

After focusing on minutia, Miller attempts a *coup de grace* at the end of his curious review. Without evidence to support the contention, he speculates that I am "taken in . . . by the image of imperial majesty and splendor attached to K'ang-hsi and his reign" and also concludes that I assume that K'ang-hsi's later reign was one of "political tranquillity." I do believe that K'ang-hsi was more effective in achieving Sino-Manchu balance in his policies than any of his Ch'ing predecessors, but that judgment does not imply "imperial majesty or splendor" and certainly not "political tranquillity."⁴ And then broadening his attack, but without referring to other scholars in early Ch'ing studies, Miller calls it a field "still burdened by unsupported generalizations and unwarranted assumptions." It would be helpful if Miller would indicate the names and works of those covered by his indictment.

Those of us in early Ch'ing studies await Miller's own contributions to this field with interest and anticipation. In the meantime, one can only hope that he will deal with central issues and interpretations, rather than with sidelights, both in his current work at the Central Intelligence Agency and in any future scholarly publications.

ROBERT B. OXNAM

The Asia Society

⁴The standard English-language books that cover the K'ang-hsi reign, including *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period* and Spence's *Emperor of China*, make it clear that his reign was anything but tranquil.

Corrigendum

McKim Marriott's item of correspondence, "Interpreting Indian Society: A Monistic Alternative to Dumont's Dualism," *JAS*, XXXVI (1976), pp. 189–95, contains the following editorial error: p. 193, paragraph 3 begins, "Dumont's withdrawal from indology . . ." This should read, "Dumont's withdrawal of indology . . ." I apologize for the misleading substitution of "from" for "of" in this context.

Ed.