

書評

Michael F. Carson (comp.): *A Concordance to Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu*. (Chinese Materials Centre, 1985. 2 Vol. 1356pp. US\$58.50)

This new addition to the concordances published by the Chinese Materials Centre in Taipei will be welcomed by all students of the language and thought in ancient China, particularly because the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* 呂氏春秋 is one of the few works that can be closely dated and around which the question of authenticity does not arise. Even a cursory dip into the Concordance brings surprises. For instance, there is a general impression that the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* is basically Legalist in its approach to government and that it has a great deal in common with the *Han fei tzu* 韓非子. It, therefore, comes as a surprise that the term, *fu ts'ou* 輻湊, which figures prominently in the *Han fei tzu*, does not appear in the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* at all. No doubt there are more of such interesting points awaiting discovery by the patient reader.

The work has a Preface (pp. ix-xvi) and a discussion of the *Text History and Editions of Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* (pp. xxvii-xliv) which gives a great deal of useful information in a convenient form for the reader.

The arrangement of the present Concordance departs from the practice followed by the two previous concordances, viz., the *Kuan-tzu* (1970) and the *Han fei tzu* (1975) in two respects. First, the entries are not arranged according to the character following the concordanced character, but according to the order of appearance in the original work, as is the case in the Harvard-Yenching Concordance Series. Second, the concordanced character appears in the entries in its full form instead of being replaced by the ○ sign. As to the first point of difference, there are advantages and disadvantages in both systems, but as far as the second is concerned, the ○ serves to catch the eye in a way the full form of the character fails to do and is, therefore, preferable.

Two points may be just worth mentioning. First, although the entries are arranged according to the order of appearance, this is only true of the order of pages. As for entries to be found on the same page, there has been no attempt to put them in order of appearance. Second, there are oversights. For example, the sentence 是月也天子以雛嘗黍 from the *Chung hsia chi* 仲夏紀 (p.212) has been inadvertently left unconcordanced. These are but minor defects beside the immense convenience of having, at long last, a concordance to this important work.

D.C. Lau

The Chinese University of Hong Kong