
The next most important Middle Mongolian text in Chinese transcription, after the Secret History, is a work entitled Hua-yi yi-yu. The significance of this work was recognized long ago by Paul Pelliot, the Reverend Antoine Mostaert, and other scholars who frequently quoted Mongolian words occurring in it in various works.

However, this important source remained unpublished until Lewicki's book appeared. Its publication is to be welcomed, because it deals with a valuable source of the Mongolian of the 14th century and is also a model scholarly work in the field of Mongolian historical linguistics, written with profound knowledge of the material and of Mongolian languages in general. The book is divided into several chapters: a brief introduction (5-15), containing the history of the problem and a survey of previous works on related subjects, is followed by a long chapter dealing with the methods of restoration of Mongolian texts in Chinese transcription, as applied by the predecessors of Lewicki. In connection with Lewicki's remark that Pozdneev repeated the observations of Palladius and made minor changes in the transcription of Yuan-ch'ao pi-shih (18), it is necessary to point out that Pozdneev did not perform independent work on the Secret History at all. He got from Palladius the latter's manuscript, and published a small portion of it after making a few changes in the transcription which he considered necessary from the point of view of Mongolian phonology, but not from the viewpoint of Chinese historical phonology. The latter could not even be expected from Pozdneev, who had an inadequate knowledge of Chinese. As Pozdneev published one part of Palladius' manuscript and wrote a few articles which did not even mention Palladius' name, this led to the misunderstanding of too often attributing to Pozdneev theories of which he in reality was not the creator. The fact that Palladius had restored the Mongolian text of the Secret History became known only in 1924, when the manuscript was found in Pozdneev's papers purchased from his widow by the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Therefore, Pozdneev should be mentioned only in so far as he is responsible for certain alterations of Palladius' transcription.

Similarly, Kozin's book as discussed by Lewicki on pp. 22-24, is not a product of independent research either. Kozin is not a Sinologist and he does not know Chinese. He did not restore the Mongolian text of the Secret History, but only romanized Palladius' manuscript which had been written in Cyrillic transcription. He, too, introduced a few insignificant changes in transcription and made a Russian translation mainly on the basis of the Chinese glosses as translated by Palladius.

The third chapter of Lewicki's book contains an analysis of the Chinese transcription of the Mongolian texts of the 14th century. This is the central and most responsible part of his work, because his entire research is based on it. Lewicki performed the difficult task of restoration of the text seriously and conscientiously, and he is right in insisting that the text restoration be based on the pronunciation of the 14th century and not that of the modern period (26). Pages 28-55 consist of tables containing 509 Chinese characters, their Ancient Chinese equivalents, and their $hP'ags-pa$ and Mongolian equivalents. These tables are much more detailed than those by Haenisch.2

As the latter bases his work on the modern North Chinese pronunciation, the difference between his transcription and that of Lewicki is considerable. On p. 51 ff. we find a complete list of syllables with an enumeration of all the Mongolian words in which they occur. This part of the work is also written excellently, and the author of this review has only a few corrections to add to Lewicki's transcription of the Written Mongolian forms given in his book in parentheses:

1. $bogum$ (51) should be $bogom$ : the second syllable has the vowel $o < *a$.


2. The form ăbûgă (53) is correct and in Written Mongolian, too, there is a word ębûgə, i.e. without a final n; cf. ębûgə in the letters of the Il Khans and in the inscription in memory of Hindu; its meaning is 'great-grandfather.'

It occurs also in the Dagur language in the form ęûkə 'the elder brother of the mother, the husband of the elder sister of the father.' Thus, there is no need for addition of a final n as Lewicki suggests.

3. The vocalism of the second syllable of nökûçăgsă (54) is ă < ĕ, i.e. it should be nököçăgsă < *nökeçęgsęn.

4. The consonant in ęükăbürï 'jackal' (54) is not k but g; cf. Mo. ęagebürï, Kalmuck tsoöw. If there had been k it would not have vanished in the Hua-yi yi-yu and the latter would not read ăiwă.

5. An interesting form is ęürgă 'locust' (55), which is certainly a Turkic word; cf. Uzbek ęçırtkă.

6. The words doyułaq 'lame' and soxor 'blind' (68) should be transcribed as doyolaq < *doyalaq and soxor < *soqar.

It should be mentioned that Lewicki’s observation that the Chinese voiceless aspirate consonants correspond to Mongolian voice consonants, but the Chinese aspirated voiceless consonants correspond to Mongolian voiceless consonants (81), is correct from the phonemic point of view, while from the purely phonetic point of view the Chinese voiceless aspirated consonants correspond to Mongolian voiceless aspirate consonants and the Chinese voiceless unaspirated consonants correspond to Mongolian voiceless weak consonants (mediae lenes): Chin. tʰ : Khalkha tʰ = Chin. t : Kh. n. This fact explains why the Chinese authors did not have any difficulty in transcribing the Mongolian words concerned.

The fourth chapter (89-132) deals with the Middle Mongolian language represented in the Hua-yi yi-yu. This is an interesting description of one of the Middle Mongolian dialects.

Lewicki starts with the problem of vocalic harmony and remarks that among the former scholars engaged in the study of Sino-Mongolian texts of the 14th century there was no complete agreement as to whether there had been vocalic harmony or not (89). I do not think this is so. The fact of the matter is that we find in the works of the European scholars two different methods of transcription of Chinese characters: Pelliot and Mostaert did not confine themselves to a simple transliteration of the Chinese characters, but rendered the Mongolian words according to what their historical pronunciation was. Hence Pelliot wrote, for example, ęgulärün, bo'äsu, da'ünär, mün, and so on, and in Mostaert’s works we find such forms as nökör, öki-ben, öesün, hëdeküi-ben, and kesedkün. On the other hand, Pozdneev, who published part of Palladius’ manuscript, slightly modified the vocalization of Palladius’ original text and brought the Mongolian text closer to the phonetic features of the Mongolian language. Palladius confined himself to a transliteration of the Chinese characters according to their modern North Chinese pronunciation. His transcription is only a conventional transliteration. Kozin mechanically romanized the text of Palladius’ restoration of the Secret History, but in the second part of his book, where he gives a Written Mongolian version of the text, he writes ö and ü where they are supposed to be. Haenisch, too, confined himself to transliterating the Chinese characters and did not use a transcription reflecting the historical Mongolian pronunciation. Therefore, he writes nikan, udur, de’u lu’e, tunggelik, bolek, now’uju, and ujeju.

In the preface of his book Haenisch remarks that the back and front vowels are not distinguished in the Chinese transcription but hinted at only by the consonantism or eventually by forms (‘nur durch den Konsonantismus oder etwaige unterscheidende Formantien ange- deutet’). Haenisch does not deny vocalic harmony, but he is fully aware of the difficulty in distinguishing between, for example, ö and o, because the first syllable of the words nökör and
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nɔyai are rendered by the same Chinese character. Thus, as a matter of fact, nobody doubted that vocalic harmony had existed in the 14th century, and the only difference between the two groups of scholars is that some harmonize their texts and others do not.

On page 94 (note 1) Lewicki quotes Kotwicz and admits the existence of a form sū which might have existed along with su. Lewicki seemingly is not acquainted with my book on the Mongolian ḥP'ags-pa script, published a few days before the German invasion of the USSR, in which I demonstrated that the form sū had never existed.

Lewicki also analyses the groups *-aγa-, *-aγā-, etc. His remarks on *-γoγa- ơ'o need correction: Mo. boyol < *boyal (but not *boyol) 'slave, serf.' The form χo'osun has developed from *gyuwasun and not *qyoγasun 'empty.' Just the same, to'osun "dust" is not derived from *toywasun but from toγasun < *toyasun < *toβasun / tobaray 'dust, earth.'

The form iyögür 'end, top' (96) is a misprint instead of iyögür.

The translation of a few words also needs correction: nōkōṛa itself does not mean 'the day after to-morrow' but 'another' (but nōkōṛa udīr is 'the day after to-morrow,' verbatim 'another day'). The word ĕ'ārīn (97) is not 'soi mēme,' but only 'own.'

An interesting form is kōrgā 'drum' (98) which occurs in Mongolian languages as Mo. kōserge < *kōsergė 'drum' and 'bellows' (primarily 'an animal hide inflated with air') = Burkit-Alar yōrgs 'bellows,' Burkit-Bokhan χūrχu id. The form kōrgā in the Hua-yi yi-yu resembles the Burkit form χūrχu (with a short vowel) and also the Turkic form körük 'bellows.'

Lewicki says on p. 98 that the groups *-aγa- and *-aγā- in the language of the ḥP'ags-pa script are contracted and become either ā (ā) or a'ā (āā). He considers the latter development a rare one and thus corrects what has been written previously on this subject. I cannot agree with Lewicki's remarks for the following reasons. The character transcribed as -' - by Lewicki renders a glottal stop of the Arabic type (ق). According to the spelling rules of the ḥP'ags-pa script, this character is written jointly with the preceding character when the vowels before and after -' - are the same. Thus, e.g. qa'ā is written q'a (cf. q'ān = q'a'an). On the other hand, when the vowel after -' - is different from that before the glottal stop, the character rendering the latter is written separately from the preceding character: a'ū is written a'-u (cf. ba'-u-t'u-qayi = ba'ut'qayi). Sometimes the vertical line connecting the character for -' - with the preceding character is damaged or otherwise not to be seen, and this creates the impression of the character for -' - being written separately. That an indiscernible connective line is able to mislead can be demonstrated by words misread by Lewicki in his edition of the documents in the ḥP'ags-pa script, e.g. the passage a-raγ-γa-nas-k'i'-ul-ju (arabnas kivulju) 'letting make a consecration' which he erroneously reads as ar-baγ-sa-k'i'-ul-ju (arban sakivulju) 'causing to guard it ten times.' This example suffices to demonstrate how difficult it is to divide a word, written with the ḥP'ags-pa characters, into syllables. However, even if it were possible it would be difficult as q'an and


14 Sometimes at random and erroneously; cf. my review of Pelliot's restoration in HIAS 13, pp. 264-265.


17 Mo. qyosasun < *gyuwasun, Mogol quasan 'empty' was thoroughly discussed in N. Poppe, Die Sprache der mongolischen Quadratschrift und das Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi, Asia Major N. F., I Jahrgang, I Heft, p. 100-101.
those written as qa'nu quoted by Lewicki,\textsuperscript{21} it would not write anything, because, as I have demonstrated, there are in the \textit{hP'ags-pa} script forms of the type \textit{d'ulqaquti} (i.e. with -\textit{d} written jointly with \textit{d}) and forms of the type \textit{'ihe'en, 'ulu'\textit{u}}.\textsuperscript{22} This is merely an orthographic difference. As the character -\textit{d} - renders a glottal stop it requires a preceding vowel, no matter whether the latter is denoted in writing or not, simply because a glottal stop after a consonant is impossible in Mongolian. My remarks made in \textit{Muqaddimat al-Adab} (28) Eino, Secret History Eino, Khalkha t'dono, Buriat Bono id. In connection with these forms I might add that in the orthography. I may add, that, contrary to the latter is denoted in writing or not, simply be-
tween the vowels is correct, as is his remark that inscription of Kiu-yung kulan.

Lewicki’s statement concerning the history of the long vowels is correct, as is his remark that of the first syllable in the Kalmuck language. The quality of a long vowel resulting from the contraction of two vowels usually corresponds to the orthography. I may add, that, contrary to the former and transcribed by Haenisch as cigorsun.\textsuperscript{25} However, there are exceptions: *\textit{oya} and *\textit{uyu} (e.g. *\textit{t'oya} > o ' number; *\textit{jiluya} > Kh. n\textit{zol} 'bridle, *\textit{kogesun} > Kalm. *\textit{kosn} 'foam,' *\textit{ciluge} > t\textit{silo} 'space').

The Mongolian language as represented in the \textit{Hua-yi yi-yu} is marked by numerous examples of assimilation of the vowel of the second syllable to that of the first syllable (105): n\textit{kool} < *\textit{niked 'companions,' t\textit{oro} < t\textit{ore 'law,' k\textit{oolosun} < k\textit{olesun 'sweat,' b\textit{koo}\textit{un} < *\textit{bokkeu} 'gnat.}\textsuperscript{24} A particularly interesting form is \textit{chin} 'wolf' (106); cf. \textit{Muqaddimat al-Adab} (28) \textit{chin, Secret History chin}, Kalmkha t'son, Buriat \textit{son} id. In connection with these forms I might add that in the modern Mongolian languages (Kalmkha, Buriat, Kalmuck, etc.) the ancient diphthong *\textit{ua} < *\textit{ba} has become either a short or a long vowel: Kh. joro 'omen' < *\textit{irua}, but Kh. n\textit{zrodo} and Bur. \textit{zodo 'fir-tree' < *\textit{fidua}. Interesting also are the forms \textit{ciyorsun} 'juniper' and \textit{cikor} 'devil.' The former corresponds to a form occurring in the Secret History and transcribed by Haenisch as \textit{cigorsun}\textsuperscript{25} and by Pelliot as \textit{ci\textit{gorsun}.}\textsuperscript{26} The correct transcription of this is that of Lewicki; cf. Mo. \textit{cyursu} 'une sapinière, forêt de sapins.'\textsuperscript{27} The form \textit{cikor} corresponds to Mo. \textit{cidk\textit{ur}, Kh. \textit{t'so0\textit{d}x\textit{or}, Kalmuck \textit{t'sot\textit{ki}r / t'sut\textit{ki}, Ordos \textit{n\textit{do0\textit{d}x\textit{or}, and the development *\textit{u} > \textit{o} in the second syllable is difficult to explain. Similar cases are Kalm. \textit{so0\textit{d} < *\textit{st\textit{l}u 'bouillon, soup,' Kh. \textit{t'so0\textit{d}dx\textit{or} < *\textit{cid\textit{ur} 'hobble,' Kh. \textit{sor\textit{w}os / \textit{so0\textit{m}os < *\textit{so0\textit{b}us\textit{i} 'tendon,' Kh. \textit{so0\textit{d}l\textit{k} / \textit{siul\textit{k} < *\textit{siul\textit{u} 'verse,' and others. The word \textit{ad\textit{\textacute{d}}\textit{\textacute{d}}a 'now' corresponds to Mo. \textit{ed\textit{\textacute{d}}\textit{\textacute{d}}}e and is interesting because of the vowel \textit{\textacute{d} < *\textit{u} in the second syllable. This development corroborates the rule that *\textit{uyu} > \textit{o} through *\textit{oya}; cf. \textit{hP'ags-pa} jiro\textit{g\textacute{a}n 'six,' Buriat-Alar \textit{zor\textit{y}on, Buriat-Ekhir\textit{i}t jory\textit{d} id.\textsuperscript{28} Analogically, *\textit{u\textit{g}e has developed into \textit{\textacute{d} through *\textit{ed\textit{\textacute{d}}\textit{e} > *\textit{ed\textit{\textacute{d}}\textit{\textacute{d}}e, *\textit{ciluge} > *\textit{cil\textacute{u}e} > Kh. \textit{t'sol\textit{\textacute{d} 'space, freedom,' and so on. The transitional groups *\textit{oya} and *\textit{ug\textit{e are also responsible for the development *\textit{i} > \textit{o and *\textit{u} > \textit{o in the first syllable in the Kalmuck language where *\textit{uyu} and *\textit{ug\textit{e} in the non-first syllables have resulted in \textit{\textacute{d} and \textit{z: Kalm. d\textit{zol\textit{\textacute{d} < *\textit{jiluya} < *\textit{jil\textit{ua} 'bridle, Kalm. t\textit{so0\textit{d} < *\textit{ciluge} > *\textit{cil\textacute{u}e} 'space, free time, freedom.'

The word ‘new’ occurs in the \textit{Hua-yi yi-yu} in the ancient form \textit{sin\textit{i} (106); cf. Mo. \textit{si\textit{n}, Kh. \textit{si\textit{n}, Bur. \textit{se\textit{n}a id., but \textit{Muqaddimat al-Adab} (36) \textit{si\textit{n}, Ibn Muhanna’s glossary (p. 446 of my edition) \textit{si\textit{n}, Monguor \textit{se\textit{n} id.}

Peculiar features of the language represented in the \textit{Hua-yi yi-yu} are the voiced consonants in the place of voiceless consonants and vice versa (107). Lewicki quotes interesting examples of which \textit{yudsun 'boot' has its equivalents in the Buriat dialects; cf. Alar \textit{godoh\textit{n} but in other dialects \textit{guloh\textit{n}.\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Muqaddimat al-Adab yudsun / yutu\textit{sun} id. It should be remarked about \textit{nik\textit{a}n 'one' (107) that this is probably the original ancient form but not an example of ‘assourdissement’ as Lewicki states; cf. \textit{Secret History niken, Dagur ne'k'\textit{\textacute{a}, Mogol nik\textit{a}n id.'

Lewicki’s hypothesis that Mongolian had primarily only one series of occlusives (108) gives

\textsuperscript{21} Lewicki, \textit{Hua-yi yi-yu}, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{22} Poppe, \textit{Kvadratnaia pis'mennost'}, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{23} Poppe, \textit{Mongol'skii slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{24} Lewicki erroneously derives them from forms with a *\textit{u} in the second syllable.
\textsuperscript{25} Haenisch, \textit{Wörterbuch zu Manghol un Niuca Toba-\textit{ca'an}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{26} Pelliot, \textit{Histoire Secrète des Mongols}, § 74, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{28} Poppe, \textit{Die Sprache der mongolischen Quadratschrift} und das \textit{Yuan-ch'ao pi-shi}, p. 100-101.
\textsuperscript{29} N. N. Poppe, \textit{Zametki o govore Aginskikh burijat, Trudy Mongol'skoi Komissii} 8 (1932), p. 16-17.
rise to objections; the most ancient documents of the Mongolian languages, e.g. the texts in hP'ags-pa script and the dictionaries compiled by Moslem authors, show that there were t and d, q and γ, k and g (though the relations were somehow different from the modern languages). Moreover, the Common Altaic, too, had a complete series of voiceless occlusives *t, *k, *p and another series of voiced occlusives: *d, *γ, *g, and *b. Lewicki’s remarks on the final postlingual consonants in the language of the hP'ags-pa script (109) need an addition: *γ > q and g become - before the suffix of the plural: ayima’dudun, čeriu’dun. An interesting form is ɣajarlyun, a genitive of ɣajarliq < *γajarliq. Certain words ending in *γ-γiγ lose their *γ in the plural also in Buriat dialects where *γarγudud becomes -γuüt, e.g. Buriat-Aga ɣal’ut < *γarγal’uyud ‘the people of a khan,’ ɣal’uši < *γarγal’uyidi (accusative).

Lewicki correctly points out that various scholars have transcribed the velar, postlingual consonant in different manners: some used the letter q, others ɣ (109). The mark q is to be preferred, because in Ancient Mongolian it really was q and not a spirant. This is evident from the hP’ags-pa transcription of Chinese words in which the Chinese h (pronounced as ɣ) is rendered by another character and not q; cf. γiv t’u mèv = Hou-t’u miao (name of a temple), γon jhi = huan śe ‘prince,’ γon t’ay γiv = huan t’ai hou ‘the dowager empress.’ ɣyan ši yim bodis’uḍ = Mongolian pronunciation Huan shi yin for the Chinese Kuan she yin ‘Avalokiteśvara.’ This shows that the creators of the hP’ags-pa script were anxious to distinguish between the Mongolian q and the Chinese h. We might add that the Moslem authors use for the Xongolian q the Arabic character ɣ = q while the Arabic script has three characters for various h-sounds: ɣ = h, ɣ = ɣ, and ɣ = h (the latter is used to transcribe the Mongolian h < *ɣ).

Lewicki discusses on p. 112 the Middle Mongolian h- < *ɣ (or *p). First of all, a misprint should be corrected: Dagur has ɣ- and not f. To Lewicki’s remark about the difficulty of distinguishing between ɣ- and h- in Chinese transcription I might add that in Dagur ɣ- < *ɣ- and h- < *ɣ- have converged; cf. Dag. ɣarboń < *harbun ‘ten’ and ɣarboń < *garbu- ‘to shoot.’ The same thing occurred in the Monguor language: ɣ- < h- and ɣ- < q- have converged, cf. ɣarwán < *harbun ‘ten’ and ɣawar < *gabár ‘nose.’ It is impossible to agree with Pelliot’s opinion that the sound k in koyimosun ‘stockings made of felt’ is due to a strong aspiration (Lewicki, p. 112); koyimosun is simply misspelled, and this word is written in all the remaining documents with an initial h.

To Lewicki’s discussion of the sounds s and š (113) it should be added that the groups *sqi and *ski always result in ski: cf. Mo. ayušKI < *aγušqi ‘lungs,’ giški < *giški- ‘to step, to trample.’

The form ɣada’ar ‘bridle’ = Mo. qaʃayar, Kh. xadzár, Bur. xázár is very old: cf. Secret History qada’ar, Muqaddimat al-Adab qadár, Mogol qadár, Dagur xaválo < Solon xaval, cf. Tungus (Barguzin) kadamár < *kadazfar id. This phonetic description is followed by a chapter on morphology. Lewicki starts with the derivation of nouns which are of no particular interest, because the suffixes concerned are well known. Much more interesting is the data on the declension (113 ff.). Of the forms given on p. 118 those in -uaj (e.g. kánúaj) do not belong in the declension, because these are substantive forms of pronouns of the English type mine, yours. They are never used as attributes; cf. tada irgan Bandon-i’ kanu’ai ba ya’un-uaj ba ka’un asaqqu uga-trample.’ To Lewicki’s discussion of the sounds s and š (113) it should be added that the groups *sqi and *ski always result in ski: cf. Mo. ayušKI < *aγušqi ‘lungs,’ giški < *giški- ‘to step, to trample.’

The form ɣada’ar ‘bridle’ = Mo. qaʃayar, Kh. xadzár, Bur. xázár is very old: cf. Secret History qada’ar, Muqaddimat al-Adab qadár, Mogol qadár, Dagur xaválo < Solon xaval, cf. Tungus (Barguzin) kadamár < *kadazfar id.

The form ɣada’ar ‘bridle’ = Mo. qaʃayar, Kh. xadzár, Bur. xázár is very old: cf. Secret History qada’ar, Muqaddimat al-Adab qadár, Mogol qadár, Dagur xaválo < Solon xaval, cf. Tungus (Barguzin) kadamár < *kadazfar id. This phonetic description is followed by a chapter on morphology. Lewicki starts with the derivation of nouns which are of no particular interest, because the suffixes concerned are well known. Much more interesting is the data on the declension (113 ff.). Of the forms given on p. 118 those in -uaj (e.g. kánúaj) do not belong in the declension, because these are substantive forms of pronouns of the English type mine, yours. They are never used as attributes; cf. tada irgan Bandon-i’ kanu’ai ba ya’un-uaj ba ka’un asaqqu uga-trample.’ To Lewicki’s discussion of the sounds s and š (113) it should be added that the groups *sqi and *ski always result in ski: cf. Mo. ayušKI < *aγušqi ‘lungs,’ giški < *giški- ‘to step, to trample.’

The form ɣada’ar ‘bridle’ = Mo. qaʃayar, Kh. xadzár, Bur. xázár is very old: cf. Secret History qada’ar, Muqaddimat al-Adab qadár, Mogol qadár, Dagur xaválo < Solon xaval, cf. Tungus (Barguzin) kadamár < *kadazfar id.
be a mispelled word, as Lewicki believes (119), though in the ancient language there are such forms as *morin-ča* 'from the horse;' *ger-če* 'from the house,' and in the modern language the forms *eščine* 'from this' and *teščine* 'from that' occur.

A particular feature of the declension of stems ending in *n* in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* is the gemination of it before the vowel of a suffix. The cause of this phenomenon is not known, but at any rate this gemination does not have anything in common with the appearance of the consonant *n* in the Turkic genitive and accusative: *gan-niŋ*, *gan-ni* quoted by Lewicki (121). Lewicki should know that the consonant *n* in Turkic languages is due to the influence of the pronominal declension, cf. *mān* and genitive *mān-ŋ > mā-niŋ* 'of me.'

Interesting plural forms are those in -an and -l (121-123): *dāčalān* 'coats,' *dābā'lāl* 'passes,' *kimul* 'nails.' The form in -n mentioned by Lewicki (122) has already been thoroughly discussed in various articles.²³


This is the fourth volume of a series of five, three of which have been reviewed in this JOURNAL (JAOS 67. 220 ff.; 70. 141 ff.). Mr. Ledoux died just before the publication of the third volume; fortunately, he had finished the MSS for the two volumes that were to follow. His heirs must be thanked that they have decided to complete the catalogue in the manner it was begun. Since the collection is going to be sold, as it was the wish of Mr. Ledoux, these books will be the only record left. It is a model record of a model collection, and a monument to a model collector.

Of what caliber this collector was, can be gleaned from the fact that he had assembled twenty-two Sharakus. It takes, of course, means far exceeding those of an average person to do so; but this was not the decisive factor in Ledoux's case. He was deeply interested in this enigmatic genius, and spent considerable work and expense to lift the mystery that surrounds this artist: he is the co-author, with Harold G. Henderson, of "The Surviving Works of Sharaku" (New York, 1939), which probably will remain for some time the standard work in a Western language, now that Fritz Rumpf has died.

Each print is shortly described, usually in the words of that monograph, to which the reader is referred for further details. It seems that Ledoux did not come around to make use of a correction Rumpf offered about no. 21, the famous double-portrait of Nakamura Konozō and Nakajima Wadaemon. According to Rumpf, the part played by Konozō is that of the keeper of a funayodo kanagawaya, kanagawaya being houses that rented