

Buddhists for them (pp. 280–81). Yet Turner has observed the integrative functions of pilgrimage. While the unity created at pilgrimage sites is fragile, and tends to dissolve when pilgrims return home, Turner notes that, over time, pilgrimages create a religious unity that transcends political boundaries. The Islamic *hadj* is an obvious example. Turner argues that pilgrimages “have a stabilizing function in regard to both local and international relations within a system of shared religious values” (Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* [Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1974], p. 175). Indeed, pilgrimages typically play such a role, as the evidence from India and elsewhere suggests. The crucial question for scholarship is not whether Kataragama *can* play a role in creating a sense of religious unity in Sri Lanka, but rather why it is that it does *not* play such a role today. In short, what I had in mind when I wrote the essay was not a “blueprint for Sri Lanka’s future,” but knowledge of the relevant literature.

BRYAN PFAFFENBERGER
Knox College

A Clarification

As Mary B. Rankin’s review of *China from the 1911 Revolution to Liberation* (*JAS* 38, no. 2 [February 1979]: 331–32), makes plain, but perhaps not sufficiently plain to the unsuspecting reader, this book is the second in a series of three volumes in English which have been translated from a series of four volumes in French. In the process of reorganization for this purpose, the first part of the present volume down to 1921 is from the French volume of which I was co-author, but the remainder of the present volume after 1921 is from a French volume with which I had no connection.

MARIE-CLAIRE BERGÈRE
École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales

A Reply to Professor Wang

C. H. Wang’s criticism of my book, *Chinese Theories of Literature*, in his review article (*JAS* 38, no. 3 [May 1979]) shows a strong streak of historicism, the limitations of which I intend to discuss in a forthcoming book. For the time being, I shall make only a few brief comments. It is anachronistic to attribute to an ancient author ideas that he could not have had, but not anachronistic to describe in one’s own terms what he said. Interpretation, by its very nature, entails “translating” an author’s words into different terms; otherwise all interpretations would be either impossible or tautological. When T. S. Eliot was asked what he meant by “Lady, three white leopards sat under a juniper-tree,” he replied by repeating the line. Eliot the poet had the privilege to do so, but Eliot the critic could not have. If we had to interpret an ancient author in the terminology of his own age, then we would have to describe the measurements of a Chou bronze not in centimeters or inches but in Chou *ch’ih*. Neither do I think it anachronistic to criticize an ancient author for what appears to be faulty reasoning. Of course I did not criticize the author of the “Major Preface” for failing to observe my categories, of which he had never heard, but for expressing several different views of poetry without explaining how they could be reconciled.

JAMES J. Y. LIU
Stanford University