sülü, "Krieg führen, zu Felde ziehen," W. Bang und A. von Gabain, "Analytischer Index der Türkischen Turfan-Texte," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, No. 12 (Berlin, 1931), 500, but I propose no etymology. Raşid al-Din, however, does not agree with Maqrizi. E. Quatremère, Historie des Mongols de la Perse (Paris, 1836) 112, line 8 has the following.

\[\text{تنكر كوركان وفا سباحش يسر سولامش أورا بتواسنت} \]

which he translates: "Tenker-kourkan étant venu à mourir, elle épousa le fils de Soulamisch." A. K. Arendt, Rašid-al-Din, Сборник Летописей, (Moscow, 1946) 331 translates "Когда Тениз-гурген скончался, ее [Тудуге] посвятал за себя его сын Суламиш." ("When Tengiz Gürgen died his son Sülemeš sought her in marriage.") Raşid al-Din, ed. Jahn (Prague, 1941) 60, last line, confirms this marriage. I am unable to say whether Sülemeš was the son of Tengiz Gürgen (reading uncertain) or the son of Áfál, grandson of Baiju. I have not found another Sülemeš.

F 111, O 303, line 3: ارچنجین For the name Irincan, cf. L. Hambis, op. cit. 74, note 4. He is mentioned in Raşid al-Din, ed. Quatremère, op. cit. 96. The name Ağacı is Turkish "lord, or commander of the troops" (Orkhon, Uighur, etc.).

F 114, O 311: King of Armenia and Takfûr of Sîs; there was no king of Armenia proper at this time. The passage may be corrupt, the meaning rather being: King of Armenia, i.e., the Takfûr of Sîs. The author, however, may be referring to a powerful feudal lord in Armenia proper when he speaks of "king." In Armenian the word t'agavor is the usual word for king, while ark'ai frequently refers to foreign monarchs (if the latter word is here the corresponding word for malik "king").

Richard N. Frye.

Harvard University.


It is difficult to judge fairly the merits and demerits of a descrip-
tive analytical study when the author lacks firsthand acquaint-
ance with his source material. In the present instance, the author
has sought to meet the handicap by a threefold program of
extensive reading, the generous use of well-qualified informants,
and the employment of modern techniques of critical analysis. She
has also attempted to turn this handicap into an advantage by
using the data as a demonstration of what a trained observer can
do with secondhand data at long range.

The reader cannot help being impressed by the orderly manner
in which the data have been assembled and by the incisive
phrasing and keen logic with which they have been presented.
These speak for themselves and are a tribute not only to the
author but to the entire study of society as a science. Dr. Benedict
is certainly to be congratulated in having made available such an
excellent study. The reader gets the impression, however, that
the justification for such an experiment has been carried some-
what to excess. He feels that the study has sufficient merit in itself
as not to have necessitated such a complete apologia as that con-
tained in Chapter I, no matter how important and true its
content.

*The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* is an interpretation of
Japanese personality and character primarily during periods of
response to emotional stress and, as Dr. Benedict points out
(p. 20), “All the ways in which the Japanese departed from
Western conventions of war were data on their view of life and
on their convictions of the whole duty of man.”

By far the most valuable aspect of the study is the analysis of
the Japanese sense of loyalty, especially as this involves the in-
curring of obligations and their repayment. A very useful table
is given on page 116 which outlines schematically these obliga-
tions and their reciprocals.

The obligations or *on* of an individual are fivefold: those re-
ceived from the emperor, from the parents, from one’s lord, from
one’s teacher, and through the contacts of daily life. Each *on*
has its reciprocal payment but the payment is of two kinds,
those which have no limit in time or space and which can never
be fully repaid (i.e., duty to the Emperor, to one’s parents, and
to one’s work) and those which can and must be specifically repaid. The first is termed *gimu* and the latter *giri* or debts which are repaid “with mathematical equivalence.” Such *giri* payments are of two types: *giri*-to-the-world, which involves duties to one’s liege lord, duties to one’s family, duties incurred as a result of gifts of money or favors, and finally duties to closely related kin such as aunts, uncles, nephews, nieces; the second type of *giri*, that to one’s name, involves the clearing of “one’s reputation of insult or imputation of failure.” This *giri* involves also two other factors: “One’s duty to admit no (professional) failure or ignorance” and “One’s duty to fulfill the Japanese proprieties, e.g., observing all respect behavior, not living above one’s station in life, curbing all displays of emotion on inappropriate occasions, etc.”

Chapters 5 through 8, the heart of the book, are devoted to this summary of Japan’s ethical code, to the sense of loyalty, and to the meaning and interpretation of obligation and to its repayment.

Useful as such a schematization may be, however, it should be borne in mind that in the minds of the Japanese the concepts of these virtues of *on*, *giri*, and *gimu* remain largely nebulous in character and are far less sharply defined than the author’s scheme would lead one to suppose. The Japanese are not conscious of any such plan or outline of behavior nor would they all agree on the precise manner in which it has been presented.

Dr. Benedict has also brought together a number of observations, many of which, while not new, serve a very useful purpose in interpreting the reasons for given action. Among these observations probably the most cogent are the extreme sense of the importance of social hierarchy and the sense of compulsion to observe the conventions which such a hierarchy imposes, a greater sense of shame than guilt on occasions of mistake or failure, and the effect or result of such an attitude under conditions of strenuous competition, the preoccupation with this life rather than the next and the duty of the individual to master completely both mind and body, especially the control of the emotions.

The greatest single weakness of the study is probably the almost total disregard for the extent to which environment—and in par-
ticular Japan's weak and vulnerable economy—has been responsible for the development of those particular responses which are so typically Japanese.

The only reason given (p. 21) for Japan's policy of aggressive expansion, especially on the continental mainland, and for participation in World War II is the transfer of this extreme sense of social hierarchy from the national scene to that of East Asia. Japan's reasoning is explained as follows: "There was anarchy in the world as long as every nation had absolute sovereignty; it was necessary for her (Japan) to fight to establish a hierarchy—under Japan of course, since she alone represented a nation truly hierarchal from top to bottom and hence understood the necessity of taking 'one's proper place.'"

Such a thesis is suggested by Japanese traditions regarding the importance attached to social hierarchy itself but it does not represent the serious reasoning either of Japanese economists or of the people as a whole. It was essentially the rallying cry of the militant jingoists of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere school of thought. This leads to a second point of weakness, the apparent or implied trust placed by Dr. Benedict upon the utterances of Japanese propagandists, as if these utterances were the real expression of the Japanese people rather than fuel to keep the home fires burning. The general propaganda line, certainly of the Japanese radio, was that Japan's lack of material resources could be more than compensated by the greatness of her spiritual resources. This again is in keeping with Japanese cultural tradition. It is very doubtful, however, if there was ever a time when there was not a lurking and probably a real fear of eventual defeat and of the consequences thereof.

It is too much to assume that the Government propaganda line was intended for more than those who had to have it in order to be convinced to carry on. There was grave doubt in the minds of a great many Japanese and especially those who were well educated. In the face of daily mounting destruction as the war progressed, the propaganda line was the only one the Government could consistently have followed. It did not, however, reflect the sober and considered opinion of informed Japanese.
Another weakness of the study is its failure to lay sufficient emphasis upon the shifting character or personality of the Japanese as expressed in terms of their response to changing circumstances. No one can question the author’s realization that Western influences, economic competition, the stunning effects of defeat, and the completely changed outlook of the people have dimmed the external expressions of conventional cultural patterns. Apparently, however, the extent of this dimming process is not realized, for it is likely that the casual observer in Japan today would scarcely recognize the traditional code as outlined in The Chrysanthemum and the Sword, so much have they been overshadowed by current forces and influences. To the trained observer, however, they would still be visible and still be active, but who can say how long some of them will survive?

There are numerous other points throughout the book which would have been greatly improved by more elaboration and by a greater emphasis upon environmental and especially economic causes. Thus considerable emphasis is placed (pp. 37-38) upon the lack of mercy measures. Unless the statement, “Preoccupation with mercy toward the damaged rather than with other welfare measures . . . is certainly alien to the Japanese” is greatly qualified, it cannot be accepted as a fair statement.

This latter is only one of several instances in which the reader feels that only half the truth has been revealed, for it is often true of Japanese character that when there is a failure in one direction there is adequate or even over compensation in another.

Possibly then this reviewer would have to summarize his total impression as the feeling that, while the stuff was most beautiful and while it was most excellently tailored, somehow there was a lack of true fit in the garment finished for the Japanese.

GORDON BOWLES.

Harvard University.