



Review: [untitled]
Author(s): C. R. Bawden
Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 21, No. 1/3 (1958), pp. 660-662
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/610648
Accessed: 17/03/2011 11:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and *School of Oriental and African Studies* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.*

http://www.jstor.org

that will have the widest popular appeal is its treatment of modern totalitarianism as a new and more frightful form of Oriental despotism. He is pessimistic of the ability of those countries that were the homelands of hydraulic society to resist the onrush of Communism and societal regression into a worse bureaucratic state slavery than ever before. He is scarcely more optimistic about the chances of the free countries of the West, where he finds public opinion 'ambivalent about the form and function of private property and enterprise' to escape bureaucratic state slavery. One must applaud his fervently expressed admiration for freedom but one is puzzled to find not so much as a mention of the part to be played by democratic institutions, constitutional rights, and the supremacy of law in the defence of freedom. Without such safeguards the independence of Big Business or Big Labour would seem to be but frail shields against modern style Big Government in an industrial country, especially for those minorities whose interests are not protected by these colossi. It is a commonplace of politics that the tyranny of the majority can be worse than the caprice of an arbitrary despot. The real battle for liberty in the non-Communist world is not against creeping socialism but against just such simplifications of the world situation into black and white terms as we have in this book—which, as in the case of McCarthyism in America, may lead people to prostitute the very free institutions which they pretend to prize but do not understand.

E. G. PULLEYBLANK

NICHOLAS POPPE: *The Mongolian monuments in ḥP'ags-pa script. Second edition translated and edited by John R. Krueger.* (Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 8.) xii, 147 pp., 12 plates, map. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957. DM. 30.

This volume is an English edition, somewhat revised, of Professor Poppe's earlier Russian work, which was published in 1941 but was never generally obtainable. It reproduces in facsimile the text of 13 monuments in the Mongol language and the ḥP'ags-pa, or square, script, and gives a transliteration, transcription, and translation of each, together with an extensive commentary, an account of the history and nature of the script and of the peculiarities of the language recorded in it, a glossary of all the words found in the 13 texts examined and in others as well, and an extensive bibliography. A map shows the geographical location of the monuments.

Professor Poppe here provides the first full account of the ḥP'ags-pa script as it was used for the Mongol language, and of the linguistic peculiarities of that stage of the language for which it was employed. This stage is of importance to Mongolists as it differs to some extent from what has come to be known as Written Mongolian. Professor Poppe's translations represent a considerable advance in accuracy upon the work of his forerunners, from whom he quotes extensively. His selection of texts is sufficiently wide to exemplify both script and language, and the plates bring together in one place monuments which have hitherto been accessible only with difficulty. Besides such comparatively well-known texts as the four tax-exemption decrees of 1276, 1314 (two), and 1283, the proclamations of 1306 and 1307, the Mannerheim fragment, and the two Chü-yung-kuan inscriptions, he gives photographs also of a less familiar tax-exemption edict of 1321 and of four *p'ai-tzu*. The high quality of the linguistic and philological analysis need not be insisted upon by a reviewer, and the book as a whole is sure of a warm welcome. Of its various sections the least satisfactory is the commentary and since Professor Poppe's work will certainly become the standard handbook of ḥP'ags-pa Mongol it is necessary to point out that in matters of detail the commentary must be carefully controlled by the reader.

The treatment accorded to the Chinese text of the first four tax-exemption edicts (the fifth is fragmentary) seems to me to be open to question. Professor Poppe is probably right in stating (p. 7) that these bilingual texts were first composed in Mongol and then translated into Chinese; though it is only of a very few that the Mongol text survives. However, where parallel texts exist it is probably best, as was the opinion of Haenisch (*Steuergerechtsame der chinesischen Klöster*, Leipzig, 1940, pp. 56–7) to make use of both. Professor Poppe's procedure seems to me of doubtful validity. First he has dismissed the great pioneer work of Chavannes who assembled, edited, and translated no less than 61 inscriptions with the words (p. 7): 'these inconsistencies (i.e. between the two texts) can, in the majority of cases, be explained by the inaccurate French translation of the Chinese text in the work of Ed. Chavannes'. But he has then regularly referred to the Chinese text via this 'inaccurate' translation, without citing the original Chinese. Secondly, although he frequently recalls the fact that Chavannes was working from the Chinese text, he also frequently leaves the impression that Chavannes was using the Mongol text. Thus a statement such as that in n. 19, p. 88, sub *gèyiddur* that 'Chavannes translates it "habitations"' is quite misleading. The word translated by

Chavannes is the Chinese 房舍. The use of this term does corroborate Professor Poppe's undoubtedly correct recovery of the earlier meaning of the Mongol word *keyid* (now = 'monastery') but Chavannes' translation is not strictly speaking the relevant thing.

A second example may be more important. In n. 7, p. 81, Professor Poppe discusses the difficult phrase *yorč'iqun yabuqun elč'ine*. Chavannes translated the corresponding Chinese text as 'courriers officiels qui vont et viennent pour faire appliquer (les édits impériaux)' and his translation 'qui vont et viennent' was repeated by Lewicki. Professor Poppe concludes: 'There is no basis for translating *yorč'i-* as "to go" and *yabu-* as "to come"; consequently the translation "qui vont et viennent" is not quite accurate'. As far as this statement refers to Chavannes it is quite inapplicable. His text runs 來往行踏的使臣 and it was on this basis and not that stated by Professor Poppe that he made his translation. There seems to me no obstacle to translating 來往 literally as 'qui vont et viennent' and in any case there is not much between this and Professor Poppe's own 'going to and fro'. It looks as if what happened is that the author of the Chinese text construed the Mongol as **yorč'iju yabuqun*, making it parallel for instance with the phrase *barilju yabu·ayi* discussed by Professor Poppe in his n. 12. This latter phrase appears in the Chinese text as 收執行踏的(令旨). Elsewhere, as in the edict of 1314 (Poppe II, Chavannes X) the phrase 行踏 is simplified to 行. Chavannes was mistaken in translating this as 'pour faire appliquer'. The Chinese 行 serves as a gloss in the 'Secret history' and elsewhere to Mongol *yabu-* 'to go' and the phrase 行踏, 行 evidently gives to the verbal form preceding it an habitual sense and no more: cf. Professor Poppe's translation (p. 47) 'a writ to be retained'. Nor is it indispensable, as many edicts omit it from the phrase 來往(行踏的)使臣 (e.g. the edict of 1314). The Chinese phrase 來往 was probably meant as equivalent to Mongol *yorč'i-* (though this is glossed simply 去 in the 'Secret history') while 行踏 corresponded to *yabu-*. Thus it seems that the texts of the Chinese and Mongol inscriptions differ subtly at this point, the Mongol being, as Professor Poppe says, a sort of compound, to be translated 'are under way', while the Chinese supposes the more usual Mongol construction of *converbum imperfecti* plus another verb form. But this possible elucidation has been obscured by the uncritical citation of Chavannes' translation without the original Chinese.

More than once one wishes either that Chavannes' text had not been quoted or that it had been more adequately examined; a simple statement that his translation differs from the correct translation of the Mongol text really serves no useful purpose. Note 49b would have been more helpful if it had been pointed out that the sole reason why Chavannes' translation differs from Professor Poppe's is that Chavannes mistook the phrase 提調著行者 for a nominal group meaning 'the administrators' whereas 者 as is usual in this type of language, and as Chavannes usually understood it, corresponds to the Mongol imperative suffix *-tuγai*.

Professor Poppe mentions that the main body of his book remains essentially unchanged from the original edition. It is a pity that more use was not made of the opportunities afforded by revision to bring up to date some notes rendered obsolete by such a publication as Haenisch's *Steuergerechtsame*. Note 14, p. 87, has, as far as Chavannes' translation is concerned, been overtaken, for Haenisch pointed out (op. cit., p. 40, n. 3) that the Chinese phrase 替頭裏, the phrase which misled Chavannes, is the equivalent of Mongol *oran-a*. The two texts thus correspond in meaning. Haenisch also suggested that the contradictory texts mentioned in Professor Poppe's n. 10e, p. 85, can be reconciled by supposing a forgery of the Chinese text by the clerics affected, and wilful damaging of the stele to cover the falsification. This interesting hypothesis might have been referred to.

Mr. Krueger has undertaken the difficult task of translating and editing this complicated manual. The translation is, as far as one can judge, accurate, though a few infelicities, such as the first sentence on p. 100, remain to puzzle the reader. His reduction of the number of notes by using the same reference number for words and phrases which occur in the text of more than one inscription in essentially the same form (p. 145) is not an entirely successful procedure, for he has not ensured that the text of the note is always equally applicable to the second or third occurrence of the item concerned. Thus n. 20, p. 88, as far as it concerns Chavannes, is all very well when applied to text no. I (Chavannes XLIII) but when applied to text no. II (Chavannes X) it simply does not correspond with facts. The phrase under review is in Mongol *ul·a ši·usu bu barit'uqayi* which in the Chinese text appears as 鋪馬祗應休着者. Chavannes (no. X) translates this as 'que les fournitures en chevaux de poste ne soient pas requises' and explains in a footnote that 鋪馬 means 'post-horse' and that 祗應 means 'the act of supplying something'. In

later texts he was misled by the more usual meaning ' bedding ' of 鋪 to admit this unfortunate alternative into his translations, but it is ungenerous to suppress his earlier and correct translation of the phrase 鋪馬 and to omit to explain what, to the non-sinologist, must appear the absurd translation ' literie et chevaux '.

A number of errors in the commentary might have been picked up during the work of re-editing. Thus the quotations from Wylie's work in notes 36 and 37 have been wrongly made. He did translate *gey deṅ ku* and he translated *k'ebid* as ' les abris ' (shelters), not as ' shops '. In n. 41b Chavannes is incorrectly quoted as explaining his translation ' aménagements d'eau ' as meaning ' equipment (for irrigation purposes, etc.) '. The words ' aménagement d'eau ' mean here ' distribution of waters ' and Chavannes' explanation is quite other than what is made of it. Note 43, p. 95, gives a quotation from Chavannes' translation but it is from an inscription not examined by Professor Poppe (that of 1318) and is hence strictly speaking irrelevant. The correct passage comes a couple of sides earlier and it looks as if two pages of *T'oung Pao* were turned over together by mistake. Finally, n. 6, p. 81, reads: ' . . . *noyadda* which Chavannes leaves untranslated '. Chavannes' text had 官人每 corresponding to *noyadda* and he rendered it ' fonctionnaires '. Reference to the original sources at the time of making the translation from the Russian might have permitted the detection and exclusion of such errors of fact as these.

In some ways the method of editing shows a lack of balance. One would for instance willingly barter the information offered on p. 143 that p. is an abbreviation for page, vol. for volume, and so on, for a translation of the many Russian phrases which have been left in the original tongue in what is, after all, a translation of a Russian book. To give Tibetan script as well as transliteration is superfluous and only raises the price of an already costly book. Chinese characters for such well known titles as *Hsiao-ching* should be either quite familiar to the reader or else irrelevant to him and could have been omitted. The map is in some ways curiously out of date and appears not to have been revised since it was originally drawn for the Russian edition. Especially one wishes that the key indicated which inscription was to be found at which site.

There are a few minor points to be noted:

p. 7, n. 25. Three inscriptions were published by Haenisch, dated 1350 ?, 1351, and 1352 ?.

p. 40, line 28. For ' the *t'i tien* which ' read ' the *t'i tien* who '.

p. 87, line 22. Read ' temple of *Yao* '.

p. 121, line 51. The word *bō·et'ele* should surely be translated ' as long as . . . is '; cf. Haenisch, III, 25: ' so lange keine . . . vorliegen '.

p. 125, sub *jü lu*, etc. For Chiao Te-jen read Chiao Te-jun.

p. 142, sub 135. For Tsai read Ts'ai.
For 言舌 read 話.
For 74 read 75.
For 3121 read 1321.

Ts'ai's Chinese text of no. IV (not available to Professor Poppe) permits the establishment of the year 1321 as that of the edict. It shows an extra line giving the year 1331 as the year of erection of the stele, and hence 1321 is the last year which will fit the formula for the date of promulgation.

Apart from the criticisms made above, which fall upon one part of the book only, Professor Poppe's work is a most useful and thorough handbook of the Mongol language at a stage which has up to now been insufficiently studied. Its detailed phonological and grammatical analyses, accurate translations and transliterations, and the carefully compiled glossary, will be most welcome to all Mongolists. The ḥP'ags-pa script may well prove to have been more extensively used even than is now believed. A recent publication entitled ' The Mongolian People's Republic ' (Ulan Bator, 1956) mentions (p. 107) that ' to-day, books printed in the square writing are still to be found in private collections in Inner Mongolia '.

C. R. BAWDEN

JAMES WILLIAM MORLEY: *The Japanese thrust into Siberia, 1918.* (Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University.) xv, 395 pp. New York: Columbia University Press; London, etc.: Oxford University Press, 1957. 48*s*.

Japan's intervention in Siberia cost her much money and a great deal of goodwill. Because Japan was the last of the Allies to evacuate the area—Japanese troops did not leave Vladivostock until 1922 and they remained in Northern Sakhalin until 1925—she was to bear thereafter the brunt of Soviet hostility. For the same reason the United States and, to a lesser extent, Great Britain and France regarded Japan's Siberian adventure with suspicion. Was this, they asked themselves, an attempt by Japan to establish a permanent protectorate over at least the Maritime Province ? The whole affair became an object of mistrust for many, perhaps the