

were translations from Sanskrit and came from India, but that was usually easily recognised.) The new approach marks the inception of a new field of comparative Himalayan studies of Buddhism in which the relevance of Nepalese material is undeniable.

This book is a scholarly research work, in some way even pioneering, which addresses mainly specialists and is in some aspects open to discussion or controversy. Substantial chunks of the book are of interest to religionists and historians and interpreters of Buddhism and even educated readers of Buddhist literature among the general public, but the style of writing and lack of explanations of some terms and names current to specialists may on first perusal put them off from deeper study. On the technical side there is scope for minor improvements. The Index is not comprehensive enough which goes also for the list of abbreviations (which is not entirely alphabetical). The Bibliography would benefit from putting surnames of authors first. Some restructuring of the text, which would include incorporating some materials from notes into the main text, might also improve the readability of the book, should it ever come to its reprint. On the whole it is a valuable contribution to Buddhist scholarship.

KAREL WERNER

*School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*

THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR OF 1894–95: PERCEPTIONS, POWER, AND PRIMACY. By S.C.M. PAINE. pp. 412  
Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

doi:10.1017/S1356186308009280

The Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95 is indeed a much neglected subject in western literature, an event that irreversibly changed the scene of world politics and fundamentally altered the course of history of both the belligerents.

By the time of the hostility, Japan had already successfully carried out western-style socio-political reforms since the late 1860s in her attempt to enter into the modern era. Though still constitutionally unstable, Japan had become an industrialised nation without the rest of the world noticing. One of the fruits yielded from the Meiji Reforms (1868–71) was the creation of her modern military prowess, which would eventually plunge human society into a world war in little more than half a century. China, on the other hand, had been in the process of a socio-political decay since the early nineteenth century, which was drastically accelerated by the country's defeat in the Opium Wars against Britain (1839–41) and a Franco-British coalition (1860–61).

This background is perfectly captured by the author. The book follows the course of the war through western journalists' eye in an insightful narration, an approach never attempted before, therefore an invaluable contribution to Sino-Japanese War scholarship. The author also provides the reader with a brilliant analysis of the changing scene of colonialism in the East and the balance of power on the world stage at the time. She brings us to the realisation that the world map was changed just before the turn of the century by the emergence of two powers, the United States of America in the western hemisphere through the Spanish War of 1898, and Japan in the eastern hemisphere through the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, nearly a decade before her much more recognised victory over Russia in 1904. Aside of that, while there are few facts of significance that we have not already been aware of, Paine adds a much more pertinent Russian dimension to the picture, which offers insights into the motivation of both the belligerents and the western powers at play. Russian is here catalogued with Japan as a reformed regime, in comparison with the two unreformed regimes, China and Korea, where the war was fought. She also points out that it was at least partially through China's fear of the

Russian threat that Japan was able to hold her opponent at bay on the eve of the hostility, preventing her from making an all-out effort to prepare for the eventuality. Both these facts have been largely ignored or under-estimated in western and Chinese literature.

The major weakness of the book is obviously the lack of original Chinese sources, which seriously compromises its structural soundness, for a general account of the war would have involved consulting all the important sources and works in the major languages concerned, and a criticism of the wartime journalism would also have needed sources from both sides of the hostility to check on the relevance of the coverage. For this reason, the reader is not afforded a comprehensive narration of the course of the hostility, nor an analysis of comparative strength and readiness of the antagonists. The result therefore takes the form of a compromise between a general history and a case study of journalism.

Mistakes in factual narration caused by quotations from unchecked sources would also have been easily avoided had the author had access to original sources. For instance, there were no “Moslem banners” in the Chinese military structure, as quoted in page 141, and *The New York Times*’s report that “the Chinese and Manchu soldiers frequently attacked one another, and many bloody fights have taken place” (p. 169), which is quoted as a fact, is in effect a hearsay never recorded by Chinese or Japanese sources. Fights between Chinese units did occur in the battles of P’yngyang and Port Arthur but they were the results of the confusion caused by countermands rather than ethnic hostility.

Furthermore, misdates such as the Emperors Kangxi and Yongzheng’s “combined rule extended from 1661 to 1799” (the correct dates should be 1661–1735) are hard to explain, and the combination of the Pinying, which is a pronouncing system used with the simplified characters in mainland China, and the traditional characters, which are used in Taiwan and Hong Kong with the Wade-Giles pronouncing system, gives the reader an odd impression.

LIU WEI  
Zhejiang University, China

LOAN-WORDS IN INDONESIAN AND MALAY. Edited by RUSSEL JONES. pp. 360. Leiden, KITLV Press, 2007.

doi:10.1017/S1356186308009292

Finding comprehensive and reliable information about the origins of Indonesian and Malay loan-words has always been difficult. Few Indonesian and Malay general dictionaries, monolingual or bilingual, contain such information. Moreover, most of those that do mark loan-words, including Wilkinson (1959), Karow and Hilgers-Hesse (1962), Labrousse (1984), and some others, are out of print and difficult to find nowadays outside of scholarly libraries. The only recent bilingual dictionary that is readily available and that contains etymological information is Stevens and Schmidgall-Tellings (2004). In addition, a series of check-lists of varying quality exists, under the general title of the Indonesian Etymological Project, published irregularly between 1978 and 1997 that covers loan words from Sanskrit (1997), Arabic (and Persian) (1978), Chinese (in press) and European languages (1983). It is very difficult to find copies of the individual volumes in this series. There also exist some monographs, such as Santa Maria (1967) on Portuguese loans, and Kong Yuan Zhi (1987) on Chinese loans. The etymological information provided in general dictionaries, moreover, is most often limited to just an abbreviation for the source (for example, S for Sanskrit, A for Arabic, etc.) without any further details or discussion.

The book under review is therefore a welcome addition to our knowledge of loan-words in Indonesian and Malay. Based on meticulous scholarship and beautifully produced, this work has in-depth information about loan-words in Indonesian and Malay, contains much more reliable and