

Professor Chan was a man of lasting loyalties—diverse, but complementary, not competing. He retained a strong affection for colleagues with whom he was associated and for those institutions that had supported his education and scholarly work over the years. This was no less true of his devotion to his homeland. A longstanding and active member of the Academia Sinica in Taiwan, he also contributed generously to his family and hometown in Kuangtung, and was pleased to assist during his last years in the translation of his major works into Chinese.

WM. THEODORE DE BARY
Columbia University

HERRLEE GLESSNER CREEL

(1905–1994)

Herrlee Glessner Creel, the Martin A. Ryerson Emeritus Distinguished Service Professor of Chinese History at the University of Chicago, died at his home in Palos Park, Illinois, after a long illness, on June 1, 1994. He was 89. His passing marks the end of an era. He was a giant among specialists on early Chinese civilization, and has been described as the doyen of American sinologists. He established the University of Chicago as a leading center of East Asian Studies. It is not given to many men in any generation to have the impact on a significant area of scholarship that Herrlee Creel has had on our understanding of early Chinese civilization.

From the appearance of his first book in 1929 until the time of his death, Professor Creel was in the forefront of sinological scholarship. Some indication of the lasting value of his work may be seen in the fact that, although he published in this field for half a century, most of his major books remain in print. This is due not only to the quality of his scholarship but also, in no small part, to his prose style, which consistently exemplified standards of cogency, lucidity, and grace rarely found in academic writing. In his ability to explore the frontiers of knowledge, no matter how esoteric or complex the subject matter, and report his findings with a degree of clarity and elegance that made them readily accessible, not only to specialists but to the interested layman, he set standards to which most of us can only aspire. Although he described himself as a specialist on early Chinese history, the history of Chinese philosophy, and the history of Chinese governmental institutions, his range was much broader, and included contributions to archaeology and anthropology; epigraphy, philology, and linguistics; intellectual, cultural, economic, and institutional history; and philosophy, art, and literature.

Herrlee Creel was born in Chicago on January 19, 1905. He was educated at the University of Chicago: Ph.B., 1926; A.M., 1927; Ph.D., 1929 (in Chinese Philosophy). After teaching as an assistant professor of psychology at Lombard College in 1929–30, he received fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies (1930–33), the Harvard-Yenching Institute (1931–35), and the Rockefeller Foundation (1936, 1945–46). In 1936 he accepted a position at the University of Chicago, where he was Instructor in Chinese History and Language (1936–37), Assistant

Professor of Early Chinese Literature and Institutions (1937–41), Associate Professor (1941–49), Professor (1949–64), and Martin A. Ryerson Distinguished Service Professor of Chinese History (1964–74). He served as a Lieutenant Colonel of Military Intelligence in the United States Army from 1943 to 1945. He was a member of the Committee on Chinese Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, a member of its Committee on Far Eastern Studies, and President of the American Oriental Society. He was also a member of the Association for Asian Studies and of the American Philosophical Society.

The most important of his books include *The Birth of China* (1936), the first comprehensive report on the significance of the excavations at Anyang, which immediately attracted worldwide attention; *Studies in Early Chinese Culture* (1937), an influential collection of monographs; *Literary Chinese by the Inductive Method*, vols. I–III (1938–52), a pioneering, although controversial, attempt to teach literary Chinese through carefully glossed excerpts from standard classical texts; *Newspaper Chinese by the Inductive Method* (1943), an attempt to apply the same pedagogical method to the reading of Chinese newspapers; *Confucius, the Man and the Myth* (1949), a major critical analysis of the historical Confucius; *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung* (1953), an influential survey of Chinese thought; *The Origins of Statecraft in China, Vol. 1: The Western Chou Empire* (1970), a magisterial description of the polity of the Western Chou dynasty; *What is Taoism? and Other Studies in Chinese Cultural History* (1970), an influential collection of articles; and *Shen Pu-hai: A Chinese Political Philosopher of the Fourth Century B.C.* (1974), an important monograph on a little-known early Chinese specialist on administrative technique. A more complete bibliography of his writings is included as an appendix in David T. Roy and Tsuen-hsuei Tsien, eds., *Ancient China: Studies in Early Chinese Civilization* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1978), pages 343–346.

No one who ever crossed swords with Herrlee Creel in intellectual controversy, or who had the opportunity to study under him, is likely ever to forget him. He belonged to that generation of sinologists who had to learn Chinese the hard way, before any of the modern techniques of language pedagogy had been developed. His insistence on introducing students to Chinese by way of the ancient classical texts, without the benefit of any exposure to the modern language, was, and remains, controversial; yet he was a dedicated teacher whose obvious commitment to his subject left an indelible impression on all who came in contact with him. His arrival on the faculty of the University of Chicago in 1936 served to put it on the sinological map, where it has enjoyed a prominent place ever since; and that position could never have been achieved or sustained without his unrelenting efforts to build a research library and a viable program. He was a scholar of international stature whose work will endure for the foreseeable future. All in all, we shall not look upon his like again.

DAVID T. ROY
University of Chicago