

training and research effort apparently designed to fill in research and personnel gaps in their total national resources on modern Asia; second, that China and India appear to be the focal points of this intensive effort; third, that the African and Southeast Asian areas are surprisingly weak latecomers to the Soviet "social science" scene—earlier academic work on any of the two having been largely confined to linguistics, ethnology, and history; fourth, that language and area training programs are substantial and, in the case of the former, compare favorably with—indeed, in some aspects may be superior to—similar programs in the United States, though the U. S. appears considerably ahead in number, range, and size of programs, and is, of course, less limited by ideological restraints; fifth, that the Soviets still seem strongest in linguistics, history, geography, and ethnography, the traditional Russian areas of concentration, even though they are making a concerted effort to expand and strengthen work on modern Asian history, politics, economics, and international relations; sixth, that the major Soviet libraries are poor in Western sources on Asia, though some of these publications appear to be available in "restricted Institute collections" to a rather wide range of specialists in the field; and seventh, that with respect to research materials in Asian languages—especially on China, Korea and Central Asia—the Soviets have the advantage of accessibility and varying degrees of control of the areas.

These developments probably result from an increasing Soviet awareness of the inadequacy of their social science training and research on major areas of Asia; from an implicit recognition of Western, especially U. S. superiority in many of these fields, accompanied by an urgent desire to catch up; and, finally, from the greater opportunities or possibilities for a wider range of such inquiry engendered by the domestic and foreign-policy changes of the post-Stalin era.

Russian-Mongol-Chinese Conference

(Report contributed by Professor
Robert A. Rupen, Bryn Mawr College.)

Recent reports of a ten-day conference of Russian, Mongol, and Chinese scholars held in Ulan Bator, capital of the Mongolian People's Republic, in November of 1956, illuminate: (1) one form of Soviet-Chinese intellectual cooperation, with the Mongols as intermediaries; (2) another phase of renewed Chinese involvement in Outer Mongolian affairs; (3) recent publications and work in Mongolian studies, and plans for the future; and (4) the personalities involved in contemporary Mongolian studies in the three countries.¹

¹ The reports on which this account is based are: Shao Hsun-cheng, "Ho-pien Meng-ku t'ung-shih ti san-kuo hsueh-che hui-yi" ["Recording the Conference of Scholars from Three Countries on the Cooperative Compilation of a History of Mongolia"], *Hsin chien she* [New Construction], No. 3 (March 1957), pp. 63-65; [N. Shastina], "Soveshchanie istorikov-mongolovedov v Ulan-Batore" ["Conference of Historians—Mongolian Specialists in

The Conference accomplished its main task of adopting detailed plans for publication in 1965 of a joint Russian-Mongol-Chinese three-volume history of the Mongolian People's Republic. In addition, Mongol scholars (who called the Conference) delivered four reports on various phases of Mongolian history, and the conferees proposed new publications in the field of Mongolian studies. Annual conferences of a similar character are to meet alternately in Ulan Bator, Moscow, and Peking. Ten Mongols, six Russians, and three Chinese participated in the 1956 Conference, which represents another stage in the renewal of Chinese activity in Outer Mongolia: Communist China recognized the MPR in 1949, established trade relations with it in 1952, and began sending emigrants there for permanent settlement in 1955.²

Controversy at the Conference concerned mainly classification of the period of Mongolian history from the seventeenth century to 1919, subject-matter of the second volume of the proposed history. The Russians (I. Ya. Zlatkin) argued for "modern history" as the descriptive appellation, because the world had become "modern" by the seventeenth century, while the Mongols and Chinese insisted on "feudal" because Mongolia was at that stage even if the rest of the world was not. All accepted a compromise for the title of the second volume: "Feudal Mongolia in the Period of Modern History." Mongols are scheduled to write most of the three volumes, with Chinese and Soviet scholars supplying five of the total of twenty-five chapters. Preparatory work is to be completed in 1959, with writing to begin in 1960, and 1965 the target-date for publication.

The second part of the Conference dealt with delivery and discussion of four reports by Mongolian scholars. Ts. Puntsuknorob, who is Chief of the Office of Historical Research, Historical Research Institute of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party,³ delivered the first report, "Concerning the Problem of Periodic Division in Mongolian History." Kh. Perlee, archaeologist and Corresponding Member of the Mongolian Scientific Committee, presented the second report, "Ancient Cities in Mongolia."⁴ He discovered in

Ulan Bator"], *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie* [*Soviet Oriental Studies*], No. 2 (1957), pp. 171-175; and I. Ya. Zlatkin and S. V. Kisel'ev, "Soveshchanie istorikov Mongol'skoi Narodnoi Respubliki, Kitaiskoi Narodnoi Respubliki, i Sovetskogo Soyuza v Ulan-Batore" ["Conference of Historians of the Mongolian People's Republic, Chinese People's Republic, and the Soviet Union in Ulan Bator"], *Voprosy Istorii* [*Questions of History*], No. 2 (1957), pp. 211-213. Only the citation of a Mongolian report of the same conference was available: Kh. Ser-Ozhav, "Gurvan ulsyn tüükhchdiin zövlölgöön" ["A Conference of Historians of Three Nations"], *Shinzhlekha ukhaan* [*Science*], No. 1 (1957), pp. 40-41.

Cf. N. N. Poppe, "Mongolovedenie v SSSR" ["Mongolian Studies in the USSR"], *Vestnik instituta po izucheniiyu istorii i kul'turi SSSR* [*Journal of the Institute for Study of the History and Culture of the USSR*], No. 1 (14) (Munich, 1955), pp. 25-43; and Rupen rev. of *Istoriya MNR* [*History of the MPR*] (Moscow, 1954), in *Central Asiatic Journal*, I, No. 4 (1955), 297-308.

² See Rupen, "Notes on Outer Mongolia Since 1945," and "Outer Mongolia Since 1955," *PA*, XXVIII (March 1955), 71-79, and XXX (Dec. 1957), 342-357.

³ Puntsuknorob wrote *Mongolyn avtonomii üyeiin tüükh, 1911-1919* [*A History of the Period of Mongolian Autonomy, 1911-1919*] (Ulan Bator, 1955).

⁴ See Perlee's important article, "K istorii drevnikh gorodov i poselenii v Mongolii"

the MPR in ten years of work some 200 sites and remains of ancient cities, the oldest dating from the Huns of the third to the first century B.C. To continue this investigation, the Mongolian Scientific Committee and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR have established a joint archaeological expedition, which will concentrate its efforts in central and northwestern Outer Mongolia during the period 1957–59, and Chinese archaeologists were invited to join this expedition. Tsendein Damdinsuren, probably the leading contemporary Mongolian intellectual and author,⁵ delivered the third report, “Concerning the Cultural Heritage of Mongolia During the Period of Feudalism.” D. Tumur-Ochir, head of the Historical Research Institute of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People’s Revolutionary Party,⁶ spoke to the Conference on “The Influence of the October [Bolshevik] Revolution on Mongolia.” N. Jagvaral, an economist, led the Mongolian delegation at the Conference, and the other Mongols were Natsokdorji, historian and author;⁷ Serojab, an historian (see n. 1); Dorjisure, linguist and archaeologist; and Chimed, a linguist. The Mongol scholars called particular attention to important studies of ancient Turkish inscriptions by a young colleague not present at the Conference, Lubsandendeb.⁸ Mongolian publications announced at the Conference for the 1957–59 period included: text and commentary on the *Secret History*, the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* of Sagang Sečen, the *Altan Tobči*,⁹ and a collection of archival documents of pre-revolutionary and revolutionary Mongolia.

The Soviet delegation was led by S. V. Kiselëv, an archaeologist and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Kiselëv has since 1946 carried out archaeological investigations at Kara Korum (Qara Qorum), the old Mongolian capital.¹⁰ I. Ya. Zlatkin, a member of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow, apparently took the most active part of the Soviet delegates

[“Towards the History of Ancient Cities and Settlements in Mongolia”], *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* [Soviet Archaeology], No. 3 (1957), pp. 43–53.

⁵ Damdinsuren, now a professor at Choibalsan University in Ulan Bator, was born in 1908; from 1933 to 1938, and again in 1949, he studied in Leningrad at the Institute of Oriental Studies. From 1942 to 1946 he edited the leading Ulan Bator newspaper, *Ünen* [“Pravda”], and he holds three Choibalsan Prizes. His most recent work is *Istoricheskie korni Geseriada* [Historical Basis of the Geser Saga] (Moscow-Leningrad, 1957).

⁶ See Tumur-Ochir’s recent article, “O nekapitalisticheskom puti razvitiya otstalykh stran kommunizmu” [“About the Non-Capitalist Route of Development of Backward Countries to Communism”], *Voprosy Filosofii* [Questions of Philosophy], No. 1 (1956).

⁷ Natsokdorji, *Aratskoe osvoboditel’noe dvizhenie v Khobdoskom raione Vneshnei Mongolii pod rukovodstvom Ayushi* [The Arat Freedom-Movement in the Kobdo District of Outer Mongolia under the Leadership of Ayushi].

⁸ Lubsandendeb has compiled an important, 22,000-word Mongolian-Russian dictionary: *Mongol-Oros tol’; Mongol’sko-Russkii slovar’* (Moscow, 1957).

⁹ Cf. *Altan Tobči, A Brief History of the Mongols* by bLo’bzañ bsTan-’jin, *Scripta Mongolica I* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), and *Erdeni-yin Tobči, Mongolian Chronicle* by Savang Sečen, 4 vols., *Scripta Mongolica II* (1956).

¹⁰ Kiselëv’s several published works include, *Drevnyaya istoriya Yuzhnoi Sibiri* [Ancient History of Southern Siberia] (Moscow, 1951), and an important chapter on the culture of the Mongols in the 12th–14th centuries in the 1954 *Istoriya MNR* (see n. 1).

to the Conference.¹¹ Other Soviet delegates included two women, P. P. Staritsina and N. P. Shastina.¹² A. T. Yakimov, especially interested in Lamaism, has written extensively on this subject,¹³ and the other Soviet delegate to the Conference, A. M. Pechnikov, specializes in recent Mongolian economic developments. The Russians at the Conference noted that they planned early publication of monographs dealing with various phases of Mongolia, including a history of Russo-Mongol relations (Zlatkin); an edition of the traditional Mongolian legal code, the *Khalkha Jiom* (S. D. Dylykov);¹⁴ and other items.

The three Chinese at the Conference included the delegation-leader, Professor Weng Tu-chien; Professor Han Ju-lin, chairman of the Department of History at the University of Nanking; and Professor Shao Hsun-cheng, a specialist in the Mongolian middle ages. Weng Tu-chien heads the Office of Research in Mongolian History, Branch II of the Institute of History of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and specializes in early Mongolian history. The Chinese announced that their plans include translation of three major works about Mongolia,¹⁵ a listing of geographical terms with their Mongol and Chinese equivalents and alternatives, and a collection of original source materials from the Yüan Dynasty.

Two new periodical publications were announced: one a series issued semian-

¹¹ The publications of Zlatkin, a leading Soviet writer on contemporary Outer Mongolia, include: *Mongol'skaya Narodnaya Respublika* (Moscow, 1950), and the sections on Mongolia in *Novaya istoriya stran zarubezhnogo Vostoka* [*New History of Countries of the Foreign Orient*], I, 239–261, 513–523; II, 90–104. He also edited the significant 1952 compilation, *MNR—Sbornik statei* [*MPR—Collection of Articles*], and in the 1930's he edited the Ulan Bator journal, *Sovremennaya Mongoliya* [*Contemporary Mongolia*]. (The bulk of this journal is now available on microfilm at the Library of Congress.)

¹² Staritsina's publications include articles in the *Trudy Moskovskogo instituta vostokovedeniya* [*Proceedings of the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies*], No. 2 (1940), pp. 153–168, and No. 5 (1947), pp. 285–296; and in the *Kratkie soobshchenie instituta vostokovedeniya* [*Brief Communications of the Institute of Oriental Studies*], V (1952), 3–16; VI (1952), 3–15. Shastina's work includes two translations published in 1957: *Shara tudzhi; Mongol'skaya letopis' XVII veka* [*Šara tuji; Mongolian Chronicle of the 17th Century*], and *Dzhiovanni del Plano Karpini, "Istoriya Mongalov"*; *Gil'om de Rubruk, "Puteshestvie v vostochnye strany"* [*Giovanni del Plano-Carpini, "History of the Mongols"*]; *William of Rubruk, "Travels in Eastern Countries"*].

¹³ One of Yakimov's articles is "K voprosu ob obshchestvennom stroe dorevolutsionnoi Mongolii i o roli lamaizma" ["On the Question of the Social Structure of Pre-Revolutionary Mongolia and the Role of Lamaism"], *Trudy Moskovskogo instituta vostokovedenie*, No. 2 (1940).

¹⁴ Dylykov is a Buryat Mongol scholar at the Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow. He wrote *Demokraticheskoe dvizhenie mongol'skogo naroda v Kitae* [*Democratic Movement of the Mongolian People in China*] (Moscow, 1953). See Rupen rev., *FEQ*, XIV (Aug. 1955), 599–602.

¹⁵ The Chinese are translating: B. Ya. Vladimirtsov, *Obshchestvennii stroi mongolov* (Leningrad, 1934) [Carsow's French translation is, *Le Régime social des Mongols* (Paris, 1948)]; the Stalin Prize-winning, *Zolotaya Orda i eë Padenie* (2nd ed., Moscow-Leningrad 1950) [Thuret's French translation is, *La horde d'or; la domination tatare au XIII et au XIV siècle de la Mer jaune à la Mer noire* (Paris, 1939)]; and C. d'Ohsson's four-volume, *Histoire des Mongols depuis Tchinguiz-Khan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlane* (The Hague and Amsterdam, 1834).

nually in Moscow, Peking, and Ulan Bator, entitled, "Mongolian Historical Library"; the other a bulletin devoted to short articles on various Mongolian questions.

Mongolian studies in capitalist and other countries, and specifically the work of Owen Lattimore, were discussed at the Conference. Shao reports (see n. 1) that Zlatkin suggested: "Possibly because of the limitation of certain conditions, Lattimore might not always understand the actual situation in Mongolia, or he might not always be able to say all that he wants to in his writings. But much of his research-product seems quite worth absorbing. To absorb critically the products of scholars outside of the socialist states should be one of the main tasks of Marxist historians at the present time. . ."

It seems apparent that Mongolian studies are entering a new phase with increased activity by native Mongolian scholars, and Russian-Mongol-Chinese collaboration. Obviously, however, the Marxist framework which will dominate all of this work vitiates much of its value in Western eyes.

Indian and Far Eastern Studies at the University of Cambridge

(Report prepared by Mr. E. B. Ceadel, Lecturer in Japanese in the University of Cambridge.)

History of their development up to 1945

A professorship of Sanskrit was established in 1867, as an indirect result of interest in Indian languages deriving from British political connections in India. The first professor was E. B. Cowell, who held the chair until 1903 and was noteworthy for the massive amount of his publications. After a short tenure by C. Bendall, the chair was occupied by Professor E. J. Rapson from 1906 to 1936, during which period he made many important contributions to the study of Indian history and numismatics. His successor is Professor H. W. Bailey, who is well known also for his pioneering work on the Khotanese language.

A professorship of Chinese was established in 1888 when Sir Thomas Wade was appointed. In the course of his distinguished diplomatic career he had collected a fine collection of books, which he had given to the University Library two years before his appointment. The Wade collection forms the nucleus of the present Chinese collection. Wade's name is well-known as the originator of the Wade system of romanisation. After Wade's death in 1895, Professor H. A. Giles succeeded in 1897, and held the chair, to which only a very small salary was attached, until 1932 when he retired at the age of 87. Among his many publications his large *Chinese-English Dictionary* and *Chinese Biographical Dictionary* were most famous, and during his tenure Chinese was for the first time introduced as a subject for official teaching, in which official examinations could be set. Giles was succeeded in 1933 by the late Professor A. C. Moule, a full account of whose work may be found in *JAS*, XVII (Nov. 1957), 173-175. The chair held by Moule had been re-established as a chair in "Chinese Language and History,"