonce translations of the most recent international scientific terminology and concepts, but that does not mean that they have been absorbed as an integral part of intellectual and technological discourse in China. Still less does the sending of the tens of thousands of scientists to the West where they earn degrees for theses and papers written in European languages indicate that theoretical science has been adapted to fit the sinographic mode. One wonders, in fact, whether there may not be a fundamental incompatibility between the concrete, visually splendiferous sinographs and the abstract, understandably spare propositions of scientific theory.

The Great Inertia is the aching cry of a thoughtful critic from within the Chinese tradition addressed to the enthusiastic advocate from without. This is a book that deserves an honest, impartial reading. I wish that it would be made more widely available in an inexpensive paperback edition. Surely we are desperately in need of a counter to the prevailing view that there are no basic qualitative differences between Chinese technology and Western science. Qian's book is an eloquent rejoinder to the relativistic proponents of China's past glories who fail to account for the present yawning disparities with the West.

Oracle Shell and Bone Inscriptions

M.V. Kryukov. *The Language of Yin Inscriptions*. Moscow: Nauka, Central Department of Oriental Literature, 1980. 77 pages. Translated by E.H. Tsipan from *Yaz'ik In'skikh Nadpisei* (1973).

This volume is part of the distinguished series, "Languages of Asia and Africa," founded in 1959 by G.P. Serdyuchenko, under whose general supervision more than a hundred language monographs were published. In many cases, the volumes in this series represent the only formal treatments of a number of languages in the world.

M.V. Kryukov was expected to produce a conventional linguistic description. The problem is that the Oracle Shell and Bone Inscriptions (hereafter OSBI[s]) represent an unconventional kind of language. In his "Diachronical Remarks" at the end of the book, Kryukov states that, "We have no grounds to doubt that the language of the oracle bone inscriptions was directly linked with the living conversational language of the Yin ethnical community." (p. 71) While this sounds like a reasonable and sensible statement, I would question the degree of the linkage between the living language of Sinitic speakers during the late Shang period and the OSBIs. As I have asseverated on numerous occasions, in my estimation there was always an enormous gulf between speech and sinographically expressed language in China until the rise of written vernacular under the impact of Buddhism, and even then the nature of the script prevented the full phonetic rendering or recording of any real dialect.

Given the constraints under which he is operating, Kryukov does a commendable job of presenting the essential known features of OSBIal language. It is understandable that he has to skip phonology altogether, although this is normally the springboard for further discussion of a language. In its place, he offers a brief explanation of the mechanics of the writing system. Naturally, the largest proportion of the book is taken up with a description of the grammar of the OSBIs. Since the OSBIs had only a tenuous and indirect relationship with real language, this becomes somewhat problematic.

Kryukov approaches the grammar of the OSBIs at three levels: the word (which he divides into notional words, semi-auxiliary words, and auxiliary words), the syntagma, and the sentence. The lack of clear morphological and other types of markers for these different levels makes the analysis very difficult and tentative.

The juvenile state of OSBI studies demands an account of previous work on the subject and this Kryukov provides in his useful introduction. He also offers general information about the divinatory process to which the OSBIs belonged.

The book closes with an appendix containing three sample texts, including their translations, and a bibliography of 52 collections of published OSBIs and 29 secondary studies in Chinese, Japanese, and Western languages.

LI Pu. *Jiagu Wenxuan Zhu.* [*Annotated Anthology of Oracle Shell and Bone Inscriptions*]. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji [Classics], 1989. 16 + 355 pages.

For those who have a serious interest in reading OSBIs but have no background or training, this book is an excellent place to begin. *Jiagu Wenxuan Zhu* brings together 60 texts from Yinxu (the Wastes of Yin) and from the newly discovered southern site of Xiaotun. The texts cover a broad range of topics, from astronomical phenomena, meterological concerns, and calendrical matters to agriculture, government, military affairs, hunting and fishing, construction, tribute, education, birth, sickness, sacrifice, and so forth.

Each text is provided with the following:

1. A clear, non-scale drawing of the bone or shell including, of course, the inscription(s) engraved upon it.
2. A copy of the inscription(s) laid out grid-fashion and indicating the direction(s) in which it (or they, if there is more than one inscription on the shell or bone) should be read. Beside or beneath the copy is a rendering of the inscription in regular sinographs.

3. A brief explanation of the provenience and prior publication, subject and significance, and other general information about the inscription(s).
4. Extensive annotations which gently guide the novice through the most elementary stages of OSBI studies. The notes provide generous cross references and scholarly, but not obscurantist, discussions of difficult points.
5. A straightforward translation into Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM).

The book concludes with the following handy appendices:

1. A genealogical chart of the Shang rulers (based on Dong Zuobin's *Fifty Years of Oracle Shell and Bone Inscription Studies*), giving archaic and modern forms of the graphs.
2. Charts of the calendrical phonograms (stems and branches) in their various forms (early and late OSBIal, bronze, and seal) and their combination as a complete cycle of sixty.
3. The archaic and modern forms of the names of 120 Shang dynasty diviners.
4. Bibliography of primary sources and scholarly studies (in Chinese only).
5. An index to the text and line of each occurrence of all graphs. The index is arranged according to the total number of strokes in the modern forms of the graphs, but the archaic forms (including radicals) are also given.
6. An index to graphs discussed in the annotations. The graphs are listed according to the total stroke count of their modern forms.

It is evident from all of these aids that the compiler and annotator was genuinely desirous of helping the reader become familiar with the OSBIs in a hands-on fashion, rather than scaring her away with arcane and intimidating irrelvancies -- as is, lamentably, so often the case with so-called "introductions" to OSBI studies.

WANG Yuxin, YANG Shenguan, and NIE Yuhai, comp. *Jiaguwen Jingcui Xuandu* [*Selected Readings in Oracle Bone and Shell Inscriptions*]. Peking: Yuwen, 1989. 14 + 657 pages.

The intent of this volume is quite different from that of the volume reviewed just above. Where *Jiagu Wenxuan Zhu* was designed for the serious tyro, *Jiaguwen Jingcui Xuandu* is for the intermediate reader. It presents 690 representative texts, many with multiple inscriptions, dealing with virtually every area of Shang society, politics, and culture. The OSBIs are drawn according to their original shapes, occasionally with indication of scale provided. On facing pages, the outline of the bone or shell is repeated, but graphs are given in their modern forms. No indication of directionality is given, nor are there any annotations or commentary whatsoever.

This book does, however, have one tremendously valuable feature, namely, pages 552-622 are an index to each of the 12,921 separate occurrences of the 931 different graphs in the collection (both figures are according to my count). The first 743 graphs are listed according to total stroke count of the modern forms and the remaining 188 graphs, which cannot with assurance be identified with modern counterparts, are listed according to the order of their appearance in the collection.

The beauty of this index is that it enables the student to do statistical samples of various aspects of Shang civilization. I found it extremely revealing to leaf through the index to determine which graphs were most common. Naturally, graphs such as *bu* ("pyromantic crack-making [for divination]", 422 occurrences) and *zhen* ("divine, submit a charge", 446 occurrences) are among the highest frequency items. The most prominent

single group of graphs are the 22 calendrical stems and branches. They occur 2,731 times or 21.13 % of the total. This overwhelming preponderance of the stems and branches corroborates my thesis that the phonograms constitute the core of the writing system. The index also makes it easy to see which types of animals were sacrificed and hunted most often, what kinds of problems (the weather, especially rain, tribal enemies, parturition, etc.) worried the ruler.

What surprises me most about the OSBIs is how terribly circumscribed they are. We are dealing here not with a flexible script that could be used to describe a landscape, record a narrative, or express a poetic emotion. Rather, this is a functional tool designed for a very specific purpose, divination concerning a limited set of topics. Even the next stage in the development of the tetragraphic script, the bronze inscriptions, are very restricted in their purview. It was only much later, around the mid-Zhou period, that written language acquired a more lyrical, unfettered voice. Consequently, the OSBIal language strikes me as being very young. In contrast to many other commentators on the history of Chinese writing, I do not see the OSBIal script as mature by any stretch of the imagination. This is not to discount the fact that the basic technical components (phonophores, semantemes, grammatical particles, and so forth) of the future full-fledged script were basically all in place by the end of the Shang. What we must caution against is the assertion that there was no significant development of the capabilities of the script during the Zhou and Qin periods.

To end on a more prosaic note, the book closes with a list of the sources for each text in the collection. Finally, users of *Jiaguwen Jingcui Xuandu* should be forewarned that the quality of the printing leaves much to be desired. Blurring and blotting renders many of the texts virtually unreadable. Still and all, this is a most welcome addition to the shelf of all who have more than a casual attraction to Shang studies.

LIU Xiang, et al. *Shang Zhou Guwenzi Duben* [*A Reader of Shang and Zhou Paleography*]. Peking: Yuwen, 1989. 2 + 420 pages.

If the previous volume was intended for intermediate students, this one surely must have been meant for those who are already advanced. The first part of the book consists of 38 selections from Shang OSBIs (beginning, appropriately and significantly, with a complete cycle of the calendrical stems and branches, which I will try to demonstrate in a forthcoming monograph form the original core of the Chinese writing system), 2 Zhou OSBIs and 24 Zhou bronze inscriptions. The selected items are given first in line drawings or rubbings. Each selection is then transcribed into modern tetragraphs and extensively annotated. Unusual readings are indicated with Pinyin and the texts are provided with loose translations.

The editors have judiciously chosen texts which represent a wide variety of content and orthographic styles. Many of the items included are well known to Chinese paleographers and should be mastered before the student moves on to do independent research on unannotated texts.

The second part of the book is an introduction to the paleography of the Chinese script. Topics covered include the types of ancient inscriptions (OSB, bronzes, pottery, gemstones [especially jade], bamboo strips and silk, seals, and coins); the value of the study of ancient inscriptions for scholarship in general; paleographical methods; the development of the ancient Chinese script; grammatical peculiarities. From the standpoint of traditional Chinese methods for dealing with ancient scripts and texts, this may be considered to be a concise and reliable overview. It could have been improved by escaping from the restrictive mold of Chinese textual studies by devoting more attention to the importance of phonology and the genuine etymology of words (the latter is still barely known in Sinology since emphasis is unremittingly placed upon the shapes of the graphs).

The last section of the book consists of a dictionary of 231 graphs frequently occurring in Shang and Zhou inscriptions. Each entry gives the MSM pronunciation in Pinyin, the antitomous quasi-spelling (*fanqie*), and rhyme class. There follows an analysis of the shape of the graph and examples of its different meanings and functions. The editors have considerately provided an alphabetical index to the dictionary as well as an index by total stroke count.

As is common with publications of this sort in China because of the profusion of unusual graphic forms, the text has been written out by hand. Although neat, the writing has a spidery quality which, when coupled with the printing which is quite faint on some pages, makes it difficult to read. For those who are intent upon refining their paleographical skills, however, the *Shang Zhou Guwenzi Duben* is a worthwhile investment.

Riccardo Fracasso. *A Technical Glossary of Jiaguology (Oracle Bone Studies).* Supplemento n. 56 agli *Annali*, Istituto Universitario Orientale, 48.3 (Naples 1988). viii + 99 pages.

Apart from the monstrously awkward sinoanglicism, "jiaguology," which appears in the title and scattered throughout the text, this is a handy and reliable glossary of terms relating to the scientific study of OSBIs. The glossary consists of 302 terms arranged by multiple-sort alphabetical order of their Pinyin romanizations. A supplementary index by total stroke count of head and successive graphs may be found at the back of the volume.

Each entry is provided with a precise English translation or series of alternative translations. For more important or problematic terms, a brief discussion of the history of their usage and scholarly opinions concerning them are also provided. Fracasso makes frequent reference to the authorities whose works are included in his substantial bibliography of works in Chinese, Japanese, and Western languages.

Although the OSBIs are the oldest form of Chinese writing, their study is still in its infancy. This is born out of the fact that the vast majority of technical terms in this fairly complete glossary were coined in this century and many of them are still being debated and revised today.

Inasmuch as Fracasso strives for absolute precision, this is not a book for the casual reader (e.g. *linfeng* are defined as "the sutures joining the epidermal scutes of a turtle shell"). Indeed, such daunting definitions will undoubtedly send even the determined reader scurrying to his English dictionary.

There is also much arcane knowledge in this book that is necessary for the smooth reading of the Chinese archeological literature on the subject. For example, we learn on p. 37 that the *si Tang* ("four Halls") is a convoluted way of referring to the four greatest pioneers of OSBI studies, viz., Luo Zhengu, Wang Guowei, Dong Zuobin, and Guo Moruo whose literary styles (*zi*) were respectively Xuetang ("Snowy Hall"), Guantang ("Observatory Hall"), Yantang ("Hall of Refinement"), and Dingtang ("Hall of Bronze Tripods").

All of this esoteric wisdom is made much more assimilable by the inclusion of 20 figures consisting of maps, charts, diagrams, and drawings. For anyone who wishes to tap the scholarly literature on OSBIs, this small book is essential (if you are lucky enough to obtain a copy).

XU Zhongshu, ed. *Jiagu Wenzi Dian [Dictionary of Oracle Shell and Bone Graphs].* Chengdu: Sichuan Cishu, 1988. 8 + 2 + 98 + 18 + 4 + 1,613 pages.

If *Jiagu Wenxuan Zhu* is for beginners in OSBIs and *Jiaguwen Jingcui Xuandu* is for intermediates, then *Jiagu Wenzi Dian* is for advanced students. This is a massive tome, but one which I have found immensely helpful in dealing with OSBIal materials.

Each entry includes the following components (when applicable):

1. The typical OSBIal form of the graph, together with significant variants (divided by time periods) which are specified according to their serial numbers in the collections where they appear.
2. An explanation of the shape of the graph, including traditional "etymologies" which are not always followed.
3. An explanation of the meaning of the graph, if it is known.
4. Citations illustrating the graph in context. This feature is particularly valuable because the citations are all rendered into the modern forms of the graphs, when that is allowed by our present level of knowledge. Each citation is identified by the collection from which it is taken and the serial number of the revelent OSBI therein.

Perhaps the most surprising revelation that may be derived from consulting this dictionary is the large number of graphs whose meanings are not known. My impression is that only about 1,121 (my count) of the 2,849 (my count) OSBIal graphs in the *Jiagu Wenzi Dian* can be more or less securely equated with modern sinographs. In other words, the meanings of over 60% of the graphs in the OSBIal script, nearly 2/3rds, is unknown. This has several possible implications for our general understanding of the role and nature of sinographs.

In the first place, we must simply admit that the OSBIal script has only been partially deciphered, It is questionable, in my mind, whether a full decipherment will ever be possible. The reason for this, I believe, is that the script was never meant to be used as a representational device for real language. That is, the OSBIal script from its very inception gives little indication of having been intended to record speech fully, i.e., where each element of spoken language is faithfully represented by a corresponding element of the script. Rather, as I have said elsewhere, the OSBIal script functioned as a kind of priestly demicryptography. It is obvious that the OSBIal script was based upon the Old Sinitic (OS) language, but it was far from being an accurate recording device for living OS.

Every language in the world that has ever existed depends upon phonology and morphology to convey the ideas and sentiments of its speakers. The OSBIal script, however gives the **impression** that OS virtually lacked morphology and that its phonology was very vague. Current research is beginning to demonstrate that OS did indeed have such linguistic features as cases and suffixes and that these were marked by specific configurations of sounds.

If the OSBIal script was not designed to represent real language, what then was its purpose? The answer to this question may be readily discerned by examining the narrowly limited concerns of the diviners and their patrons. OSBIal divination was an esoteric affair. There was no reason, therefore, for the script to be accessible to the public or to record daily discourse. Hence my pessimism about the prospects for its complete decipherment. A script can only be deciphered when (and to the extent that) it represents a real language, whether living or dead.

The second overwhelming realization one gains with precision from the statistics (2,849 OSBIal graphs of which less than a third are decipherable) is that, already shortly after the OSBIal script was invented (through contact with other Eurasian consonantaries, as I shall show in a forthcoming monograph), its custodians took the fatal step of opting for an essentially open-ended, infinitely expanding set of pictoideophonetic graphs. Once they made this choice, it became impossible for the script to behave efficiently as a syllabary, consonantary, or alphabet. This, in turn, swiftly led to all sorts of problems for

the common man (i.e., the non-diviner) who may have wanted to use the script for practical purposes.

With such a gigantic and ever growing (i.e., non-closed) system of writing, it became very difficult to learn and to standardize. And how does one classify such a huge collection of fundamentally arbitrary and largely illogical shapes? There were no explicit or even implicit rules governing the constitution and the arrangement of the components of newly created graphs. This led to virtual chaos for anyone who wished to order the graphs in an analytical sequence for the purpose of retrieving information later on. The compilers of the *Jiagu Wenzi Dian* make a feeble attempt to organize the nearly three thousand OSBIal graphs in the dictionary according to the *Shuowen* (dated to 100 CE) "radicals," but it is really an unworkable procedure. One would swiftly go insane, for example, trying to find  under  and (variants ,) under !! This is a script designed not for the organization and dissemination of knowledge, but for royal and religious ritual. Nor can the vast majority of the OSBIal graphs be classified according to the total number of their strokes because they have so many variants and because there are no standards for determining what is a stroke in this script. For someone who believes that a script should serve the needs of the full spectrum of society, the situation presented by the OSBIs is quite hopeless. This heritage of the OSBIal script still haunts Chinese language reformers today.

M.V. Kryukov and KHUAN Shu-in. *Drevnekitaisii Yaz'ik.* Moscow: Glavnaya Redaktisiya Vostochnoi Literatur'i, 1978. 512 pages.

This is a textbook for learning Ancient Chinese that is quite unlike anything available in a Western European language or, for that matter, to the best of my knowledge, in Chinese, Japanese, or any other language. Kryukov's and Khuan's approach is methodical and thorough, but the most unusual quality of the book is its heavy emphasis on the earliest phases in the development of the written language.

The book consists of sixty lessons that focus on authentic texts from the following periods:

1. Archaic (14th-11th c. BCE)
2. Early Preclassical (10th-8th c. BCE)
3. Late Preclassical (7th-6th c. BCE)
4. Early Classical (5th-3rd c. BCE)
5. Late Classical (2nd c BC - 2nd c. CE)
6. Postclassical (3rd-5th c. CE)

The first ten texts, for the Archaic period, of necessity were all drawn from the Oracle Shell and Bone Inscriptions. This is in keeping with Kryukov's expertise in this subfield of Sinology (cf. the review of his *The Language of Yin Inscriptions* above). The next nine texts, for the Early Preclassical period, are all bronze inscriptions. And so forth. My one complaint about the book is that the precise sources of the texts are not provided. For beginning college students this may not be necessary, but it would save their professors, who might wish to use this book, the time and trouble of tracking down the originals.

Kryukov and Khuan appear to be very pedagogically oriented. In their introduction they present a "Method for Working on Old Chinese Texts" which informs their presentation throughout. They begin by dividing words into three categories:

> 1. significant words that possess a fixed meaning but no external sign of their part of speech which is determined instead by their place in a particular sentence;

2. auxiliary or functional words which lack a specified meaning but play a strong grammatical role;
3. semifunctional words such as modal predicates, adverbials, pronomials, etc., that fall between the above two categories.

Having established these three categories of words, the authors then proceed to lay out their "concrete procedure for analyzing ancient Chinese texts":

1. suggested articulation of the text;
2. suggested analysis of the text;
3. conditional grammatical translation;
4. determination of the lexical meaning of the significant words;
5. literal translation;
6. literary translation.

The layout of the lessons is dedicated to guiding the student through the various steps just outlined. The six main divisions of the text (archaic, early preclassical, etc.) are preceded by brief general remarks which characterize the language and literature of the period in question and describe the specific texts chosen. Each lesson begins with the original text arranged grid-fashion without punctuation. Since the horizontal rows and vertical columns are both numbered, it is easy in class discussion to refer to a specific graph. The first section consists of detailed and illuminating grammatical commentary. That is followed by a list of graphs that appear in the texts. This gives only Modern Standard Mandarin pronunciations and four digit numbers keyed to the glossary of 1,801 graphs occurring in the book that may be found on pp. 388-484. (It is interesting to note that the number 1,801 is close to that of the Tōyō Kanji (1,850 sinographs designated for "daily use" in Japan). This would seem to be roughly the maximum number of discrete visual forms most human beings can tolerate in a writing system. The current number of sinographs in actual daily use in China, and for that matter, the number of sinographs commonly used in premodern times, even in Literary Sinitic texts, did not differ greatly from this magnitude. There is good evidence that the typical human mind rebels when it is forced to memorize more than about 3,000 separate graphs as the stock in trade of a writing system. We may safely say that the overwhelming majority of the 60,000+ sinographs in the largest character dictionaries were of extremely low frequency. The meanings and sounds of a sizable proportion of them are not even known. As is the case today, many people simply invented a new sinograph for their own name or as a variant of a previously existing sinograph, with the result that the total set is constantly filling up with forms known only to a handful of individuals.) The glossary gives the graph, its serial number, pronunciation and a barebones definition. Every occurrence of the graph in the book is designated by text and exact grid coordinates. Also listed are polynomial terms and proper names.

Then comes a section containing lexical commentary on certain items in the text that require more explanation than is possible in the glossary. The lesson concludes with questions for homework, including Russian sentences for translation into the Sinitic of the period in question. Scattered throughout the book are drawings and rubbings that serve to illuminate various aspects of the texts. On pp. 346-382 may be found sample Russian translations ("keys") for all of the Chinese texts. Other aids for the student are a summary table (pp. 383-387) of all the sinographs arranged according to the brilliant system of I. M. Oshanin, an alphabetically ordered list (pp. 485-488) of the function words giving the locations of their explanations in the grammatical commentaries, a series of revealing tables (pp. 489-496) showing the changing patterns of function word usage during the six periods covered in the book, a short bibliography of works cited, and a long table of contents.

This is an intelligent and thorough exposé of the basic mechanics of and even some inner secrets about ancient Chinese writing. Students who receive their initial training with this book and under the guidance of a teacher who is up to the high standards it demands are fortunate indeed.

Sarah Allan. *The Shape of the Turtle: Myth, Art, and Cosmos in Early China.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991. xi + 230 pages.

Some of the questions that led to the writing of this book have been puzzling the author since her undergraduate and graduate days, such as: "Why is there so little myth in early Chinese texts? What was the shape of the comos in the minds of the early Chinese? What is the meaning of the *taotie* on Shang dynasty bronzes? What is the relationship between their decor and their ritual purpose?" Of course, anyone who could answer all of these questions would immediately be recognized as the unparalleled authority on Shang civilization. Is Sarah Allan that person?

Let us take the matter of the paucity of myth in China. Allan attributes this striking absence to the structure of Chinese religion. According to her, because the focus of Chinese religion has always been ancestor worship, the spirits were only important insofar as they related to the living. They could not live a life of their own in some other, supernatural world. This, however, can not possibly be the correct answer because there is a great deal of mythic fragments that survive in such works as the *Shujing [Document Classic], Shijing [Poetry Classic], Shanhaijing [Mountain and Sea Classic], and Yijing [Classic of Change],* but above all in "Tianwen [Questions about the Deities]" in the *Chuci [Songs of the South]* a hauntingly enigmatic collection of riddles concerning the gods, and in representational art that is now being archeologically recovered. Allan herself analyzes many of these fragments in this book and indeed declares unhesitatingly that the Shang was a mythic civilization. She even goes so far as to state that "the historical legends of Yao and Shun and of a Xia dynasty founded by Yu derive from Shang myth." (p. 73) The Xia, according to Allan, were a mythical inverse of the Shang. (p. 17)

The question remains, then, what caused the fragmentation of what appears to have been a once flourishing body of myth. The answer lies in the extreme skepticism with which the orthodox Confucian tradition viewed all things spiritual and supernatural. Since the literati, by definition, were the guardians of writing, it was within their power either to preserve or destroy any records of the old myths. It is obvious from the current decimated condition of the Chinese myths, as well as from explicit statements in the *Analects* and later texts, that the Confucian literati consciously and deliberately set out to suppress, if not to eradicate altogether, the ancient body of irrational and unhistorical narratives told by their ancestors.

The scholars, however, did not reckon with a very powerful mechanism for preserving the mythic tradition, namely, oral transmission. In attempting to reconstruct China's mythic heritage, there is still time for modern researchers to tap a once flourishing, but now flagging, oral mythology. Unfortunately these myths -- including entire *bona fide* epics such as *Moz Yiz Daihvuengz* (about the great Zhuang archer hero Yiz shooting down ten suns to rescue his people) -- are mostly preserved in non-Sinitic languages with which few researchers are familiar.

Not only are the non-Sinitic peoples vital for the preservation of Chinese myth, they were essential for its very foundations. In the process of expanding from its base in the Yellow River Valley, the Chinese polity absorbed a congeries of different ethnic and linguistic groups. In the final analysis, we will find that most of Chinese mythology derives from these sources. It is, therefore, somewhat disappointing that Allan makes no mention of any of these groups. But this is typical for sinologists who are transfixed by the tetragraphic culture of the center.

As a guide to mainstream efforts to cope with the unruly world of the gods, Allan's book has much to commend itself. She begins with a brief introduction to the history of and scholarship on the Shang dynasty. Next, the author moves to a discussion of various myth fragments and their historicization, an excellent interpretation of the turtle as a symbol of the cosmos, a clear explanation of divination and sacrifice, and -- what I consider to be the centerpiece of the book -- an investigation of the meaning of motifs on Shang bronzes where she opposes the view of Max Loehr and Robert Bagley that they were primarily ornamental.

There are a few mechanical slipups (Thomas Sebeok's name is twice misspelled, David Keightley's *Sources of Shang History* is not specified as the source of note 5 on p. 200, etc.) but the book is basically very well produced, especially considering the complexity of the subject material. Not only are conventional sinographs included, there are also many neatly drawn OSBIal graphs included right in the text. Numerous rubbings, photographs, and other illustrations highlight various points discussed in the text. In our efforts to come to grips with Shang civilization, *Myth, Art and Cosmos in Early China* will occupy a significant place.

Proto-Language and Culture

Walter A. Koch, ed. *Geneses of Language/Genesen der Sprache.* Acta Colloqui (February, 1986). Bochum Publications in eEvolutionary Cultural Semiotics. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer, 1990. xvii + 444 pages.

In a previous issue of *Sino-Platonic Papers* (Reviews [II], 14 [December, 1989], B26-27), we reviewed an earlier volume in the same Bochum series which sponsored this and the following edited collections of papers. As might be expected for a young field (language origins) which has not yet received the approval of mainstream linguists, much of the work presented here is controversial. Nonetheless, the topic upon which it focuses is intrinsically interesting and the quality of the research continues to improve. We are, therefore, happy to introduce these relatively obscure publications to our readers.

The challenge facing those who strive to understand the origins of language, a phenomenon that occurred no later than around 20,000 to 40,000 years ago, is how to be speculatively concrete, a paradox raised by the editor in his introduction. Koch and his colleagues achieve their aim by making one huge assumption, namely, that there is a continuity between human language and prior mammalian and even other types of animan communication. Once this assumption is made, researchers are enabled to observe clinically processes which they believe also took place when human consciousness and speech first came into being.

A good example of this approach is the first paper in the book by Juan D. Delius entitled "Sapient Sauropsids and Hollering Hominids." Delius sees the origins of language as a biological and evolutionary question that may be separated into three issues: the physiogeny of language (its production and reception by the brain and associated sensorimotor structures), the ontogeny of language (its development as a capacity of the brain within specific individuals), and the phylogeny of language (its evolution as a capacity of the human brain). To comprehend these processes, the author leaps backward in the evolutionary scheme to study the behavior of birds, particularly pigeons, whose cognitive capacities he has been investigating for quite some time. I am convinced by the experimental evidence he presents that pigeons do possess the ability to categorize stimuli into conceptual classes and that these classes may be labeled with "summary neural codes."

Horst Singer's "Evolutionäre Schichten der Bedeutung" is a more theoretical attempt to come to grips with stages in the development of the human ability to extract and

manipulate meaning. It is interesting to note that Singer is still guided by the insights of Humbdolt and Herder. Still more highly nuanced is the paper of Michael Fleischer entitled "Die Sprache des Hundes oder die 'Sprache' des Hundes." Fleischer views "language" as a complex of symbols communicated through various stimuli (optical, visual, auditory, tactile, and olfactory as they are presented in space and time). It is indicative of the center of this type of investigation that the author's detailed 5-page bibliography lists only one paper in English -- all the rest are in German. I was also impressed by the author's elaborate and detailed description of the different types of sounds made by dogs.

"Sprache (oder Schrift?) bei unseren nächsten Verwandten" by Holger Preuschoft is a review of the literature concerning the teaching of sign language to apes. The author comes to no firm conclusion as to whether this is really language, but he is certainly sympathetic to the proposition that it is communication. Helmut Jachnow's "Überlegungen zu Erscheinungsweisen und Ursachen des Wandels nonverbalen kommunikativen Verhaltens" presents some general theoretical considerations of problems concerning nonverbal communicative behavior, drawing heavily on concepts developed by Soviet linguists.

For those who are willing to spend time acquainting themselves with the history of studies on protolanguages in this century, Eric deGrolier's long "Toward a Tentative 'Reconstruction' of *Homo sapiens sapiens* Language(s): An Essay in Glossogenetics Theory" is an excellent place to begin. In contrast, Bernard H. Bichakjian's "Linguistic Paedomorphosis: A New Theory of Language Evolution" is so short, sketchy and tied to other forthcoming articles of the author that I could not gain much more from it than that he believes language evolution may proceed in the direction of early acquired features. Jan Wind's "The Evolutionary History of the Human Vocal Tract," on the other hand, is densely biological. Focusing on phylogeny, it traces the possible evolution of the larynx through various species, culminating in man. The enormous complexity of the etiology for these changes is shown in Wind's Fig. 4, which looks like a drawing of detailed electronic circuitry, but is actually a diagrammatic representation of a score of interrelated processes during primate evolution that are likely to have led to the development of human speech. These include physical, physiological, and social factors.

Udo L. Figge, in his "Our Language Origins: Consonants and Cognition," emphasizes the articulateness and cognitivity of human speech. To understand how these traits may have arisen, he examines the degree to which primate communication also achieves similar skills.

The prolific Bernard H. Bichakjian has a second paper in the volume entitled "The Primitive Features of a Protolanguage." He begins with a discussion of the different ways that biologists and linguists view evolution. After defining what makes a given feature "primitive," he moves on to a description of phonological, morphological, and syntactic features. Thoroughly informed by the main theoretical questions of Indo-European historical linguistics, the paper closes with a few brief reflections on *Urmensch and Ursprache*.

"Naturalness in Diachonic Morphology as a Determining Factor of Language Change" by Thomas Stoltz applies Willi Mayerthaler's concept of natural morphology to data drawn from Finnic, Latvian, and Icelandic. Mayerthaler posits that pure agglutination, as in Turkish, represents the ideal morphological system or, in different terms, the goal of all morphological change. What emerges from the confrontation between universal naturalness and language normalcy is a recognition that an ideal steady state is never achieved because of the idiosyncratic genius of each language.

In a carefully entitled article, Marianne Kubler-Kruse studies "The Development of Spontaneous Gestural Languages." She sees a continuum of gestural communication which spans the entire range from simple pointing to elaborate sign languages. Like Kubler-Kruse, Susan Vogel closely observes the behavior of children and young chimpanzees in her "The Ontogenesis of the Reality-Fiction Distinction: A Comparative Approach to Play." She is particularly attentive to interaction between mother and infant at

the simplest, most basic level. Jan Wind also studies the function of the mother for language development in his "Die Rolle elterlicher Empathie in der Ortogenese der Sprache."

Norman Boretzky's "Creole Languages -- A case of Language Genesis or Interference" is essentially a critique of the hypotheses of Derek Bickerton (Bioprogram) and Peter Mühlhäusler (Universalist). Boretzky's conclusion is remarkably frank, for he declares that "creoles can contribute little or nothing to the reconstruction of early phases of human language. The deplorable fact that many things are not well understood in the evolution of creoles, does not automatically speak for universals." (pp. 336-337)

"Comparative Linguistics and the Genesis of Language," by Micheal Job, is an extremely wide-ranging and important statement on theoretical and methodological issues facing the linguist who has an interest in glottogenesis. After a careful examination of several reconstructed proto-languages (including a look at the possibilities for Sino-Tibetan), based on the best available scholarship, the author decides that the temporal gap between Universal Proto-Speech (supposedly 25,000 Before Present) and reliably reconstructed protolanguages is so great that it cannot be bridged using the method of historical - comparative linguistics. This does not, surprisingly, cause him to be pessimistic about the future of efforts to find answers to questions about language origins. For those who have an interest in such questions, Job counsels a greater reliance on **imagination** and less faith in "the more or less mute letters of those texts which set tight bounds to the comparative linguist's scientific efforts." (p. 70)

Walter A. Koch responds enthusiastically to the call for **imaginative** approaches to the problem of language origins in his "Ding-Dong II and Further Design-Schemes for Glottogenesis." Ding-Dong II is but a small part of a grand superscheme which includes Pooh Pooh (30-15 million years ago), Bla-Bla (2 million years ago), Chick-Chick (1 million years ago), Ta-Ta (500,000 years ago), Bow-Wow (250,000 years ago), Ding-Dong I and II (100,000 years ago), Sing-Song (50,000 years ago), Conversation (40,000 years ago), Universal Proto-speech (the earliest language of *Homo sapiens sapiens*, 25,000 years ago), and Proto-languages I and II (10,000 to 5,000 years ago). Koch is by no means the first to speculate on these various schemes for the origins of human language, but he is the first to attempt to link them all into a single conceptual whole. Koch asserts the **naturalness** of language and the interrelatedness of all aspects of the evolution of language. Since he is a visually oriented thinker, Koch is prone to express his ideas in elaborate charts and clever diagrams which require a great deal of effort to absorb and interpret.

In 1980, an unusual film entitled *La geurre du feu* (*The Quest for Fire / Am Anfang war das Feuer*) was released. It was based on a novel with the same title by Joseph Henri Rosny Aîné, pseudonym for Joseph Henri Boex (1856-1940). The theme of the film is the importance of fire for mankind and, in particular, the progress from passive to active use of fire. The significance of this film for glottogeneticists is that it shows human beings communicating at a period somewhere between 80,0000 and 40,0000 BP. In the film, not a single word is spoken in any of the ethnolanguages of today. Instead, the actors make extensive use of body language (the anthropologist Desmond Morris was a consultant for the film) and short, simple utterances in a language called Ulam (devised by the amateur linguist Anthony Burgess). While the film must undoubtedly have been fascinating and inspiring, Eric de Grolier in 1985 rightly characterized it as "paleofiction." As Peter L.W. Koch, the author of "Some Remarks on the Film *La guerre du feu*" included in this volume, deftly observes, Ulam is merely an interesting amalgam of elements of Indo-European languages whose parent dates back only about 6,000 years ago.

The book closes with five brief appendices which comment in various illuminating ways upon some of the papers. There are "Creolisierung und Sprachwendung," "Spontane Gestensprache und sprachliche Phylogenese," and "Hund und Mensch und ihre kommunikativen Invarianten," all by Helmut Jachnow, and "On How to Present the Temporal Side of Language Origin" and "*Quest for Fire* and Some Functions of

Paleofiction" by Boni Kirstein. An *Index Nominum* and an *Index Rerum* permit ready access to specific points in all 18 papers in the volume.

Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed. *Proto-Languages and Proto-Cultures.* Materials from the First International Interdisciplinary Symposium on Language and Prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988. Bochum Publications in Evolutionary Cultural Semiotics. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer, 1990. ii + 297 pages.

This is the third volume of papers form the symposium named above after the title. For a review of the first volume, entitled *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures,* see *Sino-Platonic Papers,* 14 (December, 1989), B26-27. A second volume, also edited by Shevoroshkin and published in 1989 by Brockmeyer, was entitled *Explorations in Language Macrofamilies.* It would appear that the symposium has had a decided effect outside of the scholarly world, with detailed coverage of efforts to reconstruct Nostratic and Proto-World having appeared recently in the *New York Times, Insight, Atlantic Monthly, U.S. News and World Report,* and other major media outlets. There even seems to be some weakening of resistance on the part of mainstream historical and comparative linguists who until recently have been fiercely, even violently, opposed to any attempts at deep reconstruction or long-range comparisons. Now, at least, conventional linguists are willing (or perhaps they have been forced) to discuss some of the issues raised by people like Sergei Starostin, Aron Dolgopolsky, and Joseph Greenberg. Still, there is a definite sense of bitterness felt by the editor and his cohorts at being shut off from research grants and failing to gain formal recognition from the academic establishment as being involved in a worthwhile endeavor. As a subscriber to *Mother Tongue*, the Newsletter of the Association for the Study of Language in Prehistory, I am also aware of some unhappy divisions among various factions within the Nostratic camp. All of this controversy, however, is to be expected of a truly revolutionary movement as it undergoes rapid growing pains and strives to attain legitimacy.

The present volume is a good example of the type of rigorous, scientific work being done by the Nostraticists and other deep reconstructionalists. The first section of the book is called "Language and Culture." The first paper in it, "Ancient Eastern and Southeastern Asia: Comparative-Historical Data and Their Interpretations (Preliminary Report)," by Ilya Peiros, is a quick, rather sober look at the Austronesian, Sino-Tibetan, Austroasiatic and Para-Thai language families. Much of what Peiros has to say about Sino-Tibetan is based on an unpublished manuscript entitled "Materialy k sino-tibetskomu ètimologicheskomu slovarĭu" by Sergei Starostin and him that was constructed on the basis of the five most complete vocabularies: Sinitic (in Starostin's Old Sinitic reconstruction), Tibetan, Burmese, Lushei, and Kachin. Since, as I have maintained, there currently exists no genuine etymological dictionary for Sino-Tibetan (much less for Sinitic itself), this would be an enormously important tool for comparative linguists and students of Chinese civilization. Let us hope that it is quickly made available to the larger scholarly community. The same goes for the Berkely Sino-Tibetan thesaurus project.

Karl Menges, the noted Turkologist, weighs in with his own short but substantial preliminary report on "Altaic and East Nostratic." It is significant that, of his nine references, five are by the famous Japanologist Roy Andrew Miller. A key sentence in Menges' report is this: "Somewhere in Eastern Central Asia the great Altaic movements started, leading over protracted historical periods (roughly between 1500 B.C and A.D. 500) to the Altaic expansion over the Korean Penninsula and onto the Japanese islands." Most of what the author has to say about Altaic is naturally of fairly recent vintage. His remarks on East Nostratic (Uralic, Altaic, and Dravidian) *per se* are restricted to the final two paragraphs.

Another preliminary report is Alexander Militarëv's "Afroasian Cultural Terms." This consists of a list of 59 reconstructed cultural words divided into six groups:

cultivation of land, wild and domestic ungulate animals (with V. Blažek, camels; equids; hunting, roaming, and following herds (of wild ungulates); and dwelling. Among the languages taken into account are Sumerian, Egyptian, Akkadian, Aramaic (Syrian), Arabic, Amharic, Gurage, Bolewa, Dera, Ngamo, Somrai, Ahaggar, and other Semitic, Chadic, Cushitic, and Berber languages. This is elegant and convincing work.

Less impressive, but more intriguing, is John Bengston's "Notes on the Sino-Caucasian Affinity of Sumerian (Preliminary Report)" which opens the section of the book dealing with "Sino-Caucasian Languages" (some people refer to them as "Dene-Caucasian Languages" because they have affinities with certain Amerind tongues). This links Sumerian with Basque and Burushaski, not to mention a host of North Caucasian, Sino-Tibetan, and Na-Dene (Amerind) languages. The small amount of data that Bengston has brought together is by no means definitive, but he does seem to have made a credible start on the classification of several of the most refractory languages in the world.

Vladimir Orel and Sergei Starostin follow intrepidly with their "Etruscan as an East Caucasian Language." If they are successful in completing this tentative effort, they will have solved another of the great linguistic puzzles from antiquity.

The third section of the book deals with "Nostratic / Eurasiatic Languages." It opens with a "Summary of Noun and Verb Inflectional Correspondences in Proto-Dravidian and Proto-Uralian" by Stephen Tyler. The author uses a series of linguistic tree diagrams to show that Dravidian and Uralic are two closely related languages of one East Nostratic branch, the other branch being Altaic. The other paper in this section is by the noted Stanford linguist, Joseph Greenberg, and is entitled "The Prehistory of the Indo-European Vowel System in Comparative and Typological Perspective." This very substantial work (pp. 77-136) was originally delivered as the Collitz lecture at the Stanford Summer Linguistic Institute on July 28th, 1987. It shows very close phonological analysis and an amazing control of the relevant scholarly literature in use during the past century. Greenberg's aim is to reconcile his conception of Eurasiatic with the better established Nostratic.

The final section of the book is entitled "Reconstructions" and consists of "The Nostratic Reconstructions of V. Illich-Svitych," translated and arranged by Mark Kaiser, "Comparative-Phonetic Tables for Nostratic Reconstructions" by Vladimir Dybo, and a "Semantic Index to Nostratic Reconstructions" by Mark Kaiser. The first and third papers are handy stopgaps upon which linguists who do not know Russian must rely until a complete English translation of Illich-Svitych's Nostratic Dictionary becomes available. The second is made up of eighteen elegant tables which present the complete sound system of the six classical members of the Nostratic family.

While *Proto-Languages and Proto-Cultures* will not grace the bookshelves of most historical linguists, it is a clear demonstration that a growing body of careful scholars are willing to pursue questions about the detailed affiliation of language groupings far beyond what could have been imagined a century ago. The movement has gained a momentum which seems unstoppable, in spite of the strong resistance from certain quarters.

Additional works in the same series noted but not seen:

Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed. *Explorations in Language Macrofamilies*. Materials from the first International Interdisciplinary Symposium on Language and Prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988. BPX 23. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer, 1989.

Contents

Nostratic Languages

V. Dybo, "V. M. Illich-Svitych and the Development of Uralic and Dravidian Linguistics"

I. Hegedüs, "The Applicability of Exact Methods in Nostratic Research."

Interphyletic Comparisons

S. Starostin, "Nostratic and Sino-Caucasian."

S. Nikolaev and O. Mudrak, "Gilyak and Chukchi-Kamchatkan as Almosan-Keresiouan Languages: Lexical Evidence."

Reconstructions

O. Mudrak, "Kamchukchee Roots."

V. Illich-Svitych, "The Relationship of the Nostratic Family Languages: A Probabilistic Evaluation of the Similarities in Question."

V. Dybo, "Comparative-Phonetic Tables."

V. Illich-Svitych, "Three Entries from the *Nostratic Dictionary*."

J. Parkinson, translation and arrangement, "A Nostratic Word List: Reconstructions by V. Illich-Svitych."

Mark Kaiser. *Lexical Archaisms in Slavic: From Nostratic to Common Slavic.* BPX 26. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer, 1990.

Includes chapters on the history of distant comparison, Slavic reflexes of Nostratic roots, and an analysis of distribution.

An important forthcoming volume in the series for Sinologists who have an interest in the earliest beginnings of Sinitic languages is Vitaly Shevoroshkin, ed., *Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages*, Materials from the First International Interdisciplinary Symposium on Language and Prehistory, Ann Arbor, 8-12 November, 1988 (Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. Norbert Brockmeyer, 1991[?]) with the following chapters (approximately 264 pages):

V. Shevoroshkin, "Introduction."

Dene-Sino-Caucasian Languages

S. Starostin, "On the Hypothesis of a Genetic Connection between the Sino-Tibetan Languages and the Yeniseian and North-Caucasian Languages," translation and introduction by W. Baxter III.

S. Nikolaev, "Sino-Caucasian Languages in America."

J. Bengston, "Notes on Sino-Caucasian."
"Some Sino-Caucasian Etymologies."

"Macro-Caucasian Phonology (Part I)."
Postscript I
Postscript II
"Macro-Caucasian: A Historical Linguistics."
"Hypothesis (Abstracts)."
"On Dene-Caucasian Substratum in Europe."
"Some Macro-Caucasian Etymologies."

Reconstructions

S. Nikolaev and S. Starostin, "North-Caucasian Roots," edited and arranged by A. Eulenberg.

Language and Script

Kevin Robb, ed. *Language and Thought in Early Greek Philosophy*. LaSalle, Illinois: The Hegler Institute, Monist Library of Philosophy, 1983. 285 pages.

The editor begins his Introduction with a review of several theses put forward by Eric Havelock in his milestone *Preface to Plato* in 1963. These are the essentially oral character of the Archaic age, the late introduction of the alphabet to Greece, the change in modes of Greek composition and thought occasioned by the shift from the oral to the written word, and the central position of Plato as the first thinker in whose writings the full implications of literacy were revealed. While Robb takes it for granted in the early eighties that there was a consensus among Hellenists and even Semiticists on the late (c. 750 BCE) arrival of the alphabet in Greece, he could not have known that in the middle and late eighties, Semitic epigraphers such as Joseph Naveh would push vigorously for an early (eleventh or even twelfth century) date. Since all of Havelock's other theses hinge on the date of the adoption of the alphabet by Greece, it is no wonder that he expended so much effort in *Preface to Plato* arguing for the middle of the eighth century.

The orthodoxy on this vital subject has shifted rapidly so that now most Semiticists accept a pre-first millennium time frame for the introduction of the alphabet into Greece and even many Hellenists are cautiously edging upward toward the tenth century. Does this mean that all of Havelock's ideas about the relationship between literacy and thought must now fall? If not, how then do we reconcile this manifest discrepancy between changes in the mode of thought that took place in mid-eighth-century Greece and the assertion that they were dependent upon the rise of popular literacy?

First of all, there are still many weaknesses in the case for an early introduction of the alphabet to Greece. These are extremely technical and hence inappropriate for discussion here. Yet even if we do admit that a Semitic script came to Greece before the tenth century BCE, we must recognize that it would only have been a consonantary and not a full alphabet. Havelock's theses, which are based on the notion of **popular literacy**, thus remain completely unshaken, because it is universally accepted that it was the Greeks who invented the full alphabet (with both consonants and vowels), thus facilitating the spread of literacy among the people. The development of a consonantary certainly represents an advance over syllabaries and morphosyllabaries in terms of its potential for popular literacy, but only the complete phonetic alphabet could provide the conditions for the radical transformations in society and thought delineated by Havelock for Platonic Greece. Therefore, we may say that, regardless of how high the date of alleged Greek contact with Northwest Semitic scripts may be pushed, it does not affect Havelock's brilliant explanations of events that took place in post-Homeric Greece.

Suitably, the leading paper in this volume is Eric Havelock's "The Linguistic Task of the Presocratics" which is divided into two parts: "Ionian Science in Search of an Abstract Vocabulary" and "The Language of the Milesian 'School.'" This is warmly recommended reading for historians of Chinese technology who are puzzled by the apparent lack of theoretical science in traditional China and the possible implications of the sinographic script for this phenomenon. This is a long and richly provocative paper; all of the other papers in the volume address issues which it raises. In the interest of space, I shall list here only their titles and the names of the authors:

G. S. Kirk, "Orality and Sequence."

Jonathan Barnes, "Aphorism and Argument."

Charles H. Kahn, "Philosophy and the Written Word: Some Thoughts on Heraclitus and the Early Greek Uses of Prose."

J. P. Hershbell, "The Oral-Poetic Religion of Xenophanes."

Julius M. Moravcsik, "Heraclitean Concepts and Explanations."

Kevin Robb, "Preliterate Ages and the Linguistic Art of Heraclitus."

Arthur W. H. Adkins, "Orality and Philosophy."

Joseph Margolis, "The Emergence of Philosophy."

Dallas Willard, "Concerning the 'Knowledge' of the Pre-Socratic Greeks."

Wallace I. Matson, "From Water to Atoms: The Triumph of Metaphysics."

Robert S. Brumbaugh, "Diction and Dialectic: The Language of Plato's Stranger from Elea."

The volume concludes with a "Select Bibliography on Orality and Literacy" by Joanne Beil.

Wayne Senner, ed. *The Origins of Writing*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1989. viii + 245 pages.

This is an excellent presentation of the best current scholarly opinion concerning the origins and evolution of the major writing systems of the world. Originally conceived as a lecture series held at Arizona State University in 1984, the lectures complemented a traveling exhibit on the origins of writing entitled "Sign, Symbol, Script" that had been organized at the University of Wisconsin by Keith N. Schoville. Because both the series and the exhibit were supported by funding and other types of support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and a variety of private, public, and institutional sources, the book is necessarily directed to the educated lay reader. The fact that it was also originally conceived as a series of public lectures to accompany an exhibition composed of artifacts makes this very much a visually oriented book. There are numerous maps, photographs, charts, and drawings to illuminate the carefully argued essays. Notes are kept to a minimum (usually between ten and twenty) and there are suggestions for further readings that are more or less accessible to nonspecialists.

A sense of the book's coverage can be gained from a list of the titles of the articles and their authors. The editor begins with "Theories and Myths on the Origins of Writing:

A Historical Overview." This is followed by "Two Precursors of Writing: Plain and Complex Tokens" by Denise Schmandt-Besserat, "Early Cuneiform" by M.W. Green, "The Origins of Egyptian Heiroglyphs" by Henry George Fischer, "The Invention and Development of the Alphabet" by Frank Moore Cross, "The Arabic Alphabet" by James A. Bellamy, "The Art of Writing in Ancient Greece" by Ronald S. Stroud, "The Origins and Development of the Latin Alphabet" by Rex Wallace, "The Runes: The Earliest Germanic Writing System" by Elmer H. Antonsen, "Ogham: The Ancient Script of the Celts" by Ruth P. M. Lehmann, "The Origins of Writing in China: Scripts and Cultural Contexts" by David N. Keightley, and "The Ancient Writing of Middle America" by Floyd G. Lounsbury.

Many questions, of course, remain unanswered, and the cautious scholars represented in this volume would be among the first to admit that the evolution of writing as a whole and of its primary constituents is not well known. Why do the runes share archaic features with Mediterranean scripts? Are the Central Asian Turkic runes connected in any way to European runes? What is the relationship between the alphabetiform paleolithic and neolithic symbol systems that have been found in great profusion at many sites in Europe? The latter, which I consider to be of great importance in the prehistory of writing, are not even mentioned in this volume. Can it be proven that writing in the New World grew up in total isolation from all other writing systems? Above all, how do we account for the appearance of the Chinese script in virtually full-blown form (though restricted to highly circumscribed applications) around 1200 BCE with no known viable precursors inside of China and at about the same time as the importation of the chariot?

Keightley, both at the very end and the very beginning of his article, stresses the indigenous, "largely" isolated nature of the Chinese writing system. (He begins the second half of the article with the statement that "There is little doubt that Chinese writing was entirely indigenous.") Keightley holds that the sinographic script has its roots in the composite emblems of the east around the late third century millennium BCE rather than in the linear pottery marks from the northwest during the fifth millennium BCE. While I would argue that neither of these symbol sets represented language *per se* and hence cannot be considered as writing, I take the exactly opposite position of Keightley on this issue. For the past several years, I have been working on a monograph which argues that Chinese writing arose first through contact with peoples to the west and that it was first linear (indeed alphabetiform and phonogrammatic) and that it only subsequently mushroomed into a wild proliferation of componential graphs. Keightley, at any rate, has certainly been misled by WU Hung who asserts that the Eastern Neolithic bird-and-sun motifs shown in fig. 16 (p. 198) should actually be read as *yang-niao* ("sun birds"), allegedly the name of a local eastern Yi group that is said to have settled in the lower Yantze area. This is completely implausible because the Yi did not even speak a Sinitic language, hence they can not be conceived of as using the expression *yang-niao* (even in its archaic reconstruction **rang-tiəgwx* or ** ljang-tiəw?)* ("south-facing bird, the bird which goes south [for the winter]").

Keightley's uses of the expression "high literacy" (p. 171) with regard to Chinese civilization surely must not be taken in the sense of "high degree of literacy," since the Chinese script as it developed with all its maddening complexity was designed to ensure low literacy. By "high literacy," he must mean "restricted to the high culture," which is essentially a correct description of the state of affairs throughout Chinese history, but an unusual usage of this standard demographical expression. One wonders, though, what Keightley really means by the expression, nonetheless, because on p. 192, he does talk about "high literacy rates in traditional China." Citing Evelyn Rawski's widely quoted *Education and Popular Literacy in Ch'ing China*, Keightley mentions that literacy rates in nineteenth-century China "were probably higher than those in much of preindustrial Europe." This is a dangerous generalization which (like the assertion that the Great Wall can be seen from the moon or that there were more books printed in imperial China than in all the rest of the world) was invented by a Westerner, which has by no means been

satisfactorily demonstrated, and which is in fact highly improbable in light if the enormous difficulty of the script. Much of the issue, of course, hinges on what Rawski means by "functional literacy." Since, in some cases, it might mean the ability to recognize only a few graphs -- perhaps not even one's own name, much less a book or a government edict -- we are not really in the conventional realm of literacy at all.

Theoretically, Keightley adapts the standard position of virtually all historians of writing that the earliest stages of the development of script would be expected to be pictographic in nature. Here again, I believe that our presuppositions about the evolution of writing are greatly in need of revision. In the monograph on the origins of the Chinese script that I am preparing, I shall propose that picto/ideo/logography and abstract, linear, phonetic scripts developed along parallel tracks from the very earliest stages of the development of writing. Occasionally they joined in mixed systems, and ultimately linear, phonetic scripts have displaced picto/ideo/logoraphic scripts throughout most of the world because of their greater efficiency.

Keightley's characterization of the Chinese script as "logographic" is assuredly to be preferred over the usual -- but egregiously inappropriate -- "ideographic." However, as I have pointed out on numerous occasions, sinographs do not represent spoken words on a one-for-one basis and hence cannot technically be designated as logographs. Rather, they stand for syllabic morphemes as, for example, in *tao-lu* ("road") which is an early polysyllabic word that survived despite the strongly monsyllabicizing tendency of the script.

Keightley's hypothesis that the componential nature of eastern neolithic pottery-making techniques is consonant with, and thus may help to account for, the combinatorial script is novel and ingenious, but not at all convincing. The earliest layers of the Chinese script, as I shall show in my forthcoming monograph, were purely phonetic. The combinatorial impulse developed slightly later, most likely through stimulus diffusion. William Boltz's astute observation that "At least one of the components must have had a phonetic function" is very much to the point. The more Chinese scribes opted for picto/ideo/logographic elements in their writing system at the expense of pure phoneticism, the more were they forced to adopt combinatorial principles to disambiguate homographs and homophones. Soon they entered a vicious circle which swiftly resulted in the mad explosion of graphic forms (60,000+ to date). This is not an easy script to learn, and anyone who tells us that it is has never subjected himself to the mind-pulverizingly tedious labor required to master it, and is thus unqualified to make such a claim, or he is simply being duplicitous. Common sense tells us this, but I can prove it irrefutably by reference to specific Dunhuang documents from the Tang and Five Dynasties periods.

The editor of this volume is so firmly convinced by Keightley's assertions of the utter uniqueness and independence of the Chinese script that he is moved to expostulate: "the door has closed permanently on a millennium of philosophical and theological ruminations about the origins of ancient Chinese." (p. 18) Indeed we should not regret the closing of this unscientific and speculative view of Chinese civilization and its script. On the other hand, it is my duty as a scholar in relentless pursuit of the truth to state that a new door is opening on the origins of Chinese civilization -- that of language and archeology -- and it will reveal unmistakably that China has never been hermetically sealed off from the rest of the world.

ZHOU Youguang. *Shijie Zimu Jianshi* [*A Concise History of World Alphabets*]. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiaoyu [Education], 1990. 2+2+359 pages.

In the context of Chinese scholarship on the history of writing, this is a very important book. As such, it is a travesty that only 1,500 copies were issued. Probably half of that number will end up abroad, which means that the book will have very little impact in China. This is sad, because what usually passes for *wenzixue* ("study of

scripts") in China is restricted solely to the history of the sinographs. Zhou's is the first book written by a Chinese in a Chinese language that places the sinographs in the framework of the worldwide development of scripts. As such, it goes a long way toward rectifying the supposed uniqueness and isolation of the Chinese writing system.

Much of what Zhou has to say may be found in standard Western treatises on the history of writing, but it is remarkable that he is saying it here in Chinese. He also has some original contributions of his own to make concerning the scripts of East Asia. And, as might be expected from China's foremost sociolinguist, Zhou also provides interesting information on such subjects as language reform and latinization.

The book is full of illustrative charts, diagrams, and maps. Most fascinating of all is the fact that Professor Zhou wrote the entire book on a word processor using Pinyin inputting with automatic conversion to sinographs. *Shijie Zimu Jianshi* is proof that a Chinese author can write about a complicated subject *in extenso* while touchtyping the sounds of the words in his mind. The primacy of the sinographs and their stranglehold over the writing process (and consequently to a limited extent over the thought process) in China has finally and irrevocably been broken. It is ironic that phonetic liberation from the morphosyllabic script had to wait for the introduction of an extraordinarily complicated (but relatively easy to use) piece of technology from the West. Now whole novels are being composed in China without the intervention of the brush and all of the enormously complex tetragraphic shapes to which it is linked; authors merely key into their computers the phonetic representations of the words that fill their heads, just as we do when typing English, French, or German. The implications of these changes for the nature and structure of thought in China are revolutionary in scope.

Florian Coulmas. *The Writing Systems of the World.* The Language Library. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989. ix + 302 pages.

The basic thesis of this book is that scripts do not merely record speech, but that they have a tendency to shape the languages which they are used to write in various subtle and not so subtle ways. This is even the case in a country like China where the vast majority of the populace has been illiterate throughout three thousand and more years of the existence of the sinographic script. Because of the prestige accorded the script by virtually all segments of the population, including the illiterate themselves, the dominant mode of persuasive political and intellectual discourse was strongly conditioned by the tetragraphs. The same holds for Japan, Korea, and, to a certain extent, Vietnam whose languages belong to completely different families but which absorbed large amounts of tetragraphic lexical items and, in certain contexts, even imposed Sinitic syntax as the only acceptable mode of civilized expression. To this day, language reform efforts have been hampered in these countries -- and in China itself -- because of the powerful effect of the Chinese script in shaping language usage in ways that went at cross purposes to the genius of spoken language.

The disparity between script and speech is particularly stark for any language which adopts the sinographs as a recording device. There are a number of reasons why this is so, but I shall name only two chief ones. The first is the fact that the sinographs, constituting neither a phonetic nor a phonemic but rather a morphosyllabic script, are poor indicators of sounds and hence not well equipped to indicate all the nuances of language. The second factor, their pictoideographic quality, serves partly to compensate in writing for their phonetic inflexibility, yet at the same time causes them to be correspondingly divorced from speech because it is humanly impossible to speak pictoideographically. This explains why no one can understand a Classical Chinese text read aloud unless he has memorized it beforehand. There is also a high degree of incomprehension when typical writing in Modern Standard Mandarin, which freely mixes in Classical Chinese elements, is read aloud. Contrast this with materials written in languages which use alphabetic scripts, such

as English, German, French, and Italian, where virtually anything that is grammatically correct can be readily understood when read aloud. The absence of grammar itself as a category of traditional learning is probably likewise partly a function of the nature of the Chinese script, but a full discussion of that subject would lead us far afield from the book under review.

Coulmas begins his book with an intelligent statement: "Writing is the single most important sign system ever invented on our planet." What is intelligent is his admission that there are other sign systems created by man for conveying ideas and information, but that writing is a sign system which has a peculiarly close linkage with language. The author goes on to expatiate upon the consequences of writing for the development of societies. Citing liberally the works of Jack Goody, Coulmas states that there is a concurrence of complex, more highly organized civilizations and writing. He wisely refrains, however, from claiming that there is a causal effect between these two phenomena. The first chapter closes with a discussion of the functions of writing (mnemonic, distancing, reifying, social control, interactional, aesthetic).

The second chapter outlines the evolution of writing "from icon to symbol." This is standard fare based on the current standard sources. Coulmas goes beyond his sources, however, when he declares that "the decisive step in the development of writing is *phonetization*." (p. 33). Here he is in agreement with John DeFrancis' landmark volume entitled *Visible Speech*.

The theoretical part of the book ends with chapter 3 which contrasts units of speech and units of writing. Here again, be begins with a well-conceived formulation: "As far as is known, no graphical system of communication ever developed that was independent of, and more powerful than, speech." This is followed by a nuanced explication of what, to many, might appear to be a sweeping and unjustified generalization. It needs to be pointed out, however, that when Coulmas makes a distinction between "Chinese" and "Taiwanese" on pp. 38-39, he is really talking about the difference between simplified / reformed / PRC and complicated / traditional / ROC codifications of the standard character set. This has nothing at all to do with the question of writing Taiwanese which, to this day, remains highly problematic. It is interesting to observe, further, that like certain African tribes which have no word for "word" (p. 40), Sinitic has only acquired a word for "word" in this century after contact with modern linguistic theory. *Zi*, which is often translated loosely as "word," actually meant "graph". *Ci*, which now is used to signify "word," originally meant something like "phrase." Prior to this century, there was no concept of "word" in China.

Coulmas introduces the notion of the "economy" of a script and correctly finds the Chinese script to be uncanonical and make more demands on its users "than a rational and regular cenemic [i.e., sense discriminative rather than sense determinative, that is, pleremic] orthography." (p. 53)

Part II is the heart of the book inasmuch as it describes the actual writing systems of the world. It begins with the theocratic script of Egypt. Coulmas tellingly cites a fifteenth-century BCE Egyptian who advised, "Put writing in your heart that you may protect yourself from hard labour of any kind." (p. 70) Coulmas comments that it was in the best interests of those few who were literate to guard their privilege and to ensure that writing was complicated so it could not be readily available for everybody.

The author next takes up cuneiform writing which was used for Sumerian, Akkadian and other Semitic languages, Elamite, Hittite, Old Persian, and Ugaritic. In this chapter he emphasizes the importance of the clay used for the tablets in influencing the shapes of the graphs and the extensive lexical borrowing among the various languages that used the script.

Next we come to chapters on the Chinese writing system, the first as applied to Sinitic languages and the second for other languages (Vietnamese, Korean, and Japanese). Coulmas rightly points out that the preparatory stages of the Chinese script have still not been archeologically recovered. Throughout these chapters, Coulmas displays

fundamentally good sense. Unfortunately, he is constantly led astray by Chinese authorities. Among misstatements that result from this sort of bad advice are that many characters in the oracle shell and bone inscriptions closely resemble their modern equivalents. Observation of the examples he cites (for ox, sheep, tree, moon, earth, water, and tripod) in fig. 6.2 should rapidly dispel that assertion. The pottery marks from Banpo are touted by many Chinese scholars as precursors of the sinographs which leads Coulmas to doubt his own sensible statement from the beginning of the chapter. Coulmas also succumbs to the three customary assertions that Chinese writing must be considered a genuinely independent development (in spite of the fact that we still cannot explain its abrupt and full-blown emergence at all satisfactorily), that pictures of concrete objects stood at the beginning of Chinese writing, and that the Chinese script is peculiarly well suited to Sinitic languages because the latter are presumably "isolating." During the next decade, all of these ideas will come under intense scrutiny.

Coulmas' critical faculties return when he comes to an analysis of the structure of the graphs and their functions. He presents some novel and revealing statistics, especially when comparing the Chinese script with other writing systems. It is rather amazing that a non-Sinologist like Coulmas can see things about the Chinese script much more clearly than most Chinese scholars. To cite only one example of his perceptive insights, Coulmas points out that mastery of the Chinese script was invariably acquired in conjunction with learning Mandarin, which entirely deflates the common claim that the sinographs cross topolect boundaries effortlessly.

After searchingly perceptive chapters on Semitic consonantaries, the rise and spread of the alphabet, and writing in India, Coulmas moves on to Part III which deals with practical problems. Among these are decipherment, the creation of new alphabets, and writing reform. The latter chapter is particularly important for students of languages that still use sinographs for writing to one degree or another. As he does throughout the book, Coulmas shows himself to be very balanced and nonconfrontational on this sensitive subject.

The Writing Systems of the World is a reliable summary of the subject by an acknowledged authority. Referring to the best available scholarly sources, Coulmas has written a work that will remain a standard text for many years to come.

Akira Nakanishi. *Writing Systems of the World -- Alphabets, Syllabaries, Pictograms--* . Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle, 1980. English-language edition of *Sekai no Moji* (Kyoto: Shōkadō, 1975). 122 pages.

This is a glossy collector's item with little analysis or interpretation. The book is a "collector's item" in two senses. First, it is beautifully produced and lavishly illustrated, hence a handsome addition to anyone's library. Secondly, it consists, in large measure, of artifacts brought back by the author from his script-hunting trips around the world.

Mr. Nakanishi was born into a family that owns a printing business and, since his student days at Kyoto University, he has been fascinated by scripts and written characters, which he considers to be "the most important product of human culture." Notice that he is interested in the plurality and variety of the forms themselves, not how they work nor how they relate.

The book is divided into nine main sections dealing with the scripts of Europe, the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, West Asia, the Indian subcontinent, Southeast Asia, East Asia, Africa, North and South America, and Oceania. It focuses on 29 scripts in "common use" but gives examples of hundreds more that are less well known, including many which are extinct. Each section begins with a listing of the various countries in the region covered, together with brief information about their official languages and about the special features of the scripts they use. One of the most interesting aspects of this coverage is that the countries are given in alphabetical order according to their English names, but

their own self-designations are supplied as well, both in the original orthographies and in Latin transcription.

To give the reader a palpable sense of what the worlds' diverse writing systems look like in action, the author makes extensive use of newspapers, stamps, currency, shop signs, and so forth. For each of the main scripts, basic data provided are: transcriptions, use of diacritical marks, ligatures, reading direction, punctuation, and numerals.

The book closes with two appendices (on types of script and directionality), a glossary of terms, a bibliography of works in Western languages and in Japanese, and an index. Helpful regional maps are scattered throughout the text and there are impressive color maps of the world on the endpapers.

NIE Hongyin. *Zhongouo de Wenzi* [*The Scripts of China*]. Peking: Renmin Jiaoyu, 1989. 2 + 116 pages.

This book is written in simple, unpretentious language and has a crude appearance. Conceptually, however, it is a significant work and deserves recognition for its not inconsiderable achievement of making clear the fact that there have been and still are many other Chinese scripts than the *hanzi* (sinographs) or *fangkuaizi* (tetragraphs). What is more, the author admits that, in spite of their long history, traditional Chinese methods for the study of writing are hopelessly out of date and must be thoroughly reformed merely in order to treat scientifically the many scripts found within China. He himself does a credible job of introducing China's numerous scripts under the following rubrics: Sinographic, Turco-Sogdian, Indic, Arabic, and Latin. The first third of the book deals with more general and theoretical issues, while the last third discusses the discovery and decipherment of ancient scripts and concludes with a look into the future, the author pleading for unconventional approaches that would permit all Chinese to read. Unfortunately, while he understands the value of diglossia, he seems oblivious to the virtues of digraphia.

Binyong Yin and Mary Felley. *Chinese Romanization: Pronounciation and Orthography.* Beijing: Sinolingua, 1990. 10 + 8 + 580 pages.

This is a long book but it requires only a short review. Because it clearly marks the transition from Pinyin as an aid for the phonetic annotation of the sinographs to Pinyin as an independent script, *Chinese Romanization* is one of the most important books in Chinese applied linguistics of this century. Because it will play a major role in unifying the speakers of the largest language group in the world (unlike the sinographs which were so effective in keeping them separated into dozens of mutually unintelligible topolects [i.e., language] for more than 2,500 years), *Chinese Romanization* is one of the most significant linguistic books ever written. The statement that Pinyin is a self-sufficient writing system has now been made. There can be no turning back, particularly since Yin Binyong, the primary author of the book, is one of China's most respected scholars at the State Language Commission and the Institute for Applied Linguistics of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

For the record, this reviewer is pleased to have played a central role in the creation of *Chinese Romanization.* It was I who introduced Yin to his collaborator, Mary Felley, a young Dartmouth College student whom I had earlier encouraged to take an interest in Chinese language reform. I also suggested to Yin the idea for *Chinese Romanization* and put him in contact with HUANG Youyi, an editor of Foreign Languages Press who would arrange for the book's publication. It is therefore with a feeling of immense satisfaction that I greet the arrival of this book and recommend it enthusiastically to librarians, computer specialists, language teachers, and all others who are involved with practical applications of

Mandarin. *Chinese Romanization* will answer virtually all of their questions concerning the pronunciation and official romanized orthography of China's national language.

Part I treats of the pronunciation of Mandarin. It begins with an introduction of the alphabet, then moves quickly to a description of simple vowels and tones, the consonants in related groups of three or four, dipthongs, vowels plus nasal consonants, other vowel combinations, initials, finals, and syllables. All of this is accomplished concisely and systematically in 77 pages.

Part II is the meat of the book and discusses in great detail the rules for correctly spelling the following: common nouns, proper nouns, pronouns, numerals and measure words, verbs, complements, reduplication , modals, verb-object constructions, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, interjections, onomatopoeic words, and idioms and other types of embedded classical elements. There is also a generous section on the components and categories of sentences and on proper punctuation. All of these subjects are explained clearly and in depth, and are provided with numerous illustrative examples.

The final section of the book shows Hanyu Pinyin in action, with sample passages of prose, poetry, fiction, essay-writing, and scientific writing. Each passage is presented first in Hanyu Pinyin written according to the orthographic rules laid out in the book, then in sinographs, and then in English translation. (The same format is followed for the illustrative sentences in the main body of the text.) The reader will come away from these passages with the consciousness that Hanyu Pinyin is already a working reality, waiting only for wider application and continuing perfection.

Most alphabetical orthographies are arrived at through trial and error coupled with long practice. In a sense, that is what *Chinese Romanization* represents: the culmination of four centuries of experimentation that started with Matteo Ricci. In the case of the romanization of Sinitic languages, however, there have been many discontinuities and false hopes because of the tremendous resistance to change embodied in the privileged tradition of the tetragraphically literate scholarly class (primarily orthodox Confucians). To this day, only enlightened, open-minded, and compassionate intellectuals such as Yin Binyong and Zhou Youguang, who wrote a magnificent forward for this book, can fully understand -- and act on -- the profound implications that Hanyu Pinyin holds for China's masses and for the world. Consequently, it is fitting that they nurture, foster, and speed along Hanyu Pinyin as it develops into a legitimate alternative script for writing Mandarin in those situations where it is warranted. The final establishment of Hanyu Pinyin as an acceptable medium for writing Mandarin depends upon its acceptance by the people. As with the growth of all orthographies, Hanyu Pinyin too will undergo modifications through usage. Already there are those, for example, who believe a distinction should be made between adverbial *-di* and adjectival *-de*, and among change-of-state *le*, perfective *liao*, and emphatic *la*. For now, however, *Chinese Romanization* constitutes the splendid birth of Hanyu Pinyin as a fully functioning orthography on the verge of widespread adoption. For the benefit of China, her people, and the world, may this be sooner rather than later.

Zhongguo Minzu Guwen Yanjiuhui [Research Society for the Ancient Scripts of Chinese Nationalities], ed. *Zhongguo Minzu Guwenzi Yanjiu* [*Studies on the Ancient Scripts of Chinese Nationalities*]. Peking: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue, 1984. ii + 521 pages.

In 31 mostly short to mediun-length papers, the leading Chinese authorities on ancient non-Sinitic languages present the state of the field as of a conference held in August, 1980. It is a mixed report. China presently controls territory which has yielded a large number of texts written in mostly extinct languages that are extremely important for historical linguistics. Unfortunately, there are very few scholars in China who are capable of reading these ancient scripts and languages. Often there may be only a single Chinese scholar or two who can handle these scripts, and sometimes not even one, whereas there

are likely to be dozens of scholars working on each of them in the West. This is extremely ironic and embarrassing for China, hence the need to publish more works such as the present one. Even more vital, however, is the importance of providing solid training for a cadre of researchers on the whole gamut of these ancient scripts and languages. This is particularly crucial since newly discovered manuscripts keep turning up in China. Without qualified scholars to study and publish them, these precious materials simply molder away in storerooms, when they might potentially hold the answers to crucial questions about Chinese and Eurasian history.

Scripts and languages covered in this volume include Kharosthī, Tocharian (Karashahr and Kucha), Khotanese, Old Turkic, Uighur, Chagatay, Tangut, Tibetan, Tai, Yi (Lolo), Nakhi, Khitan, Jurchen, Mongolian, Phags-pa, Korean, Manchu, and tetragraphic Zhuang.

ZHENG Liangwei (Robert L. Cheng). *Zouxiang Biaozhunhua de Taiwanhuawen* (*Essays on Written Taiwanese*). Taipei: Zili Wanbao Wenhua, 1989. 2 + 14 + 447 pages.

For nearly two decades, Robert Cheng has been struggling honestly and valiantly with the problem of how to write Taiwanese. Anyone who reads his many searching articles on this topic will soon be disabused of the deceptive myth that all of the Sinitic topolects share the same written form. Those naive souls, particularly linguists and sinologists (who ought to know better) who still cling to this pollyannaish outlook, should be required to read the works of Robert Cheng as he tries to establish a standardized written form for Taiwanese.

As I have often told the author and others, unless a phonetic script is adopted -- at least as a *kana*-like auxiliary for non-Mandarin, non-Classical Chinese morphemes -- there never will be a viable written Taiwanese. The standard set of tetragraphs is simply inadequate to the task. Cheng himself frequently resorts to a combination of tetragraphs and romanization; that is a reasonable (if cumbersome, as is the mixed Japanese writing system) solution. The author has also experimented with romanization as a feasible device for entering Taiwanese into computers and word processers. What he has discovered is that this form of inputting is fine and dandy, but what does one do about conversion and acceptable output? My suggestion is simply to forget about the sinographs when it comes to Taiwanese, Cantonese, and the other topolects (i.e., Sinitic languages). More often that not, they will simply get in the way, confusing readers and writers alike.

In this volume, Cheng discusses some specific problems in setting up Taiwanese as a functioning written language. He also addresses sociolinguistic issues such as the need for doing so and the implications for thought, literature, and other aspects of culture and society. A particularly striking instance of the vast gulf between Taiwanese and written Modern Standard Mandarin is the script of the Yang Lihua *gezaixi* and its translation (N.B.) into Taiwanese given on pages 123-152. Cheng's prefatory remarks to this revealing exercise include the following frank observation:

> Between Modern Chinese book language in which old Sinitic elements are embedded (taking the present script as an example) and spoken Taiwanese (taking the present literal translation into Taiwanese as an example), there exists an extremely large difference. Most people think that among the Sinitic "topolects" or between ancient and modern Sinitic only the pronunciation is dissimilar, but that other elements such as grammar and vocabulary are the same, so that all one need do is to use the sinographs to bridge the gap. This way of thinking is quite inaccurate as can be seen from the following playscript.

Bravo to Robert Cheng for telling the truth! If more Chinese linguists did so, China's linguistic picture would soon become a much healthier and accurate one.

Taiyu Wenzhai [*Digest of the Languages of Taiwan*].

This is a very handy compilation of photoreproduced clippings from newspapers and magazines of articles concerning the various languages (Taiwanese, Hoklo, Hakka, Saya, Amei, etc.) and scripts of Taiwan. I was surprised by the diversity and intensity of opinion that exists in the Republic of China on the matter of language reform and, more urgently, preservation.

Sadly, the *Digest* was shut down by the government in November of 1989 after having produced four substantial issues averaging about 175 pages in length. (Since writing that sentence in the fall of 1990, however, I have received news that the *Digest* is once again being published.) The ostensible reason for this administrative and police action against the volunteer, not-for-profit operation was that it had failed to register with the government. That, of course, was merely a pretext, since there are hundreds of such small-scale publications that flourish without interference in Taiwan. The government's concern with the *Digest* obviously stemmed, rather, from its raising such sensitive issues as romanization, the status of unofficial topolects, and non-Sinitic languages vis-à-vis government sanctioned and sponsored MSM, and the relationship between one's true mother tongue and one's culture. The *Digest* took no positions on any of these matters, but the mere fact that it brought together in one place a host of conflicting views and raised them to the surface constituted a powerful threat to the linguistic policies of the government which is still controlled largely by mainlanders. In a time of rapidly rising indigenous political consciousness and expectation, the question of language can become an explosive factor.

In the editor's remarks announcing the government's closing of the *Digest*, he made two significant comments that bear repeating. The first is that "Without any doubt, the alphabetization of Sinitic languages (*Hanyu zimuhua*) is a road that must be taken. But how should we treat the old Sinographs (*Hanzi*) ? Should they be completely abolished? Partially preserved? Simplified? Should the form of the new alphabet be like that of the Sound Annotating Symbols (*Zhuyin Fuhao*)? Romanization? Korean Hangul? These are all questions worthy of pondering upon."

The second is that "the Sinographization (*Hanzihua*) of Taiwanese languages is also an important question. At present, the movement for written Taiwanese languages stresses the sinographs. However, because **the Sinographs to be used for writing Taiwanese languages have not yet been finalized**, everyone has his own opinions [about how to do it]." Although the editor does not point it out, the inadequacy of the sinographs as a script for recording living Sinitic language shows unmistakably why the questions of the previous paragraph -- and a host of others -- will continue to be asked, in spite of anything the governments of the ROC or PRC may do to suppress them.

QIU Xueqiang. *Miaoyu Fangyan* [*Marvelous Topolecticisms*]. Hong Kong: Zhonghua, 1989. 3 + 136 pages.

This little book is full of interesting mix-ups in Sinitic due to interference among the various topolects and the confusion that results from writing down topolectical expressions with inappropriate tetragraphs. The author's explanations and message would be much clearer, however, if he provided phonetic transcriptions of the terms discussed. Unfortunately, because he seldom does so, the full effect of the instances of topolectical interference is not felt.

One of the most interesting facets of the book is Qiu's repeated demonstration that English and other foreign transcriptions of Sinitic topolectical names (e.g., Amoy and Swatow) are nearly always far more accurate than those in Modern Standard Mandarin (Xiamen and Shantou). Conversely, in trying to make sense of loanwords as recorded in sinographs, it is essential to pronounce them according to the topolect into which they were first borrowed rather than into MSM (e.g., Amoy *sabun* < Malay *sabun* ["soap"], cf. MSM *xuewen* as the meaningless and misleading pronunciation of the two graphs used to write this word).

Marvelous Topolecticisms, while entertaining and informative, is poorly written and badly organized. Many of the author's jokes fall flat, and he often uses material from other secondary sources that is not well assimilated. Still, if one is looking for an easy, nonscholarly introduction to the charms of Sinitic topolects, this is not a bad place to begin.

Edwin G. Pulleyblank. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin.* Vancouver: UBC Press, 1991. 488 pages.

Here is the long-awaited companion to the author's *Middle Chinese* (1984) which makes the phonological studies carried out in the latter available to non-specialists in an extremely handy form. *Lexicon* consists of approximately 8,000 sinographs arranged in strictly alphabetical order for ease of reference. This alone will definitely make it the first source to which Sinologists will turn when they wish to find a Middle Sinitic (MS) or Early Mandarin reconstruction. Bernhard Karlgren's landmark *Grammata Serica Recensa (GSR)*, the standard in the field, has always been notorious for how difficult it is to use (partial radical index in back; main listing by rhyme categories). The *Guangyun Shengxi* , edited by SHEN Jianshi, rearranges the *GSR* transcriptions (with some minor changes) according to a different set of sound groups, but does have a complete radical plus residual stroke index at the back). S. A. Starostin's important new *Rekonstruktsiya Drevnekitaiskoi Fonologicheskoi Sistem'i* is maddeningly arranged by rhyme groups and has no index whatsoever. Hugh Stimson's *The Jongyuan In Yunn: A Guide to Old Mandarin Pronunciation* (includes Middle Sinitic reconstructions) is arranged by the rhyme groups of the original fourteenth-century work, but has a radical plus residual stroke index. Chou Fa-Kao's *A Pronouncing Dictionary of Chinese Characters in Archaic & Ancient Chinese, Mandarin and Cantonese* has become the favorite of many sinologists because it is arranged according to radical, so that one does not have to turn first to an index and then go to the main body. For sheer convenience, *Lexicon* is certain to supersede all of these works. (Compilers of dictionaries and other types of reference works should be forewarned: no matter how good the contents of a work may be, if it employs a lousy lookup system that is frustrating and wastes hours of precious time, users will avoid it like the plague if there is any viable alternative.)

Lexicon has other virtues. Each entry is provided with the following: the Modern Standard Mandarin pronunciation in Pinyin, the appropriate sinograph, the number of its radical plus residual strokes according to the *Kangxi Zidian*, the serial number in Morohashi's *Dai Kan-Wa Jiten*, the serial number in Karlgren's *GSR*, Early Mandarin reconstruction, Late Middle Sinitic, Early Middle Sinitic, and English gloss(es). Merely as an alphabetical index to Morohashi and *GSR*, *Lexicon* will become a valuable tool for scholars.

But these niceties, of course, are not what the book is all about. Pulleyblank's intention was to provide with his *Lexicon* the first sustained, full-scale reappraisal of *GSR*. I leave it to historical phonologists to determine how successful he has been. From the standpoint of the intensely interested non-specialist, however, there are some dubious aspects to the whole enterprise of phonemic reconstructions in which Pulleyblank is engaged. His use of a whole barrage of International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) symbols gives one the (false?) sense of security that we can record Middle Sinitic as accurately as

we can a living language in the field. Are all of those complicated distinctions really a reflection of the way Tang dynasty Chinese was spoken in Chang'an or Nanking or anywhere, for that matter? Pulleyblank's reconstructions of Old Sinitic (mercifully omitted from *Lexicon*) become even more esoteric and impenetrable (also changing radically from one year to the next). It would seem that the less certain he is of his material, the more complicated and forbidding his reconstructions become. Honesty should dictate the opposite policy. It is curious that the Proto-Indo-European reconstructions in Calvert Watkins' *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots* make do with the 26 letters of the alphabet, superscript w, schwa (seldom used), and macron. And yet we know infinitely more about Proto-Indo-European than we do about Old Sinitic. Here I am prompted to quote from Stimson (p. 27):

> Because in dealing with MC we are dealing with a language much of whose phonemics is overtly expressed in the data but whose phonetics can be observed only indirectly, I find a transcription based on phonemic principles more realistic than one that tries to represent phonetic detail. Karlgren's transcription is an example of the latter, especially in its earliest forms. His finicky attention to dubious distinctions, such as raised ^{w} as opposed to a u sitting squarely on the line, k opposed to kj, and p opposed to pj, is wasteful and gives a false impression of scientific accuracy. Most important, such a transcription conceals the phonological structure.

If this can be said of Karlgren, whose reconstructions are positively simple in comparison with the intimidatingly complex creations of the *Lexicon*, what would Stimson have said of Pulleyblank? I sometimes get the impression that Pulleyblank and others of his persuasion do not themselves really believe in the absolute (or even proximate) accuracy of their transcriptions which bristle with forbidding diacriticals and special symbols, but that subconsciously they feel they can forestall criticism by cowing into submission those who do not feel they have the leisure to keep up with their constantly shifting reconstructions. Pulleyblank also seems to operate on a principle of inversion whereby his transcriptions become more complicated and seemingly more precise the farther back in time he goes. (Or does he really believe that the phonology of Old Sinitic was more elaborate than that of Middle Sinitic?)

Aside from the scientific verifiability of Pulleyblank's reconstructions, there is also a practical problem for scholars who wish to cite these awkward forms. Not only do 99.9% of all sinologists lack the full range of IPA symbols in their computers and on their typewriters, probably almost as many have little idea how to pronounce or interpret them. Pulleyblank would probably say, "Well, they should learn." But that is wishful thinking. One of the reasons that sinologists are unwilling to invest time in learning these esoteric symbols is because they have little faith that they reflect reality for the Tang and earlier periods. IPA is fine for notation of field observations of living languages, but are we justified in asserting that we know the pronunciation of Middle Sinitic as well as we know that of Athapascan, and that we know Old Sinitic even better? So how are scholars going to cite the reconstructions of Pulleyblank? Or will they ignore them? These are real problems that need to be addressed by historical phonologists and sinologists alike. I would suggest as one possibility for coping with the situation a conversion table that provides equivalents for each of Pulleyblank's syllable-types in a more conventional appearance.

The introduction is informative and generally fairly straightforward. There are several arguments Pulleyblank indulges in, somewhat gratuitously, that deserve closer scrutiny. It is curious, for example, that he should accuse modern scholars of inventing the reading Tǔbō "instead of the traditional reading Tǔfān still found, for instance, in the *Xiandai Hanyu Cidian* (1978)." The actual situation, in fact, would appear to be exactly

the opposite: the traditional reading was probably Tŭbō whereas the modern reading is Tŭfān. All that Pulleyblank would have had to do is to check his *Mathews'* (1790b.2, not to mention Giles [3383 and 12,000] who compiled his dictionary in 1892) to find that Chinese were saying Tŭbō long before many of them switched to Tŭfān, under sinographic influence. There is also an avalanche of other evidence to support Tŭbō as the earlier and more authentic reading, a portion of which is presented in my long article entitled "Tufan and Tulufan: The Origins of the Old Chinese Names for Tibet and Turfan," *Central and Inner Asian Studies,* 4 (1990), 14-70. I am certain that Pulleyblank is aware of this article, but perhaps he chose to ignore it because the evidence it presents does not fit with some long-cherished theory of his. He takes a similar stance on the pronunciation of the name of the "Tocharians" which he insists (his word) must be Yuezhi when there are persuasive grounds for pronouncing the name as Ruzhi or Rouzhi. Here again Pulleyblank accuses modern scholars "in Beijing," as he puts it, of inventing the Ruzhi pronunciation for some perverse reason, when the situation is precisely the opposite. Just as with Tubo, most careful, traditional scholars that I know in Taiwan and in China pronounce the name as Ruzhi or Rouzhi, not Yuezhi, and they have been doing so since long before he or I can remember.

As I have frequently stated, because of the poor sound representation of the sinographs, it is unlikely that we will ever be able to reconstruct early stages of Sinitic with confidence unless we make extensive use of transcriptional data. For this reason, I am a strong supporter of the methods employed by scholars such as South Coblin in his researches on Eastern Han Sinitic and by Takata Tokio in his studies on the phonology of Tang period Gansu dialect. It is also the reason why I am myself with all of my might trying to identify loanwords in Sinitic from the very earliest stages up to the present day. In my estimation, purely internal reconstruction is a chimera (except as a theoretical construct that has no necessary and binding relationship to phonetic reality at any given moment in history).

I shall close by mentioning one of the most remarkable aspects of *Lexicon*, namely, that it was entirely typeset on a Macintosh personal computer. Ted Pulleyblank has learned how to make his computer do wonderful tricks, and for that I stand in awe of him.

Reference Tools for Sinitic Languages

ZHANG Jihua. *Changyong Kouyu Yuhui* [*A Glossary of Common Colloquialisms*]. Peking: Beijing Yanshan, 1988. 8 + 19 + 29 pages.

The author attepts in his introduction to make a distinction between Pekingese colloquialisms and Pekingese topolecticisms, but he is unsuccessful in doing so. His general imprecision is evident in the very title of this work which gives no indication that it has to do with special Pekingese words, phrases, proverbs, and sentences that are more or less writable in sinographs. The only distinction I can observe between the expressions collected in this dictionary and in the numerous collections of Pekingese colloquialisms that I have reviewed in previous issues of *SPP* (see also the following review) is that the compiler of the present work is able to provide citations to the use of most of the expressions he has gathered in literary works, most of which are quite current, whereas the majority of expressions in the other collections are seldom, if ever, written down. In many cases, in fact, native Pekingese -- even those who are fully literate -- feel quite comfortable using a wide variety of colloquial expressions that they have no idea whatsoever how to write down.

The arrangement of the dictionary is very strange and cumbersome. Expressions consisting of one sinograph are grouped together separately, as are those consisting of two,

three, four, five, six, seven, eight, and nine or more sinographs. These groups are further subdivided according to the number of stokes in the first sinograph of the expression. The same hard-to-use arrangement is repeated in a useless nineteen page index at the front of the book. Fortunately, there is a romanized index (multiple sort according to head sinographs) at the back of the book.

The compiler's use of Pinyin is also bizarre. For example, the last entry in the volume is given as *nǐngtīngběijīngrénchǎojiàbùtīngguānwàirénshuōhuà* ("OnewouldratherlistentoPekingesearguingthantooutsidersholdingaconversation")! It is as though the compiler conceives of this complex sentence as one monstrous fourteen-syllable word. To tell the truth, I am dubious about the authenticity of this sentence, which the compiler picked up from a story by Deng Youmei, as I am of a large number of other enteries. I think Deng is here simply adapting or appropriating a well-known Suzhou proverb ("It's better to listen to Suzhouese arguing than to Ningboese making love"). During my travels to China, I must have heard the latter proverb a score of times, but not once did I ever hear anyone utter Deng Youmei's fourteen'syllable imitation.

The best part of this dictionary is the short (two pages) essay by Lao She entitled "Zenyang Yunyong Konyu [How to Use Spoken Language]," which is reprinted from the second issue of *Yuwen Xuexi* [*Language Learning*] for 1951. But even this essay is rather pathetic for several reasons. First of all, Lao She makes a plea for authors to write simply and straightforwardly, approaching the spoken language as closely as possible. It is obvious, however, that Lao She is painfully aware that one cannot approach the spoken language too closely in one's writing because there are no means to record much of it using the tetragraphic script. For political reasons, Lao She is also forced to contradict himself directly by sanctioning the adoption of such manifestly un-Mandarin, un-Pekingese slogans as *Kang Mei yuan Chao* ("Resist America and Support Korea!"). How sad that, even after years of groveling in this fashion, Lao She was forced to commit suicide for his bourgeois attitudes.

XU Shirong. *Beijing Tuyu Cidian* [*A Dictionary of Peking Colloquialisms*]. Peking: Beijing, 1990. 12 + 23 + 599 pages.

We have a special affection for dictionaries and other reference works relating to Pekingese (see *SPP* 8, pp. 26-27 and *SPP* 14, pp. B33-36). In a sense, however, we are beginning to feel that there is an *embarras de richesses* of tools for the study of Pekingese, especially in comparison with materials on other Sinitic topolects (languages). The disparity has become so great, in fact, that we here make a public appeal for the compilation of similar works elucidating the intricacies of Chengtu, Taiyuan, Wenchow, Kunming, Meihsien, and dozens (nay, hundreds!) of other equally interesting cases throughout China.

Just when we were beginning to resent the overabundance of tools for the study of Pekingese and were becoming bored by some of the more inferior specimens (such as the item reviewed just above), along comes a really good one that helps us to solve problems that previously had stymied us. While Xu Shirong's philological skills are not equal to those of Chen Gang, the author of our favorite dictionary of Peking colloquialisms, he is nevertheless a genuine linguist with a penchant for thoroughness. His *Beijing Tuyu Cidian*, consequently, has much to offer.

Quite properly, Xu begins his introductory essay by making a sharp distinction between Pekingese and Modern Standard Mandarin. This is not true only (and massively so) with regard to vocabulary, but is also evident in the phonology of the two languages. In spite of what our preconceptions may be of the allegedly close relationship between MSM and Pekingese, it is extremely difficult for someone who knows only the former to understand someone speaking the latter. Surprisingly, a large part of the incomprehension is due to phonological differences between the two languages ("butterfly" is *hùtiěr* not

húdié, "camel" is *luòtou* not *luòtuó*, etc.). Xu very carefully and analytically explains some of these differences.

As an example of the types of problems that may be encountered when speakers of MSM and Pekingese interact, let us describe the actual linguistic situation in one household that we witnessed. The husband is from Szechuan, the wife from Anhwei; both speak the topolects of their own native places plus lightly accented MSM. Since husband and wife are both applied linguists, they are intimately familiar with IPA and Hanyu Pinyin and hence are very sensitive to proper pronunciation. Their three children were all born in Peking and grew up there. The parents speak MSM together and with their children. The children, being natives of Peking, also speak Pekingese. What is interesting is that when the children lapse into full-blown Pekingese among themselves or with their friends, the parents are unable to understand much of what they say. One of the sons who works in a factory and thus has daily contact with workers slurs his words in a peculiarly Pekingese fashion and uses so much Pekingese slang that his speech is unintelligible to monolingual speakers of MSM.

The next part of Xu's introduction deals with various categories of Pekingese colloquialisms. One is occupational jargon and another is underworld argot. Both are impenetrable to outsiders, the latter intentionally so. A most peculiar type of jargon is called *qiekou* (literally "cut-mouth," the term is derived from the traditional pseudo-spelling technique known as *fanqie* ("cut-and-splice" or "antitomy"). The most common type of "cut-mouth" uses two syllables for each syllable of the intended communication (the initial of the first syllable and the final of the second syllable are joined to form one syllable of the message). There are also other varieties of "cut-mouth" which intentionally distort an utterance in a regular fashion, somewhat akin to our so-called "Pig Latin," though much more complicated. For those who wish to explore this highly esoteric subject further, we may recommend WU Hanchi, ed, *Quanguo Gejie Qiekou Da Cidian* [*All-China Dictionary of Cut-Mouth Jargon from Various Occupations*] (Shanghai: Donghu Tushu, 1924), rpt. as *Qiekou Da Cidian* [*Dictionary of Cut-Mouth Jargon*], Minsu, Minjian Wenxue Yingyin Ziliao zhi Ershilui [Photo-offset Materials for Folk and Polular Literature, 26] (Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi, 1989).

Xu breaks Pekingese colloquialisms down into the following fourteen categories: 1. special local products, foods, objects, and activities; 2. special names for parts of the body, individuals in their relationships to others, and plants and animals; 3. local customs; 4. idioms and idiomatic phrases; 5. metaphors; 6. insults; 7. euphemisms; 8. borrowings from other languages; 9. phraseology revealing old customs; 10. witticisms; 11. quadrisyllabic set phrases; 12. distinctive suffixes; 13. adjectival prefixes; 14. truncated witticisms (*xiehouyu*).

According to Xu, Pekingese colloquialisms have had the following eleven features: 1. numerous morphemes, words, and expressions cannot be written in sinographs; 2. phonetic transformations and deformations camouflage morphemes from standard Mandarin speech; 3. many words and expressions seem to be phonetic transcriptions of unidentifiable foreign terms; 4. scattered elements from Classical Chinese (book language); 5. expressions that reveal traces of historical phenomena from earlier periods; 6. relative stability and continuity of usage through time; 7. preserved elements of ancient vernacular Sinitic (this is quite different from no. 4); 8. phonetic transformation of one syllable in quadrisyllabic expressions; 9. unusual linguistic structures; 10. an abundance of vivid idiomatic imagery; 11. fine distinctions of different types of movements.

There are also noticeable differences between the grammar of MSM and that of Pekingese, which Xu attributes to the fact that the former is chiefly a modern type of book language and the latter is a kind of spoken language. He mention six instances: 1. inversion; 2. in certain constructions, *bu* ("no, not") looses its normal negative function; 3.-*men* (plural signifier) is occasionally used in the singular; 4. special suffixes; 5. postpositions may combine with the word preceding them to form an independent unit that

can end a sentence; 6. elaborate phonological transformations of subtle interjections, consisting of one or two syllables, at the ends of sentences.

The dictionary is arranged according to the alphabetical order of head characters. It is divided into two sections: colloquialisms in common use (pp. 1-502) and colloquialisms from old Peking (pp. 503-599). An index of Pinyin syllables follows the introduction and permits swift access to both sections of the dictionary. It is followed by an index of the total stroke count of the head characters in both sections of the dictionary. Following the total stroke index is a chart of the phonetic realizations of retroflex *-r* after various vowel, diphthong, and nasal endings and a concise chart of the tone sandhi patterns.

From *alabaza* ("filthy") to *zuo-zhenxian-de* ("seamstress"), *Beijing Tuyu Cidian* is a tremendous resource for the best studied of China's innumerable topolects. The subleties of Pekingese speech are revealed in all their glory in this generous dictionary. There is even a stative verb, for example, that describes the way a trembling fat person's belly or body looks (*denlen*). It also confirms the existence of an old colloquial word for "dolt, bumpkin" that I hear from time to time (*diangdiangr*). Here, too, I finally found out that *cuibar* ("lackey, toady"), a word much favored by Peking youth today and whose roots I have been assiduously tracing for several years because none of my friends from Peking is sure how to write it, is actually quite old and that it may derive from *suicui* ("servant, sycophant, underling, bootlicker"). But, in spite of the rich assortment of delicious goodies served up by Xu, I was not able to find out anything about *der* ("let's go!"), which has a strongly trilled *-r*.

The quest goes on.

LIU Jiexiu, comp. *Hanyu Chengyu Kaoshi Cidian* [*A Dictionary of Set Phrases in Sinitic with Sources and Explanations*]. Peking: Commercial, 1989. 200 + 1,668 pages.

Zhongguo Chengyu Da Cidian [*Unabridged Dictionary of Chinese Set Phrases*]. Shanghai: Shanghai Cishu, 1987. 2 + 20 + 1,989 pages.

We are trained to translate the word *chengyu* as "idiom" but this is misleading because *chengyu* function very differently in Sinitic languages than do idioms (expressions whose meanings are not predictable from the usual meanings of their constituent elements, e.g., "kick the bucket," "pass the buck," etc.) in other languages. It is safest to render *chengyu* as "set phrases" which sticks fairly closely to the literal meaning of its two syllables.

I used to collect dictionaries of *chengyu* but soon gave up because there simply were too many of them and most of them are worthless. The situation with *chengyu* dictionaries is rather like that for sinographic computer inputting schemes: a new one appears about once a month to great fanfare ("the final solution to the problem!") but it is no good for anything, so it is quickly consigned to the dustheap of history. There are other, deeper conections between the peculiarities of *chengyu* and the difficulties of dealing with sinographs in computers. Both result from the imposition of a script well suited for the unsayable, artificial book language known as Classical or Literary Chinese upon the living, spoken Sinitic vernaculars. I shall have more to say about the sharp dissonance between literary *chengyu* and the living vernaculars in the following paragraphs.

Another reason why I stopped collecting *chengyu* dictionaries was because of the appearance in 1971 of Miu Tianhua's *Chengyu Dian* [*Dictionary of Set Phrases*] (Taipei: Fuxing). Here was a scholarly work whose quality so far overshadowed the run-of-the-mill trash that glutted the market, confused adolescent minds, and unconscionably wasted forests of paper that I simply decided not to bother paying attention any longer to the hundreds of indistinguishable volumes that appear with suffocating regularity.

My disregard of new *chengyu* dictionaries came to an abrupt (although temporary) halt with the recent appearance of the two large tomes under review. Both clearly represent

determined attempts to be comprehensive, thorough, and scholarly. Consequently, I went to the trouble of obtaining these large reference works, studying them, and comparing them. After doing so, there is no doubt in my mind that Liu's is easily the hands-down winner. It is, in fact, a stupendous achievement for a single individual, as we shall see momentarily when I describe its virtues in greater detail.

It is, infact, somewhat troubling that the Shanghai volume was ever published at all. This dictionary was compiled by a team of staff researchers drawn from the Sinitic Reference Books Compilation Department of Commercial Press, the Compilation Office for the *Unabridged Dictionary of Sinitic* (*Hanyu Da Cidian*), and the Lexicography Department of the Shanghai Reference Book Press. Surely this large team, especially those members who came from Commercial Press, must have been aware of Liu's one-man project which had been underway for nearly two decades. As it turns out, although the Shanghai volume is superior to all other preexisting *chengyu* dictionaries, at best it needlessly duplicates Liu's dictionary and in many respects is decidedly inferior.

The Shanghai volume has over 18,000 entries, while Liu's has over 17,600. When subentries are added in, however, Liu's amounts to approximately 20,000 items. The appearance of the Shanghai volume is rather embarrassing. On many of the pages, it is still possible to see tape marks from the paste-up. The tacky color illustrations at the beginning of the book also set the wrong tone. At least the Shanghai editors had the good sense to arrange their dictionary according to alphabetic order (of the head characters). They also include an alphabetical index of the head characters before the main body of the text and a complete listing of all entries in the dictionary by total stroke count of the head characters after the text. Aside from its huge size and chapter references to works cited (a feature already present in Miu Tianhua's dictionary), there is not much to distinguish the Shanghai volume from dozens of other better-than-average *chengyu* dictionaries.

Not so the work of Liu Jiexiu. His *Kaoshi Cidian* is a true labor of love. It must have taken boundless amounts of dedication for one man to produce such an enormous tome, furthermore, one that is packed with innovative (in the world of Chinese scholarship and publishing) details. The quality of this dictionary so far outshines virtually all other examples of Chinese lexicography that it is difficult to comprehend where Liu derived the sources of his inspiration and the sustaining energy necessary to bring his grand conception to reality.

The *Kaoshi Cidian* (hereafter *KC*) begins with a succinct, straightforward, and sensibly stated set of general priciples. This is followed by a Pinyin index of all head characters. The thoughtfulness of the compiler is evident already in his indication of the exact column on each page where the entries for a given character start. Next follows an index of head characters by total stroke count. Then comes a complete listing, nearly 200 pages in triple columns, of all entries in the dictionary arranged according to the 4-corner code (this alone shows the seriousness of Liu's purpose, although now only a few people in the world can use this intelligent system for lookup by shape).

After the 4-corner index begins the dictionary proper. In the very first entry, we get a taste of Liu's high sinological standards.

āi bīng bì shèng [He who commiserates with his troops will win." The original sense. Now distorted to mean "An army burning with righteous indignation is bound to win.]

Lao Zi, ch. 69: Therefore,

> When opposing forces are evenly matched,
> The one who is saddened will be victorious.

This means that when the strength of two opposing armies is comparable, the side that is full of sorrowful emotions will be victorious. The commonly circulating edition of the *Lao Zi* has *xiangjia* ("mutually increase") instead of *xiangruo* ("comparable") which we have taken from

> the A and B silk manuscripts of the *Lao Zi, Classic of Integrity* that were preserved in the Han tomb at Mawangdui.
>
> Later this *chengyu* was used to indicate that an army which struggled to overcome constraints would certainly wage war victoriously.

It is remarkable and highly praiseworthy that Liu translates or paraphrases quoted Literary Chinese passages into good Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM). His explanations, likewise, are in clear, unpretentious MSM. Such solicitation for his reader is virtually unheard of for a Chinese scholar. Even more amazing, on pages 1658-1664, he lists a sizable portion of the sources he cites, giving title, publisher, and month and year of publication. Glancing at this bibliography, we can gain an idea of how wide his reading was during the course of preparing his dictionary (how many other compilers of *chengyu* dictionaries have read the *Zutang Ji* [*Collection from the Hall of Patriarchs*])? It is also evident that he has made an effort to use the most recent reliable editions of cited works. Yet all of this pales beside his citation of specific page numbers (and even sometimes which column of a page) in the main body of his text. I suspect that it will be at least another generation before even a handful of other Chinese Sinologists are willing to adopt this considerate scholarly practice.

At every turn, we find Liu doing something to make it easier for his reader to understand instead of trying to intimidate with opaque, confusing classicisms. If there is a difficult graph in a cited passage, Liu is not above providing a phonetic gloss in Pinyin. If an expression or passage needs clarification, Liu will cite relevant commentaries and, if necessary, will go so far as to explain the commentaries.

Fearful that he may not have given a bountiful enough banquet in the main text, Liu dishes up over one hundred pages (pp. 1544-1657) of dessert in the form of a collection of 5,000 *shuyu* ("farmiliar phrases"). These are expressions well known to those who are steeped in the literary tradition, but not widely enough used by the common person to be called "set phrases".

Liu closes his dictionary with a modest four-page afterward describing his struggles during the course of compilation and penetrating criticisms of the entire process. I consider this a monument of modern Chinese scholarship.

Liu Jiexiu dedicated a good part of his life to his dictionary of *chengyu*; the Shanghai Reference Books Press devoted a substantial amount of manpower and funding to the compilation of their *chengyu* dictionary; Chinese bookbuyers snap up hundreds of thousands of *chengyu* handbooks every year. Is it all worth it? Why do Chinese torture themselves with trying to command a segment of their living languages which is embedded, fossilized, nonliving Literary Chinese. Although use of *chengyu* is declining, and overuse is looked upon as pedantic, most Chinese people still try to spice up their speech, and especially their writing if they are more than moderately literate, with a few *chengyu* now and then.

The closest approximation to *chengyu* in English is the use of Greek or Latin phraseology in the original. The language in all respects (grammer, lexicon, syntax, etc.) is separate from English. So, too, is Literary Chinese distinct from MSM. Just as few Americans who still use snatches of Greek or Latin in their speech and writing are able to analyze it linguistically, so are few Chinese who use such expresions as *mò míng qí miào* or *qǐ yǒu cǐ lǐ* able to understand the separate parts of these expressions. They simply know that the former means "amazing" and the latter means "preposterous." They use such expressions as single words and do not bother with the meanings of the components in Literary Chinese. Still less do most Chinese know the stories behind *chengyu* like *zhǐ lù wéi mǎ* ("pointing at a deer and calling it a horse") or *Qǐ rén yōu tiān* ("the man from Qi worrying that the sky will fall down").

The answer to the question why Chinese trouble themselves with learning archaic expressions that are alien to the grammar and structure of their own spoken languages is that it represents the only part of the classical literary tradition that is available to the vast

majority of the population. Without *chengyu*, now that the *baihua yundong* ("vernacular movement") is behind them, Chinese would be even more irreparably cut off from their literary past than they already are.

One of the most intriguing aspects of *chengyu* is that the vast majority of them are four syllables long. My very rough estimate of the length of *chengyu* is 98% quadrisyllabic, 1% octosyllabic, .4% trisyllabic, .3% hexasyllabic, .2% pentasyllabic, and .1% heptasyllabic or other lengths. Is there any reasonable explanation for this overwhelming preference for quadrisyllabism? We may note that the average length of a word in MSM is almost exactly two syllables. Similarly, there are thousands of bisyllabic expressions in Literary Chinese, most of them (for example, those that are onomatopoeic) probably drawn from one of the ancient spoken languages. Hence there seems to be a natural tendency for bisyllabism in Sinitic languages and for clustering together of bisyllabic units to form larger groups. The marked dominance of quadrisyllabism in *chengyu*, however, seems due not so much to the genius of spoken Sinitic languages as to the exigencies of the tetragraphic script which, because of its morphological deficiencies, requires a high degree of parallelism and fixed grammatical structure (order) for intelligibility. Just as the characters themselves are square-shaped, so I have long argued that Chinese poetry and Chinese phraseology is basically square (or rectangular). This is certainly a subject deserving of extensive research.

One final note on the subject of *chengyu* is to comment on what orthographic form they should take in romanized texts. This is a question that has been nagging experts for decades. Should they be treated as one long word? As separate syllables without hyphenation? As separate syllables joined by hyphens between each syllable or just in the middle? And so forth. I believe that, since *chengyu* are as lexically and grammatically foreign to MSM as Greek and Latin are to English, they should be given in italics and syllabically parsed according to the grammar of Classical Chinese. This would help people realize that *chengyu* should be analyzed as whole embedded units and not according to the grammar of MSM.

John S. Rohsenow, comp. *A Chinese-English Dictionary of Enigmatic Folk Similes* (*Xiēhòuyǔ*). Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1991. xvii + 324 pages.

I had the privilege of reading this book in manuscript form many years ago, perhaps as long as a decade or more. At the time, I was quite enthusiastic and gave the author a strong recommendation for publication. Unfortunately, it has taken until now for Rohsenow's own labor of love to see the light of day. In the meantime, he has experienced a series of horror stories trying to get the book set with characters throughout and with tones correctly placed above the romanization. The tragicomic tale of how the manuscript was finally put to bed may be read in *Characters and Computers*, edited by Victor H. Mair and Yongquan Liu (Amsterdam: IOS, 1991), the *Proceedings* of the University of Pennsylvania International Symposium on East Asian Information Processing.

If it is amazing that Chinese would spend so much time collecting, explaining, and memorizing *xiehouyu* ("truncated witticisms"), and they do so with a frequency second only to their attachment to *chengyu* (see preceding review), it is all the more astounding that an American would devote a significant portion of his life to them. Why? My guess is that Rohsenow, being an anthropological linguist, feels that he can gain a glimpse of the Chinese psyche through these clever, enigmatic sayings that is not revealed through the more usual sort of discourse. If so, he may well have the right idea, for within the crude satire of the *xiehouyu* is contained a stark reflection of Chinese social values.

The favorite cast of characters in the repertoire of *xiehouyu* are dung beetles, flies, pigs, dwarves, beggers, people with pock-marked faces, hungry people, fat people, ugly people, old ladies, daffy children, ghosts, the King of Hell, goats, monkeys, wolves, dogs, rats, frogs, toads, and so forth -- is short, just about anything or anyone that can be

made fun of. Rohsenow has not shied away from the ribald and the risqué, but I know a few that are unprintable.

Rohsenow claims that these enigmatic folk similes are "ubiquitous" in China. This may have been true a generation ago in the countryside, but modern urban life, internationalization, the demise of traditional performing arts in favor of television (which is truly "ubiquitous"), and universal nontraditional elementary education have diminished the role of *xiehouyu* in Chinese life to the point that few people now use them regularly. Many modern cultured people, in fact, profess not to use them at all because they smack of vulgarity and backwardness, just as too many *chengyu* in one's speech may brand one as pedantic. I am dubious of Rohsenow's claim that "all speakers of Mandarin" know the pun of "no law" (*fǎ*) for "no hair" (*fǎ*) that is left unsaid after *héshang dǎ sǎn* ("a Buddhist monk holding an umbrella") -- certainly not now.

The author provides an informative introduction which shows how new truncated witticisms have been invented in the last few decades, particularly in connection with certain political campaigns. He also discusses the history, scope, and evolution of these witticisms, as well as their classification according to the canons of rhetoric. The one thing missing from the introduction that might have been added is that other topolects than Mandarin have their own *xiehouyu*. Rohsenow must have been aware of this because he cites the works of Samuel H. N. Cheung and C. C. Sun, both of whom have studied Cantonese truncated witticisims. I have even come across similar types of sayings among the non-Sinitic peoples of China (e.g., Uighurs), but these were clearly created in emulation of Chinese *xiehouyu*.

A rough guess would be that Rohsenow has collected about 4,000 *xiehouyu* in this book. These he arranges by alphabetical order of the head characters of the sayings. Rohsenow provides each entry with complete romanization, sinographs, and English translation. He also provides usage notes, background notes, and other types of information elucidating the sayings. The book concludes with a useful bibliography and a topical index.

The author has informed me that he has turned his attention now to compiling a dictionary of *yanyu* ("proverbs"). Although the *xiehouyu* are difficult to understand because of the puns in the second member, I suspect that *yanyu* will pose an even bigger challenge for Rohsenow. In the first place, there are many more of them (I used to collect Chinese dictionaries of *yanyu* until the multivolumed monsters so inundated my office that I had to unload some of them and stop piling up new ones). Secondly, most of the *yanyu* are based on a specific literary allusion which will oblige Rohsenow to do an awful lot of library research to track them all down. Judging from the present work, I am sure that Rohsenow's dictionary will be a valuable reference work but, also judging from the present work, and the sheer magnitude of the task, it may be a long time coming. I wish him smooth sailing.

Shijie Chengyu Diangu Cidian [*A Dictionary of the Sources of Idioms of the World's Languages*]. Shanghai: Wenhui, 1989. 3 + 2 + 65 + 587 + 118 + 64 pages.

If there are *chengyu* in Sinitic languages, then there must be *chengyu* in non-Sinitic languages. Right? Wrong, unless one here understands *chengyu* in the sense of "idioms" in contrast to its meaning when applied to Sinitic languages (see review of the *chengyu* dictionaries above). And, even if we do admit that *chengyu* may mean "idiom" when applied to non-Sinitic languages, there are still many entries in this dictionary that are not *chengyu*.

There are indeed some true idioms in this dictionary, e.g., "hair stand on end," "*yerin kulağı vardir*, there's an ear on the ground [Turkish]," etc., but "yellow press," "yellow journalism," "Rosie the Riveter," and "Colonel Blimp" hardly qualify. Regardless of how the nearly 4,000 entries in this book should be classified, they are an interesting

assortment of expressions drawn from 21 different languages (Arabic, Persian, Korean, German, Russian, French, Latin, Nepali, Portuguese, Pashto, Japanese, Ceylonese, Esperanto, Turkish, Spanish, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Hindi, English, and Vietnamese).

Each entry begins with a Mandarin translation (the dictionary is arranged alphabetically according to the first character of the translation, not a very useful procedure), the foreign expression in its original orthography and without any transcription (silly, in light of the fact that no one will be able to read all of the scripts involved), and an ample explanation of the meaning of the expression and the story behind it.

At the end of the book, there are indices for each of the languages and then a classified index (government, the military, love, education, etc.) of the Chinese translations of all the entries.

MENG Zong, et. al., ed. *Dongci Yongfa Cidian* [*Usage Dictionary of Verbs*]. Shanghai: Shanghai Cishu, 1987. 2 + 31 + 960 + 11 pages.

This dictionary covers the usages of 1,328 verbs. Since a number of the verbs have two or more entries for each of their separate meanings, there are actually a total of 2,117 entries. The majority of the verbs are bisyllabic and the rest are monosyllabic, except for a couple of trisyllabic exceptions. Whether monosyllabic, bisyllabic, or trisyllabic, each verb is treated as a single word and listed alphabetically by head character. Each entry gives first a definition and synonyms, then sample sentences for such appropriate category of usage. The editors have established thirteen categories of verbal usage, plus several other types of verbal functions, but these do not seem to have been arrived at in any systematic fashion, rather simply through observation and thus have an *ad hoc* quality. While the sample sentences are useful in showing how the various verbs may be used, the categories of usage are not very illuminating. The introduction which describes them is rather scattered and confusing.

The main body of the text is preceded by an alphabetical index of all entries and it is followed by a total stroke count index of head characters

Literature and the Life of Peking

Tao-ching Hsü. *The Chinese Conception of the Theatre*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1985. xxiii + 685 pages.

The research for this book was begun in the late forties and the manuscript was completed in 1955(!!). Subsequently, the author sent it around from one press to another, meeting with rejection after rejection. Having read the book myself now, I can understand why publishers would be reluctant to take in on. Aside from the fact that the research that went into the book is more than three decades out of date, there are many other problems which should make one be wary.

Upon initial encounter, *The Chinese Conception of the Theatre* is eye-catching. This is a big book with numerous color photographs, fancy pull-out charts, neat graphics, an abundance of carefully stripped-in sinographs, elaborate musical scores, and so forth. The British printer, Louis Drapkin of Birmingham, has done an excellent job with a complicated text. The printing costs for such a large and lavishly produced book must have been quite substantial, yet the University of Washington Press is offering it for the modest price of $35.00. My guess is that the author, or a friend or patron, must have subsidized the publication of the book heavily. That alone should raise one's suspicion about the

quality. Considering its minimal usefulness for scholars, even at the low price that it is being sold for, this book is not a steal.

This is, in fact, a book written by an amateur author for amateur readers. There is no question that Tao-ching Hsü has had a life-long love affair with Peking opera and that he has expended an enormous amount of time and effort studying it. The problem is that he is unacquainted with sinological standards and procedures, hence unable to present his materials in such a fashion that specialists can utilize them. On the other hand, while the aficionado might derive some pleasure and edification from reading this book, the scholarly pretensions and thousands of untranslated, untranscribed sinographs are sure to intimidate her.

Conception is divided into five parts, each with about nine chapters, entitled "The Chinese Theatre of To-day," "The Artistry of the Chinese Theatre," "The History of the Chinese Theatre," "The Heritage of the Chinese Theatre," and "The Chinese and European Theatre." Without any doubt whatsoever, the best part of Hsü's presentation is his description of the Greek and Elizabethan theaters (most likely because the sources he relies on here are superior to those which he uses for the Chinese theater and because he probably had formal training in the history of European theater, whereas his knowledge of Chinese theater seems to have been acquired rather haphazardly). Of the parts dealing with the Chinese theater, the most valuable is the first which describes the day-to-day business and organization of a Peking opera troupe. It would appear that Hsü acquired this information from long and intimate association with actors and managers.

Finally, it should be pointed out that *Conceptions* does not treat the Chinese theater as a whole, but only of Peking opera together with the furthest extent of its presumed historical background. The author has little to say about other regional styles or opera, except for Kunqu which he sees as constituting an element in the historical background of Peking opera.

In sum, the specialist might be able to glean something of worth from this massive volume, but he must wade through a tremendous amount of verbiage before finding it. The layman will certainly learn much from this book, unfortunately not all of it accurate, thus even he must proceed with caution.

ZHANG Qingchang. *Hutong ji Qita: Shehuiyuyanxue de Tansuo* [*Alleys and Others: A Sociolinguistic Investigation*]. Peking: Beijing Yuyan Xueyuan, 1990. [viii] + 250 pages.

The profound degree to which Chinese language, society, and history have been Altaicized is perhaps nowhere made more evident than through a study of the street names of its capital city. This fascinating and unusual little book also affords a revealing glimpse at the enormous dissonance that exists between the oral origins of Chinese place names and their tetragraphic representations. The author is able to trace a few Peking street names back as far as the period of Khitan, Jurchen, and Mongol rule, but adequate documentation is available primarily only for the Ming (nominally Han but also heavily dominated by Arabic, Persian, and Altaic influences) and Manchu periods.

Let us dive right into the heart of things by looking at the word *hutong* itself. The author believes that this most distinctive feature of the topographical nomenclature of Peking comes from the Mongolian word [*xuttuk*] which was pronounced approximately *hudug*. The original meaning of this Mandarin loanword is "well." According to the author, cognates pronounced roughly *huto* do exist in Evenki, Jurchen, Manchu, Turkish, and Uighur. I have found the word as a Turkic borrowing into Russian (see E.N. Shipova, *Slovar' Tyurkizmov v Russkom Yaz'ike* [Alma-Ata: Iztatel'stvo "Nauka" Kazakhskoi SSR, 1976], p. 367) with the meaning "steppe well, pit with water." Shipova gives the Kalmuck form *hudug* and Mongolian *qudug*. In Modern Standard Turkish, we have *kuyu* (*New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary* [Istanbul: Redhouse Yayinevi,

1968, 1988] p. 692b). Gerard Clauson (*An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1972], p. 598b), traces the word back through Mongolian to a Turkic root *kuḏ* ("to pour out [a liquid]"). The eight different sinographic representations of *hutong* confirm that it is a borrowing. The likelihood that Mongolian *xuttuk* is indeed the source of the Mandarin word is great since many *hutong* are identified by a particular well located therein and some are even redundantly named *shuijing* ("well") *hutong*, *jing'er* ("well") *hutong*, and so forth.

Of course, it is not just *hutong* which demonstrates that importance of Altaic languages (particularly Mongolian and Manchu -- but the influence stretches back at least as far as the Six Dynasties [roughly the third through sixth centuries]) for the development of Sinitic languages, and the author scatters examples of this impact here and there in his delightful book. Since several of the chapters were originally journal articles, there is a certain amount of repetition and lack of organization, yet the volume is full of interesting insights about the interaction of people and places as reflected in toponymy. One of the reasons the author's arguments are so persuasive is that much of his evidence is presented in the form of tables, charts, and percentages packed with specific data.

Zhang Qingchang mines the names of the streets and alleys for much else besides Altaic influence. In them, he also discovers valuable information for reconstructing various aspects of life in old Peking, including the ethnographic origins of its inhabitants, animal husbandry, handicraft industries, commerce, social structure, government, inperial establishment, military organization, and religious architecture. The massive renaming of place names during the Cultural Revolution played havoc with the history of Peking and Zhang concludes his book by rightfully condeming it.

Religion and Philosophy

Akira Hirakawa. *A History of Indian Buddhism: From Śākyamuni to Early Buddhism.* Translated and edited by Paul Groner. Asian Studies at Hawaii, 36. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990. xvii + 402 pages.

This is a translation of volume 1 of Hirakawa's *Indō Bukkyō shi* (Tokyo: Sunjūsha, 1974) which covers from the very beginnings to just before Nāgārjuna. As might be expected from Hirakawa, it puts great emphasis on Abhidharma and stupa worship. Still, it is a comprehensive guide to the subject. The book is distinguished by its extensive utilization of Chinese sources and references to Japanese scholarship. Originally intended as a college text, it is written in a straightforward, informative style. The English translation is expertly done and, in some ways, may even be said to be an improvement on the Japanese version.

After Hirakawa's eight pages of notes, most referring to Sanskrit texts and Japanese studies, Groner offers an enormously helpful forty page, densely packed, Bibliographical Essay keyed to the eighteen chapters of the book plus its introduction. The Bibliography proper is likewise divided into two sections, Japanese sources cited by Hirakawa (ten pages) and Related Readings (mostly Western scholarship) gathered by Groner (nearly thirty pages). The book concludes with a helpful index.

The University of Hawaii Press deserves congratulations for bringing out such a handsome, reliable tool and Paul Groner our thanks for the demanding work necessary for making it a reality.

Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed. *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990. ix + 342 pages.

Another important book on Buddhism from the University of Hawaii Press published in the same year as the Hirakawa volume. Aside from the history of early Indian Buddhism reviewed just above, there are also the continuing studies in East Asian Buddhism from Kuroda Institute and the Buddhist and Taoist Studies series, not to mention other individual titles. There can be little doubt that Hawaii now is the strongest press in this country publishing books on Asia and that in their catalog Buddhism occupies pride of place. It is not, of course, merely that the quantity of books on Asian and Buddhist studies in large, but that their significance and quality are also estimable.

Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha is a fine example of one such book. Consisting of eight weighty papers plus an adroit introduction by the editor and an appendix on the standards of scriptural authenticity in Indian Buddhism by Ronald M. Davidson, this book is certain to become a classic not only in the field of Chinese Buddhist studies but in Buddhist studies in general as well. Considering the fact that half of the authors in the volume received their Ph.D.'s within the last five or six years and that most of the rest are still fairly young, the scholarly achievement represented here bodes well for the future of Buddhist studies.

Most of the authors included in this volume are American or have close American connections; the others are Japanese or have close Japanese connections, including one distinguished Italian. Buswell is to be congratulated for bringing thogether such an excellent cast of contributors and for conceiving of such a significant topic for them to collaborate upon. Most regrettable, however, is the fact that the book was originally even more broadly conceived as a survey of the indigenous scriptual literature of all non-Indian Buddhist traditions. As such, it would have included chapters on Tibetan *gter-ma* (treasure texts) and visionary cycles, Southeast Asian apocyphal *Jātakas*, and other such texts. Judging from the names of the authors who are mentioned in the preface as having proposed papers on Tibetan texts, this section would have been a particularly strong addition to the volume.

Considering the exigencies of academic book publishing in the current economic climate, however, we must be grateful for what we have before us. The chapters of *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* are the following: Kyoko Tokuno's extremely valuable "The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues" in which we learn, among other things, how the Taoist canon grew rapidly by voraciously cannibalizing the Buddhist canon; Michel Strickmann's "The *Consecration Sūtra*: A Buddhist Book of Spells" with its astute assessment of the failure of Sinology to perceive what Buddhism and other Chinese religions are all about, as well as his dozens of lengthy footnotes that amount to a whole series of miniature bibliographical essays; Stephen R. Bokenkamp's "Stages of Transcendence: The *Bhūmi* Concept in Taoist Scripture" which demonstrates unmistakably that the "ten cycles" of the *Lingbao* scriptures are based on the earliest Buddhist translations concerning the *daśabhumi* and are laced with pseudo-Sanskrit names and terms; Kōtatsu Fujita"s "The Textual Origins of the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching* : A Canonical Scripture of Pure Land Buddhism" is a densely packed discussion of the Indian, Central Asian, and Chinese elements that went into the "compilation" of this *Sūtra on the Contemplation of the Buddha of Immeasurable Life*, including some vital observations on the problem of translation in early Chinese Buddhism; Whalen Lai's "The *Chan-ch'a ching*: Religion and Magic in Medieval China," an examination of this strange divinatory book and its close relationship to *Treatise on the Awakening of Faith According to the Mahāyāna*,"easily the *summa buddhologica* of Far Eastern Buddhism"; Mark Edward Lewis's "The Suppression of the Three Stages Sect: Apocrypha as a Political Issue," which shows how important Buddhism can be for non-Buddhists, even for political scientists; Antonino Forte's "The Relativity of the Concept of Orthodoxy in Chinese Buddhism: Chih-sheng's Indictment of Shih-li and the Proscription of the *Dharma Mirror Sūtra*" which, in

the author's inimitably exacting style, documents a particular case of what the previous article called attention to; and Paul Groner's "The *Fan-wang Ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*" dealing with religious practice as determined by the precepts by which monks were ordained. Susan Singer has expertly prepared a sweet index that brings together all these excellent articles for ready, if not easy, access.

Kōun Yamada, tr, and comm. *Gateless Gate*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1979; second rev. ed., 1990. xxvii + 280 pages.

It is curious that in the same year as the republication of Yamada Kōun's *Gateless Gate*, the tenth(!) English translation of this enigmatic Zen text appeared. This is *The Gateless Barrier: The Wu-men Kuan (Mumonkan)* (San Francisco: North Point, 1990) by Robert Aiken, Rōshi of the Diamond Sangha in Honolulu, who acknowledges Yamada's deep understanding of the text. The sheer number of translations calls our attention to the centrality of this collection of 48 cases with commentary by Wumen (1183-1260), the Southern Sung compiler, for the Zen tradition.

In his preface, the son of the translator, Masamichi Yamada, makes the intriguing admission that "It is often the case that an English explanation is clearer and more direct than a Japanese one. Non-Japanese practitioners who read the present book will have the opportunity to meet a *Mumonkan teishō* ('explication') that may be more distinct and straightforward than a *teishō* in Japanese." This is certainly food for thought (all the more, one wonders about the accessibility of the *Wumenguan* itself to the noninitiate), which prompts me to raise the question of how Zen is being transformed by the diverse natures of the various languages through which it passes. If Zen is **clearer** in English than in Japanese, is it any longer Zen? Is it possible to be as "unclear" (ambiguous, vague) in English as it is in Chinese or Japanese? Specifically, what is it about English that makes it clearer and more direct than Chinese or Japanese? It is high time that someone (preferably a Chinese or a Japanese) wrote a treatise on this profoundly provocative topic. Since I shall not be the one to do so, I have to content myself for the moment with savoring the delicate Sino-Anglo-Sanskrit-Japanese nuances of Yamada Rōshi's exegesis.

It shoud be apparent that this is not a book for beginners. This is not the place to begin if one wishes "to dip into Zen." The Rōshi kindly and valiantly endeavors to write in a direct, conversational style. Unfortunately, a specialized vocabulary and manner of speech has so enveloped Zen -- even in English -- that it has become well-nigh impenetrable for outsiders. I am reminded of the incomprehension of laymen when they encounter scientific manuals or listen in on "hackerese."

The very first case, the famous case on Zhaozhou's Dog, is a typical example of the problems that are faced. Someone asked the master Zhaozhou ("in all earnestness" is not in the Chinese original) whether a dog has Buddha nature. Zhaozhou's reply, in Yamada's rendering, is "Mu!" For someone who does not know Japanese, the translation by itself is pure nonsense. Obviously, the Rōshi expected that the reader would be forced to read his accompanying *teishō* where he explains that *mu* is equal to *wu* in Chinese which means "nothing," "nonbeing" or "to have nothing." Therefore, he says, if we take Zhaozhou's answer literally, it means "No, [a dog does not have Buddha nature]". The Rōshi immediately declares, however, that this is not right. Why? Because Śākyamuni had affirmed that all living beings have Buddha nature. Yamada simply does not accept the possibility that Zhaozhou could deny Śākyamuni's assertion. But if Zhaozhou did not mean to say that a dog lacks Buddha nature, what then was his intention? Yamada engages in a lot of sophistry about Mu having no meaning and the necessity of concentrating upon it so as to break through into enlightenment, etc., etc. Perhaps Zhaozhou meant to negate the foolish question. And there are all sorts of other speculative scenarios about what he intended. The point is, can English be made to act in such a fashion that it conveys all of

the verbal-nominal ambiguities of Chinese *wu* and Japanese *mu*. If not, which is probably the actual situation, is Zen possible in English? Conversely, is anti-Zen possible in Chinese and Japanese? MU!

Similarly vexing issues arise with virtually every case in the collection. Take number four, which asks why the western babarian has no beard (the question is the case). We know very well that the western barbarian, like all good western barbarians, did have a big beard (usually thought of as flaming red and hence hard to miss). So why bother even to ask? It is the same with another celebrated case which asks whether there is a red-bearded barbarian or whether the barbarian's beard is red (*chixu hu* or *huxu chi*). The problem with the Western intellect is that it is actually forced by the constraints of the language in which it operates to take such questions seriously and consequently to attempt to solve them. From one point of view, that may be a good thing, but it is not very conducive to Zen.

And so forth.

This book is replete with prefaces, forwards, dedications, postscripts, and epilogues, both ancient and modern. Among the appendices are a succinct "Introduction to the History of Zen Practice" by the indefatigably prolific Thomas Cleary, various bibliographies and glossaries in Chinese, Japanese, and English, and a series of ten unpaginated lineage charts, which no true Zen treatise can be without. And that may be what Zen is really all about.

Kuang-ming Wu. *The Butterfly as Companion: Meditations on the First Three Chapters of the Chuang Tzu*. SUNY Series in Religion and Philosophy. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990. xiv + 512 pages.

Here is an author who addresses his audience as "dear reader," calls Chuang Tzu a "Taoist bum," and speaks as though "fluttering" is sufficient justification for a very long and tiresome book. Though it is big, heavy, and pompous, this is in essense a creation of pop culture. What do Mama Cass, Al Chung-liang Huang, Douglas R. Hofstadter, Yehudi Menuhin, and Karl Marx have in common? They, and a cast of hundreds, including Miss Kimberly DeMunn of the honors class on Chuang Tzu at Oshkosh, are the supporting cast in the author's interminable blather about China's most frequently misportrayed thinker.

Platitudes, platitudes, and more platitudes. This is a book of dull platitudes posing as philosophical disquisition. Whoever is taken in by it will never get close to the spirit of Chuang Tzu. I hesitate to offer even one example of the fluff that fills page after page of this book. At random, I let my finger fall upon the following: "Nothing is deadlier to Chuang Tzu than a Chuang Tzu scholasticism which embalms him in the temple of scholarship; he would rather be a turtle dragging its tail in the mud of real obscure living." The best that can be said for this pronouncement is that it tries hard to be cute. To think that we are being asked to suffer through thousands and thousands of such lines makes one seriously doubt the credentials of Robert Cummings Neville, the series editor, who has written a glowing forward for the author. Furthermore. whoever SUNY Press asked to read the manuscript did not do their job of responsible criticism by weeding out an embarrassing submission. The only reason why I am devoting so much time to this review right now is to do what little I can to prevent innocent, gullible students from being deceived when, for instance, the author claims that he offers them Chuang Tzu's words "undisturbed" and in their "literal," "poetic" form.

To finish this painful review as quickly as possible, the book consists of a Prologue made up of four "preliminary meditations," an enormously long chapter for each of the first three chapters of the *Chuang Tzu*, and an Epilogue made up of four (note the symmetry, it could have been three or five) "inconclusive meditations." If there is any focus to the book, I suppose we would have to say that it is the treatment of the three chapters of Chuang Tzu. Each chapter is provided with photoreproductions of the Chinese text which

will be of absolutely no value to those who are most likely to peek into this book. Then comes the "translation" with glosses. But these are not really translations because the author is incapable of translating Chinese into readable English. Such a riot of bold-faced type, hyphens, dashes, and asterisks totally obscures the meaning of the text. "Qiwu lun" is mangled as "Things, Theories -- Sorting Themselves Out" and the heart of the entire book reads thus:

> In **what** were **earlier*** times,
> **Chuang Chou* dreamed, making a butterfly.**
> **So flitted, flitted,** he **was** a **butterfly.**
> Indeed, he **showed*** what he himself was, **going** as he
> pleasantly **intended!**
> He did **not understand Chou.**
> **So suddenly,** he **awoke.**
> **Then -- so thoroughly, thoroughly,** it **was Chou.**
>
> (But then he did) **not understand --**
> did the **dream of Chou make** the **butterfly?**
> Did the **dream of** the **butterfly make Chou?**
>
> **Chou with the butterfly --**
> **there must-be, then,** a **division.***
> **This it** is which men **call 'things changing'."***

Although this is much better than most of what Wu has to offer (it should be since this is the *pièce de résistance* of his entire oeuvre), it is difficult to comprehend how anyone could stomach more than a few lines of this fractured English (never mind what he does to Japanese ["Murobashi" for Morshashi, "*Lesshi*" for *Resshi*, etc.] since few will notice after all the mind-numbing turgidity of the English). And it is not just the garbled English that is worrisome, for there is plentiful evidence that Wu does not understand the Chinese original very well either. Zhuang Zhou did not "make" a butterfly; he *was* (*wei*) a butterfly. Zhou was not "with" the butterfly because *yu* means "and." And so on. It is evident from these and countless other gross gaucheries that Wu reads Literary Chinese at about the level of a high school student in Taiwan. After so many years of meditating on the butterfly as companion, it is hard to believe that Wu still does not understand the Chinese text upon which his ruminations are based.

Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, tr. and ed. *Chinesische Manichaica: Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar.* Studies in Oriental Religions, 14. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987. 184 + 18 pages.

This is a handy, scholarly translation of the three main Chinese Manichaean texts into German. Elsewhere (*SPP*, 14, B47-48 and *T'oung Pao*, 73, 313-324), I extensively reviewed recent scholarship in English and in Chinese on Manichaeism. Schmidt-Glintzer's work compares favorably, although he is not a specialist on Manichaeism, but rather primarly a Buddhist historiographer. However, considering the fact that Chinese Manichaeism was heavily indebted to Buddhism and was often, to be sure, confused with it, there is no compelling reason why Schmidt-Glintzer should have avoided the texts he translates here. They are the *Monijiao xiabu zan* [*The Last Part of the Manichaean Hymns*], *Moni guangfo jiaofa yilue* [*Compendium on the Doctrines and Laws of Mani, the Buddha of Light*], and the so-called Pelliot Tractate. All three texts have been published in the *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, and Schmidt-Glintzer reproduces them at the back of this book.

After a brief introduction describing the texts and the previous scholarship on them, Schmidt-Glintzer plunges directly into the translations. He accounts himself as well as might be expected with these very obscure texts. Perhaps the only way he could have improved his results would have been to consult with a Middle Iranian specialist. By doing so, he might have been able to identify more of the transcribed terms.

Schmidt-Glintzer's greatest contribution is in his lengthy (pp. 107-178) glossary. Because of the limited corpus of Chinese Manichaen texts and the difficulty of its vocabulary, the collocation of each occurrence of all special terms is essential if progress is to be made in understanding these texts. This Schmidt-Glintzer has done. We now have an alphabetically ordered, annotated glossary with line references and tentative translations for all technical vocabulary in the three main texts of Chinese Manichaeism.

A brief bibliography, badly in need of expansion and updating, is given on pp. 179-180. Pages 181-184 are text critical remarks, mostly emendations. For someone who wishes to go beyond Schmidt-Glintzer, I suggest a more explicit comparison with Buddhist technical vocabulary, from which Manichaeism has borrowed so much.

Words

Martin Manser. *The Guinness Book of Words*. Middlesex: Guinness, 1988. 158 pages.

Being an ardent verbophile, I could hardly resist a book with the title this one has. Naturally, I bought it and took it home to devour. Upon opening it up and reading the first entry, however, I felt cheated. I also began to have doubts about the reliability of *The Guinness Book of Records*, if this book is any indication of the creditworthiness of Guinness publications.

> **The earliest written language** discovered has been on Yanshao culture pottery near Sian in the Shensi province found in 1962. This bears proto-characters for the numbers 5, 7, and 8 and has been dated to 5000-4000 BC.
>
> The **wrtten language** with the **longest continuous** history is Chinese, extending over more than 6000 years from the Yangshao culture (see above) to the present day.

Shame on *The Guinness Book of Words* for purveying such poppycock! No one has any idea what the isolated Banpo pottery marks mean. Furthermore, there are much earlier Paeolithic and Neolithic signs and symbols recovered by the thousands from European sites, many of them identical to the couple dozen Yangshao pottery marks. The oldest known decipherable written **language** is Sumerian and that is followed by Egyptian. There may be earlier examples of writing from Europe, but they cannot be positively demonstrated to represente language because they have not yet been deciphered. The Yangshao pottery marks are undecipherable because they occur only singly and hence can not remotely be said to represent language.

In the section on "The World's Main Languages" (pp 12-13), the author lists Guoyu (that should either be Kuo-yü or Putonghua since Manser assiduously avoids the customary designation in English which is Mandarin). It is difficult to fathom precisely what he means when he says that this language (it is actually a branch consisting of many languages that are mutually only partially intelligible) was "converted to the Pinyin system of phonetic pronunciation in 1958." Manser lists Cantonese as the seventeenth largest

language in the world in terms of the number of individuals who speak it, Wu as the twenty-second, and Min (Fukien) as tied for twenty-second place, but strangely turns around and calls them dialects. By contrast, Bengali, Punabi, and Marathi are all called languages, but their kinship is actually closer than that which exists among Cantonese, Wu, and Min (Fukien). Is Manser using some sort of double standard here, or does he not have any standards at all? Hindustani, number five on the list, is said to be "a combination of Hindi and Urdu." If so, then why does the author list Urdu as the thirteenth largest language in the world?? The only note for number sixteen, Korean, aside from its population which is given as 55,000,000, is that it is "Not known to be related to any other tongue." Who says so? Not Samuel Martin, Fred Lukoff, Roy Andrew Miller, S. Robert Ramsey, and dozens of other reputable linguists. Javanese, number twenty-one on the list, is said to be spoken by 45,000,000 people and to serve as the language of 50 per cent of the Indonesian population. Wait a minute! In 1987, Indonesia's population was 172,245,000. So Manser's figures simply do not jibe.

If, like me, you were suckered into buying *The Guinness Book of Words* by the parent company's formidable reputation, unless you are litigious you might as well throw the book away, as I have just done, and I did not even make it past page 13. It is all hollow.

Horace G. Danner and Roger Noël *An Introduction to an Academic Vocabulary; Word Clusters from Latin, Greek, and German: A Vade Mecum for the Serious Student.* Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America. xxi + 311 pages.

The subtitle of this book is a misnomer. The authors have actually concentrated on congnates from the Romance languages -- French, Romanian, Italian, Portugese, and Spanish. They have, however, provided generous references to Latin, Greek, and German as well as to Indo-European roots.

Unlike most other books for improving one's vocabulary, this one has adopted a decidedly inductive approach. The student is encouraged to discover the operative roots for himself. Having worked through the book myself, I was surprised to find that the authors have actually succeeded in making what is often drudgery (learning words) into fun. Here I found out, for example, that "flak" is an acronym for German *fliegerabwehrkanone* ("antiaircraft gun"), that Mayday is the English rendering of French *m'aider* ("help me!"), that Satin is a variant of Zaitun, a medieval name associated with Quanzhou whence the product was thought to have come, perhaps by corruption of the name of the river which flows through its center, and much else of interest.

The arrangement of the book is as follows. There are ten sections of word cluster tests consisting of ten groups of three to five related words. The student is supposed to test herself before and after studying the section to see whether she can pick out the common meaning (usually a root) underlying the group. Then comes a sectional "wordbuilder" test which is similar but asks the student to define a specified morpheme in groups of two or three words. Each of the word clusters is then taken up in detail. First comes a list of (generally around twenty to thirty) words that contain a common element which the student usually can determine without difficulty. Below that are Romance cognates, words and phrases with disguised Latin roots, placenames, related Germanic words, and Greek cognates or equivalents. For enrichment, chapters are also accompanied by examples of how to use the wordbuilders, and curious information about words that are not necessarily related to the clusters or to the wordbuilders. The student then turns the page where the common element of the cluster is identified and defined. Beneath that is what the authors call their CLAVIS which is a discussion of the root or roots covered in the cluster.

There are also many other goodies in the book, including a pronunciation key for difficult words, a bibliography of standard sources, and indices of special sections (e.g.,

terms from academia, American Indian languages, Arabic, doublets, Chinese, Persian, mathematics and engineering, philosophy, psychology and dozens of other fields).

Designed as a text cum workbook for high school and college students, this book will be usefully entertaining to anyone who loves words. The authors deserve praise for sharing their infectious enthusiasm for language with their readers, whom I hope will be many. Whoever reads this book will be enriched.

Will C. Barnes. *Arizona Place Names*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1985. 503 pages.

Only a sharp, 5'4" first class private in the U. S. Army like Will Barnes (1858-1937), who later assisted Gifford Pinchot in founding the United States Forest Service and who rode around Arizona on horesback from 1905 to 1935, could have created this marvelous work. A minor classic first published in 1935, *Arizona Place Names* is fulll of gems such as these:

> Pima gets its name from the Indians who were so dubbed by the Spanish for responding *pima-tc* ("I don't know") and *pia-tc* ("no") to questions that were asked them.
>
> A mine in Maricope County is called Perhaps because of the uncertainty of finding gold there.
>
> Apache means "enemy" and is also what the Zuni called the Navaho. They called themselves *N'de* or *Inde* which naturally means " The People" (cf. Navaho *Dine*), which means the same thing.
>
> Tonto is Spanish for "fool, stupid" (Hi-yo, Silver away!)
>
> Geronimo (from the Spanish name Jerome given to him by the Mexicans) was called in Apache *Goy-ath-lay* ("He Who Yawns").
>
> Lokasakal Spring is from a Navaho word meaning "place where reeds grow" [*lok'aa'*, "reed, rush, cat-tail"].

There are similarly captivating stories about Tempe, Tucson, Phoenix, Arizona, and hundreds of other place names, including many tales of Indian wars. This is a veritable history of the state of Arizona told through an examination of the origins of its place names. Would that I had a book like this for every state in the Union and for every province of the world!

The New World

Robert W. Young and William Morgan, Sr. *The Navajo Language: A Grammar and Colloquial Dictionary*. Revised Edition. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987 (first ed. 1980).
xv + 437 + 1,069 pages.

This dictionary represents the results of an enormous NEH-funded project involving over two dozen consultants and staff members. Furthermore, it is built upon a

distinguished scholarly foundation that was laid by giants such as Edward Sapir, Harry Hoijer, and Clyde Kuckhohn. The introduction provides a historical sketch of the growth of Navaho language studies and how earlier work has been incorporated into and modified in the present book.

The grammar is a complete presentation of all aspects of the language and includes full verbal paradigms. The treatment of stems relating to the movement of different kinds of objects, through incredibly complex, is exhaustive.

One of the most fascinating parts of the grammar, at least for me, is the root index for Navajo and comparative Athapaskan prepared by Jeffrey Leer of the University of Alaska. Some of the source material utilized by Leer was collected by LI Fang-kuei in the early thirties. The fact that Navajo is related to languages spread across California, British Columbia, and Alaska is highly suggestive of the ultimate origins of all these languages in Northeast Asia.

A large English-Navajo dictionary at the back which is keyed to the Navajo-English grammar with its sample phrases and sentences, all translated, makes this a complete learning tool for anyone who wishes to become familiar with or fluent in the language.

The entire grammar and dictionary were typed out laboriously by members of the staff. This must have been an exceedingly painstaking job because of the elaborate diacriticals that are employed. The volume is beautifully bound and printed on fine paper, although the small point size makes it a bit of a strain on the eyes. Otherwise, this is a monument of which the American taxpayers can be proud.

Nigel Davies. *Voyagers to the New World.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986; originally published in Great Britian in 1979 by MacMillan London Ltd. xiv + 287 pages.

Were there pre-Columbian contacts with the New World? (Of course there were, since it has now been proven conclusively that the inhabitants of the New World, the so-called "American Indians," came to this hemisphere from Asia. Only the date is in doubt, but most authorities agree that it was between roughly 30,000 and 15,000 BCE.) Did New World civilization develop entirely independently? How did cotton and the calendar get planted in the western hemisphere?

Nigel Davies does not shy away from tackling these awesome questions head-on. Armed with a heavy dose of skepticism and no less satire, Davies subjects the more radical and simplisitc diffusionist theories to a withering assault. Unlike the majority of antidiffusionists or isolationists (who happen to account for nearly all linguists, archeologists and anthropologists dealing with the New World), hoewever, he does not irrationally dismiss out of hand all possibility of the influence of Old World civilization upon that of the New World.

Citing up-to-date scholarship, as of the seventies, Davies closely examines the evidence against pre-Columbian contact. Seldom does he present the case in favor of it, and often he simply caricatures the whole idea by picking a weak proponent and ridiculing him mercilessly. Still, at the end of the book and after citing such formidable opponents as Robert Heine-Gelden, Davies is honest enough to admit that there are instances of striking resemblance between elements of New World and Old World civilization that independant origin or convergence is incapable of explaining.

Readers may be surprised to learn that China figures so prominently in this book. It is, in fact, mentioned more frequently than any other country outside of the New World. (After China comes Egypt, and Japan is not far behind.) And, for those Sinologists who have not been following this extremely important debate, it may come as something of a shock to find that Joseph Needham and Lu Gwei-djen, the doyen(ne)s of the history of Chinese technology, have written a book entitled *Trans-Pacific Echoes and Resonances: Listening Once Again* (Singapore and Philadelphia: World Scientific, 1985) which comes

down securely in favor of a formative Chinese influence in the New World long before Columbus ever appeared on the scene. (And it wasn't just the Chinese who were visiting the shores of North and South Vin[e]land / Ericsonland long before the slightly disoriented Genoese came poking around a mere half a millennium ago!) Honest archeologists, historians, and anthropologists must now rethink the entire structure and meaning of New World civilizations.

"Barbarian" Business

Arthur Waldron. *The Great Wall of China: From History to Myth.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. xv + 296 pages.

Virtually every popular conception about "The Great Wall" (that it is a single wall stretching from the ocean to Central Asia, that is was built by the First Emperor of the Ch'in dynasty with massive armies of forced labor, that it can be seen from the moon, that it was designed solely to keep out "the barbarians," that it looks throughout its length and has looked throughout history like the recently rebuilt Ming and Qing dynasty sections north of Peking, that it was frequently represented in Chinese art, that the legend of Meng Jiangnü's tears toppling the section of the wall where her husband's bones were buried somehow reflects history, and so forth *ad infinitum*) is false. Either these wild notions are the products of the Westerner's unfettered imagination or they are the simplistic effusions of modern patriotic fervor fueled largely by the Westerners' exoticism.

This is historical revisionism at its best. Waldron's dissection of the mythology of "The Great Wall" is razor-sharp, well documented, and insightful. Relying on archeology, philology, literary criticism, the first-hand accounts of travellers, and many other types of sources, Waldron frontally and thoroughly debunks all of this palaver. But that is just a small part of what he does in this stellar book. His intention is not merely to demolish the old wall that exists only in our minds, but to reconstruct the real systems of defensive works that existed at various periods of history. Beyond that, he describes the complicated manner in which the walls functioned in the delicate interplay between steppe nomads and sedentary agriculturalists.

There have been many books written about the "great Wall," some on quite a lavish scale, especially in recent years. Naturally, none of them question the wall's seemingly palpable existence but strive mightily to perpetuate the exaggerated claims that have been made about it. If you still believe that there is a **Great** Wall, you need to read this book -- now! Your mental health depends upon it.

Daniel Kane. *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters.* Uralic and Altaic Series, 153. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 1989. xi + 461 pages.

Originally presented as a Ph.D. dissertation to the Australian National University, the work under review has been brought up to date by the incorporation of studies published during the past decade. The Introduction has also necessarily been rewritten and new items added to the Bibliography.

The Introduction is quite extensive and amounts to a small monograph by itself. Its eight chapters outline the historical background of the Jurchen language and its script, the relationship of the Jurchen script with the Khitan large and small scripts as well as with the Chinese script, Jurchen glosses preserved in Chinese historical sources, important

inscriptions in which the Jurchen script is preserved, other miscellaneous materials that preserve written Jurchen, the sketchy history of the text that forms the basis of this study, and a description of the language of the text being studied.

The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Burean of Interpreters, called *Nüzhen Yiyu* in Chinese, forms the bulk of the book. Like many other Sino-Xenic vocabularies of this sort, it is arranged according to the categories of Chinese encyclopedias (e.g., astronomy, geography, time and seasons, flora, fauna, etc.). There are altogether 1,154 entries, from **agua* ("sky, heaven") to **aš[h]a* ("small"). Each entry is provided with the text in sinographs according to the Awanokuni manuscript (a facsimile of which is given at the back of the book), romanized transcription and translation of the Chinese gloss into English, romanized transcription of the sinographic transcription of the Jurchen, reconstruction of the Jurchen term, the cognate word in the vocabulary of the Bureau of Translators according to Wilhelm Grube and to Gisaburō N. Kiyose, the cognate word in standard written Manchu according to Erich Hauer and Jerry Norman, the cognate word in modern spoken Manchu (Sibe) according to Yamamoto Kengo, and other notes and cross-references when appropriate. It is remarkable how closely the Jurchen and Sibe (the only surviving Manchu dialect, spoken by a garrison stranded since the middle of the eighteenth century in northern Sinkiang) languages resemble each other, considering that they are separated by nearly a thousand years.

Following the text is an index of the English equivalents of the entries, a list of Chinese and Japanese terms, and a glossary. The Introduction includes numerous tables and charts. The greatest disappointment in reading this book is to find that there is no Jurchen script version of the text in question. Still, this is a valuable study and should be of particular interest to Altaicists, especially Tunguisic specialists.

Nicholas Sims-Williams and James Hamilton. *Documents turco-sogdiens du IX^{e}-X^{e} siècle de Touen-houang.* Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Part II, Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. III, Sogdian. London: School of Oriental and African Studies on behalf of Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, 1990. 94 pages + 47 plates.

This volume of a distinguished series studies eight Dunhuang manuscripts, five preserved in Paris and three in London. Sims-Williams and Hamilton are a formidable team for handling these unusual documents dating to the ninth and tenth centuries. Of the eight documents, two are accounts, two are short religious notations, three are letters, and one is a crude graffito which I shall discuss in a bit more detail shortly.

The texts are basically written in Sogdian with some Turkish terms and titles, once in a while whole sentences, thrown in from time to time. There are also occasionally Chinese words and even occasionally Syriac Christian names. What this shows unmistakably is that Dunhuang was truly a polyglot community. This has important implications for the history of the region and for China, as well, since so much of Central, South, and West Asian culture flowed into the Middle Kingdom through the funnel of which Dunhuang stood at the head.

One of the most unsettling aspects of dealing with this kind of text is the uncertainty of our reconstructions of Middle Sinitic. There are no few Chinese names, titles, and other words included in these documents, but because we are not yet confident of the sounds of Standard Middle Sinitic, matching up the Chinese terms that are recorded phonetically in these documents with the correct sinographs is highly problematic. The authors regularly cite Bernhard Kalgren's reconstructions of Ancient Chinese and Edwin Pulleyblank's reconstructions of Early and Late Middle Chinese, but these often do not fit very well with what the Sogdian phonetic transcriptions are telling us. This is probably because the

reconstructions of Karlgren and Pulleyblank are based on the normative, idealized language of the Tang capitals (Loyang and Chang'an).

I believe that the authors would have fared much better had they utilized reconstructions based on Tang and Five Dynasties Dunhuang dialectical pronunciations. Fortunately, we are better prepared to reconstruct this particular dialect of Sinitic than we are for the language of any other area of China at a comparable period. The reason this is so is that, among the Dunhuang manuscripts, there is copious data available on local rhyming patterns. The Chinese linguist, Lo Changpei, had worked on these materials in the thirties and the authors duly cite him, although his findings are not presented in an easily usable form. Still more significantly, however, there also exist among the Dunhuang manuscripts documents which transcribe local Sinitic in Tibetan, Khotan Brāhmī, and Sogdian scripts. These materials have been published and made available in a readily accessible form by the young Japanese scholar Takata Tokio, *Tonkō shiryō ni yoru Chūgokugo shi no kenkyū: kyū, jyū seiki no Kasei hōgen (A Historical Study of the Chinese Language Based on Dunhuang Materials: The Hexi Dialect of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries),* Tōyōgaku sōsho (Oriental Studies Library), 33 (Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1988). South Coblin has recently begun to look very closely at some of the same body of materials in an effort to reconstruct more precisely the sounds of Sinitic as it was represented at Dunhuang during the Tang and Five dynasties periods.

The final document the authors study is both gross and graphic. Writen in poor Sogdian but dependent for its thrust upon a Turkic name which is interpreted in the manner of a pornographic Chinese pun, the scribbled lines are accompanied by an obscene drawing. Although by no means of any literary value whatsoever, this brief text is living proof of the intimate relationship among the various languages spoken at Duhuang even (perhaps I should say especially) among the less well educated.

After the texts is an annotated glossary of all words appearing in the texts and an index of all words cited in the texts and in the commentaries. The book concludes with photofacsimilies of the texts studied and of other relevent texts, many of them highly fragmentary. It is good to have these photographs because it is easy to see from them that several of the texts are written on the manuscripts interlinearly or next to previous Chinese texts.

Sims-Williams and Hamilton are meticulous scholars who are well-versed in their respective fields. Their combined expertise inspires confidence in the reader that, given the present state of our knowledge, this is the best that can be done with these refractory texts. This book is also a pleasure to read because of the exceptionally fine typsetting and printing of a difficult job by Stephen Austin and Sons.

Reinhard F. Hahn, in collaboration with Ablahat Ibrahim. *Spoken Uyghur.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991. xxii + 632 pages.

This is an excellent textbook for the study of Modern Uyghur, whether in the classroom or for individual purposes. In fact, it is the only such work written in any language other than Russian, Mandarin, or Uyghur itself. Nonetheless, one must declare this to be a model textbook for the introductory study of languages that are less commonly taught.

The preface and introduction provide a succinct rationale for the book and basic information about the background and importance of Uyghur, its dialects, and so forth. They are followed by a very useful list of special signs and symbols indicating various phonetic and grammatical properties as well as a list of abbreviations.

Then follows Part I which is entitled"Principles of Morphophonology and Orthography." This is a thorough and systematic description of the phonological system of Uyghur. Because of harmony, assimilation, devoicing, and other processes that play so prominent a role in all Turkic languages, it is vital that close attention be paid to this aspect

of Uyghur at the outset. Since Uyghur is an agglutinative language, however, its morphological structure is relatively simple and hence does not require such extensive treatment as is necessary for the phonological system. The orthography of Uyghur is rather complicated, but Hahn does a good job of presenting it for those who have had no prior exposure to the scripts involved. Old Uyghur was originally written in an Aramaic-based script that spawned the traditional Mongolian, Oyrad, and Manchu scripts. It later gave way under Islamic influence to several adaptations of the Arabic script, none of which is very suitable for Uyghur. During the sixties and seventies, a romanized orthography based on the usage of Hanyu Pinyin was the only official script for Uyghur in China. In the Soviet Union, a Cyrillic-script-based alphabet is employed for writing Uyghur. Finally, there is the system of romanized transliteration, used by the author himself, that is quite similar to that employed by most Turcologists in the West.

The heart of the book, of course, is Part II which consists of fifteen dialogue units. Each of these includes the text in Arabic script and in transliteration, new elements (lexical items and agglutinative morphemes set forth with scientific precision), translation, supplementary vocabulary, and superb notes. The subjects of the dialogues have been aptly chosen for maximum exposure to Uyghur society and culture. Anyone who conscientiously reads through all fifteen dialogues together with their supplementary materials will be equipped to make his own way in Sinkiang or the Uyghur-speaking areas of the Soviet Union.

Part III is made up of several alphabetized reference sections. The first of these is an "Element Index (Uyghur-English)" that is an accumulation of all illustrative samples, new elements, and supplementary vocabulary in the book, plus useful linguistic terms, roots from which previously existing items are derived, stems that are intermediate derivations between roots and previously occurring items, and relevant archaic morphemes occasionally encountered in writing. The element index amounts to a fairly substantial dictionary that is conveniently keyed to the dialogues and their explanatory material. It is followed by an English-Uyghur glossary that is a simplified reverse version of the element index. The last major section of Part III is a reference guide to inflexion of both nouns and verbs. The coverage for aspectual verbs is particularly helpful.

The book concludes with a selected bibliography of works in Russian, Uyghur, Mandarin, German, and English, and a subject index.

This is a first-class work of linguistic scholarship and pedagogical acumen. Beyond that, it should be mentioned that the author has done a splendid job of preparing the typographically complicated camera-ready copy by himself. The volume is beautifully designed and handsomely executed. The University of Washington Press, Reinhard Hahn, and his advisers are to be warmly congratulated on a signal contribution to the study of one of the most significant languages of China.

South Asia

Bh. Krishnamurti, ed. *South Asian Langauges: Structure, Convergence and Diglossia.* MLBD Series in Linguistics, 3. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986. xxii + 390 pages.

This volume consists of thirty selected papers that were originally presented before the Second International Conference on South Asian Languages and Linguistics held in Hyderabad, January 9-11, 1980. The papers fall about equally (11, 11, and 8) into three parts characterized as in the subtitle. The authors are all recognized authorities. Their papers are mostly fairly short (average ten pages), tightly argued, and abreast of the best recent sholarship in the field.

The papers in the part on structure tend to be rather technical and are paralleled by similar recent work in Chinese linguistics. The papers in the convergence section are more theoretical but nonetheless cite sizable quantities of data (often comparative). Comparable papers in Chinese linguistics are rare. The papers in the diglossia part are sociolinguistic in their orientation. Similar papers are almost unknown for Chinese languages.

Chinese linguists looking for fresh ground to till would do well to peruse the present volume for inspiration. If they did, they might begin to ask such questions as: What is the relationship between Cantonese and Southern Min? What is the relationship between Cantonese and the languages of the indigenous non-Han peoples of the area, on the one hand, and between Southern Min and the original autochthonous languages of people living in what is now Fukien? How are we to analyze the interaction between literary and colloquial in the various Sinitic topolects, between formal and spoken, between standard and local, etc.? Judged by the methodology employed in the book, there are all sorts of convergence and diglossia operative in China. It would be worthwhile to begin to look at some of them.

Jyotindra Jain and Aarti Aggarwala. *National Handicrafts and Handloom Museum.* Museums of India, New Delhi. Photographs by Pankaj Shah. Ahmedabad: Mapin, 1989. 221 pages.

Like China, India is a multiethnic, multilinguistic, multireligious land of huge population and great contrasts that have played themselves out through three thousand and more years of history. The present volume is something of a tour de force in that it strives to encompass virtually the whole of the Indian folk art tradition through examination of and reflection upon some 200 items taken from among the more than 20, 000 in the collections of the National Handicrafts and Handlooms Museum (Crafts Museum), New Delhi.

The types of objects discussed include metalwork; jewelry; wood, stone, and iron carving; printed wood, paper mâché and lac-turnery; folk painting; textiles; basketry and matting; terracotta and glazed pottery; and dolls, toys, puppets, and masks. Jyotindra Jain (who was assisted by Aarti Aggarwala) masterfully writes an explanatory essay for each of the nine sections of the book in which he describes the history, technology, meaning, and distribution of the types of objects covered therein.

A glance at the map on page 7 shows graphically that the 208 places mentioned in the text cover the height and the breadth of India. The variety of objects coming from these widely scattered places is enormous. They range from wood carvings done in Nagaland or Arunachal Pradesh but looking for all the world as if they might have come from Africa; to itinerant storytellers' scrolls from West Bengal that have clear affinities with South, Southeast, Central, and East Asian analogs (see my *Painting and Performance*); to hukkas (or hookah, hooka -- from Arabic, also called narghile -- from Persian) or hubble-bubble water pipes that are apparently of Near Eastern origin but found their way to the most remote tribes of many parts of Asia including Shensi; to split cane and bamboo basketry from Assam that is strikingly remniscent of similar objects from southwest China; to *kathputli* puppets from Rajasthan that are hauntingly evocative of the *budaixi* puppets of Taiwan. All of these objects are expertly described by Jain and Aggarwala, *sans*, of course, the reflections on their associations with traditions outside of India. From the very first page of the book, however, I could not avoid seeing all sorts of interconnections with other cultures, including China's regional traditions. The opening photograph shows a round, plastered, mud brick Banni hut Kachchh with thatched conical roof constructed as part of the six acre village complex erected on the grounds of the museum. Looking at it, I felt as though I had been transported back to the reconstructed neolithic village at Banpo outside of Sian. Not to mention the Pennsylvania Dutch hex signs painted on either side of the door, or the little Shinto-like shrine standing just to the left of the house. Or.... But I am an incurable believer in the unity of humanity that has deep roots in our common origins

and continuing communication, so I tend to see interconnections when often there probably are none (at least that can be satisfactorily demonstrated to isolationist skeptics).

To bring us back to reality and the volume under review, the authors conclude with an excellent glossary and a generous bibliography. My one complaint about the book is the lack of all diacriticals for transcriptions of words from Indian languages. At least there should be an explanation of why they were omitted, especially in light of the fact that diacriticals were dutifully included for European languages. The quality of the typesetting, however, which was done in Bombay, is overall of high quality.

V.S. Pramar. *Haveli: Wooden Houses and Mansions of Gujarat*. Photographs by Arand Patel and V.S. Pramar. Ahmedabad: Mapin, 1989. 239 pages.

Haveli (a term of Persian derivation) are aristocratic residential buildings made of ornately carved wood that are found in Gujarat and Rajasthan. The present volume focuses only on those in Gujarat, but what a feast for the eyes! Most of the buildings described in this book date to about 150 years ago, but there are records and remnants of similar architecture dating back to around 1600 CE. The foundations of the basic building techniques involved, however, go back much earlier. What the author has to say on this subject is so important that I quote him here in extenso:

> It is a striking fact that in both Punjab and Himachal, there are large groups of Gurjars who are thought to have migrated there in the past. And it cannot, therefore, be entirely coincidental that timber-bonding appears precisely in those areas where Gurjars are known to have settled and which formed part of their migratory routes. It is not possible to say how far in time this regional use of timber-bonding extends, but it reappears in the Indus Valley about 2000 B.C., albeit on a very limited scale. While it is tempting to speculate that the former evolved from the latter, the time lag is too great for this.
>
> There is ample evidence however that this technique was employed in the intervening period outside India. A revealing description of the ancient Greek house in the pre-Christian era: "Timber was now used in the composition of the walls as well as of roofs. In the countries south and west of the Black Sea, a single method of building became practically universal. Walls rested on a substructure of undressed stone, strengthened with timber, above which came a timber framework, with vertical posts tied in to the roof and panels between filled with crude or kiln-baked brick. Above all, this device afforded the structureal elasticity so necessary in a region continually subject to earthquakes. It was one which only deforestation could render impractical, and despite the latter has survived to the present day... from Crete and Greece to the inland cities of Anatolia and Syria, it dictated the main principles of design...." [quoting Seton Lloyd in Trewin Copplestone, ed., *World Architecture* (1963), p. 36]
>
> This quotation provides extremely significant evidence. To begin with, the construction technique -- a mixture of wood and brick -- was by then a 'universal' style of building, and was certainly known to all those who traded with those regions. Secondly, the style once established, persists up to the present day despite a shortage of timber. Here we find striking parallels in Gujarat, which maintained a similar style despite the laborious process of sea-imports. Thirdly, it explains the very *raison d'etre* for the technique -- to resist earthquake forces.

Going further back in time, to 1000 B.C., Henri Frankfort writes about Syrian architecture: "It (the palace of Niqmeps) used wood, moreover, in a most lavish fashion.... The building stands on stone foundations.... Next follows a construction of wood and bricks: beams, sometimes as much as a foot in diameter, are laid flush with the inner and outer faces of the falls, and support short timbers lying across the wall at intervals of two to four feet. These are followed by more beams supporting timbers." [*The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*, Pelican History of Art (1970), p. 253]

It is evident from the description that the Gujarati method of construction is identical. Such an indentiy of techniques stretching over great distances in time and space is remarkable and indicates close contact and persistence of a tradition. Moreover, the region of Syria referred to was then ruled by a tribe known as the Matanni who have been clearly identified as Aryans [Frankfort, p. 248], so that the assumption of contact is quite valid.

For an even earlier period there is a description of Anatolian architecture of about 2200 B.C. by Seton Lloyd: "Early Bronze Age architecture and building construction varies very little from district to district. Stone foundations are used and an upper structure, either of stone or of mud-brick inserted as panels of filling in a framework of timber posts and beams. The upright posts which occur at intervals of two to three feet in the walls are attached to the ends of roof-beams above, giving a form of stability which is intentionally kept slightly elastic as a precaution against earthquakes." [in Stuart Piggott, ed., *The Dawn of Civilization* (1961), p. 186]

Lloyd then describes Troy of 2300 B.C., "Even the protective outer walls with their powerfully buttressed sub-structures, were plentifully reinforced with wooden beams, while the houses themselves probably had upper storeys lightly built of plaster in a framework of timber. Closely clustering together over narrow alleyways, they must have resembled the 'half-timber' slums of Jacobean London...." [*Ibid.*, p. 187] The last observation could well apply to any medieval town of North Gujarat.

The key word in all these descriptions is timber *reinforcement* added to either stone or brick, and the reason cited is precaution against earthquakes. It seems likely then that this particular technique of wooden construction originated in West Asia in very ancient times and became a widely used method in areas which traditionally traded with ancient India. Whether this technique was introduced into Gujarat by migrants, or whether it was simply borrowed to meet the instability of a brick wall in mud mortar, it is certain that Gujarat imported the technique from West Asia. Given the fact of significant migrations into Gujarat, it is likely that this technique was adhered to simply because it had become a strong tradition.

A significant piece of evidence which supports this view and which reveals a great deal about contacts across the Arabian Sea, is provided by K.A.C. Creswell, the great scholar of ancient Islamic architecture. Creswell discovered that at the time of Muhammad the Ka'ba had walls of alternative layers of stone and timber. Intrigued by this curious method of construction he traced its origin to 1th century [BCE] Abyssinia.

> "The walls," he writes, "with their door- and window-frames, are contructed in a most characteristic fashion; the walls are built of small rough stones... set in an earthy mortar. At intervals horizontal timbers are let into the walls, one on the outer and one on the inner face of the wall at each level. These are crossed by numerous short, round logs which pass through the wall.... They are slotted below so as to fit down over the longitudinal beams which they clamp securely together, so strengthening the whole fabric of the wall." [*Early Muslim Architecture* (1969), p. 3]
>
> A glance at the figure referred to by Creswell and a comparison with Gujarati woodwork will indicate the extrordinary similarity between the two. The way in which bonding timbers and door-frames are constructed [is] identical in 11th century Abyssinia and medieval Gujarat. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the carpenters who made them were following a common tradition. While the idea of bonding timber could simply have been borrowed, the identical carpentry details can be explained in no other way than by assuming that the carpenters of one region worked in another. It is noteworthy that all the areas with this kind of construction border the Arabian Sea and it now becomes obvious that the route by which it travelled -- as did timber -- was the sea. Thus, both the material and its technique were seaborne, over the Arabian Sea in various directions. It also indicates why the Muslims in North India did not resort to timber bonding in a major way. In regions scarce in timber -- including the northern plains -- only sea-carriage made the technique feasible on a major scale. With no other alternative, they resorted to the technique they had acquired from the Romans -- using brick in lime mortar.
>
> At this point the technical digression is necessary to explain why timber bonding resists earthquakes. When an earthquake strikes a brick building, the accompanying tensile forces have a tendency to rend the brickwork vertically asunder because brickwork, unlike timber, has little resistance to tension. By griding he brickwork with a wooden framework resembling a cage, timber, which functions in this case like steel in reinforced concrete, could resist the tension and prevent the walls from rending. The use of timber was thus not dictated by taste or tradition but was a structural necessity in a region prone to earthquakes. The epicentre of this region is formed by Anatolia, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Though Gujarat is not earthquake prone, the effect of loading a weakly bonded wall with beams is the same -- brickwork tends to develop cracks exactly where the beams rest, eventually leading to the collapse of the wall. Wooden bonding or framing permitted the wall to be left weak without endangering the structure. (Pramar, pp. 45-48)

I consider this to be brilliant scholarship of the highest significance. The level of scholarship on Chinese architecture is still far below this. It is very much bound to texts and woodblock prints, devoting very little attention to observation and analysis of actual structures and techniques. Chinese architectural studies, furthermore, like Sinology in general, are almost totally innocent of and uninterested in anything that transpired outside the borders of the Middle Kingdom. This is a grave fallacy, of course, because the key to a full understanding of Chinese history and civilization is having a grasp on their interrelationships with surrounding peoples. To pretend as though China has operated in an essential vacuum from the time of the Duke of Zhou or even earlier is dangerous and sufficient to ensure that there will be fatal flaws in one's research.

Aside from this expert historical background, there are also chapters dealing with the settlement pattern, sociology, and planning of houses in Saurashtra, North Gujarat, and South Gujarat, as well as on Muslim variants, temples, together with precise information on the carpentry construction and details about the carving of the woodwork. There are numerous clear drawings, plans, and maps throughout plus spectacular photographs illustrating all facets of the text. It is heartening that so much care and exactitude have been lavished on a type of domestic, vernacular architecture, since such solicitude is normally reserved for monumental structures.

Miscellaneous

Edward J. Rozek, ed. and pref. *Walter H. Judd: Chronicles of a Statesman.* Denver: Grier, n.d. xi + 403 pages.

This book is made up of 34 lectures, talks, speeches, and interviews of Walter Judd. I remember Judd from my high school days as a colorful Republican orator. He was staunchly conservative and passionately anti-communist. It was only when I read the volume under review that I realized how central China was to all of his thinking.

Judd went to bandit-infested South China as a missionary doctor in 1925. Except for two years when he returned to the United States to recover from a bout of malaria that almost killed him, Judd served in China (Nanking, Fukien, and Shensi) until 1938. At that time, he began to travel around America lecturing on foreign policy in the Pacific and the dangers of Japanese militarism. In 1942, Judd was elected to the House of Representatives from the Fifth Minnesota District and he kept his seat for twenty years. After retirement from the House, he remained active and vigorously spoke out on matters of foreign policy.

Judd's poignant experiences in China and his deep love of the country and its people informed all of his thinking. China shows up in almost all of his speeches, if only to quote a Chinese saying or anecdote by way of illustration. He quoted Confucius, Mencius, and HU Shi as readily as he did Chiang Kai-shek, Mao Tse-tung, and bandit chieftains. Judd was by no means a sinologist, but he had lived in China under harsh conditions for many years, so he had learned much from first-hand experience. He even perceived, though dimly, the need for Chinese language reform. Judd began a lecture given at the University of Colorado on June 23, 1978 with the following words: "Another problem for the Chinese is that they've got to modernize their language. Their language was made for a stationary world." The great paradox for all Chinese which Judd recognized so keenly was the pressing need for CHANGE while still preserving something of their heritage.

By now, Judd has probably been forgotten by all but a few of our citizens, yet he was a key figure in his time. He was the first American to see the Dalai Lama after his escape to India in 1959. He was a delegate to the twelfth General Assembly of the United Nations and a founder of various organizations dedicated to helping Chinese refugees and to liberating China from "the yoke of Communism." He strongly believed in the freedom of man and was willing to proclaim his beliefs loudly and clearly for others to hear and to act upon them. He was well informed about world affairs and thought through them clearly. In 1965, he outlined four deeds that the Communists could carry out which would demonstrate their desire for "peaceful coexistence":

1. tear down the Berlin Wall
2. let the people of Eastern Europe vote
3. stop using Cuba as a base for subverting the Western Hemisphere

4. accept disarmament, with inspection.

The only problem with Walter Judd is that he was a generation ahead of his time.

Benedict Anderson. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 1983. 160 pages.

Although the title does not reveal it, this is really a book about the importance of language for the formation of nation-states. A wide-ranging study that touches upon virtually every inhabitated area of the world, *Imagined Communities* is a no-holds-barred look at the growth of nationalism during the last couple of centuries. Anderson begins and ends with the theme that nationalistic impulses transcend even supposedlly supranationalistic ideologies such as Marxism. In between, he discourses eloquently -- and sometimes radically -- on the complex interplay between various levels of language and power structures.

In spite of its brevity, Anderson's argument is immensely learned and perceptive. What he has to say about the Chinese script, for example, is uncannily apt: "...written Arabic functioned like Chinese characters to create a community of signs, not sounds" (p. 20) "...[T]he deader the written language -- the farther [sic] it was from speech -- the better: in principle everyone has access to a pure world of signs." (p. 20) "Chinese mandarins looked with approval on barbarians who painfully learned to paint Middle Kingdon ideograms. These barbarians were already halfway to full absorbtion. Half-civilized was vastly better than barbarian." (pp. 20-21) How incredibly apt these formulations are! Considering Anderson's background as a Southeast Asian specialist, it is nothing short of amazing that he could arrive at such accurate conclusions which elude even the majority of professional sinologists.

Anderson cleverly sets up several categories of languages. Among these are classical "truth-languages" (Church Latin, Qur'anic Arabic, Examination Chinese, etc.) of the great sacral cultures. These have been or are being replaced (usually slowly, but sometimes with great rapidity) by the vernacular "print-languages" (English, French, German, Turkinsh, *quốc ngữ*, Mandarin, *bahasa Indonesia*, Mozambique-Portuguese, Indian English, etc.) which were given fixity by print-capitalism and have displaced the classical styles as "languages-of-state."

It is crucial to observe, however, that Benedict does not simplistically equate the nationalism of a given country with a particular language:

> It is always a mistake to treat languages in the way that certain nationalist ideologues treat them -- as *emblems* of nation-ness, like flags, costumes, folk dances, and the rest. Much the most important thing about language is its capacity for generation imagined communities, building in effect *particular solidarities.* (p. 122)

And again:

> Language is not an instrument of exclusion: in principle, anyone can learn any language. On the contrary, it is fundamentally inclusive, limited only by the fatality of Babel: no one lives long enough to learn *all* languages. Print-language is what invents nationalism, not *a* particular language per se. (p. 122)

The nonequivalence of ethnic groupings and languages-of-state is obvious when we examine the role of English in India, of Portuguese in Mozambique, and of *bahasa*

Indonesia which was essentially created as late as the twenties in this century. Benedict also touches upon creoles, bilingualism of elites, and other such subjects, not as a linguist (even a sociolinguist), but from the viewpoint of the political scientist.

There are many other gems in this small volume that I should like to call to the attention of scholars in various fields. For example, students of popular culture would surely welcome Anderson's qualifying note to the following statement: "...the literate were adepts, strategic strata in a cosmological hierarchy of which the apex was divine." To this he counters: "This is not to say that the illiterate did not read. What they read, however, was not words but the visible world. 'In the eyes of all who were capable of reflection the material world was scarcely more than a sort of mask, behind which took place all the really important things; it seemed to them also a language, intended to express by signs a more profound reality.'" (p. 22; the quotation is from Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, tr. I. A. Manyon [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961], 2 vols., p. 83)

I came away from reading this book much enlightened about the profound subtleties of language in the bureaucratic and political arena. It would be wonderful if someone made a full-scale investigation of the rise of the modern Chinese nation based on the premises of Anderson's thought-provoking thesis. On the other hand, it is unfortunate that Anderson himself did not take into account John DeFrancis' two authoritative monographs that are so germane to his purpose. I am referring, of course, to *Nationalism and Language Reform in China* (1950) and *Colonialism and Language Policy in Viet Nam* (1977). In fact, considering his otherwise impressive bibliographical control, it seems almost impossible that Anderson could have avoided encountering these two key works which are of such great significance for his theme -- unless he purposely eschewed them because of disagreement with their fundamental tenets or approach. Such, in fact, may well have been the case because DeFrancis adopts a descriptive, diachronic stance that sees a gradual evolutionary progress toward more rational, democratic policies. Anderson, in contrast, views history more as an amoral, synchronic specimen for testing large ideas about political science that are statistically verifiable in the aggregate.

Previous Issues

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
1	Nov. 1986	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Need for an Alphabetically Arranged General Usage Dictionary of Mandarin Chinese: A Review Article of Some Recent Dictionaries and Current Lexicographical Projects	31
2	Dec. 1986	Andrew Jones *Hiroshima*	The Poetics of Uncertainty in Early Chinese Literature	45
3	March 1987	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	A Partial Bibliography for the Study of Indian Influence on Chinese Popular Literature	iv, 214
4	Nov. 1987	Robert M. Sanders *University of Hawaii*	The Four Languages of "Mandarin"	14
5	Dec. 1987	Eric A. Havelock *Vassar College*	Chinese Characters and the Greek Alphabet	4
6	Jan. 1988	J. Marshall Unger *University of Hawaii*	Computers and Japanese Literacy: Nihonzin no Yomikaki Nôryoku to Konpyuta	13
7	Jan. 1988	Chang Tsung-tung *Goethe-Universität*	Indo-European Vocabulary in Old Chinese	i, 56
8	Feb. 1988	various	Reviews (I)	ii, 39
9	Dec. 1988	Soho Machida *Daitoku-ji, Kyoto*	Life and Light, the Infinite: A Historical and Philological Analysis of the Amida Cult	46
10	June 1989	Pratoom Angurarohita *Chulalongkorn University Bangkok*	Buddhist Influence on the Neo-Confucian Concept of the Sage	31
11	July 1989	Edward Shaughnessy *University of Chicago*	Western Cultural Innovations in China, 1200 BC	8

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
12	Aug. 1989	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Contributions of T'ang and Five Dynasties Transformation Texts (*pien-wen*) to Later Chinese Popular Literature	71
13	Oct. 1989	Jiaosheng Wang *Shanghai*	The Complete *Ci*-Poems of Li Qingzhao: A New English Translation	xii, 122
14	Dec. 1989	various	Reviews (II)	69
15	Jan. 1990	George Cardona *University of Pennsylvania*	On Attitudes Toward Language in Ancient India	19
16	March 1990	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Three Brief Essays Concerning Chinese Tocharistan	16
17	April 1990	Heather Peters *University Museum of Philadelphia*	Tattooed Faces and Stilt Houses: Who Were the Ancient Yue?	28
18	May 1990	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Two Non-Tetragraphic Northern Sinitic Languages a. Implications of the Soviet Dungan Script for Chinese Language Reform b. Who Were the Gyámi?	28
19	June 1990	Bosat Man *Nalanda*	Backhill/Peking/Beijing	6
20	Oct. 1990	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Introduction and Notes for a Translation of the Ma-wang-tui MSS of the *Lao Tzu*	68

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
21	Dec. 1990	Philippa Jane Benson *Carnegie Mellon University*	Two Cross-Cultural Studies on Reading Theory	9, 13
22	March 1991	David Moser *University of Michigan*	Slips of the Tongue and Pen in Chinese	45
23	April 1991	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Tracks of the Tao, Semantics of Zen	10
24	Aug. 1991	David A. Utz *University of Pennsylvania*	Language, Writing, and Tradition in Iran	24
25	Aug. 1991	Jean DeBernardi *University of Alberta*	Linguistic Nationalism: The Case of Southern Min	22 + 3 figs.
26	Sept. 1991	JAO Tsung-i *Chinese University of Hong Kong*	Questions on the Origins of Writing Raised by the Silk Road	10
27	Aug. 1991	Victor H. Mair, ed. *University of Pennsylvania*	*Schriftfestschrift: Essays in Honor of John DeFrancis on His Eightieth Birthday*	ix, 245
28	Sept. 1991	ZHOU Youguang *State Language Commission, Peking*	The Family of Chinese Character-Type Scripts (*Twenty Members and Four Stages of Development*)	11
29	Sept. 1991	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	What Is a Chinese "Dialect/Topolect"? Reflections on Some Key Sino-English Linguistic Terms	31
30	Oct. 1991	M. V. Sofronov *Institute of Far Eastern Studies, Academy of Sciences, Moscow*	Chinese Philology and the Scripts of Central Asia	10

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
31	Oct. 1991	various	Reviews (III)	68
32	Aug. 1992	David McCraw *University of Hawaii*	How the Chinawoman Lost Her Voice	27
33	Sept. 1992	FENG Lide and Kevin Stuart *Chuankou No. 1 Middle School and Qinghai Education College*	Interethnic Contact on the Inner Asian Frontier: The Gangou People of Minhe County, Qinghai	34
34	Oct. 1992	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Two Papers on Sinolinguistics 1. A Hypothesis Concerning the Origin of the Term *fanqie* (“Countertomy”) 2. East Asian Round-Trip Words	13
35	Nov. 1992	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania* with an added note by Edwin G. Pulleyblank	Reviews (IV)	37
36	Feb. 1993	XU Wenkan *Hanyu Da Cidian editorial offices, Shanghai*	Hanyu Wailaici de Yuyuan Kaozheng he Cidian Bianzuan (Philological Research on the Etymology of Loanwords in Sinitic and Dictionary Compilation)	13
37	March 1993	Tanya Storch *University of New Mexico*	Chinese Buddhist Historiography and Orality	16
38	April 1993	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Linguistic and Textual Antecedents of *The Sutra of the Wise and the Foolish*	95

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
39	Aug. 1993	Jordan Paper *York University*	A Material Case for a Late Bering Strait Crossing Coincident with Pre-Columbian Trans-Pacific Crossings	17
40	Sept. 1993	Michael Carr *Center for Language Studies, Otaru University of Commerce*	*Tiao*-Fish through Chinese Dictionaries	68
41	Oct. 1993	Paul Goldin *Harvard University*	Miching Mallecho: The *Zhanguo ce* and Classical Rhetoric	27
42	Nov. 1993	Renchin-Jashe Yulshul *Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Kokonor (Qinghai)* and Kevin Stuart *Institute of Foreign Languages, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia*	Kham Tibetan Language Materials	39
43	Dec. 1993	MA Quanlin, MA Wanxiang, and MA Zhicheng *Xining* Edited by Kevin Stuart *Kokonor*	Salar Language Materials	72
44	Jan. 1994	Dolkun Kamberi *Columbia University*	The Three Thousand Year Old Charchan Man Preserved at Zaghunluq	15
45	May 1994	Mark Hansell *Carleton College*	The Sino-Alphabet: The Assimilation of Roman Letters into the Chinese Writing System	28
46	July 1994	various	Reviews (V)	2, 155

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
47	Aug. 1994	Robert S. Bauer *Mahidol University Salaya Nakornpathom, Thailand*	Sino-Tibetan *kolo “Wheel”	11
48	Sept. 1994	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Introduction and Notes for a Complete Translation of the *Chuang Tzu*	xxxiv, 110
49	Oct. 1994	Ludo Rocher *University of Pennsylvania*	Orality and Textuality in the Indian Context	28
50	Nov. 1994	YIN Binyong *State Language Commission and Institute for Applied Linguistics (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)*	Diyi ge Lading Zimu de Hanyu Pinyin Fang’an Shi Zenyang Chansheng de? [How Was the First Romanized Spelling System for Sinitic Produced?]	7
51	Nov. 1994	HAN Kangxin *Institute of Archeology Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	The Study of Ancient Human Skeletons from Xinjiang, China	9 + 4 figs.
52	Nov. 1994	Warren A. Shibles *University of Wisconsin Whitewater*	Chinese Romanization Systems: IPA Transliteration	20
53	Nov. 1994	XU Wenkan *Editorial Offices of the Hanyu Da Cidian Shanghai*	Guanyu Tuhuoluoren de Qiyuan he Qianxi Wenti [On the Problem of the Origins and Migrations of the Tocharians]	11
54	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Jegün Yogur	34
55	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Dongxiang	34

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
56	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Dagur	36
57	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Monguor	31
58	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Baoan	28
59	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart *Qinghai Junior Teachers College;* Limusishiden *Qinghai Medical College Attached Hospital, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)*	China's Monguor Minority: Ethnography and Folktales	i, I, 193
60	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart, Li Xuewei, and Shelear *Qinghai Junior Teachers College, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)*	China's Dagur Minority: Society, Shamanism, and Folklore	vii, 167
61	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart and Li Xuewei *Qinghai Junior Teachers College, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)*	Tales from China's Forest Hunters: Oroqen Folktales	iv, 59
62	Dec. 1994	William C. Hannas *Georgetown University*	Reflections on the "Unity" of Spoken and Written Chinese and Academic Learning in China	5
63	Dec. 1994	Sarah M. Nelson *University of Denver*	The Development of Complexity in Prehistoric North China	17

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
64	Jan. 1995	Arne Østmoe *Bangkok, Thailand, and Drøbak, Norway*	A Germanic-Tai Linguistic Puzzle	81, 6
65	Feb. 1995	Penglin Wang *Chinese University of Hong Kong*	Indo-European Loanwords in Altaic	28
66	March 1995	ZHU Qingzhi *Sichuan University and Peking University*	Some Linguistic Evidence for Early Cultural Exchange Between China and India	7
67	April 1995	David McCraw *University of Hawaii*	Pursuing Zhuangzi as a Rhymemaster: A Snark-Hunt in Eight Fits	38
68	May 1995	Ke Peng, Yanshi Zhu *University of Chicago and Tokyo, Japan*	New Research on the Origin of Cowries Used in Ancient China	i, 26
69	Jan. 1996	Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis, Keith Slater, *et al. Qinghai, Santa Barbara, etc.*	Language Materials of China's Monguor Minority: Huzhu Mongghul and Minhe Mangghuer	xi, 266
70	Feb. 1996	David Utz, Xinru Liu, *Taylor Carman, Bryan Van Norden, and the Editor Philadelphia, Vassar, etc.*	Reviews VI	93
71	March 1996	Erik Zürcher *Leiden University* Seishi Karashima *Soka University* Huanming Qin *Tang Studies Hotline*	Vernacularisms in Medieval Chinese Texts	31 + 11 + 8
72	May 1996	E. Bruce Brooks *University of Massachusetts*	The Life and Mentorship of Confucius	44

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
73	June 1996	ZHANG Juan, et al., and Kevin Stuart *Qinghai, Inner Mongolia, Shanxi, Henan, Liaoning*	Blue Cloth and Pearl Deer; Yogur Folklore	iii, 76
74	Jan. 1997	David Moser *University of Michigan & Beijing Foreign Studies University*	Covert Sexism in Mandarin Chinese	23
75	Feb. 1997	Haun Saussy *Stanford University*	The Prestige of Writing: Wen^2, Letter, Picture, Image, Ideography	40
76	Feb. 1997	Patricia Eichenbaum Karetzky *Bard College*	The Evolution of the Symbolism of the Paradise of the Buddha of Infinite Life and Its Western Origins	28
77	Jan. 1998	Daniel Hsieh *Purdue University*	The Origin and Nature of the "Nineteen Old Poems"	49
78	Feb. 1998	Narsu *Inner Mongolia College of Agriculture & Animal Husbandry* Kevin Stuart *Qinghai Junior Teachers' College*	Practical Mongolian Sentences (With English Translation)	iii + 49 + ii + 66
79	March 1998	Dennis Grafflin *Bates College*	A Southeast Asian Voice in the Daodejing?	8
80	July 1998	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Study of Saka History	ii + 225
81	Sept. 1998	Hera S. Walker *Ursinus College (Philadelphia)*	Indigenous or Foreign?: A Look at the Origins of the Monkey Hero Sun Wukong	iv + 110

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
82	Sept. 1998	I. S. Gurevich *Russian Academy of Sciences*	A Fragment of a pien-wen(?) Related to the Cycle “On Buddha’s Life”	15
83	Oct. 1998	Minglang Zhou *University of Colorado at Boulder*	Tense/Aspect markers in Mandarin and Xiang dialects, and their contact	20
84	Oct. 1998	Ulf Jäger *Gronau/Westfalen, Germany*	The New Old Mummies from Eastern Central Asia: Ancestors of the Tocharian Knights Depicted on the Buddhist Wallpaintings of Kucha and Turfan? Some Circumstantial Evidence	9
85	Oct. 1998	Mariko Namba Walter *University of New England*	Tokharian Buddhism in Kucha: Buddhism of Indo-European Centum Speakers in Chinese Turkestan before the 10th Century C.E.	30
86	Oct. 1998	Jidong Yang *University of Pennsylvania*	Siba: Bronze Age Culture of the Gansu Corridor	18
87	Nov. 1998	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Canine Conundrums: Eurasian Dog Ancestor Myths in Historical and Ethnic Perspective	74
88	Dec. 1998	Saroj Kumar Chaudhuri *Aichi Gakusen University*	Siddham in China and Japan	9, 124
89	Jan. 1999	Alvin Lin *Yale University*	Writing Taiwanese: The Development of Modern Written Taiwanese	4 + 41 + 4
90	Jan. 1999	Victor H. Mair et al	Reviews VII [including review of The Original Analects]	2, 38
91	Jan. 1999	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Phonosymbolism or Etymology: The Case of the Verb “Cop”	28

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
92	Jan. 1999	Christine Louise Lin *Dartmouth College*	The Presbyterian Church in Taiwan and the Advocacy of Local Autonomy	xiii + 136
93	Jan. 1999	David S. Nivison *Stanford University*	The Key to the Chronology of the Three Dynasties: The "Modern Text" Bamboo Annals	iv + 68
94	March 1999	Julie Lee Wei *Hoover Institute*	Correspondence Between the Chinese Calendar Signs and the Phoenician Alphabet	65 + 6
95	May 1999	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	A Medieval, Central Asian Buddhist Theme in a Late Ming Taoist Tale by Feng Meng-lung	27
96	June 1999	E. Bruce Brooks *University of Massachusetts*	Alexandrian Motifs in Chinese Texts	14
97	Dec. 1999	LI Shuicheng *Peking University*	Sino-Western Contact in the Second Millennium BC	iv, 29
98	Jan. 2000	Peter Daniels, Daniel Boucher, and other authors	Reviews VIII	108
99	Feb. 2000	Anthony Barbieri-Low *Princeton University*	Wheeled Vehicles in the Chinese Bronze Age (c. 2000-741 BC)	v, 98 + 5 color plates
100	Feb. 2000	Wayne Alt *Community College of Baltimore County (Essex)*	Zhuangzi, Mysticism, and the Rejection of Distinctions	29
101	March 2000	C. Michele Thompson *South Connecticut State University*	The Viêt Peoples and the Origins of Nom	71, 1

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
102	March 2000	Theresa Jen *Bryn Mawr College* Ping Xu *Baruch College*	Penless Chinese Character Reproduction	15
103	June 2000	Carrie E. Reid *Middlebury College*	Early Chinese Tattoo	52
104	July 2000	David W. Pankenier *Lehigh University*	Popular Astrology and Border Affairs in Early China	19 + 1 color plate
105	Aug. 2000	Anne Birrell *Cambridge University*	Postmodernist Theory in Recent Studies of Chinese Literature	31
106	Sept. 2000	Yu Taishan *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Hypothesis about the Sources of the Sai Tribes	i, 3, 200
107	Sept. 2000	Jacques deLisle, Adelheid E. Krohne, and the editor	Reviews IX	148 + map
108	Sept. 2000	Ruth H. Chang *University of Pennsylvania*	Understanding *Di* and *Tian*: Deity and Heaven From Shang to Tang	vii, 54
109	Oct. 2000	Conán Dean Carey *Stanford University*	In Hell the One without Sin is Lord	ii, 60
110	Oct. 2000	Toh Hoong Teik *Harvard University*	Shaykh 'Alam: The Emperor of Early Sixteenth-Century China	20
111	Nov. 2000	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Need for a New Era	10
112	July 2001	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Notes on the Anau Inscription	xi, 93

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
113	Aug. 2001	Ray Collins *Chepachet, RI* David Kerr *Melbourne, FL*	Etymology of the Word "Macrobiotic:s" and Its Use in Modern Chinese Scholarship	18
114	March 2002	Ramnath Subbaraman *University of Chicago*	Beyond the Question of the Monkey Imposter: Indian Influence on the Chinese Novel, *The Journey to the West*	35
115	April 2002	ZHOU Jixu *Sichuan Normal University*	Correspondences of Basic Words Between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European	8
116	May 2002	LIU Yongquan *Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	On the Problem of Chinese Lettered Words	13
117	May 2002	SHANG Wei *Columbia University*	*Baihua, Guanhua, Fangyan* and the May Fourth Reading of *Rulin Waishi*	10
118	June 2002	Justine T. Snow *Port Townsend, WA*	Evidence for the Indo-European Origin of Two Ancient Chinese Deities	ii, 75, 1 color, 1 b-w print
119	July 2002	WU Zhen *Xinjiang Museum, Ürümchi*	"Hu" Non-Chinese as They Appear in the Materials from the Astana Graveyard at Turfan	21, 5 figs.
120	July 2002	Anne Birrell *University of Cambridge, Clare Hall*	Female-Gendered Myth in the *Classic of Mountains and Seas*	47
121	July 2002	Mark Edward Lewis *Stanford University*	Dicing and Divination in Early China	22, 7 figs.

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
122	July 2002	Julie Wilensky *Yale Univesity*	The Magical *Kunlun* and "Devil Slaves": Chinese Perceptions of Dark-skinned People and Africa before 1500	51, 3 figs.
123	Aug. 2002	Paul R. Goldin and the editor	Reviews X	30
124	August 2002	Fredrik T. Hiebert *University of Pennsylvania* John Colarusso *McMaster University*	The Context of the Anau Seal Remarks on the Anau and Niyä Seals	1-34 35-47
125	July 2003	ZHOU Jixu *Sichuan Normal University* *Shanghai Normal University*	Correspondences of Cultural Words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European	19
126	Aug. 2003	Tim Miller *University of Washington*	A Southern Min Word in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*	14
127	Oct. 2003	Sundeep S. Jhutti *Petaluma, California*	The Getes	125, 8 color plates
128	Nov. 2003	Yinpo Tschang *New York City*	On Proto-Shang	18
129	Dec. 2003	Michael Witzel *Harvard University*	Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Exchange in Prehistoric Western Central Asia	70
130	Feb. 2004	Bede Fahey *Fort St. John, British Columbia*	Mayan: A Sino-Tibetan Language? A Comparative Study	61

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
131	March 2004	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A History of the Relationship between the Western and Eastern Han, Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties and the Western Regions	1, 3, 352
132	April 2004	Kim Hayes *Sydney*	On the Presence of Non-Chinese at Anyang	11
133	April 2004	John L. Sorenson *Brigham Young University* Carl L. Johannessen *University of Oregon*	*Scientific Evidence for Pre-Columbian Transoceanic Voyages* CD-ROM	48, 166, 19, 15 plates
134	May 2004	Xieyan Hincha *Neumädewitz, Germany*	Two Steps Toward Digraphia in China	i, 22
135	May 2004	John J. Emerson *Portland, Oregon*	*The Secret History of the Mongols* and Western Literature	21
136	May 2004	Serge Papillon *Mouvaux, France and Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia*	Influences tokhariennes sur la mythologie chinoise	47
137	June 2004	Hoong Teik Toh *Harvard University*	Some Classical Malay Materials for the Study of the Chinese Novel *Journey to the West*	64
138	June 2004	Julie Lee Wei *San Jose and London*	Dogs and Cats: Lessons from Learning Chinese	17
139	June 2004	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Hypothesis on the Origin of the Yu State	20
140	June 2004	Yinpo Tschang *New York City*	Shih and Zong: Social Organization in Bronze Age China	28
141	July 2004	Yinpo Tschang *New York City*	Chaos in Heaven: On the Calendars of Preclassical China	30

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
142	July 2004	Katheryn Linduff, ed. *University of Pittsburgh*	*Silk Road Exchange in China*	64
143	July 2004	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Sleep in *Dream*: Soporific Responses to Depression in *Story of the Stone*	99
144	July 2004	RONG Xinjiang *Peking University*	Land Route or Sea Route? Commentary on the Study of the Paths of Transmission and Areas in which Buddhism Was Disseminated during the Han Period	32
145	Aug. 2004	the editor	Reviews XI	2, 41
146	Feb. 2005	Hoong Teik Toh *Academia Sinica*	The *-yu* Ending in Xiongnu, Xianbei, and Gaoju Onomastica	24
147	March 2005	Hoong Teik Toh *Academia Sinica*	Ch. *Qiong* ~ Tib. Khyung; Taoism ~ Bonpo -- Some Questions Related to Early Ethno-Religious History in Sichuan	18
148	April 2005	Lucas Christopoulos *Beijing Sports University*	Le gréco-bouddhisme et l'art du poing en Chine	52
149	May 2005	Kimberly S. Te Winkle *University College, London*	A Sacred Trinity: God, Mountain, and Bird: Cultic Practices of the Bronze Age Chengdu Plain	ii, 103 (41 in color)
150	May 2005	Dolkun Kamberi *Washington, DC*	Uyghurs and Uyghur Identity	44
151	June 2005	Jane Jia SI *University of Pennsylvania*	The Genealogy of Dictionaries: Producers, Literary Audience, and the Circulation of English Texts in the Treaty Port of Shanghai	44, 4 tables

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
152	June 2005	Denis Mair *Seattle*	The Dance of Qian and Kun in the *Zhouyi*	13, 2 figs.
153	July 2005	Alan Piper *London (UK)*	The Mysterious Origins of the Word “Marihuana”	17
154	July 2005	Serge Papillon *Belfort, France*	*Mythologie sino-européenne*	174, 1 plate
155	July 2005	Denis Mair *Seattle*	Janus-Like Concepts in the *Li* and *Kun* Trigrams	8
156	July 2005	Abolqasem Esmailpour *Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran*	*Manichean Gnosis and Creation*	157
157	Aug. 2005	Ralph D. Sawyer *Independent Scholar*	Paradoxical Coexistence of Prognostication and Warfare	13
158	Aug. 2005	Mark Edward Lewis *Stanford University*	Writings on Warfare Found in Ancient Chinese Tombs	15
159	Aug. 2005	Jens Østergaard Petersen *University of Copenhagen*	The *Zuozhuan* Account of the Death of King Zhao of Chu and Its Sources	47
160	Sept. 2005	Matteo Compareti *Venice*	Literary Evidence for the Identification of Some Common Scenes in Han Funerary Art	14
161	Sept. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	The Names of the *Yi Jing* Trigrams: An Inquiry into Their Linguistic Origins	18
162	Sept. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	Counting and Knotting: Correspondences between Old Chinese and Indo-European	71, map

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
163	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	Huangdi and Huntun (the Yellow Emperor and Wonton): A New Hypothesis on Some Figures in Chinese Mythology	44
164	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	Shang and Zhou: An Inquiry into the Linguistic Origins of Two Dynastic Names	62
165	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	DAO and DE: An Inquiry into the Linguistic Origins of Some Terms in Chinese Philosophy and Morality	51
166	Nov. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London* Hodong Kim *Seoul National University* and David Selvia and the Editor *both of the University of Pennsylvania*	Reviews XII	i, 63
167	Dec. 2005	ZHOU Jixu *Sichuan Normal University*	Old Chinese '帝*tees' and Proto-Indo-European “*deus”: Similarity in Religious Ideas and a Common Source in Linguistics	17
168	Dec. 2005	Judith A. Lerner *New York City*	Aspects of Assimilation: the Funerary Practices and Furnishings of Central Asians in China	51, v, 9 plates
169	Jan. 2006	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Conversion Tables for the Three-Volume Edition of the *Hanyu Da Cidian*	i, 284
170	Feb. 2006	Amber R. Woodward *University of Pennsylvania*	Learning English, Losing Face, and Taking Over: The Method (or Madness) of Li Yang and His Crazy English	18

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* will be 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. For prices of paper copies, see the catalog at www.sino-platonic.org				
171	June 2006	John DeFrancis *University of Hawaii*	The Prospects for Chinese Writing Reform	26, 3 figs.
172	Aug. 2006	Deborah Beaser	The Outlook for Taiwanese Language Preservation	18
173	Oct. 2006	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Study of the History of the Relationship Between the Western and Eastern Han, Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties and the Western Regions	167
174	Nov. 2006	Mariko Namba Walter	Sogdians and Buddhism	65
175	Dec. 2006	Zhou Jixu *Center for East Asian Studies, University of Pennsylvania; Chinese Department, Sichuan Normal University*	The Rise of Agricultural Civilization in China: The Disparity between Archeological Discovery and the Documentary Record and Its Explanation	38
176	May 2007	Eric Henry *University of North Carolina*	The Submerged History of Yuè	36