



Review: [Untitled]

Reviewed Work(s):

The Mongol Tales of the 32 Wooden Men (#c#n Qoyar Modun Kümün-ü Üliger) in Their Mongol Version of 1746 (1686) by Shushama Lohia

G. Kara

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 93, No. 1. (Jan. - Mar., 1973), pp. 93-94.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28197301%2F03%2993%3A1%3C93%3ATMTOT3%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

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/aos.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.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Personality in Japanese History. Introduced and edited by ALBERT M. CRAIG and DONALD H. SHIVELY. Pp. x + 481. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS. 1970. \$8.75.

Despite the overall excellence of this symposium volume, prepared by his former students as a *Festschrift* for Prof. E. O. Reischauer's sixtieth birthday, two caveats are in order. The first is that despite the stimulating introduction by Professor Craig, highly suggestive of several methodologies—anthropological, sociological, psychoanalytical—by which much more “rounded” views of Japanese personalities might be developed, few of the contributors seriously attempt all that Craig postulates. The second is that although the title suggests the entire span of Japanese history, of the 14 contributions to the book seven deal with Tokugawa era figures, six deal with Meiji or post-Meiji individuals and only one, John Pelzel's general piece on “Human Nature in the Japanese Myths,” can be classified as pre-Tokugawa.

Since all those working in the Japanese history field know the problem of trying to assemble biographical data for an in-depth portrait of any Japanese historical personality, the very fact that such a symposium as this has been put together at all is sufficient to merit high praise. Moreover, anyone reading this volume will be certainly fascinated both by the impressive range of interests of the contributors as well as by the remarkably felicitous style in which all of them have written. This reviewer was most impressed by George Akita's outstanding and highly original interpretation of Itō Miyoji, by Howard Hibbett's exciting evocation of the “tortured soul” of Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, by Donald Shively's remarkably vivid depiction of the “bizarre” Tokugawa Tsunayoshi, and by John Hall's insightful use of Ikeda Mitsumasa's private diary.

Of special pertinence in the light of Mishima Yukio's avowed interest in the philosophy of Wang Yang-ming (Ō Yō-mei) and in the Tokugawa sage-rebel Ōshio Heihachirō is Tetsuo Najita's brilliant chapter on Ōshio. Almost prophetic in his assessment, Najita writes of the “self-destructive implications of Ōshio's thinking.” (p. 175) Moreover, on p. 174 Najita states: “. . . Ōshio's structure of ethical ideas could permit him to relate thought to action, but not action to strategic organization. This was fatal to his cause. . . . His rebellion was fated to end miserably.” Reading such a judgment of Ōshio and knowing Mishima's idealization of Ōshio, one feels as though Najita were in fact writing of Mishima himself and his quixotic “assault” on the headquarters of the Self-Defense Forces. Again, when Najita describes the intensely personal nature of Ōshio's actions, the parallel with Mishima is striking: “His iconoclasm . . .

pointed less toward practical and theoretical considerations of revolt, more toward realizing immortality as a sage, as a ‘great hero.’” (p. 167) Also of great interest is Najita's conclusion that it is “misleading” to think that the Tokugawa Bakufu was “shaken at its foundation by Ōshio's rebellion.” (p. 178) Indeed, although many observers, especially foreigners, have tended to view Mishima's dramatic suicide as having caused Japanese parliamentary democracy to be “shaken at its foundation,” as Najita makes clear in the case of Ōshio, Mishima's act, like Ōshio's, has undoubtedly caused the government “concern” but has not “structurally challenged” it in a “fundamental sense.”

For the study of Japanese history in the United States, the publication of this book is a significant landmark, one in which Prof. Reischauer may take great personal pride. All of the 14 articles are by the so-called “second generation” of American scholars of things Japanese. All are currently teaching at major American universities, and all are training their own graduate students. The volume under review here surely shows these scholars to their best advantage. It demonstrates conclusively that they have not only complete competence in utilizing their Japanese source materials but also can apply to them the most sophisticated techniques of American scholarship. If, as it must, this collection of personality studies serves to secure even more firmly the “legitimacy” of Japanese studies within American academe, would that it could also convince our colleagues in Japan not only of the very high level of American research on Japan but, more importantly, of the far greater potential for this type of scholarship from the Japanese themselves.

GRANT K. GOODMAN

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The Mongol Tales of the 32 Wooden Men (Γučin Qoyar Modun Kümün-ü Üliger) in their *Mongol Version of 1746 (1686)*. Translated and annotated by SHUSHAMA LOHIA. Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 25. Pp. 290, 2 plates. Wiesbaden: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ. 1968. DM. 38.

Mongolian written sources and oral tradition not only conserve many tales and motifs of Indian origin, but even the idea of tale-collections goes back to Indian (North Indian, Nepalese, etc.) models: in the case of the “Enchanted Corpse” (*Siditü kegür*), to the *Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā*, the “Drop that Feeds the People” (*Arad-i lejigeküi dusul*), to the *Pañcatantra*, the *Arfi Borji*, *Gisene* and *Bigarmijid* or the “Thirty-Two Wooden Men,” to different collections of the tales of King Vikramāditya's Enchanted Throne. (Naturally, the frequent

interplay of the oral and literary traditions has created several recensions of one and the same topic, and sometimes it is only the frame-story that has remained more or less unchanged.) The Indian ideas, however, usually were not adopted directly into the written or oral literature of the Mongols; in most cases the Tibetan culture served as a vehicle for transferring India's cultural goods to the Far North.

Probably the Vikramāditya-cycle is one of those very few elements of Mongolian literature of Indian origin which were borrowed immediately, as Mongolian literary tradition and some colophons suggest; at least it appears to be without Tibetan antecedents. The problems of oral transmission and of the language as well as the content of two Mongolian Vikramāditya-cycles have been analysed by Bawden in *Śatapiṭaka*, vols 13 and 22 (for the language, add: the use of the concessive form *-baču* in the written sources seems to have appeared in the xviii century). The present book contains an annotated English translation of a modern printed version of the Tales of the Enchanted Throne (pp. 53-278), *Tiimen jiryalangtu Gisen-e qayan allan sirege oluysan cedege* under the title *Tučin qoyar modun kümün-ü üliġer*, ed. by *Öbör Mongġol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriġ-a* in Kalgan (alias Čiyulaltu Qayalya or Changchiak'ou, 1958) and an introduction (pp. 1-52) dealing with the interrelations of the three cognate cycles, *Arġi Borġi*, *Bigarmıjıd* and *Kisana* (though <Kṛṣṇa, >Mong. *Gisen-e*> *Gesnē*), with the comparison of the Indian versions, which have not much in common with the Mongolian cycles. Dr. Lohia discusses questions concerning the author (actually, translator) and the date of the Mongolian *Gisene*-cycle and she quotes and translates its colophon in two slightly different variants. (For safety's sake, the text and the translation of the printed variant are reproduced twice, pp. 16-17 and p. 37; misprints—not always the same—dominate both of them; although these and other errors are not too difficult to emend, still it is boring to see *manh-a baranham-a* instead of *Ma'hā Bara'ham-a* "Mahā Brāhma[na]" or *enġhvang* instead of *Agdvang* "Ñag-dbañ.") The colophon in question does not mention the legend of the two Indian monks who are said to have visited Urga in the xviii century, but it indicates the translators, their patron and the scribes as well as the place (*Furban Sayıqan*, in South Gobi?), the date and the fact that the "original" was composed in Indian (*Enedkeg*). Relying upon the identification of the patron with a Khalkha Čoyimpil *Jasay* of the xviii century, the author considers this colophon was written in 1746. A few Hindi expressions are given as the presumed originals of certain Mongolian expressions, but one may ask why just Hindi and e.g. why not Nepalese?

Some comments on some of the author's notes: note 17, p. 56, *airan* or *ayiray* "kumys, fermented (mare-)milk" have nothing to do with *araki* (or honorary *sarqud*) "brandy," for the different kinds of which see Pallas' *Sammlungen* (and, for the correct meaning, Lessing's *Dictionary*); p. 140, n. 42, see Bredon-Mitrofanov, *The Moon Year*. P. 68: *Janggi*, *kündü*, *boşoyo* are Mongolian ranks of the Manchu period. For Tibetan names and terms see p. 91, *Ningbuu* (*Sññ-po*), *Marpa*, pp. 152 ff. *Čorġi*, *Rabjamba*, *Gesġüi*, etc., p. 156, *Dälba*. In the translation it would have been better to give also the Mongolian form of the Indian or Pseudo-Indian names.

Instead of listing here my sorrowful remarks concerning the tremendous quantity of misprints and mistakes, I finish this notice by recalling Bawden's review in *BSOAS*, vol. XXXII, 1969, pp. 637-638, but mitigating its effect by the hope that even this not quite fortunate rebirth of Kṛṣṇa by Dr. Lohia will help in recovering the Enchanted Golden Throne of Bigarmıjıd.

G. KARA

UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST

Manual of Mongol Astrology and Divination, with a Critical Introduction by the Reverend ANTOINE MOSTAERT, C.I.C.M. and an Editor's Foreword by FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES. Harvard-Yenching Institute, Scripta Mongolica, IV. Pp. vi + 127, Cambridge, Mass.: HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1969. \$7.00.

Arts of divination (Mong. *tölge*, *üfel*, *üfelge*, *mergele*), an ancient witness of human interest in future events, had been widely practised by the Mongols through many centuries, but among its various kinds as, e.g., scapulimancy (*daluyin tölge*), fortune-telling by dice (*şoo-yin tölge*), by coins (*joyos-un tölge*, *Kitad-un tabun joyos-un üfel*), by cards, etc., as well as chiromancy (*yar tölge*), physiognomy, dream-reading (*Jegüdüün-ü tayılburı*), augury (*sibayun-u iro*), zoomancy (e.g., divinatory "hippology," *morin-u iro*), different other presages (e.g., *nayan nigen mayu iru-a*, *nayan tülkigür*, *arban qoyar jılün iru-a-yin üjekü*, *kümün-ü bey-e tataqu-yi üjeküi sudur*, *berı-yin jıruqai*, etc.), oracles, prophecy (*suryal* or *lüngdün*, Tib. *luñ-bstan*; cf. e.g., A. Sárközi, "On a Preclassical Mongolian Prophetic Book" in *Acta Orient. Hung.*, vol. XXIV), geomancy and weather-lore (*čay ayur-un bayidal*), strange though it may appear, it is astrology (*jıruqai*), a knowledge born in irrigation cultures, that was the most respected in the land of pasture.

Most of the Mongols' divinatory practices were of foreign origin, Indo-Tibetan and Chinese, with or without traces of an intermediary influence of the Uighur civil-