

particular texts and has written a history of art that is at the same time a history from art, one that will benefit everyone interested in East-West cultural transfers. Since no one can possibly read all the evidence in the original, we should welcome Knauer's carefully executed "translations" of Chinese funerary camels.

THOMAS T. ALLSEN
The College of New Jersey

Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Berichts über den persönlichen Feldzug des Kangxi Kaisers gegen Galdan (1696–1697). By BORJIGIDAI OYUNBILIG. Tunguso-Sibirica 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999. 163 pp.

As made explicit not only by the title, but also by the author himself in his foreword, this work is not a research on the Kangxi Emperor's expedition against Galdan, but an analysis of the historiographical process and ways which led to the "official" description of this enterprise in both the Manchu and Chinese versions of the "Emperor's strategic plans for the personally operated pacification and consolidation of the north-western territories," i.e., the *Beye dailame wargi amargi babe necihiyeme toktobuba bodogon-i bithe/ Shengzu ren huangdi qinzheng pingding shuomo fanglüe*. In other words, does this work—as a representative of analogous official Qing historiographical works—respect real events, or was it written in order to glorify the Qing emperor's enterprise(s), making recourse to well-known methods like omissions, changes, or simply wrong translations concerning contemporary information found in (mainly Manchu) primary sources?

Aiming to give an answer to this question, the author—a former lecturer of Mongolian at the Zentralasiatisches Seminar of Bonn University, well versed in Mongolian, Manchu, and Chinese—focuses in the first chapter on the "Science of sources" (*Quellenkunde*) and its various problems, such as the subdivision of sources (primary, secondary, traditional, intentionally and not intentionally delivered sources) and their value and use in historiography. The research's intention is "to clarify how contemporary Central Asian primary sources have been re-elaborated and changed, in view of the later analysts' final aims, and how for different reasons they have been further altered in their Chinese translations. Finally, it is the present research's work aim to find how Manchu-Chinese official historiography as well as Chinese translations of Manchu historical compilations should be characterized as sources, and what is their real value" (pp. 11–12). In this section, the author's analysis of the "Problems of China's official historiography" (p. 23–27) focuses on four kinds of sources, namely the Shilu, Zhengshi, Biaozhuan, and Qijuzhu types, all of them to be classified as nonprimary sources.

The second part opens with an introduction to Kangxi's three expeditions against Galdan: the first from 1 April until 7 July 1696, the second from 14 October 1696 until 12 January 1697, and the third from 26 February until 4 July 1697. According to the author's well-documented analysis (see below), the only real necessary—and successful—campaign was the first one. The second, mainly devoted to amusing hunts, was stopped because Kangxi was caught in Galdan's trap and believed in his enemy's strategic lie of an imminent surrender. To present this hunting trip and Kangxi's naive miscalculation as a successful imperial expedition was therefore one of the duties of court historians, and was well managed in the compilation of the *fanglüe / bodogon-i bithe* of that campaign. The third expedition presented similar dilemmas and

problems, since Galdan died even before Kangxi could start his expedition from Ningxia, and therefore—the author concludes with grim humor—his campaign was a war against an already deceased enemy (p. 34).

The following parts of this chapter deal with the history of the compilation of the Manchu and Chinese *fanglüe*, and already in this section the author shows, with the example of the wrong translation into Chinese of the Manchu *uberi* (in Chinese rendered with *ge*), that the first versions consisted of 51 chapters each and not of 102, as generally accepted on the basis of the Chinese text (p. 39). Comparing the contents of Kangxi's Manchu letters (published in *Gong zhong dang Kangxichao zouzhe*. / *Secret Palace Memorials of the K'ang-hsi Period*. Special Series No. 8–9. Taipei: National Palace Museum 1977) with the *Beye dailame wargi amargi babe necihiyeme toktobuha bodogon-i bithe* (pp. 52–64), the author then shows the amount of information that was cut or altered in order to transform the second expedition from an “amusing hunting trip” (as it effectively was, judging from the emperor's letters) into a successful military expedition (p. 67). Direct quotations and their comparison from both works, given on the following pages, clearly prove step by step this incredible masterwork of refined historical falsification. For example (p. 75), in a letter the emperor mentions his “shooting on rabbits”—but in the *bodogon-i bithe* the same passage does not include any reference to “rabbits,” and what was left is a martially “shooting” emperor, whose target, evidently, must have been the enemy in combat. Another telling falsification is the aforementioned note regarding the end of the second expedition which, in the emperor's letter, is described as a consequence of Galdan's wish to surrender. Kangxi did not realize that this was only a tactical maneuver of Galdan, and blindly believed it: in the *bodogon-i bithe* this obvious blunder on the emperor's part obviously could not be mentioned, and instead of the “incriminating” letter we read that the emperor interrupted the war because he was inspired by feelings of piety towards an enemy begging for peace (p. 87).

The third chapter deals with the Chinese translation (*Shuomo fanglüe*) of the *bodogon-i bithe* and the mistakes—intentional or not—made by the Chinese translators. The author identifies eight kinds of “mistakes” and provides substantial evidence for each category. These categories are:

(1) Changes “ex eventu”: here we find corrections of the emperor's original statements which were not in accordance with the circumstances in the times of its translation (for example, the emperor's calculations of distances, which later proved to be wrong).

(2) Changes due to “ethnospecific” reasons: these changes were made most probably by the Han (Chinese) translators who wanted to underline the emperor's position as “Chinese” emperor, clearly distinguishing between the Middle Kingdom (*guo nei*) and “barbarians” (*guo wai*). Especially interesting is an example on pp. 110–11, where the *bodogon-i bithe*'s “*manju ambase de ala*” (inform the Manchu dignitaries) is rendered in the Chinese text as “*zhu tachen*”—i.e., [inform] all the dignitaries. The author sees this as an example of a policy that distinguished among the different nationalities and placed Manchus in the first place, a situation that could hardly be accepted in a Chinese translation made by Chinese historians.

(3) Changes due to war propaganda. It is interesting, for instance, to see how Galdan is represented in sources not depending on the Manchu/Qing viewpoint, as in a letter of Damba Qasiha to Kangxi.

(4) Additions: the examples in these cases are mainly brief explanations for the Chinese reader of passages in the Manchu original that are not easily understood, and represent, quite naturally, a Chinese perspective.

(5) Omissions: the author quotes various examples of omissions; for example, passages unworthy to be referred to the emperor as “son of Heaven.”

(6) Semantic differences: these often referred to horses, for which the Manchu language was richer and more colorful than the Chinese—for instance, a Manchu *jerde morin* (“sorrel horse”) became in Chinese a mere *chi ma* (“red horse”).

(7) Explanations: here syntactical questions are tackled, mainly aiming to make Manchu terms and concepts more comprehensible to the Chinese reader.

(8) Wrong translations: these are mainly the result of superficial and hasty work, and a proof that the translation was not successively checked against the Manchu original. One has to ask, however, if giving the price of a camel at thirty ounces in the Manchu version, but at twenty ounces in the Chinese one (as in the example on p. 146), is not a simple misprint.

With this very detailed and excellently documented study, the author dissipates all doubts—if any existed—about the value of original documents, on how they were changed and adapted to the needs of the official court historiography. Furthermore, he offers a deep inside look into the historiography of Qing China, highlighting in a very concrete way the importance of Manchu documents and sources. It is certainly not an exaggeration to state that further research in Qing history (at least until the Kangxi period but even later) should be carried out with the inclusion of Manchu sources too, whenever these are available.

In conclusion, I would like to add a minor critical remark, about the occasionally incorrect rendering of Manchu names, which sometimes are given in their right Manchu form, like Unda for Wen-da, but sometimes in Chinese transliteration only, for example, Luo-cha instead of Loca (p. 36).

GIOVANNI STARY
University of Venice

JAPAN

The Columbia Guide to Modern Japanese History. By GARY D. ALLINSON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999. xiv, 259 pp. \$45.00.

The turn of a century and new challenges to Japan’s vaunted economic growth and social stability give occasion for a fresh assessment of the experience of Japan since 1850—the period commonly labeled “modern.” Gary D. Allinson, Ellen Bayard Weedon Professor of East Asian Studies at the University of Virginia, has written a compact volume that serves both as a highly readable survey and a scholar’s handbook. The readily accessible resource guide, which fills the second half of the volume, has descriptions of leading institutions and personalities; a topical, briefly annotated bibliography, including film and on-line resources; a chronology; and key documents. The author consciously avoids theoretical sparring, and writes with a degree of human interest that can hold the attention of a novice to Japanese history. While he incorporates innovative approaches in his telling of history, the basic lines of the story do not part from mainstream historiography.