
Die Erklärung dieser Schriftzeichen wirft ihrerseits nun auch wieder Licht auf manche Darstellungen auf den Bronzen.
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Erich Haenisch, Chinas Weg vom Lehnsreich zum Einheitsstaat. (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1947, Heft 3; München 1948, 23 p.)

In this lecture Prof. Haenisch discusses the crucial period of China's history, the transition from a feudal to a bureaucratic "Gentry" state. He limits his discussion to the political and moral aspects of this change, mentioning the consequences of the decay of feudalism and feudalistic thinking on politics, but especially referring to the arguments of the philosophers of this period. Basing his arguments mainly on the Chan-kuo-tse'h and the Shih-chi, Haenisch gives a vivid picture of this side of the development. However, on the other hand one should not forget that the philosophical opinions and political activities were the consequence of radical social changes which happened between the late 5th and the 3rd century B.C. In this respect much has been done in the last ten years, in this country mainly by D. Bodde in his books and articles, some of which are mentioned by Haenisch, and in China by many modern scholars, none of which is quoted. This undoubtedly is a consequence of Germany's being cut off from any communication with international research since Hitler's regime. Our ideas on the character of the provincial administration and its coming into existence in Ch'in, as well as in other parts of China, have changed as have our explanations of the "well-field" system. It cannot be denied that the Han empire adopted Confucianism, and therefore in a way kept to "traditionalism", not as a result of a decision made by some politicians, but rather as a consequence of the way in which the new leading group, the "gentry", built their new moral values. This process has been better analysed already by Franke in his "Geschichte".

The value of this short article lies in the fact that Haenisch, without mentioning it, undoubtedly draws some comparisons between the development in China during the latter half of the first millennium B.C. and today's Europe. In this light his violent stand against the "totalitarian" Ch'in and for a more traditional Han, evolving out of the breakdown of Ch'in, becomes understandable.
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Together with almost 20 smaller articles published in several journals in Switzerland, Holland, Italy and India, this book is Prof. Koppers' second fieldreport, his first being
the results of studies in Tiera del Fuego, undertaken together with P. Gusinde in the early twenties. Koppers in this book has proved once more that he and his collaborators of the "Vienna school" are not only "writing-table" ethnologists but also good field-workers: the report he gives is a full representative picture of the life of one of India's numerous primitive tribes. It is more than a pure report, as Koppers always checks his own observations against the materials brought by other scholars working before him in the same area. On the other hand, Koppers' book shows clearly some of the characteristics of his "school". He emphasizes strongly the religious part of the culture of the Bhil tribe, as this problem interests him specially, giving less attention to other aspects of the culture. For example, he refrains from publishing some festival and marriage songs because of their sexual character and gives only texts of non-sexual songs. Thus, the picture of the Bhil-culture necessarily remains incomplete in this special direction. This, of course, is only human, and a functionalist for instance writing a monography on the same tribe, would perhaps have overemphasized just this point, leaving out the religious conceptions; for completeness' sake perhaps we should have such a monography too...

Prof. Koppers states in the "fore-word" that good luck gave him the chance to study the Bhil and other Central-Indian tribes; he did not choose this tribe in India for special, scientific reasons. Still, his book hits in the center of a complex studied now by ethnologists, sociologists, and orientalists everywhere. It is the question of the behavior of a primitive culture towards a higher developed one on the side, and the problem of the origin of the high civilizations on the other. The first problem is normally studied by sociologists, and they tread the clash between European culture and indigenous cultures, for instance in Africa. But in order to get solid results the clash between Chinese and Indian civilizations and the more primitive tribes in Indo-China, Indonesia as well as in South-China and Central-India has to be studied too. Koppers' book gives much material for inquiries in this direction.

The other problem until now has been studied only for the origin of the Chinese civilization. Abundant textual material makes it possible to attack the problem of the origin of Near-Eastern, especially Anatolian cultures, in the near future. India offers special difficulties. The textual material is perhaps the richest in the world, but due to the lack of historical sense in the Indians as well as to meager geographical dates in their books, it is very hard to get any concrete facts to build on. In the last years two scholars, W. Ruben and W. Koppers tried to find a new, promising way. Both started with the study of India's still living primitive tribes. Koppers, the ethnologist, tried to get an understanding of the original Bhil culture by eliminating all cultural traits introduced by the Indian high culture. Ruben, the orientalist (especially in his book: Eisen­schniede und Daenonen, Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie, Suppl. volume), tried to reduce some cultural traits in the Indian high culture to elements originally belonging to one or several primitive cultures, thus gaining an idea of the process of the development of the high culture. Both scholars, working differently, came across a number of serious difficulties. The Bhil culture for instance contains, as Koppers was able to show, not only elements resulting from contacts with Hindu culture, but also a number of elements clearly deriving from contacts with islamic-mediterranean cultures. These elements are already deeply embedded into the whole structure of Bhil culture, in spite of their comparatively recent age, and are hardly discernable any more as foreign imports. If this is the case, much more difficult will it prove to find older layers resulting from earlier foreign influences, as we generally are not able to check the age of an element of Hindu high culture yet. On the other hand Ruben, who certainly