

statements elsewhere in *Gōngyáng*. One wonders why the passage was not rendered directly and accurately as “proper time.”

This volume also includes a translation of the *Spring and Autumn*. This translation is generally more consistent than that of *Gōngyáng*, but is marred by the translator’s decision to use passive voice in *Spring and Autumn* entries where Lǚ is the subject (noted on Yīn 5, p. 19 n. 1). Consequently, entries stating that “we conducted the rain-seeking sacrifice” become “there was a great sacrifice for rain” (Zhuāng 5, p. 32), and we find such awkward constructions as “battle was joined with the army of the state of Qì” rather than “we joined in battle with the Qì army” (Zhuāng 9, p. 57). The *Spring and Autumn* is a self-referential work written from Lǚ’s perspective. By employing passive voice to translate these entries, the translator has transformed it into a work written in third-person perspective, and in so doing has severely distorted its sense and tone. The translator offers no reasons for this change and, indeed, does not seem to be aware of the significance of what he has done.

A final concern is the cover, which features the words *bāo biǎn* 褒貶, ‘praise and blame’. Despite its lengthy association with *Spring and Autumn* exegesis, this pair appears nowhere in *Gōngyáng*, and the word *bāo* 褒, ‘praise’, occurs only once. Unfortunately, the cover thus continues to perpetuate the misconception that *Gōngyáng* is primarily concerned with praise and blame.

The editors at Palgrave Macmillan must share blame in this matter. Proper vetting of this translation during the publication process would have revealed many of these problems, but apparently this did not occur. This translation should not have been published in its present form. Its many substantial errors and misrepresentation of the style of *Gōngyáng* render it not only unhelpful to scholars but highly misleading to the general readers at whom it is aimed.

NEWELL ANN VAN AUKEN  
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

#### REFERENCES

- Chūnqiū Gōngyáng zhuàn Hé shì jiě gǔ* 春秋公羊傳何氏解詁. 1992. Edited by Hé Xiū 何休 (129–182) and Lù Dé míng 陸德明 (556–627), *Sì bù bèiyào* 四部備要.
- Chūnqiū Gōngyáng zhuàn zhùshū* 春秋公羊傳注疏. 1980. Edited by Hé Xiū 何休 (129–182) and Xú Yàn 徐彥 (Táng). 2 vols. *Sì bù bèiyào*.
- Gentz, Joachim. 2001. *Das Gongyang zhuàn: Auslegung und Kanonisierung der Frühlings- und Herbstanalen (Chunqiu)*. Opera sinologica, vol. 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mǎ Yuè rán 馬悅然 (Göran Malmqvist). 2009. Mǎ Yuè rán lùn Xīn yì Gōngyáng zhuàn èr sān shì 馬悅然論《新譯公羊傳》二三事 (Göran Malmqvist’s Jottings on *Xin Yi Gongyang zhuàn*). *Hàn xué yánjiū tōngxùn* 漢學研究通訊 28.1: 31–32.
- Malmqvist, Göran. 1971, 1975, 1977. Studies on the *Gongyang* and *Guuliang* Commentaries, parts 1–3. *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 43: 67–222; 47: 19–69; 49: 33–215.
- Stephenson, F. Richard, and Kevin K. C. Yau. 1992. Astronomical Records in the *Ch’un-ch’iu* Chronicle. *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 23: 31–51.
- Xuě Kè 雪克, comm. and modern Chinese trans., and Zhōu Fēngwǔ 周鳳五, ed. 1998. *Xīn yì Gōngyáng zhuàn* 新譯公羊傳. Taipei: Sānmín 三民.
- Yáng Bójùn 楊伯峻. [1981] 1991. Foreword (Qiányán 前言). *Chūnqiū Zuǒ zhuàn zhù* 春秋左傳注. Taipei: Fūwén.

---

*Sogdians in China: Archaeological and Art Historical Analyses of Tombs and Texts from the 3rd to the 10th Century AD*. By PATRICK WERTMANN. Archäologie in China / Archaeology in China and East Asia, vol. 5. Darmstadt: PHILIPP VON ZABERN, 2015. Pp. iv + 336, 116 plates. €86.

As indicated in its title, the purpose of this volume is to cover in detail the archaeological material related to the Sogdian presence in China from the third to the tenth centuries. There is a short introduction, a somewhat longer Part II (pp. 9–28) sketching out the history of the Sogdians from earliest time to their settlements in China and some elements of their activities there, followed by Part III,

“Archaeological artifacts from China related to the Sogdians” (pp. 29–125), the major focus of the volume. The tomb sites examined are primarily arranged geographically west to east, followed by ossuaries and finally tomb furniture held by museums both in China and outside that have no archaeological context but are clearly of Sogdian origin. The discussion of the tombs and find material is quite detailed. The scenes depicted on the stone slabs that make up the sarcophagi and stone couches are described in detail, and references are made to the secondary scholarly studies where relevant. In Part IV, “Discussion” (pp. 127–66), the author draws back to discuss overall specific items such as ossuaries, sarcophagi, and coffins, as well as themes and motifs, such as scenes of the hunts, banquets, and music and dance that occupy a major role in the art of the tombs. The very short Part V, “Conclusions” (pp. 167–70), is followed by an extensive bibliography (pp. 171–90), evidence of the scholarly interest, both in China and beyond, in the study of the Sogdians across Asia. The volume concludes with many carefully prepared ancillary materials. There are 116 plates that illustrate the text, many in glowing color that outshine their original sources. The illustration captions are listed separately, pp. 211–15, and credits, pp. 215–17. The meticulously prepared Tables 1–15 (pp. 193–210) include a listing of the materials included in the volume, a list of the Western Region localities with population figures according to the *Hanshu*, the dimensions and contents of the tombs of the Shi family cemetery at Ningxia, minute details as available of the find material from the major Sogdian tombs to the ossuaries, and much else.

There is much to say about this admirable volume but I will limit my discussion to some general themes and a few questions, as well as mentioning some errors. I find the general introduction to the history of Central Asia to be disappointing. The account of Khotan on p. 13 and other Central Asian city-states is composed of a pastiche of translations from the *Hanshu* and *Hou Hanshu* rather than a narrative based on those sources. It is not clear what a review of Central Asia going back to the Han or to the Tibetans has to do with the Sogdians in China. The treatment of the Six Dynasties, the period of important Sogdian activity, is also inadequate and perfunctory, being simply a list of dynasty names and dates.

The contribution that this volume has to offer to the study of the Sogdians in China is in Part III, which underlines the fact that the burials of these Sogdians were quite unlike what is found in their native place. The overall layout in China is like that of the Han-Chinese among whom they lived, with a passageway leading to the burial chamber, of a range of complexity based on social status, of course. In China, there generally is no evidence of the Zoroastrian exposure for animals or vultures to consume the flesh (“excarnation” is the word used by the author) followed by burial of urns containing the bones. Rather the rites would seem to honor the injunction not to contaminate sacred fire by cremation, nor to allow the body to touch the earth, but rather to place it on stone. This fine wide-ranging study of the early Sogdian experience in China allows one to see how this emigré community adjusted themselves to a new environment and yet maintained a set of traditional values. Given the complexity of the material and the amount of secondary literature on the subject, there are many questions to be addressed.

The phrasing used a number of times by the author that the skeletal remains were placed on the burial couch conflicts with his statement, for example, that “the deceased was dressed at the time of his burial” (p. 77). Since the bones were in anatomical order, it may be assumed that there had been no excarnation by dogs or vultures, and thus that there had been not only skeletal remains at the time of the burial. It was the body, not merely bones, that had been placed on the stone couch to avoid touching the earth, and it is true that there are traces of something having been burned as well as a number of animal bones scattered about, indicating that some sort of rite, not yet identified, had been performed in the burial chamber.

The term “sovereign” is frequently used in the text, obviously incorrectly, to refer to the figure of the deceased. It is probably meant as a translation for the Chinese *zhuren* 主人, but surely there is some other term better suited to the context. There is no reason at one point (p. 62) and elsewhere for the writer to say that the “sovereign” perhaps represents the “tomb owner”; as it is a certainty that it is the deceased. It is not clear why a riderless horse leads to the conjecture that it represents a goddess (p. 91), when the pairing of such a horse and empty cart is seen as a symbol of means of transportation to Paradise already in the Han. In this regard, the scenes on the two slabs on either side of the outer wall, facing each other across the doorway in the Yu Hong sarcophagus, are especially revealing. That

on the right side, as one faces the door, has no rider, but is accompanied by three men, one of whom holds the reins, and there are two dogs which are part of the *sagdid* ritual, while on the other side of the door is a crowned figure over whom a fancy umbrella is held, and whose mount has trappings of ribbons on its legs (Plate 66.1). Clearly this represents a passage to Paradise. The more elaborate figure on the left may represent the deceased in Paradise or, perhaps more likely, a welcoming deity who holds in his hand an object that may be a symbol of the deceased, that is, his record of speech, action, and thought such as figured in the meeting with Daēna in Master Shi's tomb.

As the writer observes (p. 169), the tomb material is that of high-status persons who represented only a small segment of the Sogdian population. The find material neither retained entirely their traditional Sogdian funerary practices nor were new forms exclusive to the Sogdians alone. The stone used in the burials allowed them to observe some of the Zoroastrian beliefs, that the body was not to touch the earth, but in other respects, they accepted and adopted certain aspects of their native traditions with those common among the Han-Chinese of their cultural sphere and that best suited their requirements. The writer divides the décor depicted in the tombs into two types, religious and secular. The latter, scenes of the hunt and banquets with music and dance, is taken to shed light on the former lives of the deceased in their Chinese environment, yet this emphasis may be heavily influenced by what that represented in their ancestral homeland. That is to say, the writer suggests that the scenes are not necessarily biographical but represent more general symbolic values intended to secure a prestigious life in the other world. This observation does not downplay the scenes that display the deceased's life, professions, and beliefs, probably the majority of the décor, so the biographical content was important. But here one must weigh the extent to which these scenes were biographical, and here there are largely differing opinions in the scholarly literature. All through the volume, where appropriate, the writer has cited these various views, largely content to let others speak to the significance of the material. It is also to be expected that in a study focused on the archaeology of the Sogdians in China little attention is paid to the written sources.

In a volume presenting such rich and complicated material it is inevitable that there will be some lapses. I cite a few here only to suggest that care be taken in citations:

p. 17: the river does not divide the city of Cheshi 車師; rather the river divides and flows along both sides of the height on which the city was located;

p. 23 n. 187: La Vaissière, 2004, 125ff. does not correspond to any item in the bibliography;

p. 24 n. 188: Lerner, 2001, 222, but in the bibliography that item only has pp. 18–25;

p. 25: the Ancient Letters were not found in Sogdiana as the reader may be led to believe;

p. 26: Zoroastrianism is said to be monotheistic, but the text goes on to list its many gods;

p. 40: Xu Xianxiu (d. 584) was a Northern Qi Han-Chinese official, not Northern Zhou, as is correctly noted on p. 53;

p. 46 n. 295: Dien, 2011: there is no entry for this in the bibliography, and I do not know what it should be;

p. 46 n. 296: Juliano and Dien, 2002, should be Juliano and Lerner, 2002.

p. 96 n. 494: there is a reference to Lovgren 2007 but the work is not listed in the bibliography. There is also no indication what the writer concludes about the information being cited.

The surname of J. C. Y. Watt is consistently referred to as Wyatt, both in the notes and in the bibliography.

There are very few lapses or typos in the text. On p. 15, surely the distance of Shanshan to Yangguan Pass is 1600 *li*, rather than 6600.

I find it disturbing that references to the standard histories are cited by online addresses which do not even include chapter numbers, much less pages. As a member of an older generation, I would hope that this procedure does not replace citations of the *Zhonghua shuju* edition by *juan* and page.

The reference to the “nomadic Xianbei” even centuries after they settled down in China would seem to be misleading.

This volume serves also to bring together widely scattered objects such as the Xinjiang ossuaries and objects that survive without archaeological contexts. The burial couches include those held by a museum in Macau, the Miho Museum, Japan, a couch divided between Cologne, Germany, the Musée

Guimet, Paris, and the Fine Arts Museum, Boston, and another three couches, two in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, and a final one in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. All are treated with the careful and full descriptions devoted to the more famous tombs at Xi'an and elsewhere. We find here a very useful survey of the state of what is known of the archaeology of the Sogdians in China, and thus a foundation on which to build the continuing study of this fascinating subject as well as a basis of comparison as new finds are reported. As such this book joins the distinguished series of such volumes being published by the German Archaeological Institute on the early archaeology of Eastern Asia.

ALBERT E. DIEN  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

---

*Antiquarianism, Language, and Medical Philology: From Early Modern to Modern Sino-Japanese Medical Discourses.* Edited by BENJAMIN A. ELMAN. Sir Henry Wellcome Asian Studies, vol. 12. Boston: BRILL, 2015. Pp. viii + 232. \$135.

This book, one of the products of a series of seminars led by Benjamin Elman, titled “East Asia and the Early Modern World: Fresh Perspectives on Intellectual and Cultural History 1550–1800,” challenges the notion that European medical modernity is an adequate model for understanding developments in East Asia. It does so primarily by examining one of the elephants in the room of East Asian medical history: the role played in medicine by texts and the scholarly skills needed to work with them.

In his introductory essay, Benjamin Elman situates the broader concerns of the book. For the purposes of this volume, he defines philology as “an umbrella term for any and all activities involving the study, deployment, or evaluation of ideas contained in classical texts” (p. 2) and notes that the contributions to this volume cohere around a concern for “the firsthand uses of language for medicine and the secondhand tools of philology needed to master the medical classics” (p. 3). The importance of texts and the study of texts in East Asian medicine has long been recognized, but this is the first book devoted to exploring this topic. As such it is an extremely welcome addition to the growing literature on East Asian medical history.

Apart from their general interest in the role of texts in medicine, the nine chapters in this book have little connection to one another. I will therefore present a brief summary of each chapter before concluding with an evaluation of the book as a whole.

Asaf Goldschmidt’s contribution to the volume, “Reasoning with Cases: The Transmission of Medical Knowledge in Twelfth-Century China,” is, given the period it covers, somewhat out of place among the other essays. Nevertheless, his discussion of the *Treatise on Cold Damage* (*Shanghan lun* 傷寒論)—a highly influential early text that is important in many of the chapters—provides useful contextualization. Goldschmidt analyzes the medical case records of the Song literatus and physician Xu Shuwei 許叔微 (1079–1154), author of the first Chinese book devoted entirely to such records. Goldschmidt contends that Xu was driven to this innovation by the need to reconcile contemporary medical practice with the doctrines contained in older medical texts being published and propagated by the imperial government. He begins by presenting a brief but welcome revision of the history of medical cases in China, including the often-neglected Song exemplars of the genre. This is followed by a survey of Xu’s historical context, life, and medical writings. The heart of the chapter is an examination of the first three cases from Xu’s collection. Goldschmidt concludes that Xu’s medical cases were part of an overarching effort to educate his medical peers and improve their clinical practice, an effort that largely failed, as Xu’s books were generally ignored until the Ming.

Goldschmidt’s chapter possesses much intrinsic interest. Unfortunately, his argument rests on the contention that the *Treatise on Cold Damage* had been “virtually out of circulation for centuries” (p. 20), a contention that has been seriously questioned by other scholars, including myself (“The *Treatise on Cold Damage* and the Formation of Literati Medicine: Epidemiological and Medical Change in China 1000–1400,” PhD Diss., Columbia Univ., 2015, pp. 10–54). There are also smaller problems