REVIEWS

THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

URI RUBIN:
Between Bible and Qur’an: the Children of Israel and the Islamic self-image.
(Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam, 17.) xiii, 318 pp.

Rubin tackles the fascinating and crucial issue of the development of the Islamic self-image and perception of world history in the first few centuries of Islam. He does so by examining that self-image in relation to monotheistic groups that preceded Muslims, generally designated as the ‘Children of Israel’, ‘Jews’, ‘Christians’, ‘those who were before you’, etc. His sources are extensive and drawn from various types of hadiths: Sunni and Shi‘; legal, exegetical and historiographical; sound (sahih) and unsound. The isnads are not examined for authenticity, but general regions in which the hadiths were first circulated. Although Rubin examines these sources from a literary point of view and makes no attempt to determine the historicity of the events described in them, they are placed within the chronology of the development of the Islamic self-image.

Rubin argues that the history of Muhammad was produced under the impact of later events, particularly the great conquests outside Arabia, and so the first stages of development of Islamic historical perception should begin with the events outside Arabia. Hence, chapters i and ii begin by examining traditions from the period of the Arab conquest of Syria which reflect the apologetic needs of the conquerors. Through traditions by Ka‘b al-Ahbar, a Jewish convert to Islam, an Arab-Jewish messianism is created that provides divine legitimization for the Islamic conquest. The early Islamic historiographers saw the conquest as fulfilment of a divine promise given in the Torah and as a renewed version of the Israelite conquest of Canaan. The messianic theme of the Lost Tribes of Israel, who in these hadiths fight alongside Muslims in an eschatological battle for Constantinople, further demonstrates that Jews and Arabs shared a divine mission to drive out the Byzantines from the Holy Land. Chapter ii examines hadiths that demonstrate reactions against this focus on Syria and the Promised Land at the expense of Arabia. The Jewish-Arab messianism was redirected so as to elevate the Hijaz to the rank of the Promised Land. This was done, for example, by making the Ka‘ba a destination of pilgrimage for the prophets before Muhammad and by linking the Lost Tribes to Arabia.

Chapters iii to v explore the more familiar depiction of the Children of Israel in early Islamic literature. No longer are they righteous believers. Instead, because of their sinfulness, they are inferior to the righteous Arabs. Chapter iii shows how various sins of the Children of Israel already delineated in the Qur’an (such as the unwillingness of the Israelite spies sent by Moses to fight for the Promised Land) are used to contrast with devout Muslims who are ready to follow Muhammad into any battle. Similarly, chapter iv examines traditions about the Children of Israel’s refusal to say hiṣṣa (derived
from the biblical story of *shibboleth* according to Rubin), which in the Quran is seen as an act of deliberate disobedience and rejection of God’s mercy. Once again, Muslims (with Muhammad on the way to al-Hudaybiyya) demonstrate their superiority by making the required statement. Chapter v shows that the Children of Israel have been replaced by Arab believers as God’s chosen people because of the latter’s virtues and the former’s worship of the golden calf.

In chapters vi to x yet another stage of development in the Islamic self-image is highlighted. Now the sins of the Children of Israel are shared by Muslims. Chapter vi discusses the *firaq* tradition—that is, Muslims share with other communities the sin of schism and civil war. Those groups singled out for these anti-heretical messages include the Khawārij, Qadāris and Shiis. The danger to the Islamic self-image is that of assimilation. The parallels include the number of sects (70 to 72). Chapter vii expands the parallels; disputes about the Bible and Quran are the origins of division among Jews and Muslims, respectively. Again the danger is assimilation, since heretics represent Jewish and Christian models of schism. This danger is more explicitly stated in the *sunna* statement examined in Chapter viii. The Prophet states that the Muslims are destined to follow the evil example of those before them. Sunni versions of this tradition attack the Shiis or Qadāris, while Shi versions attack Sunnis with this charge. Chapter ix discusses the *halaka* statement, which states that the Muslim community will perish. Because they committed the same sins, they will suffer the same punishments as the communities that preceded them. The sins include schism and division over the Quran, civil wars, denying *qadar*, impertinent inquiries, writing down *hadīths*, and so on. The *halaka* statement did not usually specify the nature of the shared punishment. However, in chapter x traditions name the eschatological calamity as the metamorphosis of Muslim sinners into apes and pigs—a punishment inflicted on the People of the Book according to Quran 5:60. This punishment was again directed primarily at heretics.

Rubin has shown that the image of the Children of Israel and the Islamic self-image each went through three major stages. The former went from being described as a righteous community to a sinful one; ultimately, they became the very symbol of deviation. The latter went from being God’s new chosen community, but equal with Jews and Christians, to being superior to them. However, later divisions restored the equality: Muslims were guilty of the same sins, and so were to suffer the same punishments. These changes are paralleled by a shift from the use of the Bible as a source of vocabulary and ideas to the Quran as the sole source of information.

Rubin has superbly shown the development of the Islamic self-image and its intimate relation to the depiction of the Children of Israel. He has done so, however, by selecting traditions and fitting them into his chronology, which may be problematic. For example, Ka‘b al-Aḥbār is the locus of traditions which appear at different stages of development of the Islamic self-image. Without dating these traditions in the manner of Schacht, Juynboll, Schoeler, and others, one cannot be certain that those which speak of the righteousness of the Children of Israel actually predate those speaking of their sinfulness. Rubin addresses this issue in detail only in the last two pages of his conclusion. Instead of relying on dating, ‘one ought to rely on external considerations that will make sense’. Therefore, he begins with traditions that contain a ‘massive Biblical presence’. Because Islam was influenced by Judaism and Christianity and the Quran could become a source only when it became widely available—which it did not until at least early Umayyad
times—Rubin concludes that ‘it is feasible to assume that Jewish and Christian models of sacred history preceded Qur’anic ones in Islamic tradition’. It also seems reasonable that the need for legitimization was replaced by self-satisfaction, which in turn is replaced with disillusionment and fear of assimilation. While I agree that his external considerations make sense, others might argue that they do not. Thus, if there is a weakness in this excellent study, it is that Rubin did not expand on this critical and tantalizing section of his argument.

HERBERT BERG

ARZINA R. LALANI:

*Early Shi‘i thought: the teachings of Imam Muhammad al-Ba‘qir.*


This timely study, based on the author’s doctoral dissertation, is the first book-length examination in English of the life and thought of Muhammad al-Ba‘qir, the fifth Imam of the Twelver Shia. It opens with two chapters offering a useful survey of the major events of early Shi‘i history. Chapter iii deals with al-Ba‘qir’s biography, emphasizing his relationship with various Shi‘i groups such as the Kaysaniyya, the Jarridiyya or those later known as Ghulat. This chapter includes some interesting observations; for example, the author suggests that the epithet ‘al-Ba‘qir’ (short for ba‘qir al-‘ilm, ‘the one who splits knowledge open’ or ‘the one who possesses great knowledge’) was already in use during the Imam’s lifetime. She also adduces convincing evidence that, at least within his own circle, al-Ba‘qir was recognized as an Imam while he was still alive (pp. 44–5). At the end of the chapter Lalani reviews the conflicting reports about al-Ba‘qir’s death date (the earliest date cited being 114/732 and the latest 125/743) and concludes that this remains an open question (p. 57). To her observations it might be added that according to the renowned Imami scholar Ibn Babawayh (d. 381/991), al-Ba‘qir was poisoned during the brief reign of Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd (r. 126f./744) (Ibn Babawayh, *Risāla fi ‘l-i‘tiqād* (Tehran, 1317/1900), p. 105 = *A Shi‘ite creed*, tr. Asaf A.A. Fyzee (Oxford, 1942), p. 102). A possible explanation for this late death date is that it originally referred to al-Ba‘qir’s namesake Muhammad b. ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās (d. between 124/741f. and 126/743f.) and was then mistakenly applied to al-Ba‘qir.

The next chapter depicts al-Ba‘qir’s views on the imamate and also deals more generally with some of the major disagreements on this issue between Sunnis and Shi‘is. The author’s analysis of these disagreements at times leads her to lend greater credence to the Shi‘i point of view (as in her discussion of the Ghadir Khumm tradition, pp. 70–73). Chapter v discusses al-Ba‘qir’s views on some theological issues, including God’s unity, predestination, and the distinction between imān (faith) and islām. It is followed by a chapter devoted to al-Ba‘qir’s position in traditionist circles, both Shi‘i and non-Shi‘i. The seventh and final chapter comprises al-Ba‘qir’s contribution to Shi‘i jurisprudence. Lalani shows that in addition to playing a major role in the growth of Imāmi law, much of Zaydi and Ismaili figh also derived from him.

The author is well aware of the problem of telling reliable reports from unreliable ones (cf. e.g. pp. 27 (‘if these reports are genuine statements of words spoken about ‘Ali’), 40 (‘whether or not the traditions about [al-Ba‘qir’s]
At times she is content with general statements, for example that while not every legal pronouncement ascribed to al-Bāqir may be authentic, it would be wrong to dismiss the entire corpus as fictitious (p. 117; cf. p. 19). At the end of chapter v she goes further by observing that even though our information on the Imam’s theological ideas derived from texts compiled long after his death, these texts can be taken to reflect his views because ‘theological language which is identifiably later than his own is never attributed to him, nor are theological views that are clearly different from those of his time’ (p. 95). A more prudent formulation would be that these texts reflect the views of early Shi'ite circles around al-Bāqir, even if they cannot always be shown to have been held by the Imam himself.

The book contains a number of inaccuracies. One is the statement that it is not usual for al-Ṭabarī (in his Jāmi‘ al-bayān) to express his own views on the correct interpretation of particular qur'anic words or passages (p. 63); the opposite is in fact true. Another is the claim (p. 9) that the Muṭṭa‘īb’s denied the duty of commanding right and forbidding wrong; their position on this duty is not known (cf. Michael Cook, Commanding right and forbidding wrong in Islamic thought (Cambridge, 2000), p. 308; P. Crone and F. W. Zimmermann, The epistle of Sulṭān ibn Dhakwān (Oxford, 2000), p. 236). The correct death dates for Abū l-Qāsim al-Balkhī and Abū Nu‘aym al-Ḳadhāhānī are, respectively, 319/931 and 430/1038 (cf. p. 138 n. 21 and p. 101). Al-Ṭabarī’s Majmu‘ al-bayān is consistently rendered as Majmū‘ al-bayān, while the Banū Sī‘ida appear as ‘Banū Sa‘da’ (p. 3). There are also quite a few errors of transliteration. Some passages are not really relevant. It is thus not clear how the discussion of the term qumāt (pp. 124–5) or of the views on ‘ismah of al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān and later Ismaili authors (p. 82) advances our understanding of al-Bāqir’s position on these issues.

There is a good bibliography, though one would have welcomed the inclusion of al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī’s Basā‘ir al-darajāt, the importance of which is recognized by the author (p. 15). Since most of the manuscripts cited are also available in print, it would have been helpful to refer to the printed editions.

Despite these criticisms, the author is to be commended for presenting a balanced picture of one of the most central figures of early Shi'ism.

ETAN KOHLBERG

DELLIA CORTESE:
Ismaili and other Arabic manuscripts: a descriptive catalogue of manuscripts in the Library of the Institute of Ismaili Studies.

WILFRED MADELUNG and PAUL E. WALKER (ed. and trans.):
HEINZ HALM:
*The Fatimids and their traditions of learning.*

The Institute of Ismaili Studies in London has, over the past decades, set on foot a programme of publications relating to Ismailism, which bids fair to rescue Ismailism from the margins of Islamic scholarship to which it has been consigned by its failure in the Fatimid period to establish a hold over the mainstream of Islam, whether Sunni or Shiite. It is a programme supported by a major library, which includes an important manuscript collection. A two-volume catalogue of this collection was published in 1984 and 1985; manuscripts subsequently acquired have now been catalogued by Delia Cortese to the number of 188. Of these, some are copies of the same texts, but twenty-seven are collections, considerably increasing the actual number of works. Some are by non-Ismaili authors, but in any case they are for the most part of Tayyibi Ismaili origin in India, and largely of twentieth-century date; a few are Syrian Nizari. They point to the much greater quantity of material which is still not in the public domain; and while there may be few surprises, suggest what may yet be found. Just as importantly, they point to the scholarly industry and thus the intellectual history of modern Ismaili communities prior to or simultaneously with the growth of Ismaili studies in the Western tradition of scholarship since the 1930s. In that tradition, Poonawala’s *Biobibliography of Isma‘ili literature* forms an indispensable work of reference; and it is good that Cortese has adopted the same approach, making this catalogue a supplement to his work as well as Gacek’s.

Not all surprises depend on fresh discoveries of lost works. In the Institute’s original collection are two copies of the work now edited and translated by Paul E. Walker and Wilferd Madelung, the *Kitāb al-munāzarāt* or Book of Discussions by Ibn al-Haytham (not to be confused with the celebrated scientist Ibn al-Haytham in Fatimid Egypt in the following century). As Walker explains in his acknowledgements, its contents had remained unsuspected until he took a second look. And indeed it is a fascinating text, at its historical as well as its face value: for its *bāṭin*, as it were, as well as its *zāhir*. It is an account of long conversations held by the author with Abū ‘Abd Allah, the Dā‘ī who brought the Fatimid Mahdi to power in Ifrīqiya, from his arrival in the royal city of Raqqāda at the end of March 909 to his departure for Sijilmāsa on 6 June, and then with his brother and deputy Abū l-‘Abbās until the arrival of the Mahdi himself at the very beginning of 910. These conversations are primarily theological, concerned with proofs of the Imamate. They contain, however, Ibn al-Haytham’s account of himself to the Dā‘ī as a Shiite within the Hanafite circles of Qayrawān. This serves to situate the discussion in the Ifrīqiyan context before the narrative turns to stories of the justice of Abū l-’Abbās as governor on behalf of his brother, and concludes with an account of the arrival of the Mahdi and the excellence of his Qādī, Aḥḥāb ibn Hārūn. There is no mention at all of the killing of Abū ‘Abd Allah and his brother for treason in 911. Instead, a possible mention of the rebellion that followed their death becomes a lament for the disasters from which ’we’ have now been delivered by ’the son of the Imam’—a reference to the great rebellion of Abū Yazīd, 945–7, and his defeat by the new Imam Caliph, Ismā‘īl al-Manṣūr. This brings the narrative back to the
beginning, where Ibn al-Haytham declares that he is writing in response to an invitation from a superior to recall the past in this way.

That the gist of the account was the proof of the Imamate supplied in the course of the conversations it records, is apparent from the source of the text. The *Kitāb al-Munāzārat* has survived, in fact, as a long quotation abstracted from the *Kitāb al-azhrār* of the sixteenth-century writer Ḥasan ibn Nūh al-Bharūchī (cf. Cortese, p. 9), who included the work for this very reason. It takes us back to the origins of the dynasty in the messianism of the late ninth century, which brought the Mahdi to power, but obliged him to justify his claim to the Imamate and Caliphate; to the representation, in other words, of God on earth. The obligation, we may think, lay behind the composition of this work, although not unproblematically. The ‘contemporary Shī‘ witness’ of the subtitle to *The advent of the Fatimids* turns out to be highly retrospective. Written in praise of the Dā‘ī and his brother by one of their adherents, thirty-five years after they had been done to death for denying the Imamate of the Mahdi, it can hardly have been an innocent contribution to the delicate subject of the Mahdi’s identity, and his resurrection of the Imamate in the line of ‘Alī. For one thing, it is in the first place self-serving, a proof of Ibn al-Haytham’s own credentials. The conversations he reports, in the form of questions and answers bandied about between himself and his two interlocutors, are brilliant displays of scriptural quotation, exegesis and philosophical analogy, through which the author demonstrates his own knowledge and expertise, is instructed in the higher lore of the Imamate, and gains acceptance into the upper echelons of the new regime. How long he stayed there after the downfall of the brothers is another matter. He may have become a protégé of the Qāḍī Aflah ibn Hārūn; on his own admission he went as a dā‘ī to al-Andalus, and subsequently to Tāhurt on the western borders of the Mahdi’s domain, where he seems to have fallen from grace; Halm thinks that he may have written the biography of the Mahdi. The impression is of one whose career had been checked by association with Abū ‘Abd Allah and his brother, but who had been called upon at the beginning of a new reign to represent these unfortunate outcasts in a newly favourable light. The question, of course, is why.

The answer is perhaps to be found on pp. 55–6 of the text, p. 107 of the translation, where Ibn al-Haytham is emboldened to ask Abū ‘Abd Allah for the name of the Imam, still secret despite the imminent appearance of the Mahdi. The Dā‘ī, for once, is hesitant, giving the name of Muhammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Ja‘far. He is aware that it would be a miracle if he were still alive at the age of around 150, but explains away the prophecy that the Mahdi would bear the name of the Prophet with the contention that Ismā‘īl, the son of Abraham, had taken the place of ‘Abd Allah as the ultimate rather than the proximate father of the Messenger of God. For once, again, Ibn al-Haytham affirms a contrary opinion, that the name of Muhammad ibn Ismā‘īl is a cover for another, the one yet to come. This is precisely the explanation that the Mahdi himself gave for the name of Muhammad ibn Ismā‘īl when he himself claimed descent from ‘Abd Allah, the eldest son of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, and by choosing the name ‘Abd Allah for himself, ensured that his son Muḥammad would indeed bear the familiar name of the Prophet. Ibn al-Haytham was thus clearly on the right side as far as the dynasty was concerned, while Abū ‘Abd Allah was equally clearly in the wrong. It seems likely that it was precisely such a disagreement over the identity of the Mahdi that provoked the killing of the Dā‘ī and his brother, rather than the
evil-minded ambition of Abu ‘l-Abbās, to which the Qādī al-Nu‘mān attributed the whole unfortunate affair.

The Mahdi’s version of his ancestry presumably remained in force down to the death of his son Muhammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Qā‘im in 946; down, therefore, almost to the time of Ibn al-Haytham’s writing. But as the correspondence of the Mahdi shows, the subject remained controversial, to the extent that from the middle of the century onwards, Muhammad ibn Ismā‘īl was admitted into the genealogy of the dynasty as the ancestor of a line of Imams which had emerged from concealment to establish the Fatimid dynasty. The invitation to Ibn al-Haytham to rehabilitate Abū ‘Abd Allah and Abū ‘l-Abbās would stand close to the beginning of the process by which the dynasty re-presented itself to the world in the reign of Ismā‘īl al-Manṣūr (whose name in this context seems particularly significant), and especially in that of his son and successor al-Mu‘izz. His work, in other words, belongs firmly within the great corpus of literature produced on behalf of the dynasty from the accession of al-Manṣūr in 946–7 to the death of al-Mu‘izz in Egypt in 975, as a record of the events it relates and it must be read accordingly.

This is not a view which is shared (or at least, it is not apparent) in Walker’s excellent introduction and notes to his excellent edition and translation, produced, as he says, in close consultation with Professor Madelung. This is predicated on the opinion that the crucial quarrel over Muhammad ibn Ismā‘īl and the identity of the Mahdi had occurred at Salamiya in Syria in 899, leaving the killing of Abū ‘Abd Allah and his brother to be explained by a variety of considerations at the local level of revolutionary politics. (For the alternative view presented here, cf. M. Brett, The rise of the Fatimids (Leiden, 2001); ‘The Mim, the ‘Ayn, and the making of Isma‘ilism’, BSOAS, lxv (1994); ‘The realm of the Imam’, BSOAS, lxx (1996).) On that basis, it evaluates the contribution of the Munāzarāt to the reconstruction of those politics—not, perhaps, quite the revelation claimed in the Preface. The most interesting disclosure, if Ibn al-Haytham is to be believed, is his own autobiographical account of a Shiite presence among the Hanafi scholars of Qayrawān, who welcomed the revolution and provided it with key personnel. But for that very reason, his account is partisan as well as retrospective, making for a difficult text despite its apparent simplicity. What it does provide is a vignette of the circumstances and an example of the form in which such knotty matters as the Imamate were debated. Ibn al-Haytham’s account of his exchanges with the two brothers is a careful composition rather than a verbatim record; nevertheless, as Walker points out, it exemplifies the question and answer technique familiar from other sources as a device for attracting and leading the disciple into the heart of the faith, the knowledge of the Imam. It slips very nicely into the traditions of Fatimid learning described by Heinz Halm.

The Fatimids and their traditions of learning is a succinct description of a major subject. This, in the parlance of the dynasty, is the Da‘wa, ‘the Calling’, a term which refers to the mission of the Imamate to the world; the doctrine of the Imamate; the teaching of the doctrine and recruitment to the cause; and finally the organization required for this purpose. It covers both the theory and the practice; and the problem is to distinguish between the two, in general and at any given time. The theory revolves in the first instance around the distinction between zāhir and bātin, the patent and the hidden meaning of God’s message, which is broadly apparent in the difference between the discourse of Abū ‘Abd Allah and that of his brother, as described by Ibn al-Haytham and reported by the Qādī al-Nu‘mān in his Iftīāh. It centres,
however, on the succession to the Imamate in the line of descent from Ḥusayn, a succession which was hidden from the world from the death of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq in 765 until the appearance of the Fatimid Mahdi in 910. At his appearance the Mahdi, the rightful Imam in succession to the Prophet as supreme authority for the faith, assumed the Caliphate, the government of the community as exercised by Muḥammad and ‘Alī. The first Imam to do so since the death of ‘Alī in 661, he had founded a dynasty which was destined, God willing, to extend its political authority to the entire world. Prior to his appearance, however, the message of his coming had been spread throughout the world by missionaries such as the Dā‘ī Abū ‘Abd Allah, who subsequently continued to serve the cause at home, in the lands over which the Imam Caliph reigned, and abroad, where he was yet to be acknowledged.

The practice is less clear. The history of the mission before the appearance of the Mahdi is particularly obscure, although Halm takes a confident line on his ancestors in Syria and their worldwide missionary activity. He is on surer ground in the Fatimid period itself, when the dynasty and its adherents provide the information. From this we have a picture of a zāhir or open doctrine of the Sharī‘a which justifies the rule of the Caliph over the mass of his Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, and a bātin or secret doctrine reserved for the Mu‘minūn, the faithful who not only submit to the Law of God, but believe in the Imam. The one is taught openly, the other only to postulants and initiates. Once again the starting-point is the mass of literature dating from the middle of the tenth century, specifically from the pen of the Qādī al-Nu‘mān. With the move of the dynasty to Egypt, however, the information becomes much more sporadic, and although Halm’s references confirm the picture given by al-Nu‘mān, they span the whole two-hundred years down to the extinction of the dynasty in 1171. We only glimpse the appearance of a Chief Dā‘ī alongside the Chief Qādī in the ceremonial round of this highly ceremonious state in the course of its religious and political vicissitudes. The position in the provinces of Egypt and Syria is obscure. Abroad, in distant Khurasan, where the state is not of the faith, and habitually hostile, the late tenth-century treatise of al-Naysabūrī portrays the dā‘ī as the ruler as well as the teacher of his flock, not only independent of the local authorities, but of the Imam Caliph except in the last recourse. The way seems prepared for the appearance, a hundred years later, of Ḥasan-i Sabbāh and his Da‘wa Jadīda, or new doctrine of the Imamate, on the basis of which he and his Iranian followers seceded from the Fatimid Da‘wa in 1096.

Curiously, it is these schismatics who alone are identified by Halm as heirs of the Fatimids today. No mention is made of the Yemenis, whose tradition is in a more direct line of descent from the dynasty, and whose importance is witnessed by Cortese’s catalogue. Yet they provide substantial evidence of the dealings of the Imamate with its followers at a distance, including one of Cortese’s entries, a letter from al-Ḥakim to the Dā‘ī Ḥarūn ibn Muḥammad, which refers him to the Da‘ā’īm al-Islām of the Qādī al-Nu‘mān as the one and only guide to the Law (Cortese, p. 122). In the second half of the eleventh century, the letters of al-Mustansir document a considerable correspondence with the Sulayhids, who had conquered and now ruled the country in his name. Halm points instead to a considerable toing-and-froing between Cairo and Iraq/Iran, though the degree of central direction may be doubtful; Cairo typically replied to questions rather than dispatched its instructions. In the eleventh century the most distinguished of the visitors from the East were the Iranian al-Kirmānī, al-Shirāzī and Nāṣir-i Khusraw, representing a wave of Iranian influence in the Da‘wa which overshadowed the contribution of
the westerners, the heirs of the Qādī al-Nu’mān. Their great contribution was intellectual, the importation of Neoplatonic cosmology into the doctrine of the dynasty in such a way as to place the Imam at the centre of all knowledge, all science: divine and human, physical and metaphysical. It was a major step, which in principle brought the dynasty in from the messianic periphery from which the Da’wa had conducted its original campaign, to the forefront of intellectual inquiry in the Islamic world.

What a pity, therefore, that the last two chapters of *The Fatimids and their traditions of learning*, given over to ‘Al-Hakim’s ‘‘House of Knowledge’’ and ‘Scientific institutions under the Fatimids’, should be largely a tale of disappointment. The Dār al-‘Ilm or ‘House of Knowledge’ was founded in 1005 as an academic as well as a public library, with qualified staff, for the study of the whole range of religious, linguistic and natural sciences. It was associated in its early years with the production of an improved astronomical table, and with the greater Ibn al-Haytham, Alhazen, celebrated for his work on optics. But the promise of an intellectual centre for the Islamic world seems not to have been realized, and terminated in the plunder of its books in 1068, in the course of the civil war which almost put an end to the dynasty. Thus ‘Scientific institutions’ is little more than the tale of a repeated but unsuccessful attempt to build an observatory on the Muqattam hills. But it is fitting that the chapter, and the book, should close on the theme of a library; as Halm says, the Da’wa without books was unthinkable. As we see from Cortese’s catalogue, it is the bookish tradition that has survived, and which is in the process of rejuvenation in the library of the Institute of Ismaili Studies. Those studies, which have grown enormously in the past decades, may not only alter our view of the place of the Fatimids in the history of Islam, but provide a better understanding of the history of Islam itself.

MICHAEL BRETT

MICHAEL COOK:  

The qur’anic precept of ‘Commanding right and forbidding wrong’ (*al-amr bi’l-ma’ruf wa’nahy ‘an al-munkar*) has had a wide-ranging and lasting impact on Islamic religious, legal and political thought. Its universal ethical appeal together with its lack of specific focus invited discussion of its practical significance and efforts to derive concrete norms from it in different spheres of life. The present study traces the evolution of this impact, in the context of Quran exegesis, hadith, early biographical literature and of the major legal, theological and sectarian school traditions, through the ages to contemporary treatment. Close attention is paid to reports on cases of actual practice, although, as the author notes, much less is generally recorded about the practice than the theory. In the concluding chapters, the perspective is broadened beyond the frame of Islam in thought-provoking comparative discussion as to how the issues raised by the precept have been approached in other religious and cultural traditions. Altogether the book is exemplary both in the comprehensive and perceptive treatment of its subject and the meticulous evaluation of the broad range of accessible sources. While it may be too detailed to be fully read by most students of Islam, it will, no doubt, become a standard reference work in Islamic studies.
A few of the author’s interpretations and conclusions may be questioned. He describes Ahmad b. Hanbal, on the basis of his pronouncements concerning the precept, as a pious quietist who 'stood for unhesitating obedience to the ruler', while keeping his distance from government. ‘He was ready to render unto Caesar the things which were Caesar’s; beyond that, what he asked most of all was to be left alone’ (p. 113). Ibn Hanbal’s quietism, according to Cook’s interpretation, contrasted sharply with the militant activism that characterized much of later Hanbalism. The activist moralist Ibn Taymiyya, 'in condemning the quietist variety of moralism, ... was dissociating himself from something perilously close to the attitude of the founder of the school' (p. 157). In thus presenting Ibn Hanbal as a withdrawn quietist on the basis of his stand on cases of morality, Cook plays down counter-evidence and ignores the distinct strain of zealotry in his religious make-up which expressed itself in his obsessive pursuit of 'innovations' in matters of dogma and belief. The comparison of his attitude to government with the Christian 'giving Caesar his due' is quite out of place in an Islamic context where the caliph is the head of Islam whose foremost duty is to promote and defend the orthodox faith, not a remote emperor to whom one pays tax while considering him irrelevant to the spiritual Kingdom of God. Ibn Hanbal never had any doubt that the caliph should do everything in his power to suppress heresy and that the faithful should aid him in this. His predicament was that the caliphs during the miḥna rather espoused what he viewed as heresy. His religious attitude thus was not so remote from later Ḥanbalite militancy as Cook suggests. It is true that he would hardly have approved the rabble rousing activity of al-Barbahārī and his like. Yet he would certainly have appreciated the successful efforts of the later Ḥanbalites of Baghdad to press the caliphs to adopt the Ḥādīthīyya creed in pursuit of their own miḥna against heretics.

Difficult to understand is Cook’s judgement that the charges of anthropomorphism levelled by most Sunnis against the early Ḥanbalites were unfounded allegation and calumny, a calumny which the prominent Ḥanbalite theologian Ibn al-Jawzī upheld against his own school (p. 142). H. Laoust and others have argued that the polemical name mushabbiha should not be applied to the early Ḥanbalites since it was resented and thrown back at their opponents by them. The term anthropomorphism, however, is primarily descriptive, and it cannot be denied that the Quran and hadith contain anthropomorphic expressions whose literal acceptance, whether accompanied by the famous formula oʃ bi-lā kayf or not, inevitably entails an anthropomorphic concept of God. That Ibn Hanbal and his early school, with the exception of Ibn al-Jawzī, were the main advocates of the literal acceptance of these anthropomorphisms has been reaffirmed by D. Gimaret in his recent study of the treatment of the anthropomorphisms in hadith in early Islamic theology (Dieu à l'image de l'homme, Paris, 1997, p. 2). Ibn al-Jawzī should be commended for his honesty in this respect, not charged with calumniating his own school.

Dealing with the Ismaili attitude to the precept, Cook refers to the creed Tāj al-aqā'id of the Yemenite Ṭayyibi da'ī muftaq Muhammad b. 'Ali b. al-Walid, who states that the duty of forbidding wrong is to be performed by al-'ulama’ dīna ghayrīhim. Cook interprets this as meaning ‘the scholars, to the exclusion of others’ and comments that ‘we have here an unabashed assertion of clerical authority scarcely paralleled elsewhere’ (p. 304, see also p. 472). In support of this interpretation he quotes W. Ivanow’s comment on the statement that it was ‘intended to uphold the interests of the priestly class’. This interpretation is, however, hardly tenable in view of Ibn al-Walid’s
later statement that ‘the believer’ (mu’min) is obligated (quoted by Cook in n. 341). Ismailis did not recognize a class of ‘ulama’ distinct from ignorant laymen as it existed in Sunnism and Twelver Shiism. There was a teaching hierarchy, but if Ibn al-Walid had intended to restrict the duty to its higher ranks, he would no doubt have spoken of hudud or du‘āt. The mu’min in Ibn al-Walid’s usage was the initiated Isma’ili, who was by definition ‘ālim, in contrast to the uninitiated Muslim, who was ignorant in religion. Ibn al-Walid’s statement is thus merely a parallel to the common doctrine that only those who know the religious law must practise the precept.

P. 21, n. 21: The interpretation of ‘Banū Hāshīm’ in the exegesis transmitted by al-Kalbī as the Abbasids is anachronistic. In early Islam Banū Hāshīm meant the whole clan of Muhammad, including Ṭālibids, Abbasids and others. Pp. 204–5: Abū ’l-Husayn al-Baṣrī should not be viewed as a member of the school of ‘Abd al-Jabbār, even though he was a pupil of his. He was recognized as the founder of a separate school by the Mu’tazila as well as their opponents. His Taṣaffuh al-adillā cannot be the source of Ibn al-Malāhīmî’s treatment of al-amr bi’l-ma‘rūf (as suggested on p. 218) since it was left incomplete by the author and did not reach the topic.

W. MADELUNG

ALEXANDER SCHAUER:

Muslime und Franken: ethnische, soziale und religiöse Gruppen im Kitāb al-i’tibār des Usâma ibn Munqid.


The Kitāb al-i’tibār by Usâma b. Munqidh is the principal Arabic narrative source on the Crusades during the first half of the twelfth century. It has therefore been subject to a number of studies, such as those by Hartwig Derenbourg (1889), André Miquel (1983) and Robert Irwin (1998). Schauer’s study sets out to explore this source from a new angle: Usâma’s description of the various ethnic, social and religious groups. The aim of the study is thus to question the assumption of a dichotomous confrontation between two cultures during the Crusades (‘Muslim vs. Franks’). To this end the author analyses the representation of all groups which appear in the Kitāb al-i’tibār, in order to set Usâma’s descriptions of the Latin Christians in the wider textual context. At the same time he strives to question traditional perceptions of Usâma’s text as either an expression of unproblematic Frankish-Muslim co-existence or as the story of a hero in the fight against foreign invaders.

Schauer’s main conclusion is that Usâma based his evaluation of groups and individuals primarily on their social status. Considerations of ethnic origin played a secondary role to the question of whether an individual conformed to the social duties and obligations bound to his social position. The few instances where the question of religious background played a role are negligible, as they were mainly a product of the need to conform to the developing idea of jihād during the middle of the twelfth century.

In chapters ii and iii Schauer discusses Usâma’s life and his Kitāb al-i’tibār. It is questionable whether such a large part of the study had to be devoted to this subject considering the significant number of existing studies. It is mainly his argument concerning the lack of importance accorded to religion in Usâma’s writings, that is relevant in this section for the study as a whole.
Usâma rarely cursed the Franks, and when he did so the curses were employed in an arbitrary way. Schauer infers from this pattern that their use was a result of later influences (pp. 52ff.) and not the result of his own perception of the social world. Consequently, he discards these curses as irrelevant insertions, which were made merely to conform to the idea of jihâd, which had become hegemonic when Usâma ‘wrote’ his text. Two later authors who described the Frankish-Muslim encounter within this firmly established jihâd discourse are Ibn Wâsîl (d. 697/1298) in his Mufarrij al-kuru and Abû Shâma (d. 665/1267) in his Kitâb al-rawdatayn. According to Schauer’s argument one would have expected them to curse the Franks in more regular and less arbitrary ways. However, both texts display a similarly arbitrary pattern, hardly different from the one observed with Usâma. The degree to which the importance of religious components in the perception of the social world of medieval authors can be evaluated by their use of curses is therefore questionable. As it stands religious factors are rather downplayed.

Chapter iv researches extensively the use of the different social, religious and ethnic terms. Chapter v concludes the study with a reflection on ‘Limits and possibilities of Christian-Muslim coexistence according to the Kitâb al-i’tibâr’. The ‘limits’ were set on the cultural level by disdain for the Franks, which Usâma regularly expressed. The ‘possibilities’, on the other hand, pertain to the fact that a large number of social similarities existed, which led to regular contact between the two sides. M. Köhler in his Allianzen und Verträge (1987) and other authors have drawn similar conclusions. The present study’s core chapter iv and concluding chapter v are thus an illustration, by taking a specific text, of the existing secondary literature in the field. Schauer has certainly rendered a valuable service as he has successfully exemplified a number of relevant issues (diplomatic relations (pp. 107–16), prisoners and hostages (pp. 116–21) and shared court culture (pp. 150–54)) in the discussion of one of the central Arabic sources for the early Crusade period.

However, throughout the study one misses a discussion of central terms. Considering the significant development of scholarly work on the question of identities, and specifically national/racial/ethnic identities, one would have expected a short statement of how the author understands a term such as ethnicity. The only explicit reference is on p. 122 where it is stated that ‘the ethnic term in Usâma ibn Munqîdh’s Kitâb al-i’tibâr is not meant in a “national” or “racist” sense, but rather in a “cultural”’. At the same time the author assumes that the ‘Greeks’ (seemingly adherents to the Greek Orthodox creed) are a ‘nation’ (p. 86) and that ethnicity is linked to a ‘Volkszugehörigkeit’ (p. 86). This rather bewildering absence of a clear framework gives the impression that the author bases his study on an assumption of fixed and essential identities. For example, after equating language and ethnicity (p. 62) he states: ‘Usâma was not able to resist influences of the Turkish language’. The reader wonders here whether the assumption of such watertight ethnic categories and a resistance to ‘influences’ can be made so easily. A study, which at the present date sets out to explore ethnic and other layers of identity, should at least reflect on the possible fluidity of identity markers and how these are constructed in a given social and discursive environment. For instance, medieval Arabic authors often referred to the Bedouins as ‘Arabs’, and described them in rather unfavourable terms. Here, the question arises as to how these authors understood their own ‘Arabness’ in contrast to the nomadic populations on the one hand and other settled populations, which are described as non-Arabs on the other hand.

Schauer’s study does not in this regard follow, regrettably, the shift in the
study of Arab/Islamic history during the last two decades, which has been to consider more seriously developments in neighbouring fields. In the present work such developments are ignored for the benefit of a reference system based entirely on studies which have been published in the field during the last century. With regard to questions such as ethnicity his study serves mainly as a starting point for future research, which will explore the question with greater reference to recent discussions of how identities were constructed, sustained and debated. Nevertheless, the question posed in his study and the way in which it is approached—in the scope of the author’s framework—are a valuable contribution.

KONRAD HIRSCHLER

MICHAEL BRET: 
*The rise of the Fatimids: the world of the Mediterranean and the Middle East in the fourth century of the Hijra, tenth century C.E.*

There has been an upsurge of interest in Fatimid studies during the last couple of decades as witnessed by the writings of Th. Bianquis, H. Halm, Y. Lev, W. Madelung, A. Fu‘ad Sayyid and P. E. Walker as well as the publications sponsored by The Institute of Ismaili Studies, London. A major international conference on the Fatimids was also held in 1998 in Paris (M. Barrucand, (ed.), *L’Égypte fatimide, son art et son histoire*, Paris, 1999). Brett’s book is the latest addition to this impressive corpus.

The Ismaili *da’wa* of the 3rd/9th century which summoned Muslims everywhere to allegiance to the Ismaili Imam spread rapidly from the central Islamic lands to Central Asia and to North Africa; and its success culminated in the establishment of the Fatimid *dawla* or state in 297/909 in Ifrīqiya. ‘Abd Allāh al-Mahdī, who had led the Ismaili movement as an Imam, now began to reign, as the first Fatimid caliph, over a state which soon grew into a major Mediterranean empire. The Fatimids, whose dynasty was eventually uprooted in Egypt in 567/1171, did not abandon their *da’wa* organization on assuming power as they entertained universalist claims. In fact, they gradually intensified their *da’wa* activities, especially after transferring the seat of their state to Cairo in 362/973, and attained lasting success outside the Fatimid *dawla*, notably in Yaman, Persia and Central Asia, where Ismailism survived the collapse of the Fatimid state and dynasty in its Musta‘li-Tayyibī and Nizarī forms.

The book under review focuses on the first century of Fatimid rule during the 4th/10th century, effectively ending with the reign of al-‘Azīz (365–386/975–996), and aims to contextualize Fatimid history within the broader context of the Mediterranean and Muslim worlds, investigating the subject matter historiographically, doctrinally, politically and geographically (p. ix). In his introductory chapter (pp. 1–26), after reviewing the modern progress in the field and citing the shortcomings of approaches adopted by other scholars, the author emphasizes the need for reinterpreting Fatimid history. As a result, he sets himself the task of investigating Fatimid history in terms of its political and religious dimensions—since the Fatimids were at
once Imams and caliphs who simultaneously headed the Ismaili da’wa and the Fatimid—as well as the broader contexts and complexities within which the Fatimid caliph–Imams operated. The main body of Brett’s book is comprised of three parts, entitled respectively, ‘The Fatimid revolution’ (pp. 27–132), ‘North Africa and the Mediterranean’ (pp. 133–266) and ‘Egypt and the East’ (pp. 267–434).

In part 1, the author discusses the pre-Fatimid phase of Ismaili history and the issues related to the ‘Alid genealogy of the Fatimids; he also presents a detailed description of the dā‘ī Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī’s activities among the Berbers of North Africa and his success in preparing the ground for the establishment of the Fatimid state. This is perhaps the most controversial part of the book under review. The author here takes issue with the Stern–Madelung version of the early Ismaili da’wa, which has been substantiated by a wealth of Ismaili and non-Ismaili sources and has found wide currency among modern scholars of Ismaili studies. However, the author not only omits to propose a convincing alternative version of the pre-Fatimid history of the Ismailis, but his own arguments do not amount to a refutation of the Stern–Madelung version. In fact, in this part and elsewhere in the book, the author’s discussion of the Ismailis and the Qarmatīs, both often referred to indistinguishably as the ‘Seveners’, and the relations between the Qarmatīs and the Fatimids seem to be somewhat muddled. In this context, one should mention the movement organized by Zikrāwāyh and his sons which eventually acquired Qarmatī characteristics. It should also be added that the Qarmatīs do not seem to have ever recognized the Fatimids as their Imams, as suggested inconsistently by Brett (pp. 203, 204, 295, 328, 365–6); the Qarmatīs continued to await the reappearance of their Mahdi.

The author has used an impressive array of primary and secondary sources and his book draws on his earlier writings on North African history and the region’s trade relations and production structure. These, together with the Fatimid dynasty’s relations with the Byzantines, the Umayyads of Cordova, the Abbasids and a number of regional rulers, are among this book’s most important contributions. Indeed, Brett’s treatment of the Fatimids as caliphs is more comprehensive than their portrayal as Ismaili Imams. In other words, this book is extremely informative in terms of the socio-economic and political history of the Fatimids, while its discussion of Ismaili religious institutions and teachings is at times problematic, reflecting the author’s new interpretations based on particular readings of the sources which also permit alternative interpretations (e.g. pp. 120–27). He also offers a number of complex hypotheses without providing sufficient evidence. The author broadly categorizes Ismaili theology and esoteric teachings (ḥikma) as the ‘doctrine of the imam’, which reflects a rather limited perception of a more elaborate, multifaceted field of intellectual enquiry with its cosmological and salvational doctrines. On the other hand, he shows a masterful command of the socio-economic and political dimensions of Fatimid history, particularly as this history unfolded in North Africa and in its broader Mediterranean context.

The book under review also contains an excellent bibliography together with six maps and a number of indices. Despite some of its questionable doctrinal interpretations and unclear treatment of the complex issues of the Ismaili da’wa, Brett’s The rise of the Fatimids does represent a major contribution to Fatimid studies as a contextualized political history of the Fatimid state in the course of its first century.

FARHAD DAFTARY
G. J. VAN GELDER:  
*Of dishes and discourse; classical Arabic literary representations of food.* 

‘A more or less thematically arranged compilation of bits of prose and poetry, with or without commentary or connecting text between the quotations: in short a kind of literary banquet.’ This description of classical Arabic *adab* anthologies provided by van Gelder (p. 39) could be said to apply to some extent also well to this publication—a modern ‘literary banquet’ couched in the mould of, and with ingredients and recipes derived from, the rich larders of Arabian *adab*. True to the tradition, the author is reluctant to impose himself and lets his sources speak instead. The ‘connecting text between the quotations’, while illuminating and admirably erudite, remains purposefully (and refreshingly) aloof from the ‘contemporary jargon and ideas’ (p. 5) of modern literary criticism which figure only as the butt of occasional satirical asides. The lone concession is the adoption by van Gelder of Bakhtin’s term ‘polyphony’ (a texture of different though related parts) which he proceeds to contrasts with cacophony, the simultaneous sounding of the disparate and discordant (p. 105).

Charting the multifarious interface of dishes and discourse over more than a millennium of texts certainly yields much polyphony, spiced up with welcome interludes of cacophony (and cacophagy, see p. 80!). Indeed, the subject is replete with themes ranging from ‘utmost luxury and delight to utter filth and loathing’ (p. 108), all served up with that unique blend of humour and learning which poetry is there to recount and thus immortalize. The texts from the early Islamic period, while not averse to the joys of the palate, paint a different picture. There is much warning against overindulgence in good food, and simplicity and restraint are recommended. In the *Epistles of the Pure Brethren*, for instance, the appeal of food descriptions ‘is exploited as an educational tool, while at the same time food is depreciated’ (p. 38).

Chapter iv examines the theme of eating and food as it appears in classical Arabic *Belles-Lettres* from 800 to 1500 A.D. It begins with a survey of chapters on food in a wide range of *adab* anthologies from Ibn Qutayba (d. 889) to al-Ibshı́:hı́ (d. 1446). This is followed by a section on food in narrative and poetry which, as the author points out, discusses ‘the closest possible connections between food and text’. The central nexus is perhaps the word *adab* itself, with its double meaning of good manners and erudition which are most effectively combined at the dinner table. Much humour is generated by narratives where the salutary balance between manners, literacy and gastronomy is upset by the behaviour of one of the protagonists, the *locus classicus* being the *maqaṣna* of the *Madīra* by al-Hamadhānī (d. 1008) which, as van Gelder observes, can be said to revolve around a pun exploited later in an ‘absurd fancy’ by al-Maʿarri ( ). The key infringement in this *maqaṣna*, ‘the substitution of words for food’ (p. 51) is shown to be recurrent theme also in a number of
other works, whereupon the discussion moves to a different type of interface between eating and writing: poetry inspired by food and food inspired, or prompted by, poetry. Of particular note here are not only the ecphrastic epigrams, riddle-like metaphorical descriptions of dishes both elaborate and humble, but the versified cooking recipes which appear in Ibn al-Warraq’s renowned Kitāb al-Tabīkh (tenth century), a cookery book in which poetry functions perhaps as ‘the equivalent of the luscious colour photographs’ of modern counterparts (p. 63). Several poems of this type are translated and discussed, followed by examples of food descriptions in prose, some highly literary and elaborate and composed for a variety of aims. The section concludes with a brief survey of food-related themes in popular story telling with examples from al-Tanūkhī and the Thousand and One Nights. The third and final section of Chapter iv delves into an altogether different realm, the picaresque story of Abu ‘l-Qāsim by al-Azdi (eleventh century) who emerges as the supreme anti-hero of classical Arabic literature; alimentary topoi abound to excess, outrageously fused with excremental ones which later van Gelder shows to have been favoured also by an earlier, no less daring, versifier.

Chapter v on ‘food for satire and parody’ is the crowning glory of this small study. It begins with a survey of the bizarre eating habits seemingly entertained by the addressees of early hijā’ poetry and goes on to introduce, inter alia, a number of late Egyptian authors such as Ibn Sudun (d. 1464), al-Hajjār (fifteenth century), al-Shirbīnī (d. 1687) al-Anbūṭī (d. 1758) whose works abound with a distinctly Egyptian type of satire and sense of the absurd. Food plays an important role in all of them, whether it be Ibn Sudun’s mock doxologies, al-Shirbīnī’s stunning ridicule of Egyptian peasant fare or al-Anbūṭī’s culinary recasting of Ibn Mālik’s versified grammar. Van Gelder’s treatment shows that these authors, despite being outside the received canon of classical Arabic literature, are an integral and significant part of the tradition and deserve rather more attention than they have hitherto received. In discussing their works van Gelder is at pains to counter common stances of contemporary criticism by arguing (convincingly) that parody, however sharp, need not necessarily be subversive (p. 94) and that the fashionable search for sexual innuendoes in literary imagery may, in certain forms of Arabic literature, be quite misleading (p. 92). The latter issue is taken up in greater detail in the first section of the final chapter which dwells upon linkages between food and sex in Arabic poetic imagery and food descriptions. The book concludes with additional, but somewhat less prolific sections on food and eating in the literature of dream interpretation, and on food metaphors in the language and terminology of classical Arabic literary criticism.

Van Gelder’s adab-like compilation about adab has the merit of its forebears in being both highly entertaining and instructive, and thus of benefit to both specialists and general readers interested in the history and literary portrayal of food. It is a rich mine of information and constitutes, behind an appearance of light-heartedness and ease, an academic tour-de-force.

STEFAN SPERL

NAVID KERMANI:

gott ist schön. Das ästhetische Erleben des Koran.

Some months ago, when I was waiting at Cairo Airport for my flight to Europe, I found myself sitting beside a middle-aged Egyptian businessman,
dressed in an elegant suit and carrying a small briefcase. After some minutes he took a small Quran out of his pocket and began very melodically reciting some verses in a low voice. When he had finished, he quite naturally devoted the rest of the waiting period to his statistical tables and business documents as he had been doing before. In this moment of individual piety, once again one of the most striking characteristics of the Islamic culture could be felt: the immediate and daily importance of the holy scripture—even in comparatively unholy surroundings—and the fact that singing or reciting the verses musically is regarded as a matter of course. Thus religious experience in Islam has an aesthetic dimension that is moreover not restricted to ritual prayer, but also to be observed in the most profane situations, when listening to a Quran cassette in a taxi or waiting at the airport. Nevertheless, this part of Islam is rarely noticed outside the Muslim world, sometimes even deliberately ignored, even in scholarly circles. The Muslim concept of the *iʿjāz* (the inimitability of Quranic speech) or the conviction that the Quran cannot (according to some even must not) be translated are perceived only from a legal point of view and sometimes taken as proof for an alleged Islamic fanaticism. It is precisely this contradiction which forms the starting point of the highly readable book under review, *Gott ist schön* (‘God is beautiful. The aesthetic experience of the Quran’). Its author, Navid Kermani, a freelance writer and researcher who has recently published a book on the contemporary situation in Iran, had submitted this book in 1997 as his Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Bonn under the expert guidance of Professor Stefan Wild. In 2000, he was awarded the Ernst-Bloch award for his thesis.

*Gott ist schön* is divided into six long parts, each of which endeavours to address the central topic from a different angle. The introductory chapter (‘The first listeners’, pp. 15–93) concentrates on early Islamic history and on the traditions of its revelation. From the very beginning, the language of the Quran and its recitation were considered to be an essential element of the salvation history and could not be separated from its contents. Many a conversion to Islam—the most well-known being that of ‘Umar—is said to have taken place mostly, if not solely because of the aesthetic fascination that cast its spell over the hearer of the verses. Kermani here draws heavily on the concept of the ‘cultural memory’ that was formulated by Jan Assmann (cf. the latter’s ground-breaking book *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich, 1992). He thereby avoids the tricky question of the authenticity of those early reports, many of which were invented or at least embellished in later times. In spite of this they (according to Kermani) are valuable sources, because they are remembered collectively and are given a kind of authenticity of their own by this cultural memory. It is without doubt justified and useful to apply this idea to Islamic history, but Kermani sometimes tends to quote his sources somewhat too indiscriminately and without taking sufficient account of when they were written. Thus—to give just one example—Muhammad Rashid Riḍā, Ibn Kathīr, Mahmūd Rāmīyār, Ibn Hishām, Ṣādiq al-Rāfīʿī, al-Jāḥīz and Muhammad Abū Zahra are cited within some pages (54 sqq.) as witnesses for the same case, in the same context. True, they all handed down the cultural memory and became themselves part of it, but this eclecticism seems to me an oversimplification that implicitly neglects the developments and differences within this cultural memory over the centuries.

The second chapter (‘The text’, pp. 94–170) looks into the question of
whether the text of the Quran itself favours an aesthetic interpretation. Without rashly calling the language of the revelation poetic or even equating the Quran with poetry, Kermani rightly states that it is the reader who makes it poetic by reading or reciting it. The decisive precondition for this is what he calls the ‘poeticity’ of the Quran (pp. 98sqq.). Part of this poeticity is the openness of much of its meaning which may render the understanding of the text arduous, but at the same time it paves the way for its aesthetic interpretation (pp. 121sqq.). In the West, however, the ambiguity of quranic language was only rarely appreciated as a necessary theological consequence that leaves the revelation open, and was instead rejected and criticized as being defective or outright wrong. Therefore, the (predominantly Arab) Muslim conviction of the untranslatability of the Quran could only be perceived as being motivated by dogmatic rigidity, while it should—following Kermani’s argumentation—be seen more as the result of a certain experience of reception: the Quran cannot be translated not because the theologians forbade it, but because the poeticity and ambiguity of the text make it impossible.

Chapter three (‘The sound’, pp. 171–232) investigates the oral character of the Quran. In spite of being collected and written down early on, ‘the Qur’ān is, according to its own concept, the liturgical recitation of God’s direct speech’ (p. 172) and deserves to be regarded as a musical score. Hence the significance of correct recitation (tajwīd), the rules of which are stipulated in every detail and mark the transition from speech to music. Kermani even goes so far as to speak of the ‘recipient turning instinctively towards a voiced and singing performance’ and of the impossibility of simply reading the Quran (p. 189)—which is in a way corroborated by the businessman at Cairo Airport. The theological level of this idea of the ‘orality of the scripture’ is the constant remembrance of the initial event of the Islamic salvation history, namely the act of sending down (tanzīl) the Quran. The significance of the recitation of the Quran is thus directly linked to the Muslim concept of revelation (pp. 212sqq.).

At the centre of the fourth chapter (‘The miracle’, pp. 233–314) stands the genesis and development of the iʿjāz theory. In great detail Kermani follows the teachings of ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī (d. 1078) about the composition of the Quran (pp. 253–84) and confirms that he was well ahead of his time in that he anticipated many findings of later semiotics and literary theory. Once more, Kermani comes to the conclusion that the iʿjāz is less a religious dogma than an expression of the aesthetic reception of the Quran.

Chapter five (‘The prophet among the poets’, pp. 315–64) returns to the difficult relationship between the Quran and poetry, this time illustrated by the person of Muḥammad. Kermani draws interesting parallels between the Islamic prophetology and the Western, especially German, philosophical theory of the genius (‘Geniea¨sthetik’) of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (pp. 319sqq.). Both ideas can be traced back to the ancient model of Plato’s theory of enthusiasm which defines the artist as a relative of the prophet, both being inspired messengers of divine words (p. 336). Again, this does not mean an identity of prophet and poet, as the poetic word in the Islamic context remained ambivalent, but it should be, Kermani maintains, reason enough to see not only the legal, but also the artistic and aesthetic dimensions of Islam.

The sixth and final chapter (‘The listening of the Sufis’, pp. 365–425) is
devoted to the mystical experience of the Quran. Those qatla l-Qur’an who heard certain verses of the Quran and were killed on the spot, died not just from horror with regard to the final judgement. Rather, they seemed to have felt a strange mixture of lust and dismay, which is also an expression of an ecstatic aesthetic fascination. Kermani concludes by drawing an analogy with extreme immersion in music as illustrated by Schopenhauer’s and Adorno’s views on music and art.

Having finished reading the book, the reader is left with ambivalent thoughts. On the one hand, Kermani’s approach and his intention to (re-)discover the aesthetic dimension of Islam cannot be described as anything less than inspired, astute, at times even ingenious. He manages thoroughly to correct the one-sided image of Islam in the West that centres almost exclusively on its legal and dogmatic aspects and totally eclipses its aesthetic values. Moreover, he points out the arrogance of the Islamic fundamentalists and their self-appointed monopolization of the interpretation of the Quran that is by no means justified by the traditional concept of the openness of the holy scripture. It is not by chance that he often refers to Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd, whose exegesis he knows very well, having written his M.A. thesis on it. On the other hand, however, he sometimes tends to overshoot the mark and to ignore in his turn aspects other than the aesthetic. Concepts like i'jāz and the untranslatability of the Quran may very well be interpreted as having been motivated by aesthetic reasons in addition to the dogmatic and theological aspects, but the latter should not simply be ignored. Therefore, Kermani sometimes exaggerates his criticism of Western orientalists and their alleged total ignorance of, even hostility towards, the nature of poetic speech or art in general. Of course, Rudi Paret’s German translation of the Quran is not elegant, let alone beautiful; he was not Rückert—but never intended to be. The aesthetic interpretation of Islam is without doubt a most valuable addition to the existing image, but hardly suitable to replace it in toto.

Another shortcoming of the book is the author’s habit of writing redundantly. Many a topic is dealt with in more than one chapter, with only minor differences, and the sub-headings (which do not turn up in the table of contents) are not always a reliable guide: e.g. nobody would think to look up the problem of the (un)translatability of the Quran treated under ‘idea and structure’ (p. 149) or the author’s (brilliant) remarks on the genesis of the quranic text and its variations in the chapter about the sound, under ‘The text as a musical score’ (p. 197). This redundancy and the abundant direct quotations even of remote secondary literature on philosophy and literary theory, not all of which really seem to be necessary (Thomas Mann, Karl Kraus, Pablo Neruda, Octavio Paz, Umberto Eco and many others), all this results in an essayistic style—admittedly well written—that sometimes makes it hard work to follow the author’s argumentation. The book could have been abridged by around 200 pages without losing any of its substance. Some of the points Kermani critically observes in al-Jurjānī’s work (‘indeed a certain lack of planning with regard to the sequence of his topics’, p. 277) ironically also apply to his own book.

Nevertheless, Gott ist schön is one of the most important publications on the Quran in recent years. It is full of inspiration and insight, even when one disagrees with the author. It is to be highly recommended, although not just because it is provocative; an English translation is an absolute must.

RAINER BRUNNER
This collection of twenty-one essays by a cadre of international scholars is a long-awaited and well-deserved tribute to B. W. Robinson, a figure who looms large in the study of the Islamic arts of the book and of Persian painting in particular. The carefully edited essays have copious illustrations—many of which are in colour, are provided with useful appendices (including transcribed written sources), and contain much information that is new. Indices of proper names and subjects provide essential reference tools. The accessibility of the writing and the volume’s rich illustrations will make it appealing to a wide readership.

The scope of the essays complements Robinson’s interests as a scholar—the Persian painting tradition from the advent of the Mongols to the modern period in Iran and Central Asia—with some forays beyond those geographic and linguistic parameters into the Ottoman world. The methods of research employed in the essays are also in line with Robinson’s scholarship: a taxonomy of styles and schools prevails, as does an interest in things biographical, studies focused on artistic personalities (e.g. the essays of Diba, Ivanov, Skelton, Bailey, Swietochowski and Welch). Hence, most of the volume’s contributors pay tribute to Robinson by reproducing his method and interests, the cumulative results of which are addressed directly by Assadullah Souren Melikian-Chirvani who observes, somewhat laconically, ‘The truth is that the study of Persian manuscripts is still in its infancy. An admirable recording enterprise has been started by scholars such as Basil Robinson whose catalogues of several British libraries will remain for decades invaluable tools for any researcher. The stage is set for the next development’ (p. 169). In his foreword to the volume, Robert Hillenbrand comments on Robinson’s emphasis on provenance and attribution, noting that he ‘laid a solid foundation for scholars who have tried many other kinds of approaches to the material’ (p. ix). This is certainly true. Robinson moved well beyond the scholarship of a preceding generation, as well as some of his close peers, for example Ivan Stchoukine, to set new standards for manuscript study. Close analysis of numerous manuscripts in public and private collections allowed Robinson to refine knowledge about fifteenth-century Persian painting in particular (his passion for this period resulted in a book in 1991), while at the same time bringing new materials to the light of day. His long essay, ‘Survey of Persian painting’, published in 1982 in *Art et société dans le monde Iranien*, remains indispensable reading—as do many of his studies—and defines a canon of manuscripts for this historical period. Normally one would have expected a complete list of Robinson’s publications—to help readers understand the nature and scope of his contribution—but perhaps this element of the Germanic *Festschrift* is now dispensable? In this instance, Hillenbrand accounts for its absence by noting the imminent publication of Robinson’s collected scholarship.

While some scholars have used the *Festschrift* as an opportunity to extend previous research of familiar paintings and illustrated manuscripts, others
used it as a way to branch out into new terrain. Of particular note are the essays centred on single manuscripts (Cagman, Grube, Hillenbrand, Melikian-Chirvani, Simpson, Soucek), a methodological emphasis espoused by Melikian-Chirvani (p. 169). Three of these authors focus on extremely significant but understudied manuscripts: Grube examines Ibrahim Sultan’s ‘Anthology of prose texts’, for too long neglected in the Suleymaniye Library’s underworked corpus of illustrated manuscripts (his essay is to be read in conjunction with Sims’s thought provoking study of Ibrahim Sultan’s ‘library’ of books). Simpson completes the Herculean task of reconstructing the Inju-period Shāhnāma of 1341; and Soucek analyses the Ann Arbor Shāhnāma as a visual link in the stylistic line between Jalāyirid-Timūrid painting and late fifteenth-century Shiraz painting. Each article contains detailed information about the manuscript under study and its ramifications for various facets of manuscript history. Cagman’s essay on the physically and visually overwhelming Ottoman-period Quran copied by Aḥmad Qarahšāhı and now in the Topkapi Palace Library, is similar in its persistent focus on book archaeology and description. When Cagman emerges at the end of the essay, she is able to refine debates about the Quran’s genesis and production. Melikian-Chirvani takes an innovative approach to manuscript study simply by his very choice of book—an anthology. Such literary compilations are largely understudied because they do not conform to the text-and-image patterns that play out in the great majority of court-sponsored books. In his analysis of text and image, he stages a compelling interpretation of the paintings as allegories of contemporary life. Also interpretive in vein is Hillenbrand’s essay on the 1307 manuscript of al-Bırunı’s Al-Athar al-hāqiya. It begins with an ingenious proposition—why was a manuscript written in 1000 illustrated in 1307? To bolster his argument, Hillenbrand adduces numerous historical factors to explain the Ilkhanid-period interest in Bırunı’s work, and at the same time identifies a real conundrum, that the ecumenicism implicit in the text is opposed by a directed cycle of images.

Although limitations prevent the mention of every contribution, some of the more thematically directed essays are of special note. Adamova focuses on the evidence of seals and attributory inscriptions added to single sheet drawings and paintings during the reign of Shāh ‘Abbās. The essay represents an important contribution to the study of the album in the late sixteenth century, although her focus is on the refinements that written or stamped notation can make to the chronology of an artist’s oeuvre. Brend’s contribution is one of the more conceptually oriented essays, a detailed survey of the roles performed by marginal imagery in the fifteenth-century manuscript and full of insightful formal observations. Canby’s essay homes in on the materials and instruments used in the practice of late Safavid drawing, and is especially valuable as a close analysis of graphic mark.

Although most essays give priority to questions of patronage and attribution/provenance, and tend to stay close to a deeply traditional scholarship, there are frequent signs that a profoundly object-based inquiry can lead to new and different kinds of thinking about Persian painting, even if the questions do not yet fully benefit from a wider awareness of studies in the discipline of the history of art. In closing, one last point needs to be made. It is clear that the Festschrift was a project several years in the making, with 1995 the latest dated reference to publications in the notes. The project to honour B. W. Robinson started several years earlier. Unfortunately, these many years of planning—editing a volume is never an easy task—resulted in a certain unevenness of its contributions, with some of them now a little out
of date in their scholarly apparatus. Although the book’s intellectual impact would have been greater if it had appeared in print in the mid-1990s, this still does not detract from the deeply personal research and ideas of its contributors. In short, the volume is essential reading.

DAVID ROXBURGH


Wheeler Thackston’s translation of volume one of the Jāmī’ al-Tawārīkh having appeared in 1998 and 1999, the major work of Rashīd al-Dīn is now accessible to an English-reading audience. The second volume of the Jāmī’ al-Tawārīkh is concerned with the histories of earlier rulers of Iran and the remaining peoples and dynasties of the known world. A French translation of the section on the History of the Franks (tr. Karl Jahn, Leiden, 1951) and an English paraphrase of the section on the History of India (The Hague, 1965) have appeared, and it is a credit to Curzon Press’ Studies in the History of Iran and Turkey series that they have now brought out a translation of Rashīd al-Dīn’s History of the Seljuqs. This very welcome translation should encourage interest in the other, if possibly less important, works of the statesman and historian, Rashīd al-Dīn Fādillāh Hamadānī.

It is generally accepted that Rashīd al-Dīn and his team here owe much to the Saljūq-nāma of Zahir al-Dīn Nishāpūrī. Divergent views have been expressed about the true nature of this work and the editor of the work under review, C. E. Bosworth, explains the main theories relating to the question of the Saljūq-nāma. There has also been uncertainty over the extent to which Rashīd al-Dīn’s compilers preserved the originals and used other sources. Work leading towards a critical edition of Nishāpūrī’s original text, extant as the Royal Asiatic Society’s MS Persian 22b, is currently being undertaken by A. H. Morton, according to whom a substantial part of the Jāmī’ al-Tawārīkh text is derived from other and even Arabic sources. K. A. Luther (d. 1996) who completed his translation of Ahmed Ates’s edition (Ankara, 1960) in 1971 was aware of the problems surrounding the authorship of the text but he did not address them in a wholly satisfactory manner in his introduction, a criticism which can be levelled in turn at Bosworth himself in his own preface.

Nishāpūrī’s original work certainly became a major source for subsequent chronicles of this period and such histories as Rāwandi’s Rāhat al-sudūr, Mustawfi’s Tārīkh-i Gazāda, the so-called Risāla-i Jawāni, the Zubdat al-tawārīkh of Rashīd al-Dīn’s contemporary, Abū ’l-Qāsim Kāshānī, and Afdal al-Dīn Kirmānī, to name just a few, all rely on it for much of their material.

Zahir al-Dīn Nishāpūrī wrote his history of the Seljuqs early in the reign of Toghirl III b. Arslan (1176–94), the ruler of Iraq, by which time the Great Seljuq sultans were great in name only. A tutor to Mas‘ūd and Arslan, presumably but not certainly the sultans, Nishāpūrī hoped through writing his chronicle to curry favour with Toghirl and restore his faded fortunes. Luther argues, not altogether convincingly, that in many ways, in the tradition
of Persian ‘men of the pen’, he was writing a ‘mirror for princes’ and trying to rekindle the teachings of Nizām al-Mulk in his royal audience. In Luther’s view, he was a Persian traditionalist still coming to terms with Turkish ascendancy, with Iran under the rule of Turan. The power of the sultans had by this stage passed to their mamluks and atabegs, men, in the conservative view of Nīshāpūrī, unworthy to rule given their status as slaves or sons of slaves. Even the Ghaznavids had been dismissed since, their ‘king is the son of a slave’ with ‘no great lineage’ and one whose ‘kingdom will not remain with him’. (p. 33). Nīshāpūrī believed in the divine right of kings and he wished that his king should reclaim his birthright from the mamluks and atabegs. Abū Ḥamīd Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, the continuator of his history until Tūghril’s death in 1194, suggests that this was indeed the aim of the young sultan. ‘The Sultan wanted to bring the affairs of the realm back to the principles of the past, as the rule of the sultans had been’ (p. 156). The book was to be ‘a book of counsel and a kind of political tract for royalty, as well as a source of historical information’ (p. 12).

The text itself is short, clear and chronological. It does not differentiate between the eastern and western branches of the Seljuqs. However, its precise and simple content is sometimes obscured by a translation which unfortunately reflects too perfectly the imprecision of the original Persian. This is particularly noticeable in the confusing use of unattributable pronouns which can render some passages incomprehensible. Though Bosworth has corrected some of the ‘infelicities of translation’ others remain. Thus we have Sultan Barkyarūq ‘wearing only an undershirt like water on your hand’ (p. 71). The existence of other peculiarities such as ‘that’ followed by direct speech contained in quotation marks (pp. 117, 131, etc.) suggest that maybe Luther had not fully prepared the translation for publication.

The book opens with a brief account of the ancestry of the Seljuqs and then their migration from Turkestan into Transoxiana for reasons not fully supported elsewhere. The description of the family’s early prosperity and strength also appears at variance with other sources (see C. E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids, 1963). God’s humbling of the Ghaznavids for their sins and the Seljuqs’ subsequent elevation is followed by accounts of the early sultans, anecdotal and historical, as well as comment on the rewards of justice and the losses incurred through heresy. Chapters are devoted to the reigns of the individual sultans, mixing historical records with anecdotal illustrations of inescapable divine will, with Alp Arslan whose ‘arrows never went astray’ (p. 47) failing to ward off his assassin’s fatal blow (p. 54), and Nizām al-Mulk and Malik Shāh whose pen-box and crown were bound together and were twins, dying within a month of each other (p. 62), a coincidence inspiring the comment, ‘See the power of God! Behold the weakness of the Sultan!’ (p. 62). Accounts of the struggles against the evil and insidious power of the Assassins occur frequently. However, in the later chapters dealing with the Iraqi sultans and their viziers, a time and place closer to home, the accounts deal more with the actions and movements of the main players rather than reporting anecdotal incidents.

Luther’s translation will be welcome to both students of Rashīd al-Dīn and students of medieval Persian history. Though not the original Safiūq-nāma, it still succeeds in opening up a major source of Seljuq history to a wider audience and provides life and colour to a period previously hidden for many behind secondary sources.

GEORGE LANE
The book under review comprises fifteen lessons, with the main grammatical points introduced through dialogues. Grammar is explained under sections labelled ‘Language points’ which are followed by exercises. There is a key to all the exercises at the end of the book, as well as a Turkish–English and English–Turkish glossary and a useful summary of the main grammatical points for quick reference. There are also two cassettes accompanying the book.

The authors state in the introduction that the book is organized mainly around the dialogues. This is a good approach, especially as the book sets out to teach colloquial Turkish. However, there are some problems here: as the authors want to tackle certain grammatical structures, these are worked into the dialogues with the result that some parts of the dialogues sit uneasily and come across as contrived. This, to a limited extent, is unavoidable in language teaching manuals. What is avoidable however, are translation and grammatical mistakes. Unfortunately there are quite a number of such errors in the dialogues, reading texts and sample sentences. Here are just a few of them: the email message on p. 222: \textit{Kesin iyi bir zamanın vardır}. This is translated on p. 295 as: ‘I’m sure (literally: it is sure) you’re having a good time’. No one whose first language is Turkish would say \textit{iyi bir zamanın vardır}; the natural way to speak of having a good time in Turkish is \textit{iyi vakit geçirmek} or \textit{eğlenmek}. One is led to infer that the Turkish passage has been translated from English into Turkish (and not very competently), rather than its being originally a piece of Turkish writing. This view is confirmed with further examples from the same passage: \textit{Sana birşey sormak istiyorum} is translated as ‘I want to ask you something’. The translation would be correct if it were a sentence in isolation, but in this context it is not: ‘ask’ in English can mean to ask or to make a request, such as asking a favour. Turkish, however, has different words for ‘to ask a question’ and ‘to request’. If the passage had originally been written in Turkish, one would have expected to read \textit{Senden bir ricam var} or \textit{Senden birşey rica edebilir miyim?} Another possibility would have been \textit{Senden birşey istiyorum}, but \textit{sormak} is only used for asking a question.

Later in the same passage there is a reference to \textit{milli kütüphane}, which is given in the translation of the passage as ‘public library’. The Turkish should be \textit{halk kütüphanesi}. \textit{Milli Kütüphane} means the National Library. The difference between a \textit{halk kütüphanesi} and a \textit{milli kütüphane} is as important in Turkey as it is in Britain. Another example from the same passage (and there are still a few more) is the sentence \textit{Umarım müzikallerin birine gitmemelisin!} ‘I hope you don’t have to go to one of those musicals!’. The English by itself is fine with a touch of sarcasm thrown in, but again it is not what the Turkish says. In fact the Turkish does not say a great deal because in Turkish you cannot use both \textit{umarım} and \textit{gitmemelisin} in the same sentence. \textit{Umarım} means ‘I hope’, and \textit{gitmemelisin} is ‘you must not go’ or ‘you should not go’. You cannot say you hope something will not happen at the same time as saying that it must not/it should not happen. The correct form should be \textit{Umarım müzikallerin birine gitmek zorunda kalmanız} or perhaps \textit{gitmen gerekmez/gitmen lazım gelmez}. \textit{Layık} on page 52 is given for ‘laicist’ or ‘secular’, when the word should be \textit{laik}. \textit{Layık} means ‘worthy’ or ‘suitable’.
These and similar mistranslations make one think that either the authors had some problems in translating certain words or expressions, or that the informants on whom the authors relied did not have Turkish as their first language. It is also possible that the informants normally operate in a different language or learned another language alongside Turkish at a young age, and that certain linguistic systems of that language are imposed on their Turkish. It is inevitable that there will be some minor errors in such an involved book, but in the case of *Colloquial Turkish* there are too many of them. In a language teaching book, authors have to be particularly sensitive about mistakes, because one may end up teaching incorrect things to students. It is a pity that the very hard and arduous work which clearly went into the preparation of this course has been marred by such shortcomings.

There are also some factual errors in the short passages on the history of the Turks and on Atatürk. Süleyman the Magnificent is not called *Muhteşem Sultan Süleyman* in Turkish, but rather *Kanuni Sultan Süleyman*, and on p. 52 the authors’ excessive use of capital letters in the sentence seems to bestow a new epithet on Atatürk: ‘Mustafa Kemal became Turkey’s national superhero, as he was the Conqueror of the Greeks’. Referring to him earlier as ‘paşa “general” Mustafa Kemal’ is misleading to students of the language, as it gives the incorrect word order for the title Mustafa Kemal Paşa. This passage is in fact so superficial, muddled and misleading that it would have been far better to give the readers the titles of a few reference books on Turkish history and leave them to learn their history of the Republic correctly from these sources.

There are far too many typos, e.g. undotted ‘ı’ given as dotted, umlauts missing, c and s given without the cedilla when there should be one. It is difficult to produce a book or even a review without any such errors, but in *Colloquial Turkish* they abound, which means the student can learn words with the wrong spelling and also the wrong pronunciation. This is especially important in Turkish, as words are pronounced as they are written.

The authors say that the main focus of this course is on the colloquial spoken language. It is probably with this in mind that they use forms like *Hadi be!* and *Dur be!* which are glossed as ‘Come on!’ and ‘Hold on!’’. In fact what is implied with this usage is normally much stronger, the implication being that the person at whom these expressions are directed is being told off for doing or not doing whatever the situation requires. Children would be rebuked if they used *be*. Similarly one of the early dialogues (Lesson 4, Dialogue 1) contains *Gözlerin görmüyor mu?* ‘Are you blind?’ (the usual form is in fact in the singular; *Gözün görmüyor mu?*). Whilst it is useful for students to learn to recognize such expressions, they should not be presented as ordinary colloquial remarks. It should be explained that using such expressions can cause offence, or worse. One can only wonder what reaction the student would receive if s/he decides to practise the expression *boktan herif o* given in Dialogue 2 in Lesson 9.

The grammatical explanations given in ‘Language points’ are often long, repetitious and sometimes unnecessarily complicated, e.g. the sequence -leri/-leri- on p. 166. These could be presented in a more systematic way with less description, but more examples. Rather than elucidate the grammatical complexities of Turkish, the authors seem almost determined sometimes to obfuscate, and this can be discouraging.

Some related grammatical topics are discussed at different places in the book, rather than following on more closely, which would have resulted in less repetition and a more logical progression. A case in point are the genitive
and possessive constructions, which are discussed at various places through the book. These are linked to what the authors call ‘complex postpositional constructions’ (not a helpful term for students wishing to learn a foreign language) which are introduced at the very end of the book (p. 246). These are a very useful set of words for generating sentences, and are essential vocabulary: introducing alt, üst, arka, ön, iç, dış ‘under, above, behind, front, inside, outside’ etc. earlier would have ensured the structuring of forms like masanın altında, resmin üstünde, kapının arkasında (under the table, over the picture, behind the door), which are genitive-possessive structures. This would have enabled students to practise these structures with all the appropriate case endings which together form one of the most complicated features of Turkish; it also means that at the very end of the book you are expected to translate such simple sentences as ‘She’s in the house’, ‘What’s behind this wall?’, ‘Your pen has fallen under the table’, etc. While it is always helpful to have revision of earlier simple grammatical items, these are not given here for revision but for first-time practice. At this stage of a language course, one would expect to be given involved, complex sentences and reading passages to translate. The student will not feel challenged. This is a pity, because there is a wealth of information that needs to be digested and activated.

With good editing to eliminate literals, translation and language errors and to bring clarity to the grammatical explanations and rearrange the topics in a way that will be more helpful to students, this book can make a valuable contribution to the teaching of Turkish, so that the hard work of the authors can claim the praise which it would then deserve.

BENGISU RONA

NAPHTALI KINBERG (ed. LEAH KINBERG and Kees Versteegh):
Studies in the linguistic structure of Classical Arabic.
(Studies in Semitic Language and Linguistics, XXXI.) ix, 275 pp.

Although this book is basically a collection of articles which have been previously published in outlets such as BSOAS, JSS, JSAI, JAOS, Lingua, ZAL, etc., editors Kees Versteegh and Leah Kinberg have wisely seen fit to include the author’s never-before published ‘Treatise on the pronunciation of the dād’ (pp. 197–267). The volume is certainly a fitting tribute to the late Israeli linguist, Naphtali Kinberg, who at the time of his death in 1997 at the age of 49 was working on the aforementioned fascinating topic in historical phonetics. Versteegh’s informative preface summarizes Kinberg’s productive career in the United States and in Israel (pp. vii–ix). Let me state at the outset that this genre of making available outstanding scholarship in one convenient place is an appealing feature of the multi-faceted Brill series, Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics, edited by T. Muraoka and Kees Versteegh, of which this is volume 31.

Kinberg’s previously published articles deal mainly with syntactic topics. They include the (1980, JSS) study of ḫin/pan law, considered by the writer to be a shortened form of ḫinna ḫxxaffafih, the (1981–82, JSAI) work on lārin phrases in Early Literary Arabic, and the (1998, JAOS) work on la-qad+prefix tense verb. In one of the reprinted essays, ‘Causal and adversative meanings of the particle lākin in Arabic’ (pp. 103–11), which originally appeared in JAOS (107, 1987: 61–5), it remains unclear why A. Barthélémy was wrong in
proposing two etymologies for lākīn ‘but’, one of which is cognate with Hebrew lāxēn ‘therefore’ (p. 110). It seems to me that most of the evidence cited still supports Barthélémy’s theory.

The following remarks focus on phonetic matters, i.e., the aforementioned final unpublished piece on the dād, and the author’s ‘The concepts of elevation and depression in Medieval Arabic phonetic theory’ (1987, ZAL) (pp. 183–96).

One of the most pleasing aspects of the article on medieval phonetic theory is the accurate translation and interpretation of numerous difficult passages by the medieval Arab grammarians, such as Sibawayhi, Ibn al-Anbārī, Al-Suyūṭī, Ibn Jinnī and Al-Zamakhshārī. In a quoted passage from the latter’s Kitāb al-Mufassal (p. 189), mutbaq may be translated throughout as ‘emphatic’ rather than ‘covered’, since āṯābq is one of the terms used for emphasis or velarization-pharyngalization. I believe the author is absolutely right in his comparison of the classification of Hebrew vowels into rōm ‘elevation’ and māttā ‘depression’ as a result of the influence of the Arabic raf’ ‘elevation’ and xafīd ‘depression’ (p. 195). However, it may be going a bit too far to explain the supralinear dot in Arabic xā’ and yāyn and the lack in hā’ and ‘ayn as a manifestation of this phenomenon (ibid.).

The translation of ‘Ali b. Sulaymān al-Manṣūrī’s (d. 1722 A.D.) Risāla fī kayfīyyat an-nuqṭ biddād is accurate and stylistically pleasing, as one may easily compare the printed Arabic original, which is happily made available (pp. 231–67). The translation is based on manuscripts from the Hans Daiber collection, now owned by The Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, as well as on a photocopy of an original in the Ghazi Husrav-Bey Library in Sarajevo (see p. 199 for all the pertinent details). Versteegh, who wrote in his introduction to Kinberg’s edition, commentary, and translation, defends Jean Cantineau’s lateral(ized) theory on the original pronunciation of this phoneme—long considered a marker of the uniqueness of Arabic (p. 197), which is also, in all probability, the theory advocated by Al-Manṣūrī (see pp. 198–9). In this connection, witness the reference to Arabic as ḥuvat ud dhād ‘the language of the dād’, and the dād, not coincidentally in my view, also occurs in another well-known designation for the Arabic language, viz., ḥuvatu mudar ‘the language of Mudar’. Versteegh has also invested considerable time studying what we may learn from Arabic loanwords in other languages and the pronunciation of the dād (see his ‘Loanwords from Arabic and the merger of d/d’, IOS 19 (1999: 273–86)). I believe he is right in his analysis about the original pronunciation of the tā‘, which is based on the description given by Sibawayhi in his Kitāb, viz., that it was dād, which was not directly opposed to any other phoneme (p. 198). It is interesting to note Sibawayhi’s mention of an allophone of the dād as dād da’if; however, further research is needed before we can ascertain the phonetic nature of this allophone. I doubt Al-Nassir’s theory, viz., that it is realised somewhat like dād will hold up under close scrutiny (ibid., quoted from A. A. Al-Nassir, Sibawayhi the phonologist: a critical study of the phonetic and phonological theory of Sibawayhi as presented in his treatise Al-Kitāb, London: Kegan Paul International, 1993).

The volume contains a few typographical and other errors, chief of which are the following. The cited essay by A. F. L. Beeston appeared in the journal Language, not language (p. 100); mūnā ‘we died’ is incorrect for mutna (p. 123); and a referenced article by Dominique Caubet appeared (and not ‘to appear’) in Alan S. Kaye, ed., Semitic studies in honor of Wolf Leslau on the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991 (p. 181).

ALAN S. KAYE
SVANTE E. CORNELL:
Small nations and great powers: A study of ethnopolitical conflict in the Caucasus.

The book under review covers a wide range of issues pertaining to the conflicts in the Caucasus. Starting with a general survey of the Caucasus with its multi-ethnic and religious settings, the author proceeds to an evaluation of the Imperial Russian and Soviet legacy and of the nature and roots of the Caucasian conflicts. The following chapters are devoted to concrete cases: the Armenian–Azerbaijani war over Nagorno-Karabakh, the wars of Georgia with South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and Russia’s war with Chechnya. The author also discusses the conflict between the Ingush and Ossetians and the potential conflict situations in Daghestan (in particular, the problem of the divided Lezghi nation). Considerable attention is given to the great powers' policy towards the Caucasian region: Turkey, Iran, Russia, and the United States. The final chapter discusses the Caucasus from a Eurasian geopolitical perspective.

The time when analysts regarded the conflicts in the Caucasus as clashes of civilizations, with religious differences being given a prominent role, already belongs to history. The author criticizes this approach, proposing a more realistic definition applicable to all conflicts in the Caucasus: 'The conflicts are primarily political conflicts over territory and ownership thereof. Naturally, the conflicts are all due to the process of politicizing ethnicity' (p. 18). 'In a sense, the main determinant of the conflicts is a security dilemma based on fear; or one could say, on the development of nationalisms mirroring each other, fuelling and directed against each other, and scarcely able to develop without each other' (pp. 55–6). One could continue the analogy by pointing, in particular, to mirroring separatisms of Georgians and Azeris seeking secession from the Soviet Union as opposed to Abkhazians, South Ossetians and Karabakh Armenians seeking separation from, respectively, Georgia and Azerbaijan.

The book contains many precise and insightful observations, for instance the author’s remark that 'the primary reason for the increasingly conflictual attitude of minorities in the late 1980s was not discrimination but the strengthening of group identity' (p. 51). The post-Soviet minorities’ rejection of the notion of ‘autonomy’ is explained by the purely decorative nature of this term in the Soviet totalitarian ‘federal’ structure. The minorities seek secession or confederal solutions as ‘the only safe perceived way for national survival and development’ (p. 46). Equally justified are a positive evaluation of the role of the Confederation of the Peoples of the Caucasus and a negative assessment of the great powers’ rivalry over the Caucasus, which, ‘has delayed rather than hastened the resolutions of these conflicts’. Moreover, ‘all four interested states are pursuing their own interests in the region rather than working impartially and unselfishly for the resolution of the conflicts’ (p. 54).

The descriptions of concrete cases vary in their scope and depth. Thus, the discussion of the Azeri-Armenian conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, based on balanced use of relevant sources and personal interviews, is probably among the best chapters in the book. The author emphasizes that, unlike other Caucasian wars, this conflict is the only inter-state one. Though its resolution is not impossible, it will remain a very difficult task for the
international community and will continue to destabilize the region for a long time to come.

The chapter on Georgia/Abkhazia/South Ossetia, by contrast, gives the impression of being a more arbitrary compilation of facts. Russia’s deportation of Abkhazians to Ottoman Turkey is explained by the Abkhazians’ closeness to Circassians (p. 146), not, as it were, by a series of anti-Russian rebellions, after which the Abkhazians were labelled as a ‘guilty population’. Georgian was never a second language for Abkhazians (as claimed on p. 146); at the time the Abkhazian Principality was incorporated into Russia (in 1810), the majority of Abkhazians were monolingual, only some southern Abkhazians having knowledge of Mingrelian. On p. 178 the author asserts that in 1979 Armenians outnumbered Abkhazians in Abkhazia, this in stark contradiction to the census data provided on p. 156! Few will believe Cornell’s assertion that the Georgian ‘guerrillas’ operate in Abkhazia ‘outside the control of the state’ (p. 186) in contrast to the assessment of Amnesty International. Given that the number of Abkhaz troops over the whole war period (1992–3) is estimated at roughly 5,000, some 70 to 80 per cent of them being ethnic Abkhazians, the information about the arrival in Abkhazia of 2,000 troops from Transdnestria will only bewilder any expert observer.

Speaking of proposals on political solutions, the author dismisses the idea of a ‘common state’ as a Russian ploy and regards instead the asymmetric federation (whatever this may mean), proposed by Shevardnadze, as ‘the right model for the future of the Georgian state’ (p. 196). The problem is that the three Caucasian de facto states (Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Karabakh), which managed to defend themselves militarily and survive economic blockades, will not be easily persuaded to give up their independence in exchange for vague promises of even the ‘highest level of autonomy’ and to return to the control of the very same governments which waged full-scale wars against them. The tentative conclusion will be that these de facto states will continue to exist for a considerable period of time, even without recognition de jure (cf. analogues such as Taiwan and Northern Cyprus), which renders the insistence on ‘asymmetric federation’ remote from political reality.

The war in Chechnya, the most destructive and tragic conflict on the territory of the former USSR, is also the best documented of all Caucasian wars. The author follows the conflict from its inception through to its tragic outcomes. The sad conclusion is that ‘Chechnya had lost the peace when it, not unpredictably, failed to create a functional society and state’ (p. 250). Interestingly, the terms ‘separatism’ and ‘secessionism’, abundantly used when referring to former autonomies within Georgia and Azerbaijan, disappear altogether in the discourse over Chechnya, the Chechen war being portrayed primarily in terms of the Russian ‘invasion’ and the Chechen struggle for the ‘ideals of independence’. Since the wars over Karabakh, South Ossetia and Abkhazia did not differ substantially in character from that of Chechnya, all being wars for national liberation, the only discernible difference is Chechnya’s anti-Russian stance; one wonders whether this factor can explain the author’s obviously more benevolent attitude towards the Chechen cause.

The final chapter discusses the Caucasus as a security complex and examines the appearance of the two ‘Caucasian strategic alignments’, namely a west-east axis, including the USA, Turkey, Georgia, Azerbaijan plus Uzbekistan, and a north-south axis, involving Russia, Armenia and Iran. The author emphasizes that the geo-strategic importance of the Caucasus has so far been a complicating rather than a facilitating factor. Though regional
integration could bring great benefits to the population of Caucasian states, the deep mistrust and unresolved political-territorial problems, exacerbated by the issue of refugees, are obstacles along the way of peace and integration, the achievement of which, as the author predicts, will not be easy. Despite some imbalances and inaccuracies (not to mention quite a few typos), on the whole Cornell’s book presents a useful source for Western readers’ knowledge about the Caucasus and its present political problems.

VIACHESLAV A. CHIRIKBA

AMJAD JAIMGUKHA:
The Circassians: a handbook.

This is the first modern account of the Circassians, once the largest North Caucasian people, whose ancestry lies lost in the mists of time and whose territory presently makes up part of the Russian Federation. The Circassians were known to Europe and the East in the past principally because of the beauty of their women (‘a fair Circassian’) and the legendary bravery of their men. The Circassian Mamluks had a lasting and significant impact on Egypt’s history. But since the brutal decimation of Circassia by Imperial Russia and the forced emigration of the majority of its population to the Ottoman Empire, this nation has been mostly forgotten and neglected. One of the few works on the Circassians which appeared in the twentieth century is Aytek Namitok’s Origines des Circassiens, (Paris, 1939). The book under review, by Amjad Jaimoukha, fills a substantial gap in Western readers’ knowledge of this Caucasian nation.

The book encompasses nearly all aspects of Circassian history and life (people and land; history; politics and current affairs; the diaspora; economy; religion and beliefs; social structure; folklore; arts, crafts and architecture; music and dance; language and linguistic policy; literature; theatre, media and film). The useful appendices include Circassian proverbs and sayings, chronology, the Circassian pantheon and caste system, latinized Kabardian alphabet, extensive bibliography and index.

In the nineteenth century the territory of Circassia became a bone of contention between its two rival neighbours, Turkey and Russia. Eventually Turkey ceded Circassia, which it possessed only nominally, to Russia, thus presenting the latter with the uneasy task of conquering the Circassian territory. This period is among the most tragic chapters in the history of the Circassians; many were exterminated or forced to flee their homeland. The author justly mentions yet another aspect of that sad situation—the uncompromising and disastrous decisions taken by Circassian leaders, who preferred to lead their people to wholesale emigration, thus effectively giving up their homeland. If it were not for the ethnic cleansing of the indigenous population of the Western Caucasus (Circassians, Ubykhs, Abkhazians) in the nineteenth century, the recent history of this region, and indeed of the entire Caucasus, would have been quite different from what it is today.

There are still many gaps in our knowledge of Circassian history, even of the relatively recent Soviet period, such as the Baksan revolt of 1928 (p. 80). No less revealing is the fresh look at the question of Kabarda’s ‘voluntary’ incorporation into the Russian Empire which, as the author argues, became
possible only after a series of military campaigns against the Kabardians. ‘When General Yermolov, military commander of the southern Tsarist forces, arrived on the scene in 1816, Kabarda was on her knees. Four decades of open conflict had demoralized the people and left the land in ruins. The Kabardians suffered heavy losses’ (p. 63).

There is a chapter devoted to Circassian communities in the diaspora, which are undergoing some revival owing to the resumption of contacts with their ethnic kin in the Caucasus and the increase in literacy and Circassian self-identity. The process of assimilation is nevertheless taking its toll, the majority of young Circassians in the diaspora being unable to speak their ancestral language. Their proficiency in the official languages (mostly Arabic or Turkish) does, of course, considerably enhance their career opportunities, and with no education in the native tongue (with some exceptions in Israel and Jordan), it is difficult to be optimistic about the future of the Circassian language in the diaspora.

The Abkhaz-Georgian war of 1992–93, which revived in the minds of many Circassians the dark days of their own history of suppression and foreign domination, played a crucial role in the re-emergence of Circassian identity, both in the Caucasus and especially in the diaspora. A considerable number of Circassians, Abazas and Chechens came to the rescue of their kindred Abkhazians and fought alongside Abkhaz forces. For the first time since the days of their struggle with Tsarist Russia, all the North Caucasian communities were united in a common cause, now around the Abkhaz issue, which ‘allowed them for the first time to assume a strong political stance’ (p. 105). The new leaders, who emerged on the wave of the support campaign during the Abkhazian war, reached a level of popularity exceeding that of the old Soviet apparatchiks, and their growing influence ‘at times threatened to sweep the local authorities out of power’. But the Chechen scenario was not repeated in the Circassian republics. Despite their popularity, the new leaders were not experienced politicians, and as the old élites had reluctantly decided to support the pro-Abkhazian movement, such manoeuvrings helped them to retain and even consolidate their grip on power.

The Circassian language and oral literature, in particular the monumental Nart epics, received some attention from Western scholars, especially in the shape of the distinguished Georges Dumézil. The Nart sagas are ‘the most essential ingredient of Circassian culture’, comparable in importance to what Greek mythology is to Western civilization. A lesser known cultural phenomenon is the sophisticated Circassian chivalrous code of behaviour ‘Adyghe Xabze’. Circassian literature written in the Cyrillic script flourished in Soviet times, though it had to comply with the official Soviet ideology and refrain from touching on forbidden themes. After the collapse of Communism, previously ‘closed’ topics came to the fore and could be discussed openly. Yet, a less positive consequence of the new freedom was the fact that the cosy collaboration of the Soviet State with the writers came to an end, and the subsidy system was scrapped: ‘Market forces became important factors in shaping the literary life’ (p. 282). The number of publications in Circassian in the post-Soviet period has consequently dropped dramatically.

In an appendix to the book the author presents his own proposal for a latinized Kabardinian alphabet. The need for such an alphabet, which would arguably better serve the cultural needs of Circassians both in the Caucasus and in the diaspora, is indeed pressing, but the objective difficulty is the huge Circassian consonantal inventory. No less of a tremendous task is to convince Circassian societies at large, in particular the writers, of the necessity to
new perspectives for Circassians, as well as for other small Caucasian nations, are being opened up with the spread of the Internet. Jaimoukha's successful activity in creating a Circassian website, which contains an impressive bibliography on Circassia and the Caucasus in general, is a graphic example of the new possibilities for the spread of information on the Circassians and for day-to-day communication between the Caucasian and diaspora communities.

In general, the book presents reliable, detailed and up-to-date information on the Circassian nation which will undoubtedly be welcomed by a very broad readership, including of course the numerous Caucasian diaspora communities.

Ahmad Tafazzoli:

*Sasanian society. I. Warriors II. Scribes III. Dehqâns.*


*Sasanian society* is the global title of the three articles mentioned in the subtitle, which resulted from the late and sorely missed Professor Tafazzoli's Ehsan Yarshater Distinguished Lectures. Unfortunately the author himself could not prepare his lectures for the press. D. N. MacKenzie has done him this last service, and R. P. Mottahedeh has seen to the booklet's publication on behalf of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies of Harvard University as the first volume of the Yarshater Lectures Series.

The three parts of the book are: (1) Warriors, (2) Scribes and secretaries, and (3) Dehqâns. No general description of Sasanian society is given, and even the representation of these social and functional groups and classes is incomplete. One understands, however, the author's choice: had he included the Zoroastrian priesthood, the wealth of source material would have been overwhelming. Had he written about craftsmen, merchants and peasants, he would have had to make do with sparse testimonies.

Even so, a remarkable methodological gap between the first article and the two following cannot be overlooked. Tafazzoli describes in the chapter ‘Warriors’ (not aristocracy!) what can be said about the structure and components of the late Sasanian military organization: army, military posts, divisions of the army, ranks, war (i.e. terms for fighting and combat). Much of what is presented in this part of the book has also been said by others (e.g. about the colour of the warriors' clothes, p. 1). So this chapter is largely a reliable description of the state of the art, especially in matters of terminology. But I regard the two following parts ‘Scribes and secretaries’ and ‘Dehqâns’ as the highlight of the book; the author displays his impressive command of all the relevant Middle Persian, New Persian and Arabic sources on Sasanian history.

Tafazzoli not only describes the contribution of these groups to the social system of Sasanian and post-Sasanian Iran, he also succeeds in identifying the names and determining the functions of their prominent representatives. It is no exaggeration to say that his book is an important contribution to a future prosopography of Iran in the first millennium A.D.
To edit another scholar’s Nachlass is of course a risky task. As a rule one does not know what the author himself had intended to add to, to change in or to cancel from his draft text. In the present case the most obvious problem is the absence of much of the secondary literature which often conceals the fact that the author repeats or confirms what has already become communis opinio in Iranological studies. There can be no doubt that Tafazzoli himself would have referred to, e.g. A. V. Rossi, ‘Perception et symbologie des couleurs dans le monde irani en et d’Asie Centrale’, in La Persia et l’Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X secolo, Rome, 1996, p. 91 (ad p. 1 the colour of the warriors’ cloths), C. A. Inostrancev, ‘The Sasanian military theory’, JCOI 7, 1926, 7–52 (ad pp. 1–17 Warriors), B. Utas, ‘Jung u āštī: War and Peace in Iran’, in: Kalyānāmitrārāgānum, ed. E. Kahrs, Oslo, 1986, 287–302 (ad pp. 16–17 War), and G. Widengren, Der Feudalismus im alten Iran, Cologne and Opladen 1969, 27–32 (ad p. 51 girdle as the insignia of nobility in ancient Iran).

Another problem is that it sometimes remains unclear whether passages of the text belong to the author or to the editor(s). Are the parts in square brackets on p. 11 which go against Szemerey (the unquoted source is Iranica V, Acta Iranica 5, Tehran-Liège, Leiden, 1975, 366–75) an addition by the author himself or by somebody else?

Some brief remarks: p. 5: MP. *whwyrd* so far translated as ‘confused’, is in my view rather ‘weakened’, which makes excellent sense in the present context.


p. 11: For the *dižbed Tīr Mīhr* cf. Man. Parth. Tīr Mīhr šāh (Sundermann, BTT 11, Berlin 1981, p. 104 with n. 1)? Cf. that the ruler of Samarkand and a ruler of Sistan were called both ‘king’ or ‘lord’ and ‘dehqān’ (p. 47).

p. 11: Read: the Greek form (not: from).


p. 17: *zambag* ‘battle’ is exclusively Parthian. Its MP equivalent is *ardīg*.

p. 21: MP *rāšt*, not *št*.


p. 31: *ḥstr* instead of *hstr*.

pp. 32–3: To speak of a special kind of script for the accountants of the royal stables, the fire temples and judicial matters is certainly misleading.


p. 34: n. 98: read *rdw’n p’k’n*.

p. 38: I think that the ‘q’ in the word *dehqān* still needs explanation. If it is the Arabicized form of a Persian *dehqān*, then the simplest option would be the rendering of Persian ḡ by q (cf. A. Siddiqi, Studien über die persischen
Fremdwörter im klassischen Arabisch, Göttingen, 1919, 73–4, where some of the developments of k > g are in fact g > q. Note that Taftazzoli’s explanation in the present publication differs slightly from that given in Encyclopaedia Iranica vii, p. 223.

p. 39: read: the same author.

p. 47: concerning the continuation of the name of king Dēwāštič I think that the name is derived from a common Sogdian appellative ‘demoniac’ (an apotropaic name?). In my view the separation of both words as proposed in I. Gershevitch, A grammar of Manichean Sogdian, Oxford, 1954, §1277, is artificial.

p. 57: Ma’mūn.

These remarks are not intended to detract from the great informative merit and the high scholarly standard of Professor Taftazzoli’s work, which might unfortunately be his last publication.

WERNER SUNDERMANN

JASON DAVID BEDÜHN:
The Manichaean body in discipline and ritual.

In this well-presented book the author wishes to ‘“save” the Manichaeans for history by recovering how they proposed to save themselves’ (p. x) and concentrates in this on the central activity of the Manichean Elects; the use of their own bodies as a ritual place fit to release the light trapped in the food they consume and so conduct this light upwards to the light-paradise which they also wish to reach upon death.

The book contains a preface, seven chapters, a table of textual references, fifty-eight pages of endnotes, a bibliography and a selective index of ancient and modern authorities, texts quoted and topics covered. Six pages of black-and-white plates and some tables accompany the text. The seven chapters comprise an introduction, principally on methodology, five chapters on Manichaean teachings and practice (ii. Disciplinary regimens; iii. Disciplinary rationales; iv. Alimentary rites; v. Alimentary rationales; and vi. The liberation of the embodied self) and a final chapter vii, ‘Ein Etwas am Leibe’ that picks up the discussion from the introductory chapter.

In each chapter the Manichaean sources are surveyed in the order of Central, Western and Eastern sources with a summary of each source group and a comprehensive résumé at the end of each section. BeDuhn points out that the otherwise so valuable Central sources (Arabic and Syriac) are remarkably silent on the subject of his book. The Western sources include the genuine Manichaean Coptic texts and the Latin sources, which are in the main preserved or interwoven with Augustine of Hippo’s often caustic comments on them. This combination of two very divergent sources causes difficulties and, naturally, the unavoidable use of Augustine sometimes brings the author close to what he claims to want to avoid, i.e. seeing Manichaeism through the eyes of its detractors. The Eastern sources comprise Middle Iranian (Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian), Turkish and Chinese in the main; on pp. 203–4 one of the most isolated sources, the sole Manichaean text in Bactrian, M1224 (the ‘Bactrian Fragment’) is given great prominence and a translation is offered, although the publication from which this is supposedly
taken (according to p. 275) contains neither the full original text nor a complete translation of it. The translation seems to have been taken from the unpublished hand-out presented by Gershevitch at the Second European Seminar on Central Asian Studies, 7–10 April 1987, in SOAS, London. The Sogdian, Turkish and Chinese texts are often demonstrably based in the main on Middle Persian and Parthian texts (some of which are known) but must be quoted because of their better state of preservation. Nevertheless it seems that significant Iranian texts should have been given more prominence. A case in point is the Parthian ‘Sermon about the Light Nous’, §15 of Sundermann’s edition which provides a close equivalent to the Coptic source quoted on p. 100, showing how consistently preserved certain Manichaean precepts were.

On the question of the presence of the Manichaean Hearers at the sacred meal, BeDuhn refers to the Parthian text M177, which he interprets as giving a clear indication that the Hearers left the room after presenting the food but before the Elects (in this case Mani) started the sacred meal (p. 137 ‘the Auditors depart, prior to the “food hour”’; they are not present at the time the Elect makes his or her prayer’). This may have been the procedure, but the text does not prove it, since it says: ‘And (at) the meal time, when (kd) the beneficent one in prayer pleaded for that youth; then (dy’n) he bowed three times’. The text seems to contain a break but the point is that Mani’s disciples (z’dg’n ‘sons’) then ask him why he bowed, i.e. they were able to observe Mani at least, though it is not clear if the disciples were Elects or Auditors. A pictorial analysis (on pp. 156–7) of miniatures in some fragments from Turfan is used to support the importance of the ritual meal but cannot clarify this question.

At various points BeDuhn quotes a mainly Foucaultian theoretical framework that stresses the channels of power in a community and the individual’s relationship to these. He stresses the sparse nature of the sources on the question of the individual’s role in the community, but then replaces any detailed discussion of facts with further quotes from his theoretical mentors which can only serve to state expectations rather than present facts that support them, plausible though the resulting picture of a re-formed individual within public view is. I wonder if there is any anecdotal information available from adjacent sources. Of relevance may also be the apparent lack of evidence for vows taken by a Manichaean; if each Manichaean had nothing other than his personal commitment to guide him, this would explain the constant reiteration of the Manichaean’s purpose in the texts. On the other hand, it is not surprising that societies that placed greater emphasis on family bonds nurtured and maintained religious groups that remodelled the individual entirely according to the needs and aims of the community.

At various points, particularly in the introduction and in the last chapter, BeDuhn advocates a ‘speech acts’ approach to Manichaean ritual and hymnal texts. The language of these texts creates its own reality. Nevertheless, BeDuhn is happy to leave it at generalizations; he does not show us how these texts work. These texts are also relevant to the question of the relationship of the individual Manichaean and the community. The ‘we’ perspective in Manichaean hymns is central; the verbal strategies in hymns and in particular the use of personal pronouns should be a fruitful ground for study in this question.

The central theme of the book is the ritualization of eating and, in particular, the new orientation of the body to perform the task. Manichaean Elects are so re-made as Manichaean that they simply live Manichaism. This radical and surely very strenuous form of religious life is not asceticism
in the sense of flight from the world because the Elects use their bodies to liberate the light trapped in the material world, i.e. they are very much interested in a ritualized contact with the world to this purpose. They keep this contact with the help of the Hearer who deflect from them the harm involved in the procurement of food and, in return, partake of the salutary powers of intercession possessed by the Elect. 

BeDuhn positions this view of Manichaeism as a departure from a series of misunderstandings about the nature of Manichaeism that have dominated studies on this religion. He proposes an entirely ritualized view of Manichaeism and sees gnosis as playing only a minor role. He sees his study as an attempt to see Manichaeism as it was; ‘we moderns’, a returning phrase of his, should not pervert Manichaeism because this puts us ‘in danger of losing’ it.

In the impressive amount of material quoted in the book the author admirably surmounts the difficulties faced by any student of Manichaeism to transcend the piecemeal nature of the various sources in order to arrive at a coherent and consistent portrayal of what they actually mean. The frequent repetition and, sometimes, the piecemeal development of the argument in this repetition or even in the endnotes accompanying them is inevitable. There are a number of small but irritating inaccuracies in the Iranian words quoted. Middle Persian and Parthian mānista: mān ‘monastery’ (from the verb mān- ‘to dwell’) is consistently and falsely transcribed with -ı: pad (p. 133) is pad, the enclitic -m’n (p. 110) is ‘us’, not ‘me’; the quote on p. 137 (repeated on p. 150) should be pd ... qft ‘hynd (lit. ‘they fell at the feet of ...’). Words from the Middle Iranian languages are quoted mostly in transliteration but those from the other languages in transcription; uniformity in this and consistent indication of the language being quoted would have made for better reading.

This should not detract from the value the book has as a significant study on the rationale of Manichaeism.

**Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst**

PHILIP HUYSE:

*Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka’ba-i Zardusṭ (SKZ).*


The trilingual inscription of Shapur I at Naqš-i Rustam was first discovered in 1939 by archaeologists excavating under the aegis of the Oriental Institute of Chicago University. Inscribed on two sides of the tower complex known as the Ka’ba-i Zardusṭ, the inscription gives a schematic account in Middle Persian, Parthian and Greek of Shapur’s victorious wars against the Romans and of his administrative and religious policies at home. The text was later (1943) given its now more familiar title of *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* by the great historian of the Hellenistic and Roman East, Michael Rostovtzeff, on grounds of its similarity in grandiloquence and boastfulness with the well-known auto-obituary of Caesar Augustus in Ancyra. The outbreak of the Second World War meant that few scholars were available to utilize this major new historical source fully. An important article on the place-names in particular, however, was published by Professor W. B. Henning in this *Bulletin* (BSOS ix, 1939, 823–49) but the text did not become the subject of a major study in English until 1953 when Martin Sprengling published *Third Century*
Iran. Sapor and Kartir (Chicago)—a work which was not properly typeset and which enjoyed very limited circulation. Far more influential is the almost contemporaneous monograph by E. Honigmann and A. Maricq (Recherches sur les Res Gestae Divi Saporis, Brussels, 1953) and five years later Maricq himself published an editio major of the Greek text in the form of a journal article (Syria 34, 1958, 288–96). A detailed study of the historical information on the Romano-Persian wars given by the inscription was published by E. Kettenhofen (Die römisch-persischen Kriege des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr., Wiesbaden, 1982.). The ŠKZ (as the inscription is more properly known) was studied along with several other early Sasanian royal inscriptions by M. Back in his substantial monograph (Die sasanidischen Staatsinschriften, Leiden, 1978). However, as all major Iranian inscriptions have been or are being (re-)edited and (re-)published in the established series the Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, the Corpus edition of this important inscription which carries with it the quasi-status of being the definitive edition (at least for one if not several generations of scholars) has been eagerly awaited.

The handsomely produced volumes under review constitute the most substantial and thorough effort to present this important trilingual inscription to a wide scholarly community as the text is of importance to both scholars of Iranology and of Roman history. Volume I contains the trilingual text laid out in three columns. This highly desirable layout, which is essential for the comparative study of all three versions of this text, is possible because although the format of this two-volume edition is A4 in concert with the other volumes of the Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum series, both volumes are bound on the short side which means that one needs to work on a very large desk if one wishes to consult both volumes at once. The format will also cause problems with library shelving as the spines of the volumes are unlikely to be made visible to the reader. One wonders if there are grounds here for the two volumes to be cased with the title clearly inscribed on the spine of the long-side of the case. The texts of the Middle Iranian versions are given in standard transcription and all three versions are accompanied by separate German translations. A standard set of paragraph numbers replaces the traditional division by line-numbering. This may cause some problems to students familiar only with the Greek version which is usually cited by line-numbers. However, the uniform paragraph-numbering will make the comparative study of the three versions of the text very much easier. The volume contains detailed glossaries to all three versions and includes much valuable information on historical geography. The very full introduction includes an important discussion on the history of the discovery of the inscription and the way in which the text and its various versions were composed.

The second volume contains the philological and historical commentary to the text. The editor’s thorough knowledge of Greek epigraphy and of Roman history makes his commentary a major contribution to the history of the period. As one would expect a lengthy discussion is devoted to the problematic section at the end of the account of the Second Campaign which mentions the capture of Dura Europos and of other cities of the Middle Euphrates after Shapur’s great victory at Barbalissos which is much further up-river. The date of the capture of Dura as indicated by coins found on the bodies of the besieged Roman troops could not be earlier than 256/7 but the main campaign which climaxed with the capture of Antioch took place almost three years earlier. The existence of a Roman military document dated to 254 and the presence of Sasanian (?) graffiti on the dipinti of the famous synagogue at Dura both suggest an initial Roman attempt to hold the city and its brief
occupation by the Sassanians before the final onslaught which is so well reconstructed by the recent archaeological work of Pierre Leriche. It is not impossible to postulate that Dura was a later conquest because it was by-passed in the initial stages of the campaign but the isolated Roman garrison withdrew after 254 and the city was briefly occupied by Sasanian forces. The city was then re-occupied by fresh Roman troops from the Danubian frontier brought to the region by Valerian. The elaborate defences were the work of these battle-hardened professionals who were determined to make Dura a strong-point. This meant that Shapur had no choice but to ‘take out’ the cities on the Middle Euphrates as far up-river as Circesium—future site of a major Roman fortress under Diocletian—to remove this threat to his flanks three years after his initial success and as he was preparing to face the Valerian’s counter-attack. Huyse’s commentary is supplemented by a number of appendices. That on the origin of the author/translator of the Greek version is particularly valuable and Huyse’s conclusion that he was a Greek from Seleucia is entirely convincing. The second volume contains photographs of squeezes of all the lettered panels of the inscription and the standard of reproduction is extremely high.

This excellent edition of one of the most famous early Sasanian royal inscriptions is likely to remain standard for some time to come. The prohibitive cost of the two volumes, however, may mean that many scholars, especially Roman historians, will continue to cite the inscriptions from the edition of the Greek version by Maricq.

SAMUEL N. C. LIEU

JOSEF TROPPER:
Ugaritische Grammatik.

By any standards this book is the most complete reference grammar of Ugaritic to date. The description of the Ugaritic writing system, phonology, morphology, and syntax occupies no fewer than nine hundred densely printed pages. The other hundred or so pages contain eight indexes, abbreviations and a bibliography. But its most useful feature are the copious, and often exhaustive, citations of relevant occurrences of the forms or constructions. The following general observations will focus on the qualitative progress this grammar has made when compared with its predecessors.

A grammar of a language such as Ugaritic, preserved almost exclusively in consonantal writing, will primarily aim to reconstruct forms and describe their use in actual texts. The limited and sometimes damaged records make it difficult to arrive at generalizations. In such cases, these efforts will at best produce hypothetical forms whose value will remain somewhat provisional. The grammarian may instead choose to leave moot points open, perhaps adding brief comparative notes here and there. Unlike Gordon’s now classic Ugaritic grammar, which follows the latter method, the work under review has gone far in exploiting available resources, and the results are generally good.

A case in point is the description of the verbal system. Those who grew up with Gordon’s grammar will recall that finer points concerning the time
reference of *yqtl* and *qtl*, together with their aspectual and modal nuances, have been deliberately left open. Learners are supposed to familiarize themselves with the complexities of the use of the forms in the texts. Two other manuals, one by Segert and the other by Sivan, start where Gordon left off. Segert’s teaching grammar presents the Ugaritic verbal system somewhat rigidly from an aspectual point of view. Consequently it cannot give a satisfactory account of the preterital use of *yqtl*. Sivan, using Rainey’s view of Northwest Semitic prefix conjugation, does not suffer from this drawback, though neither does his grammar really offer a fuller picture of the Ugaritic verbal system. In this respect Tropper’s grammar is superior to its predecessors. Its theoretical basis is also more accountable. Tense is here viewed as a category that has something to do with the relation between the moment of utterance and the event or situation described; hence anterior, simultaneous, or posterior to the utterance. Aspect, on the other hand, is about the way the state of affairs is presented, namely as a finished product (perfective), or as a process that is still ongoing (imperfective). Starting with these notions Tropper proceeds to describe the use of the ‘shorter preformative conjugation *yaqtul’*, the ‘longer preformative conjugation *yaqtulu’*, and *qatala*: the shorter form *yaqtul* expresses a perfective action that takes place before the utterance, hence the preterite, whereas the longer form *yaqtulu* indicates an ongoing situation that may take place before, after, or simultaneously with the moment of utterance. The form *qatala* cuts across all three time references, but it is, according to Tropper, basically perfective. This general description of the use of *qatala*, *yaqtul* and *yaqtulu* has the advantage of being more comprehensive and clearer than other grammars. It is true that those who have worked through Ugaritic texts are not completely unfamiliar with this understanding, nevertheless it is only fair to say that this is the first grammar of Ugaritic to offer a more economical description of the complicated tense-aspect system regardless of whether or not one agrees with Tropper’s interpretation of individual examples.

The modal system is treated in a separate chapter, perhaps for ease of consultation. Thus while the indicative mood is found with all three forms above (*yaqtulu, yaqtul, qatala*), the volitive mood is represented by the imperative, the jussive (whose form is identical with *yaqtul*) and *qatala*. The modal use of the longer form *yaqtulu* is dealt with only in passing (pp. 734–5, under the heading of modal nuances like *must, may* and *can*). The modal use of the infinitive is discussed in an earlier chapter detailing with the narrative and imperatival uses of the infinitive (pp. 491–3). Had he thought of drawing more fully on recent studies of modality, Tropper could have gone a step further in describing the Ugaritic modal system. In this grammar, as in traditional grammars, modality is almost exclusively described in terms of wish and command, thus deontic modality. Forms with energetic ending -n are discussed in terms of their emphatic and affirmative values. As a matter of fact, these forms could have been more broadly presented in terms of the whole range of epistemic modality where the speaker expresses some belief, judgement, doubt, or conviction about the possibility or the necessity of the truth of the statement. This will help explain the large number of cases in which forms with the energetic ending -n do not seem to bear emphasis.

An extremely useful part of this grammar is the long chapter on particles (pp. 737–836). The detailed and exhaustive description has substantially superseded previous treatments given in manuals and special studies in both extent and clarity. Besides the staple material like adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, emphatic particles, and particles of existence, the treatment also
includes various enclitic particles other than the well-known enclitic -m, namely -n, -y, -k, -t, which are left virtually unexplained in other manuals. Tropper’s analysis has also improved upon the most complete, if not always lucid, treatment of these particles by K. Aartun (AOAT 21/1–2, 1974). One of the improvements is the interpretation that -y represents a particle marking a direct speech rather than an emphatic particle. Probably because of the scarcity of the data, the discussions on enclitic -k and -t are less enlightening. Even if one is not convinced by everything that this grammar says about the individual enclitic particles, the material and the discussion merit serious consideration.

Students of Ugaritic and Semitic languages in general will certainly be indebted to this reference grammar for a long time to come.

AGUSTINUS GIANTO

ANTONIO GIUSTOZZI:


Antonio Giustozzi’s fascinating book focuses on Afghanistan under the communist government of the PDPA (People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan), which ruled the country from the coup of April 1978 until the fall of President Najibullah in April 1992. In addition to numerous academic works, the descriptions and analyses are based on secret Soviet reports which have recently become available, radio broadcasts, and interviews with different actors. Using these new sources, the author is able to offer an original perspective to this important period of contemporary Afghan history and to integrate the social, political and military aspects of the pro-Soviet regime.

The book is divided into four parts enriched by appendices (statistical tables, maps and graphs) and a wide bibliography. Part 1 deals with the limits of ‘sovietization’. Aware of the weakness of the state in the provinces, the Soviet leadership wanted to move step-by-step to rebuild the state apparatus and to widen the political base of the regime. This was no longer a workable programme after Amin’s bloody dictatorship and the generalized armed uprising (1979). After analysing the reforms the communists had tried to implement, Antonio Giustozzi addresses government policy: consolidation of the party base, organization of propaganda, compromises with some local powers. The majority of PDPA members were young, secular intellectuals from Kabul. The party failed to extend its support in the countryside and was unable to prevent the explosion of tensions between urban and rural populations, as well as between secular and religious educated people. Land reform, introduced to help the peasantry, was not understood by its beneficiaries and remained largely ineffective. The same pattern of failure may be seen for the female emancipation and literacy campaigns.

Part 2 tackles the efforts made by the Communist Government to reorganize the regular armed forces. The author emphasizes the lack of strength of the Afghan army at the beginning of the war and its incapacity to conduct counter-guerrilla activities. The internal rivalries between the two communist factions (Khalq and Parcham), the various purges, low morale,
bad relations between officers and soldiers, and the very high desertion rate are all factors which explain this ineffectiveness. Another strategy the government implemented was to reinforce the troops of the Ministry of the Interior (sarandoy), which received the important strategic tasks of protecting the economic assets and fighting at village level. At the end of the 1980s, their role began to decline. In spite of new recruitment measures based on economic incentives (from 1985), the regular armed forces never reached their planned full strength. The improvement of the Afghan army was never achieved and its military activities remained highly ineffective.

The second half of the book is possibly even more interesting than the first. Here Giustozzi analyses the causes of the failure of national reconciliation and the role of the different militias and their complex relationships with the resistance.

In Part 3, the author explains the ‘pacification policy’. Acknowledging the limits of their earlier approach, Soviet advisers and Afghan leaders elaborated a new strategy. Under Soviet pressure, President Karmal launched a reform programme, known as the Ten Theses, in October 1995. It continued more coherently under his successor Najibullah between 1986 and 1992, but with varying success. The regime intended to favour political over military means, to appear more respectful of Islam, to represent the various strata of the population, and to respect a certain level of local autonomy. It attempted ‘to co-opt the armed opposition in the countryside, striking deals with single commanders or single villages’ (p. 119). At first, it was an opportunistic tactic, but it progressively became the main long-term strategy of the regime, especially after Soviet withdrawal in 1989.

Part 4 examines the role of the militias up to the fall of Kabul (1992). To tackle the problem of the army and the withdrawal of the Red Army, the communist regime developed a new strategy and encouraged the rise of several militias in the second half of the 1980s. The latter have played a fundamental role in the pacification of the country, especially in the northern provinces. A ‘sort of feudal relationship between the central government and the militia leaders’ was established, leading to further fragmentation of the country (p. 231). Their commanders were often mujahedin. They committed various sorts of abuse (robbing refugees or ransacking villages) and their imperfect loyalty compromised the existence of the Communist Government. They finally provoked the fall of Kabul when the resources of the central state dried up (after 1991 the Soviet Union was unable to meet its commitments).

Antonio Giustozzi writes clearly and is very well informed. His insightful book fills an important gap in Afghan studies, since most Western scholars have focused on the resistance or on the geo-political issues of the conflict. Unfortunately, one regrets the relative lack of analysis of the nationalities policy implemented by the Communist Government on the Soviet model, which has certainly contributed to the ethnicization of the Afghan society throughout the war (see pp. 236 and 242–3 for instance) and will have long-lasting effects. The author could also have developed his rich final insight linking the present situation in Afghanistan with the strategy of the Communist regime, when he mentions the possible appearance of a reaction against the warlords from some quarter, probably outside their area of influence, e.g. from the southern Pashtun belt, where it could also have exploited ethnic resentment against the dominance of ethnic minorities in Kabul. This is what actually happened with the Taliban’ (p. 250). But that is another story.
The work under review traces the social changes that occurred in Egyptian society over the last two hundred or so years. More specifically, it examines how authority and influence shifted and changed hands from the Mamluks to Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha, then to his dynasty, and also to the British from 1882 until 1952, when the Egyptian military initiated their coup d’état. This coup was supposed to benefit the hitherto deprived classes of society, yet Sonbol considers that the only groups to profit were the military and their cronies. She concludes that the importance of the military was reduced during Sadat’s rule, allowing a new class of businessmen to gain prominence.

Sonbol’s study is worthy of interest if only for its categorization and description of the holders of power and authority—referred to as the *khassa*. She stresses that the *khassa* still exist today, despite the 1952 revolution and its abolition of class differences, but that it comprises different groups. The groups changed over time, but the ruling class have always been part of the *khassa*, as are tax collectors and assessors, and sometimes the military, as well as the merchant or business class. The merchant class is important especially since it maintains direct or indirect foreign relations. The groups in the *khassa* complement each other, yet each fights for greater control and power. Sonbol specifies that the *khassa* are not necessarily the *ammah*, or larger public, recognize them as those who wield power and influence. The *ammah* includes members of the clergy, professionals, and other intellectuals, although some clergy were, in the past, part of the *khassa*; they could control the public as well as intercede for people with the rulers.

The first chapter gives the historical background, with a criticism of the conventional view that Egypt’s only noteworthy attribute in the eighteenth century was the internal strife between the warlords, Mamluks, and the Ottoman garrisons in Egypt. Sonbol aptly points out that people’s lives went on as usual, and that life was organized and ordered: transactions took place, court cases were heard, sentences were passed, and justice was carried out in accordance with existing laws.

Chapter ii shows how the destruction of the Mamluks allowed Muhammad ‘Ali to secure Egypt for himself. He took over the *khassa*, rid himself of the *multazims* (tax collectors), and then appointed local notables to collect taxes from their respective areas. By the end of the nineteenth century, this group had become part of the new *khassa*, together with the British and other foreigners who now controlled the country.

Sonbol, who herself uses more secondary than primary sources, points out that one difficulty faced by those seeking to determine the conditions of the merchants during Muhammad ‘Ali’s time is the lack of such sources or data.

The third chapter describes how the need to modernize the country necessitated the use of European languages in the legal and administrative domains. Accordingly, Egyptians wanting upward social mobility and seeking to join the administration needed to be fluent in foreign languages. The author cites an example, based on her own research, of the School of *Hakimas*, senior healthcare nurses, where the period of study was three years. Egyptian female graduates aspiring to more advanced study needed to demonstrate their fluency in a foreign language in an oral exam. Conditions such as these accentuated the duality of Egyptian society. Members of the *khassa* eventually
The author aptly observes that the contradictions and conflicts that separated Zaghlul and other members of the Wafd from the Palace and the British were only fully resolved after 1952.

In Chapter VI, Sonbol is equally scathing about the khassa that established itself after the 1952 coup. She argues that Nasser’s rhetoric with regard to the abolition of class differences actually helped to augment class consciousness, so that the poorer classes now demanded a greater share of wealth corresponding to that of the better-off middle classes of professionals and intellectuals. Moreover, because the new order represented themselves as members of the ‘ammah or public, whilst they saw themselves as symbols of the people’s will, they considered political equality to be inconsequential. The policy of Nasser’s military regime was to ‘humble bureaucrats and intellectuals’. This involved ‘no freedom of expression, no respect for life or property, no concept of law above the needs of the state’. The state that emerged represented only one order—that of armed officers and their allies. Scientists, engineers and doctors were needed, but were seldom asked whether they approved of the policies carried out in their respective administrations, as these were dictated by a government composed mainly of military officers.

Chapter VII discusses Sadat’s presidency, describing how internal needs and external factors led to a new open door policy. Once again, this favoured the new khassa, namely allies and close affiliates of the new president, as well as businessmen. Sonbol surmises that Sadat continued the same discourse as his predecessor, but that he had one discourse for the people and another for the khassa, and that he was far more elitist than was Nasser.

In Chapter VII and the conclusion the author reflects on the fact that while in the past the khassa set the standards for Egypt, she suspects that the ‘ammah may have finally gained the upper hand, as they are the ones who now set the tone.

Sonbol’s analysis is sound, her judgements impartial, and her arguments convincing. However, the value of her book is marred by a lack of thoroughness. For example, she mentions, on page 47, that the Qanunname of Egypt was issued in 1528 by the Ottoman Sultan Selim I, but it was his son, Sulayman, who actually instituted the Qanunname, since Selim I died in 1520. On the same page, when referring to the Ottoman invasion of Egypt, she says ‘after the 1916 invasion’. She writes, on page 49, that diwan al-madaris was initiated in 1926, whereas she means 1826. Then on page 61, she declares that a general Coptic congress took place in Assiut in 1910; however, the Egyptian government, after the Wardani incident, refused to allow the Coptic congress to take place in 1910, and it was held in 1911. Further, on page 64, she says that there were one million Swiss and Belgians in Egypt after 1840—which seems slightly far-fetched, especially since she herself writes that there were 150,000 foreigners in Egypt at that time. She later refers to the ‘celebrated’ case of Shaykh ‘Ali Yusuf, founder of the newspaper al-Mu’ayyad, who married a girl from ‘the elite classes’, and Sonbol mentions Malak Hifni
Nasif. Shaykh ‘Ali Yusuf actually married a daughter of Shaykh al-Sadat, who was one of the *ashraf*. As for Malak Hifni Nasif, *bahiyyat al-badiyyah*, she was married to ‘Abd al-Sattar al-Basil. Sonbol also states that a secret police force was instituted in 1940, yet it was established in the early 1920s to fight political crime. There is also the burning of the Cairo Opera House which, according to Sonbol, took place in the 1990s, whereas it burned down in 1971. Montreux is referred to as Montreaux. Also according to Sonbol, Isma’il Sidqi was fired as Prime Minister of Egypt after the Badari incident, but the Badari case was debated in the Egyptian Parliament in January 1933, and Sidqi only resigned in September 1933, as a result of King Fuad and Ibrashi’s machinations. In referring to the Ziwar cabinet of 1925, she writes 1952. The bread riots took place in Egypt in 1977, not in 1981.

MALAK BADRAWI

MAI GHOUSSOUB and EMMA SINCLAIR-WEBB (ed.):
*Imagined masculinities: male identities and culture in the modern Middle East.*


There has been a significant increase during the 1990s in publications on Western ‘masculinity’. Some have been written in response, and sometimes as a challenge, to a perceived imbalance in gender and identity studies that favours women. These (primarily male) authors assert that feminist literature and women’s studies have either excluded men, or have neglected to address the complexities and possible diversity of male identities. The juxtaposition of more fully explored and developed female identities against some essentialized, monolithic, and normally patriarchal ‘male’ in much feminist literature has been viewed as tactically disempowering towards men, and some have sought to rectify the situation by reclaiming a male focus in their writing. Positions entrenched in exclusionary policies, however, have only served to widen the gender divide and have failed productively to engage with the social and cultural politics of gendering.

More inclusive approaches to gender studies have also responded to the under-representation of ‘masculinity’ in earlier feminist works and women’s studies, but have more successfully avoided the pitfalls of the ‘all-male’ works by bridging the divide between the sexes. Contemporary gender studies address notions of masculinity and femininity within a unified discursive field, thereby recognizing not only their necessary relation to one another, but also the possibility of multiple and overlapping gender identities. Writers, such as the contributing authors to Cornwall and Lindisfarne’s *Dislocating masculinity* (1994), consider the construction of hegemonic and variant masculinities within particular ethnographic contexts, and thereby collectively challenge the notion of a natural, universal and heterosexual masculinity. The compilation of writings in Ghoussoub and Sinclair-Webb’s edited volume under review here, *Imagined masculinities*, follows suit, and makes a significant contribution not only to the study of masculinities, but also to gender research in the Middle East more generally.

Despite commonly held assumptions about patriarchal dominance in Middle Eastern cultures and societies, studies of the production and reproduction of masculine identities have been scant, and much of the gender focus in this region has been on women in relation to issues of social status,
Islam, politics and law. Ghoussoub and Sinclair-Webb’s volume initiates a much-needed correction to this deficiency. *Imagined masculinities* presents the work of fifteen academics, journalists and writers of various cultural backgrounds, all of whom share the premise that masculinity, like femininity, is socially constructed with complex webs of power relations. In addition to newly-authored contributions, a few of the chapters are excerpts reprinted from existing publications, such as Bouhdiba’s ‘Sexuality in Islam’, and others are translations from works in Arabic which present an English-reading audience with a valuable insight into gender studies pursued by non-Western scholars and writers. One of the great merits of the book is that the editors have not equated the Middle East exclusively with Islam, and have included several fascinating contributions on Jewish-Israeli notions of masculinity (but unfortunately none specifically addressing the Christian communities of the region), and regional coverage extends widely from Morocco to Turkey and into the Arabian Peninsula without ever positing generalized notions of ‘Middle Eastern’ practices.

The book has been divided into three parts. The first, entitled ‘Making men: institutions and social practices’, comprises essays that analyse the making of masculinity in ritualistic and institutionalized contexts. The editors claim to have achieved a chronology from childhood to adulthood here, but with only five chapters in the section, two of which deal with circumcision and three that analyse masculinity within military and combative contexts, there are certainly a great many lacunae in relation to the ageing process. In fact, elderly males, or even those who have passed beyond the ritual ‘wedding night’, tend to be relegated outside of studies of masculinity, falsely suggesting that either masculine identity remains static with maturity, or that older men assume classic patriarchal roles. The contributions in this section are nevertheless among the strongest in the book, and particularly enlightening is the contrast between both Bouhdiba’s and Khal’s accounts of Muslim circumcisions with that of Bilu’s highly informative (though at times overly theoretical) analysis of circumcisions, haircuts and the Torah among Israel’s ultra-orthodox Jews. Sinclair-Webb’s study of military service and manhood is situated within the intricate relationship between gender, ethnicity and power in contemporary Turkey, and the government’s ongoing oppression of the Kurds. I felt, however, that this relation could have been better highlighted in order to demonstrate more clearly how questions of gender identity cannot be disentangled from ones regarding language, ethnicity and race. Peteet’s essay on male gender in the Intifada is an abbreviated version of an article originally published in 1994 that nicely complements her earlier and more extensive work on women in the Palestinian resistance movement. Kaplan’s study of gender and sexuality in the all-Israeli military ‘melting pot’ points out how some men, while fully upholding the hegemonic masculine ideal espoused by the army and nation, may also develop a homosexual identity.

Part 2 of the book on ‘Male fictions’ takes a more literary slant on the issue of masculinity, with contributions considering medieval and modern Arabic literature, the Egyptian cinema, and propagandist journalism. The first two chapters are particularly insightful and complement each other nicely in their historic focus. In her analysis of ‘wiles of women’ stories, such as those integrated within such frame stories as *The Thousand and One Nights*, Najmabadi provocatively suggests that, in contrast to the way that the Oedipus story works to produce ‘heterosocial heteronormativity’, these circulate in the Middle East to produce and reproduce a ‘repudiation of the world of women, while distancing from male homoeroticism to construct a
homosocial adult manhood’. In the following chapter, Lagrange engages in a somewhat extensive historical survey of ‘homosexuality’ in Arabic literature, and posits several possible reasons for the subject’s general neglect in contemporary writing in comparison with literature of the Classical Age. The book’s third part, ‘Memoir and male identity’, completes the volume with three chapters by Jewish and Arabic writers. All three present highly entertaining autobiographical insights into the lives of Middle Eastern men and explore important episodes in the construction of gender identities.

_Imagined masculinities_ provides a necessary study in the Middle East context, and will be extremely valuable for students in gender, anthropology, and Near and Middle Eastern studies. We can only hope for more follow up on this important issue.

**TREVOR H. J. MARCHAND**

**RUTH RODED (ed.):**

*Women in Islam and the Middle East: a reader.*


Ruth Roded has been associated with the Department of the History of Islam and the Middle East at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for over twenty-five years. During this time she has worked to transmit an understanding of the complex role of women in the history and culture of this part of the world. From the first course she taught on women in Islam and Middle Eastern history, it became clear to the author that the only way to do justice to this controversial subject was by enabling her students to read primary sources (in translation, if necessary) and form their own opinion. This was a perilous path, fraught with dangers in not only the selection of materials, in their translation (mainly into English), but also in the omission of material.

Ruth Roded is careful to highlight the particular difficulties of interpreting early Islamic, particularly quranic, references to women. Hence her effort to let the material speak for itself is introduced by text which attempts to ‘locate’ the material. Here she raises questions which the twenty-first century reader might wish to ask. She is also careful to note the biases which emerge—particularly in European travel literature—isolating Islam as denigrating to women, when the facts presented seem to suggest that what is being perceived is a social and cultural attitude common to Arab Christians, Muslims and Jews alike. She cites, for an example, the work of Henry Harris Jessup, a Protestant missionary in Syria for seventeen years in the mid-nineteenth century. In his book *Women of the Arabs* he refers to a number of scholarly works and Arabic written and oral sources, yet his attitude to the subject is extraordinarily biased. ‘The scourging and beating of wives is one of the worst features of Moslem domestic life’, he says. Yet, as Ruth Roded shows, Jessup, by his own evidence, admits that Christians in nineteenth-century Syria beat their wives as often as did Muslims. In fact she goes on to state that the nineteenth-century man’s ‘right and even obligation to punish women and children in his care by beating if necessary was widely recognized in the West as well as the East until very recently’ (p. 6). With this cultural relativistic approach to the material outlined in her 20-page introduction, the selected readings which comprise the bulk of the book offer a promise of being more than a reaffirmation of orientalist scholarship.

The readings are divided into five parts: Part 1, The foundation of Islam;
Part 2, Early Islamic history; Part 3, Women as sources, actors and subjects of Islamic law; Part 4, Women’s roles in medieval society; Part 5, Twentieth-century vicissitudes. Each part is introduced by Roded who offers some interpretive insight into and contextualization of the materials she has selected as well as, frequently, a set of questions which she feels the material raises. However, the readings cannot begin to answer the questions raised and the reader is often left with the sense that fewer readings and more interpretation by Roded would have been more satisfying. The material cannot be understood out of context and it is the interpretation or directed reading towards that end which has value. For example, in Part 1, Roded chooses from the Quran select passages from just three chapters. Surah XXIV Light; Surah XXXIII The Clans; and Surah IV Women. These are the contentious passages concerned with the appropriate modesty of women, the ‘superiority’ of men to women, the right to beat women, and the admonishment to bring in arbitration when a man and his wife are in disagreement. The very wording of these passages in Arabic has been the cause of much debate and interpretation. In English translation this becomes even more controversial and problematic.

This book is not an easy one to read on its own. It can easily be appropriated to justify a now stale orientalist image of women in the Middle East. However, as a text which is used to accompany a directed course on women in the Middle East it has great potential. The materials which Ruth Roded has identified, translated into English and notated make an excellent starting point for a taught course. This material and the questions raised by the author in each chapter can be addressed in the course of classroom discussion and debate. Furthermore, it might then be possible to expand the material presented and to bring it into greater focus and clarity by selecting accompanying material on the roles and attitudes towards Arab Jewish and Christian women. As a teaching text, this book has significant potential. If the material in this book were enhanced by additional supporting historical texts on Arab Christian and Jewish women, the reader would emerge with a firmer grounding in Women in Islam and the Middle East.

DAWN CHATTY

SUAD JOSEPH (ed.):

Gender and citizenship in the Middle East. (With a foreword by Deniz Kandiyoti.)


The work under review discusses a number of important issues: specific ways in which women are incorporated into the political sphere in different Middle Eastern countries; how women’s rights and privileges are limited and they are therefore not fully enfranchised citizens; how various forms of state and governance shape and constrain the political and civic participation of women; and the varied ways in which women systematically challenge patriarchal states.

The book provides historical analysis of different forms of patriarchy (systems of social relations) in a number of Middle Eastern societies. This is an important analysis, as Islam per se is not viewed as the only phenomenon shaping women’s lives—women in these societies are also subject to patriarchal laws and the regulations of the Christian and Jewish religions.
The introductory chapter by Suad Joseph provides a thorough review of the literature on citizenship. Joseph argues that citizenship is a legal process, and that its practice can therefore be constrained by law. It is also a cultural process which treats men and women differently. Sometimes equality of rights may be enshrined in law but culture determines an unequal status for women and men. This is an important argument, as it sheds light on the differing relationships of men and women to the laws and practices of citizenship in Middle Eastern societies.

Suad Joseph also draws on the theoretical work of many authors on nation-building and state-building, and argues that to link women/mothers to nation and men/fathers to state (the state being masculine and patriarchal) reproduces gender hierarchy. Women’s experiences show that they are caught between the conflicting demands of nation-building and state-building projects.

The contributors to this volume argue that in most Middle Eastern countries there is an inter-relationship between citizenship and religion. This is because the citizens as legal subjects are constituted through membership of religious communities, institutionalizing religious identity as political identity. This is taking into consideration the fact that religious identities are not fixed but are historically specific and therefore change according to political, economic, social and cultural factors, as well as gender, ethnicity, age, etc.

In all Middle Eastern countries, the family is a part of the political process and religion is embedded in politics. Different religious laws determine family law, a critical feature of citizenship laws and practices. The patriarchal family means that women are not free, autonomous individuals; their rights and obligations as citizens depend not only on their personhood, but also on their familyhood. The family is not a free association of individuals but an institution characterized by unequal power relations and governed by rules invented, interpreted and administered by male communal authorities.

Altorki, in her study of Saudi Arabia, argues that the Western definition assumes that citizenship is a homogeneous, undifferentiated, universal category, but this definition is problematic and does not apply to the Middle East, as women in these societies are not contract-making individuals who defend their own interests in society. Haya Al-Mughni and Mary Ann Tetreault argue that nationality is not synonymous with citizenship: nationality means that a person belongs to a particular state, but some groups within society are excluded from certain state entitlements. For example, until 1999 women in Kuwait were not entitled to political participation and were denied the right to vote. Only those women not supported by male relatives are entitled to social welfare. Female wages are lower than male wages, even if women have higher educational qualifications than men. Kuwaiti women are forbidden by law to marry non-Muslims. The children of Kuwaiti women and non-Kuwaiti men are considered to be foreigners. (These laws do not apply to Kuwaiti men.)

This demonstrates the gendered construction of citizenship and adds weight to the assumption that women are not viewed as individuals in their own right but as family members whose rights and duties are defined in relation to their kinsmen. Men are seen as the protectors and keepers of women, ensuring that their honour is preserved and their sexuality remains under control. Therefore, women’s political, social and economic existence is controlled by men.

This volume also contributes to the debate about women’s varied ways of struggle for liberation. Everywhere the laws of masculinist/patriarchal states institutionalize gendered citizenship. But women are challenging this
masculinist discourse of citizenship. Case studies by Mervat F. Hatem on Egypt, Marnia Lazreg on Algeria, Sondra Hale on Sudan, Islah Jad, Penny Johnson, and Rita Giacaman on Palestine, Yesim Arat on Turkey and Homa Hoodfar on Iran demonstrate how women work with the state, but systematically demand reforms. Further case studies by Mounira M. Charrad on Tunisia and Morocco, Abla Amawi and Barbara Swirski on Jewish and Palestinian Arab women in Israel demonstrate how women look to their respective states to protect them from the tyrannies of their families. Jacqueline S. Ismael and Shereen T. Ismael on Iraq, and Soraya Altorki on Saudi Arabia demonstrate how women turn to their families from the tyrannies of the state. This also applies to the Palestinian women who turn to their community from the tyrannies of the state of Israel. Case studies of Egypt, Algeria, Iran, Palestine and Israel also show that women challenge and at the same time work with the state because the tyrannies of the state and family are interwoven.

The case studies of Saudi Arabia, Iran and Kuwait are particularly fascinating in demonstrating how women are in different ways challenging the state and extending their rights. In Saudi Arabia, where women are denied access to many occupations and men can easily divorce their wives, some women have begun to pool their resources by establishing women’s banks and building protection for their interest through their traditional networks. In Iran, a significant number of Islamist and secular women, despite their diverse views on the nature of religion and the Islamic state, are working together against patriarchal gender relations and have managed to bring about some major changes in their own favour. In Kuwait, despite the Islamist upsurge, female labour force participation has increased from 2 per cent in 1965 to 17 per cent in 1997. Women’s educational achievements are equally remarkable; 62 per cent of senior positions are occupied by women. A significant number of women occupy important managerial positions in both the private and the state sectors. This is the most important argument of this book, as it shows the power of Middle Eastern women to mobilize, in their varied ways, to extend their citizenship rights.

ELAHEH ROSTAMI POVEY

SOUTH ASIA

JENS BRAARVIG (ed.):
Buddhist manuscripts, volume I. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I.

With a considerable number of more or less fragmentary manuscripts of highly important Buddhist texts, both Śrāvakāyānist and Mahāyānist, having come to light over the past decade, Buddhist studies have recently received a very significant new impetus. Among the first of these manuscript discoveries to have been described were the birch bark scrolls containing texts in Gandhari Prakrit and Kharoṣṭhī script now kept in London at the British Library, these evidently being the older of the recently discovered manuscripts. The publication under review now presents scholars with a valuable selection of palm-leaf manuscripts in Brāhmī or Kharoṣṭhī script, as well as fragments of
a leather manuscript in Graeco-Bactrian script, all apparently coming from the Bamiyan valley in Afghanistan and kept in Norway in the collection of Martin Schøyen.

A General Introduction from the pen of its general editor, Jens Braarvig, opens the present volume (pp. i–iii). In her Appendix (pp. 285–300) on the palaeography and dating of the Brähmi fragments published in this volume, Lore Sander concludes that the five manuscripts in question reflect ‘the development of the Brähmi script from the 3rd to the 6th centuries in a region named [...] “Greater Gandhāra”’ (p. 300). The main part of the volume contains the edition and discussion by several scholars of the manuscript materials. In these individual contributions the manuscript fragments first receive diplomatic transliterations and then, in most cases, what is here termed ‘reconstructions’ made on the basis of parallel textual material in Sanskrit, and also when available in Pali, Chinese and/or Tibetan.

From the Dirghāgama come six fragments, edited by Mark Allon and Richard Salomon, of a version of the Mahāparinirvānasūtra (pp. 243–73) in Gandhari Prakrit (somewhat Sanskritized linguistically and/or orthographically) from a palm-leaf manuscript in Kharoṣṭhī script. This study shows the fragments to belong to a recension of the Sutra differing significantly from other known versions, even though it does bear some notable similarities with the translation in the Dirghāgama of the Chinese canon. It may possibly belong, then, to the Dharmaguptakanikāyā. (A single fragment from Murtuq of a different, and highly Sanskritized, recension was published in 1968 by E. Waldeșmidt, who assigned it also to the Dharmaguptaka canon on the basis of the Chinese translation; see his monograph Drei Fragmente buddhistischer Süttras aus den Turfanhandschriften and his article ‘Central Asian Sutra fragments and their relation to the Chinese Agamas’ in H. Bechert (ed.), Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung (Göttingen, 1980), pp. 162–9. But see the remarks by M. Nishimura, ‘Die Sprache der Dharmaguptaka’, in: H. Bechert et al. (ed.), Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur II (Göttingen, 1997), pp. 260–4, a work not included in the bibliography to the volume under review.) The present edition of the fragments is followed by several pages of palaeographical and linguistic observations, and by some ‘Preliminary observations’ on the relationship of the Gandhari text to other texts of this Sutra.

Fragments in Brähmi script from the Camgiśūtra, an account of a discussion between a Brahman and the Buddha about religious authority, are edited by Torkel Brekke (pp. 53–62), who assigns the text to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin tradition. The parallel from the Caiñśūtra in the Majjhimanikāyā of the Theravādins is also reproduced here.

Brähmi fragments of the cycle of legends relating to King Asoka, including the Asokamukhanagavinaṇava-pariccheda, are edited by Klaus Wille (pp. 219–31).

A Brähmi fragment of the Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga containing the Episode of the monastic steward Dravya Mallaputra is published by Seishi Karashima (pp. 223–41), who attributes it to the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. (As pointed out already in 1932 by S. Lévi, and by other scholars since, the Bamiyan area of Afghanistan had earlier yielded portions of Vinaya works attributable also to the Mahāsāṃghikas.)

A large number of fragments of an Āstasāhanikā Prajñāpāramitā are edited by Lore Sander (pp. 1–51), who assigns the Brähmi manuscript in question to the Kusāṇa period, probably to the second half of the third century C.E. (p. 288). The manuscript from which these fragments come is therefore the oldest of those studied in this volume. Very significantly, therefore, the
recension of the Sutra to which these very old fragments belong differs somewhat from the recension represented by the Indo-Scythian Lokakṣema’s Chinese translation of the late second century, and they are indeed closer to the recension represented by the very much later Nepalese manuscripts on which the printed edition of the Sanskrit is based. This circumstance tends to support the view that just because a Chinese translation contains a shorter, and simpler, text of a given work, it is not necessarily older, or more ‘original’, than a longer and more elaborate recension.

In addition, the Schøyen Collection includes fragments of one very large manuscript in Brähmi script described by Sander (p. 291) as a local development of ‘Gilgit/Bamiyan, Type I’ which she dates to the fifth century (p. 293). The following four texts have been identified in this manuscript.

1. Fragments of the Śrīmālādevīsimhanādasūtra are edited by Kazunobu Matsuda (pp. 65–76). To his transliteration the editor appends Chinese and Tibetan translations of the passages to which the fragments belong. The Tibetan text, taken from Tsukinowa’s edition (Kyōto, 1940), contains a number of misprints.

2. A portion of a ‘Pravāranāsūtra’ is edited by Kazunobu Matsuda (pp. 77–80), who points out that the fragment actually reads prāvāraṇa (p. 80). This text is connected by him with the Mahāyāna.

3. Fragments of the Sarvadharmapravṛttinirdesa (pp. 81–166), the diplomatic transliteration of which by Jens Braarvig is followed by his ‘reconstruction’ using Chinese and Tibetan translations of the whole Sūtra.

4. Fragments, nineteen in all, of the AjātaśatrukaukṣyavinoJanmāsūtra are published by Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (pp. 167–216, 301–2). This work was translated by Lokakṣema in the late second century, and it is extant also in a Tibetan translation; the parts of these two translations corresponding to the edited fragments are reproduced here, together with Dharmarākṣa’s third-century Chinese translation. For the edition of the relevant portions of the Tibetan text, a manuscript from Tabo has been used.

Three very small, and unidentified, fragments assigned to the same manuscript are published on pp. 217–8.

Finally, two small fragments of a Buddhist manuscript on leather in the Bactrian language and a cursive Graeco-Bactrian script are edited by Nicholas Sims-Williams (pp. 275–7), who dates them to about the fifth century.

Twelve beautifully clear facsimile plates of reproductions of the edited fragments are appended to this volume.

With the exception of the fragments of the Aśoka legend, the two additional fragments of the AjātaśatrukaukṣyavinoJanmāsūtra on pp. 301–2, and the Bactrian fragments, the texts presented in this volume are accompanied by English translations. For some texts the fragments only have been translated, whilst for the majority the translation is of a fuller ‘reconstruction’ that makes use both of the fragments and of any other available parallel material in an Indian language, as well as of Chinese and Tibetan versions of the text. In style and quality these translations differ appreciably, no uniformity having been aimed at. The question may arise as to whether translations—which perforce greatly increase the bulk (and price) of the volume—are always needed for the purposes of such a publication. Where there is no context, as in the case of an unidentified fragment, a good translation is of course very often scarcely possible. And where ample parallel materials in Indian languages, as well as in Chinese and Tibetan, are available, an accompanying translation may not really be required, an example being the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (of which there is an English translation by
E. Conze the revised edition of which, published under the title *The Perfection of Wisdom in eight thousand lines and its verse summary* (Bolinas, California, 1973), has not been referred to by Sander. An exception is no doubt the case where what is here termed a ‘reconstruction’ consisting of a full-scale multilingual synoptic edition of the whole text has been translated, an example being the *Sarvadharma-pravṛtti-nīrdeṣa-sūtra* rendered in its entirety.

In Braarvig’s translation of the latter Sutra, the expression *kim samdhāya* (p. 102) probably means ‘intending what=having what in mind?’, rather than ‘with certain hidden intentions’ (p. 103, a meaning appropriate in only a limited set of texts). And *pratībhāna*, a *pratisamvīd* ‘penetrative knowledge’, presumably refers to intelligence and insightful/inspired speech (relating to the content level), rather than just to ‘eloquence’ (on the level of expression) (p. 82 ff.). In the introduction to his contribution on the *Śrīmālādevīsīṃhanāda-sūtra*, Matsuda remarks (p. 65) that ‘this Sūtra employs the narrative of Queen Śrīmālā to express the Tathāgatagarbha theory that “although all beings are enmired in a limited set of texts). And *pratibhā* “having a single recourse” (Tib. *nes pa i don*), modifying the noun *nīrdeśāh* (namely of this ŚMDSS), is rather loosely rendered as ‘clearly bring[ing] out the meaning’; whilst ekavagratimāraṇa ‘having recourse in unity’—the Tibetan has *rton pa gcig pa ‘having a single recourse’—is also quite approximatively rendered by ‘basis of Oneness’ (is the reference to the ekayāna treated in the ŚMDSS?). These two epithets are accompanied, also as a modifier of nīrdeśāh, by the adjective *chinna-plotika* ‘having the bond(s) severed’ (Tib. *rgyul ba ? bcad pa*), a usage of the expression that usefully expands the entries in Edgerton’s BHSD under *ploti, ploti ka, and plotika/pilotika*. In Sander’s translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasriśākā*, it is noted (p. 8) that the translations of *rūpa (skandha)* by ‘form’ and *sannyās (skandha)* by ‘perception’ follow Groner’s English translation of A. Hirakawa’s *History of Indian Buddhism* (Honolulu, 1990); no explanation has been offered as to why these translation equivalents are to be preferred to those in much of the specialized work done on the subject in recent decades. On p. 11, *sarvajñā* ‘Omniscient’ and *sarvajñātva* ‘state/condition of the Omniscient’ are both rendered by ‘omniscience’, as is also (and correctly) *sarvajñatā* (p. 31). On p. 26 f., the words *sammiḥjita* and *sammiḥjita, rendered as beginning’ and ‘ending respectively, would appear to designate rather an opening (cf. *prasārita* ‘extension’, another antonym of *sammiḥjita)—i.e. an engagement in terms of positive affirmation, *vidhī*, according to Haribhadra—and a drawing together—i.e. a retraction in terms of negation, *pratisedhā*. Given the context on p. 45 f., *dharma* would normally be rendered as ‘thing’ (in other words, a [mentally posited] factor or phenomenon) rather than as ‘religious precept’.

In this volume there is no index, but one will no doubt follow in the second volume, the publication of which is announced as being imminent and which is eagerly awaited. The present publication constitutes a most valuable contribution to Buddhist studies providing us with Sanskrit texts, albeit fragmentary, of several major works.

D. SEYFORT RUEGG
MAHES RAJ PANT:
Jāṭarūpa’s commentary on the Amarakośa. For the first time critically edited together with an Introduction, Appendices and Indexes.

This edition of the Amarakośatīkā ascribed to Jāṭarūpa, carefully edited in Nagari and lavishly annotated, celebrates M. R. Pant’s identification, under the auspices of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, of the oldest direct attestation of a work of Sanskrit lexicography, an incomplete palm-leaf copy (less than 40 per cent) of a Buddhist author’s commentary on Amara’s seminal lexicon. The date of the manuscript corresponds to A.D. 1119.

It has been used, and apparently misquoted (I, 383ff.), by the better known medieval Bengali commentators. The editor attributes discrepancies between their quotations and this Amarakośatīkā to incompetent oral transmission (I, 408), but it would seem at least equally likely that the fault lies with the colophon verse in attributing the present text to the well-known ‘Jāṭarūpa’. The verse makes a pun on Vulgate koṣa (tiṅkāyā vikacah kriṭhaḥ), whereas the prose colophon (I, 67), and an early occurrence in the text (II, 154, line 18), have kośa.

The editor has been able to supplement the older manuscript with the help of an eighteenth-century copy, of which, however, only the beginning was extant (it has since been mislaid). He takes enormous pains to demonstrate that the later manuscript is (to all intents) a corrupt and miscorrected direct copy of the other. The palaeography, orthography and punctuation of the early specimen are described in suitably exhaustive detail. Even the 114 pp. devoted to analysing the scribal errors found in both, and the 30 pp. that strive to attest ‘Buddhistic and Prakritic influence’ as a separate phenomenon, though predictable, will no doubt be found useful by apprentices in the art of editing Newari material.

An expert analysis of the commentator’s grammatical usage (I, 414ff.) seems to show that this Jāṭarūpa offers an amalgam of Pāṇiniya quotations with underlying Cāndrā tenets, but also a measure of inconsistency with both. The discussion of the commentator’s time and place locates him in Bengal and finds a terminus post quem of A.D. 991 (I, 300f.). It compares him with other commentators, all of whom are shown, in the case of Bengal, to presuppose Jāṭarūpa, or to be either demonstrably, or in the case of Kśirasvāmin probably, later.

The observation that the ‘Gauda’ whom Kśirasvāmin criticizes is a source very close to the Jāṭarūpa is evidently important. It seems possible to suggest, however, that corruption of Jāṭarūpa’s Tikā is involved in the three cases where that Gauda differs from it (I, 305ff.). What is in question is substantially (1) stambhordhvam dārvāntaraśthāpanārtham yad āsajyate, glossing śilā, where Jāṭarūpa has adhahkāṣṭhe dvārasya; (2) jalāntas tariṇ āha, glossing kūpakāh, where he has jalagatā gurusilādayah; and (3) tīlī for tīlām. In particular, the Gauda’s gloss on śilā looks like a misunderstanding of Jāṭarūpa’s remark adhahkāṣṭhe dvārasya śilā / tasyā upari sthitam dāru (via a misreading *tasyopari?).

The Gauda’s taru could reflect a variant reading *tarusilādayah for Jāṭarūpa’s gurusilādayah, which would bring this gloss on kūpakā closer to the word’s more usual sense ‘mast’ (DEDR, 1984, no. 1895) and to Kśirasvāmin’s gloss gunuvṛkṣa. Jāṭarūpa’s gurusilā and Kśirasvāmin’s
guṇavṛksa both have a rather suspect and superfluous first member; and *taruśilā- would provide a basis for Kṣirasvāmin's two alternative glosses vṛksa and adhāra, since adhārádāra is his gloss on śilā.

Thus it could be that Jātarūpa did read tūlī for the plant (tūla being the more familiar word, but as denoting the substance 'cotton'). His second mention of tūlāti would seem to imply an alternative interpretation for the whole hemistich; but it rests on an editorial emendation.

Pant's introduction includes a list of Jātarūpa's significant departures from the vulgate Amarakośa text, selective since many discrepancies serve only to prove that the text already existed in a defective (Buddhist Sanskrit?) orthography; edīka is labelled 'madhyaḥrasva' against the metre; sṛgālah competes with sṛgālī; and 'kavātām ... kapaṭāma ity api drjayate' and 'kūśalām ... kūśalām ity api' seem to express a measure of incredulity (cf. I, 312, n.; but at I, 339 and 385, Pant takes kūśalām ity api to attest a choice of readings). Every effort is made to distinguish genuine readings from casual misreadings, and to discover some pattern within the welter of discord that arises in later commentaries.

As when comparing commentaries, the editor studiously refrains from assessing the relative value of Jātarūpa's readings. Yet it would seem possible to infer that, since Jātarūpa is so often in the right, those of his readings that were subsequently rejected, ivālī, tripiṣṭāpaṃ, uṛdhakah, kuruvakah, varīkā, etc., genuinely serve to identify an original 'Eastern' and probably Buddhist tradition as the main impetus underlying Sanskrit lexicography. This would be consistent with the incorporation in the commentary of several dozen Eastern Apabhramśa or hybridized Middle Bengali taxonyms, such as would be resistant to Sanskritization: amarāyikā (<uparajīti); akānaviddhi (glossing aviddhadharmā), etc. In later Bengali commentaries they were replaced by more specifically vernacular forms, e.g. akanidhi, akānādhī <akānaviddhi.

Apart from one large lacuna (2.5 to 3.3), Pant has supplied the text of Amarakośa according to Bhānuji's Vulgate recension, even where Jātarūpa's text disagreed with it or is missing. An effort has been made to lay out the text in a readable fashion, including, for better or worse, a fairly strict enforcement of sandhi, with manuscript readings relegated to the apparatus.

The attempt to imitate roman typographical possibilities in Nagari is generally user-friendly (and a credit to the Shri Jainendra Press), but it does produce some dire results. The commentary on 3.5.24c dvyaṃkam as-is-us-anntam (referring to disyllabic neuters) reads in Nagari asantamisantarame-santa-mmantam ca dvyaṃkam, which is meant to convey 'as'-antam 'is'-antam 'us'-antam 'an'-'antam' ca 'dvyaṃkam'. Since, to avoid an opening dactyl, the pāda has to be read as dvyaṃkarma ca iti -js- ... in any case, this mere prose Anvaya should have been printed in italics throughout. It is also questionable whether it was right to emend (I, 99) the commentary's annantam to conform with the text's annantam (metri gratia).

The gloss on 2.4.80cd-81a arka-yāryakaparṇāntamarkaprārṇa represents 'arka'-ūdāy 'arka-prārṇa'-antar 'arka-prārṇa', but Nagari has been deemed incapable of tolerating a non-italic ādy in sandhi. It would have been simpler, more effective, and space-saving, to attach a typographically sophisticated romanized edition to a diplomatic Nagari transcription.

Much of Part II is devoted to appended notes on the more important emendations; to a concordance with parallel texts in other old commentaries; and to copious indexes. The indexes list all the words that Jātarūpa has chosen to gloss, his cross-references to Amara, his quotations from Śaṅcava, etc., from Pāṇini, etc., and from literary texts; and all those instances where
his quotations involve variant readings. No aspect of this highly significant survival has been neglected. It promises considerable progress in understanding the interrelationship of those many and disparate glosses that most Sanskrit dictionaries ascribe simply to ‘lex.’.

J. C. WRIGHT

DIPAK BHATTACHARYA (ed.):
The Paippalāda-saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Critically edited from palmleaf manuscripts in the Oriya script discovered by Durgamohan Bhattacharya and one Sāradā manuscript. Vol. I. Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas.

From the palm-leaf manuscripts of the Paippalāda Atharvaveda that were discovered in 1959, fifteen of the text’s twenty Kāṇḍas, 510 of its 923 identifiable separate compositions, have now been assiduously edited by Dipak Bhattacharya, son of the scholar who made the original discovery but did not live to complete his edition of four Kāṇḍas (Paippalāda Samāhitā, First Kāṇḍa, Calcutta, 1964; Volume two, Calcutta, 1970).

The date 1997, which is that of its prefaces, has been assigned to the publication of the new edition, but there seems to be no evidence that it was issued much before the year 2000. In principle, the Orissan manuscripts (Or.) and the older, but defective and generally less reliable, Kashmir version (K) have been edited together, with a minimum of conjectural restoration. The first four Kāṇḍas have been re-edited, and a fresh introduction surveys the available textual evidence (including Vyākaraṇa); the little that is known of their historical background; and the measure of orthographic normalization which has to be applied. Every effort is made to indicate briefly the actual state of scribal disarray, and to define an element of local mispronunciation.

The indications are that recordings of Orissan recitation contribute only further distortion of the written material. The specimen in First Kāṇḍa, p. xvii, merely corroborated manuscript testimony; and the only example vouchsafed by the present editor involves the substitution of a familiar word sruc- for the blatant graphic corruption of K and Or. smus- for RV and Saunaka (S) stus-. Why, when K jajñe is accepted passim in lieu of misspelt Or. yajñe (p. xxxv), the editor opts for Or. smusejyam (6.1.6, underlined to indicate dubiety), rather than K smuseyyam is not explained.

Although there is no professed intention to reconstruct (or rule out) a purely Orissan archetype, the evidence of K seems to be taken into account more in the hope of emending Or. than of reconstructing an Ur-Paippalāda. Thus at 7.7.6 girau jātah svar ahāsi ‘sākam somena bahhrunā is read on the basis of Or. svar ahāsu and K svar āsi (p. xxxi), although prosody may recommend a reading *suvār āsi, akin to the paradox in RV 10.1.2 sā jātō gārbho āsi rōdasyoḥ. Paipp. āsi for *āsi may have had āsī in mind (RV 10.121.1 jātāh ... āsī). If so, Or. ahāsu rests on some attempt to emend that āsi.

When no basis is found for compromise (‘‘) or conjecture (*), the ‘best’ Or. reading is adopted (p. xxxii), usually with underlining and annotation. No attention appears to have been paid to prosody. Despite a general reference to Karl Hoffmann’s work as indispensable (p. x), preference is given
to unmetrical Or. readings in 2.36.4a, 2.58.4a, 2.70.5c, and 3.22.4b over Hoffmann’s immaculate solutions in Aufsätze, pp. 741, 562ff., and 750.

The principle of retaining the Or. consensus in case of doubt produces mixed results. In the blessing of a wedding dress, 15.5a–6b, Hoffmann opted for *cakrātus tvā in v. 5b (p. 813). The new edition tacitly agrees, but it discards K -us and retains corrupt Or. cakrata with underlined -ta-. This is probably right, but only because *cakrāntams tvā will be the actual Paipp. misreading (converting *kṛtikāś cakrāntams tvā into a seven-syllable Pathyā?). For this, in what is a versification of MS gnās tvākṛntam, is the link that explains two sets of emendations, ApMP cakrāntam tvā, Ś yā ākṛntam and K cakrata tvā, KāthGS cakratus tvā. The latter pair sacrifice consistency of tense, as well as the ca that suitably conjoins kṛtikāś with revath.

The evidence of K (abhayaṁ tu) in collusion with KāthGS (avayam u) is rightly rejected outright, in favour of Or. abhayam vi in v. 6b. Hoffmann gave only doubtful credence to this (p. 817f.). Since, however, the spelling abhayam would not necessarily obscure the obvious meaning avayam, it is indeed probable that Paipp. a[v]ayam vi was influenced by vi-kṣan- in v. 5a, like the needlessly prefixed vi-tan- of v. 5c in K.

On the other hand, the massively emended K ava ... -vantam in v. 5d may be in better company with ApMP āva ... avṛṣṇam (and Ś 10.7.42 āpavṛṣṇ-) than is Or. ava ... apricam with HŚ āva ... aprīcata. The Or. Reading has been adopted, with underlining; but since the basis is a replacement of *aprīcan by avṛṣṇam (not necessarily via *aprījan, despite Hoffmann, p. 817), the Or. -p- is as questionable as that of Or. patipatiṇi, which has been edited out in favour of K patipatiṇi (in view of Paṇini’s patipatiṇi: p. xxxvii).

Grammarians’ evidence is not unimpeachable, as witness Aufsätze, p. 758. The Kāśikā reading of a verse-final locative asyām māmakī tanū in 6.6.8 need not decisively overrule Paipp. tanu (Or. tanu, K tanum). Given the existence of verse-ending -u duals in RV, the view that *tanu is ‘grammatically impossible’ (p. xxxi) is uncomfortably reminiscent of the ‘durgaha’ that was a pretext for emendation in the earlier edition.

The choices often seem arbitrary, as when 4.33.2 makes the correction *śṝjātāṁ jātavedasam agni[m]/ vaiśvānaram, with sajātām ... agnir ousted as scribal error. More obvious Paipp. errors, 1.30.2 viṁhāvṛa for viṁhāvṛa and 1.111.3 hrdaṁ for hrdaṁ, are advisedly retained (with underlining), although the support for viṁhāvṛa (RV, Ś) seems at least as strong as that added for sujātām (YV, Ṣ). In the present editor’s introduction to Volume two, 1970, xxv, he sought to alter the alteration by citing also RV 3.23.3 sūjātāṁ mātrīṣu priyāṁ / agnīṃ; but one can at least as appositely cite RV 2.1.5 táva (agnे) ... sajātyām. The fact that both Paipp. sources share sajātām and attest a common misreading *agnīvaṁśvānaram is exactly the sort of evidence that makes it seem appropriate to minimize dilemma by reconstructing a purely Paippalāda archetype, as Karl Hoffmann recommended. Only on that basis can one hope to fathom its relationship with Ś and other texts.

At 2.19.3a the inscrutable K dṛtyām is retained, in preference to the impossible Or. gṛtyām, without mention of Hoffmann’s support for *dṛtyām (p. 822). In 2.91.3, K acchava is still deemed preferable to Or. acchavavo, ignoring Hoffmann’s recognition of *atsvavo (p. 767).

The reliability of the apparatus remains hard to gauge. 1.111.3d now reads pareṣṭa with Ś, against the parītya of both K and the 1964 edition, implying that the agreement of Or. with Ś had previously been ignored. Since parā-i- appears to be intransitive in Vedic verse (with āstam pāra-i- as a special case), hṛtraṁ ... parītya may be the better reading, with Ś śīndhor mādhyam...
pāretya as an emendation based on the misreading paretya. In 1.46.1-2, vyadhmano replaces vyadmano without comment; and there is no reaction to Hoffmann’s preference (p. 234) for the readings of K somap pra [ñir]jad ... nāsavyād, although loss of the third-person markers in Or. is indeed the more obvious hypothesis.

Discrepancies in reading between the first announcement in Our Heritage, 1957 [publ. 1960], and First Kānda, 1964, to which attention was drawn in BSOAS xxx, 1967, 201f., have not been fully explained. 1.2.1a (=1964 yanty) implies that yantv was wrongly read for all manuscripts in OH. 1.3.2e reverts to virud (=OH; now underlined) plus vihi, with no mention of the three 1964 readings, itemized as virar(ihi) and twice vidud(vihi). 1.4.4b now reads vartram with the second syllable underlined (OH vartrim, 1964 vartram). If this were a misprint, for vartram ‘dam’ as in S, it would not be underlined. If it is another tacit change in the reading of all three sources, it would still have been in keeping to read ‘vartram as a compromise; but the K reading (19.20.13 vrtram ... yathā) has not been cited. For 1.5.1cd, information previously given of variation within Or. has been suppressed.

Despite a fair sprinkling of misprints in the English introduction, the Nagari text has evidently been prepared and printed with scrupulous care. Delightful as it is to look forward to the appearance of the second volume, completing the vital task that was begun in 1959, the absence of any readable facsimile reproduction or direct collation of the original Orissan sources continues to be a disincentive for any more critical evaluation of their relationship with each other, with the Kashmir text, and with Saunaka.

J. C. WRIGHT

ÉRIC PIRART:
Les Nāśatya. Vol. II. Traduction commentée des strophes consacrées aux Āsvin dans les mandala II-V de la Rgvedasamanhitā.

Following his study of the Āsvin hymns of Book 1 of the Rgveda (Les Nāśatya, I, 1995), Pirart now examines those of the first four Family Books, registering features of grammar, prosody, composition, and nuance, and noting Iranian analogies. He provides reasonable coverage of the opinions of Sāyana and of modern scholars.

Modern facilities for textual analysis lend strength to the interpretations. Thus an early crux, 2.39.1a grāvāneva ... jarethe, is appropriately solved with the help of a Book 5 remark (grāveva jaritad ...) that looks like a paraphrase of the same idiom; and he uses a Book 1 phrase (nidhāyo mādhūntam) to substantiate Bergaigne’s rendering of 1b vrksām nidhimāntam, versus the meaningless misconception of Sāyana and Geldner.

The method is, however, subject to caveat. In an inauspicious beginning, he proposes in 2.27.16ab māyāh ... pāsāh ... ripāvṛ vicṛttadh to read ripāvṛ ‘vicṛttadh ‘que celui qui porte préjudice ne peut relâcher’, i.e., against both Pāthas and with no encouragement from the metre, but in deference to MS (pāsam ... avicartyaṁ), AV, etc., and in the belief that vicṛt means ‘release’ in RV 1.25.21 (vi pāsam ... vrtr). Even if the negative participle could be so construed, it would spoil the Book 2 image, for the implication that the toils
of death are inevitable only for the enemy accords ill with the speaker’s personal anxiety (tāh āti vesam).
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brother Somāhuti), the plural name would logically apply rather to the plural patrons (sūribhyah) than to the one singer (grnate). This probably indicates that the epithet Grtsamadāh identified not ‘our’ name, but ‘our’ Soma, effective under this private name (gīhā vanvāntah). When the word is used to designate co-authors, Grtsamadāh may indeed be taking turns in the manner imputed to the septet of 9.67.

Somāhuti possibly combines two images: the ostensible identification of the grnānt as grtsamadā Soma in his first hymn, and of the hōtr as āhuta Agni in his last. That 2.27–29 are attributed to a son Kurma seems a simple inference from the group’s striking final image of a scared son scuttling for shelter from paternal wrath, like some creature from a beast of prey.

Pirart notes etymologizing references to two of the Rṣi names: 3.58.4 viśye jānāso havante ... mitrāso nā, and 4.30.24 vāmānvānam ... devō dadātu. The Brhaddevatā etymology grnānt mādaya- is vaguely implicit in 2.4.9 grtsamadāh ... grnate; and the appearance of atrā, designating one single serpent only in the Atri hymn 5.32.8, also deserves a mention (even if it may be only a backformation from the serpent epithet atrān). The author’s conviction that ‘le nom d’Atri doit être séparé de atrān’ (p. 192) seems to rest upon his belief that the traditional etymology for both can be ruled out, on the dubious grounds that *ad-tr- could not become atr- (J.As., 1998, 549, n., despite aṭra ‘food’); and that apād aṭrā and the aṭrān can, but aṭrī cannot, be based on an *atra- ‘without protection’. If the word aḍri is, say, ‘*impermeable’, then aṭrī ‘*invincible’ (an Agni epithet in 2.8.5) from tirātī must be at least as plausible as Pirart’s *aṭ-ri or *a-tri and *a-tra.

Detailed indexes are provided for this and the previous volume conjointly.

An appended note on the verse MBh. 3.292.11 is concerned about a double negative, one that does not actually exist. Van Buitenen rightly subordinated 11b (mā ca te paripanthinah) to 11a (śivās te santu pāntānah); but, missing the Vedic allusion in 11b, he inferred Anuvṛtti of pāntānah, and so gave paripanthinah ‘adverse’. Pirart corrects 11b, but deems resumptive tathā in 11c to imply Anuvṛtti of the negative mā of 11b (p. 335). The substitute Southern reading in 11c (āgamās ca tathā santu) confirms, however, that its natural link is not with 11b but with 11a (śivās te santu pāntānah ... āgamās ca tathā ...).

J. C. WRIGHT

HORST LASIC:
Jñānaśrīmitraś Vyaśpicarcā. Sanskrittext, Übersetzung, Analyse.
(Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 48.)

HORST LASIC:
Ratnakirtiś Vyāptinarṇaya. Sanskrittext, Übersetzung, Analyse.
(Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 49.)

The first of these two books is the author’s revised and enlarged 1999 Ph.D. thesis and the second is his 1994 dissertation, also revised and enlarged. As
the subtitles indicate, both publications have the same internal structure, presenting a Sanskrit text and its translation and analysis. Both are the result of the author’s engagement in preparing sources for the study of the evolution of the Buddhist epistemological tradition and logic (basically the theory of perception and inference). There would appear to be a group of experts in the Institute for Cultural History of Asia in the Austrian Academy of Sciences working on this project. Young, able scholars are obviously encouraged to participate by working on textual sources. The fact that these two works have been published in the prestigious series of Vienna University in itself speaks for the high standard of scholarship displayed by the author in dealing with the two texts and presenting their translations and analyses. The introductions, though, are less informative than they could be, at least for those outside the circle of the specialists involved.

Thus in his introduction to the first book the author does not even suggest or mention possible dates for Jñānasrīmitra and does not say much about him, except that when Frauwallner wrote about him (‘Jñānaśrī’, WZKM 38, 1932, 229–34), he was still an obscure and almost unknown figure, but that a few years later twelve philosophical works of his were discovered (and published by Anantalal Thakur, Patna, 1959, 2nd ed. 1987—not traceable in the SOAS or British Library). Only from the introduction to the second book does one learn that Ratnakīrti regarded Jñānasrīmitra as his guru.

From Frauwallner’s article it transpires that he knew of one work of Jñānasrīmitra, Kāryakārayaṇabhāvasiddhi (on the relation between cause and effect), which is included in the Bstan-'gyur (Tanjur), and that he also traced a stanza by Jñānasrīmitra in Sāyana-Mādhava’s Servadarśanasāṅgraha (fourteenth century), which is concerned with the doctrine of momentariness (ksanabhāṅgavāda), and another of his stanzas in the work of Udayana (a Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika thinker, late tenth and beginning of eleventh century) which also appears twice in Ratnakīrti’s works. From this Frauwallner concluded that Jñānasrīmitra must have been an important author and places him in the first half of the tenth century, and Ratnakīrti a little later.

In view of Frauwallner’s assessment of his importance, the discovery of Jñānasrīmitra’s twelve philosophical works does not represent a great surprise. They all deal with various problems of logic and epistemology, but a work on metrics is also ascribed to him (cf. Michael Hahn, Jñānasrīmitra’s Vṛttamālāstūṣṭi, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1971). Tāranātha is another source for Jñānasrīmitra. He dedicated a few paragraphs to him in his History of Buddhism in India, showing a high regard for his work. According to Tāranātha, Jñānasrīmitra was born in Gauda (now in Central Bengal), studied first the Śrāvaka Tripitaka, then Mahāyāna texts, including Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga, and eventually also Guhy Tantras. He is further reported to have had visions of Sākyamuni, Maitreya and Avalokiteśvara and the power to foresee future events, and he was also described as ‘the second great Central Pillar’ of the seat of learning in Vikramāśila (founded towards the end of the eighth century) where he gave instructions to Atiśa (who lived between 982–1054).

Atiśa, as is known from other sources, had studied for twelve years in the (now vanished) monasteries of the kingdom of Śrī Vijaya (on present-day Sumatra), which had extensive libraries, and he came to Vikramāśila in March 1041. (A year later he arrived in Tibet where he was instrumental in reforming the monastic system and practices of ritual Tantrism.) The assumption is that if Atiśa accepted instructions from Jñānasrīmitra, the latter must have been
his senior which would place his lifespan somewhere between the second half of the tenth century and the middle of the eleventh century.

In the introduction to the second book the author dates Ratnakirti in the first half of the eleventh century, but if he was Jñānaśrīmitra’s disciple, he would probably have flourished well after the middle of the eleventh century. (S. R. Bhatt seems to be wide of the mark, dating Ratnakirti to about 940 in the *Companion encyclopedia of Asian philosophy*, p. 433.) Ratnakirti is much better known and several of his ten known works have already been translated into English or German. The author describes him as belonging to the last phase of the Buddhist scholarly tradition in India, concerned with the theory of perception and inference, which has its starting point with Dignāga and Dharmakirti. Ratnakirti discusses, in a number of short works, themes important for this tradition, such as whether the Buddha was omniscient, the refutation of the idea of God creator and the proofs for the momentariness of all things.

As for the contents of the two small works here presented, they are both dedicated to the investigation (cārcā or nirnāya) of inferential knowledge, particularly to the relation of necessary connection (vyāpti, lit. pervasion or permeation) between major and middle terms in syllogism. In the form in which they are presented both works are interesting mainly for specialists, but both, together with other similar basic textual studies, are no doubt important as sources for the global picture of the historical development of the Buddhist theory of knowledge and logic. If we discount surveys of the subject in encyclopedias, usually based on rather limited source materials, we have no major up-to-date work which would present a comprehensive picture of the field. The only comprehensive treatment of it ever published is *Buddhist Logic I–II* by F. Th. Stcherbatsky (1930–32, repr. New York, 1962), now of course rather outdated. A new one, taking into account all, even recently discovered sources, is certainly a desideratum. Perhaps one can look forward to the time when such a work might emerge from the circle of scholars in the Austrian Institute mentioned above.

KAREL WERNER

MICHAE L. W. MYERS:

*Brahman: a comparative theology.*


This is an unusual, not to say strange, book in that in focusing on the fundamental concept of Indian Vedantic philosophy, it purports to use the comparative method (well rehearsed in the academic study of religious thought) from the theological position rooted in the Christian tradition, yet claims to provide critical reflection on ‘world view construction’. In the event it would appear that the study of other traditions, for the author reflects also on Buddhist and Chinese systems, serves him to clarify for himself the fundamental tenets of Christian belief in order to deepen their theological formulation in an attempt to give them an air of academic respectability.

This, the author seems to think, is achieved by his adopted method called ‘holistic theology’ which excludes ‘one-dimensional strategies’, by which he means relying solely on one source of authority, such as scriptures, mystical experience, or natural theology based on reason. Holistic theology, on the other hand, allows all of these and even insights of science. That clearly
makes ‘two-dimensional strategies’, such as ‘correlative thinking’, epitomized by yin and yang of Taoism, also inadequate. An example of early holism is, for the author, Vedic ‘henotheism’, a controversial and now outdated concept, but the author acclaims it as ‘an example of freedom of expression rather than diminution of divine power’. Based on other outdated views of the Vedic tenets, the author finds in the Vedas ‘nascent eschatology’ as opposed to the ‘developed context of eschatology’ of later texts.

The bulk of the book is presented under the heading ‘Systematics’. This includes evaluating śruti or revelation through sacred texts, which helps the author to see the literal understanding of Christian scripture as inadequate and to admit also its figurative nature. In discussing the question whether Brahman is God, the author considers, besides the contradictory answers of Dvaita and Advaita, also the case of ‘the Christ-like Buddha, Amida’. As Buddha, Amida shows transcendental and metaphysical aspects, but ‘as a bodhisattva’ he ‘displays definite humane and compassionate elements of personality’. This provides the author with ‘support for a wider conception of Christ, including Christ’s transcendental and metaphysical aspects’. The question is also connected with the problem of the subject as self- or not-self, of Buddhism, but in the end theology prevails, for the question ‘Is Brahman God?’ only ‘invites one to entertain a wider conception and more profound doctrine of God’ through ‘dialectical understanding’. But what does it mean?

Any concept of God opens the question of theodicy. As far as I know, nobody has ever provided a satisfactory answer. Although the author ponders the concepts of rta, the cosmic law, and of karma, its ethical dimension, taking into account the views of John Hick as well as St Augustine, he too fails to provide a satisfactory answer, falling back on the biblical theory of Job, utilizing even its extended Swahili version derived from the Quran, to ‘offer a positive account of evil’, with some help from Martin Buber. The only positive element in his interpretation of Job’s story is the endorsement of freedom of choice. But where is the explanation of evil (on the premise of the existence of a just, merciful and omnipotent God) inflicted on innocent children or even of a birth with disability (famously resolved in Glen Hoddle’s formulation)? The author’s formulation is a remarkable example of modern liberal theological jargon, conceptually diffused: ‘The world is a place where cosmic order is achieved by the human modelling of great love and great service. The ideals of love and service are provided by personal deity and impersonal principle. The world is place and principle, a vector of awesome proportions directed toward God.’

The book finishes with a chapter on ‘Humanity, comparative Christology and eschatology’. It exploits the not altogether invalid comparisons between Christian, Hindu and Mahāyāna Buddhist concepts of God/Christ, Gods/Avatāras and Śūnyatā/Buddha-bodhisattva. But it culminates in a eulogy on Christology, presenting Jesus as Wisdom incarnate, as Logos, as Cosmic Law, as Sage, as the Culmination of Apocalyptic History, as Divine Physician, as Fulfillment of the Scriptures, and as Bearer of the Kerygma (‘that which is proclaimed’), many of these attributes being inspired by Indian paradigms. Even the Christian understanding of eschaton, the final goal, which is the Kingdom of God, can be squared with mokṣa (liberation) which is ‘the highest bliss of conscious life’ (sačcidānanda). But as Jesus said ‘I am the life’, this freedom from bondage can be attained through ‘the model of an enlightened teacher ... a living embodiment of religious ideal: Christ, Kṛṣṇa, Avalokiteśvara ... When teacher and student embody the religious ideal, the synergistic result is rightly called spirit. Borrowing insight from
India, we may learn that such a spirit is Brahman. In theology which is truly systematic, Brahman and the Holy Spirit are one and the same.’

Specialists in and students of the academic study of religions will hardly find this book useful, but it is no doubt a remarkable exercise in ecumenical thinking. Whether it will find favour with theologians of various persuasions is another matter.

KAREL WERNER

EVA WILDEN:
Der Kreislauf der Opfergaben im Veda.

Translated in the English summary as ‘The circulation of sacrificial gifts’, the title refers to the exchange of liquid nourishment between men and gods which is arguably the main raison d’être of Vedic (śrauta) sacrifice. The author sets out to establish this as its ‘metaphysical basic pattern’, examining Agni-related material in, successively, the Rgveda, YV-Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas, and Upanisads.

While her analysis of passages documenting the history of intellectual responses to a substantially static ritual tradition is illuminating, the main inferences are rather oddly formulated. That the system (‘a primary paradigm of action in Vedic times’) ‘collapses and becomes obsolete’ in the Upanisads seems to be an argument from relative silence in the ‘Vedanta’ and somewhat belies the system’s survival fairly intact into the twentieth century.

The view is taken that, whereas ‘in the mid-Vedic period there arises a well-balanced system of dependence between gods and humans’, only ‘traces of such an interpretation of sacrifice can be found already in Rgvedic times’. This seems a misleading way of reporting the fact (p. 12) that only a relatively late source, RV 1.164.51, chooses to point explicitly to the meteorological analogy of evaporation and precipitation. This mechanistic observation, coupled with a nod in the direction of the big bang (dharma prathama), is sandwiched in between pleas to suck riches from the fertile breast of mother Sarasvatī and to be made fruitful by the pluvious effusions of young Sarasvant. As an interpretation of sacrifice, abetted by the Sarasvatī-Sarasvant correlation appended to 7.96, it seems satirical enough to please any Buddhist, and indeed it is no proof that circulation theory basically involved evaporation.

While demonstrating the constant underlying postulate of a cyclic food-chain, the study presents a meticulous and critical survey of the ever more unwieldy secondary literature on the subject (the appended bibliography lacks two books referred to on p. 9). It reviews, and where possible revises, the meaning of crucial terminology: dhārman as an inexorable rule, vrata as an acknowledged duty, mitra as confederate, etc. For priyām dhāma, however, it is hardly necessary to substitute ‘eigen(t ümlich)e (Lebens)-Grundlage’ (p. 169f.) in lieu of ‘preferred domain’, when the etymology shows that dhāman is not basically an ‘Ursprungsort’, and stray mentions of terrain and air as the dhāman of animals do not particularly support the notion.

The word vidātha remains unsatisfactorily rendered as ‘distribution’ (p. 28). It is a concomitant of battle (RV 3.8.5 samaryā ā vidāthe, etc.), as
well as of distribution (2.1.4 vidāthe deva bhājaye) and sacrifice (3.3.3 ketām yaśñānāṁ vidāthasya sādhanaṁ); and it can be given (5.33.9 vidāthasya rātāu).

Since (with Bloomfield, JAOS, 1898, 12ff.) it is more obviously akin to vittā ‘possessed’, it would mean ‘possession’, but with basic nuances ‘reward, plunder’: the gloss ‘Preis- und Beute-Verteilung’ is superfluous. As the ‘possessed’, it would mean ‘possession’, but with basic nuances ‘reward, plunder’.

A more normal locative appears, as in 1.166.2 krīlanti ... vidāthasya ghṛṣvayah, but here the word still has to convey a gainful activity that enables the Maruts to produce fertile fluid (nityam nā simam mādhīu bibhrata īṣa).

The case in point, 8.39.1de ubhē hi vidāthe kavīr #antaś carati dūtyām, is, with Geldner, a truncated reference to 4.8.4ab (Gāyatri) and 4.7.8ab (a Tristubh expansion), i.e., its two pādas ... kavīh and ... dūtyām reflect two separate clauses in 4.8, sā hōtaḥ and sēd u dūtyām (and misconstrue sēd u dūtyāṁ #cikitvaṁ antā ṭvate, dropping cikitvān, and probably leaving dūtyām in apposition with the subject: a construction of antās car- with two accusatives would be anomalous). In its first pāda, ubhē vidāthe accommodates 4.7 ubhē ... rōdasī, which is possibly (following 4.8) the object of samecikitvān rather than of vēh ... antār; and samecikitvān is correspondingly dropped: hence he goes between the twofold rewards, he is the Dūtya and the Kavi’. Agni’s status as kavīh in respect of earthly and heavenly rewards is a transformation based on the fusion of 4.8 sā hōtaḥ with 4.7 ubhē rōdasī; and transitive antās car- gets a sense quite different from ‘penetrate’ in 3.55.8.

Soma is described as a puzzle, untidily duplicating the ‘model’ of fireworship. The reason for this emerges only at the end of the discussion (p. 65ff.), when the author tries to envisage a point in time as die Aier das Somaopfer kennenlernten und es in irgendeiner Weise in ihr ursprüngliches Feueropfer zu integrieren bemüht waren’. Even if Wüst had not long since demonstrated the relative antiquity of Book 9 on statistical grounds (and this is scarcely invalidated by Lommel’s objection that it need not be wholly old, but merely conservative and archaic), it would still be much more probable that its simple and magical rain-making cult would antedate the complex Agnistoma of later literature.

Particularly valuable is a fresh examination of a priyam dhāma passage in the YV section and a paścagnīvīdyā passage in the Upaniṣad section, with all the relevant texts synoptically displayed in pull-out charts. The first seeks to show how the explanations given in MS can be the source of all other Vedic versions of the idea that Agnāyadhāna and Agnicayana both rest upon a union of heaven and earth. Much that has been misunderstood hitherto is clarified in the process.

The author is, however, willing to believe that the brief statement about Ādhāna in MS presupposes its complex discussion of Cayana. This seems inherently unlikely. The comment on Ādhāna is probably no more than a brief argument in support of a fanciful derivation of āṣa from ṣpus, one that is fragmented and lost in the Cayana’s fully-fledged myth. The relevant pull-out synopsis contains one of the book’s very few oversights: the word ‘Agnicayana’ is to be deleted from the top line, following ‘TB 1.1.3’ (which in fact relates to Ādhāna). Another occurs in the second synopsis: lokāh pratyuṭthāyai for ‘thāyai in SBr. 11.6.2.10.

The observation that the Kānya SBr. is superior to the Mādhyandina
recension in the Ādhāna context is significant, as is the demonstration that the pañcagānvidyā passage in ŚBr. is the source of JBr. and other Upanisadic versions. As with the Cayana passage, growing interest in the theory of the universal circulation of water can be held responsible for the changes, which involve dropping the moon’s role as a soma-reservoir in favour of Parjanya as a rain-god (pp. 189, 195f.), and so effectively replacing ritual symbolism with a mystic amalgam of divine providence and meteorological reality.

The suggestion that JBr. presents an alteration of the consensus of BAUp. and ChUp. is, however, scarcely tenable. Coincidence can explain the fact that JBr. and ChUp. share the readings prthivī (as a clarification of ŚBr. imām > Up. ayam lokalāh) with vāk (clarifying ŚBr. mykhām > Up. vyāttam). In JBr., striyō ... tasyoapastham (but tasyā abiuter) is merely corrupt. More significantly, JBr. has esa vā agnih as a stage intermediate between ŚBr. te vā ete abiuter and Up. asau vai loko ’gnih. Similarly, its striyah (for *strī) is closer to striyam than yosā. Its stanayitnuh ... dyauh instead of ŚBr. divam ... adityam anticipates a steady progression towards plain rain and wind in BAUp. (parjanyah ... samvatsarasāh) and ChUp. (parjanyah ... váyuh).

This beautifully presented book offers interesting original solutions to many unsolved problems of Vedic religion, diligently seeking ‘die Fragen zu all den auf uns gekommenen Antworten’. It shows sound appreciation of the vital necessity of text-historical analysis in a field where the sequence and interrelationship of texts have yet to be established with certainty.

J. C. WRIGHT

NICHOLAS SUTTON:
Religious doctrines in the Mahābhārata.

Sutton sets out his stall clearly in the introduction to this work, which contains a number of challenging statements indicating directions he proposes not to take: ‘historical text criticism is an inexact science frequently displaying circular logic’ (p. xiv); ‘where a Western scholar may recognise a clear doctrinal contradiction ..., Indian thought may recognise a subtle approach to the resolution of a complex issue’ (p. xv); ‘I do not believe that the Mahābhārata’s teachings are concealed in any form of symbolic code, especially one that has only been penetrated by twentieth century Western scholarship’ (p. xvi); ‘To my mind a major weakness of much modern work on the epic is excessive theorising based on inadequate textual study’ (p. xxi, n. 8).

On the other hand, Sutton approves of Heesterman’s praise for ‘the patient and sometimes fruitless task of listening to facts and documents for their own sake’ (p. xvi). He describes his own principal task as one of simply ‘cataloguing’ the text’s doctrinal statements (p. xiii), though he proposes also to explain and interpret them, and occasionally to consider their relevance to present-day thinking.

Catalogues tend not to be startling or dramatic works, and Sutton’s book is no exception; on the other hand, catalogues tend to be very useful, and Religious doctrines in the Mahābhārata has this merit too. Sutton’s chief concern is the didactic sections of the epic rather than its narrative. He deals with these voluminous writings under a sequence of substantive headings (eschatology, ethics, etc.); inevitably there are some overlaps, and occasionally
it happens that an issue is addressed under a slightly surprising heading, but for the most part the enquirer who wishes to know what the Mahābhārata has to say on a given theme will be able to find guidance here. The index is not enormous, but it is adequate and helpful.

I have two reservations regarding Sutton’s work. The first is his contention that the theology of the Mahābhārata is, fundamentally, monotheistic. This is implicit in much of what he says, and causes him sometimes to express himself in rather odd ways: ‘the universe is created and controlled by one supreme Deity, known in the epic as Nārāyaṇa or Śiva’ (p. 12); ‘Within the Mahābhārata we thus have a monotheism of a unique type, expressed sometimes as if Viṣṇu and sometimes as if Śiva were the Supreme Deity’ (p. 191). On pp. 203–10 he deals with the issue specifically, noting ‘that the term “monotheism” has become culture-bound to the extent that it is accepted as referring only to Judaeo-Christian or Islamic theism’ (p. 203), and he proposes a ‘broader definition’ for it. But the problem with the term as applied to the religion of the Mahābhārata is not simply that it is ‘culture-bound’, but rather that it is inappropriate: it indicates a belief in a single god, not in a set of gods one of whom may be viewed as supreme. To justify his use of it, Sutton has to talk down Indra, Brahmā and so forth (pp. 207–9): easy enough in the Mahābhārata, where these gods do play a subordinate role—but where they are still, indisputably, gods. Sutton also has to show that Viṣṇu and Śiva are, in some sense, ‘the same’ or ‘complementary’, so, for example, he notes the existence of passages where one great deity is glorified and the other ignored, and writes that ‘such passages are aware of the existence and status ascribed to the other Deity and hence the fact that there are no assertions of supremacy provides some indication of a theology based on complementarity’ (p. 198). Well, perhaps, but other explanations come to mind; and things are not helped by the attribution of ‘awareness’ to the text (an attribution which Sutton makes repeatedly).

The insistence on a form of monotheism no doubt stems from Sutton’s own background in Christian-based theology, which sometimes shows itself in other ways too. From time to time he refers to aspects of the religion of the Mahābhārata that do not exist—but that a Christian might have expected to exist. ‘There is little or no reference to mission in the Gītā’ (p. 66); ‘nowhere in the Mahābhārata is there any instruction for the individual to be a member of any religious order ... The Deity ... is not a remote figure only to be approached through an intercessor, and humanity is not viewed as inherently flawed’ (p. 72). And sometimes he seems unnecessarily defensive about his topic, referring to ‘the frequently encountered claims of Western thought, both Christian and secular, to ethical superiority over that of India’ (p. 335), and lamenting the frequency with which scholars damn other people’s doctrines (pp. 453–4). All this may make his work read a little strangely in the country where it has been published.

My second reservation has simply to do with accuracy. It is excellent that Sutton cites the Sanskrit text of the Mahābhārata to support his arguments, but it is unfortunate that so many of the citations are disfigured by misspellings. On p. 29, as one example out of many, appears the six-word sentence putrāḥ śūrīśavah santi presyāś ca priyakārīndah, but two of the words are spelt incorrectly. (Sadly, there is a similar error in the quotation with which the book concludes.) Sutton’s translations too are sometimes open to doubt. A particularly clear case is his translation of 14.46.48, which ends, ‘Neither are the Vedas, yajñas, the heavens of this world, austerity or religious vows’ (p. 36). But the text (which he cites) reads vedā yajñās ca lokaś ca na
tapo na parākramah: not ‘religious vows’ but ‘valour’. In this case, the explanation is presumably to be found in the fact that some editions predating the Critical Edition had vrātāni ca for parākramah, and that Ganguli’s translation was based on that reading. This sort of thing obviously reduces the reliability of an otherwise useful work. Caveat lector.

JOHN D. SMITH

STELLA SANDAHL:
A Hindi reference grammar.

The aim of this reference grammar is defined as ‘to present the Hindi language as clearly as possible in order to understand and translate correctly complex texts, both fiction and non-fiction’ (p. v); it has grown from instructional material used with students who were often already speakers of Hindi or a related language, but wanted to deepen their understanding of its structures. (Such students would require some background in linguistics, since Stella Sandahl pulls no punches in her use of technical terminology.) The aim of offering a clear statement of the language is efficiently and economically achieved within 156 pages; Sandahl’s methodology occasionally strikes out on its own, for example by treating the future tense as ‘an aspectless presumptive within the subjunctive system’ (and the lack of an index leaves readers wondering if they have a future here at all), but the analysis is grounded in copious examples that lend the book a useful readability. The book’s conciseness is a great strength, and marks it out from most other currently available grammars.

Interestingly, the application of a narrowly grammatical approach to the analysis of a language is seen here to have some rather serious restrictions. Grammarians often allow themselves some latitude when it comes to the realism of their examples (Sandahl’s paradigms for the vocative include the nouns vidhi ‘method’, bhālu ‘bear’, dibbiyā ‘little box’, and kuā ‘well’—oh well!), but it does seem important that an intended readership of translators be properly briefed in respect of register and style. Sandahl’s choice of vocabulary reflects Sanskritizing tendencies that take us far from contemporary Hindi. To offer duhi tā for daughter (p. 17) is unrealistic, while to offer the classical kapi (p. 18) for ‘monkey’ is to make simians of readers trying to address the real (as opposed to the mythological) bandar log. The application of Sanskritic norms to modern Hindi can also disturb the conventions of the modern language: full homorganic nasal consonants have been used in place of the vowel nasality that is required in words like ḍkh, jāc, and gāḍhī. Conversely the use of tilde to transliterate anusvār is inappropriate in such contexts as dād (for dāmd, dand) and acañ (acñ, ançal). A sense of remoteness from modern conventions returns in the retroflex spelling landan (p. 117), which gave way to landan many decades ago—perhaps through a polite dissimilation from land, a rude word for ‘penis’. Finally, the Devanagari font here itself has an archaic look both in overall design and in the choice of certain graphs for which more acceptable modern alternatives exist. Furthermore, the particular font used here has difficulty in representing certain Hindi forms that are absent or rare in Sanskrit orthography: subscript dots and candrabindu are often mislocated, and the conjunct ‘fi’ (in common words like daftar and haftā) seems to be unachievable. If this list of complaints
seems overlong, its justification lies in the need to show that Hindi is not just a kind of debased Sanskrit; it has its own conventions and sensibilities, an awareness of which is necessary for all those who aspire to a knowledge of the language.

Though Sandahl’s presentation of the grammatical material is mostly lucid and precise, the book does contain an unacceptably high number of mistakes and idiosyncrasies that need attention. Typographic errors are legion, especially in the Devanagari (a passage on p. 101 crams eight typos into four lines); subject pronouns are frequently omitted from example sentences, infringing the rule that permits such omissions only when a subject is clearly established by its context (many of the examples are from literary texts, but only one is so identified). Numerous mistakes unfortunately coincide with the errors most commonly made by the intended readership for this book, namely students learning the language: these shibboleths are exemplified by a missing ne (p. 139), the writing of unho̅ne as two words (p. 31), ‘this/that’ confusions (p. 63, twice), errors of gender (p. 36), of person (p. 28) and of tense (p. 24), incorrect use of the pronoun koı (p. 52), a confusion of gayā/gâyā ‘went/sang’ participles (p. 103), a misinterpreted ‘compulsion’ expression (p. 112), and failures to translate correctly the nuances of compound verbs—here called ‘combined verbs’ (passim).

Despite its seemingly rather remote perspective on the language, this book does represent a useful contribution to the Hindi shelf; it is much to be hoped that careful editing may remove some of the existing blemishes from future editions.

RUPERT SNEILL

LAURI HONKO:
Textualising the Siri epic.
(FF Communications No. 264.) Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1998.

LAURI HONKO, in collaboration with CHINNAPPA GOWDA, ANNELI HONKO and VIVEKAE RAI:
The Siri epic, as performed by Gopala Naika.
Parts 1 and 2. (FF Communications 265 and 266.) Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1998.

LAURI HONKO (ed.):
Textualization of oral epics.

Professor Lauri Honko is among the world’s leading theoretical folklorists, and one with a strong pragmatic bent, too; he is at the centre of current debates not just on texts and performance but also on ethics and archiving. For nearly a decade he led a team of Finnish and local Tulu folklorists
(themselves trained by Honko and others in Finland) in a project documenting an oral epic sung in the Tulu language in south India. The results of that research are published in the first three volumes under review: (1998, FFC 264, FFC 265, FFC 266). The fourth and final book (2000), Honko’s edited collection of essays on oral epics from across the world, also derives from the Tulu epic project and is centred around Honko’s introduction.

The first three volumes document the Siri epic sung in the Tulu language on the coast of Karnataka, in south India; the first provides the analysis, while the second and third contain a translation of one performance of the epic. Inspired by the passion of Elias Lönnrot, Finnish collector and translator of the Kalevala epic in the early nineteenth century, as well as by a concern to balance power relations between folklore users and collectors, Honko found in the Siri epic a field in which to experiment empirically with the perennially perplexing issues of epic composition, memory and textuality.

The first volume is entitled Textualising the Siri epic because Honko believes that ‘textualization’—the documentation, transcription, translation and publication of the epic text—is the only means by which scholars can communicate with one another about these long, complex narratives. The text published in volumes two and three is a translation of a performance given in 1990 by Gopala Naika; for seven days, at the home of a local scholar, Naika sang the epic in a total of 15,683 lines (five shorter than the Iliad, as Honko remarks). Having taped this massive text, the Finnish scholars then realized they had an obligation (as well as an interest) to translate it. This was a Herculean task, requiring two Tulu scholars (Chinnappa Gowda and Viveka Rai) to spend four to eight weeks in Finland annually for several years, plus additional work and support in India. The end product, the two-volume The Siri epic, as performed by Gopala Naika, in 900 pages of bilingual text (with Tulu in Roman, its traditional script) will certainly stand as a monument to oral epic studies.

The slimmer, 650-page, analytic study, though weakened by the author’s lack of competence in Tulu and knowledge of India generally, nevertheless makes an important contribution to the comparative study of epics. Honko divides the book into four sections. The first of these sections is a series of short essays on virtually every important question in epic scholarship, from genre definition to narrative segmentation. Before settling down to tackle these issues, however, Honko sets out his stall in defence of the singer, rather than tradition, as the key to understanding epics: ‘The dynamics of tradition must be sought in individual action, in use and performance. The tradition engraved on the mind and consciousness of the individual is not chaotic in the way the somewhat arbitrarily defined collective tradition tends to be’ (p. 72). The mind, as it turns out, is central to Honko’s analysis: in order to solve the dilemma of how an epic survives when there is no fixed text and the epic is never (or rarely) performed in full, Honko presents the concept of a ‘mental text’. Memorization is essential for epic composition, but Honko argues that a coherent notion of the story, a collage of characters, images and meanings, exists first in the mind of the singer. This is the ‘pool of tradition’, which may encompass other singers’ renditions of the story, even other epic stories, as well as personal and cultural interpretations attached to the epic. From this repertoire performances are realized, though they are neither identical nor complete. This ‘mental text’ is Honko’s big idea, although he also writes with originality on other aspects of the epic singer’s craft, including epic register, intertextuality and organic variation.
Some ideas, however, are not entirely convincing. For example, the author’s emphasis on the individual singer would be more persuasive if it were not in part a justification for the fact that he chose to ‘document’ the epic tradition by studying a single performance from a single singer (although he did consult other singers and performances). True, the role of the individual tends to get lost in abstract notions of ‘tradition’, but even in the author’s own description of the individual, tradition is ‘engraved on the mind’ of the singers; epics, perhaps more than other oral narratives, are social documents shaped by the force of cultural tradition. Other contentious points include the author’s definition of epic, with its highly subjective criterion of ‘quality of greatness, even superiority’ (p. 28); his claim that his categories of epic composition match the singer’s local ones (p. 131); and the idea of a purely ‘oral epic’ in the highly literate Tulu country.

The second section of the analytic study is a series of essays, evaluating earlier studies of oral epics, from Egypt to Sumatra. As brief, idiosyncratic, synopses of epic scholarship, these reports are of limited use, and a far more satisfying choice would have been to incorporate them into a single, more sustained chapter. The third section presents the details of the Siri epic, including relevant contextual material. This section, too, has the flavour of a fragmented field report, and although much of the information is valuable, the reader strains to gain an overview of the complexity of the Siri epic. We do learn that the epic is sung in a variety of settings, but most importantly at temple festivals, in which women become possessed by the divine Siri. Indeed, ritual uses of the epic (highlighted by the extensive invocations), especially spirit possession and its healing capacities and dialogue, are arguably more important than the narrative, although Honko is probably right to insist that the mental text must exist as a frame of reference, even if the story is not sung in anything but fragments. The fourth and last section of the analytic volume consists of a 30-page synopsis of the epic, and here again an overview (a 2–3 page narrative summary, for instance) would have been useful to readers.

The second and third volumes in the Siri series contain an English translation and roman transliteration (Tulu has no script) of Gopala Naika’s performance of the Siri epic. As Honko explains, the translation aims for cultural encoding so as to permit the English reader to experience something of the original, which is an admirable aim but one which nearly always produces unsatisfactory results, and the present case is no exception. The first page I turned to contained this line: ‘As of today, your granddaughter will be the girl, the girl of our right’ (part 2, 547). Elsewhere we read: ‘Now, the sari round her waist, now, Siddu stripped off. To a fold, to a fold she was folding’ (part 1, 177). While undoubtedly faithful to the original, these lines communicate little in English.

Nevertheless, these three volumes on the Siri epic are a major contribution to epic scholarship, adding both new ideas and text. Packed into their dense pages are fascinating observations by the Tulu singer, who describes his own conception of the epic and its performance, which Honko uses to assist his own understanding of a complex creative process.

The final book under review is a collection of essays, from papers given at a conference at Turku, Finland, in 1996, organized around the bedevilling problem of how to represent oral epics (or any oral performance) in writing. Honko has written an excellent historical survey of this theoretical and practical issue in the introduction, which also proposes that the debilitating split between oral and literary epics should be mediated by a third term, ‘tradition-oriented’ epic; a clumsy phrase, but it does underline the
criss-crossed modes of epic transmission, oral, printed, written, scribal, local scholarly and so on. Then follow fourteen essays discussing oral epic and textualization with reference to Homeric, south Slav, Old Norse, Turkic, Siberian, Sanskrit, Tulu, West African, Swahili, Arabic, Native American and southern Cook Island epic traditions. Not just a concise reader in the world’s oral epics, this set of essays raises both theoretical and practical questions: Is a CD a better document than a book? Should a published translation include the parts that the singer forgot but sang later when he realized his ‘mistake’? For me, however, the most memorable moment in this rich volume is a historical one, noted by A. T. Hatto. N. G. Trofimov, a Evenk (Tungus) singer, wrote down his version of the great epic Sodani ‘under canvass and by candlelight when each hard day’s work herding the reindeer was done. The great bard was ailing, and a day came in 1971, when he had to be flown to hospital. He died in the operating chair, but in his hold-all his record of Sodani was found in an exercise-book’ (p. 139). The means of textual transmission are diverse.

STUART BLACKBURN

MARK HARRISON and BISWAMOY PATI (ed.):
Health, medicine and empire: perspectives on colonial India.

The variety and scope of the emerging field of imperialism and medicine in South Asia has been reflected in this monograph in the series ‘New Perspectives in South Asian History’. Edited by Pati and Harrison, the chapters presented are written by both eminent scholars in the field and new researchers. The book makes an important contribution to the development of historiography in studies of colonial medicine. In their presentation of a critical approach to Western medicine in India the editors have moved away from using models of analysis that concentrate on aspects of medicine as a form of state intervention and social control.

The ten essays benefit from the expertise of authors writing from different historical perspectives. The book presents a consensual view in the representation of both the utilization and implementation of Western medicine in India. The topics discussed (such as the examination of leprosy, Unani medicine and medical missions) have previously been largely neglected in studies on colonial medicine in India. The use of rare material adds to the development of analysis in various issues raised in the field.

The first chapter, by Mark Harrison, charts Europe’s relationship with India’s indigenous medical systems through four phases, starting with the earliest ‘encounters’ of the Portuguese in 1670, up to 1900. He argues that from a position of interaction, developments in European science created a gulf which was apparent even by the second phase, 1670 to 1770. Harrison goes on to show how, during the nineteenth century, this gulf widened and how European practitioners accepted only those basic ideas in indigenous systems that served to reinforce aspects within Western medical traditions.

Through the use of notes taken by missionaries in the field Rosemary Fitzgerald demonstrates how the initial scepticism within the missionary
movement about embracing medicine in its evangelical mission had altered by
the end of the century. Her analysis gives insights into the diversity of the
work of the Protestant missionary movement in India.

The next three chapters examine the use of ‘imported space’ by exploring
how the establishment, management and utilization of an institution alien to
Indian concepts and treatment of mental illness was incorporated into Indian
systems of thought. Waltraund Ernst examines the changes in medical
reasoning for the repatriation of European lunatics. Ernst also considers the
segregation of patients on grounds of race and class. James Mills uses a
unique collection of case notes from an asylum in Lucknow to show how the
asylum formed part of individual survival strategies. For example, it provided
shelter for the poor and needy, and criminals used the institution in order to
escape jail sentences or to endure lighter sentences. The asylum was also used
by the community as a punitive tool for recalcitrant family members.

In a rare account given from the view of the patient Sanjiv Kaker brings
a new dimension to the social history of medicine. Set against a background
of medical controversy and diverse public opinion in the attitude towards and
treatment of lepers in Colonial India, Kakar explores factors that contributed
to patient resistance in leprosy asylums. He examines how patients took an
active part in deciding how they were treated: they showed dissatisfaction
towards policies for segregating the sexes, about religious instruction with the
purpose of conversion to Christianity, and to cutbacks and food shortages.

Sanjoy Bhattacharya gives an account of a smallpox eradication pro-
grame. He breaks away from examining colonial medicine as a monolithic
institution in South Asia, instead focusing on the diversity in medical
approaches. Through his research into localized problems at grassroots level
we can fully appreciate the challenges faced in implementing a medical
programme; for example, the problems associated in transporting, preserving
and manufacturing the smallpox vaccine in India. Bhattacharya unravels the
various controversies within the medical profession, including public reactions
and activities such as experimentation on human subjects.

Biswa moy Pati gives a detailed analysis of the local infrastructure and
shows how ineffectual town planning affected the overall health management
of an important pilgrimage centre, Puri in Orissa. Continuing with the theme
of ‘sacred space’ and colonial intervention in the case of infectious diseases
and religious practices, Manjiri Kamat examines a combination of the
connections made between pilgrimage and epidemics and of indigenous
popular responses to colonial intervention.

Neshat Quaiser expands on contradictions and complexities in attitudes
towards and philosophies about the Unani (Islamic/Graeco-Arabic) medical
system and early modern medicine (doctory) in Colonial India. By focusing
on these two systems of knowledge he examines the ambiguities of the colonial
system of medical knowledge. He exemplifies how the revival of traditional
Indian medicine was linked to a distinct resistance to imperial rule.

The pharmaceutical industry provides a useful case study for Anil Kumar
who, with limited sources, presents a brilliant argument of how the colonial
authorities restricted the growth of and controlled the Indian drug industry
to suit their needs.

The book is essential reading for anyone with an interest in the history of
India. Given the diversity in South Asia the research presented provides an
example of how fruitful studies in history of medicine can be.

SHIRLEY GONSA LVES
M. MADHAVA PRASAD:  
*The ideology of the Hindi film: a historical construction.*  

This is undoubtedly the most important monograph published on Hindi cinema to date, essential reading for anyone with any interest in Indian film studies. In this insightful and thought-provoking book, Prasad draws on film theory and film analysis to illustrate his examination of India’s (partial) transition to capitalism. The book is divided into two parts. The first deals with the economics of the industry, the narrative of the films, and the prohibition of the private, while the second is a longer analysis of the Hindi cinema in the wider context of the 1970s. The last chapter examines two later films, finding a new nationalist modernity through the new relationship between character and the state.

Prasad’s arguments are often contestable, but are stimulating and reward repeated reading as he has raised topics that are rarely analysed, querying their assumptions in an exciting and original manner. For example, I particularly welcome his firm stance that Hindi cinema is a modern form, rather than a manifestation of some essential ‘Indianness’ found in ‘rasa’ theory and the ‘folk’. However, I am unclear how this fits into his arguments about specifically Indian structures of spectation, namely *darshana*, a hierarchy of looking found in religious and political spheres. Similarly I enjoyed his persuasive argument challenging widely held beliefs about the absence of kissing in Hindi films, which he sees as part of the prohibition of the depiction of the private by the dominant narrative of the ‘feudal family romance’. However, I disagree with his findings, arguing that we need to understand the conventions of kissing in other cinemas which we then find are replaced by other structures in the Hindi film.

One of the most exciting parts of the book is Prasad’s theorization of a model of change at a ‘moment of disaggregation’ in the 1970s. As the traditional coalitions of Congress fissured under pressure, the government began to fund what Prasad calls ‘state sponsored realism’. The industry responded with a new populist cinema ‘the aesthetic of mobilisation’, centred largely on the persona of the ‘Angry Young Man’ of the superstar Amitabh Bachchan, while developing its own forms of realism in a middle-class cinema. While this model cannot be taken as historical ‘fact’, it provides a fresh and suggestive way of understanding the nexus between politics and popular film at this critical moment in Indian history.

The major problem with the book is that it is barely reworked from its original format as a Ph.D. dissertation. Some sections are less readable than others largely because definitions of key terms, usually Marxist, are not always adequately glossed. Other crucial terms, such as Prasad’s suggestive category of the ‘feudal family romance’, are not defined at sufficient length. It is to be regretted that the new paperback edition, presumably aimed at a wider audience including students, has not addressed these problems. Nevertheless, they do not distract from the merits of this outstanding book by a brilliant young scholar.

RACHEL DWYER
The recent spate of books on Muslims in China continues to expand. The last few years have seen works by Michael Dillon, by Maris Boyd Gillette, and by Maria Jaschok and Shui Jingjun, and now here is another from Elisabeth Allès (which though published well over a year before the time of writing, still seems to be virtually unobtainable in the UK). The appeal of the field to researchers needs little explanation and one can only hope that that interest will not peter out entirely when the academic community tires of running circles around issues of identity and giddily staggers into pastures fresh. In the meantime, these works provide us with a range of rich new data and the luxury of picking and choosing between their various theoretical merits.

Allès states that her objective is to study the identity of the Hui (Chinese Muslims) in precise places and at precise times; this, she asserts, will lead to a clearer understanding of the ethnic and religious dimensions of Hui identity. She begins with a brief survey of the academic literature to date and concludes by dismissing Dru Gladney’s use of the term ‘ethno-religious group’ to describe the Hui, on the grounds that it confuses rather than clarifies the issue. Allès argues that use of the term ethnic group (‘une ethnie’), ‘est pour un groupe une manière parmi d’autres de concevoir son existence et son unité, et cette manière ne s’impose qu’à la faveur de certaines circonstances et au service de certaines stratégies’ (p. 17). Here she is at odds with most of the prevailing literature, which suggests, whether or not the Hui have any common ethnic roots, their shared historical experiences and the fact that since the 1950s they have been so conspicuously labelled and treated as an ethnic group by the government of the PRC, has resulted to a great extent in their considering themselves to be, and indeed functioning as, such a group. Thus unlike those who start from the premise that Hui identity, or multiple-identity, has always been composed of a shifting blend of historical, cultural, religious, and indeed ethnic characteristics, Allès assumes the task of disentangling ‘the Chinese’ from ‘the Islamic’ component of their make-up at various critical junctures. She concludes by conceding that while a Hui ethnic group may currently be in the process of emerging, at the heart of their identity lies not the merging of two cultures but their juxtaposition.

The study is based on three sites in northern Henan which Allès visited at intervals throughout the 1990s; the Hui village of Sanpo near Loyang; Shunhe, the Hui quarter of the ancient imperial capital of Kaifeng; and Guancheng, the principal Hui quarter of the modern city of Zhengzhou. The book is divided into three sections. The first, chapters i-iv, provides a general historical background and introduction to the contemporary situation of the Hui in Henan. Here, in analysing the Hui people’s own accounts of their origins and early history, Allès sifts the historical evidence into that which connects them, on the one hand to Islam—such as their early Arabic and Persian roots, genealogical links to the Prophet and the tombs of foreign saints—and, on the other, to China—the legitimation of their presence there by imperial
edicts, government-sponsored internal migrations, the granting of Chinese family names by the emperor, and so on. She then examines the specific historical evolution of her three subject communities, and it is here in the historical and contemporary data of her case studies that, to my mind, the strength of this book lies.

In the second section, chapters v-viii, Allès draws on data primarily from Sanpo but also from Kaifeng and Zhengzhou, in order to detail Hui similarities with, and differences from, the Han; this she does by looking at various aspects of social organization such as lineages, marriage alliances and funeral rituals. She then proceeds to analyse how these differences and similarities determine the nature of conflicts that typically arise between Han and Hui. And finally, in this section, she presents brief biographies of five men whose lives were shaped by virtue of their being Hui, living at a particular time and place in Chinese history.

But for many readers the principal interest of this book will lie in the final section, chapters ix-xii, in which Allès turns her attention to the religious element of Hui identity and focuses on the mosque, and specifically the women’s mosque. In drawing attention to this little known phenomenon; the existence in China not only of female ahongs, but of mosques run by women for women, Allès (along with Jaschok and Shui whose recent book is devoted to this subject), has opened up a rich field of research. This is a subject set to attract considerable attention, not only among historians and anthropologists, but also among those working in gender studies. Allès, perhaps wisely, however, restricts herself to establishing some basic facts about the physical appearance of the mosques, their location, financial and administrative organization and so on. Even in an interesting section in which she seeks to establish the origin and development of these sites, she seems almost purposefully to side-step any discussion of the contested notions of social and sexual equality that are inherent in the various explanations.

Islam has a long tradition of female religious teachers, notably in Central Asia, but with the exception of parts of South-East Asia (where presumably it is an offshoot of the Chinese tradition), the women’s mosque is unique to China. The phenomenon does therefore require explanation. The existence of women’s mosques in the Central Plains is well attested in Ming dynasty sources, but earlier references, according to Allès, are scarce. Dismissing more common explanations that they were an outgrowth of quranic schools for women (nixue), she traces their origin back to the Yuan when large numbers of Han women intermarried with the Muslim migrants from Central Asia. According to Allès, against a backcloth of political crisis these women introduced the Muslim community to the concept of creating women’s associations and places of refuge, as was already well-established among Chinese Buddhists and Daoists. Here, Allès argues, lies the origin of the women’s mosque. It is an appealing argument, which deserves further research, but is there not a strong suggestion here of the merging of two cultures?

There is no doubt that this is a book that will be of interest to students of contemporary China and more generally to anyone interested in the Islamic world. It represents a useful contribution to the field and will hopefully be the first of many more local studies of Muslims in China.

L. J. NEWBY
MARIA JASCHOK and SHUI JINGJUN:  
The history of women’s mosques in Chinese Islam: a mosque of their own.  

This co-authored book raises intriguing questions about the relationship between gender, Hui Muslim identity and Islam and it stimulates a fresh and original debate on the indigenization of Islam in China. At the heart of the work lies the fascinating discussion of the origin and development of sites of worship for women (nūsī) under the guidance of nū ahong (female religious leaders) in the zhongyang diqu (Central China) and especially in Henan province.

Each chapter can be taken as a separate unit and, though some sections are more readable than others, they nevertheless blend into a powerful narrative which weaves together an array of mutually compatible themes. The complex structure of the book, divided in five parts (thirteen chapters) and an epilogue (five appendices), intentionally reflects the differing theoretical approaches and cross-cultural perspectives of the authors and contributors. The first part consists of an introductory chapter which helps to situate the study and prepares the reader to undertake a journey in space and time in the gendered culture of Islam in Central China. The second part explains the origin of women’s mosques, the third provides useful insights on women’s lives, the fourth delves into issues related to the impact of nūsī culture and the fifth presents life testimonies of Hui Muslim women. Finally, the short appendices offer useful material for further study of women’s mosques.

The second chapter starts with the presentation of feminist discourses on ‘the impact of Islamic religion on women and of women on Islam’ and then proceeds to an accurate explanation of the ideas on women’s position in family and society exposed by influential Hui Muslim scholars of the Ming (1368–1644) and especially Qing (1644–1911) dynasties. It finally highlights the lack of recent Chinese sources on the religious life of Hui Muslim women. The third chapter convincingly contends that women’s mosques and the institution of nū ahong in central China originated as a strategy of survival of Islam in areas where Muslims were compelled to negotiate continuously their presence with the surrounding environment. According to the central argument of the chapter the establishment of women’s mosques, probably during the reign of the emperor Jiaqing (1796–1820), stems from an established tradition of women’s religious education, which dates back to the late Ming and early Qing. The topic of women’s religious instruction is further elaborated in the following chapter, which deals with contemporary China and provides stimulating data relating to the present number and distribution of women’s mosques.

Chapter v describes how teaching on sexual, ethical and health issues imparted by nū ahong, whose main task is to transmit religious and ritual knowledge, still draws its inspiration from texts dating from as far back as the late Ming dynasty. Consequently, the mosque education offered by nū ahong is obsolete and does not conform to the needs and concerns of contemporary Chinese society. Chapter vi analyses marriage, divorce and remarriage patterns among Muslims in central China. It draws useful comparisons between pre- and post-1949 China and stresses that overall attitudes towards divorce and especially marriage have changed considerably in the last half-century. Whilst arranged marriage was the customary
experience of Muslim women in central China prior to 1949, nowadays women freely choose their husbands. Chapter vii revolves around the organization of women’s mosques and offers interesting details on the economic management of mosques: significantly, it stresses that some women’s mosques operate independently from men’s mosques.

As for chapter viii, in its first part it addresses gendered historical processes through the analysis of different sources of memory construction. It then shifts to uncover discourses of equality, justice and purity related to Hui Muslim women and their sites of worship. Chapter ix investigates ‘... the existential ambiguities in women “thinking” their body as a site of God-ordained affliction’ by using differing threads such as the history of dress among Hui Muslims, and the exploration of ‘popular myths on the origin of gendered sinfulness and remorse’. Chapter x discusses women’s spirituality in the light of ‘fates of female souls’ and enlightens the reader on the instrumental role of nü ahong as religious brokers between God and women. Taken together these two chapters unravel the innovative spirit of independent female religious culture of Hui Muslims in Central China and, at the same time, raise significant questions about the impact of nüisi culture in contemporary China.

Chapter xi offers the textual analysis of a booklet which chronicles how, in recent years, a young Han embraced Islam and became a nü ahong, a radical decision that painfully distanced the woman from her own family. The following chapter (xii) introduces different facets on the lives of nü ahong, thus providing an illuminating picture of the complex existences of female religious leaders in various environments and at different times; it ends with the account of a woman who married into a prominent ahong family and whose life experiences poignantly demonstrate the painful tensions that cut across different generations of Hui Muslims.

In summary, this book could be located at the intersection of women’s studies, anthropology, history, religious and cross-cultural studies. It represents a thoroughly researched treatment of a complex topic and provides a wealth of material for anyone interested in the history of Islam in China. By offering stimulating and thought-provoking viewpoints, it establishes a valuable foundation for future research.

CHIARA BETTA

JENNY F. SO (ed.):
Music in the age of Confucius.

The late 1970s marked a significant stage in the modern study of ancient Chinese music. Early in 1978 archaeologists at Leigudun, Suizhou, completed the excavation of the tomb of Marquis Yi of Zeng, with its huge cache of musical instruments dating from around 433 B.C. This was in itself of obvious archaeological interest, but its deeper impact upon the study of ancient Chinese music was not realized immediately. Only recently freed from the ideological constraints of the Cultural Revolution, Chinese musicologists were still sceptical of any possible relevance to them in what they called ‘antiquarian music’ (gudai yinyue), claiming that ‘traditional music’ (chuantong yinyue) represented the continuing musical life-blood of the masses. The debate was entered into vociferously by Chinese, South Korean and Western musicologists.
at the 1979 Durham Oriental Music Festival (see Fang Kun in Renmin Yinyue 178, January 1980, also Asian Music xii/2, 1981), but ‘antiquarian music’ was already beginning to come in from the cold. When I visited the Beijing Central Conservatory in 1980 I was introduced to an elderly mouth-organ player, found by a research team despatched to the countryside to discover ancient skills that had survived the recent upheavals, just as the Yuefu had sent fieldworkers out in the first century B.C., and the compilers of the Shi Jing in the Western Zhou. As the value of the Zeng Hou Yi tomb sank in, contemporary China—as in the Song dynasty—was back in the business of trying to re-create authentic music from the ancient dynasties.

Twenty years later, that attempt continues, and Jenny So’s valuable and sumptuously illustrated book reviews the progress to date, concentrating on what is now understood about music in south-central China in the late fifth century B.C. In the first of five essays, she and John Major set the scene, describing the contents of the tombs occupied by the Marquis and his consort, ‘the largest group of ancient musical instruments known, not just in China but in the entire ancient world’. They analyse the composition of the separate ensembles arranged to play court ritual and chamber music, compare them with the literary sources, and relate the music of Zeng, a small vassal state of Chu, to that of the northern states. The heavy, largely percussive style of music in the early Bronze Age—the age of Confucius—was now giving way to ensembles dominated by strings and wind instruments.

In the second essay, ‘Percussion’, Robert Bagley examines the bells and chimes of Zeng Hou Yi. He discusses the implications of their inscriptions, ‘the oldest record of musical thinking known from China’, and the two striking points marked on each bell. He points to the extreme difficulty of casting sets of dual-note bells, concluding that southern bellsmiths were more skilled than their northern counterparts, and proposing that the first sets were not cast as such but assembled from existing bells of different sizes, with subsequent sets later cast in replica. The three-octave chromatic scales available on the Marquis’s bell set enabled its players to start their pentatonic scale on any pitch, while the inscriptions on the bells related pitch standards in Zeng to those of Chu. Bagley speculates that the reason for this unique and expensively cast guide to transposition had to do with some unknown political code linking the two states, an intriguing but so far inconclusive idea.

Bo Lowergren reviews recent finds of four types of zither, the multi-stringed se, the pre-Han qin and zhu, and the prototype of today’s zheng. Examples of the first three were all found at Leigudun, revealing details of their manufacture, decoration, and design development. The absence of the zheng may mark it out as a south-east regional instrument in the late Bronze Age. Discoveries of the qin, on the other hand, suggest a northern or trans-Asian origin, and only marginal appreciation in Chu, where the number and style of se unearthed since 1935 indicate its greater popularity. Paintings on examples found at Leigudun and Mawangdui confirm the use of stringed instruments in shamanistic rituals. One of these is the most problematic instrument, the five-stringed zhu: extinct in China since the Han dynasty, hints of its possible ancestry to the Korean kômûngô still await investigation.

When it comes to wind instruments, the multiplicity of archaeological, historical and literary evidence, dating from 5000 B.C. onwards, is sometimes contradictory. Feng Guangsheng assesses the contribution of the Suizhou finds to their study and clarifies the relationship between the chi and di transverse flutes, and include the best preserved set of Chinese Bronze Age panpipes (xiao), the universally popular instrument which inexplicably
disappeared from China during the Song dynasty. Of special interest is the description of *sheng* manufacture from gourds grown within a tubular mould, the method used to make all six found in Marquis Yi’s tomb, and the fact that Chu and the far south-west was the region where the mouth-organ first flourished. The question of a possible South-East Asian origin is hinted at but left unstated.

The principal conclusion of Lothar von Falkenhausen’s summing up is that although ritual (as distinct from shamanistic) music was already perceived as conservative in the fifth century B.C., it was still much more varied and lively than later attempts at reconstruction. By contrast, music for entertainment was rapidly developing. It apparently placed less emphasis on precise tuning, the bugbear of court musicologists responsible for ‘correct music’ (*cheng yue*) in the imperial era. Tuning, in fact, is one of the general areas identified in the book as requiring further research, along with tempo, rhythm, and the nature of the first Chinese notational system. Von Falkenhausen makes two points that deserve to be emphasized more forcefully at the beginning of the book; first, that the central chamber of the Marquis’s tomb had already been entered before excavation, and second, that there is so far no corroboration that the constitution of the ensembles placed in the Leigudun chambers was the same as those used by live musicians.

KEITH PRATT

RAINER HOFFMAN and HU QIUCHA:

*Neokonfuzianer und Sinobuddhisten: drei Studien zur Entstehung der Lixue-Philosophie in der späten Tang-Dynastie.*


Prior to the introduction of Buddhism to China, emperors frequently lived and even ruled for over one-hundred years. ‘But emperor Ming of Han, during whose reign the Buddha’s Law came to China, ruled a mere eighteen years. After him, chaos and death, not continuity were the order of the day [...] It is obvious that Buddhism has accomplished nothing.’ The Daoist argument (of longevity) against the purported merits of Buddhism comes from the well-known Confucian scholar Han Yu (768–824) and is quoted in the work under review which, as its subtitle reveals, is the bringing together of three separate studies on the early origins of *lixue*-philosophy in late Tang China. It also provides a valuable bilingual (Chinese-German) anthology of Confucian and Buddhist texts of Han Yu’s time.

The complicated relationship between Confucian and Buddhist scholarship and the accessory role of Daoist ideas therein has been the subject of studies by C. Hartman (Princeton, 1986), R. Emmerich (Wiesbaden, 1987), and T. H. Barrett (Oxford, 1992). The latter two provide opposing views on the case of Han Yu’s junior associate Li Ao (d. 836). Hoffmann and Hu adopt the term ‘Reform Confucians’ for the generation of scholars based around Han Yu, Li Ao, Liu Zongyuan (773–829), and Liu Yuxi (772–842), cursorily including Bai Juyi. The authors’ central thesis is straightforward: ‘no Confucian reform [would have been possible] without Sino-Buddhist heresy’. The first essay: ‘Das Eigene und das Fremde’ follows the development of a ‘Buddhism with Chinese characteristics’ through the stages of *xuanxue* Buddhism, academic Sanskritism, Sui-Tang Neobuddhism, and the political
Buddhism of empress Wu Zetian’s prelates, resulting in the well-known Inquiry into the origin of humanity (Yuanrenlun) by Zongmi of Guifeng (d. 841). The text of Yuanrenlun with a translation based on the work of H. Dumoulin (Tokyo, 1938) and P. Gregory (Honolulu, 1995) is appended to this first essay. Yuanrenlun is a textbook example of doctrinary classification (panjiao) as is ‘Das Eigene und das Fremde’. The authors consider Zongmi the most important of the Sui-Tang Neobuddhists, but give still greater credit to ‘New Zen’ teachers such as Shenhui (d. 764) and Linji (d. 867) for allowing ‘Chinese vitalism to triumph over Indian spiritualism’. That the authors are mistaken about the historical context of this ‘New Zen’ is apparent from the following:

One should not forget that the movement [sic] of Huineng and Shenhui was directed against the entire courtly Buddhism of the Middle Tang, against the clerical pomp of the two capitals which had turned religion into a political farce. The new connection between spirit and everyday life was not in the last place furthered by the rule of manual labor instituted for monks in monasteries of the [Southern School].

Firstly, Huineng and Shenhui did not initiate a ‘movement’ in the sense of the Modern Devotion in Europe, least of all Huineng (d. 713?), a historiographically obscure southern saint whose relation to Shenhui is still unclear. As to monastic reform (‘one day no work, one day no food’), T. Griffith Foulk has made clear that this so-called ‘pure rule’, usually ascribed to Baizhang (d. 814) is an anachronism, if not a falsification; it was certainly not a part of (Huineng’s and) Shenhui’s ‘New Zen’. Lastly, nothing in Shenhui’s career suggests that he had any scruples about joining the ‘clerical pomp’ in the Tang capitals. Neither was Shenhui a ‘reformer’ in any modern sense. Quite the contrary: his proselytizing campaign of the 760s (to benefit the imperial war chest!) stood for all that was opposed by modern reformers like Martin Luther.

But ‘New Zen’ or not, the ‘Reform Confucian’ generation was apparently and to varying extents open to the ideas of a gentrified Sino-Buddhism. This, at least, is the thesis of the second essay ‘Kosmosdebatte und instrumentelle Vernunft’ (‘cosmic debates and instrumental ingenuity’), which presents the famous debate on the role of Heaven (tianlun) between Han Yu, Liu Zongyuan, and especially Liu Yuxi. Buddhist influences are most notable in the contributions by Liu Zongyuan (Tiantai school) and Liu Yuxi (Huayan school). Their well-known memorial texts for Huineng as well as their contributions to the tianlun debate are appended to this essay. It is unclear whether their different Buddhist leanings also inspired different kinds of hagiography, but Liu Zongyuan’s preoccupation with soteriology, messianism and transcendence as well as Liu Yuxi’s legalism, naturalism and instrumentalism are exposed in their respective tianlun texts. It also appears from the essay that both men were able to formulate contiguous conceptions of li in different contexts in dialogue with the traditional Mencian ethics represented by Han Yu.

Han Yu’s efforts to maintain a ‘Confucian platform’ in these debates between ‘Sinobuddhist heresy’ and China’s central tradition, but also his attempts to realize his platform in his own career, are examined in depth in the final essay: ‘Han Yu, Mengzi und die Gentry’. Han Yu’s ‘middle-class values’ (he was from a family of bureaucrats) apparently conflicted with the relatively cosmopolitan ideology of the grands noms (haomen) of the palace intimi (neiting). His ‘compassionate conservative’ treatment of the victims of
the Yellow River flood of 799 cost him his job as a censor—not just because of conflicting class values, as the authors suggest, but also because his plea for lenient taxation ran contrary to emperor Dezong’s centralist reforms for which strict taxation was a prerequisite. But Dezong’s reforms failed dramatically and the ‘desperate times’ (Barrett) which followed were probably the underlying reason for the pronounced conservatism of Han Yu’s later years. To call Han Yu a ‘culturalist nationalist’ (as Hoffmann and Hu do) misses the point that his inquiry on ‘The origins of the (Confucian) Way’ (Yuandao) is really a plea to read China’s central tradition in its proper historical context, untainted by later Daoist or Buddhist re-interpretations. Han Yu speaks of the Way (sidao), not of culture (siwen) because he is concerned with political purity, not cultural purism. To the purity of political ethics it is historicity, not ethnicity, that matters: as Chinese as Laozi and Zhuangzi may be, a public servant can only rely on Confucius and Mencius to save the country.

I am not convinced that Han Yu would not have reached these conclusions had he not been exposed to the ‘Sino-Buddhist heresies’ of his friends Liu Zongyuan and Liu Yuxi, or that the two Liu would have taken different stands in the tianlun debate had they not dabbled in the Buddhadharma. It remains to be seen how far the term lixue may be applied to the writings of these three scholars of the High Tang, and how much of it was already discernable in Zongmi’s Yuanrenlun. I would rather favour Peter Gregory’s cautious conclusion that ‘[Zongmi’s] essay [goes] beyond the polemical intent of earlier works [and] shifts the field of controversy to a new and more philosophical level of debate [upon] which Confucianism was called [...] to respond’ (P. N. Gregory (tr.), Inquiry into the origin of humanity, Honolulu, 1995, 37).

Kees Kuiken

NOËL GOLVERS:

The object of this study is a little notebook by the Jesuit China missionary François de Rougemont (1624–76), accidentally discovered by the author in the archives of the Royal Library in Brussels. Minutely compiled over 140 pages, this ‘account book’ contains a mixture of figures and brief explanations relating to the missionary’s private expenditures. On this basis, a comprehensive account of the life of his missionary station is reconstructed, shedding light on the social universe of the Changshu mission. Thus we learn of the essentials as well as of the more pleasant aspects of clerical life in seventeenth-century China: from wax for church candles to the occasional pheasant as a gift to the physician; from alms and Christian hardware to doufu, wine and Castilian cakes. We read that Suzhou was the only place where European travellers could obtain butter and that tobacco was smoked by tea-sipping officials in their pavilions. The local preference for crabs, yam and pork dumplings is documented in as much detail as the execution of spiritual exercises by Chinese Christians. The deeper the reader is drawn into the account, the more facets of contemporary life emerge.
In order to make the ‘account book’ accessible to a modern audience, most authors would have chosen to produce an annotated translation. Golvers went far beyond this option, creating something akin to three interlinked monographs. The book is thus divided into an introduction (pp. 1–90), the text itself (pp. 91–237) and a third part dedicated to commentaries (pp. 239–630). The appendices (pp. 631–794) contain various indexes, but crucially also the *Elogium* (pp. 634–52). The introduction begins with a comprehensive biography of François de Rougemont, exposing the tormented religious and political life in the Netherlands during the seventeenth century. It also reveals the devout religious upbringing of the young François whose mother, according to anecdotal evidence, made him wear Franciscan garb during his childhood. The subsequent exegetical paragraphs provide valuable historical insight. From this point onwards, the author’s meticulous and systematic approach begins to breathe life into the welter of information connected with the manuscript itself. An interesting chapter on languages gives a vivid portrait of the China mission’s polyglot environment, with Latin employed for church use, Portuguese as the *lingua franca* among Europeans, Chinese as second nature to all Jesuit ‘Confucians’, and Flemish, finally, for the author’s more intimate usage.

This linguistic diversity becomes evident in the second part, where the ‘account book’ is reproduced in full (except for its Chinese additions), even retaining the reverse pagination of the hand-written original. The author’s translation into English is not merely accurate but also imaginative, necessary because of the brevity of some of the entries. Special praise is due for his diligent identification of words rendered in humanist Latin or in unorthodox romanizations of the Chinese. A unique feature of the account book are the ‘spiritual comments’ interwoven into the ‘account book’ proper. De Rougemont’s religious self-examination stands out like a burning candle amidst the financial and material data, and provides us with a unique insight into the missionary’s spiritual identity and personal background.

In Part 3 Golvers combines the economic and missionary data of the manuscript with other crucial accounts of the period, such as A. Launay’s *Journal d’André Ly* and the *Histoire d’une Dame chrétienne de la Chine* by Ph. Couplet, alongside missionary correspondence kept at the archives of the Society of Jesus. The commentaries are divided into seven chapters, introducing the Changshu mission—with de Rougemont at its very centre—and looking at the wider material and economic realities of the Jiangnan region during his lifetime. In subsequent chapters we learn of the region’s Christian topography, of de Rougemont’s ten major travels and the conditions encountered en route, of the structure of social life in his mission and the Christians’ position in Jiangnan society, as well as of the missionary’s professional life and the priestly organization of his mission. In chapter v we gain a detailed picture of the mission’s Christian literature, composed by Europeans and translated into Chinese by the Jesuit missionaries. The two concluding chapters deal with the more ‘mundane’ aspects of life, commenting on aspects of food and clothing as well as the services of physicians and artisans (chapter vi) and on the financial position of the mission, with illustrative examples of the contemporary payment and currency systems (chapter vii).

The glossaries and indexes of the appendix are characteristic of the author’s appreciation of detail and structure, while rendering all the accumulated information into a highly useful and stimulating book. The posthumous homage paid to the manuscript’s author by his colleague Egidius Estrix is also reprinted in the appendix, his *Elogium* forming the basis of
much of the biographical information we possess on François de Rougemont. The eulogy was composed in 1690 and contains references to his publications (chiefly the *Historia Tartaro-Sinica*, *Innocentia Victrix* and his Chinese catechism) as well as several quotations from the missionary’s correspondence with Couplet.

Golvers’ monograph certainly does not make for light reading. Nor does the book reward readers for their patience with challenging hypotheses or spectacular discoveries. But this is a different category of book—a monograph with a mission to reveal details of an intricate mosaic, for educated readers to integrate into their own pre-existing knowledge. In this sense, Noël Golvers has brought to life a period of Chinese-European contacts which is usually reserved for ‘grander’ aspects of history. His study is therefore an indispensable addition to any collection specializing in the history of Eastern Asia and to anybody with a special research interest in the early life of the Jesuit China mission.

LARS PETER LAAMANN

JULIAN WARD:
*Xu X iake (1587–1641): the art of travel writing.*

This survey of the life and work of the late Ming traveller Xu X iake 徐霞客 (Xu Hongzu 徐弘祖) is based on a Ph.D. thesis written by Julian Ward, now a lecturer in Chinese at Edinburgh University. Xu has long been revered in China as an explorer and even as an early environmentalist, but apart from a short book by Li Chi, *The travel diaries of Hsü Hsia-k’o* (Hong Kong, 1974) and some extracts in Richard E. Strassberg, *Inscribed landscapes: travel writing from Imperial China* (Berkeley, 1994), his life and work have not been extensively discussed in English. Julian Ward summarizes the history of travel writing in China up to Xu’s time, and describes what is known of Xu’s life, but concentrates on his last and most fully documented journey, to south-west China in 1636–40.

Ward examines the publication history of Xu’s diaries—which were lucky to survive the cataclysmic events of the Manchu conquest of Jiangnan 江南 in 1645—and, by comparing the originally published version with a fuller version recording the south-western journey which resurfaced in the 1970s, he argues that Xu is more of a literary artist, and perhaps less of a scientific pioneer, than was previously thought. In a short chapter on south-west China in the Ming, Ward makes the point that this area, although regarded as ‘exotic’ by contemporaries, was far from being *terra incognita* when Xu visited it. The whole question of Xu’s status as a ‘proto-scientist’, in a similar category to Xu Guangqi 徐光啟 or Song Yingxing 宋應星, is one with which Ward does not fully get to grips. In the context of seventeenth-century China, it is questionable whether one can criticize Xu for ‘amateurish’ methods of research (p. 57), or whether it is meaningful to make a dichotomy between the ‘scientific’ and the ‘aesthetic’ (p. 170). However, Ward persuasively demonstrates that Xu, although rightly regarded as an exceptional character by his contemporaries, did represent a certain late Ming type: a member of the literati class who for lack of interest or opportunity never embarked on the bureaucratic rat-race and instead cultivated the ‘obsessional’ side of his
personality and an interest in the strange (qi 奇). Clearly, though, for Xu obsession (pi 奢) was not just a pose but a powerful motivation.

Ward could, perhaps, have taken further his discussion of how Xu’s own sense of what he was doing related to late Ming currents of thought. He makes some reference to the ideas about art associated with the name of Dong Qichang 董其昌 (1555–1636), but, I believe, overestimates the influence of the early Ming artist Wang Lü 王履 (1332–91, p. 20). It is rash, in a work of this kind, to tangle with such loaded terms as the ‘sublime’ and the ‘picturesque’ (pp. xiii, 162, 188, 202) which have a very specific meaning in Western art history but are not readily applicable to Chinese aesthetics.

Ward’s main theme is Xu’s use of language and how this reflects his sensibility. By supplementing the traditional edition of Xu’s work with the edition which resurfaced in the 1970s, he is able to give ample evidence that Xu was not just a practical recorder of his experiences, but a consciously literary author. Ward’s argument that those parts of Xu’s diary which were written when he was staying temporarily in various centres of comparative civilization rather than in the mountains reflect his access to books is less persuasive; it is noticeable that the authors identified by Ward as having the greatest influence on Xu are such canonical figures as Tao Yuanming 桃花源 and Li Bai 李白, whose works he must surely have known by heart; he would not have needed access to a library to quote from them. If there is a stylistic difference between what Xu wrote when staying in towns and what he wrote on the road, this presumably reflects different degrees of comfort and leisure.

Given that Xu’s use of language is a central theme of the book, the numerous passages from his diaries and other writings translated by Ward are of some importance to the argument. Generally, Ward’s translations read very well, and convey the enthusiasm of Xu’s reactions to what he saw and experienced. There are a few instances where the accuracy of his translation is questionable. ‘Screams of delight’ (p. 83) is not a good rendering of shuxiao 舒啸, a type of vocalization connected with Taoist breathing practices. Ward misinterprets a Zhuangzi 庄子 reference (無及於垂天之翼也) to mean that Xu, climbing a mountain in Guangxi, found himself ‘as high as if I were flying through the sky’ (p. 171), when in fact the meaning is the opposite, that he was frustrated at never getting nearer the summit. Lanruo 藍若 (not lanre) is not a ‘fragrant plant’ (p. 176) but a Chinese phonetic rendering of the Sanskrit word āranya, a forest, hence a place of retirement or hermitage.

There are a number of errors in romanization, and too many misprints (the fault of the publisher rather than the author). However, these are minor defects. Generally, this is an illuminating book, which conveys a lively impression of a remarkable individual.

ALISON HARDIE

WOLFGANG KUBIN (ed.):
Symbols of anguish: in search of melancholy in China.

It is wonderful to see the gusto with which the sixteen authors and one editor gathered here attack the potentially depressing topic of melancholy in this excellent volume, which, especially since it spans the transition from premodern to modern literature, forms a fitting tribute to Helmut Martin (1940–99), who
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sadly did not live to see the publication of his essay on tension and despair in the work of Zhang Ailing. Not unnaturally, references to Robert Burton abound, and of course pick up his own gleanings from Ricci, though mercifully perhaps no one strives to be as discursive in their treatment of the theme of the volume as their seventeenth-century predecessor.

On the other hand, one comes away from a first reading of this collection with a strong feeling that more might have been said. As the editor points out on p. 9, the starting point of the participants’ deliberations was the relentlessly upbeat picture of China presented by writers like Lin Yutang. Yet, as Raymond Dawson pointed out some time ago, stereotypes about China tend to have a remarkably chameleon-like quality to them, veering alarmingly between extremes dedicated consistently only to the notion that whatever ‘the Chinese’ are like, a priori they cannot be like ‘us’ at all. Lin was perhaps trying to strike a positive note precisely because the Ah Q like passiveness detected in his fellow-countrymen by some of his contemporaries tended to play into the hands of imperialists all too glad to view ‘the Chinese’ as a hopelessly apathetic lot who needed a firm imperialist hand (whether Western or Japanese) to get them to shape up. Yet his picture of Chinese jollity comes at times perilously close to an earlier stereotype of the constantly smiling Chinese as child-like innocents, not yet ‘grown-up’ enough to meet with civilized nations on an equal footing. Had the concept of ‘teenager’ been around at the time, perhaps the early modern angst and apathy of the Chinese could have been depicted as signs of growing up.

But in fact Lin, by addressing a resolutely ignorant Western audience in English, was free to start from scratch, since no one knew too much about China anyhow. This emphatically would not have been the case with a contemporary Japanese audience, who do seem to have been aware of plenty of evidence in traditional Chinese literature for what one might take to be the melancholic nature if not of the Chinese, then at least of the Chinese literary tradition. True, the best-known writers on this topic actually published somewhat later than Lin, when China had conspicuously ‘stood up’—I have in mind Shiba Rokurō, Chūgoku bangaku ni okeru kodokukan, first published in 1958 and reprinted in the series Iwanami bunko in 1990, and Ota Teizō, Tōyo shisō ni okeru kodoku to mujō, published by Hosei daigaku, Tokyo, in 1970. These studies, moreover, unmentioned by any of the contributors, may either have been written to an agenda of their own, or may be dealing with something that Robert Burton would have ruled out of order, even if deeming any aspect of the topic beyond his interest is hardly typical of Burton’s approach.

Either way, the reader is still left with no answer to some obvious questions, such as is the ‘Scholar’s Frustration’ (a syndrome long ago identified by Helmut Wilhelm) a type of melancholy or not? When Hu Shi (again, a figure not addressed in this volume) advised at the self-conscious dawn of Chinese literary modernity ‘Do not say you are sad if you are not’ was he directing his remarks at a tendency to melancholy, or at some other convention? Certainly sleeves are wet with tears in Tang poetry to suggest that the problem was a real one. In short, there is plenty to learn from this collection, but plenty more to learn that could easily go in another volume. Given that even a compendious modern edition of The anatomy of melancholy runs to over twice the length of Kubin’s collection, we should surely not be surprised. For those disposed not to be idle, there is still plenty of work to be done on Chinese literature—and, as the spirit of conviviality that shines through this conference volume bringing together scholars from all over Europe, Asia and America suggests, plenty of reasons not to be solitary either.
DAVID B. HONEY:
*Incense at the altar: pioneering sinologists and the development of Classical Chinese philology.*

HARTMUT WALRAVENS:
*Paul Pelliot (1878–1945): his life and works—a bibliography.*

David Honey probably possesses what is now a rather rare qualification for tracing the early history of Chinese studies, in that a 1994 interview with Hans Hågerdal put on record his initial involvement in Chinese studies through missionary activity, a route which, together with consular service, accounted for the entry into the field of many European and North American China scholars well into the twentieth century, but which has formed a much more unusual starting point of late. The genealogical interests of his home institution, Brigham Young University, have also served him well in constructing an introduction to the development of philological sinology based on clear patterns of personal filiation, rather than on hypothetical schools intellectually defined. As his preface states, he makes no claims to comprehensiveness either in his coverage of Chinese studies or in his listing of sinologists, but by concentrating on the main figures involved in the philological study of China, in what was after all during the most significant period of its emergence a largely philological subject, he has effectively supplied a basic history of the establishment of Chinese studies which usefully reflects the perspectives of those involved at the time.

Thus an introductory chapter takes us swiftly through Jesuit scholarship to the beginnings of academic sinology in France, allowing the first main section of his work to concentrate on Chavannes, Pelliot and Maspero. The next section deals with German language sinology, from Klaproth to Haloun, while the final section on the English-speaking world covers developments from Robert Morrison to Edward Schafer, encompassing on the way separate sections for James Legge, Arthur Waley, and American experts as a group, from Rockhill through Fairbank to Cleaves, reserving a full section for Peter Boodberg, who was, with Schafer, Honey’s own teacher.

Against the obvious (and candidly admitted) drawbacks of the genealogical approach on display in such a selection, one must set many incidental pieces of useful information worked into the larger pattern for no better reason than that they communicate the whereabouts of scholarship exciting Honey’s own personal admiration, whether connected to his own sinological antecedents or not. A good example of this would be the listing on pp. 164–6 of the complete Haloun papers in Cambridge University Library—though of course, as pointed out in this journal, 62/1, 1999, 174–5, Haloun’s scholarship is also reflected in other archival sources. In the case of that little published but much loved scholar, as with several others, Honey was perhaps unlucky not to have had to hand Bernhard Führer, *Vergessen und verloren: Die Geschichte der österreichischen Chinastudien* (Bochum: projekt verlag, 2001), which would
have helped him with several matters of detail. But there are signs that Honey’s work has been some time in reaching publication (surely, contra p. 252, Rockhill’s work on William of Rubruck has now been replaced in the Hakluyt series by the joint efforts of Peter Jackson and David Morgan), so rather than carp over the inevitable omissions, one should look rather to the great wealth of bibliographical information that has been incorporated, making it all the easier for students to use as a guide to a world of scholarship that they ignore at their peril. Fortunately, moreover, proofreading standards appear to have been quite high: Martianus Capella (p. xviii) and Charles Bawden (p. 152) have suffered slightly, but the host of luminaries from the centuries and decades in between have been given their due, often for the first time in an English-language publication.

If, however, we court disaster by ignoring the work of earlier generations, not all of whom were complete fools, then it is most perilous of all, of course, to embark unawares even today on any topic touched upon by the remarkable Paul Pelliot. This is not because he was infallible, but simply because he had read more about China and Inner Asia than any of us ever will, and had such powers of memory as to be able to recall information from utterly disparate sources and so make connections unlikely to occur to any other scholar, either before or since. Yet, given his penchant for scattering these gems of information throughout a career total of many hundreds of book reviews, the chances of finding them have in the past always been fairly slim. The new chronological bibliography by Walravens at least gives one a fighting chance of running them down, equipped as it is with author and title indexes for these reviews and other publications, plus an inevitably incomplete but still useful index by content as well.

The volume also contains much useful information on what might be termed ‘Pelliotica’, starting with a reprinting (unfortunately not free from typographical errors) of his most eloquent English-language obituary, by J. J. L. Duyvendak, and also of the delightful recent reminiscences of Pelliot as a teacher (a piece also listed by Honey) from the veteran Altaicist Denis Sinor. The body of the work and the indexes associated with it are then followed on pp. 219–41 by a listing of items about Pelliot and the materials collected by him; this section too is equipped with indexes by name and by title. The subsection here on materials includes many works on the Pelliot collection of Dunhuang manuscripts, and even one or two articles on specific manuscripts, though obviously this is very far from a full account, which would in any case duplicate the work of the cataloguers of that collection. Even the section on Japanese ‘Pelliotica’ is evidently not designed to be comprehensive. In the Ajia rekishi jiten published by Heibonsha in 1962 there is an entry on Pelliot by Enoki Kazuo, who also contributed a brief account of the Pelliot Nachlass to the Tōyō Gakuhō 32.2 (1949); neither item is mentioned here. Indeed, the number of errors in the Japanese entries suggest that this area of bibliography is not a particular favourite for Walravens: Umehara Sueji’s name, for example, is correctly written on p. 222, but not on several earlier occurrences.

In a sense, of course, this does not matter, any more than anything much written by Pelliot and his admirers matters—most of it concerned details, ‘facts for facts’ sake’, in a famous formulation by John K. Fairbank. Surely we can dismiss the bulk of it as mere dross, and equate ‘sinology’ as represented by such men (and, much more occasionally, women) with a discredited Orientalism best forgotten in the new millennium. Some of Pelliot’s actions, such as walking off with the cream of the Dunhuang manuscripts,
are of course open to criticism, as Arthur Waley long ago pointed out in *Ballads and stories from Tun-huang* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1960), 237–8, and Sinor’s report shows that in his later years Pelliot was well aware that his scholarship was in a way self-indulgent. But, to judge from a 1903 review cited in Duyvendak’s obituary (p. xvi), Pelliot’s original aims cannot be faulted: mangling a Chinese name, he says, is as bad as mangling a European one. In other words, the Chinese are not an inferior people, deserving only of amateur, inferior scholarship, but have to be treated on the same level as Europeans—a policy which, once he had insisted on it, involved him in those days in a great deal of hard work, as it would have done also in the supposedly more enlightened and less imperialistic era of ‘area studies’, and alas as it would to some extent even today. Only when the BBC stops regularly mangling Chinese names, even at the best of times equating pinyin and Russian ‘zh’, for example, will we begin to be in a position to be condescending towards Paul Pelliot.

T. H. BARRETT

ROBERT WARDY:
*Aristotle in China: language, categories and translation.*

Here is a book well worth reading by anyone remotely interested in the Chinese language, but one that is best set aside during the hurly-burly of teaching and studied in those few moments of quiet still to be found in our rapidly contracting summer vacations. The question addressed is not a new one: to what degree did the nature of the Chinese language impose ‘guidance and constraint’ on Chinese thought? It is a type of question particularly associated with the name of Benjamin Lee Whorf, and one which A. C. Graham certainly pondered throughout much of his remarkable career. One does rather wonder why Chinese has been so often singled out in this regard. Surely it cannot be because of something so epiphenomenal, or rather totally unconnected, as the unfamiliarity of the script to European eyes? In more strictly linguistic terms there are, after all, some fairly strange languages much closer to home, such as Circassian, which baffled even Sir Harold Bailey. Or are there more unpleasant Orientalistic motives lurking beneath the surface, a desire to see a tongue spoken by so many people as actually hampering their thoughts, destining them an intellectually second-rate position behind speakers of Indo-European (and, one tentatively supposes, Semitic) languages?

Robert Wardy is far too polite to follow such a line of attack; instead he takes the route of Christoph Harbsmeier in his contribution to *Science and civilisation in China*, Volume 7, Part 1 (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), in confronting the question, teasing out its meaning, and adducing the wealth of counter-evidence available in the early texts of the Chinese language itself. Harbsmeier, in his somewhat more broadly conceived study, then goes on to consider the question of translation from Indo-European languages, noting in particular the impressive ability shown by Chinese translators of the Tang period in rendering Buddhist texts on logic from Sanskrit into Chinese. The work that Wardy concentrates on in the second part of the monograph under review he too has examined to some extent, though it seems to disappoint him.

But Wardy’s much closer look at the *Categories of Aristotle as translated*
by Francisco Furtado and Li Zhizao in 1631 from the edition with commentary prepared by the Jesuits of Coimbra (it would be too much to expect a direct confrontation between Aristotle himself and early Chinese thought) shows in detail that the Aristotelian tradition in Europe and Ming thought were, thanks to the ingenuity of the two intelligent and dedicated men involved in the translation, in remarkably effective communication with each other. Nor do we have to depend entirely on Wardy’s judgement for this, in that copious quotation, liberally sprinkled with Chinese characters, allows any sinologist to appreciate the validity of the points he is making at a glance. That is not to say that his translation is always beyond criticism: on p. 81, for example, I would not translate *tui lun zhi fa* as ‘regulations for discussion’, but as ‘a method of discussion’, in that the more concrete ‘regulations’ would probably be represented by some other word, such as *fa*. This example, however, has no effect on Wardy’s argument, and looking through the bilingual glossary of technical terminology that covers pp. 153–60 (impatient sinologists wishing to cut to the chase may well read this book backwards) I see nothing plainly injudicious in the English equivalents chosen for the key Chinese terms.

What one does notice, however, are one or two fascinating hints that some awareness of the earlier encounter with alien forms of thought originally expressed in Indian languages may have been hovering in Li’s mind, if not in Furtado’s. Cause, a notion for which one would expect some compound involving *yin*, as in modern speech, is instead expressed by the phrase *suoyiran*, ‘wherefore it is thus’, a term prominent in the thought of the Six Dynasties but not so conspicuous in subsequent ages. Are not the Buddhist overtones of *yin* being deliberately avoided? On the other hand, ‘object’ is rendered by *jie*, a regular equivalent in Buddhist terminology for *dhatu*, which is by no means the same thing, but which means something in a philosophical context in a way that *jie* in its more literal senses of ‘boundary’ or ‘bounded area’ does not.

In short, like all well wrought pieces of research, Robert Wardy’s monograph does not, for all its commendable directness, present us with some Gordian knot cloven indisputably quite in twain, but also leaves a number of loose ends to puzzle over, seen perhaps from a new angle. As we head back to the classroom we will probably not have had enough time to take things any further, but one day—maybe in retirement—a few thoughtful sinologists around the world will no doubt pick up this Chinese Aristotle, and other translations too, such as the works of nineteenth-century scientific translation recently studied by David Wright, and will find more to say on the rather weighty matters raised in this slimmish volume. For such stimulating prompting from a slightly unexpected quarter, we in Chinese studies clearly owe a considerable debt to Robert Wardy, and hope that he will find other examples of cultural intercommunication between the classical tradition of Western philosophy and China with which to beguile our increasingly rare moments of reflection.

T. H. BARRETT

VIRGINIA YIP AND STEPHEN MATTHEWS:
*Intermediate Cantonese: a grammar and workbook.*  

This is the companion and continuation volume to the same authors’ *Basic Cantonese* which was published in the previous year. Like its predecessor it defies easy categorization, being neither a teaching textbook nor a
comprehensive working grammar of the language, and is aimed apparently at random somewhere between the teacher and the student in such a way that neither is likely to benefit greatly.

For the teacher it is not comprehensive enough or analytical enough to provide in-depth material which would add much colour and weight to classroom presentation. For the student it is so perfunctory (perhaps ‘ungenerous’ might be a better word) in its treatment of many major grammar points that it is hard to see how the innocent mind could get to grips with much of it. As in the earlier book there is for the most part a curious assumption that the student already knows a wide vocabulary which can be understood when it appears in newly introduced grammatical contexts, while here and there, as if waking briefly from this unwarranted assumption, a word or term is suddenly explained (as with houchih ‘resemble’ on p. 85). As for the ‘workbook’ element, it consists of a few brief and repetitive exercises at the end of each unit. Little or no attempt seems to be have been made to make the exercises original or interesting or to depart from the stolid fare of ‘fill in the blanks’ and ‘using formula x, change y to z’. The teacher will not stimulate the student with this material, and because of the vocabulary problem the student will often not be able to understand it without a teacher.

The book is more useful than Basic Cantonese if only because a learner who has progressed that much further has a better chance of relating to some at least of the material, but both are marred in principle by their failure to identify and target a specific readership. Cantonese: a comprehensive grammar by the same authors remains a towering achievement and neither of these ‘spin-offs’ comes even close to matching it in usefulness. Having said which, they do contain some new material elegantly rendered into exact English equivalents; they deal unswervingly with everyday usage in straightforward language devoid of jargon and pretentiousness; they are refreshingly free from contrived and unnatural examples (indeed many of the examples are sourced); and they show evidence of the insight and originality of approach which mark the earlier work of these two gifted authors. Even the most experienced teacher of Cantonese will find some food for productive thought at points in the text. For example, the casually thrown away remark on p. 16 associating tone change with familiarity is enlightening; the treatment of classifiers in Unit 8 is sparingly phrased but satisfyingly full; and the discussion of causatives and resultatives with dou in Unit 14 is unusual. By contrast rather heavy weather is made of the use and positioning of the adverbs dou (pp. 97–8) and jauh (p. 137), both of which would be better explained as being positioned before the verb rather than after other features; and the sketchiness of Unit 7 on adjectives and stative verbs makes the distinction between them less than clear.

As with most other Routledge publications there are no Chinese characters used in this book. Since there can nowadays be no significant cost barrier to including characters, their omission must presumably be ascribed to misguided editorial policy.

Hugh D. R. Baker

Yip Po-Ching:
The Chinese lexicon: a comprehensive survey.

‘The Chinese lexicon is a detailed study of the words and word combinations used in modern Chinese.’ When teaching Chinese to English-speaking learners,
it is inevitable that comparisons between Chinese and English are made. Written English can be analysed in different meaningful units, i.e., sentences, clauses, phrases, words and morphemes. Written Chinese can similarly be analysed in terms of sentences, clauses, phrases and, arguably, morphemes. What then is the Chinese equivalent to the category ‘words’? Is it 子 zi (character) or 词 ci (word)? To answer this question, we need not only to define the intricate relationship between characters and words—which is not always straightforward—we should also have a broad view on how the language has functioned in its historical as well as modern development.

It is fortunate that we now have a book which deals with the Chinese lexicon in English in such a detailed manner. Yip Po-ching’s *The Chinese lexicon: a comprehensive survey* offers us a broad picture of the words and word combinations used in modern Chinese. We know, for example, that more than two-thirds of modern Chinese words are disyllabic. It seems convenient to adopt a word-based approach in teaching spoken Chinese. However, if we look at modern Chinese against its historical and developmental background, we will find that:

What we can clearly see is that in the monosyllabically oriented classical lexicon, the increase in words is reflected in the increase in written symbols, whereas in the modern lexicon, the increase in words corresponds directly with the increase of disyllabic combinations, whilst the number of individual characters employed for the purpose has not only been vastly reduced but has subsequently remained constant (p. 18).

What does this claim, based on research findings, suggest to us in terms of pedagogic considerations in teaching Chinese as a foreign language?

There are two major approaches to Chinese language teaching in terms of reading, which are generally termed 字本位 ‘character-based’ and 词本位 ‘word-based’. We see that textbooks published in China are mostly ‘word-based’: two- or three-character words are presented as a unit. The meaning of the individual characters which constitute a word is not given. It is down to the teacher who uses the textbook to deal with this. The character-based approach, in contrast, pays attention to individual characters and their capacity to form new words. This latter approach seems to be favoured outside China, and is represented predominantly by the popular textbooks used in the UK and France, namely, *Colloquial Chinese* by T’ung and Pollard (London: Routledge, 1982) and *Méthode d’initiation à la langue et à l’écriture chinoises* by Joel Bellassen and Zhang Pengpeng (Paris: La Compagnie, 1989). The fact that some 2,000 to 3,000 core characters can form many thousands of words, and cope with the expansion of modern-day vocabulary, must deserve the attention of not only linguists but also of teachers of Chinese as a foreign language. This is precisely the rationale behind the character-based approach.

The question that follows is: how, then, does this comparatively small body of characters manage to deal with what seems to be an ever increasing number of words? *The Chinese lexicon* illustrates systematically the morphological, syntactic, phonoaesthetic and rhetorical features governing word formation in the Chinese lexicon. It provides a comprehensive analysis of how characters and words interact. We find ample examples of the varied ways in which words are formed. All of this is no doubt very useful for learners and teachers of Chinese alike.

In the appendix, the author lists dozens of intra- and inter-lexical strategies
of the Chinese and English lexicons with examples for each strategy. The section is interesting, even fascinating, to read on its own.

To conclude, The Chinese lexicon will be an invaluable resource for learners of Chinese at intermediate and advanced levels, even more so for teachers of Chinese, who will find it a comprehensive as well as an easy-to-use reference work.

LIANYI SONG

MARJORIE DRYBURGH:

North China and Japanese expansion, 1933–1937: regional power and the national interest.


Marjorie Dryburgh’s important new book is a welcome addition to the slowly growing literature on the effects of Japanese encroachment on Chinese politics in the 1930s. The book uses a wealth of contemporary Chinese-language sources, combined with memoir literature, and sets forth a powerful argument that the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kaishek exacerbated its problems in dealing with Japan by adopting too rigid an attitude towards regional Chinese militarists in North China. In doing so, it helps create a more nuanced picture of the way in which Chinese nationalism developed in the early part of the last century.

The essential work on the way in which Chiang Kaishek’s regime responded to Japanese aggression in the 1930s is Parks Coble’s Facing Japan: Chinese politics and Japanese imperialism (1991). Coble’s work gave us the ‘view from Nanjing’, showing the various pressures on Chiang’s regime—warlordism, the threat from the Communist party, factionalism—which forced him to adopt a policy of appeasement towards the Japanese after the occupation of Manchuria in 1931. Dryburgh switches focus, looking at the question from the point of view of one of the regional militarists with whom Chiang and the Japanese both had to deal. Her central figure is Song Zheyuan, commander of the 29th Army and political leader in the Hebei-Chaha’er region of North China. Throughout the period 1933 to 1937, Song was caught between two conflicting sets of demands. On the one hand, Chiang Kaishek demanded that Song show his loyalty to the central government in Nanjing by resisting Japanese pressure to grant the latter military and political rights in North China; yet Chiang refused to give Song any significant military backing so that he could defend his position. On the other, the North China Garrison Army, the Japanese military force in the region, wooed Song with promises of support if he encouraged North China to become autonomous from the Nanjing regime, and threatened him with retaliation if he refused. In Dryburgh’s account, Song’s skill as a political juggler comes through first and foremost, as he frequently kept his own statements vague and unfocused, giving the impression that he was a simpleton. When Song refused to carry out Nanjing’s demands, a common reaction among Chiang’s officials was therefore not to assume that Song was being defiant, but rather that he was not particularly intelligent, and could not be expected fully to understand his role in the wider national picture. In retrospect, however, the impression that one gets is of a skilled political operator, playing a weak hand well. For four years, as Sino-Japanese tensions escalated between 1933 and 1937, Song managed to maintain a large swathe of North China broadly under his
control, while not giving full control either to Nanjing or the Japanese. It was only the outbreak of full-scale war in 1937 that meant that Song could no longer hold to his ambiguous position, and was forced unequivocally to side with Chiang Kaishek.

Song Zheyuan’s story is told in great detail over the first four chapters, and by presenting large amounts of detailed evidence rather than editorializing, Dryburgh gradually and subtly draws the reader into sly complicity with Song’s manoeuvres. Perhaps the most important argument comes in chapter v, however, where the case against Nanjing’s handling of regional militarists like Song is weighed and found wanting. ‘If we are to identify a genuine failure in Nanjing’s prewar Japan policy,’ the author notes, ‘it is not the failure to embrace resistance, but the failure ... to develop a strategy for dealing with the Japan problem that would accommodate the complexity of the Sino-Japanese relationship and the diverse actors engaged in it.’ The foreign policy makers in Nanjing found it hard to conceive of loyalty to the national interest which was not totally congruent with loyalty to the interests of their Nationalist government. They engaged in a policy of trying to direct all their diplomacy through formal channels, with negotiation only to be carried out between Nanjing and Tokyo. This policy failed to take into account the reality on the ground in North China, where leaders such as Song Zheyuan had to deal with the ever-increasing demands of the North China Garrison Army, which often had little respect for the Tokyo government’s official policy. Furthermore, Chiang Kaishek’s demands that regional leaders such as Song should sacrifice parts of the areas under their control so that the central government could buy more time may have seemed appealing to government officials sitting in Nanjing, but were hardly calculated to appeal to the leaders who were being asked to bear these territorial losses, many of whom were only reluctant allies of Chiang’s in the first place. Song Zheyuan would have had further reason to be wary of Chiang, having seen how another major militarist, Zhang Xueliang of Manchuria, had seen his homeland invaded and occupied by the Japanese in 1931, following which there seemed to be little prospect of Chiang’s government supporting any military attempt to retake it. One cannot necessarily fault Chiang’s calculations—as we have seen, he had plenty on his plate already—but the knowledge of what had happened in Manchuria must surely have made many regional militarists think twice about their role as pawns in his national strategy against the Japanese.

Marjorie Dryburgh has written an innovative and thoughtful study of a topic which has received far less attention than it deserves. Her book is recommended reading for all those interested in the turbulent relationship between China and Japan in the early twentieth century, as well as the tensions within domestic Chinese politics during that period.

RANA MITTER

MASUDA WATARU (translated by JOSHUA A. FOGEL):

*Japan and China: mutual representations in the modern era.*


This volume contains at the same time much more and much less than one would imagine by glancing at the title. Anyone looking for a systematic treatment of Japanese perceptions of China or Chinese perceptions of Japan during the Tokugawa and Meiji periods is bound to be disappointed, since
even an introductory overview of this fascinating field of study is simply not attempted. Instead, we are presented with a series of book notes on important publications of the period bearing upon Sino-Japanese cultural relations, composed by a veteran who in his day was responsible for introducing the great Chinese writers of the Republican era, many of whom he knew personally, to a Japanese audience. In fact these notes were originally published as a series of bibliographical essays in the mid-1970s, and then translated as a series by Fogel in the periodical *Sino-Japanese Studies* during the early 1990s, with additional annotation interspersed with Masuda's own notes.

This dual annotation, now to be found in the end-notes, is useful, though not exhaustive. For example, Fogel (p. 230, note j) evidently found the Japanese reprintings of the pioneering Chinese adaptations of British medical works by the early medical missionary Benjamin Hobson impossible to locate in the United States, but had he revised his annotation in the light of information in Peter Kornicki’s catalogue of Japanese books in the library of the Wellcome Institute, *BSOAS* LX/3, 1997, 494, he would have been able to point out that these works—to say nothing of other items relating to Hobson in a purely sinological context, likewise recorded in the Chinese catalogue of the same collection by Hartmut Walravens—are readily available in London. Some indication, too, might ideally have been given of other Japanese studies of the literature covered. For example the intriguing historiographical and even more extraordinary plain fictional contemporary Japanese response to the Taiping rebellion is covered by Masuda in a number of essays from the sixteenth through to the twenty-second. Yet several of the publications dealt with in these pages were already touched upon in a study of Japanese awareness of the Taipings by the historian Masui Tsuneo as early as 1951, which was later reprinted on pp. 74–98 of his collection *Chūgoku no futatsu no higeki* (Tokyo: Kembun shuppan, 1978). No doubt other secondary studies could also have been woven into Fogel’s commentary, though one can understand his reluctance to extend his labours unduly, so perhaps confining himself to remarks on the primary materials themselves was after all the right approach to take.

In a sense, however, the omission of such further petty details in the volume under review is of much more minor consequence than what would appear to be a mere change of typography when compared with the original translated versions of the essays that appeared in the 1990s. For these included handwritten Chinese characters inserted in the main text of the translations, and in the notes at the end of each section of translation. At first sight the change in the reprint to typeset characters for all names and book titles in a separate glossary (pp. 254–79), with only characters relating to textual problems in the end-notes collected at the back of the volume, represents an advance in terms of visual clarity and professionalism. Yet the removal of so many characters from their original locations in the text and notes, where they were most useful for rapid consultation, has rather undermined the ease of consultation of this volume as a sort of bibliographical handbook of Sino-Japanese cultural relations, as indeed has the separation of the notes from proximity to their original portions of text. Even an index-glossary giving more immediate access to the information required on each name or title would have been better, though far from ideal. The amount of East Asian script required could have been handled quite easily by an American university press, to say nothing a European firm such as E. J. Brill, so the failure of the most dynamic publisher of academic texts on East Asia in Great Britain to
rise to the occasion typographically is distinctly worrying. Any publisher nowadays who is unable to mix Western and non-Western scripts with complete freedom is at a clear disadvantage in the international academic market, so we must hope that this reluctance to scatter kanji liberally throughout an English-language text marks no more than a passing phase. As it is, this volume will still have its uses to those wishing to get a quick grasp of the literary resources available for the study of the early modern phase of Sino-Japanese relations, but it is just not the solid reference work that it could have been, and that the labours of Masuda and Fogel even laid the groundwork for.

T. H. Barrett

EDITH SARRA:

Fictions of femininity: literary inventions of gender in Japanese court women’s memoirs.

Fictions of femininity presents a sustained feminist account of Heian women’s literature with substantial ramifications for how we read that body of work. Through close readings of both canonical and marginalized texts, the author outlines an animated conversation among women writers and readers about the very real social, emotional, and political consequences of having one’s body and text read as female. In doing so, this book moves beyond the restrictive and anachronistic rubrics for defining ‘court women’s memoirs’ that have dominated scholarship, treating them instead as part of a larger female discourse about erotic desire, fantasy, family, class, fictionality, and the slippery boundaries between ‘public’ and ‘private’ spaces. Like the texts it treats, Fictions of femininity yields many rewards to the careful reader. The following summary is intended to cover only some of the book’s more original contributions to scholarly accounts of these memoirs.

As the introduction acknowledges, the generic construct of ‘Japanese court women’s memoir literature’ (ōchō joryū nikki bungaku) is both compelling and problematic in equal measure. Sarra outlines several desires informing the modern conceptualization of this genre: those of Japanese writers and critics in the twentieth century to find Heian foremothers for modern Japanese ‘women’s literature’ (joryū bungaku) and the ‘I-novel’ (watakushi shōsetsu) genre; those of literary historians who treat Heian court women’s memoirs as the (perhaps socially embarrassing but necessary) nursemaid of a national prose literature; and those of feminist scholars wishing to reconstruct the voices of women who lived in other times and places. In favouring the feminist approach, Sarra highlights what was at stake for the literate and sophisticated women who wrote these memoirs as women. This distinction matters not only because dominant representations of femininity in Heian texts are male in origin; but also because, as Sarra argues, it mattered to their authors insofar as their reproductive potential defined them as tokens of exchange in the political traffic between those aristocratic men who provided the education, patronage and material support for their writings.

Sarra goes beyond this truism, however, by demonstrating how this patriarchal traffic in women informed not only the material conditions for their writings, but also those texts’ rhetorical contours. Because what Sarra
calls the ‘well-bred’ (that is, potentially marriageable) Heian woman was subject to significant constraints on her physical and visual mobility, her written texts functioned as a compensatory prosthesis which could physically travel to and be seen in settings where she herself could not. One of the central themes in this book is the complicated play between concealing and revealing which these women’s memoirs mobilized within the Heian court of public opinion. Such strategies, Sarra argues, can be seen in the rhetorical complexities of voice, viewpoint, and emotional tone within their texts as they set out to produce a complicated and calculated rhetoric of testimonial.

In chapter i, Sarra uses this approach to move beyond sterile debates about gender and genre that have largely defined the male-authored mother of Japanese women’s memoirs, the *Tosa nikki*. Noting the degree to which its author Ki no Tsurayuki seeks to align ‘feminine poetry’ with a properly passive womanhood elsewhere, Sarra suggests that the memoir’s ostensibly female writer could have served a similar function vis-à-vis prose. As a handbook for future female writers, the *Tosa nikki* would have related specialized forms of knowledge in a manner not unlike that of the men’s diaries which it claims to emulate.

Chapter ii explores the *Kagerō nikki*, a text typically viewed as a more genuinely gendered—if emotionally excessive—mother for Japanese court women’s memoirs. Yet the divide between author and (auto)biographical subject embodied in this memoir’s infamous shift from third- to first-person narration in its opening lines is as profound as the gender gap opened up at the beginning of the *Tosa nikki*. Sarra’s use of the term ‘heroine’ here and elsewhere to describe the focal subject of the memoir offers a novel and subtle approach to this issue. While it explicitly rejects the female stereotypes developed in monogatari tales, Sarra argues, the *Kagerō nikki* and other memoirs deployed that genre’s perspectival suppleness to modulate the author’s proximity to her text’s heroine. Such strategies mattered to the *Kagerō nikki* because, as Sarra notes, it was probably begun as a defence of its author’s abortive attempt to divorce her politically influential husband.

Chapters iii and iv provide the first extended study in English of one of the most intriguing and controversial of Heian court women’s memoirs, the *Sarashina nikki*. In these chapters, Sarra weaves together an account of solitary reading as a feminine autoerotic act disciplined by Buddhism, enabled by older knowing female accomplices, and rich in its capacity for dreams and fantasy. As it happens, the verb used to describe the heroine’s guilty acts of solitary silent reading, *miru* (‘to look at something’) carries sexual connotations. Any and all positions can be visualized by the girl peeping at an illustrated tale under her covers. Small wonder, Sarra suggests, that she would be loathe to give up such erotic mobility for the physical and visual restraints of marriage.

Buddhism plays a complex role in Sarra’s reading of the *Sarashina nikki*: in terms of both the law limiting desires, and their being simultaneously propagated in the form of dreams about sternly handsome monks. One is reminded of the complex interplay between constraint and incitement displayed by Christian formulations of Western sexualities. Regardless of this, Sarra notes Buddhism’s increasing prominence among the middle ranks of the male aristocracy in the mid-Heian period which went hand-in-hand with a shift in the tone of male monogatari criticism from one of patronizing amusement to anxious denunciation of their potentially ‘immoral’ effects. Sarra’s reading of the *Sarashina nikki* would imply that such didactic criticism was informed by
patriarchal anxiety that one's own 'well-bred' daughters or sisters might prefer monogatari to men.

Chapter v provides the first extended scholarly treatment in English of the Sanuki no suke nikki. Narrated by the former consort of one emperor now serving his heir, this handmaid’s tale is charged with connotations of ritual pollution and political danger to herself and her family. Inconvenient and agonizing memories of the former emperor are represented as a form of spirit possession; hence, Sarra argues, the fragmentary, multiple perspectives embedded in this memoir, which resembles a poetry anthology more than a standard nikki in its eschewal of linear temporality. Sarra further draws on a wealth of scholarship on Heian spirit possession to show how this phenomenon is deployed by the memoir’s author to excuse the handmaid as the victim of possession, while perhaps simultaneously providing a veiled reminder of her ability to summon the spirit of her former imperial patron. Here once again there is a deft interweaving of the political complexities of the author's situation with those displayed in the rhetoric of her text. These are intelligent, articulate women who are well aware of the high stakes involved in the display of a socially-scrutinized self.

Chapter vi provides a sweeping critique of the ways in which modern scholarship on Heian literature has rendered the motif of ‘fence-peeping’ (kaimami)—with its delineation of a male voyeur and passive female object blind even to the fact that she is being looked at—into the master metaphor for Heian erotics. As Sarra argues, the women narrators in monogatari bring their female audience into such scenarios in complex, sometimes critically ironic ways. She then sketches an alternative range of erotic possibilities involving parity between genders—as revealed in the Makura no sōshi, whose author displays a master voyeur’s appreciation of the erotic possibilities for both seeing and being seen by women and men of all social classes at the Heian court. Her reading thus links this text’s oft-noted rejection of rhetorical and narrative conventions with a rejection of gendered ones.

Perhaps this book’s most provocative point is that we take more seriously the links between textuality and corporeality in Heian court culture. The rhetorical strategies of calculated disclosure it sees in these texts resonate suggestively with the strategies for displaying one’s hair, clothes, voice, and calligraphic hand in which Heian women simultaneously engaged. Ultimately, it is Sarra’s sensitivity to the risks entailed in such disclosures that makes her arguments so compelling. While preserving a critical distance between heroine and author—in fact pointing out the misogyny that often accompanies modern scholarship’s tendency to equate the two—Fictions of femininity makes a strong argument for reading these memoirs as carefully crafted and politically canny testimonials to the contradictions, complexities, and constraints experienced by their female authors as wives, handmaids, mothers, daughters, and sisters living in an intensely competitive and patriarchal society.

GUSTAV HELDT

W. G. BEASLEY:

Professor Beasley is best known for his work on the nineteenth century and especially the Meiji Restoration and its aftermath, in respect of which he is
the sole British contributor to the multi-volume *Cambridge history of Japan.* But as the emphasis on pre-Meiji Japan in this book seems to indicate, he more than most must regret Japan’s recent economic trials; indeed, the outcome of the whole Meiji ‘experiment’ both before and after 1945. ‘All very interesting but no more thank you’ was apparently his feeling at the close of his first visit in 1945–46. As of 1990, on the eve of the first Japan Festival in the UK, he was concluding that interest in Japan hardly rivalled that in respect even of Italy, and would only continue to grow in line with Japan’s economy. The collapse of the ‘bubble economy’ would appear to have seen to that, notwithstanding the current second Japan Festival.

By contrast, more than thirty years ago, the late John Whitney Hall was already focusing attention in particular on the *kinsei,* ‘early modern’ Edo period, 1600–1868, in his *Japan from prehistory to modern times.* Of lasting popularity, the book featured a peaceful, stable society, by no means devoid of social change, albeit all too featureless politically, such that it might still seem comparable not only with Manchu China but even Yi Korea. And Hall’s contemporary, T. C. Smith, moving backwards from early work on the Meiji era, was already presenting a picture of a society increasingly dominated by rich farmers in which the *samurai* was almost redundant. This links with the still much neglected evidence of the rare Russian visitor of 1811–13, V. M. Golovnin, in whose eyes the ruling class had lost most of its military character.

Smith, W. B. Hauser, Nakai Nobuhiko and Nakamura Satoru give us a picture of rural Japan, at least around Osaka and Nagoya, in which the nuclear family was emerging, landlordism and tenancy were spreading, and if only as a way of getting around the rice-tax, cash-crops being grown of which undoubtedly the most important was cotton. But in any case, the incidence of tax was fixed, so that if population was stabilized as apparently was the case by 1730, by means of late marriage, abortion and perhaps infanticide, living-standards were bound to rise. To some extent, improved agricultural technology was creating Japan’s own ‘agricultural revolution’. And rural industry, especially in the Kinai region around Osaka, principally cotton spinning and weaving, was also helping to improve living standards, signifying what Susan Hanley has called ‘samurai-zation’, reflected in improved diet, clothing, and above all housing. A number of quite grand farmhouses still survive from the late eighteenth century, and not just in the Kinai. Commercialization and capital accumulation were features of this process, focused in particular on Osaka, ‘Japan’s kitchen’, which was seeing the rise of future *zaibatsu* companies like Mitsui, Sumitomo, with mining and other interests almost throughout Japan, and the Sasakawa *sake* business.

Another striking fact is that as early as 1730 Edo/Tokyo was probably the world’s largest city, with more than a million people, almost all literate, and it remained so until the early nineteenth century, i.e. through all the early years of the Industrial Revolution in England. Like many other Japanese cities it had grown rapidly in the seventeenth century, and probably remained twice the size of Osaka largely because of its role as the capital of the shogun, Japan’s real ruler. By contrast most of the other castle-towns of the *daimyo* lords shrank during the eighteenth century as further evidence of the decline of the old ‘feudal system’, but at least ten per cent of Japan’s population was still reckoned urban in the early nineteenth century. Thus there is general agreement that Japan had reached ‘early capitalism’ by this time, and Smith’s most recent book is entitled *Native sources of Japanese industrialization, 1750–1920.* Susan Hanley goes on to argue that the nineteenth century as a
whole, and thus even its second half featuring the Meiji Restoration, saw no real improvement in living standards, thereby highlighting the social cost of at least the early stages of so-called ‘modernization’, other than improved security from the Western threat in the form of the notorious military strengthening. And hand in hand with all this economic and social change had gone other, more familiar, developments acknowledged already by Hall, in art, theatre and literature, and not least emphasis on native Japanese culture to the exclusion of Chinese influence.

That recent works like K. Pomeranz’s *Great divide*, in making comparisons between West and East so much to the disadvantage of the latter, should focus so exclusively on decadent China under the Ch’ing is as mystifying to this South-East Asianist as it is doubtless to any Japanologist. And it is to be hoped that Professor Beasley’s new approach will also serve to transfer attention to Edo Japan. That so prosperous a society was increasingly and unquestionably a *sakoku*, ‘closed’ country of course conflicts with orthodox Adam Smithian, Anglo-Saxon economic thinking, founded in free trade, population expansion and migration. But that orthodoxy now resembles a treadmill with rather unpromising prospects. The ‘fairytale’ that Laurence Oliphant for one perceived in 1858 in Edo Japan, and how it worked, might now repay much greater attention.

NIGEL BRAILEY

RICHARD SIMS:

*Japanese political history since the Meiji renovation, 1868–2000.*


Superbly designed and printed, the front cover a veritable work of art, illustrated throughout with many photos of important people and events, plus some amusing cartoons by contemporary satirists—while standards of academic publishing steadily decline, what a pleasure to see a book as well produced as this.

The book’s content fully matches expectations. To complete such a comprehensive, lucid survey of Modern Japan’s stormy and tortuous political history from 1868 to the present day is an impressive achievement in itself. One can also single out some of its many admirable features for special comment.

The author begins with a brief preface where he presents his own views on the distinctive and enduring qualities of Japanese politics; then in chapter i he gets off to a good start with a concise account of the Meiji renovation’s historical background and various conflicting interpretations of its real significance. These form an excellent introduction to the book.

All major figures in the political arena are then successively described in fine detail, with shrewd comments on their character and motives. Meanwhile institutional changes, diplomatic entanglements, economic forces, social movements and currents of thought are skilfully woven into the narrative, never impeding its smooth flow. Factional disputes and personal rivalries abound at every stage; often of baffling complexity, these too are handled with effortless assurance.

The book concludes with a survey bibliography of all important works, conveniently grouped into topics with brief appraisals of their merits and deficiencies. This is a most valuable guide to further reading.
Specialists in many fields will find this book a useful backdrop for their work. Students and general readers will also benefit from gaining a firm grasp of modern Japan’s political evolution as a complete whole, rarely provided by individual biographies, more limited studies or detailed monographs.

Compared with numerous general histories of the period, in my opinion this one is easily the best and most useful of them all. It certainly establishes the author as an historian of the very highest calibre.

ANDREW FRASER

G. G. ROWLEY:
Yosano Akiko and The Tale of Genji.

In the spring of 2001, members of the listserv for Premodern Japan Studies discussed whether Arthur Waley had based his English translation of The Tale of Genji on Yosano Akiko’s 1912–13 translation of the same into modern Japanese. Like her he abbreviated some passages, skipped over others, and sanitized Genji’s character. His library contains a copy of her work, annotated in his own hand. All this proves, however, is that as with any careful scholar, he had read as much as he could about the original text as well as studying the text itself, just as Akiko herself had read all the available commentaries and steeped herself in the world of Murasaki Shikibu long before beginning her own translation. No one had attempted a translation of the novel in over two-hundred years; its language was more foreign to the Japanese of her day than it was to Waley himself.

Akiko’s profound commitment to classical Japanese literature sits ill with the common perception of her as a thoroughly modern woman. She is best known for her poetry, but just as students of classical poetry tend to focus their attention on a select few of the imperial poetry anthologies, so too do admirers of Akiko’s poetry read only her early, most passionate poems. Lauded for their frank expression of emotion and their physicality, they are said to mark the genesis of modern tanka. By reading more widely in Akiko’s poetry and by paying close attention to the classical antecedents found even in her earliest poems, Rowley is able to challenge the received wisdom regarding both Akiko and her poetry. The famous image of tangled hair, for example, can be traced to Izumi Shikibu (born 977?) and Ono no Komachi (fl. c. 850). Yes, the young Akiko caused a sensation with her first poems, poems that she later found embarrassing. She participated in debates over motherhood and promoted women’s rights. She even wrote a powerful anti-war poem at the height of the jingoistic fervour during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05. In Rowley’s eyes, however, all this pales in significance compared to Akiko’s life-long engagement with Genji monogatari.

The reader comes away from Rowley’s study awed not just by Akiko’s superhuman energy but by her prodigious mind. An autodidact, she immersed herself in the world of Murasaki Shikibu from a young age and memorized large chunks of classical literature. Like premodern readers everywhere, she read deeply, re-reading and pondering the texts that mattered to her and integrating them into her own sense of self expressed in her writings, poetry and dress. She lived out her fantasies as a Genji heroine by running away from home to be with her lover, even though no woman in Genji is ever that
bold. In this way, she appropriated and distorted the meaning of the text at one and the same time. Whether she wrote her own commentaries or turned out translations (in addition to Genji, she translated Eiga monogatari, Murasaki Shikibu nikki, Izumi Shikibu nikki, and Tsurezuregusa into modern Japanese), she expressed full confidence that no one understood the text as well as she did, and she received full endorsement of her claim by the leading literary figures of her day. She was a master stylist in her own right, and so thoroughly did she understand Genji monogatari that her final translation surpasses all others in its fluidity as well as its fidelity. Her first is another matter. Although superior to the half-baked efforts made earlier in the 1890s, it abbreviates the original. The publisher’s desire for a commercially viable book and the need to advance the action at a pace suitable for a modern audience played their part; leaving a text, that bereft of its ornamentation, negates the alterity of the past. Beyond such mundane considerations, the sections she cut are precisely those that show the dark side of Genji’s character. The reason? Rowley draws on a wealth of evidence and her own detailed analysis of Akiko’s writings to make the highly original argument that in negotiating between art and life (p. 129), Akiko identified so closely with Murasaki and saw so much of her philandering husband in Genji that she made the text into her own story, transforming both Murasaki and Genji in the process.

In addition to documenting Akiko’s lifelong devotion to Genji monogatari, Rowley offers a concise summation of Genji studies and how readers have interacted with the text. Heian period aristocrats and their epigones in medieval Japan tended to identify the text as a romance suitable for women, but also dangerous at the same time, and they mined it for information on court ceremonies and for poetical allusions. Men in the Tokugawa period turned it into a classic for all Japanese. No longer the property solely of the aristocracy, it was analysed for its insights into the ancient past, popularized, summarized, and parodied. Rowley knows of only two women who can be said to have read the work because of the way it informed their writing. I can add a third: Matsuo Taseko (1811–94) read at least a fragment of the 1675 commentary and text and alluded to Genji in her poetry. In addition, woodblock prints, novels and critical comments by male pundits suggest that women, especially courtesans, found it worth their while to be familiar with Genji, although any woman who might have wanted to treat it analytically became a figure of ridicule. In reaction to the extremes of Westernization in the 1870s and 1880s, the men who concerned themselves with building a solid foundation for modern Japan turned to the past to create a national literature suitable for shoring up the national identity by making it possible for the Japanese to take pride in their cultural heritage. As ‘the world’s first novel’, Genji monogatari was an obvious candidate for this task. It was even adduced as evidence for why the unequal treaties ought to be revised and as proof that despite the first Sino-Japanese war of 1894, the Japanese were not a war-loving people. Even so, the men who promoted Genji tended to read it through a thicket of commentaries to which they contributed their own interpretations. Akiko did both; she read it as a woman and analysed it as a man.

By acknowledging the importance of classical literature to Akiko in both professional and personal terms throughout her life, Rowley’s monograph provides an essential supplement that adds to rather than substitutes for previous studies, at least those appearing in English. (Perhaps because ‘mere’ translation is too often denigrated in academic circles, its contribution to
Akiko’s literary career is often overlooked, even though it brought her a sizeable income.) Rowley’s depiction of how Akiko’s scholarship has been ignored reminds me of another modern woman, Dorothy L. Sayers, whose translations of Dante and writings on religion have been completely overshadowed by her creation of Lord Peter Wimsey. Both women led full, complex, and multi-faceted lives that have been reduced in the years since their deaths to what was, in their eyes, their least noteworthy achievements. In the case of Yosano Akiko, at least, a complete biography of this poet, activist, translator, and scholar remains to be written.

This is a book for advanced students and scholars of Japanese literature and women’s studies. Although it is highly readable and larded with elegant and fluid translations, it presupposes a solid knowledge of The Tale of Genji and the Japanese language as well as a willingness to plough through long passages of transliterated Japanese. Rowley is well steeped in Japanese cultural studies; her knowledge of historical scholarship is more limited. She consistently refers to Akiko by her first name while calling male figures by their family name, as, for example, ‘Akiko certainly saw Tanizaki’s effort as detracting from her own accomplishment’ (p. 153). In this Rowley follows an unfortunate and nearly universal practice that implicitly denigrates women’s accomplishments in comparison to those of men. (Milton is never called John whereas Austen is too often simply Jane.) These caveats aside, the book is well worth reading not only for its fresh insights into a major modern writer, but as a model of what can be learned from an array of close textual analyses.

ANNE WALTHALL

JAMES H. GRAYSON:
Myths and legends from Korea: an annotated compendium of ancient and modern materials.

Korean myths, legends and folktales have so far been poorly served by publications in Western languages, to the dismay of teachers who hardly find anything worthwhile for reading assignments. Grayson’s hefty compilation is therefore a welcome addition to the literature. In easily readable translations it brings together a substantial number of tales, some of which are most fascinating. This is material that will induce many readers to study Korean culture more deeply, and through his introduction, comments and bibliography Grayson provides them with some of the means to do so. If, nevertheless, I have some reservations with regard to the book, it is because of the—perhaps over ambitious—claims it makes, which I feel it does not sufficiently live up to, and to a certain extent also because of the nature of the comments on the tales, which take up a considerable portion of the book.

According to Grayson, the compendium is a collection of 177 tales from the oral tradition, ‘essentially anthropological in outlook’, and intends to provide an analysis of the function of the tales, the purpose which these tales had for the listeners; it is also intended to be an introduction to the beliefs and thoughts of the Korean people in the ancient and modern periods through an analysis of the oral folklore of Korea. For the ancient period the Samguk yusa (Remnants of the Three Kingdoms) has been the main source. This raises two problems. Firstly, is this material oral? The Samguk yusa is written in Classical Chinese, and was compiled in 1285, i.e. in the Koryŏ
period, by the monk Iryón. Although it certainly drew on oral traditions, the process of change these underwent when Korean oral narratives became Chinese text should not be ignored. This may have happened long before Iryón incorporated the tales in his work. For example, although Grayson claims that in the case of the story of Tan’gun, Korea’s mythical founder, Iryón recorded a—presumably oral—folk narrative, the text quite clearly states that it is based on written sources in Chinese, which have little to do with ‘folk narratives’. In any case, whenever oral texts were put into writing, in the new context the function, too, changed and this is likely to have resulted in modifications to the text, leading it away from the meanings it may have had in the stage of orality (when functions and meanings may not be assumed to have been stable over time either). Any understanding of the material in the *Samguk yusa* should therefore be based on a discussion and understanding of the particular aims and purposes of Iryón’s composition. In other words, the *Samguk yusa* should be seen within the context of Koryó history. Here the second problem arises, because Grayson, far from attempting this, takes the narratives of the *Samguk yusa* as products of the period of the Three Kingdoms and the period of Unified Shilla (which came to an end in the tenth century), even apologizing for the fact that no medieval (that is, Koryó) tales were included.

This is not the only ‘contextual problem’. To justify the claim that the book is essentially anthropological in outlook, a detailed and careful attempt should have been made to place each tale in its cultural and social context (not to mention its intertextual connections, which are equally crucial in determining a text’s meanings and functions in any concrete situation). Obviously this is an impossible task for a selection of 177 tales. Consequently, it is not surprising that the functional analysis of the tales is frequently superficial. Discussion of the historical development of tales, too, tends to be based more on (unverifiable) common sense than on all the available evidence and existent scholarly literature. Grayson does discuss certain aspects of the historical development of the Tan’gun tales, for instance, but does not refer to Korean scholarship on the matter, such as Han Yōngu’s careful tracing of the different stages of the story. When mentioning the twentieth-century relevance of the story, he omits one of the most crucial events, the creation of a religion centred on Tan’gun in 1909 by Na Ch’ol (he erroneously dates the emergence of Tan’gun worship to the post-liberation era, p. 56). In the same passage it is wrongly suggested, by the way, that Taehan was first used to designate Korea by the provisional government in exile (instead of during the reign of Kojong), which invalidates several of the comments that follow.

Also questionable is Grayson’s tendency to stick all kinds of labels on elements in the tales, like ‘primordial’, ‘semi-heroic’, ‘magic’ etc., that imply fixed categories of interpretation, which are nevertheless not clearly defined, and in my view often problematic conceptually. One tale (p. 318) is considered ‘semi-mythological’ for no apparent reason other than that the spirit of a dead man plays a key role in it. In Grayson’s usage, magic almost equals shamanism, an unwarranted prejudice, while shamanism seems to be a cover-all for almost anything that has no place in modern Christianity, such as prophetic dreams or apparitions of the dead (examples of which abound in Confucian and Buddhist contexts). Another instance is Grayson’s liberal use of the term ‘Confucianism’. One tale (pp. 315–17) is pronounced to have a ‘Confucian ethos’ because it is supposed to be about a girl’s chastity (actually it is just about the question of who will get the girl). The story is also said to be anti-Buddhist, in spite of the final words: ‘...[the mother] was so happy
that she didn’t know what to do and began to worship Buddha even more fervently’.

The quality of the translations is on the whole certainly adequate, but I did spot some mistakes, as on p. 157: ‘the sacred king’, instead of King Sŏng (whose name happens to be written with a character meaning ‘holy’). Occasionally the comment does not match the translation; p. 78 ‘As [Yuhwa] is already pregnant, the sun’s rays do not impregnate her’ where the translation says, after the description of the sun’s rays following her: ‘She became pregnant …’ (p. 76). On a more trivial level, there are spelling mistakes and errors in the transcriptions of Japanese.

A practical defect in a handbook of this type, which few readers will read from cover to cover, is that Korean terms in the translations are not all listed in the index or glossed whenever they occur (e.g, kanja, ‘bamboo divining sticks’ 159, also 163).

Yet, in the final analysis the great merit of the book is that a considerable number of myths and tales have been brought together, in a format that allows easy comparison and is suitable for discussion in class. This applies in particular to the foundation myths and clan origin myths of the ancient Korean states, where Grayson has collected various versions from Korean and Chinese sources, and for comparative purposes added similar narratives from other states and peoples in East Asia, ranging from the foundation myths of Chinese dynasties to tales of the Tungus and the Ainu. For the book as a whole, he has also added appendices that refer the reader to similar tales in the type and motif indexes of Aarne and Thompson and in the separate indexes of this kind for China and Japan. All this makes *Myths and legends from Korea* a useful compendium.

**BOUDEWIJN WALRAVEN**

---

**CENTRAL ASIA**

**JULIAN BALDICK:**

*Animals and shaman: ancient religions of Central Asia.*


Although the subtitle of this work refers to the ‘Ancient religions of Central Asia’, the introduction describes it as a ‘comparative study of the indigenous religions of Central Asia’, and there is precious little here that refers to ‘ancient religions’. The author then goes on to reject the use of ‘Central Asia’ as a suitable term for the subject region and to define as ‘Inner Eurasia’ that region surrounded by Chinese, European, Indian and Middle Eastern cultures. His stated intention is to draw on the methodology of French historians of religion, in particular Georges Dumézil, in arguing for the idea of a common inheritance for the religions of Inner Eurasia.

Doubts over this work arise as early as the third page, when we read that ‘the population has consisted of hungry nomads, jealous of the rich sedentary civilization on the periphery’. Aside from the fact that (a) true nomadism is not characteristic of the region, and that (b) nomads are historically no more liable to famine than are sedentary civilizations (indeed it may be argued that their mobility makes them less likely to suffer famine), it ignores the fact that the mobility-based identity of the (semi-)nomadic inhabitants of the region
means that they generally regard the sedentary population as effete and decadent, while the sedentary cultures needed the animal products of the steppes as much as the (semi-)nomads needed their material produce.

Chapter i then proceeds to survey the religions of the Scythians, Hsiung-nu, T'o-pa, Huns, Juan-juan and Avars, Khazars, Bulghars, and finally the Khitans; all in twenty-three rather short pages! Chapter ii is a similarly superficial survey of the Turkic peoples, which draws largely on a selection of accounts by medieval travellers. Several pages are devoted to the practice, literature and history of Turkic Islam. In the final section on the ‘internal logic’ of the religion, the author concludes that ‘the theme of “becoming animal” ... is the most important Inner Eurasian aspect of Turkic religion ... Thus the nomadic tribes of southern Turkey have intercourse at the same time as animals, simulate the intercourse of cranes and tolerate bestiality.’

Chapter iii concerns the Mongols, again largely viewed through the accounts of medieval European travellers and the uniquitous Secret History of the Mongols. Most undergraduates are aware that in reading, for example, Carpini on the Mongols, or Chinese sources on the sexual customs of their neighbours, their inherent bias must be taken into account, but any attempt to contextualize these accounts is entirely absent here. Statements in the sources are apparently, to judge from the lack of source criticism, to be taken as gospel. At this point the reviewer checked to see that this was not a reprint of a book from the 1920s.

The Tunguz and Manchus then figure, with five pages devoted to summarizing Shirokogoroff’s 1935 study entitled Psychomental complex of the Tungus, which we are assured is ‘massive and extraordinary’, albeit ‘polemical’. This section concludes by informing us that ‘A Tunguz shaman, [however], has a hard life, constantly tense because of his work, tired after performances, unable to assist, [sic] weighed down by responsibility, confronted by hostility, worrying about involuntarily harming people and troubled about by [sic] the fate of his soul (owing to the danger that spirits may imprison it in this work when he dies). So he lacks the cheerfulness of temperament which usually characterizes the Tunguz’.

The chapter entitled ‘Conclusions’ actually carries on in much the same vein, beginning with a discussion of the previously unmentioned Samoyeds of the Arctic shores and the plot of one Samoyed epic ... [before going onto] the Hungarians and their Siberian cousins, while noting similarities with American Indians. After that ... Finnic evidence, and ... new interpretations of the Finnish and Estonian national epics’—all that in twenty pages! Clearly ‘Inner Eurasia’ is an elastic term, as indeed is ‘ancient’ or ‘indigenous’ religion.

The level of analysis remains the same. A typical paragraph begins: ‘In the eighteenth century Georgi noted that the Samoyeds consumed a hallucinogenic mushroom, fly agaric (Amanita Muscaria). A man chose a wife from another clan and after paying the bride price carried her off by force. Wives were treated with the greatest cruelty. A dead person had to be taken out of his tent through a hole in the wall ...’.

Such essentialist and Victorian Orientalist simplicities abound throughout this work. On p. 156 we go, in a single paragraph, from a 1551 list of indigenous gods compiled by a Finnish bishop, to a seventeenth-century Swedish traveller’s statement that Lapp shamans are ‘famous for their ability to stop a ship in its course’, before concluding with the information that the Lapps ‘use angelica as a panacea’. More follows, with leaps, devoid of any apparent connection, from twentieth-century Estonian saunas to prehistoric
Finnish rock carvings, again, in a single paragraph. Comparative religion may not be an exact science, but in truth, this is only comparative in the sense that the telephone directory is comparative.

There are no maps or illustrations. Nor is there any sense of historical progression, or critical scholarship. Statements such as that concerning the ship-stopping abilities of Lapp shaman are not placed in quotation marks, and the author gives no indication that this, or any, statement might be more questionable than any other. There are notable omissions from the bibliography; Charles Graves, *Proto-religions in Central Asia*, for example.

We can only wonder how this work found a publisher; it would barely suffice for an undergraduate research project. If the author was an amateur scholar, the reviewer might shake his head ruefully and leave it unreviewed. But the author is a reader in Religious Studies at a major university and even if this was written to meet the demands of the Research Assessment Exercise, the most charitable assumption, the fact that university libraries in cash-strapped Central Asia (and elsewhere) might be tempted to pay the stated £35 for what is apparently a random and hasty trawl through a card-index file makes the unpleasant task of reviewing this work necessary.

ALEX MCKAY

**SOUTH-EAST ASIA**

NICO KAPTEIN:

*The Muhimmāt al-nafā‘īs: a bilingual Meccan fatwa collection for Indonesian Muslims from the end of the nineteenth century.*


This volume further extends the excellent INIS series, which is a joint venture between the Indonesian Government’s Ministry of Religion and the Southeast Asia Department of the University of Leiden. The series both promotes important scholarly research and helps to make such scholarship available at affordable prices to Indonesian readers.

Kaptein begins by defining the form and function of the *fatwa*. His study focuses upon a collection of *fatwas* (Arabic plural *fatāwā*) issued at the end of the nineteenth century by the most prominent Meccan muftis in response to requests from Malay-Indonesian Muslims based in or visiting Mecca. He gives ample justification for this study in correctly pointing out that *fatāwā* provide ‘an important source of information for both the history of Islamic scholarly activities and for the history of Islamic societies’ (p. xi).

Kaptein wisely chooses to base his study upon the first published edition of the *Muhimmāt al-nafā‘īs*, dating from 1892. Both Shrieke and Djajadiningrat had made reference to the *Muhimmāt al-nafā‘īs*, but only knew of later editions. Thus Kaptein’s study is ground-breaking in terms of identification and use of original source material.

It is argued that the *Muhimmāt al-nafā‘īs* was most probably translated in 1887. None of the *fatāwā* were issued before 1871. The work thus clearly establishes the timeline in focus, and the author appropriately stresses that this work provides a window into the crucial cross-over period between the
era of Sufi predominance and the modernist period in the Malay-Indonesian world. The *Muhimmāt al-nafāʾis* is also important in that it provides useful information on issues of daily concern to the Malays and Indonesians directing the questions which elicited these *fatāwā*, be they pilgrims or Malay students studying in Mecca. Moreover, the relevance of this work seems to have continued into the twentieth century, as four editions appeared subsequent to the 1892 original.

The second chapter contains a facsimile rendering of the 1892 edition. The margin also includes the text of Dāwūd al-Fāṭānī’s *Diyyāʾ al-murid pāda mengetahui bagi kalimah al-tawhīd*, which makes Kaptein’s study even more valuable. The primary text contains 130 *fatāwā*, with most carrying a signature of a particular mufti. The format of each *fatwa* typically consists of four parts: a question in Arabic, a translation of the question into Malay, an answer in Arabic, and finally a translation of the answer to Malay. Nevertheless, some only appear in Malay, suggesting lacunae in the printed text.

The importance of this work lies in the insight it provides not only into Malay-Indonesian Islam, but also into the Meccan scene of the late nineteenth century. Several Meccan muftis issue *fatāwā* in this collection, with most carrying the name of Āḥmad ibn Zaīnī Dāhlān (1817–86), mufti of the Shafīʿites and shaykh al-ʿulāma in Mecca. Other *fatāwā* carry the name of his rival, Muhammad Ḥasāb Allāh (1817–1917). Furthermore, eight of the *fatāwā* in the collection were penned by the Patani Malay scholar ‘Abd al-Quādir ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Fāṭānī.

In the third chapter Kaptein provides a meticulous transliteration of the Jawi Malay part of the text, using the 1892 edition as his base manuscript, but referring to later editions when the base MS is illegible or unclear. He takes the appropriate decision to render the Jawi text according to the orthographic conventions of modern Indonesian and Malaysian, while maintaining fidelity to the morpho-syntactic form of the original text.

Chapter iv includes a summary in English of the key points of each *fatwa*, though the author is quick to stress that ‘in no way does it pretend to summarize each individual *fatwa* completely’ (p. 190). In the absence of a full translation into English, this approach is useful. The topics of the *fatāwā* are many and varied, and include whether it is permissible to change Islamic law schools; correct procedures pertaining to pilgrimage; marital and divorce laws; inheritance laws; the ritual of reciting *maulid* poems; the drinking of palm wine; and whether a community converting to Islam should continue to use former cemetery sites.

Chapters v and vi provide a useful index of people, places, and books mentioned in the *fatāwā*, as well as a glossary of Arabic terms and phrases, with page references.

The work would certainly have benefited from an annotated translation into English, in place of the summary of *fatāwā* contents. Given the effort put into transliterating the text and analysing its contents, it is surprising that the author did not take the further step of providing a full translation into English.

Other than that, the only slightly disconcerting feature is the author’s somewhat stereotypical use of the terms ‘traditionalist’ and ‘modernist’. Presumably by ‘traditionalist’ he refers to the attention in some of the *fatāwā* to the kind of legalistic detail which was not considered of relevance to modern life by twentieth-century reformist thinkers, such as *fatwa* XXV by Āḥmad Dāhlān which declares that ‘If amphibians live permanently on dry land, it is forbidden to eat them’ (p. 194). However, to brand the work as ‘traditionalist’ (p. 15) is to underestimate the importance of such interaction between Malay-Indonesian questioners and Arabian masters in triggering the
mood for reformism in South-East Asia which carried Islam in that region into a whole new era, and which led to the progressive marginalization of Sufi approaches, which had hitherto held centre stage.

Overall, this work represents a most valuable addition to the corpus of studies into the transmission of Islamic thinking from Arabia to the Malay-Indonesian world. It is as much a resource for further scholarship as a stand-alone work in itself. No doubt future scholars will mine this work extensively in search of valuable materials for further research.

PETER G. RIDDLE

AFRICA

DONALD CRUMMEY:
Land and society in the Christian kingdom of Ethiopia: from the thirteenth to the twentieth century.

One of the remarkable aspects of the history of Ethiopia is the continuity of a dominant, literate, Christian civilization and monarchy dependent on the produce of ploughing peasants for nearly two millennia. Crummey is impressed by this continuity and examines the case of the tenure known as gult as one of the common threads through the dauntingly long and complex history of the Christian kingdom. In so doing he asks the conventional, recently unfashionable, but eminently useful question of how societies organize production, and how the contradictory interests which arise in this process are managed or resolved. The author’s immediate challenge to recent scholarship is that the conceptualization of gult as an administrative estate and not ‘property’ is misleading and he argues rather that gult often became individual property and could be transferred, accumulated and acquire a market value. The argument is subtle but immensely important to scholars of Ethiopia and will also be of comparative interest to scholars of other African regions and the Sudanic belt in particular.

Thematically, the crux of the book is the chapter entitled ‘Man is free; land is tributary’ which clearly explains the historical struggle between monarch and nobility over the right to peasant produce, labour and land. The evidence presented suggests that the modern gult institution has its roots in the seventeenth century when the monarchy attempted to recover from the trials of the previous century by capturing exclusive rights to the labour and produce of the ordinary farmer in order to fund a centrally controlled and mobilized army. ‘Man is free, land is tributary’ was originally an edict made in response to structural crisis by the seventeenth-century Gondarine monarch ZàDengel. ZàDengel designed his edict to liberate large numbers of Christian farmers from virtual serfdom under the specialized military households or c’ôwa, to gain access to land and neutralize the base of praetorian power. Ultimately, however, the edict failed and ZàDengel died in battle shortly afterwards. Nevertheless Crummey presents this edict and the aims it addressed as the core material struggle which lay at the heart of the Christian kingdom, vital to the understanding of post-medieval and early modern Ethiopia.
Indeed, once the reader has grasped this central and contradictory struggle in Ethiopian society it is as well to hold on, since the book then descends rather precipitously into several chapters of detailed historical evidence about the Gondarine period and its tenurial arrangements. Crummey’s evidence from Gondar, in particular marginalia from Church manuscripts of this period, provides much documentary evidence to counter the theory that the Ethiopian aristocracy was never able to accumulate landed property, nor able to pass it on to their descendants. For example the institution called *aläqenät* in Gondar is complex and fascinating proof that the Ethiopian nobility did acquire landed property in perpetuity, and had been accumulating land for several centuries before the more notorious accumulators of the twentieth century. The so-called *zämänä mäsafent* ‘the era of the princes’ was an expression of this power and demonstrates, according to Crummey, the irrelevance of the monarchy to the substance of *gult*, at least in the seventeenth/eighteenth centuries. For the historian of modern Ethiopia Crummey’s evidence underlines the Herculean task that aspiring autocrats from Tewodros to Haile Selassie faced in funding a centralized bureaucracy. Indeed the subsequent chapters on the role of *gult* in the nineteenth century, and its eventual decline in the twentieth, offer extremely lucid and persuasive accounts. However, the primary evidence collected for the Gondarine era is lacking for later periods and other regions. If there must be a criticism therefore, it is that the rich documentary evidence about *gult* in the Gondarine era seems, at times, to overwhelm the general argument about land and society in Ethiopia as a whole and at other periods.

This book is the result of a lifetime’s study of Ethiopia and more immediately, a long-term collaborative project funded by the US National Endowment for the Humanities into the history of Ethiopian land tenure and its social context. It has involved several generations of Ethiopian scholars whose contribution Crummey clearly acknowledges. The project undertook a large-scale programme to record land-related documents in Ethiopia and in collections around the world. The records collected by the wider project will greatly enhance access to primary historical material for scholars of Ethiopian history. The wealth of primary evidence presented in this book alone will be the basis for the continuing (and in some ways) intractable debate on Ethiopian land tenure. This evidence is complemented by high-quality reproductions of Ethiopian sacred art that reflect well and enliven the sometimes dry evidence from the marginalia. Furthermore as a synthesis of and commentary on the best historical scholarship on Ethiopia Crummey’s work will provide stimuli for many other deeply fascinating research topics. Indeed, the book is an example of the best kind of engaged and generous scholarship that will encourage others to look into Ethiopian history where, as Crummey says, ‘the fields are ripe, the harvesters few’.

CEDRIC BARNES

DAVID LEE SCHOENBRUN:
*A green place, a good place: agrarian change, gender, and social identity in the Great Lakes region to the 15th century.*

David Schoenbrun has written an ambitious book, one that encompasses the ancient history of Rwanda, Burundi, north-western Tanzania, parts of eastern
Congo, and much of Uganda. This is a large-scale study, a ‘history of ideas, institutions, groups, regions, and centuries’ (p. 262), based primarily on the evidence of social change contained in language and meaning. This book is an impressive achievement, and one that should be read by archaeologists, anthropologists and historians, as well as historical linguists.

Inevitably, Schoenbrun faced problems of evidence, or, more precisely, the lack of it. This is acknowledged early on: ‘storytellers ... must navigate the twists and turns of balancing gaps and silences in the evidence with imagination’ (p. 6). The quality of Schoenbrun’s achievement, therefore, depends on how balanced his account appears to be, and how far readers will allow his imagination to run. Overall, the story told is generally convincing. It is likely that readers will feel that they have come away with a better sense of the form of ancient inter-lacustrine society than they had before.

Nonetheless readers may feel uncomfortable at times with both the nature and the use of evidence in this book. The evidence used by Schoenbrun comes mainly from glottochronology, archaeology and anthropology. There is no doubting Schoenbrun’s ability as a historical linguist. His The historical reconstruction of Great Lakes Bantu cultural vocabulary: etymologies and distributions, SUGIA, 9 (1997) is of immense value to historians of this region, and should be referred to when reading A green place, a good place. Yet it is unclear how one could demonstrate that glottochronology is an acceptably accurate indicator of when shifts in meanings occurred in the past in non-literate societies. Equally, readers may feel concerned that many of the dictionaries that form the core vocabularies for historical linguistic work in this region were written after, or as a part of the process of, colonial linguistic homogenization. These points relate more to the rate than the route of linguistic change in the past.

Schoenbrun has provided a valuable review of literature on iron age archaeology in the region, one that is imbued with an unusually deep anthropological knowledge. It may be that the continuing archaeological research in Buganda and Bunyoro could force a re-consideration of the directions of change in settlement and language that Schoenbrun proposes. Nonetheless as it stands, Schoenbrun’s use of archaeological and linguistic evidence to discuss the evolution of specialized agriculture and pastoralism makes fascinating reading, and in itself justifies the publication of the book.

The bibliography to this book is testimony to the wide-ranging ethnographic reading on which many of the arguments in this book are based. Schoenbrun uses twentieth-century ethnography to contextualize major changes in culture and production that he believes occurred 500 to 1,500 years ago. This is a problematic concept. At times, Schoenbrun’s analysis is convincing. Occasionally, however, one is left wondering how, for example, he can be sure that ancient herders ‘learned that their livestock could generate a limited tolerance to East coast fever and trypanosomiasis if some of their animals had regular but limited contact’ with the vectors of these diseases (p. 75). No one has proven conclusively that inter-lacustrine herders knew how to control the ecology of these diseases even in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries.

This problem of backward extrapolation from limited ethnographic evidence is perhaps most significant in the discussion of ancient religion. On pp. 195–207 Schoenbrun provides perhaps the most interesting and comprehensive discussion of the religious beliefs of this region available to date, but his arguments are not of equal strength. His theory (pp. 204–6) that around the fourteenth century territorial nature spirits were incorporated into or transformed into named portable temple spirits, such as Mukasa, is fascinating.
There is also a thought-provoking discussion of the development of the concept of heirlessness, and how fear of losing family property fed into religious forms that became centred around fertility (p. 196). Schoenbrun’s original research has significantly increased understanding of how ancient inter-lacustrine societies may have worked.

Unfortunately, the overall effect of the book is weakened by an occasional tendency to rely on arguments about the distant past that are based on rather limited and uncertain ethnographic evidence. Thus Schoenbrun accepts the argument that the Cwezi religion was a form of social protest that particularly appealed to women, despite the fact that the role of gender in these religious forms appears to have been much more complex than some previous models have acknowledged (as Schoenbrun himself is clearly aware (pp. 234–5)). Similarly Schoenbrun’s argument (p. 237) that Wamara dominated the northern sphere of kubandwa religion in the nineteenth century, appears to have been influenced by the standard model of southern kubandwa, where one spirit, Ryangombe, was dominant. The ethnographic evidence relating to Wamara in nineteenth-century Uganda, moreover, does not appear to support Schoenbrun’s thesis that this spirit ‘served to organize resistance to expanding state structures’. Wamara is reported to have been the clan Mucwezi of the ruling Babito in Bunyoro, for example.

These are imperfections in a useful and important book, one that tells the story of how Bantu speakers came to dominate the inter-lacustrine region, that discusses their ancient political ideologies, and that concentrates on the internal evolution of their societies. It is to be hoped that in the future the last five centuries of inter-lacustrine history will also benefit from David Schoenbrun’s consistently thought-provoking research.

SHANE DOYLE

GIAMBATTISTA SCALA:
Memoirs of Giambattista Scala, consul of His Italian Majesty in Lagos in Guinea (1862).

Giambattista Scala was the youngest son of a merchant mariner who was born in 1817 near Rapallo, then part of the Kingdom of Sardinia. Like his father and older brothers he qualified as a master mariner in Genoa. From his late teens he sailed on merchant ships in the south Atlantic. During this early part of his career he was to visit West Africa in the mid-1840s. It was, however, his experience of the cruelty of the slave trade in Brazil which, he claimed, had turned him against the slave trade despite the suspicion of others that he might very well have engaged in that trade before 1850. But things he saw and heard in Bahia convinced him of the wickedness of the trade and he thereafter resolved to commit himself only to legitimate commerce with West Africa. In early 1852 he arrived in Lagos and his subsequent career there and in Abeokuta is chronicled in this unusual and important memoir.

It is unusual because there are all too few accounts by any of the numerous ‘palm oil ruffians’ who sought to ‘get rich quick’ by buying and selling goods
and produce on the West African coast in the period after Britain’s abolition of the slave trade. It is moreover unusual in that it is, of course, an Italian account by an observant man who was eventually appointed Italy’s Consul and thus became the first representative of the Italian state in what was to become Nigeria. The memoir is a translation—and a very readable one—of a partly polemical volume Scala published in 1862. Very few copies of the original seem to have been published and this particular translation is based upon one of the very rare surviving copies which has since disappeared from the library of the University of Ibadan. The importance of the text has little to do with Scala’s general argument which resembles in many respects the self-serving and occasionally moralistic belief of many coastal traders in the curative properties of ‘legitimate trade’ for an area and for peoples long ravaged by the viciousness of the newly illegal trade in humanity. But fortunately for us Scala’s period in West Africa was unusually significant in that it immediately followed Britain’s attack on Lagos in 1851 and his account allows us to witness the development of trade between Lagos and Abeokuta. While the memoir provides a modern reader with an especially well textured account of trading in palpably ill-understood cultures whose politics had to be mastered, Scala is also a decent informant on a wider West Africa with which he traded. His major contribution is, however, to our understanding of the volatile politics of Yorubaland in the 1850s.

In common with many memoirs, Scala reveals his strong belief in his own agency and importance. A careful translation allows us to see around the bombast and self-regard. Good editing by Robert Smith adds to the value of this volume as even specialist readers can be easily misled by Scala’s accounts which like many of their sort are marred by poor recollection, mis-recorded names and dates and, oddly for a master mariner, an extremely idiosyncratic understanding of the geography of south-western Nigeria. The inclusion of some helpful maps goes some way (but not always all the way) towards resolving some of Scala’s complex itineraries. Readers are further in the editor’s debt when it comes to recognition that this rather bluff, matter-of-fact Italian mariner was also capable of occasional passages of sheer invention. There is no doubt about the overall value of this volume. It is not just a curiosity but is a useful addition to the available primary material on pre-colonial West Africa. The British Academy deserves the thanks of scholars for supporting the editing and publication of this vary rare source.

RICHARD RATHBONE

NICKI HITCHCOTT:
*Women writers in francophone Africa.*

VALÉRIE ORLANDO:
*Nomadic voices of exile: feminine identity in francophone literature of the Maghreb.*

Both of these books are concerned with notions of feminine voice, and both, in different ways, encounter the question of the adequacy of ‘Western’ discourse, including literary-theoretical discourse, to non-'Western’ cultures.
Early in her study Nicki Hitchcott quotes Achebe’s recommendation that the European critic of African literature adopt the ‘habit of humility’ (p. 11), and remarks quite rightly that ‘the Western reader cannot assume his or her limited academic values to constitute a universal system’ (p. 3). It does not follow, though, that ‘every effort’ should be made ‘to eliminate value judgements’ (p. 3), even on the aesthetic grounds under discussion at this point in her text. Fortunately it turns out in practice that she does not shy away from evaluation, and proves at once assured and culturally sensitive in what she later describes as her ‘dialogue’, as a Western feminist reader, with her chosen authors.

After an introduction to her theoretical framework, the next two chapters of Hitchcott’s book provide contextual material, including considerations of genre and a brief history of the evolution of writing by francophone women in sub-Saharan Africa—material that will be very useful to new students of the field. Subsequent chapters focus on autobiography and on individual authors including Mariama Bâ, Aminata Sow Fall, Werewere Liking and Calixthe Beyala. ‘Whereas Sartre describes the black poet affirming his authentic self through an introspective journey back to his African roots,’ Hitchcott remarks, ‘feminine identity in francophone African women’s writing is initially expressed as a tension between the two apparently contradictory poles of “modernity” and “tradition”, poles which often become translated as an opposition between the individual and the community’ (p. 153). Arguing against any simplistic identification of feminism with Western individualism, she makes a persuasive case for the pertinence of feminist theory and of the experience of female solidarity to the authors and texts on which she focuses, showing how at least some of them implicitly call into question conceptual oppositions between the individual and the collective, and between modernity and tradition.

Though Hitchcott’s handling of the encounter between the theory and the literature is in general insightful and secure, in places she seems insufficiently attentive to the knot of problems involved in speculating on the relationship between literary form, referentiality, politics and readership. She assumes too readily, I think, that the relative popularity of Beyala’s ‘Loukoum’ novels ‘relies on their Parisian context’ (p. 25), or that, to give a different sort of example, ‘innovative, experimental fiction’ is ‘inevitably progressive rather than reactionary’ (p. 109). Perhaps the notion of ‘voice’ is not always the most serviceable one in addressing these issues, even though it has always been an important part of discussions of so-called ‘francophone’ literature. Indeed Hitchcott’s treatment of Liking and Beyala is especially appealing in the context of the horizon d’attente conjured up by that label, hinging as it does on the analysis of a properly literary gap between the author’s spoken opinions and the sort of work that the texts themselves can be said to perform.

Valérie Orlando’s study also focuses on the figuration and/or pursuit of feminine identity in the ‘francophone’ literary text, and is concerned with questions of agency, approached primarily through Deleuze and Guattari. ‘It is my objective,’ she writes, ‘to demonstrate how the becoming-woman philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari frees woman from a subjugated position as an appendage of man, releasing them [sic] to new modes of self-discovery and individualism’ (p. 6).

The literature she discusses, including works by Tahar ben Jelloun, Assia Djebar, Lella Sebbar, Malika Mokeddem and Hajer Djlani, provides a rich field for such a topic, and she brings out ways in which the texts engage with issues of feminine subjectivity and ‘embrace the negotiation of difference and
diversity’ (p. 73). Despite her theoretical misgivings about ethnocentricity and ‘Western theoretical, essentialized, postcolonial depictions of the Other’ (p. 63), however, in practice she tends to ascribe her own agenda to others and to overgeneralize about the ‘ultimate objective’ of ‘contemporary Francophone writers’. For me, too much of the texts’ specificity has been lost, not only historically and politically but also literarily, when Orlando advances the argument that their aim is ‘to transcend Western stereotypes designed for the Other by the West’ (p. 153) or ‘to reach a site of multiculturalism accessible and relatable to all readers’ (p. 190). The former claim is not necessarily wrong, but a writer such as Djebar, in particular, seems sufficiently alert to issues of cultural hegemony, and the place of literature within different cultures, to remain more sceptical and more subtle about literary ‘transcendence’ than is Orlando. At least since Kateb Yacine’s *Nedjma*, some francophone literature of the Maghreb has experimented with forms of inaccessibility, not least as a way of elaborating defences against pseudo-universal values and critical appropriation.

NICK HARRISON

JAMES C. MCCANN:

Despite a growing number of publications in the field, Africa’s recent environmental history still remains little understood. James McCann’s book goes some way towards redressing this problem, but as he admits, he ‘has offered only a few examples of the continent’s great complexity’ (p. 179). The book’s encompassing title aside, it should be viewed more as a suggestive departure than a conclusive treatment, a selection of essays rather than an extended argument. What McCann has done is highlight the glaring need for considerably more research in all areas of African environmental history. For this he should be commended.

McCann is well aware that any synthesis is bound to encounter criticisms and acknowledges that he relied heavily on select secondary literature. The book’s greatest strength is its general accessibility—ideal for undergraduates—and the two opening chapters, which attempt to provide an overview of ‘Africa’s physical world’ and its precolonial states and kingdoms (moving, incidentally, much further into the past than the dates in the title). In Part 1, McCann orients the reader to particularities in Africa’s soils and climates, its geomorphology and biodiversity, and its human demography. He also begins to explore just how specific features of African environments, such as the presence or absence of water, weather patterns, agricultural fertility, and disease ‘set a context for social and historical interaction’ (p. 29). Avoiding environmental determinism he, in turn, examines how human activities in the distant past (100 a.d.) involving, among other things, ‘the plow, iron tools, and concentrated labor’, ‘transformed’ African landscapes and enabled dense urban settlements, such as the State of Aksum in the Ethiopian highlands, to emerge and be sustained (p. 42).

Part 2 of the book concentrates on four issues that have preoccupied social and natural scientists for much of the last century: forests, soils, climate
and population growth. For anyone familiar with these debates and their complex histories, McCann’s summaries provide little new evidence or fresh interpretation. Many of the texts he draws upon fall within a genre that has attempted to challenge ‘degradation narratives’ that had their origins in the colonial period. Whether in the context of desertification, deforestation or soil erosion, McCann wants to avoid what he characterizes as a simple-minded ‘neo-Malthusian’ argument. Advocates of this perspective, who include both scientists and policy makers, believe rapid population growth combined with ‘poor land management’ in arguably ‘fragile lands’ has produced ‘resource exhaustion’ in many parts of the continent (pp. 56 and 82). Testing the evidence in Ethiopia, McCann’s area of expertise, and drawing upon case studies in Guinea, Kenya, Tanzania, Ghana, and Lesotho, McCann rejects such claims and instead embraces an increasingly common view in the secondary literature: that Africans—particularly farmers and pastoralists—have been as responsible for the maintenance and amelioration, as for the destruction, of Africa’s natural environments and that change in these ‘biomes’ has been ‘neither fixed nor unidirectional’ (p. 75).

McCann’s desire to counter ‘degradation narratives’ at times detracts from some of the other points he makes regarding the social history of Africa’s environments. His discussions of the ‘biology of Asante state power’ and of Basotho ideas of their natural surroundings, which draw attention to the complex and highly contingent interactions between the social and the natural, are unfortunately situated within an ‘interpretive template’ designed to undermine historical assumptions concerning forest loss and soil erosion (p. 110). This emphasis not only reinforces an over-simplified view of the colonial past—which has not, in fact, been adequately examined—but it also suggests that ecological changes in Africa are either illusory or inconsequential. Both points of view are disconcerting.

No book could be expected to cover all the issues now included within the genre of African environmental history, yet McCann’s still has surprising omissions. This seems to be a direct consequence of his emphasis on an arguably narrow array of issues relating to land, biodiversity and natural resources. Even within such a framework, one would have expected an analysis of national parks, game reserves, and the role of wildlife, which receive virtually no mention. Likewise, more attention to the centrality of certain endemic diseases, including malaria, rinderpest, and African trypanosomiasis, would have provided a more complete picture. Moving outside this framework, the time also seems ripe to include processes like industrialization and urbanization within the field of African environmental history. An area that has thus far been entirely neglected in this literature is the mining and petroleum industries. These are extractive economies that often have severe effects on regional ecologies and populations; historical research in this area would certainly reveal new patterns and complicate our understanding of environmental change, African agency and international political economy.

In his opening and closing remarks McCann shows that he is sensitive to the need for this kind of analysis. One can certainly hope that his book will stimulate further research in these areas and prompt closer scrutiny of the recent historical record.

HELEN TILLEY
ANTHONY KIRK-GREene (ed.):  
*Glimpses of empire: a Corona anthology.*  

The Corona Club was the dining club for Colonial Services officers founded by Joseph Chamberlain in 1900 and *Corona* was the official journal of the colonial service and was published monthly from 1948 to 1962. The foundation of the journal was one of several measures introduced at that time, all of which had as their object the spreading of knowledge of good administrative practice and the promotion of debate about the direction of colonial administration in the post-Second World War era. The journal also served as a forum for the dissemination of practical information of use to individual colonial officials and their families. *Glimpses of empire* is a collection of articles which originally appeared in *Corona* and is designed to introduce readers to the contents of the publication, which is a valuable source for colonial administrative developments in the last years of the colonial empire.

Anthony Kirk-Greene has made the selection with a view to illustrating the variety of the activities of colonial government and has also tried to draw his material from as many colonial territories as possible. As far as geographical coverage is concerned Africa inevitably predominates, given its overwhelming importance in the colonial empire, but one can also find pieces relating to the West Indies, Malaya, Sarawak, Fiji, the Gilbert and Ellice islands, the Solomons, Hong Kong, Cyprus and the Falklands. And the colonial activities include those of administrators, medical and veterinary officers, officials responsible for development and co-operative schemes, education and trade union organization, engineers from the public works departments, scientists from the geological survey and the meteorological service, police and prison officers, and many more. Altogether the anthology succeeds admirably in giving a picture of the way in which the colonial service had developed since the nineteenth century from the all-purpose, Sanders of the River, district commissioner to a host of specialized officials. Whether this change was entirely to the liking of the older district officers is another matter: one does pick up hints that some of the broad brush administrators regarded such of their colleagues as community development officers as something of a luxury.

Doubts about the direction of colonial development were rarely expressed in the journal. Although *Corona* was intended to promote debate and discussion it was also clearly intended to have a positive, optimistic message. Colonial policy and practice were moving along the right lines; colonial government was getting better and better; and the lives and conditions of work of colonial officials and their families were steadily improving. The lady who complained bitterly of the way her early life had been damaged by her parents leaving her in Britain when they returned to Africa (pp. 260–2) was quickly reproved by another wife more loyal to the Colonial Service. And some mild scepticism is expressed about the benefits of mass education (p. 131). But, leaving aside the inevitable expressions of nostalgia for simpler, freer, less complicated youthful experiences, the message is serious and uplifting.

The message, expressed most openly in the earliest selections on policy, which include a report of a speech by Sir Ralph Furse, the grey eminence of
Colonial Service training, is, however, not the chief merit or attraction of this collection. The greatest interest is in providing a picture of day-to-day life in the Colonial Service with occasional broader glances at particular issues or processes. Clearly, for those concerned with the history of the Colonial Services this is a useful introduction to a valuable source. For those who enjoy a stroll through the rose garden of nostalgia there is also much pleasure to be derived from these memoirs, particularly in the contributions of the five senior officials from an earlier era, which are included at the end of the volume and which prompt the reflection that humour seemed to play a much larger part in the early Colonial Service than it did during the last years of that institution when life seemed too real and too earnest. One wonders whether the Romans left Britain with a laugh or a frown.

Anthony Kirk-Greene has written an informative introduction to the volume although one was disappointed to read a reference to ‘the School of Oriental and African Languages’ (p. xviii). Not that one should be surprised: Colonial Service training had an Oxbridge bias. The selection of articles is good but the usefulness of the volume could have been improved if the editor had indicated the dates of the volumes of *Corona* in which the chosen articles originally appeared and if he had included some biographical details, even simply the career facts, about the writers.

M. E. YAPP


*Morphological analysis in comparison* is a collection of eleven new papers on a wide range of topics in morphology which has been put together, thoroughly reviewed, revised and edited, from talks originally presented at the Seventh International Morphology Meeting in Vienna, in 1996. This volume follows on from two similar proceedings of earlier international conferences on morphology hosted in Austria and Hungary which were published by Mouton de Gruyter under the titles *Contemporary morphology* and *advances in morphology.* Like the earlier volumes, *Morphological analysis in comparison* includes papers representing a broad range of approaches to morphology, e.g. distributed morphology, natural morphology, optimality theory, minimalism, etc., and should therefore be of interest to a wide readership. The volume not only presents a wealth of new data and observations, but also includes much high-level theoretical debate and comparison of different approaches to morphology. Generally all the papers in the volume are well-written and easy to understand even for those with little expert knowledge of morphology, and there is nicely balanced discussion of languages from Europe, Africa, North America and East Asia.

Probably the most theoretically challenging of the eleven chapters are those by Andrew Spencer (‘Agreement morphology in Chukotkan’), Edwin Williams (‘Three models of the morphology-syntax interface’) and Marianne Kilani-Schoch and Wolfgang U. Dressler (‘Are fillers as precursors of morphemes relevant for morphological theory? A case story from the acquisition of French’). Spencer carefully investigates patterns in the ergative...
languages Chukchee and Koryak and shows how it can be argued that aspects of the split ergativity present in these languages can pose potentially serious problems for current versions of distributed morphology. The chapter is very clearly written and also provides a very useful overview of distributed morphology (Halle and Marantz, 1993) for those unfamiliar with this model. Williams’s paper re-examines how a very influential syntactic approach to morphology, minimalism (Chomsky, 1995), formally deals with inflectional morphology, pointing out a number of perceived weaknesses in the model, and then goes on to argue for a rather different interpretation of the principal patterns which have inspired the minimalist approach. Presenting a number of interesting new observations concerning adverbs and their scope and also the relation of affixes to free morphemes which have similar meanings, Williams’s paper is both original and highly stimulating. The third paper mentioned above, which is particularly challenging from a general theoretical point of view, by Kilani-Schoch and Dressler, also presents intriguing new data and analysis of ‘fillers’ and their role and interpretation in child language acquisition (essentially reduced syllables filled in to a prosodic structure where adults would often have full grammatical or lexical morphemes present). Kilani-Schoch and Dressler show how the patterns observed can be used as arguments for the integrated model of natural morphology and constructivism, a model which assumes that internal grammatical modules are not innate but constructed by children, and that the construction process encompasses the two first acquisitional phases of pre- and protomorphology (where it is argued segmental and prosodic phonology are not clearly distinguished from other morphology). The paper will be informative and provocative not only for morphologists, but also for all those who are more generally interested in the continual debate about (assumptions of) innateness in language.

In addition to the three papers outlined above, excellent contributions were also written by many other authors. Henry Davis (‘Salish evidence on the causative-inchoative alternation’) provides a first-rate discussion of the proper analysis of causative-inchoative alternations which is both extremely instructive and introduces important new data and insights from Lilloet Salish. Vladimir Plungian (‘Agentive nouns in Dogon’) offers a stimulating overview of an interesting grammatical marker in Dogon which seems to be neither affix nor clitic and neither an inflectional nor a derivational marker, and which raises again the problem of how the inflectional/derivational divide should be made in morphology. Finally, Lluisa Gracia and Miren Azkarate (‘Prefixation and the head-complement parameter’) show how prefixes in VO languages can be analysed as either simple modifiers or heads in a head-complement relation (as in Lieber, 1982). They then point out that such an analysis can be used to account for the general typological lack of prefixes in OV languages; such languages are assumed to be head-final in both syntax and morphology and will therefore only allow for prefixes that are modifiers. Affixes which are heads will instead follow their complement as suffixes.

In general this volume from John Benjamins includes a very satisfying range of topics, is well edited and will be instructive for those interested in morphology at all levels. Certain chapters could be easily recommended to students during an introductory course in morphology as more challenging background readings (e.g. the chapters by Gracia and Azkarate, Davis, Kilani-Schoch and Dressler, and Plungian), while other chapters could be used for discussion in more advanced morphology seminars (e.g. those by Spencer, Williams, and McDonough). Overall the book is indeed highly successful in its aims of presenting cutting-edge work in a variety of different approaches.
to morphology, and most definitely can be recommended as a highly useful resource.

ANDREW SIMPSON

SHORT NOTICES

SHOTA RUSTAVELI:
*The man in the panther’s skin.* (Translated from the Georgian by Marjory Wardrop).

Marjory Wardrop and her brother (Sir) Oliver can be credited with laying the foundation for Georgian studies in Great Britain. In her short life (1869–1909) Marjory contributed a number of English translations, of which the present work is the most substantial, being a rendition of what can simply be regarded as the defining work of the Georgian nation. Great fanfares have traditionally greeted the publication of any translation (though woe betide any advocate of rendering it into any of Georgian’s three sister languages!—the two existing Mingrelian renditions are derided rather than praised), and this one holds a special place in the hearts of most Georgians. The poem, a tale of courtly romance and adventure consisting of some 1,600 end-rhyming quatrains, was composed c. 1200 when Georgia was at its zenith under the great queen Tamar (r. 1184–1213). The poet is otherwise unknown but, on the evidence of this creation, endowed with a genius for language and literary invention.

This translation first appeared posthumously in 1912 with a first reprint in 1966. The present paperback contains a short introduction from Donald Rayfield, whose own history of Georgian literature was published in a second edition by Curzon in 2000. Though two other prose-translations are now available (by Katherine Vivian and the late R. H. Stevenson), neither seeks to remain as close to the original as the version produced by Wardrop, which feature must make hers first choice for any linguist keen to understand the often demanding original, though refinements in textual criticism and interpretation of medieval Georgian might require a modicum of alteration in some places.

Now that Curzon seem to have seen the value of reprinting worthy titles long unavailable, perhaps they could be persuaded to add to their Caucasian list the other translations from Georgian published in their day by both Wardrop siblings.

GEORGE HEWITT

GERHARD EHLERS:
HEINZ BECHERT (ed.):

Begun in 1959, the date 2015 has now been set for the cataloguing of Oriental manuscripts in Germany to come to an end. To meet this target, following the loss of select photographic reproductions as an economy measure in the 1980s, the descriptions are to be yet further attenuated in Indische Handschriften; and the complete glossary of words contained in the edited fragments is to be dropped from Sanskrit-Handschriften aus den Turfanfunden.

Janert and Narasimhan Poti compiled first a fully descriptive catalogue of 2,250 manuscripts, mainly Sanskrit (IH, ii, 1–6 and 10), and latterly a simplified description of a further 2,131 items (IH, ii, 7–9 and 11). This was then further ‘rationalized’, as well as computerized, in Gerhard Ehlers’s continuation, which described a further 264 manuscripts in Göttingen collections (ii, 12, 1995) and now adds a further 252 that are housed in Berlin (ii, 13). All are, however, still provided with an expert factual description, citation of start and finish, and with references to IH, New cat. cat., etc., by way of bibliography.

Teil 13 contains mainly F. O. Schrader’s collection of a wide variety of undated palm-leaf texts, primarily Sanskrit, in Grantha, etc., together with E. Hultzsch’s five palm-leaf texts (in Grantha), and a number of epic, puranic, and miscellaneous paper manuscripts (in Nagari and Bengali script), mainly of the eighteenth or nineteenth century. The catalogue is more attractively and economically formatted in Teil 13 than it was in Teil 12. As the manuscripts are now arranged purely in order of current location and catalogue number, so that access is solely via the index of titles (and, where appropriate, the index of authors), it would seem appropriate to repeat details of genre, authorship, date, and acquisition within the title index. After all, there is plenty of space available on the page; and a lemma like Kārikā: Valī: gives very little away, while the lemma Brāhmaṇāṇa: gives no warning that its four entries are but individual Māhaduyas.

Waldschmidt and Sander’s magnificent catalogue of the Sanskrit fragments that were salvaged from Central Asia at the beginning of the twentieth century comprised some 1,200 major items of known provenance (in ST, 1–5). Thereafter, with Bechert as the volume’s editor, and aided by the main collection’s eventual reunification in Berlin, Klaus Wille, who already made a substantial contribution to part 5 (1987), has brought the total to nearly 2,000 items (in ST, 6–8). As before, the catalogue offers full diplomatic transcription and, where possible, identification of the fragments: only the facsimile reproduction is lacking. Wille has had to deal virtually entirely with isolated and war-damaged paper fragments of unknown provenance, supplementing provisional transcriptions and identifications previously made by Schlingloff, Sander, and many others involved in related projects. Meanwhile, upwards of 5,000 fragments remain uncatalogued, plus birch-bark manuscripts awaiting restoration, etc.

In his Foreword to part 8, Wille draws attention to a fresh addition to Udānasarga: attestation, and to his own identification of hitherto missing Abhidharmadiptā Kārikās, portions of two Abhidharma texts otherwise known only from Hsūan-tsang’s translation, and traces of specific recensions of
Subodha-lanka: a Pali treatise on rhetoric in 367 verses that has been attributed, like the treatise on prosody Vuttodaya, to a twelfth-century Sinhalese author Sāngharakkha Mahaśāmi. Abhinava-tīkā (Nissaya) (anonymous).

Jaini’s texts reproduce a rare Burmese edition of 1964 (preserving its orthography), together with collation of another almost unknown edition of 1928. There is, however, no reference to Fryer’s readings that were based on two Burmese manuscripts, nor any information about the Ceylon edition of 1910, which was ‘with (porāna)sanaya’ according to Helmer Smith in CPD, 1, 60*. Manuscripts known to exist in Sri Lanka have yet to be evaluated.

After defining composition (bandha), the Subodha-lanka discusses rhetorical faults and their avoidance in vv. 17–115; then rhetorical merits in 116–163; and finally figurative and emotive speech in 164–367 (arthalaṅkāra and rasa, including santa). Acknowledging the ‘fine old Alamkāras’ of Rāmasaman and others, it illustrates rhetorical faults in traditional terms, but depicts heroic and romantic imagery in terms of Buddhist eulogy (Jaini, p. xvii). Such training, combined with inspiration (pratibhā), makes the poet, and not the imitation of traditional Kāyya and Nātya (v. 6f.).
The editor has identified passages with close parallels in Daṇḍin and Anandavardhana (but the list could have been extended), and he provides indispensable indexes of names, verses, and quotations. The discrepancy between the text’s pagination and the page references given in the Introduction and critical apparatus, not to mention the wealth of misprints, must be a function of the Pali Text Society’s computerization of Jaini’s original manuscript (p. xix, n. 2). No doubt some crass misreadings in the basic Burmese edition are also involved.

Yamaka has suffered above all, the one basic example of vyapeta yamaka being differently misprinted and wrongly labelled as avyapeta in both commentaries (p. 48f.). The specimen of dukkara avyapetavyapeta Yamaka has yato natena te nate pi ‘to (Porāṇa, p. 50) for yato nate ‘nate pi ‘to (Abhinava, p. 52). Here Fryer, 1877, had yato na iena te pi ‘to, useless as a casting vote; and the Abhinava also has a misprint (sammunnatena). This, together with the omission of Fryer’s readings, means that once again a new, valuably improved, and user-friendly publication by the Pali Text Society, intent on bringing Burmese versions to the fore, cannot be said to supersede its predecessor.

J. C. WRIGHT

W. ALLYN RICKETT:
Guanzi: political, economic, and philosophical essays from early China. Volume 1, Revised Edition

Those who welcomed the completion of Rickett’s translation of the Guanzi published by Princeton in a second volume in 1998 may be surprised to see it followed not by the third volume of studies originally announced but by a revision of the first volume of the set, which first appeared in 1984, in paperback and from a different publisher. The new preface explains all: the third volume has been abandoned, due to the loss of Rickett’s intended collaborators, Angus Graham and Robert Hartwell, but the willingness of Cheng and Tsui to take on a paperback reprint of Volume 1 has allowed for some changes to be made, primarily bringing the revised version into line with the less fussy typographical format of Volume 2.

In other respects changes have been minimal. New material in the introduction now cross-refers in the section on early printed editions of the Guanzi to the work of Harold Roth on the Huainanzi, which has some bearing on the identity of one edition, and also expatiates on the translation of two of the technical philosophical terms queried by William Boltz in review of the original Volume 1. Together with some remarks on recent East Asian scholarship on the Guanzi this lengthens the introduction by two pages, though some Chinese characters have also been removed. But throughout the translation itself, though some minor errors are corrected, the pagination is not substantially further disturbed until the final essay, the thirty-third, on the Four Appraisals (pp. 433–9; 431–5 in the 1984 edition). This is due to the inclusion here of more information on the rhyme scheme of the piece—a type of study that in Rickett’s original plans would have been deferred until the third volume, had circumstances allowed.

As it is, the revisions made here fully justify the appearance of this edition, especially in the cheaper format of paperback. Sinologists who have fallen on
hard times since 1984 may well hesitate to purchase a volume which appears at first glance very similar to that which it is designed to replace; librarians (even of institutions which have fallen on harder times), and individual scholars who have prospered even modestly, should harbour no doubts. With any luck good sales of this publication will encourage Cheng and Tsui to bring back into print similar worthy works in need of minor updating. Rickett’s readiness to make the changes which conscientiousness demanded at a time when he might well have decided to rest on his laurels should also serve as an example to others.

T. H. BARRETT

EDWIN G. PULLEYBLANK:

*Essays on Tang and pre-Tang China.*


Though much of Edwin G. Pulleyblank’s career has been concerned with philological questions, as a glance at his bibliography to 1990 in *T’ang Studies* 7 (1989) demonstrates, his original career at this School and initially at Cambridge emphasized historical matters. Indeed, his inaugural lecture at Cambridge, the first item reproduced here, remains almost a half century later a challenge to those history departments not only at Cambridge but throughout virtually the whole of the rest of the British Isles which, while conceding a certain place to China in the modern world, act as though the lavishly documented historical experience of such a large segment of the human race remains for reasons unexplained, and indeed inexplicable, none of their business. Many of the other items relate to his superb study of the origins of the rebellion of An Lushan, another publication which retains its value and which surely deserves reprinting as much as Pulleyblank’s early articles from this journal and elsewhere. One, his study of neo-Confucianism and neo-legalism in the wake of the rebellion, which was unaccountably left out of the bibliography mentioned above, formed the starting point of several doctoral studies, including my own. A brief introduction by the author alas modestly glosses over the influence of his research, mentioning only the later work that has been done on the more technical historiographic matters covered in some of the early essays. Yet his incarnation as a Tang historian is but one of the avatars of this remarkable scholar. In Japanese Buddhist philology, for example, he is credited together with John Brough and Sir Harold Bailey with having established the study of Indian materials in Chinese transcription on an entirely new foundation. The Variorum enterprise could clearly fill a number of volumes with his writings, and though he has long been absent from these shores, they would certainly be welcomed here, in his first sinological home.

T. H. BARRETT