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(May 28th 1878—October 26th 1945)

After the cruel losses caused by the war the death of Paul Pelliot is the worst disaster that could befall Far-Eastern scholarship. He was a Master, second to none, in practically every field of Sinological studies in their widest sense. Equipped with an astounding memory, great critical acumen, analytical power, indefatigable energy and love of research, minute accuracy and ability to combine and make use of the smallest facts, the strictest logic and a scrupulous respect for truth, he stood entrenched in a firm and secure knowledge of Chinese books whenever he made his excursions into the most diverse fields of Sinology. He was equally well-read in practically everything written in whatever language relating to Chinese studies. As his researches expanded and embraced all Central-Asia his store-house of information became immense. He seemed at all times to have full access to it and the wide range of his information enabled him to draw comparative material from many sources. Not only was he in the first rank in all departments of Sinological studies proper, bibliography, linguistics, textual criticism, historical research, archaeology, history of art, history of religions etc., but he was equally eminent as Mongolist and Iranist, studying by preference, though by no means exclusively, the problems of China’s relations with the outside world, whether in ancient or in modern times.
How did Pelliot become the scholar he was? I shall in these few pages briefly attempt to trace his development. Born in 1878, after his studies in Paris with masters like Sylvain Lévi, Chavannes and Cordier, he arrived early in 1900 in Hanoi, as “pensionnaire” of that excellent institution, then just founded, the Ecole française d’Extrême-orient. After a first mission to Hué, in Annam 1) he was by decree of February 15th 1900 2), of the Governor-General of Indo-China sent to China, in order to, as the Director of the school, M. Louis Finot, explains 3), “se perfectionner dans la pratique de la langue chinoise”. He arrived in Peking in good time for the siege of the Legations and was already so proficient in the use of the language that, during a semi-armistice, he risked a very daring excursion into the enemy lines, penetrating even to Jung-lu’s headquarters where he was able to paint a rosy picture of the condition of the besieged 4). He had collected a fairly complete library of Chinese books relating to Indo-China, the East Indies and the Chinese provinces bordering on Tongking, which unfortunately was lost when, in the night of June 13th, the house of the student-interpreters of the French Legation was destroyed by fire 5). After the delivery of the legations he was able to acquire a number of paintings and rare books, among which were two volumes of the Yung-lo-ta-tien 6). He received the Légion d’honneur for his conduct during the siege.

In 1901 he returned to Hanoï, where, by decree of February 6th he was made Professor of Chinese at the Ecole 7). The same year he returned to Peking and the next couple of years, apart from another mission to Hué and a home-leave to France in 1901

1) B.E.F.E.O., II, 116. 2) B.E.F.E.O., I, 75. 3) Ibid. 74.
4) The best account of this adventure of „der allzeit ungestümme Pelliot” may be found in Theodor Ritter von Winterhalder, Kämpfe in China, 1902, pp. 317—319.
he divided his time between sojourns in China, collecting books 1), and Hanoi. There was held, from December 3—8 1902, the “premier congrès international des Études d’Extrême-orient”, for which he acted as Secretary-General 2).

In the meantime he had begun to publish. It is characteristic that his first article should be a review, and that this review should be one of a catalogue of Chinese books, viz. Courant’s Catalogue des livres chinois, coréens, japonais etc. of the Bibliothèque nationale, of which the first instalment had appeared in 1900. His second article evinces his interest in geographical matters: it is a review of Cl. Madrolle, Hai-nan et la côte continentale voisine. In this Marco Polo is mentioned in passing, and à propos of unnecessary excursions by the author, the wish is expressed that there should be, in such books “un peu plus de sobriété, et de précision!” 3). In the second volume of the Bulletin this trickle of contributions becomes a stream, in the third and fourth they gush forth like a torrent. He admires Hoang’s Tableau chronologique de la dynastie mandchoue-chinoise Ta-ts’ing” (“voilà de bon et utile travail”) 4), he criticises Schlegel, who in the first volume 5) is still treated with gloves on, for his Geographical Notes 6) emphasising the need of phonetic exactness in all attempts to identify historical geographical names 7), and he also publishes his first original work, a translation of Chou Ta-kuan’s 周達觀 Chen-la Feng-t‘u-chi 真臘風土記 8).

1) Among these books were such interesting items as “deux séries de vocabulaires bilingues, chinois-tibétain, chinois-lolo et chinois-payi du Ssen-Tchouen et du Yunnan, qui . . . . remontent au XVIIIe siècle; . . . . une série en grand format des gravures exécutées en Europe au XVIIIe siècle et représentant les victoires de l’Empereur K‘ien-long en Asie centrale”. B.E.F.E.O., I, 147. One sees how old Pelliot’s interest in these engravings was when in 1920 (T‘oung Pao, XX, pp. 183—274) he published his long article Les “conquêtes de l’empereur de la Chine”!

2) Ibid. 3) B.E.F.E.O., I, 147. 4) B.E.F.E.O., II, 88.
5) B.E.F.E.O., I, 277. 6) Published in T‘oung Pao, 1901.
7) B.E.F.E.O., 94—96. 8) Ibid., 123—177.
This first "essai" is at once a "coup de maître"; it has all the qualities that are going to distinguish his work for forty years: the same exactness, the same strict method, the same astonishingly wide information, the same critical spirit, and the same ease and clarity of treatment that could only proceed from a perfectly clear and logical mind, in full possession of the facts and sure of itself. The copious notes, as usual, are not the least important part of the article. In this same second volume he begins the first of his invaluable "Notes de bibliographie chinoise" \(^1\) in which he gives a detailed analysis of the contents of the *Ku-yi-ts'ung-shu* 古逸叢書 published in Japan \(^2\). These "Notes" were continued in volume IX of that excellent *Bulletin*, one article being concerned with publications on "Le droit chinois" \(^3\) and the third, long one, in two instalments, with an analysis of "L'œuvre de Lou Sin-yuan" (陸心源) \(^4\).

Concrete problems, exact solutions, a wide reading in Chinese books grouped around a certain problem. Could anything be more formative for a young and eager mind? He had a horror of vague speculations. In reviewing Nel's biography of Philastre, the translator of the *Yi-ching*, he exclaims: "Pour moi, j'ai peine à comprendre la sorte de prédilection qu'ont certains savants pour les...

---

2. The texts were collected by Yang Shou-ch'ing 楊守敬 (1839—1915) who in the early 'eighties was in Japan as secretary to the Chinese minister to Japan, Li Shu-ch'ang 黎庶昌 (1837—1897). Yang's notes on these books were published in 1901 under the title *Jih pen-fang-shu-chih 日本訪書志* in 16 chüan. Through Li Shu-ch'ang's good offices part of this collection was published at Tókyō in 1882—1884 as the *Ku-yi-ts'ung-shu*. On Li Shu-ch'ang cf. now Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, pp. 483—484, where another work by Li, mentioned by Pelliot, *i. c.* p. 316, *Li Hsing-shih Ts'ung-kao 黎星使叢稿*, containing useful information on Japanese reprints of old Chinese books is omitted.
textes peu intelligibles" 1). A review of Henri Cordier’s *Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales* draws from him a strong protest against the mutilation of Chinese names, so frequent in that book. “J’attache pour ma part une grosse importance à cette question de forme. Estropier un nom chinois est aussi grave que d’estropier un nom européen” 2). This review demonstrates at the same time that such a political history should utilize the numerous Chinese publications of that period, of which an excellent bibliography is given 3). Some more articles should be noted in this volume. One is a brief study 4) on *Le Bhaisiyaguru* or *Yao-shih-liu-li-kuang-ju-lai*. His first on a purely Buddhistic subject (except some remarks on the festival “Avalambana” in his criticism of Schlegel in *B.E.F.E.O.* II, 192). The second is a review 5) of J. J. M. de Groot’s contribution to the *Mitteil. d. Sem. f. Orient. Spr. zu Berlin* (V, 103—151), entitled: *Is there religious liberty in China?* Another article 6), reviewing de Groot’s *Sectarianism and Religious Persecution in China* I, gives a mass of new and interesting information on Chinese sects. And in an important note 7) on *Les Mo-ni et le Houa-hou-king* he brings to light more facts about this religion of the “Mo-ni” which would continue to fascinate him in later years, and he gives the history of that curious text, the *Hua-hu-ching* 化胡經, associating Lao-tze with the origin of Buddhism. Later, in Tun-huang, he was to discover two chapters of this important text 8).

In these last-named articles he deals for the first time with the

---

1) *B.E.F.E.O.*, III, 472.
8) *B.E.F.E.O.*, VIII, 516. They were published in the *Tun-huang Shih-shih-yi-shu* 敦煌石室遺書 (1909) and the *Shih-shih-yi-pao* 石室秘寶 (1910); cf. *J.A.*, 1913, pp. 116 fll.
history of Chinese religions. His life-long interest in the work of
the Jesuit missionaries in China appears from a long review of
Cordier's *L'imprimerie sino-européenne en Chine*. Nevertheless,
during this time his principal interest was centred round the
historical-geographical problems of the South-coast and China's
early maritime relations with the West. In Vol. III he published
a long article on *Le Fou-nan*), establishing the location of this
ancient country on the site of the historical Cambodia, supplanted
later, around 600 A.D. by Chen-la 真臘, originally a vassal state.
Volume IV of the Bulletin contains his famous *Deux itinéraires de
Chine en Inde à la fin du VIIIe siècle*, a work of nearly 300 pages,
the largest consecutive study he ever wrote. The translation takes
only a few pages, but, as he explains himself 3), it has only been
a pretext, in order to pass in review a number of related problems
concerning which many old errors seemed to have obtained a certain
“droit de cité”. Not only did he successfully introduce method and
order into a host of questions which his predecessors had often
treated in a too lackadaisical manner, but he also presented many
new and ingenious solutions. The article ends: “Quand les travaux
des autres ou les miens propres ne me paraîtront pas conciliables avec
certaines de mes idées présentes, je dirai sans ambages que je me
suis trompé. Puissé-je n'avoir pas à me rétracter trop souvent!”
After more than forty years the article remains as fundamental as
it was when it first appeared.

In the same volume of the *B.E.F.E.O.* 4) were published the
results of his mission to Huê in 1903, in collaboration with father
Cadière, missionary in Annam who had conceived the plan of that
work. It is entitled: *Première étude sur les sources annamites de

l’histoire d’Annam. It is primarily a bibliographic study which lays the foundation for the study of Annamese history.

Fou-nan, *Deux itinéraires*, Annam, — it seemed that the young and brilliant scholar was entirely wrapped up in problems somehow connected with Indo-China. But there is a prophetic note in the same volume of the *B.E.F.E.O.* showing his real ambition. He reviews Yule-Cordier’s edition of Marco Polo 1) and, after a number of corrections, he writes: “Le livre de Marco Polo sera encore pendant longtemps un fructueux champ d’études. Il est bon que de temps en temps quelqu’un se charge de réunir le résultat de ses propres recherches et celles des autres”. Here is sketched, in a few words, a large part of his life’s programme and while these words were being printed, he had already begun the preparations that would lead him on Marco Polo’s tracks: — in Central-Asia.

On July 9th 1904 he sailed “en mission” to France 2). All that transpires at first is that he will represent the Ecole at the 14th International Congress of Orientalists to be held at Algiers during the Easter vacation 1905. His contributions to the *B.E.F.E.O.* continue: in a review of Bushell’s *Chinese Art* he discusses archaeological problems for the first time 3), and also for the first time, he reviews a Russian book by Prince Oukhtomskii on Lamaïsm. Douglas’ Supplementary Catalogue of Chinese Books and Manuscripts in the British Museum is castigated 4), some books on travel on the Yang-tze are reviewed 5), and in an important review 6) of Watters’ *On Yüan Chwang’s Travels in India* the rules of Chinese phonetics are systematically applied to the identification of Central-asiaonic names 7).

---

7) As a beautiful example of the scrupulous strictness of his method one should read the discussion on p. 424—430 on the romanisation of the second character of the name Hsüan-tang.
A notice 1) in the *Bulletin* betrays the fact that he has been in St-Petersburg where he received a number of books from the Academy of Sciences as a present for the Ecole. Not until p. 478 of Vol. V of the *Bulletin* are we told that Pelliot has been charged with a scientific mission to Central-Asia and for that purpose his leave of absence has been prolonged by two years. M. Senart's address 2) to the public session of the five Academies on October 5th 1905, entitled "Un nouveau champ d'exploration archéologique: le Turkestan chinois" is printed as well as Pelliot's own speech to the Comité de l’Asie française held on December 1st 1905.

The Russians, the Germans, the Swedes and the British had, in the closing years of the 19th century, explored certain parts of Turkestan. The surprising archaeological discoveries resulting from these missions had caused a sensation in the scholarly world and an international association had been founded for the exploration of Central-Asia, of which the headquarters were at St-Petersburg. France had, so far, not been represented in the field, but a French committee had been formed in connection with this international association, and its president, M. Senart, had taken the initiative for a mission to Central-Asia. The Institut, the Ministère de l'Instruction publique, the Museum of Natural History, the geographical societies all joined in the enterprise of which the direction had been confided to Pelliot 3). For studies of natural history and geography he was to be seconded by dr. Louis Vaillant, aide major de 1er classe de l’armée coloniale, and Mr. Charles Nouette was attached to the mission as special photographer 4).

The mission started from Paris on June 15th 1906 and ended in Peking in October 1908. It is out of the question here to retrace

---

4) *B.E.F.E.O.*, VI, 482.
its itinerary and summarize its results. One should read Pelliot's address delivered at the solemn reception given to him on his return to Paris by the Comité de l'Asie française and the Société de Géographie in the great amphitheatre of the Sorbonne, to an audience of more than 4000 invited guests, on December 10th 1909 1). Or that before the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres on February 25th 1910 2). Or better still the letter to M. Senart, written in the first flush of the discovery of the hoard of MSS. at Tun-huang: Une bibliothèque médiévale retrouvée au Kansou 3). Those three weeks, on his haunches in the badly-lit cave, surrounded by MSS. "dans un hachis de langues" as he once said 4), examining with lightning rapidity every single one of 15,000 scrolls in order to decide what to take and what to leave, must have been the happiest of his life and with justifiable pride I have heard him say, many years later 5), that there was only one text which he regretted to have overlooked. I think he referred to the scroll on Manichaeism published by Lo Chen-yü 6).

"Depuis près de deux ans que je vis loin des livres, j'ai beaucoup oublié" he writes in closing this letter 7). Nobody, in reading this account of his finds, would suspect weakness of memory. Rarely was anybody better equipped than he was for the particular work to be done at Tun-huang. The results of his excavations at Tun-chuq (between Kashgar and Kucha), and in the region west of Kucha, at Duldur-âqur, are no less remarkable, but, as a Sinologue,

2) Ibid., 655—660.
4) In an after-dinner speech at the International Orientalists Congress, held at Leyden, September 1931.
5) In a lecture at The Hague, 1930.
7) B.E.F.E.O., VIII, 528.
I naturally insist on Tun-huang. In an important review 1) of Chavannes' study "Les pays d'occident d'après le Wei-lio" (T'ouny Pao, VI), he had rightly complained: "Nous n'avons autant dire pas d'anciens manuscrits chinois" and he had stressed the necessity of having comparative text material and different editions 2). Here, with one stroke, by his finds and those of Sir Aurel Stein, this situation was completely revolutionised. As he says himself: "A mon sens, ces manuscrits apportent en Sinologie deux nouveautés. D'abord, le manuscrit chinois était une catégorie à peu près inconnue dans nos bibliothèques. Sans doute, il existe des manuscrits en Chine, et d'importants; mais les bibliophiles indigènes les recherchent, et nous-mêmes étions trop peu au courant de l'imprimé pour nous mettre en quête de l'inédit.... Mais aujourd'hui nous nous apercevons que la tradition manuscrite ou imprimée n'a pas été impeccable, et qu'il faut faire, en chinois comme ailleurs, de la critique de textes. Pour cette œuvre, les manuscrits du Ts'ien-fo-tong, religieux ou profanes, nous seront d'une grande utilité. Non seulement ils vaudront pour les textes qu'ils contiennent, mais, en nous montrant les formes en usage à l'époque des T'ang dans l'écriture régulière ou cursive, ils nous permettront souvent de donner la raison d'altérations insoupçonnées ou qui nous paraissent inexplicables. La seconde nouveauté est que, pour la première fois en sinologie, nous pourrons travailler en quelque sorte sur pièces d'archives. J'entends par là que la science indigène nous a toujours mis en face de résultats. Ces résultats, nous pouvions les admettre ou les rejeter en opposant les livres les uns aux autres, mais toujours des livres, écrits après coup; nous ne disposions jamais de documents originaux, indépendants, et qui n'eussent pas été destinés à la publicité. Cette fois, nous pourrons voir pas des notes privées,

1) B.E.F.E.O., VI, 360. 2) Ibid., 361—367.
par des actes, par des correspondances, ce qu'était en fait, dans une province reculée de la Chine, du VIIe au Xe siècle, la vie réelle, vie religieuse ou vie civile, que nous ne connaissions jusqu'ici qu'en ses traits généraux et d'après des écrits dogmatiques...."

The paintings, moreover, opened an entirely new chapter in the study of the history of art.

With this journey, Pelliot's formative years are closed. To his former qualifications he had added that of the great specialist of Central Asia. He acquired a practical knowledge of Eastern Turkish at Tashkend while waiting for his luggage 2) and in the 6th volume of the Bulletin he was already able to publish a Kashgar text 3). Mongol, of which a few years earlier he had confessed ignorance 4), seems to have followed pretty soon and as the years went by he became more and more engrossed in Mongol studies, as the readers of the T'oung Pao well know. Persian and Uigur, Sogdian and Toharian, Jušen or Hsi-hsia, Tibetan and Sanskrit he could handle whenever his roving studies made it desirable. He became a Marco Polo of the spirit, equipped with all the knowledge of languages, religions and books that Marco Polo himself had lacked. He threw himself into the study of the foreign religions introduced into China: Nestorianism, Manichaeism, Mazdeism. I only mention his important publication, in cooperation with Chavannes on *Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine* 5). He became deeply involved in studies on Buddhism 6). Already in his review 7) of Chavannes'

4) *B.E.F.E.O.*, III, 651.
6) An excellent analysis by Mlle Marcelle Lalou of Pelliot's Buddhistic studies up to 1928 will be found in *Bibliographie Bouddhique*, iv—v, pp. 1—22: Rétrospective, L'œuvre du Professeur Paul Pelliot. From 1928—1933 on see the annual *Bibl. Bouddh.*
7) *B.E.F.E.O.*, VI, 379.
article on *Les pays d’occident*, quoted before, he had made penetrating remarks on the relationship of early Buddhism and Taoism, a problem to which he would return more than once, as for example in his *Autour d’une traduction sanscrite du Tao-tô-king*). He emphasised the necessity of studying the Chinese religions in their historical development: “Bouddhisme, Taoisme, et pourrais-je ajouter, Confucéisme ont toujours été pris dans l’abstrait, à part des réalités vivantes qui donnent aux systèmes leur valeur occasionnelle et leur portée. Les philosophies, les religions sont nées, ont évolué et déperissent dans des conditions données de temps et de milieu. Ce sont ces conditions qu’il faut connaître, et pour leur intelligence, un petit fait correctement établi vaut de longs raisonnements. Nous avons eu beaucoup de dilettantes…”

In 1911 Pelliot was appointed Professor at the Collège de France in a chair for the languages and the history of Central Asia. In 1921 he became Membre de l’Institut. Many honours were showered on him, memberships of foreign academies, honorary doctor’s degrees, chairmanships of learned societies. He travelled a great deal, visiting all the important libraries and archives abroad. His production went on uninterruptedly, at first chiefly in the *Journal asiatique*), from 1920 on, when he succeeded Chavannes as editor of the *T’oung Pao*, mainly in this journal, of which, after Cordier’s death in 1925, for ten years he carried the responsibility alone. Only the first

1) In this review he mentions *Mou-lze* several times, and in a note on p. 390 he states that he had completed a translation of this important work, that so far had been entirely unnoticed. His annotation however was not yet finished. It was published several years later in the *T’oung Pao*, XIX, 255—433.


3) B.E.F.E.O., VI, 400.

4) One very important exception is his long article on “Le Chou-king en caractère-anciens et le Chang chou che wen” in the *Mémoires concernant l’Asie orientale*, II, 123—177 (1916) with its fundamental discussion of the *Chin-wen* and *Ku-wen* problem.
world war brought a stagnation of several years in his production. Part of that time he served in Peking as military attaché of the French Legation and he took part in the allied expedition to Siberia. He must have made as good a soldier as he was a scholar. In his bearing there was something martial, he moved easily among people, free from that shyness that often characterizes scholars who are more at home in their closet than in a drawing-room, and he spoke well and fluently in several languages.

For more than forty years his influence on our studies has been immense. I shall not attempt to enumerate any more of his important articles. Every one of them deserves reading and re-reading. His innumerable book-reviews were sometimes more important than the books discussed. "The gentle art of making enemies", he once observed to me with a smile. At times he was perhaps over-critical and his insistence on exactness in the smallest details gave him the undeserved reputation of being a stickler. Yet he taught a younger generation what exact work should be, and he himself gave a high example of that scientific probity, that scrupulous respect of facts, that passionate search for all available data, that had been too much lacking in the old-fashioned dilettantism that is not yet dead. Was it his horror of the "à peu près" that kept him from ever attempting a larger synthesis? He wrote like many Chinese scholars, sui-pi 隨筆. There always remained so much spade-work to be done, so many facts to be ascertained and the field of his interest was so wide, that the task seemed too Herculean. Probably his mind was more analytic than synthetic, more critical than creative, and the host of facts on any given subject which he could marshall at any time was never coordinated in a more permanent form. In so far the very extent of his information defeated its ultimate purpose: the burden of knowledge
which he carried was too heavy to allow his fancy free play with it in a major composition.

Pelliot lived through the invasion and the occupation and, after a period in the "zone non-occupée" he returned to Paris and, unshaken, resumed his work. The last issues of this journal and some of the supplementary volumes bear witness to part of his activity. In the spring of 1945 he went to the U.S. as a delegate to the Congress of the Institute of Pacific Relations at Hot Springs West Va. He seemed in excellent form and gave several lectures. Some months after his return to France he went to a hospital to be operated for a complaint, as he wrote to me in a dictated letter of September 19th "rien d'organique ni de caractère malin, mais quelque chose d'assez tenace". His illness however proved fatal and on October 26th he passed away unexpectedly, only 67 years old. Our deepest sympathy goes out to his widow, Madame Pelliot.

Without him Sinology is left like an orphan. He was its watchful guardian, guiding, chiding, encouraging, and forever setting an example. His rôle was unique and irreplaceable. His works live after him and will continue to influence our studies. It is imperative that his countless articles be collected so that his entire 'œuvre' should become more easily accessible.

It is also fervently hoped that the Onomasticon in the great Marco Polo edition which he prepared jointly with professor A. C. Moule will soon be published and that the many Inedita, left by him, will appear without too much delay.

Pelliot’s death means the end of an era. A heavy burden falls on us, his younger contemporaries. We have decided to continue the T'oung Pao; professor Paul Demiéville, the successor at the Collège de France of Maspero, whose tragic death fills us equally with great sadness, has kindly consented to act as co-editor. Our task will not be an easy one in this world of post-war ruins. Yet we believe that more
than ever Sinological studies have their importance; the cooperation between Chinese and Western scholarship, so ardently advocated by Pelliot 1), is now happily a fact. We for our part shall carry on to the measure of our strength 2).

J. J. L. Duyvendak.


2) While this article was in the press, I received through the kindness of professor Demiéville, the proofs of a commemorative volume in honour of Pelliot, in which are printed obituaries by MM. Edmond Faral, Jean Filliozat, Louis Vaillant, Paul Demiéville, J. Deny, L. Hambis. From this I have borrowed one or two factual details on Pelliot's life.