

The answer I attempted to provide some ten years ago, when the monograph was written, could, however, be justifiably criticized. Instead of following the thrust of my fieldwork, which started off with an analysis of the economics and politics of the land tenure and service tenure system, I return to a cultural value approach. Contrasting values of the Vihare, Devale, and Palace systems, so goes the argument, are institutionalized in such a way that the outward form and social organization are "parallel" and "supplementary." This, somehow, guarantees the persistence of this triple structure, as the functionally specific services each system provides to society are complementary rather than competitive. It may be argued that this is a functional-structural reification and ex-post-facto explanation of existing social structures. A much better approach might have been an analysis of these religious systems in the context of the social and economic history of Sri Lanka. The dissolution of the classical Sinhalese state and the trend toward feudalization would have explained the attempts by the Sinhalese radala aristocracy to wrest control over the peasantry from the court. "Tax-free" temple estates, both Vihare (Buddhist) and Devala (gods) estates, provided an opportunity to enhance the power position of the aristocracy. It appears that only within this macro-sociological context will we be able to provide a more satisfying explanation of religious structure in Sri Lanka and, with the appropriate modification, in other Southeast Asian countries.

HANS-DIETER EVERS

Universität Bielefeld

Han Festivals

Professor Jack L. Dull, in his review (*JAS*, XXXVI, Nov 1976, pp. 124–26) of my *Festivals in Classical China*, says that he found the book difficult to read and review. I regret this fact, but in particular I regret the reviewer's indifference to what seems to me a basic canon of reviewing: the obligation to acquaint the reader with what a book under review actually contains. Aside from a single derogatory reference to "competitive hunting," Dull tells the reader nothing concerning what festivals the book in fact discusses. His initial sentence, in my opinion, is unjust and misleading when it states that "the core of this volume is basically a copiously annotated, partial translation of the 'Treatise on Rituals' of the *Hou-Han-shu*." For example, the longest single item in the "Treatise" appears in translation in the book's fourth chapter ("The Great Exorcism"), where it covers one and one-half pages as against the sixty-four pages of the chapter as a whole (all of it dealing with the same subject). The "Treatise's" shortest item is translated in the book's tenth chapter ("The Supreme Intermediary"), two sentences (twenty-five English words), as against the eighteen pages of the chapter as a whole. Similar disproportions between translations of the "Treatise" and what Dull would call "copious annotation" characterize the other chapters. The real way in which I used the "Treatise" for writing the book is clearly stated on page 11.

The review criticizes the book for inadequately exploring Han popular beliefs and values, and suggests that these might have been better found by examining the religious background to the rise of the Buddhist and Taoist churches. Even if this suggestion were valid, it would be totally irrelevant to the book under review,

whose stated subject is the evolution of *annual observances* in Han China, *not* the evolution of the Buddhist and Taoist churches. Within the given field, I wonder if Dull really believes that much more of a popular nature could be extracted from the Han sources besides what the book already contains. In point of fact, his rejection of the "Treatise" as a source on popular festivals is far too sweeping. Granted that it approaches its subject from the point of view of the court and the government, the fact nevertheless remains that more than half a dozen of its recorded observances do have popular roots, including several of paramount importance for everyday Chinese both during the Han and later.

As to the reviewer's major criticism that the book lacks a unifying theme: such a theme is admittedly not the one suggested by him as being particularly appropriate—namely, the elaboration of New Text Confucianism. To have concentrated on such would have meant to slight or to ignore entirely those observances that did in fact have popular origins, and which therefore had little or nothing to do with New Text Confucianism. What the book tries to do is to trace the evolution, institutionalization, and attachment to fixed places in the Han festival calendar of a variety of annual ceremonial observances—some of them popular and ancient, others scholastic and recent—but particularly those having to do with the beginning of the year. The book goes on to examine the possible significance and continuity of these observances in later China, when some of them disappeared, others were absorbed into parallel observances, and still others retained their identity and vitality down to modern times. Of all this the review says not a word. Nor does it mention the fact that the topic has never heretofore been systematically explored.

DERK BODDE

University of Pennsylvania

On Translating Chinese Poetry

I am writing in response to Richard John Lynn's review (*JAS*, XXXVI, May 1977, pp. 551–54) of my two books, *Mei Yao-ch'en and the Development of Early Sung Poetry*, and *Heaven My Blanket, Earth My Pillow*. I find his review to be fair and perceptively written. Indeed, in my view, Professor Lynn's work in Chinese literary criticism is to be counted among the most sophisticated contributions in this area to date. There is one point, however, with which I feel compelled to take issue, primarily because I feel that the underlying question here is of interest to all students of classical Chinese language. This is his use of the word "paraphrase" for certain aspects of my translation practice. I wish to concentrate on two places where he does this.

(1) Lynn objects to my interpretation of a passage in *Ts'ang-lang shih-hua*, and offers an alternative translation of this passage. In reconsidering my reading in the light of his views, I must agree that he is correct to this extent: I failed to note that Mei Yao-ch'en and others of his period are in fact being praised by Yen Yü for carrying on T'ang traditions (albeit not always *High* T'ang traditions; therefore, from Yen's point of view, they are being "damned with faint praise"). I would still maintain, however, that in light of the complexity of the early Sung situation in poetry Yen is failing to do it justice. The primary point, though, is that my misreading did