

Kojiki.

Review Author[s]:
Roy Andrew Miller

The Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. 29, No. 2. (Feb., 1970), pp. 441-443.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-9118%28197002%2929%3A2%3C441%3AK%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H

The Journal of Asian Studies is currently published by Association for Asian Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. 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/journals/afas.html.

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 an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Wed Nov 22 09:58:49 2006

Ch'uan-p'ai), or the "revisionists," emphasized production efficiency, control of technicians, and economic incentives. Production was disrupted by sabotage and by struggle between the two factions. However, sporadic economic improvement in the midst of a general overall decline has been noticeable, according to the author.

A parallel analysis of agriculture (chapters 2 and 3) and of domestic trade (chapter 5) reveals similar conditions of confusion, disruption, and uncertainty of outlook. As for China's foreign trade (chapter 4), it has been further complicated by the deterioration of diplomatic relations with a number of its trading partners, by the relative emphasis on science and defense, and by use of foreign trade as a tool of foreign policy. The final chapter is a sketch of seven "revisionist" economists in mainland China today.

As the author states in the preface, the book is a "synthetic" and elementary study of economic trends, with emphasis on the development in 1967, the year of the height of the Cultural Revolution. Stress is placed on ideological divisions concerning the two roads of "socialist construction" which had developed in Communist China during the 1950's, and the economic effects of the political struggle for power within the Chinese Communist Party itself. References to specific data and events are abundant, but analysis of them is rather general. Theoretical issues dividing the two factions are mostly summarized rather than analyzed, and the economic consequences of policies based on such theories are not fully examined. In the final chapter, entitled "Revisionism of the Mainland Economists," one would expect a careful examination of the economic thought and policies advocated by these economists. Instead, there are more anecdotes than analysis.

Another point of distraction is the abundant use of the Communist jargon and cliché prevalent in all the writings from the mainland. Such terms as "three red flags" (*san-mien hung-chi*) are often used without explanation or clarification.

On the whole, I Fan's study is a welcome addition to the research into economic changes in Communist China. Professionals and general readers alike may find it useful and interesting. The thirty-seven-page index may may also be helpful.

NORMAN SUN

Temple University

Kojiki. Translated by DONALD L. PHILIPPI. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1968. v, 655 pp. Appendixes, Glossary, Bibliography, Index. np.

This new translation of the earliest Japanese historical-chronicle text has much to recommend it. Philippi is certainly to be congratulated on the energy and determination which have seen him through the many pages of pseudo-Chinese-semi-Japanese mismash that is the *Kojiki* text. It certainly will be easier to direct beginning students of Japanese history or literature to this new translation than to Chamberlain's original one (especially if your library's copies have either all disappeared or are rapidly coming apart at the seams); and they will probably find its more modern English somewhat easier going, even if a little less stately, than Chamberlain's elegant 19th century English *bungo*. It will also be somewhat easier for them, once directed to Philippi's translation, to figure out what is happening in a number of critical passages where until now it has been necessary for them to try to puzzle out Chamberlain's Latin. Philippi tries to tell it like it is; and we must certainly admire his decision in this respect, though we may question some of its implementation. He renders Old Japanese *Fötö* 'vulva' uniformly throughout as 'genitals,' which seems a bit unnecessarily wide of the mark; and surely 'rectum' is neither correct nor necessary for *siri* 'buttocks' (Chamberlain's 'fundament' had it exactly right, as usual).

The single most striking feature of Philippi's translation is his admirable decision to write all Old Japanese words, including names, in a transcription which attempts to reproduce the phonological structure of the language, at least to that limited extent to which we know it from the evidence of the written records. This cannot help but cause a stir among Japanologists and literateurs, who are accustomed to reading all Japanese texts as if they were modern, standard Tokyo

dialect, regardless of their age; and since it is a decision which will perforce focus attention on the fact that Old Japanese is a different, and older language, it is a laudable one. It is discouraging to find it necessary to add that the translator's attempt at an explanation and justification for his transcription (p. 21 ff.) does not do justice either to our present state of knowledge of the problem, nor to the subject itself; and also that his account of the sounds of Old Japanese (p. 23 ff.) is very unsatisfactory, perpetuating several outmoded views and speculations that are no longer held by most specialists in the field. But it would be a pity if Philippi's unfamiliarity with linguistic materials were to detract from the importance of his decision to treat Old Japanese as Old Japanese; it is simply that his implementation of his decision would have been more convincing had he been in better command of his materials.

Having decided to write the eight vowels of Old Japanese, and even to indicate something of the consonantal configuration of the language, Philippi then goes too far in the other direction and too often writes more than is really known about the language. For example, when the Old Japanese word for the abode of the dead is written with the Chinese cliché *huang-ch'üan* 'yellow springs,' there is absolutely no justification for transcribing Old Japanese *yömï,* with *ö* and *ï* as Philippi does (e.g., p. 61 *pass.*), particularly since there is no consensus even that *yomi* is the correct 'reading' in all these cases. Note that Kurano Genji in the *Nihon ko̧ten bungaku taikei edition* (Tokyo, 1958, p. 24) suggests several possible readings, but none of them *yomi* (or *yömï*) for this passage. And most important of all, when the same word appears a few lines below in the same passage but this time written in phonograms, it is clearly Old Japanese *yömö!* Much the same is true of many other readings based on semantograms in the text. Thus, one wonders why Philippi has chosen to violate the general structural parallel in the names of the god-list in 1.8:7–15 by reading *saku-ikaduti* where most authorities would have *saki-ikaduti,* parallel with *nari-* and *Fusi-ikaduti* in the same list. It is certainly high time that we all began to transcribe Old Japanese as Old Japanese, not as the modern language of Tokyo; but when we do this, we can only transcribe with confidence those words which appear in the original text written in phonograms. All others, including semantogram and *kanbun*-expansions, should either be read in modern Japanese, or in some other way identified (as for example, with an asterisk) as being on a different level of reliability. Transcribing Old Japanese as if it were modern Tokyo clearly tells us too little about the language; but it is also possible, with Philippi, to tell us too much, i.e., more than is known.

In general, the translator could with profit have made greater use of several recent Western-language publications. Brower and Miner's *Japanese Court Poetry* could have been used to considerable advantage in rendering and interpreting several of the poems in the text; my *The Japanese Language* could have been used to bring needed order into the sections on script and language in the introduction (both are cited, but appear not be have been used, by the translator). Bruno Lewin, *Aya und Hata, Bevölkerungsgruppen Altjapans kontinentaler Herkunft* (Studien zur Japanologie, Band 3, Wiesbaden, 1962) could have been used to advantage in several places, and is missing from the bibliography (compare, for example, Lewin's translations and commentary in *op. cit.,* p. 13 ff., with the relevant corresponding passages in Philippi). Philippi is unfortunately uncritical in his acceptance of that most unlikely system of identifications by which the 'Emperor Wu' of the *Sung shu* becomes the Japanese 'Yūryaku', etc. (p. 547; cf. Lewin *op. cit.,* p. 30), a scheme so contrived and improbable that it is surely best not to give it any further currency than it has already unfortunately achieved.

Philippi's translation is painstaking, accurate, and generally literate; he does not attempt to solve problems in an original fashion, but is content to pass on to the English reader the speculations of Japanese scholarship about many passages where one feels that his own speculations would have been at least equally as attractive. Our understanding of the text has not notably improved since Chamberlain; but for that matter, neither has the text—and

it would be unfair to hold Philippi accountable for either of these circumstances.

ROY ANDREW MILLER
Yale University

Japanese Poetic Diaries. BY EARL MINER. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969. xvii, 211 pp. Bibliographical Note. $6.95.

The diaries which attain the status of a serious literary form and merit the kind of attention usually given to novels or poetry are peculiarly suited to give full play to the range of perceptions and nuances cultivated by the Japanese. In a volume for the general reader as well as for the student and specialist, Mr. Miner brings together translations of four of the most outstanding, and provides an introduction with many provocative suggestions and illuminating apercus.

The four diaries are the *Tosa Nikki* of Tsurayuki, the *Izumi Shikibu Nikki,* Basho's *Oku no Hosomichi,* and Shiki's *Botan Kuroku.* The author's introductory remarks on each of the four selections will be delightfully informative for the general reader, creating the kind of alive realization that successfully brushes away the dust of centuries. Of the *Izumi Shikibu,* for example, he remarks that the image of romance is "of courtly lovers in a shadowy villa . . . pillowing themselves in each other's arms. It is the image of full joy and full communion, the realization of desire—but revealed dimly by the beams of a clouded moon . . ." (p. 36). Of the journey which is the shaping line for Basho's account, he says ". . . the journey is in a sense without a destination, or is all destination. . . . If Tsurayuki implicitly creates the journey as a metaphor for life, Basho was obsessed with the idea . . ." (p. 45). The translator's lively and loving involvement in his material is evident and refreshing.

For the student, his general remarks on the diary as a literary genre will help to place the material. Of necessity, these remarks are general and lead to the hope that he will give us a study in depth of the literary structure and techniques involved. (Work in this area for the *Izumi Shikibu Nikki* can be found in Ohashi Kiyohide, *Izumi Shikibu Nikki no Kenkyu.*) In particular, the suggestion that the seemingly idiosyncratic method of entries is, in fact, dictated by something corresponding to the elaborate structuring of *renga* or linked verse is a tantalizing one. Entry follows entry, then, to form a calculated whole that in its patterning progression renders meaning; the pause that separates the entries is as functioning as what is written down. There is reason in what seems so random; certainly there is rhyme.

The translations are close enough, given all the problems in translating such materials, so that the student will find them valuable, particularly in seeing how certain problems are handled. There are graceful successes, as in the last lines of a poem from the *Izumi Shikibu:*

> Not even the hills
> Are barrier sufficient for my tears,
> For it is they that flow,
> "Whenever I am miserable," to form
> The Lake of Meeting I desire so much. (p. 118)

Here the author has written in English a new Japanese poem, it seems to me, using certain Japanese conventions and conceits that come off successfully in English. It conveys very well the flavor of cleverness and verbal ingenuity found in much of the court poetry. Whether this justifies the wide departure from the original poem is a question which could be explored most profitably with students. To my mind, some note should be attached to all such instances of wide liberties, even when as well done as in the example given; some such notes are given, as in the *Tosa Nikki* passage describing "those who could not even write a simple line," being so drunk that they "were staggering crosses with their foot prints" (p. 60). (The very witty rendering of G. W. Sargent goes: "Even people who have never learned to write the figure one were merrily dancing figures of eight.")

KENNETH YASUDA
University of Indiana

Ryukyuan Relations with Korea and South Sea Countries. An Annotated Translation of Documents in the Rekidai Hoan. BY ATSUSHI KOBATA and MITSUGU MATSUDA.