Book reviews

BOOKS REVIEWED

Julie Scott Meisami & **Paul Starkey** (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, I-II. London – New York: Routledge, 1998. xvii + 857 pp. £175.00. ISBN 0-415-06808-8.

> In compiling the *Encyclopedia*, our aim has been so far as possible to emphasize the state of the art of current scholarship on Arabic literature, relying on recent research and less on received traditional opinion [...]. In making our selection of entries, we have taken it as our assumption that the main users of the *Encyclopedia* will be students and academics working in Arabic language and literature and, more generally, in the fields of Middle Eastern culture, history and philosophy; to these may be added students and academics working in other Middle Eastern literatures, and students of comparative literature, non-Western literatures and world literature. (Introduction, p. x.)

The aims and the purported audience of the Encyclopedia are clearly stated in the Introduction and one does not hesitate in stating that the editors have indeed succeeded in what they set out to do. The Encyclopedia is a crucial addition to the sources available for students and academics, and it will undoubtedly find its way to the bookshelves of all major libraries around the world.

The Encyclopedia fills in a clear gap in our handbooks and does this very expertly. The gigantic *Encyclopaedia of Islam* has naturally provided much information on literature, too, but its mere bulk has made it somewhat inaccessible, especially to the non-professional. The narrower and more specialized point of view of the present Encyclopedia makes it much easier to use; most of the entries centre clearly on literature and provide the user a quick reference for the literary activities of a person, period or country whereas in the more general *Encyclopaedia of Islam* one has to go through much information which has no bearing on literature (although in other respects it may be vital).

The editors have in general been able to get the best current authorities to contribute, although there are some names which one would have appreciated finding in the List of contributors (pp. vi-ix). The editors seem to have slightly favoured English-speaking scholars, although others are by no means lacking. The small number of specialists in the field is seen in the fact that many writers have also contributed to the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

When it comes to language solutions, one of the very few points where the editorial policy of the work cannot quite be welcomed, are the "Further reading" sections. As the Encyclopedia states itself to be aimed at students and academics (and not so much at the general reading audience), the bibliographical sections should have taken better account of at least German and French books, as every scholar (and student) should be able to use these languages. As it now stands, the bibliographies are often unbalanced in favour of English books and articles.

The selection of entries has been well done; the most important authors are where they should be, and several entries which one might not at first think of finding in such an Encyclopedia, are there, and with good reason, too. Thus the entry for **Beirut, modern** might surprise a student not familiar with modern Arabic literature, but is very useful.

Other useful entries include (this is a selection from among dozens of others): **books and book-making**; **libraries, medieval**; **literature and the visual arts** (although cross-references **illustration** and **miniatures** might have been added as the lemma is not the first to come into one's mind when searching for information – in general the cross-references are quite adequate), etc. Especially delightful are the numerous areal entries (e.g. **Khwārazm**) as the cosmopolitan nature of Classical literature may make one forget that there were regional factors, too.

As the work discusses both Classical and Modern literature, the question of space allotted to both is naturally moot, but I think that the editors have been successful enough in making a balanced whole. They have also been very sensitive and reasonable in selecting the entries and (obviously) giving the limits to their length – incidentally, the longest entry is, if I am not mistaken, **Alf layla wa-layla** which covers fifteen and a half columns.

In terminology, 'medieval', as used in the book, is somewhat problematic; thus, the entry **dialect in literature, medieval** covers much material up to the 19th century, which seems somewhat awkward to call medieval.

As it comes to the limitation of 'literature', one is also confronted with problems. The editors have preferred an inclusive understanding of the term (see Introduction, p. xi), and thus one finds many articles on linguistics, philosophy and other related fields. The entries on, e.g., linguistics are extremely well written, but they may fall outside the interest of most of the purported audience. Likewise, the (very good) article on **al-Zamakhsharī** centres on his theological and religious output, which in general is quite appropriate but in the present context one might have preferred to see some words on his interesting maqāmas (now passed over in the main text and only briefly mentioned in "Text editions").

In any case, though, the line between 'Litteratur' and 'Schrifttum' is fluid and any definition of 'literature' could be criticized: **Sībawayhi** has to be in, but should they have left **Ibn Mālik** out? Whatever the editors did, they would always have at least a few reviewers to harp on their solution.

Another limitation where I wholeheartedly agree with the editors is to include many Arab editors and scholars but to exclude non-Arab editors. Thus, one is content to find an article on **Shaykhū, Le Père Luwīs** (Louis Cheikho – was it really necessary to be so purist as to insist on Arabic transliterations in every case? This seems to have been the general policy of the editors, but the cross-references have been properly added, so that the user of the work has no problem in finding a

reference also under Cheikho. Yet, why the French *Le Père* in that case?) and **ʿAbbās, Iḥsān**, both of whose innumerable editions are so familiar to everybody.

There are only very few omissions which have caught my eye. Thus, we find an entry on **al-Fatḥ ibn Khāqān** (d. 861), but his famous namesake a few centuries later, the author of *Qalāʾid al-ʿiqyān* and many other works is missing.

The anonymous Classical short prose stories (anecdotes), preserved mainly in the anthologies, would have deserved an entry of their own; now the closest to this we come in the entries **adab** and **prose, non-fiction, medieval**, both well written by leading scholars but yet all too general to give enough attention to the anecdotes themselves. It goes without saying that poetry is the soul of Classical Arabic literature, but Classical, fictitious prose could and should have been given more attention. Obviously the anonymous nature of many of these anecdotes is problematic, especially as most of them lack a canonized title. Yet, one might have wanted to find entries such as Ḥāʾik al-kalām (or Weaver of Words) which would have given more emphasis to the admittedly understudied prose. Or should we say that leaving them out does, unfortunately, reflect 'the state of the art of current scholarship on Arabic literature'?

The same problem concerns many minor poets who have, in fact, not been studied at all, either ever or for decades. Several of these have been included in the Encyclopedia, and rightly so, but the lack of any 'current scholarship' on them makes them somewhat repetitive. On the other hand, the Encyclopedia was a desideratum, and to wait until profound research was done on every single author before entering him into the work, would have meant postponing the urgently needed book *ad infinitum*.

Most of the articles in the Encyclopedia are well informed, well written and well balanced. Most of the writers do not build on farfetched or hypothetical theories but give solid and reliable information on their subject.

Very rarely do we find inappropriate or misinformed articles, but there are a few which leave the reader somewhat baffled. Thus, the article on **Arabia** refers to Nicholson's dated (but still readable) *Literary History* as an authority on Comparative Semitistics (!) and then proceeds to explain the development of poetry and philological activity in Iraq and Syria (sic!) on a very superficial level, and ends up by giving, among a few others, Nicholson's *Literary History* and Goldziher's *Short History* as 'Further reading'. Yes, both make quite good reading but are they really the best authorities on *Arabia*?

To balance the very few unfortunate articles, the Encyclopedia offers many insightful articles. The bibliographical sections might have been longer and are sometimes uneven but they do give the necessary guidelines to start with.

On a technical level, the two volumes are very handy, handsome and attractive. As they will undoubtedly be a standard reference for a century or so, it is a pleasure that they are so well printed. The text has been very carefully prepared and one

finds few printer's errors (except in some unpronounceable foreign names, like the present reviewer's, interesting variants of which are found on pp. 40b and 646b; correctly by T. Seidensticker on pp. 63-64).

With such a superb and vital contribution to our bookshelves one remains baffled: To whom should we give our most cordial thanks? The two editors who must have toiled in collecting their team and keeping it in order? Or the authors themselves who have contributed well written entries? Or finally the publisher who has undertaken this undoubtedly expensive and perhaps economically risky effort to update our knowledge of Arabic literature? In any case, they have done a great job and all deserve our most sincere thanks.

JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA

Irene Schneider, *Kinderverkauf und Schuldknechtschaft – Untersuchungen zur frühen Phase des islamischen Rechts.* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 52:1.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. 454 pp. DM/SFr 154,–, ÖS 1124,–. ISBN 3-515-07086-9.

Irene Schneider's book is her doctoral dissertation presented to the University of Cologne in 1996. The study deals with the early period, the 1st and the 2nd centuries, in the development of Islamic law. Dr. Schneider's aim is to clarify what law was applied in the so-called pre-literary period, i.e., the first 150 years of the Islamic era. There are no law books or treatises dating from the period, but later literature contains references to the legal maxims and opinions of the early jurists. By analysing and dating these references, Dr. Schneider attempts to reconstruct the views and practices of the early scholars.

Dr. Schneider has chosen to focus on the issue of slavery, particularly debt slavery and the sale of children into slavery, because a consensus was reached on these matters by the time the literary period of Islamic law commenced. The general and unanimous view in legal literature was that it was forbidden to enslave a Muslim. There are, however, recorded traditions that indicate that this consensus was preceded by a controversial debate in the pre-literary period. The sources where Dr. Schneider has found evidence of this debate consist of later law books, biographical literature, tafsir and hadith literature, and works on history and lexicography.

By carefully analysing the information found in these sources, Dr. Schneider is able to conclude that, on the issue of slavery, the jurists of the pre-literary period clearly distinguished their legal decisions from pre-Islamic practices, but their opinions also largely differed from those of their successors in the literary period. Therefore, according to Dr. Schneider, we can speak of an independent jurisprudence that was based mainly on the jurists' own reasoning (*ra'y*). In some cases their views were based on the Koran, whereas the Prophet's sunna was not yet a

source of authority. Her argument supports the view that the Prophet's sunna only gained authoritative status in the early Abbasid period. There is also some indication that the early jurists knew the rulings of Jewish and Roman judges and reacted to them. They did not necessarily accept these rulings, but instead attempted to formulate an independent Islamic viewpoint which in some cases they supported by Koranic analogies.

Dr. Schneider's study is well written and her arguments are clear and convincing. This book can be warmly recommended to anyone interested in the early history of Islamic law.

IRMELI PERHO

Roswitha Badry, *Die zeitgenössische Diskussion um den islamischen Beratungsgedanken* (šūrā) *unter dem besonderen Aspekt ideengeschichtliche Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten.* (Freiburger Islamstudien, 19.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998. 654 pp. DM/SFr 280,–, ÖS 2044,–. ISBN 3-515-07048-6.

Roswitha Badry has written a bulky volume on the concept of consultation in Islamic political theory. Her aim is to describe the opinions held by various Muslim authors on the meaning and content of *shūrā* and by systematic analysis to point out the variety of opinions among these authors. The focus is on the contemporary authors, but in order to gain historical perspective on the issue, Dr. Badry also discusses the views of selected classical authors. This is pertinent to her second aim, which is to show how the concept of *shūrā* has developed or changed in the past twelve centuries.

Dr. Badry's analyses of the texts of the Muslim authors are sharp and illuminative and she succeeds well in showing the conflicting opinions of the various scholars who represent different ideological tendencies. Among the persons whose opinions she analyses are Muḥammad ʿAbduh, Muḥammad Darwaza, Muḥammad Abū Fāris, ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Mutawallī and Maulānā Maudūdī. The amount of literature quoted is impressive, but there is no appendix that would introduce all the authors whose texts are discussed. Instead, information concerning the authors' careers and background is spread out in footnotes that are extremely difficult to locate due to the absence of an index. In addition to the extensive source material, Dr. Badry has also gone very thoroughly through most of the Western studies on the issue of *shūrā* and many of the footnotes contain not only references to these studies but also verbatim quotations. All this may be very useful, but the desire to refer to more or less everything that has been written on the subject tends to blur the author's own arguments. I cannot help wondering whether narrowing down the

scope of the book and concentrating on the central arguments would have made the book more inspiring reading.

The main chapter of the book "3. Zeitgenössischen Interpretationen des islamischen Beratungsgedankens" (pp. 193-528) contains an analysis of the contemporary traditionalist, modernist and Islamist views on the meaning of *shūrā*. The next chapter "4. Bisherige Umsetzungsformen der *šūrā* – die Bedeutung der *šūrā* in den modernen islamischen Staaten" (pp. 529-592) describes parliaments and councils that are called *majlis al-shūrā* and party organizations that use the word *shūrā* in their organizational terminology. The parliaments mentioned include those of Yemen, Jordan and Egypt. I do not think that these countries can be termed Islamic states as the title of the chapter indicates. They are Muslim states, i.e., states where Muslims form the majority of the population, but the term 'Islamic state' should be restricted to describe states that implement an Islamic ideology, such as Iran and the Sudan at the present time. Neither do I see how the present-day Egyptian *majlis al-shūrā* relates to the theories discussed in chapter 3 except that the institution bears a name that contains the word *shūrā*. I do not think that any of the thinkers quoted in chapter 3 – whether traditionalist, modernist or Islamist – would consider the Egyptian institution an embodiment of their ideal *shūrā*. After all, the majority of members of the Egyptian *majlis al-shūrā* have been elected due to their prominence in the NDP and not due to their having any particular knowledge of Islamic tradition.

A similar blurring of theory and modern practice is apparent in chapter 3.5.3 "Das Problem der politischen Gleichstellung von Frauen und religiösen Minderheiten", where on p. 304 Dr. Badry apologizes for the fact that she has included a treatment of women's role in the *shūrā*. The need to make excuses arises from her view that a discussion as to whether women can participate in shūrā may be considered unnecessary because in 'fast allen islamischen Staaten mit gewählter Volksvertretung' the women have the right to vote and to stand as candidates. Dr. Badry's excuses are unnecessary, because whatever the political status of women in the present-day Muslim states, it does not make it in any way irrelevant to discuss the role assigned to the women in traditionalist, modernist or Islamist theories, because there are political groups whose aim it is to implement these theories in practice.

In spite of this criticism, the work of Dr. Badry contains a lot of information and is definitely useful for anyone interested in modern Islamic political ideas.

IRMELI PERHO

Thomas Philipp & Ulrich Haarmann (eds.), *The Mamluks in Egyptian Politics and Society*. (Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. xiv + 306 pp. £35.00/US$ 59.95. ISBN 0-521-59115-5 (hardback).

'Three wonderful, sunny days' in December 1994 on the slopes of the Taunus mountains in Bad Homburg, Germany, witnessed the symposium, the results of which have been brought together in this impeccably and beautifully produced volume. The purpose of the conference was to form an impression of the state of the art of Mamluk studies. The eighteen articles can roughly be divided into two thematic sections: first, the struggle of members of the Mamluk elite for political and social influence within their own class and system and second, the relations of the Mamluk's military establishment with its non-Mamluk environment. The results published reflect the scenic surroundings and the sunny days.

Having said this, it is sad to continue on a more critical note. Despite the high standard of the contributions they may, at least some of them, better have served their cause – disparate as they are – as articles in, for example, *Mamluk Studies Review*. The articles cover a period of over six centuries (13th to late 19th); despite the title some of the contributions, naturally, also deal with the Mamluks in Syrian politics and society; and the subject is Mamluk rule (1250-1517) as well as the Mamluk institution (1250 – late 19th century). We have contributions on courtly literature (P. M. Holt) and on historiography (Otfried Weintritt), on Mamluk astronomy (David A. King) and on weaponry (the late Ulrich Haarmann), and on marriage patterns of 18th-century Mamluks (Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot) and on Coptic festivals (Huda Lutfi). All this and much more that this reviewer finds very hard to fit under one heading, the Mamluks. You have to buy a quite expensive book to obtain the couple of articles that are of interest to you, even if you are a Mamlukist or a Mamlukologist, to use the terms proposed by Donald P. Little.[1] One could still put up with this if, as promised, we were, at the end, able to form an impression of the state of the art of Mamluk studies. But the articles simply do not sum up to a state-of-the-art panorama.

In fact, one is left with the feeling that a good opportunity to present a real state of the art was missed by the editors. Instead of their all too succinct Preface they might have contributed a Conclusion for the benefit of all those who are not Mamlukists. This reviewer at least, more at home in either 7th- or 19th-century Egypt than in the Mamluk period proper (1250-1517), would have appreciated hearing the opinions of Mamlukists on several recent developments in the field. E.g., the reception of David Ayalon's thoughts about how inadequate and misleading are the names for the two reigns of the Mamluk sultanate – Baḥrī and Burjī

1 Donald P. Little, The use of documents for the study of Mamluk history. *Mamluk Studies Review* 1 (1997), p. 1.

Mamluks – ;[2] not to mention the interesting new periodization of the Mamluk era suggested by André Raymond in 1993 and reiterated, with adjustments for the treatment of Mamluk Cairo's urban history, in the book under review, replacing the traditional bipartite but useless periodization into Baḥrī Turkish and Burjī Circassian 'dynasties', with the cut in 1382, with one divided into three (1998: four) sub-periods: 1250 to 1348; 1348 to 1412; and 1412 to 1517.[3] And what about the discussion of 'the European miracle' and the non-occurrence of a similar miracle in Islam? Have the Mamlukists considered the charge (implied perhaps) that the Mamluk regime obstructed social and economic development in the Islamic world?[4]

To be honest, there were more than just a couple of articles that this reviewer really enjoyed. Professor Ulrich Haarmann's magisterial presentation of how the Mamluk state was perceived in the West as described by Arnold von Harff after his visit to Cairo in the autumn of 1496; and the fascinating issue of how the Mamluks survived the Ottoman conquest, which is dealt with in several articles. One of the reasons this period, the 16th-century Ottoman conquest of Egypt, has not, so far, received its due proportion of attention is, as both Michael Winter in his article "The re-emergence of the Mamluks following the Ottoman conquest" and Otfried Weintritt in his "Concepts of history as reflected in Arabic historiographical writing in Ottoman Syria and Egypt (1517-1700)" note that the decades following the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517 did not favour the writing of history. It is only towards the end of the 16th century that the quality and quantity of the available sources improved.

How the Americans will ever be able to find this book on their shelves, if they follow the Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data information provided in the book, remains to be seen. Both editors' names are garbled.

KAJ ÖHRNBERG

---

2 Something David Ayalon has done since his 1949 article "The Circassians in the Mamluk Kingdom" (*JAOS* 69 (1949), p. 137, nn. 19, 21) with the definite outburst of frustration in "Baḥrī Mamlūks, Burjī Mamlūks – inadequate names for two reigns of the Mamlūk sultanate" (*Tārīḫ* 1 (1990), pp. 3-53).

3 *Le Caire*, Paris 1993, p. 120; concerning the adjustments see his "The residential districts of Cairo's elite in the Mamluk and Ottoman periods (fourteenth to eighteenth centuries)" in the book under review, p. 208.

4 See Jean-Claude Garcin, "The Mamluk Military System and the Blocking of Medieval Moslem Society" and Michael Cook, "Islam: A Comment" in J. Baechler, J. A. Hall & M. Mann (eds.), *Europe and the Rise of Capitalism*, Oxford 1988, pp. 113-130, 131-135.

Richard G. Hovannisian & Georges Sabagh (eds.), *The Persian Presence in the Islamic World.* (Thirteenth Giorgio Levi Della Vida Biennial Conference.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. xii + 267 pp. £40.00/ US$ 64.95. ISBN 0-521-59185-6 (hardback).

What a time it must have been, the late 8th and the 9th centuries in the Islamic world: the translation process from Greek into Arabic; the creative energies of the Persian intellectual elite shaping a cosmopolitan Islamic civilisation; the *'ulamā'* challenging the religious authority of the caliphs; the separation of the military elite from the rest of society. And we are still half a century from the period dubbed 'the Iranian Intermezzo' – the time between the decline of Arab power and the establishment of Turkish power – the ultimate era of cultural efflorescence.

After a rather disappointing volume *The Thousand and One Nights in Arabic Literature and Society*, the outcome of the twelfth Giorgio Levi Della Vida Biennial Conference, we now have a real substantive contribution to our knowledge of the Persian presence in the Islamic world in the 13th volume of the series. These positive words cannot, however, be extended to the editing of the volume which is as sloppy and almost non-existent as in some of the preceding ones.

It took seven years to publish the proceedings of the 11th Conference, eight years those of the 12th, and now again seven years those of the 13th. But having the present volume available is enough to make one indulgent for all the years in between conference and publication. Professor Yarshater has been given time and opportunity to elaborate and amplify his paper read at the Conference – and what a performance we are treated to.

The theme of the conference held at the University of California, Los Angeles, May 10-12, 1991, 'The Persian Presence in the Islamic World' was chosen by the recipient of the thirteenth Giorgio Levi Della Vida Award in Islamic Studies, Professor Ehsan Yarshater. Professor Yarshater's research spans Iranian studies in all their breadth; within Islamic studies his achievements are highlighted by enterprises such as the Tabari Translation Project and, crowning it all, the *Encyclopaedia Iranica.*

Professor Yarshater commences with an overview of earlier scholarly opinion of the Persians within the Islamic world (pp. 4-13); then a thorough treatment of the Persian presence among the Arabs prior to Islam (pp. 13-30); proceeding to the Persian elements in early Arabic works including the Koran and *ḥadīth* (pp. 30-47); followed by the Iranian loanwords in Arabic (pp. 47-54). The rest of the study is divided into separate 'case-studies', some of which might as well have been included in the main sections mentioned above. The headings of these are: "The widely accepted view of the Persian presence in the Islamic world" (pp. 54-58); "The revisionist view [of the Abbasid revolution]" (pp. 59-74); "The Persian phase of Islamic civilization" (pp. 74-85); "Persian culture in other Islamic lands" (pp. 85-90);

"Summation" (pp. 90-103), "The Persian presence in the modern Muslim world" (pp. 103-105); "Bibliography..." (pp. 105-125). Despite the somewhat muddled disposition Yarshater's study gives us what will for a long time be the best charting of what Richard N. Frye has felicitously called 'the Persian conquest of Islam.'

Confronted with this overwhelming wealth it might seem odd to ask for more and to point out certain omissions. Nevertheless, some central points, and pertinent matters for Professor Yarshater's argumentation should be mentioned.

To begin with, is Professor Yarshater's title *The Persian Presence in the Islamic World* appropriate? In the opinion of the present reviewer it should read *The Persian Presence in the Arab-Islamic World.* From the 11th century onwards India increasingly became a part of Perso-Islamic culture, the second great cultural nexus of the Islamic world besides Arab-Islamic culture. The present reviewer feels that Professor Yarshater's rightful reservations about most scholars more or less Arabocentric approaches to Islamic culture have to include Yarshater himself. Of the approximately 100 pages only one page is dedicated to this aspect of Islamic culture.

Further, one of Professor Yarshater's headings is "The revisionist view". This introduces an interesting discussion of one of the ever present problems in early Islamic history: the role of the Persians (or to be more precise the Khorasanians) in bringing down the Umayyad caliphate and installing the Abbasids. It is therefore surprising that Richard W. Bulliet's ground-breaking study *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: an Essay in Quantitative History* (1979) is not mentioned or its inferences, albeit tentative, put to use; this the more so as the ratio between Persian converts and non-converts in the middle of the 8th century might have had a direct bearing on the Abbasid revolution.[1] Moreover another seminal study by Bulliet has been overlooked, i.e., his *Islam: the View from the Edge* (1994), where the historical evolution of Islamic society is seen from the viewpoint of those who lived far from the political centre, mainly in Iran. Especially Bulliet's discussion of the impact of the 'Iranian diaspora' on the Muslim social and ideological order would certainly have been of significance. The book was, of course, published only in 1994 but as there are other items in the Bibliography from 1994 and even 1995 this is no excuse.

The six other contributions (pace the blurb's five) are: George Saliba's "Persian Scientists in the Islamic World: Astronomy from Maragha to Samarqand" (pp. 126-146); Annemarie Schimmel's "The West-Eastern Divan: the Influence of Persian Poetry in East and West" (pp. 147-171); Gerhard Böwering's "Ideas of Time

---

1 Saleh Said Agha has recently tried to demonstrate by demographic computations that the Arab population in Khorasan 'was of a "computable" size insufficient to enable them to play a role sufficiently adequate to confer on "*ahl Ḫurāsan*", in the context of the Revolution, an ethnic Arab identity...' See his article "The Arab population in Ḫurāsan during the Umayyad period. Some demographic computations." *Arabica* 46 (1999), pp. 211-229.

in Persian Mysticism" (pp. 172-198); Oleg Grabar's "Persian Miniatures: Illustrations or Paintings" (pp. 199-217); C. Edmund Bosworth's "The Persian Contribution to Islamic Historiography in the Pre-Mongol Period" (pp. 218-236); and Gerhard Doerfer's "The Influence of Persian Language and Literature among the Turks" (pp. 237-249).

The last sentence of Amin Banani's Introduction (pp. 1-3): '...all readers will gain a finer appreciation of the quality of the offerings which the Persians have brought to the banquet of Islamic civilization, and through it, to the world of humanity' discloses to us one of the few really disturbing omissions in this volume. There is not a single word about the Persian kitchen and the rich culinary tradition taken over by the conquering Arabs in the 7th century and made – at least when speaking of *haute cuisine* – part and parcel of Islamic culture as a whole.

KAJ ÖHRNBERG

Richard Tapper, *Frontier Nomads of Iran: A Political and Social History of the Shahsevan*. (Cambridge Middle East Studies, 7.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. xvii + 429 pp. £45.00. ISBN 0-521-58336-5 (hardback).

This study, based on ethnographic fieldwork carried out mainly between 1963 and 1966 and continued in the 1990s combined with extensive documentary research in Persian, Russian, and English sources, traces the political and social history of the Shahsevan, a once great tribal confederacy today located in various parts of northwestern Persia.

Dr Tapper addresses three main themes: first, the origin of the Shahsevan, a story with three different versions; second, transformation of the Shahsevan social and political organisation (tribe – state relations); and third, the relation between identity and history, i.e., how different constructions of identity reflect or determine the understanding of the past.

The author, 'a professional anthropologist with some pretensions as a historian' (p. xi; the present reviewer would like to add, a quite qualified and competent historian), gives us in his thought-provoking Introduction a survey of the sources used as well as an interesting methodological discussion of some of the problems when writing the history of people without their own written records. The convergence of historians and anthropologists, the former enriching their accounts with ethnographic insights, the latter scouring archives and chronicles, leads Dr Tapper to ask the question how far it is legitimate to extrapolate, e.g., from contemporary Bedouin to biblical Israelites, or, from nomads in the Iran of today to mediaeval Turkish nomads. In fact, was not ethnographic description (albeit in the disguise of marvels) part of the earliest origins of Greek historiography with Herodotus, not to

mention the vast Arabic *'ajā'ib* literature, and was not the expedition sent by King Frederick V of Denmark in 1761 to explore Arabia Felix the paragon of all efforts of extrapolation, aimed as it was to use the contemporary Bedouin to pad out the information available on the biblical patriarchs and their society?

Concerning the origin of the Shahsevan, Dr Tapper finds no evidence to back up the most widely-known 'official' version according to which Shah 'Abbas I (1587-1629) formed them as a tribal force; it was rather Nader Shah (1736-1747) who created this tribal confederacy to defend the Safavid Shahs against the Ottomans and the Russians.

'Tribe' is a term that seems to be a bone of contention between anthropologists. Dr Tapper gives us a very interesting definition:

> 'Tribe' as an analytical concept, [...], is best viewed as – [...] – a state of mind, a construction of reality, a model for action, a mode of social organization essentially opposed to that of the centralized state.

Woe to those voicing dissent; there is no love lost between different 'tribes' of anthropologists. Professor Patricia Crone, a professional historian with some pretensions as an anthropologist, has been subjected to severe criticism and direct misrepresentation of her views by Dr Tapper and Philip S. Khoury.[1]

What then about the identity of the Shahsevan? They are neither a 'tribe' nor an 'ethnic group' in any conventional sense: they are of heterogeneous origins and have no ideology of common descent, they are not politically unified, and they share religion and language with non-Shahsevan people. 'What constitutes Shahsevan identity – apart from the name – appears to have changed over time, and to vary according to a number of factors' (p. 317).

Since the late 19th century nomadism has had a hard time in general in Iran. Exceptionally hard for those like the Shahsevans who lived in the border areas on Russia's Caucasian frontier in northern Iran. The increased Russian interest in Iran led to the closing of the border between the countries which in many ways affected the life of the Shahsevan. The nomads had been accustomed to marketing their produce in Russia as well as in Iran and Russian markets had also been sources of various commodities that the nomads needed. And as the pastoral nomads were seen as a threat to the Shahs early in the 20th century, the assumption of power by Reza Shah led to a policy of settling the tribes in the name of development and

1 Patricia Crone, "The tribe and the state" in J. A. Hall (ed.), *States in History*, Oxford – New York 1986, pp. 48-77, especially p. 55; Patricia Crone, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam*, Princeton 1987, p. 236; Philip S. Khoury and Joseph Kostiner (eds.), *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*, London – New York 1991, several contributions; Patricia Crone, "Tribes and states in the Middle East" (A review article of Philip S. Khoury & Joseph Kostiner (eds.), *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*), *JRAS* 1993, pp. 353-376; Richard Tapper, *Frontier Nomads of Iran*, Cambridge 1997, pp. 7-8; Philip S. Khoury's review of Tapper's book in *American Historical Review* 104 (1999), pp. 1422-1423.

progress. Nomadic pastoralism and the interests of the modern nation state have been seen as incompatible.

The sedentarization of nomads has been swift. The ratio between nomads and settled villagers or townspeople used to be about 50% for both groups; in 1910 approximately 25% of the population, i.e. about 2.5 million were nomads, in 1965 approximately 11%, i.e. about 3 million, and in 1985 only 2.4%, i.e. 1,152,000 remained. Of these, according to Dr Tapper's calculations, some 5000-6000 households or about 40,000 people were Shahsevan.

This is certainly a work of love and great erudition, 'tribal' differences of opinion notwithstanding. The book concludes with exemplary indices.

KAJ ÖHRNBERG

Hermann Behrens, *Die Ninegalla-Hymne. Die Wohnungnahme Inannas in Nippur in altbabylonischer Zeit.* (Freiburger altorientalische Studien, 21.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998. 164 pp + photographs and hand-drawn copies of cuneiform tablets. Paperback. DM/SFr 64,–, ÖS 467,–. ISBN 3-515-06478-8.

This previously unpublished Sumerian text was studied by Hermann Behrens as his 'Habilitationsschrift' in 1989, and most of the text had already been prepared for publication by the time of his unexpected death in 1996. Pages 13-153 have been reproduced directly from the lay-out left behind by Behrens. His handwritten notes which could not be incorporated into the text, have been included separately on pp. 155-158. The publishers have also updated the index at the end of the book.

The Ninegalla hymn, probably composed in the Old Babylonian period, celebrates the goddess Inanna in Nippur by her name **nin-é-gal-la**. The reconstruction of the text is based on twelve tablets or fragments of tablets from Nippur, most of which are now housed in the University Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The book includes bibliographical abbreviations, an introduction, a composite text and translation into German, a score, comments, a conclusion, addenda, corrigenda, and an index. There are also very good photographs and clear hand-drawn copies of the tablets at the end of the book.

The goddess Ninegalla in the Sumerian tradition

The author begins with a short history of the name **nin-é-gal(-la)**. The name in its shorter form, **nin-é-gal**, 'the Lady (= Queen) of the palace', is already attested in the Fara period (2550 BC). At first the name did not denote any particular goddess, but describes the function of a goddess, and could thus be applied to every goddess in the pantheon who had something to do with the palace.

Behrens then follows the development of the use of the name in the Pre-Sargonic period (from 2450) and in the Old Akkadian period (2334-2154), when there was a month called **itu-ezem-mah-^{d}nin-é-gal-ka**, 'Monat des Hochfestes der Ninegal'. Gudea, the city-ruler of Lagash, who preceded or even coincided with the beginning of the Ur III period, also dedicated statuettes to Ninegal. During the Ur III period (2112-2004), Ninegal was worshipped in several cities: Ur, Lagash-Girsu, Umma, Eresh, Ribat and Nippur. There was also a temple in Nippur called **é-^{d}nin-é-gal**.

The earliest indication that Ninegal was another name for the goddess Inanna is found in the Ur III period by connecting the moon god Nanna/Suen with Ninegalla. According to the main tradition, Nanna/Suen was the father of Inanna. Inanna herself also had connections with the moon. The link with the moon god Nanna/Suen and Inanna/Ninegalla is made by the temple name **é-u$_4$-sakar-^{d}nin-é-gal-la**, 'Neulichttagtempel der Ninegal'.

Ninegal is mentioned by her Akkadian name *bēlat ekallim* (^{d}NIN.É.GAL-*lim*) in a votive inscription set up by Amarsuen of Ur (2046-2038). In the Old Babylonian period (2017-1595) Ninegal was also worshipped in Larsa. Rimsin of Larsa calls her **dumu-gal-^{d}suen-na**, 'the eldest daughter of Suen', which clearly identifies Ninegal with Inanna.

Ninegal is also identified with Inanna in literary texts, for instance in a hymn to the Ur III king Shulgi, 'Šulgi D'. In the 'Dumuzi-Inanna' love lyrics Ninegal(la) is identified with Inanna. However, according to another tradition, Ninegalla was a separate goddess residing in Nippur, who in the Nungal hymn (Å. Sjöberg, AfO 24, 1973, pp. 19ff.) acts as a gate keeper in Ekur, the temple of Enlil.

The structure of the hymn

The theme of the hymn is praise to the Heavenly Lady Inanna, who was worshipped in Nippur by her earthly name Ninegalla, 'the Lady of the Palace'. The hymn consists of 217 lines, and has fourteen sections of varied length. A refrain separates each section:

> **^{d}inanna nin-me-šár-ra-me-en dingir nu-mu-e-da-sá**
> **^{d}nin-é-gal-la ki-ùr-zu mu-gál nam-mah-za ga-àm-du$_{11}$**
>
> Inanna, du bist die Herrin aller **me** ('göttlichen Kräfte'), kein Gott misst sich mit dir. Ninegalla, hier ist dein Wohnort, von deiner Erhabenheit will ich sprechen!

Each section describes Inanna under a different aspect. The first section (ll. 1-8) describes Inanna as the planet Venus, the morning and evening star. She is said to be '...grosses Licht, Löwin des Himmels...'. All the lands build a temple to her. The first line of the refrain tells how Inanna is the lady of all the **me**'*s* (= divine offices, divine powers), and that there is no other god who could compete with her.

According to Behrens, the second line is the main point of the hymn: Inanna, under the name Ninegalla, has a dwelling-place 'here', i.e. in Nippur. In other words, she has established a new 'home' for herself in Nippur by having her temple rebuilt.

Sections 2-7 describe her local aspects and list different temples where she is worshipped. In section two (11-19) Inanna goes to her temple of Egaledinna in Ur, 'the place that soothes'. In section three (22-36), after the first night-watch, after she has risen from the grass like a shepherdess, she clasps a weapon like a warrior, she has tireless strength, she appears in the city of Uruk with An, and she holds an inspection of the livestock and personnel in her temple of Gu'enna'ida.

In section four (39-55) Inanna goes to her temple Ibgal in an unidentified city (a temple by the name Ibgal existed in Lagash, Umma and Isin), and her **garza** (rites/offices) are like the **me**'*s* of An and Enki. Like her father Suen she walks in the midst of heaven, and like moonlight she appears on earth in Ibgal. Curiously, the section ends with the lines

54 **garza-zu giri$_3$ ba-gá-gá**
55 **UR (-) KA-da-ga-na-ke$_4$ ša-ba-ab-hal-ha-an**

54 Auf deine (himmlischen) Ordnungen setzt du den Fuss
55 (und) teilst sie dem... Hund(?) zu.

It seems that Inanna distributes her **garza** to **UR** (= dog), who must belong to the cult personnel, at the entrance (**KA**, lit. 'mouth') of the bedchamber (**da-ga-na**). However, these lines remain unclear.

In section five (58-76) she takes her 'throne of decreeing fates' at Ekununna in Eridu, and commences the New Year festivities with her husband Dumuzi (= Amaušumgalanna), and receives offerings for the dead. Section six (79-92) describes how Inanna issues judgements in the sky with An and Enlil, and decrees fates with Enki on earth. She takes her seat, 'the throne of the silent' in Uruk-Kulab, and receives ill-fated people there. In section seven (95-106) Inanna acts as a shepherdess, and enjoys herself in the lap of her husband, Dumuzi. She takes her seat in Nippur at Kurra'igigal, 'the place where judgements are made', and receives cult personnel there. Again there is an unclear section:

102 **uz-ga-kù-ga ša-mu-ra-su$_8$-ge-eš**
103 **nu-mu-e-sì-ge(-en) giš ma-ra-e-ne**
104 **^{d}inanna nu-mu-e-da-sá-e-ne**

102 Stehen für dich (dort) die (Leute des) reinen **uzga**,
103 Du... st nicht, sie... für dich,
104 mit dir Inanna, messen sie sich nicht.

The term **uzga** (here in the temple of Kurra'igigal) in line 102, with all its other occurrences in Sumerian texts, remains unclear. It must mean some kind of cultic place in a temple. The next line is also difficult: Behrens takes the first verb to

denote Inanna – 'you do not do something'- whereas the second verb clearly denotes 'them', 3rd person pl. and is *marû* (= present tense) of the transitive verb. However, the first verb is written in two manuscripts as **nu-mu-e-sì-ge**, and only one manuscript has the ending *-en*, marking the 2nd person sg. subject/object. The fourth manuscript has this line destroyed or erased, and only the last verb **ma-ra-e-ne** is legible. Since the verb itself, **sì.g**, is difficult due to its several meanings, I cannot give any translation either.

However, the second verb is a compound **giš...dug$_4$**, which in the plural has the form **giš...e**. It is well attested that the compound verb **gìš...dug$_4$** means 'to make love', **gìš** itself meaning 'penis'. However, at least in the Cylinders of Gudea (Cyl A VIII 9) there is a variant of **giš** for **gìš**: **mí-áš-gàr giš nu-zu** 'female kid that does not know a penis', i.e. 'virgin female kid'. This could also be the case here, and thus the last part of the sentence would mean 'they are making love for you / because of you'. This theme is of course well associated with Inanna, she being the goddess of love and sex. This would also tie up very nicely with the following line 105: **kar-ke$_4$ éš-dam-šè mu-un-e$_{11}$-dè-en**, 'Dirne, du steigst hinauf zum Gasthaus'. Inanna is the hierodule in question, and the tavern, **éš-dam**, is associated with prostitution. **éš-dam** could also refer to a temple of Inanna.

In section eight (109-115) Inanna dresses up and goes to Dumuzi. She has seven bridesmen beside her. In the partly destroyed section nine (118-125) Inanna is as terrifying as fire in the evening sky, and by playing and dancing she enjoys herself with Dumuzi. She is said to travel from the moonlight to the stars and from the stars to the moonlight. Sections ten (128-143) and eleven (146-158) are badly broken. It seems that Inanna has left the temple of Emah, and it is destroyed (?). A young man pays homage to Inanna. Section twelve (161-190) is again badly broken. In section thirteen (193-204) Inanna stands in order to be marvelled at like an attractive young maiden, and she puts on a necklace. Finally, the last section (207-217) tells about Inanna's divine family relations. The last few lines (215-217) are destroyed.

In the conclusion Behrens discusses Inanna's heavenly and earthly aspects in this hymn. He also discusses the status of the hymn in the context of Old Babylonian literature. According to Behrens, the Ninegalla hymn was written in order to make Inanna's different aspects known now that she was also worshipped in Nippur under the name Ninegalla.

The hymn has its beginnings in the Ur III period, in the reign of Shulgi, because he is known to have rebuilt Inanna's temple of Baradurgarra in Nippur. The connection between the temple rebuilt by Shulgi and the hymn is made by the word **ki-ùr** 'Wohnsitz' in the refrain stating that Inanna now has her dwelling-place in Nippur. According to Behrens, this indicates the new, rebuilt temple of Inanna, probably Baradurgarra. The name of the temple is not mentioned in the text,

other than in the phrase **bara$_2$-...dúr-zu gar**, 'auf dem -Thron ist dein Sitz'. Also, the use of plene writing in the text indicates the Ur III period.

The present form of the text is from the Old Babylonian period. Behrens wonders at the end whether the hymn was actually composed in the Old Babylonian period for another completed work of restoration, as a celebration of the fact, or whether it was another Sumerian text, originally composed in the Ur III period, to be copied by Old Babylonian scribes in order to save the Sumerian literary tradition. This question remains to be answered.

We are much indebted to Hermann Behrens for his work in making this piece of Sumerian literature known, and also to his colleagues for their effort in preparing the text for publication. Without them, we would not have a chance to learn more about the goddess Inanna, this time under her name Ninegalla, in such a beautiful hymn.

PIRJO LAPINKIVI

Anna Schmid, *Die Dom zwischen sozialer Ohnmacht und Kultureller Macht: interethnische Beziehungen in Nordpakistan.* (Beiträge zur Südasienforschung. Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, 179.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997. xii + 313 pp. DM 114,–. ISBN 3-515-07211-X.

The present title was submitted as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Heidelberg, 1993. It describes and analyses the history, culture and socio-economic conditions of a small ethnic group of musicians and blacksmiths in Hunza, Northern Pakistan. This rather wide-spread group, which according to legend has migrated from Kashmir to the Gilgit District and Baltistan, call themselves Dom (sg. *Ḍom,* pl. *Ḍóma*), but by their Burushaski-speaking neighbours in Hunza and Nager they are pejoratively known as *Béricho* (sg. *Bérics*). The study focuses on the interethnic relationships between this minority group and the larger society, chiefly the Burusho.

The author has conducted extensive fieldwork among the Dom people in Hunza (1988) and acquainted herself thoroughly with the theoretical literature on the subject of minority groups. The investigation is organized into five chapters. The Introduction (pp. 1-28) presents the problem and discusses the theoretical framework of the study. The second chapter (Fragmentarisierte Wirklichkeiten: Geschichtsbilder der Dom, pp. 29-83) deals with genealogies and the historical narratives of the Dom and the counternarratives of the dominant Burusho. Chapter three (Repräsentationen und Manifestationen der Identität im Räumlichen, pp. 85-155) describes the settlements and socio-economical conditions of the Dom. The fourth chapter (Die sozialen Beziehungen der Dom, pp. 157-236) focuses on the traditional Dom professions and their importance for the larger society. The

principal conclusions are summarized in the last chapter (Schlußbetrachtung, pp. 237-247), after which follow three appendices: A glossary of important concepts (pp. 249-258), sketches of musical instruments (pp. 259-260), and fifteen photos showing the habitats and professions of the Dom (pp. 261-268). The book also contains an extensive Bibliography (pp. 271-292), Index (pp. 293-304), and English summary (pp. 305-313).

Anna Schmid's elaborate investigation furnishes us with a vast amount of well analysed new data on this relatively poorly known tribe. Although important culturally because of their professions, which are imbued with (spiritually coloured) power, the Dom people suffer from social stigma. Especially since the abolition of the local Hunza ruler in 1974, their identity formation has shifted, because it is no longer essentially backed up by the alleged connexion of the Dom with the royal family. (Yet the ruler did not always support the Dom.) Rather than being based on the significance of their occupations for the larger society, the identity formation is now based on their goal to become fully integrated into the Hunza society, as the author concludes. To achieve this, the Dom people are now deliberately abandoning their (Central Indo-Aryan) language, Domaki, for (the isolated) Burushaski (elsewhere the language shift has been mainly to Shina) and in increasing measure seeking modern education and new careers. In fact, as I noticed in 1994 when studying their language, the Dom leaders of Hunza even resent their own traditional autonym, preferring to call themselves just 'the people of Mominabad' (*Moominabáatei abáat*) or, if appropriate, 'craftsmen, musicians' (*ustáata*).

BERTIL TIKKANEN

Ernst Leumann, *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Nalini Balbir. (Glasenapp-Stiftung Band 37.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998. 1 + 726 pp. ISBN 3-515-06561-X.

There is no doubt that among German-speaking Indologists who were not earlier included in the Glasenapp-Stiftung series Ernst Leumann (1859-1931) certainly occupies a prominent place. Of Swiss origin, he studied Sanskrit at Leipzig and Berlin, and belonged (with Jacobi and Klatt) to the group of Weber's students who excelled in Jaina studies. He became professor at the then German University of Strasbourg and spent his last years teaching at the University of Freiburg i.Br. His scholarly interests were shared by his family: his younger brother Julius (1867-1945) and especially his son Manu (1889-1977) became known as linguists who were also interested in Sanskrit. Though originally a specialist in Jaina studies he himself was familiar with a wide range of Indological topics. At the turn of the century he became interested in Central Asian manuscript fragments and soon developed into one of the early masters of Khotanese Saka

studies. He wrote poetry and studies on metrics and much else as can be seen in the bibliography appended to the volume under review. The majority of the articles and reviews reprinted here, however, deal with Jaina studies. The book concludes with 16 pages of *Addenda et Corrigenda* mainly collected from notes and corrections made by Leumann himself to his own copies, and with useful indices.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Siegfried Lienhard & Irma Piovano (eds.), *Lex et Litterae. Studies in Honour of Professor Oscar Botto.* Torino: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1997. lii + 593 pp. ISBN 88-7694-279-3.

With 44 contributions, many by prominent Indologists, this is one of the most important *Festschrifts* published at the century's end and an impressive show of honour to Professor Oscar Botto. The bulky volume also contains the Bio-data, Bibliography and some photos of O. Botto, and two articles dealing with his person (by J. P. Sinha and Mario Piantelli). The remainder covers the whole field of classical Indology.

The editing of the volume has apparently taken an exceptionally long time. No fewer than six crosses in the table of contents point out contributors who died before publication (and a seventh one should be placed before the name of Heinz Mode), among them Gonda and Ojihara, who passed away as early as 1991.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Mary Brockington & Peter Schreiner (eds.), *Composing a Tradition: Concepts, Techniques and Relationships.* Proceedings of the First Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas August 1997. General editor Radoslav Katičić. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 1999. x + 351 pp. US$ 40.00. ISBN 953-154-382-8.

Croatia is not often mentioned in the history of South Asian studies, but with the Epic conferences, of which we now have the proceedings of the first one, the situation is certainly changing. The volume under review contains 18 contributions dealing with various aspects of the Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and Purāṇas. After the important introduction by Greg Bailey about the tasks of future research, they are divided into three thematic parts: Concepts, Techniques of composition, and Relationships. Taking just a few example of the papers, Minoru Hara deals with the concept of *ātman* in the Bhagavadgītā and its interpretation by Śaṅkara, John Brockington devotes two papers on the problems oral and written transmission in the Rāmāyaṇa, and Greg Bailey discusses the question of the intertextuality in the

Purāṇas. The volume is concluded by an Index of Passages Cited, a General Index and summaries of the papers in Croatian.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

R. Adriaensen, H. T. Bakker & H. Isaacson, *The Skandapurāṇa*, I: Adhyāyas 1-25. Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis. (Supplement to Groningen Oriental Studies.) Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998. xiii + 349 pp. DG 200. ISBN 90-6980-108-X.

The Gronigen Skandapurāṇa project, initiated in 1992, has been announced in a conference paper and an article in 1995 and here we have the first fruits. The book contains an elaborate Prolegomena (pp. 3-56), a detailed English summary of the part edited here (pp. 59-108), the Devanāgarī text of adhyāyas 1-25 with minute critical apparatus (pp. 109-298), and appendices, indexes and bibliography (pp. 299-349). The whole of the work consists of about 182 adhyāyas.

The text edited here has nothing to do with the swollen Skandapurāṇa of Indian editions, which have been rightly suspected by scholars as being late and unreliable compilations of different manuscripts. It is based primarily on Nepalese manuscripts and the editors claim that they here have found the text of the original Skandapurāṇa. The claim is supported by the fact that the quotations from the Skandapurāṇa given in the Dharmanibandhas are not found in the modern 'vulgate' text, but correspond to the text edited here. While one is inclined to be sceptical with regard to any attempt to achieve anything historically reliable with the Purāṇas, the present project is certainly the most promising attempt along this line. The age of the manuscripts used and the age of the quotations gave the editors reason to date their text in the period between the 6th and 8th centuries. For a Purāṇic text this is remarkable enough.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Rahul Peter Das, *Essays on Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal*. Calcutta: Firma KLM Private Limited, 1997. 111 pp. Rs. 220. ISBN 81-7102-082-8.

The book brings together four essays originally written and published in German, now translated and revised in English. "Of Worlds and Times" discusses the ideas of temporality and locality in Indian (Bengali) thought. While translated into English, a number of long quotations in German have been left intact in the footnotes. The second essay, "The Origins of Caitanya's Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal: Some Enigmas", starts with some repetitions which could have been omitted in the revision. The last one, "On Nirmal'nārāẏaṇ Gupta's Study of the Kar'cā of Gobinda

Karmakār", is a brief review a few pages long, and the third, "Recent Works On Bengali Vaiṣṇavism", a review article discussing a number of recent studies written in Bengali. This latter one, with its more than 60 pages, is also the longest. It is too common that books written in modern Indian languages other than Hindi (and perhaps Tamil) are ignored in Indology, and therefore a survey like this is very useful to have.

Without going into the details we may note that Professor Das has dealt with some rather delicate matters in a very considered and tactful way. The book is certainly a useful summary of some crucial questions. One is bound to wonder why there is no preface or bibliography, but the number of misprints is recommendably small.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

Pārśva pratiṣṭhāna granthamālā / Pārśva Foundation Series.

2. Prītam Siṃghavī (sampādak), *Lakṣmīcaṃdra-kṛta Aṇupehā*. 32 pp. Ahmadābād 1998. Rs. 25.

4 [a]. Pritam Singhvi, *Anekānta-vāda as the basis of Equanimity, Tranquality* [sic] *and Synthisis* [sic] *of opposite view points – Samanvay, śānti aur samatvayog kā ādhār anekāntavād*. 105 pp. (+ 13 unumbered). Ahmadābād 1999. Rs. 60.

4 [b]. Anuvādak Harivallabha Bhāyāṇī, *Gāthāmaṃjarī. Sātavāhana-Hāla kavi saṃpādita mūḷa prākrta gāthākośamāṃthī pasaṃda karela eka so mukatakonā mūḷa sāthe ānuvāda*. 56 pp. Ahmadābād 1999. Rs.60.

5. *Harṣavardhana-gaṇi-kṛtam Sadayavatsa-kathānakam*. Saṃpādak Prītam Siṃghavī. 101 pp. (+ 6 unnumbered). Ahmadābād 1999.

6. Harivallabha Bhāyāṇī & Prītam Siṃghavī (saṃpādak aur anuvādak), *Ānaṃdatilaka-kṛta Āṇaṃdā (Ānaṃda-gīta)*, 24 pp. Ahmadābād 1999. Rs. 20.

7. Harivallabha Bhāyāṇī, Ramaṇīka Śāha & Prītam Siṃghavī (saṃpādak), *Rāmasiṃha-muni-kṛtaṃ Dohā-pāhuḍaṃ*. xi + 74 pp. Ahmedābād 1999. Rs. 50.

The Pārśva International Educational and Research Foundation has commenced a series of small booklets, which seems to be developing into a useful addition to Middle Indo-Aryan studies. Apart from no. 4 [a], a study of Jaina philosophy in Hindi by Pritam Singhvi, all fascicles deal with texts. The second one contains a collection of 45 Jaina religious stanzas in what is called the 'Post-Apabhraṃśa' language, edited from a Jaipur Manuscript and translated into Hindi. No. 4 [b] contain a selection of 100 gāthās from Hāla's Gāhākosa (Sattasaī) translated into Gujarati by H. C. Bhayani. No. 5 contains an unpublished Jaina narrative work in Sanskrit and at the end (pp. 86-101) H. C. Bhayani's article 'The Śūdravatsa-kathā' is republished from the *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 6 (1988). The Āṇaṃdā (no. 6.)

is a late Apabhraṃśa lyrical poem in 43 double verses, published with Hindi translation. The Dohā-pāhuḍa (no. 7) is a revised version of the Apabhraṃśa text originally edited by Hiralal Jain in 1933, now published together with a Sanskrit chāyā and Gujarati translation. While other volumes have introductions in Hindi or (in the case of no. 4 [b]) in Gujarati, this also contains a brief English introduction explaining the editorial principles adopted.

The numbering of the series is hopelessly inconsistent. Looking at the actual numbers printed on the volumes, we have two number fours and no number three at all. In the list printed on the backs 4 [a] is often (but not always) given as 3, while 4 [b] is often given as no. 2 and our 2 as 3.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

D. P. M. Weerakkody, *Taprobanê. Ancient Sri Lanka as Known to Greeks and Romans*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1997. xxii + 287 pp. + 3 plates. ISDN 2-503-50552-X.

The contacts between Taprobane, or ancient Sri Lanka, and the West have often been treated (by myself, too, I am afraid) as a side issue of classical contacts with India. What has been specially devoted to Taprobane, consists of a few dissertations and articles commencing with Eugène Burnouf (Mémoire sur quelques noms de l'île de Ceylan, et particulièrement sur celui de Taprobane, sous lequel elle était connue des anciens, *Journal Asiatique* 8 (1826): 129-149). The present book is the first real monograph on the subject, which is dealt with in such a masterly way that it makes everything else antiquated.

The mastery of his subject shown by Professor Weerakkody is no news to us. Since 1981, he has discussed the various aspects of his subject in some fifteen articles published in Sri Lankan journals and collective volumes (they should have all been listed in the bibliography).

While the questions of archaeology and numismatics were not evaded by the author himself, he asked O. Bopearachchi, the well-known numismatist, to write a long foreword to his book. This foreword contains a useful summary of the archaeological evidence for Graeco-Roman contacts.

Although the discussion concentrates on the major accounts – Onesicritus and Megasthenes as the earliest ones, Strabo, Pliny, Ptolemy, the Theban Scholasticus and Cosmas – the author has done good work, collecting as many references to Taprobane in classical sources as possible. One chapter is particularly devoted to references in poetry and another to minor geographers. Under the heading *Falsa et dubia* some spurious sources, such as Iambulus, are discussed. Here I must say that I am not quite convinced by the argument that the Serendivi of Ammianus do not refer to Sri Lanka. There is further a chapter discussing the evidence of Roman

coins found in Sri Lanka and another one about the so-called interlinear inscriptions of Paranavitana, here rightly shown to be spurious. All the text passages are given in an appendix, first in the original Greek and Latin, then in English translation. These could have been put in a synoptic arrangement to facilitate reference.

The printing is excellent, although, with so few illustrations, a somewhat smaller size would have made the book easier to handle and read.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN

BRONZE AGE SEALS OF CENTRAL ASIA: NEW PERSPECTIVES

Victor Sarianidi, *Myths of Ancient Bactria and Margiana on its Seals and Amulets*. Moscow: Pentagraphic, Ltd, 1998. 4:o, 336 pp., ill. (Hardbound.) ISBN 5-93202-001-6.

Susanne Baghestani, *Metallene Compartimentsiegel aus Ost-Iran, Zentralasien und Nord-China*. (Archäologie in Iran und Turan, 1.) Rahden, Westfalen: Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, 1997. 4:o, xv + 427 pp. + 10 Tafeln (hardbound). DM 119,80. ISBN 3-89646-701-8.

The Russian Greek veteran archaeologist Victor I. Sarianidi has conducted 50 seasons of archaeological excavations and explorations. From 1969 to 1979 he worked in northern Afghanistan (ancient Bactria) and since then in the neighbouring region of Merv (ancient Margiana) in southern Turkmenistan. Sarianidi has not only made such spectacular finds as graves of Kushana kings laden with large numbers of golden objects, but discovered a whole new oasis culture that flourished in these two neighbouring areas in the Bronze Age. This previously unknown culture has been called 'the Bactria and Margiana Archaeological Complex' or BMAC by Sarianidi. Another name, 'the Oxus Civilization', was given by the French archaeologist Henri-Paul Francfort, who excavated the Harappan colonial site of Shortughai in northern Afghanistan in 1975-79.

Victor Sarianidi has distinguished himself not only by extensive field work but also by the exemplary promptness with which he has published the results in numerous journal articles and books. The latter include *Drevnie zemledel'tsy Afganistana* (Moscow 1977); *Die Kunst des alten Afghanistan* (Leipzig 1986); *Drevnosti strany Margush* (Askhabad 1990), and *Margiana and Protozoroastrism* (Athens 1998). Important books by other scholars dealing with the BMAC include Pierre Amiet, *L'âge des échanges inter-iraniens, 3500-1700 avant J.-C.* (Paris 1986), Giancarlo Ligabue & Sandro Salvatori (ed.), *Bactria: An Ancient Oasis Civilization from the Sands of Afghanistan* (Venice 1989), and Fredrik T. Hiebert, *Origins of the Bronze Age Oasis Civilization in Central Asia* (Cambridge, Mass. 1994).

Unfortunately, Sarianidi's sensational discoveries in Afghanistan propelled whole clans and villages of Afghans to rob whatever ancient tombs they could find. Sarianidi (1998: 11) estimates the number of looted graves to be in the tens of thousands. This means that the archaeological contexts relating to this newly discovered phase of the country's past were totally destroyed. Antique markets were flooded with remarkable objects of ancient art and culture that quickly dispersed to

private and public collections all over the world. Most interesting among these finds coming from Bronze Age Afghanistan were statuettes, axe-heads and seals. They all offer iconographic motifs that provide precious clues to the religious ideas and cultural affinities of the people of ancient Bactria. Bactria extends northwards to Uzbekistan, where very similar artifacts have been found, just as they have been found in Margiana.

Sarianidi was, of course, aware of what the Afghans were up to, and, regularly visiting the Kabul bazaar in the 1970s, he documented as many of the illegally dug artefacts as possible by taking photographs and making impressions. Elsewhere, he has continuously tried to trace seals of Bactria and Margiana possessed by antique dealers, private collectors and museums. Quite a number of these he has already published in his books and articles. Sarianidi's new work of 1998 is the culmination of these efforts. Thanks to the cooperation of the owners of several important collections, it presents a corpus of 1802 objects in photographs, sometimes supplemented with drawings, while the opposing page in each case gives details about the object type, material, measurements, the pictorial motif, provenance or owner, and references to previous publications. In addition to a bibliography, the book also contains a lengthy introduction, which analyses the seals and their motifs, traces parallels in the glyptics of other areas, and draws conclusions about the origins and religion of the BMAC people.

The objects are numbered consecutively and presented in two main sections, Bactria (1-1548) and Margiana (1549-1802). The 254 seals from Margiana come from archaeological excavations and explorations, while Sarianidi expressly reports an archaeological provenance (the only excavated site, Dashli) for only ten out of the 1548 seals attributed to Bactria. I have made provisional counts of the sources he reports for the Bactrian seals. The greatest number of objects comes from the private collection of Ron Garner (403), who has, in many other ways too, sponsored this book. The next greatest number of objects is reported from the 'Kabul Bazaar' (386). Then follow the collections of the Anahita Gallery in Santa Fe (371) and of Jonathan Rosen in New York (199); 28 objects are said to belong to the Louvre in Paris, 20 to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, and 6 to Collection of Corbonies [sic for Carbonnel, in Paris]; while 1 seal or amulet is reported from each of the following: Kabul Museum (no. 914), Ligabue collection [in Venice] (no. 20), Los Angeles County Museum of Art (no. 46) and Schuster collection (no. 88).

Only 191 out of the 1548 seals from Bactria have a reference to a previous publication: a publication by Sarianidi himself is mentioned most often (62 seals, including the 10 reported to come from Dashli), next comes Pierre Amiet (35), then Giancarlo Ligabue and Sandro Salvatori (30 seals, excluding those specified as published by Amiet in the same volume), Akira Hori and Keiko Ishida (17), Sotheby's and Christie's auction catalogues (15), Holly Pittman (14), M.-H. Pottier

(2), A. Glock (nos. 1452, 1471), Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique 1988 (2), and, with one seal each, G. Azarpay (no. 52), Harriet Crawford and K. Sindi (no. 941), Louis Dupree (no. 958) and A. Tajan (no. 916).

All of the above statistics cannot be taken at their face value, however. Usually just one reference is given for each seal or amulet, even if it has been published many times, by the same author or by different authors. The references are minimal also in the sense that often the reference to a previous publication of a seal includes information concerning the collection it belongs to. Thus many seals published by Amiet are not expressly mentioned as belonging to the Louvre museum, but can be recognized as such by means of the reference to Amiet. However, seal no. 919 as well belongs to the Louvre, although the sources given are 'Kabul Bazaar. Sarianidi 1986a, fig. 7 n 9'.

One thing that is immediately clear from this quick glance at the sources given is that Sarianidi's new corpus means an immense increase in the material available for the study of the glyptics of Bronze Age Bactria and Margiana. We have all the more reason to be thankful to Viktor Sarianidi for collecting this wealth of seals for us, as the photographs in which it is presented are, on the whole, of a very high quality, and the book has been well printed on good paper. It is sure to remain an important source.

And there is more to come. Sarianidi himself notes that he unfortunately could not include the material excavated in Uzbekistan, i.e., northern Bactria (p. 25), and that part of the Bactrian seals and amulets belonging to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York still remain unpublished (p. 11). 'Miniature seals and amulets with very simple designs were not always included in the Catalogue' (p. 25): this statement must be understood as a warning that the corpus is not comprehensive. A comparison of it with one of Pierre Amiet's articles (published in the 1989 volume edited by Ligabue and Salvatori) showed that several seals in the Louvre have been omitted from the book, including a large (diam. 4 cm) silver seal with the motif of winding snakes (Amiet 1989, p. 169, fig. 14f = AO 26496), a snake-shaped copper seal measuring 4.4 x 3.7 cm and coming from a collection made in Kabul (p. 171, fig. 16 b = AO 28506), and a copper seal (diam. 3.3 cm) with the unusual hare motif (p. 170, fig. 15 e = AO 26559), almost identical with seal no. 118 (diam. 4 cm) that Sarianidi records from the collection of the Anahita Gallery.

The photograph reproduced as no. 274 by Sarianidi is not the scorpion seal AO 26343 that it is said to represent (Amiet 1989, p. 170, fig. 15d referred to here has a different picture); it looks like an inferior double of no. 271. Amiet also gives measurements which are sometimes missing in Sarianidi's book (diam. 4.2 for Sarianidi no. 749 in Amiet 1989, p. 168, fig. 13c; diam. 2.1 cm for Sarianidi no. 840 in Amiet 1989, p. 169, fig. 14e) and sometimes reported differently there (diam. 5.1 cm in Sarianidi, no. 142 = AO 26183, but 6.1 cm according to Amiet 1989, p. 171, fig. 16a; similarly diam. 5.9 cm in Sarianidi no. 486 for 4.7 cm in

Amiet 1989, p. 168, fig. 13 g; 5.5 x 5.2 cm in Sarianidi no. 676 for diam. 2.3 cm in Amiet 1989, p. 169, fig. 14c; diam. 5.6 cm in Sarianidi 731 for diam. 2.2 cm in Amiet 1989, p. 169, fig. 14d). The museum number AO 26174 in Sarianidi is AO 26184 in Amiet 1989, p. 170, fig. 15a. Similar misprints are occasionally found in the references: in no. 917, Amiet 1986 fig. 198 b should be read 189 b.

On the other hand, though for example the bificial stepped 'amulet' AO 25247 illustrated as no. 995 in Sarianidi's book is likely to be of Bactrian origin, it is said to come from Luristan (see p. 222 in: P. Amiet, Quelques aspects peu connus de l'art iranien, *La Revue du Louvre* 23 (1973): 215-224). Sarianidi is himself aware that some irrelevant items, present in the large private collections of objects without archaeological context, may have been included:

> In this work, cylinder seals of unknown provenance, which have unique compositions, are denoted 'presumably from Afghanistan' [actually 'The seal apparently originates from Afghanistan': nos. 1432, 1460, 1481, 1484, 1493]. I am almost sure that most of them had nothing to do with Bactria and were imported from some other regions. (p. 25.)

Locating particular seals in the corpus is not always easy because its organization is not entirely systematic. Within each of the two regions, Bactria and Margiana, the main division is into metal seals and into amulets and seals of stone, gypsum, faience, ceramics or bone, the cylinder seals and three-sided prisms being put into their own categories in the latter division. There has been an attempt at further classifications by the motif and shape but these have not been fully carried through. One is also often left without information concerning the reverse side or, more generally, the type of the object, nor is the relative size of the object readily visible from the photographs which have a more or less uniform size.

There are thus some shortcomings in Sarianidi's magnum opus, understandably, as it was produced alongside demanding fieldwork. Fortunately, it is complemented by another important work published in 1997, but not yet known to Sarianidi, namely Susanne Baghestani's thorough analysis of the so-called 'compartmented' metal seals 'in which the pattern on the face is built up of compartments bounded by metal strips' (Stuart Piggott 1943, cited by Baghestani on p. 3). The great majority of the metal seals of Bactria and Margiana belong to this category, and 'southern Bactria' is also statistically the most important area in Baghestani's analysis, being represented by 265 items; there is thus much new material not analyzed by Baghestani in Sarianidi's corpus, which contains 885 metal seals from Bactria. On the other hand, Baghestani has been very careful and thorough in her reporting and analyzing the published material. She has also published for the first time a number of objects mostly not included in Sarianidi's book: these come from the Louvre and Guimet museums in Paris, the Prähistorische Staatssammlung in Munich and from the following private collections: M.

Le Berre, J.-P. Carbonnel, and J.-Ph. Mariaud de Serres, all in Paris; M. Bumiller in Munich, and Sammlung Berlin und Teheran (p. 160).

After an introduction (pp. 1-2) and a history of previous research (pp. 3-8), Baghestani deals with the production technology of the compartmented metal seals in chapter 3 (pp. 9-17). Among other things, she offers for the first time chemical analyses of 30 objects, which provide an idea of rather differentiated metallurgy in Central Asia and the neighbouring regions. Baghestani's scope is wider than Sarianidi's as she has systematically recorded the temporal and geographical distribution of this object category and carefully considered its various archaeological contexts, comprising more than 40 sites and about 10 cultural realms from Iran to China (map on p. 7), thus creating a firm basis for a historical understanding of its history. Chapter 4 deals with the chronology of the relevant sites (pp. 18-97), summarized in table 10 at the end of the book.

The next chapters are devoted to the typology of the compartmented seals, based on their iconography and shape (chapter 5, pp. 98-148) and to their social significance and function (chapter 6, pp. 149-157), followed by a summary (chapter 7, pp. 158-159). Typologically, the most notable trend is the South Bactrian attempt to unify the initially very varied shape by giving the seals a circular frame. From the social point of view, it is interesting that in excavations the seals are most often found in women's graves. Then follows the typologically organized catalogue (chapter 8, pp. 160-378). Baghestani's corpus comprises 641 objects (568 metal seals and 93 impressions, out of which only 179 seals and all the impressions come from regular excavations); they are presented in scaled line drawings and some selected photographs (9 tables at the end). All the material is easily accessible and can be quickly surveyed with the help of the several tables that are appended: the provenance and number of the seals and their impressions (expressed with different symbols) coming from regular excavations, organized according to countries, regions and sites (pp. 379-380), the provenance and number of metal seals obtained through trade, organized according to regions ('southern Bactria', 'Ordos region', and 'Tarim plain') and according to museums, private collections and lack of information concerning the present location (p. 381); datable seals and impressions, organized chronologically and by site (pp. 382-383). Chapter 9 contains an inventory of the objects site by site, organized according to the cultural realms (pp. 384-394), with the 'Bactrian' objects without archaeological context at the end, arranged according to the different collections (pp. 394-403). The bibliography (pp. 404-427) concludes the book. Baghestani herself notes (pp. 4-5) that she could not include compartmented seals from the latest excavations from Central Asia, and that the two fragments from Mohenjo-daro of which she learnt too late are also excluded. Besides these two metal seals, however, Mohenjo-daro has also produced three impressions of Bactrian seals; their contexts seem rather significant historically

(see my forthcoming paper "Vedic and the entry of the Indo-Aryans in India" in Nicholas Sims-Williams (ed.), *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples).*

With regard to the historical evolution and dating, Baghestani concludes (pp. 158-159) that compartmented metal seals started appearing in greater numbers around 3000 BC at Shahr-i Sukhta in Seistan in eastern Iran and at Mundigak in southwestern Afghanistan. Towards the end of the third millennium they spread everywhere in Central Asia along ancient trade routes that followed the southern corridor from Makran to Pakistani Baluchistan and the northern corridor from there across Bactria and Margiana to Kopet Dagh in southern Turkmenia. The latest examples date from about 1500 BC and come from northern Central Asia. Most of the Bactrian seals date from the first quarter of the second millennium BC. As first suggested by Pierre Amiet in 1977, the Bactrian seals are clearly related to the very similar compartmented seals found at a distance of about 7000 km to the east in the Ordos region of northern China, and, together with compartmented seals coming from the Tarim Valley in Sinkiang, provide the earliest evidence for trade along the Silk Road.

These conclusions are very much in agreement with the overall view about the cultural evolution in Central Asia as sketched by Pierre Amiet on the basis of recent archaeological discoveries in his masterful 1986 book (mentioned above) and briefly summarized in his preface to Sarianidi's work (pp. 9-10) as well as in his slightly longer introduction (pp. vii-xii) to Ali Hakemi's *Shahdad: Archaeological Excavations of a Bronze Age Center in Iran* (Rome 1997); as an important overview of the present conceptions, I would also like to refer to Sandro Salvatori's and Maurizio Tosi's joint postscript to Hakemi's book, entitled "Some reflections on Shahdad and its place in the Bronze Age of Middle Asia" (pp. 121-138).

Tablets with Proto-Elamite script have been discovered at Tepe Yahya in southern Iran and Shahr-i Sukhta in Seistan, near the border of Afghanistan, and traces of the influence exerted by the Proto-Elamite traders on the Iranian Plateau have been found as far east as Quetta in Pakistan. Even after the Proto-Elamite culture collapsed c. 2700 BC, Elamite influence continued on the plateau, where Shahdad in Kerman has been suspected to be the Elamite country of Markhashi mentioned in the cuneiform texts; an inscription of six signs in the Linear Elamite script (used in the 23rd century BC) has been found at Shahdad (Hakemi 1997: 67). By 2600 BC the urbanization of many cultural areas from the Mediterranean to the Indus Valley and from the Arabian Sea to southern Turkmenistan had been accomplished. Iran and Turan (Amiet's Outer Iran), which together form Amiet's 'Trans-Elam', by then had several important centres of metallurgy and lapidary art (in such exotic stones as chlorite, alabaster, turquoise, carnelian and lapis lazuli), producing luxury goods based on Elamite models and participating in a flourishing international trade.

Fred Hiebert (1994), based on his stratigraphic excavations at Gonur, on 14 carefully sampled and calibrated radiocarbon dates processed at two different laboratories (in the USA and in Finland), and on cultural comparisons, proposed the following chronology for Margiana:

Period 1 (late Namazga V ceramic complex) = 2200-1900 BC
Period 2 (BMAC) = 2000-1750 BC
Period 3 (similar to Takhirbai 3) = 1800-1500 BC

The BMAC or Oxus Civilization, with its compartmented seals, ceremonial axes and other élite objects, appears to have come into being with the expansion of the 'Trans-Elamite' culture northwards from Shahdad, with which the BMAC has many and striking similarities; according to Salvatori and Tosi (1997: 122, 128, 130), close contacts between Shahdad and Bactria-Margiana start in the 23rd century BC.

On the basis of different means of dating, Baghestani (pp. 143-145) divides the compartmented metal seals of BMAC into the following chronological sequence:

1. Early Phase = Early Namazga V Period = c. 2300-2100 BC: strong influence from south-east Iran (Shahdad, Tepe Yahya and Shahr-i Sukhta) and southwest Turkmenistan (Altyn-Depe) glyptics, which, Baghestani points out (p. 158), had a great variety of forms and motifs but was rather static.
2. Late Phase, subdivided into two:
   Late Namazga V Phase = c. 2100-1900 BC: new seal types and forms begin to be developed;
   Margiana Period 2 = c. 1900-1750: greatest variation is reached.

During the Late Phase, in the first quarter of the 2nd millennium BC, the BMAC iconography developed several important and clear parallels with the iconography of Syria (especially in the Mitanni seals), of Anatolia and northern Iran. These parallels, especially those relating to the anthropomorphic deity with an eagle's head, wings and talons, were first proposed by Pierre Amiet, and they are endorsed by Sarianidi (earlier and 1998, pp. 19, 23, 26-27, etc.) as well as Baghestani (pp. 144-145).

Among the new motifs that appear on the mace and axe heads of the BMAC, is the horse; and, as pointed out by Sarianidi (1998: 47), the horse or a horseman also appears also on several of the new seals (Sarianidi 1998, nos. 1395, 1397-99, 1401, 1441-42, 1444-45, 1482; the drawing of no. 1751 shows a horse, but from the photograph it looks as if the motif could also be that of a two-headed eagle), and at least some of these seals appear to date from the Bronze Age, though others may be from the first millennium BC (cf. Sarianidi, p. 47).

In a long paper published in 1988, entitled "The coming of the Aryans to Iran and India, and the cultural and ethnic identity of the Dāsas", I have argued that the

rule of the BMAC was taken over by an early, pre-Vedic, wave of Aryan speakers calling themselves Dāsa, and that from Bactria and Margiana they spread to both Iran and India, just as the rule of the Mitanni kingdom in Syria was a little later taken over by Aryan-speaking warriors, who brought horse-drawn chariots to the Near East. As this article came out in this same journal (*Studia Orientalia* 64, pp. 195-302), there is no need to repeat here all the other arguments for this hypothesis. There is one point, however, which I must emphasize here. In my opinion, the original homeland of the Aryan speakers was in the steppes around the lower course of the Volga and southern Urals. This hypothesis seems to be proved beyond doubt by the numerous very early Aryan loanwords in the Finno-Ugric languages spoken in the neighbouring forest zone around the upper course of the Volga and the Ural mountains. It is also in full agreement with the now prevalent theory that the Proto-Indo-European homeland was situated in the Pontic steppes (see especially J. P. Mallory, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans,* London 1989). It also agrees with the fact that ceramics with clear parallels in the northern steppes have been found in Margiana in and around the BMAC settlements.

Viktor Sarianidi also thinks that the BMAC people spoke an Aryan language, but he is inclined to derive these Aryans from the Mitanni kingdom of Syria. His main reasons for thinking so are twofold. First, Sarianidi would like to date the BMAC at least five hundred years later than Hiebert, being unwilling to accept the new radiocarbon dates: in his preface to Hiebert's book (1994: xxxii) he points out that

> both at Gonur south and at Togolok 21 there were some unique artifacts made of iron, a fact that does not allow the dates of the BMAC to be pushed back so far as suggested by the radiocarbon dates. To my mind, such a divergence in dates is explained either by the imperfect nature of the laboratory analyses or by some regional radiocarbon variation currently unrecognized by radiocarbon experts.

The radiocarbon dates, however, agree with the general reconstruction of the prehistory of Central Asia, which is also reflected in Baghestani's work. A second major reason is that Sarianidi opts for the hypothesis put forward by T. V. Gamkrelidze and V. V. Ivanov (*Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans,* I, The Hague 1987) and Colin Renfrew (*Archaeology and Language,* London 1987), which locates the Proto-Indo-European homeland in Anatolia. This hypothesis, however, has been severely criticized (see e.g. Mallory 1989) and has few supporters. I would like to add that the iconographic parallels between Syria and the BMAC do not imply a unidirectional influence from west to east, but there is clear evidence for an influence in the opposite direction, too: thus the two-humped camel, which is native to Central Asia and occurs on many BMAC seals as a new motif along with the horse, is found on Mitanni seals (Parpola 1988: 233, with note 274).

The BMAC seals are particularly precious in that they offer a new means to understand the religious ideas which prevailed in early Central Asia and therewith also to interpret later sources from novel angles. But their analysis and interpretation is not a simple task. An important point to bear in mind is their syncretistic nature: the components of the BMAC religion had diverse origins in the different layers of this culture. First, there is the early layer, the religion of the Chalcolithic settlers coming from the Kopet Dagh region of southern Turkmenia, which can be studied by reference to the archaeological remains in that region, possibly related to the Early Harappan cultures. Secondly, we have to take into consideration the Proto- and Trans-Elamite influence, which affected not only the BMAC but also the Early Harappan culture (where it probably led to the creation of the Indus script). There is also clear evidence of an influence exerted upon the BMAC by the Mature Harappan culture – present in northern Afghanistan itself at Shortughai. Next, we have to take into account the Indo-Iranian tradition brought to Central Asia from the north by the Aryan immigrants, even though they seem to have largely adopted the local culture, including religious ideology used to legitimize the ruling power, as happened in the Mitanni kingdom. Finally, as shown by the iconographic parallels, these new rulers established contacts with northern Iran, Cappadocia and Syria (eventually leading to the takeover of the Mitanni kingdom), and were much influenced by the religious ideas and art traditions prevailing in these regions.

In sorting out this religious syncretism represented by the BMAC iconography, we must combine different methods and sources. First, the BMAC images may be analyzed internally, from the structure and details of the composition itself. Pierre Amiet has given us an admirable model in his analysis of the scenes on the metal goblets of the 'Fullol hoard' ("Iconographie de la Bactriane proto-historique", *Anatolian Studies* 33 (1983), pp. 19-27 and pls. v-viii). Secondly, the addition of many new seals to the corpus makes it more feasible to apply internal comparison and extract meanings from the variation in the details and attributes of any given deity or symbol. Viktor Sarianidi and Susanne Baghestani have done good ground work by collecting and classifying the different motifs. One important problem in this effort concerns the relationship between two or more reasonably similar figures: may they be considered as variants of one archetype, or as separate entities? In the third place, the meaning of an iconographic figure may be studied in the light of its parallel in Near Eastern iconography, where it may also be a problem, but where literary sources may also throw light on the subject. Again, quite a lot of work in this direction has already been done. It must be borne in mind, however, that a similar figure may have had a different meaning in different cultures, for instance in Elam and in Syria, which must both be taken into consideration. The meaning of a symbol may also change over time, and one should naturally target a time close to that of the BMAC. Fourthly, a similar search should naturally be extended to parallels elsewhere, for instance in the iconography of the

Indus Civilization, which has been in contact with the BMAC. In the fifth place, as the BMAC in its later phases appears to have been ruled by Aryan speakers who later migrated to both India and Iran, later Iranian and later Indian literary and iconographic sources should be searched for possible survivals. The spread of the BMAC seals to Ordos in China underlines that the traditions of the steppe and Inner and East Asia at large must not be forgotten either; indeed, it is evident that the BMAC is an important (though not the only) source of the Eurasian 'animal style'.

For some new interpretations along these lines, see my above-mentioned paper in *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*.

The two books reviewed are indispensable for any serious work on the BMAC seals and lighten the task considerably. Undoubtedly they will also create more interest in the subject and even thus contribute to progress in this fascinating field.

ASKO PARPOLA

CURRENT ISSUES IN SINITIC SCRIPTS AND WRITTEN LANGUAGES

As far as systems of writing and written languages are concerned, East Asia is a world of its own. It is well known that writing in East Asia is intimately interconnected with history, society, religion, and – above all – art and aesthetics. These dimensions are still present when writing is applied even in its most trivial everyday functions in modern East Asia. However, in general consciousness writing in East Asia is often specifically connected with China and the Chinese characters, or *sinograms*. Too rarely do we remember that there are also other written traditions, different from the Chinese script, but still similar enough to be comprised under the general concept of *Sinitic* scripts.

The overall understanding of the Sinitic world of scripts is today made easier by a number of recent publications. Perhaps most importantly, there is a fresh introduction to the scripts of the three principal state languages of East Asia – Chinese, Korean and Japanese:

> **Insup Taylor & M. Martin Taylor**, *Writing and Literacy in Chinese, Korean and Japanese*. (Studies in Written Language and Literacy, 3.) Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. xiii + 412 pp., incl. figures, glossary, and index. ISBN (Europe:) 90-272-1794-7 / (US:) 1-55619-319-X (cloth).

This is probably the best available presentation of its field. The authors, a Korean-Canadian psycholinguist couple, are well equipped to approach the various aspects of East Asian writing, though their strongest asset clearly lies in their specialized knowledge of the psychology, sociology, and technology of writing and reading. The learning of literacy in China, Korea and Japan is covered in considerable detail, and the discussion extends to the history of the systems of education as well as the reform movements that have affected the status of the written languages in the three countries.

The work is very practical and starts from the basics – the definition of the Chinese, Korean and Japanese languages and speech communities. For Chinese we could also speak of a *script community*, since the Chinese script is used by the speakers of a variety of Sinitic languages, including not only the 'dialects' of Chinese itself but also, and equally importantly, Sino-Korean, Sino-Japanese, and historically, Sino-Vietnamese. In the introductory section, the authors discuss the general evolution and taxonomy of writing systems. The Chinese script is correctly

identified as basically *logographic*, with a proper recognition of its syllabic or *logosyllabic* properties.

The actual presentation of the material is divided into three separate parts, corresponding to the Chinese, Korean and Japanese scripts. As the volume is most suitable as a university textbook, this division is easy to defend from the reader's point of view. Nevertheless, a more integrated analysis of all the Sinitic scripts, or at least a comparative summary, would have added to the value of the work. It is, however, true that brief comparative surveys are presented in different parts of the book (e.g. Part I, Chapter 7: "Text Writing in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese"; Part III, Chapter 18: "Kanji, Hancha, and Hanzi Compared"). Altogether, the text is written in a cumulative way, so that the discussion of the Korean and Japanese systems of writing is based on what has already been said in the relatively long initial presentation of the Chinese script.

In spite of the rather voluminous text (and small print) of the book, many topics receive only superficial attention. The remarks on the history and early evolution of the Chinese script, for instance, are restricted to recapitulating the conventional 'truths'. One searches in vain for references to the innovative works of William G. Boltz, though, of course, his most recent contributions (including the one in the *Cambridge History of Early China*) were not yet available to the authors. On the other hand, the volume contains some less relevant sections, like the discussion of the civil-service examination systems of imperial China and Korea and the accompanying critique of the position of women in the traditional Confucian society (pp. 144-152, 255-257).

On the more prescriptive side, Taylor & Taylor take up the question concerning the usefulness or uselessness of the Chinese characters, as applied to the three state languages concerned. Countering the proposals of some Asian language reformers, as well as such Western authorities as John DeFrancis and Victor H. Mair, they claim that there are more advantages than disadvantages connected with the continuing use of the Chinese characters. Especially for Korean, which has a real native alternative to the 'Hancha', the authors aggressively maintain (pp. 203-210, 239-254) that the introduction of a completely alphabetic orthography would be both socially and intellectually detrimental.

Indeed, it is easy to find arguments in favour of the Chinese characters. One such argument is the fact that they create an East Asian cultural unity. From this point of view, the 'simplification' of some frequent characters (or components of characters) in both China and Japan, as also discussed by Taylor & Taylor (pp. 119-122), has only led to unnecessary confusion. However, this is the reality the East Asians have to live with, and it is certainly not the only example of incompetent political decision-makers disturbing a living tradition. One may only hope that the victory of pragmatism over fanaticism in China will ultimately lead to a full rehabilitation of the 'old' characters.

Discussing the Korean writing system, Taylor & Taylor also touch upon the question concerning the origin of the Korean alphabet. They adopt the traditional explanation and assume (p. 214) a connection with the 'articulatory organs and features' for the consonant letters, and with the 'three great powers of the universe' for the vowel letters. This is not surprising in view of the Korean background of one of the authors. The myth of the Korean alphabet being a native invention, with no external sources of stimulation, is a persistent one and amounts to a kind of linguistic *juche* ideology in both Koreas.

However, in circles more closely engaged in historical linguistics and philological studies, the origin of the Korean alphabet is still considered a question worthy of further discussion. A most important contribution to this field is the collection of essays dedicated to the Korean linguist Ki-Moon Lee and edited by Young-Key Kim-Renaud:

> **Young-Key Kim-Renaud** (ed.), *The Korean Alphabet: Its History and Structure*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997. xii + 317 pp., incl. 4 appendices and index. ISBN 0-8248-1989-6 (paperback).

Based on a symposium held in Washington, D.C. (1992), the book contains an editorial "Introduction", a final "Commentary" (Samuel E. Martin), and ten other papers: "The inventor of the Korean alphabet" (Ki-Moon Lee), "The international linguistic background of the correct sounds for the instruction of the people" (Gari Ledyard), "The principles underlying the invention of the Korean alphabet" (Pyong-Hi Ahn), "Graphical ingenuity in the Korean writing system: With new reference to calligraphy" (Sang-Oak Lee), "The vowel system of the Korean alphabet and Korean readings of Chinese characters" (Sinhang Kang), "The invention of the alphabet and the history of the Korean language" (S. Robert Ramsey), "The structure of phonological units in Han'gûl" (Chin W. Kim), "The phonological analysis reflected in the Korean writing system" (Young-Key Kim-Renaud), "Orthographic divergence in South and North Korea: Toward a unified spelling system" (Ho-Min Sohn), as well as "Experimentation with Han'gûl in Russia and the USSR, 1914-1937" (Ross King).

The papers can roughly be divided into three thematic spheres: the nature and origin of the Korean alphabet (Ki-Moon Lee, Gari Ledyard, Pyong-Hi Ahn, Sang-Oak Lee, Robert Ramsey), the phonological correlates of the Korean letters (Sinhang Kang, Chin W. Kim, Young-Key Kim-Renaud), and the history of the Korean orthography (Ho-Min Sohn, Ross King). Most papers are relatively long, detailed, and well annotated, and all are of a high quality. Moreover, they form an integrated whole, which makes the volume the most useful general reference on the Korean script available today. Obviously, the successful result is to the merit of both the qualified contributors and a competent editor.

To take up only the question concerning the origin of the Korean alphabet, the volume illustrates the variety of opinions prevailing on the matter. There are actually two questions that have to be answered: On the one hand, what was the personal degree of *involvement* of King Sejong? And, on the other, what were the *sources* of the Korean script? In his contribution, Ki-Moon Lee, while recognizing the influence of Chinese phonological thinking, defends the view that King Sejong more or less single-handedly designed and implemented the new script. In spite of the arguments presented by Lee, it is difficult to become convinced on this point. Assigning the script to the sole person of the king would make the latter into a supernatural cultural hero who lived out of the context of his own time.

Gari Ledyard, who, coincidentally, holds the *King Sejong Professorship of Korean Studies* at Columbia University, argues that the greatness of the great king is not diminished even if we recognize that he did rely on assistants, specialists and collaborators. In the case of the Korean script, this is as obvious as in other aspects of the King's activities. Moreover, even the collaborators did not work in a vacuum. We may therefore confidently assume that the Korean script was influenced by several external sources of inspiration, including, at least, the following: (1) Chinese philosophical thinking, (2) Chinese calligraphic principles, (3) Chinese phonological thinking, (4) Indo-Tibetan phonological thinking, (4) Uighuro-Mongolic and Indo-Tibetan alphabetic writing, (5) Khitan and Jurchen syllabic writing, and (6) the vPhagspa letters.

Over the years, Ledyard has been the most important proponent of the claim that it was the vPhagspa (*hP'ags-pa*, *'Phags-pa*) script that gave the forms for some of the basic Korean consonant letters. This claim has been supported by many other Western scholars, most recently by Roger Finch (*Studia Orientalia* 87: 79-100), but it has generally not been accepted by Koreans. It is also vehemently criticized by Taylor & Taylor in their book (pp. 225-229). Objectively thinking, the evidence is perhaps not binding, but the possibility of a connection lies very close at hand in view of both the actual letter shapes and the general historical situation.

A most interesting detail which Ledyard now, as it seems, has definitively solved and which speaks in favour of the vPhagspa hypothesis concerns the so-called 'Old Seal Script', which since the earliest times of the Korean script (1444) has been mentioned as one of its models. Later scholarship has normally taken this information at its face value, assuming that the *gu-zhuan* (Sino-Korean *ko-jôn*) 'Old Seal' refers to the Chinese seal script (*zhuan*). Ledyard, however, shows (pp. 63-70) that it actually refers to [*Meng*]*gu-zhuan* 'Mongolian Seal', by which, most probably, the vPhagspa script is to be understood. Since we thus *know* that the vPhagspa connection is suggested by Korean sources themselves, there is little reason to doubt the matter.

On the other hand, there is no reason to deny the genius of King Sejong. His personal involvement was the basic factor lying behind the Korean script. Also, he

and his collaborators did use their models in a creative way. They not only combined the best sides of a variety of other scripts, but they were also engaged in high-level theoretical innovation. Very early by world standards, they operated, either explicitly or implicitly, with phonemes, graphemes, and distinctive features. The graphic similarity between the letters for the laryngeals (**Ø**, **q**, **h**) and the velar nasal (**ng**) also suggests an understanding of the principle of complementarity (initial **Ø-** vs. final **-ng**), or perhaps of the 'rhinoglottophilic' relationship which possibly exists between the sounds concerned.

One of the crucial properties of the Korean script is that it combines the principle of alphabetic writing with the Sinitic tradition of syllabic structuring. To describe this property, Taylor & Taylor (p. 230) classify the Korean script as an 'alphabetic syllabary'. We could also speak of a *phonosyllabic* script, to which the *logosyllabic* Chinese script may be opposed. As both Sang-Oak Lee and Chin W. Kim emphasize in their papers, the functioning of the Korean script depends directly on the grouping of the letters into syllabic blocks. Modern readability studies show that without these blocks, with a simple linear sequence of the letters, the script would be much less effective. It is therefore interesting to recall the historical experiments of linear writing, made among the Koreans in Russia and described in detail by Ross King. Afterwards, it is not difficult to see why these experiments remained so unsuccessful.

The sources of the block principle form another potential object for deeper research. There were, without doubt, several sources, and Chinese characters were certainly among them, for they are also syllabic blocks, though not alphabetic. Another source may again have been the vPhagspa script, in which syllables are separated from each other, even if the letters within the syllables are arranged in a straight line. It seems, however, that the blocks present in the Khitan Small script as well as, more rarely, in the Jurchen (Small?) script, may also have served as a stimulus to King Sejong's script-planning team. The Khitan and Jurchen blocks operate at the word level, combining syllabic signs into a coherent word, while the Korean blocks are syllabic and combine letters into a syllable. However, in both cases, blocks are built from elements carrying only phonetic information, which is not the case with Chinese characters.

Even so, the ultimate and most important stimulus underlying the formation of the independent writing traditions in both Korea and Japan was the Chinese script. While interesting new concepts and hypotheses are currently developing on issues pertaining to the origin and earliest stages of the Chinese characters, there are many other dimensions of Chinese writing that also call for attention. The calligraphic dimension, for instance, is dealt with in two new monographic publications by Monika Drexler and Adele Schlombs:

Monika Drexler, *Daoistische Schriftmagie: Interpretationen zu den Schriftamuletten* fu *im Daozang*. (Münchener Ostasiatische Studien, 68.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1994. xviii + 304 pp., incl. 88 plates. ISBN 3-515-07172-5 (paperback).

Adele Schlombs, *Huai-su and the Beginnings of Wild Cursive Script in Chinese Calligraphy*. (Münchener Ostasiatische Studien, 75.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998. [ix +] 304 pp., incl. 88 plates. ISBN 3-515-07172-5 (paperback).

Although both of these works are rather specialized, they illustrate some of the central aspects of Chinese calligraphy, especially those connected with philosophy and religion. Adele Schlombs has undertaken to analyze the life of Huaisu, a Tang dynasty monk (AZ 725/737-782–), who was already a celebrated calligrapher in his own time and is widely respected as a pioneer of the 'wild cursive script' (*kuang-cao*). Schlombs recapitulates the personal life and artistic career of Huaisu and shows that he was, indeed, an innovator who set a new trend in calligraphic thinking. Huaisu's calligraphy was regarded by contemporaries as exceptionally 'unrestrained', 'vigorous', 'emotional', as well as 'novel' and 'unique'. Among the most famous later admirers of Huaisu, Schlombs mentions Mao Zedong, who, like Huaisu, came from what is today Hunan.

The main part of the book (pp. 44-116) contains an analysis of Huaisu's 'Autobiography' (*Zixutie*), a handscroll preserved at the National Palace Museum of Taipei and available in many calligraphic publications. The scroll contains a brief report by Huaisu of his life, with ample inclusion of contemporary evaluations. Huaisu, though living the life of a rather eccentric Tang dynasty scholar, was clearly very much concerned about the reception of his calligraphic oeuvre. Unfortunately, the scroll gives little factual information on the personal history of its author, though it does illustrate – and is certainly meant to illustrate – his aesthetic goals and ideals. Most importantly, the 'Autobiography' is itself a work of art and remains the main source on Huaisu's calligraphic style.

With such a background and significance, the question concerning the authenticity of the scroll emerges as a central one. Schlombs devotes a careful discussion (pp. 73-104) to the seals and colophons on the scroll, which start with the Five Dynasties period and end only with the last Qing emperor. She also compares the situation with the available historical information on the various versions of the scroll. The conclusion is that the extant scroll is *not* original, but most probably a late Song tracing copy to which older seals and colophons were retrospectively added. Nevertheless, it is likely to convey the original calligraphy more or less intact, which means that it can be compared with other works attributed to Huaisu.

Schlombs concludes her monograph with a comparative analysis of these other works (pp. 117-152).

The one common-sense issue that remains somewhat unclear to the reader is to what extent Schlombs has really been able to investigate the actual Palace Museum scroll. Her arguments and conclusions seem to be based on philological, historical, and stylistic comparisons only. One would, however, presume that a technical examination of the calligraphy, colophons, and seals on the scroll would also, and even more convincingly, reveal the secondary nature of the text. Under a microscope, a *tracing* copy can hardly look the same as an original piece of free-hand calligraphy. Just what the differences are is an interesting question to which Schlombs does not provide an answer.

The 'wild cursive' is often connected with the concept of 'naturalness', which is one of the central ideals of Chan Buddhism. Not surprisingly, there are indications that Chan Buddhism was the source of Huaisu's inspiration. In a very similar framework, Monika Drexler discusses the calligraphic ideals of Daoism. These are more intimately connected with the 'magical' dimensions of writing. The Daoist characters have nothing of the freedom and simplicity of the cursive, but rather, they tend to be extremely complicated and artificial. The one thing they share with the cursive script is, however, that they are almost illegible. They are characters for the eye and the mind, but not signs of a writing system meant to convey easily decodable linguistic messages.

Drexler first discusses the history of the concept *fu* 'tally', which in Daoist usage means any Chinese character specially modified for magical purposes. She then goes on examining the methods by which a regular character is transformed into a magical symbol. These methods have nothing to do with normal calligraphy, although they involve operations such as prolongation, abbreviation, permutation, and cursivization. The resulting magical symbols typically show an extremely complex structure of entangled curved lines, as illustrated by Drexler in the appendix, which contains a list of Daoist characters (pp. 203-232) arranged according to a special set of Daoist radicals (nos. 1-122).

In the main part of her work (pp. 23-83), Drexler presents a translation of the relevant section in the Daoist text (Daozang 1227) *Taishang zhuguo jiumin zonghen biyao* (Drexler's translation: 'Grundlagen genereller Wahrheiten des Allerhöchsten zur Hilfe des Landes und Errettung des Volkes'), compiled by Yuan Miaozong (AZ 1116). The text follows the so-called Tianxin 'Heavenly Heart' tradition and contains detailed instructions concerning the writing of magic characters, accompanied by corresponding philosophical and astrological explanations as well as magical spells. Apart from modified Chinese characters, the text also includes 'Pseudo-Sanskrit' symbols.

With the monographs by Schlombs and Drexler now available, it is not uninteresting to compare with each other the two very different traditions of Chinese

writing: the 'wild cursive' of Huaisu and the magic symbols of Yuan Miaozong. Obviously, the two traditions serve very different audiences. Although externally highly sophisticated, the Daoist magic is very shallow, and is meant to serve people hardly literate themselves. By contrast, the 'wild cursive', although formally reduced, is accessible only to the truly sophisticated literati mind. In a more general context, the Chinese tradition of cursive script is universal art, while the Daoist symbols remain at the level of local sorcery. This is not to say that Daoism and the Daoist characters are not worthy of study – they form an integral part of Chinese folk religion and should certainly be studied as such.

However it may be, the mystery of Chinese writing continues to inspire even modern artists. Among the more recent developments, there is the *Tianshu* 'Heavenly Book', or 'Book from the Sky', by Xu Bing (4 vols., Peking 1991), which contains xylographic texts in beautifully cut Sinitic characters which, however, are not readable, since they represent a 'heavenly' script. In a masterful manner, Xu combines transparency and opacity to create a script that raises associations without disclosing its content. This is exactly how the Chinese feel about other Sinitic scripts, especially the mediaeval Khitan, Jurchen and Tangut scripts. It has been assumed that the Tangut script, in particular, has provided a stimulus to Xu in his work.

The Tangut script remains today the last major enigma in the Sinitic world of writing. We know that the Khitan and Jurchen scripts were basically *logographic* (Khitan Large), *logosyllabic* (Jurchen), or *syllabic* (Khitan Small) systems. The material source in these cases was the Chinese script, possibly a specific northern variety of the Chinese script that was adopted and normalized for official use by the founders of the Liao and Jin empires. The Tangut script, however, is genetically *not* a derivate of the Chinese script, although typologically it fulfils the criteria of being a Sinitic script. How, then, did the Tangut script originate? The least likely possibility is that it was 'invented'. As has often been noted even in connection with the Korean script, scripts are *not* invented – they develop. Unfortunately, no source can be pointed out for the Tangut script.

What is even more puzzling is that the Tangut script can be understood, but not read. The prevailing opinion among Tangut specialists is that the Tangut 'characters' are logograms (often mistakenly called 'ideograms') very much like the Chinese characters, though without a corresponding system of internal structure. The attempts made so far to identify semantic or phonetic components in the Tangut 'characters' may be considered unsuccessful, and the question remains whether the Tangut script has this kind of structure at all. On the other hand, without *some* kind of internal structure, the Tangut script could not have survived during such a long period (several centuries) and in such a large variety of forms and functions (regular and cursive, printed and handwritten, official and casual). The extant Tangut

material, though numbering thousands of items, must still represent a tiny part of what was once written down in the Tangut script.

In the current situation, the only way to approach the Tangut 'characters' is to arrange them according to the principles of Chinese lexicography. This task has been accomplished by the Chinese Tangutologist Li Fanwen:

> **Li Fanwen**, *Xia-Han Zidian. Xixia-Chinese Dictionary.* Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe, 1997. [78 +] 1300 pp., incl. 5 plates. RMB 1000,–. ISBN 7-5004-2113-3 (hardback and cased).

The Tangut dictionary of Li Fanwen is the result of a lifelong work of its author and represents, without doubt, a monumental achievement. The volume contains an introductory section comprising a brief history of Tangut studies, as well as a survey of the phonetic and graphic principles followed by the author. The dictionary section (pp. 1-1087) contains 6,000 entries, each corresponding to a Tangut 'character', phonetically 'transcribed', graphically 'analyzed', glossed in Chinese and English, and illustrated by selected examples from actual texts. The volume concludes with a Tangut, Chinese, and English index.

The physical preparation of Li Fanwen's dictionary, with its 6,000 different 'characters', must have been a painstaking job, as is also indicated by the author himself in the preface. Since it was commercially impossible to prepare a special Tangut font for electronic typesetting, large parts of the work had to be done by hand. This explains the price of the volume, which even by the current Chinese standards is very high (1000 RMB), and it also serves as an acceptable excuse for the sometimes low quality of the Tangut printed sections. With this background in mind, one can only admire the result.

The dictionary uses two different systems to classify the Tangut 'characters'. The actual entries are ordered according to the so-called four-corner system, as explained in the introductory section, while the Tangut index (pp. 1091-1166) is based on a system of 'radicals' (listed on pp. 1088-1090). It seems that the latter approach is considerably more convenient for the identification and location of a Tangut 'character', while the four-corner system appears difficult and unpractical. People used to the four-corner system in Chinese dictionaries (like that of I. M. Oshanin) may have a different opinion, but the relatively complex forms of the Tangut 'characters' are clearly less easy to classify with this system than the basic strokes present in the Chinese script.

As far as the 'reading' of the Tangut 'characters' is concerned, Li Fanwen follows the tradition initiated by N. A. Nevskii and Nishida Tatsuo and today used, most prominently, by Ks. B. Kepping. The actual 'transcription' of the Tangut 'syllables' used by Li Fanwen is based on the modifications suggested by the Taiwanese scholar Kung Huang-ch'eng (Gong Huangcheng). The differences as

compared with the other approaches to the 'reading' of Tangut are small and mainly concern the transcription of phonological details. However, the fundamental question of Tangut studies is whether these 'readings' are at all on correct lines. Common sense points to the contrary, as was noted by Luc Kwanten, but, on the other hand, there is no alternative for the moment.

As it is, Tangut textual studies can relatively successfully be conducted in separation from Tangut linguistic studies. With the new dictionary we have the long-awaited basic tool that allows us to approach any Tangut text from almost any point of view except the linguistic. This allows the extant corpus of Tangut texts to be used for historical and cultural studies without having to touch upon the question concerning the substance and identity of the Tangut language. For many purposes, it is not relevant how the Tangut 'characters' were pronounced. On the other hand, the dictionary will provide a most important tool for future studies on the actual *decipherment* of the Tangut script.

It goes without saying that, in spite of its great potential, Li Fanwen's *magnum opus* can never become a best-seller. By any estimate, the number of persons able to 'read' Tangut texts with any fluency, even with the help of a dictionary, must be less than 20 for the whole world. Here lies also an obvious danger. The exclusivity of the field is no guarantee that Tangutology is in every respect developing on rational lines. However, to make true sense of this field would require several life-times of work. Some go insane, some resign, and those who continue may not have the brightest insight.

JUHA JANHUNEN

THE UDEGHE LANGUAGE LOST AND REFOUND

Among the most gruesome memories left by the decades of proletarian dictatorship in Russia are the dying minority languages, which are concentrated in the northern and eastern parts of the former Soviet state. One of the regions where linguistic extinction is particularly devastating is the Russian Far East, and one of the languages today already well into its terminal phase is Udeghe, also known as Ude, Udehe or Udihe. Udeghe was the language of a population that was recorded as ca. 1,850 individuals in late Czarist times (1897). The population has remained stable since then, but the proportion of native speakers among the Udeghe has rapidly come down from close to 100 percent to ca. 24 percent in 1989 and probably no more than 5 percent today. This means that the youngest fluent speakers of Udeghe are all over 50, probably over 60 years old, and the last speaker is likely to pass away in less than 20-30 years.

Rather surprisingly, with the imminent extinction of the language, interest in it has recently risen. After decades of little progress, several new publications have suddenly appeared on Udeghe. Altogether, there are today several professional linguists in several parts of the world (Russia, Canada, Europe) who seriously work, or have worked, on Udeghe. The main authorities on the language all have a Russian background and are: A. X. Girfanova (St. Petersburg), I. V. Kormushin (Moscow), I. A. Nikolaeva (London), Ye. V. Perexval'skaya (Moscow), and M. D. Simonov (Novosibirsk). Of these, Perexval'skaya has mostly confined her work to the practical issue of language revival, an effort which, unfortunately, comes too late for Udeghe. Of the others, Kormushin, Nikolaeva, and Simonov have produced five volumes of information which, taken together, vastly surpass everything that had been written on Udeghe before.

Indeed, for several decades, the principal source on Udeghe grammar and lexicon used to be the small Udeghe-Russian dictionary by Ye. R. Shneider (1936), with its very concise grammatical synopsis. Apart from this classic work, there were only the brief sketches compiled by O. P. Sunik for the collective works *Yazyki narodov SSSR* (1968) and *Yazyki mira* (1997), and by K. H. Menges for the *Handbuch der Orientalistik* (1968). In this situation, the publication of I. V. Kormushin's work marks the beginning of a new era:

> **I. V. Kormushin**, *Udyxeiskii (udehgeiskii) yazyk: Materialy po etnografii, ocherk fonetiki i grammatiki, teksty i perevody, slovar'*. Moskva: Nauka, 1998. 320 pp. ISBN 5-02-011292-5.

Kormushin's book is the result of long preparation. His field work among the Udeghe was carried out as early as 1964-74, under conditions when many more

speakers were available than today, and the manuscript for the book was more or less ready in 1978. The late publication is probably mainly connected with the author's parallel career in Turkology, to which field he has made significant contributions in the meantime. Additionally, there may have been the political issue that the Udeghe are among the most seriously affected victims of the Soviet ethnic policies, and the fate of their language may therefore not have been a politically correct topic in the Brezhnev era context. In any case, as a Tungusologist, Kormushin belongs to the generation who was still able to enjoy the guidance and support of the greatest expert in the field, V. I. Cincius.

The volume is actually a multidisciplinary handbook on the Udeghe and their language, for it consists of four sections: (1) Ethnography ("Materialy po etnografii udyxeicev"), (2) Grammar ("Ocherk fonetiki i grammatiki"), (3) Texts ("Teksty i perevody"), and (4) Glossary ("Slovar'"). In view of the relatively recent work *Istoriya i kul'tura udehgeicev* by N. V. Ivashhenko et al. (1989), the ethnographical section might appear less necessary than the others, but it has to be said that, with his linguistic competence, Kormushin is able to comment on issues not accessible to the ordinary ethnographer or anthropologist. For instance, he makes it clear that the original native form of the ethnonym Udeghe is **udihe*, which etymologically is a plural in **-se* from the basic stem **udi*. He also correctly explains the parallel ethnonym *kääkal(a)*, also used for the Udeghe, as being based on the stem *kää* 'edge, margin, shore'.

Discussing the internal taxonomy of the Tungusic family (pp. 9-12), Kormushin is likewise basically right in classifying Udeghe, together with its northern neighbour and close relative Oroch, as an intermediate (Central) branch between Ewenki-Ewen (Northern Tungusic) and Manchu-Nanai (Southern Tungusic). Further, he notes that the northern features of Udeghe are primary (substratal), while the southern features are secondary (adstratal). Relating this to the ethnonymic data, he proposes that the northern component was contributed by the bearers of the name *udihe*, while the southern component might be connected with the people identified as *kääkal*. However this may be, it is clear that the ancestors of the modern Udeghe-Oroch speakers emerged as a separate speech community already prior to the historically and archaeologically documented period of Jurchen presence in the Amur and Ussuri regions.

Kormushin then goes on to analyze various aspects of Udeghe material and spiritual culture, presenting at the same time stimulating etymological comments on the relevant lexical material. Of particular interest are his notes on taboo and the bear cult (pp. 29-33). Mythological themes are also touched upon in the texts (pp. 103-200), among which the most interesting one (Nr. 19) is perhaps the story of a young man whose elder sister marries a bear and ultimately becomes (or actually turns out to be) a bear herself. This tale contains the clues to an understanding of the mythological background of both the Siberian bear cult and the Sino-

Manchurian female shamanism. Related topics are dealt with in some other tales. Unfortunately, Kormushin does not present all of his folkloric text materials in this volume, but supplies only 20 tales out of a total of at least 51.

Kormushin's lexical data are contained in the relatively large glossary (pp. 201-315), with ca. 3,000 brief entries. Many of the words presented by him were previously unknown, and were not available to, for instance, the editors of the *Comparative Dictionary of the Tungusic Languages* (1975-77). Kormushin uses a Cyrillic-based transcription with additional signs and diacritics for some special phonemes and features. The grammatical section (pp. 35-192) illustrates well the traditional priorities of Tungusic language studies, in that it contains only a single passage on syntax (pp. 101-102), brief notes on morphology and derivation (pp. 84-101), and a remarkably detailed treatment of phonology (pp. 35-84), especially of the vowel system (pp. 37-65).

The Udeghe vowel system is notoriously a controversial issue. Kormushin continues to defend the questionable interpretation of the so-called laryngealized and pharyngealized vowels as sequences containing a glottal stop or a pharyngeal fricative, respectively. Although historically and morphophonologically correct, this interpretation is not supported by the synchronic phonological and phonetic facts. A more likely alternative is offered by the prosodic (tonal) interpretation, as recently argued by myself (*Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 88, 1999). However, Kormushin's analysis of the Udeghe vowel qualities is probably correct. He establishes as many as nine distinctive qualities (*a ä e é o ö u ü i*). The most problematic case is *ü*, which is very rare and has distributional restrictions different from the other vowels.

As if to balance the somewhat conventional approach of Kormushin, I. A. Nikolaeva offers a refreshingly modern description of Udeghe grammar:

Irina Nikolaeva, *A Grammar of Udihe*. Proefschrift, Universiteit Leiden, 1999. xliii + 551 pp.

Nikolaeva's work is not only the most extensive description of the Udeghe language, but also one of the most detailed grammars of any Tungusic language, including Manchu. As a 'modern' grammar, its only predecessor is the recent work on *Evenki* by Igor Nedjalkov (1997). In fact, Nikolaeva's work, though a public document (academic dissertation), is not yet officially published in book form, which makes it a somewhat premature object for a review. In view of its importance, however, it deserves to be discussed even in its current form, which probably does not substantially differ from the forthcoming published version (in the Mouton Grammar Library series).

Since Nikolaeva is well known as a wide-ranging specialist on North Asian ethnolinguistics, it comes as no big surprise that the first major grammar of Udeghe was prepared by her. It may nevertheless be recalled that Nikolaeva's other fields include Yukaghir and Khanty studies, and her treatment of Udeghe without doubt incorporates insights provided by this mixed background. Clearly, her strong side is the theory of grammatical description, while the field of comparative Tungusic studies is not in the immediate focus of her interests. Her field work among the Udeghe was carried out relatively recently, between 1989 and 1997, which means that the situation of the language was already very different from that recorded by Kormushin. Apart from the Russian school of Tungusology, the academic context of Nikolaeva's work has been formed by the Leiden school of linguistics. The person whose organizational support has most immediately contributed to her project on the Udeghe is Fredrik Kortlandt.

While it may still be too early to evaluate Nikolaeva's work in detail, it is illustrative to list the themes she discusses. After a brief introductory chapter (1), there follow two chapters (2-3) on phonology ("Segmental phonology", "Phonotax and prosody"), nine chapters (4-12) on morphology and parts of speech ("Noun morphology", "Nominal derivation", "Adjectives", "Verbal morphology", "Verbal derivation", "Pronouns", "Adverbs and postpositions", "Numerals and quantifiers", "Particles and extra-clausal elements"), and *twelve* chapters (13-24) on syntax and discourse ("Noun phrase", "Verbal valence", "Grammatical relations", "Valence-changing operations", "Copular clauses", "Complex sentences", "Relative clause", "Complement subordinate clause", "Adverbial clause", "Coreference", "Questions and negation", "Information structure and word order").

In the chapters on syntax, Nikolaeva quotes the data in the fashionable trilineal notation (phonemic transcription, functional analysis, translation), which certainly helps to illustrate the syntactic and morphological structures involved. The same convention is used in the selection of texts (Nos. 1-15, pp. 493-544), part of which derive from published materials, including Kormushin's work. Some of the texts recorded by Nikolaeva herself are, like those of Kormushin, mythologically interesting, and, again, we have a tale that has implications to the bear-sister myth (No. 10, a less transparent version of the same tale is contained in Kormushin's Nr. 32). In the discourse analysis, Nikolaeva offers numerous discoveries never previously made for Udeghe (or for any other Tungusic language). Some of the categories and phenomena she discusses include referentiality, topicalization, and evidentiality (including the 'mirative evidential').

While all of this is important and innovative, two suggestions might be made to Nikolaeva before the printed version of her work is finalized. First, it would be helpful to reconsider some details of the phonemic transcription (not necessarily the phonemization). One of the consequences of using data processing technology for linguistics is that it has forced us to limit the number of extra symbols and

diacritics. The Udeghe consonants, for instance, can both easily and conveniently be written *without* any extra symbols if we only accept certain simple conventions (palatal glide and nasal: *y ny*; affricates: *c j*; velar nasal: *ng*). The Udeghe front vowels inevitably require the use of the umlaut dots (*ä ö ü*) as well as, possibly, the acute accent (*é*), but the long, laryngealized and pharyngealized series can well be written as sequences (*aa aha aqa* or *aa ah aq*), which is also convenient for the morphological segmentation of inflected forms.

The other suggestion concerns the international name of the Udeghe language, which Nikolaeva renders as *Udihe*. Her arguments are apparently the same as those of Kormushin (Cyrillic *udyxe*). However, language names in international usage should be based on practical considerations, tradition, and readability. In principle, they should also follow the normative usage of the official state language in the country where the language is spoken (in this case Russian *udehge* : *udehgeiskii*). If possible, they should be compatible with the orthographies and pronunciation norms of not only English, but also of other major international languages, perhaps especially French. For all these reasons, the spelling *Udeghe* would seem to be the most appropriate shape for international usage, irrespective of how exactly (or inexactly) it corresponds to the original native shape of the ethnonym (which, moreover, may vary dialectally).

It is therefore not without satisfaction that one notes the title of the new Udeghe dictionary, which contains the spelling *Udeghe*:

> **V. T. Kyalundzyuga & M. D. Simonov**, *An Udeghe Language Dictionary: Khor River Region Dialect*, I-III. Preprint, published by **Alfred F. Majewicz**. (International Institute of Ethnolinguistic and Oriental Studies, Monograph Series, 15/1-3.) Stęszew: IIEOS, 1998-99. xx + xi + xvi + 1287 pp. ISBN 83-902273-9-89 (hardbound set).

This is a monumental dictionary, in Tungusology matched in size (though not in importance) only by the *Lamutisches Wörterbuch* of Gerhard Doerfer et al. (1980). For Udeghe, a dictionary of this size comes as a complete surprise, as it was specifically this language (together with Oroch) that was the least-documented Tungusic idiom. By all tokens, the Udeghe language was destined to disappear before its lexical resources could be recorded. The new dictionary is the result of M. D. Simonov's joint work with an educated Udeghe individual and language activist, Valentina Tunsyanovna Kyalundzyuga. The fact that the dictionary was published so well and reliably is, however, to the merit of Alfred F. Majewicz (Poznań and Stęszew), the distinguished Polish ethnolinguist and specialist on the languages of East, Northeast, and Southeast Asia.

The publication is marked as a 'preprint' mainly because the main dictionary part is copied without further editing from a computer print made in Novosibirsk. The substance of the work is, however, in a more or less final and completely usable shape, so one wonders how the final version of the dictionary could essentially differ from the present one. Perhaps the most clear indication of the 'preprint' character of the work is that its title has three different forms. The basic title *An Udeghe Language Dictionary* (on the dust cover) appears also in the form *A Dictionary of the Udeghe* (*Udihe*) *Language* (on the technical data page) as well as, most curiously, in the form *A Kyalundzyuga-Simonov Dictionary of the Udeghe* (*Udihe*) *Language* (on the actual title page). Which one of these forms is to be used in referring to the work remains to be decided by the reader. The final version, however, if ever published, will probably bear a Russian title, since Russian is the metalanguage of this dictionary. The present edition also has a Russian parallel title (on the pre-title page), which is: *Kyalundzyugi-Simonova slovar' udehgeiskogo yazyka*.

As is stated in the preface to the work, the dictionary is based on the Khor dialect, the Udeghe dialect that today has probably the largest number of active speakers. The list of informants (pp. 49-53) comprises 19 persons, all bearing the surnames Kyalundzyuga or Kimonka and born between 1894 and 1936. Ominously, the youngest informant is V. T. Kyalundzyuga herself, who was born in the same year as Shneider published his dictionary (1936). The preface also recapitulates the history of Udeghe lexicology, which, apart from Shneider, comprises the 'Oroch' vocabulary of Peter Schmidt (1928) as well as a few other word lists of historical interest only.

Apart from the main section (Udeghe-Russian, pp. 61-1148), the new dictionary comprises a useful alphabetic index (Russian-Udeghe, pp. 1149-1253) as well as special lists of botanical, ornithological, ichthyological, entomological, and ethnographical terms with no Russian counterparts (pp. 1253-1255). There are also lists of toponyms, anthroponyms, clan names, and local Russian terms (pp. 1255-1260). Perhaps most importantly for etymological studies, there is a list of 1414 lexical items recorded for the first time from Udeghe. Among these, there are derivatives of known roots as well as ca. 750 entirely new roots (including proper names). New words will possibly also be contained in the supplementary fourth volume of the dictionary, which is already announced for publication. Even so, it is not so much the number of entries as the amount of accompanying semantic and syntactic information that is important. The lexical corpus of Kyalundzyuga & Simonov is of roughly the same size as that of Kormushin (ca. 3,000), but the presentation of the data is about ten times as detailed.

The orthography used in the dictionary is based on a practical application of the Cyrillic alphabet. It is well known that Udeghe had a Roman-based orthography and literary language in the 1930s, which, however, ceased to exist with the purge

of Shneider (1937) – the martyr of Udeghe studies. Unlike most other languages of the 'Far North', Udeghe never got a second start with a Cyrillic orthography until the 1990s. Kyalundzyuga has herself published a school primer (Khabarovsk, 1999), which uses the same orthography as the dictionary. Unfortunately, this orthography is, in the details, not the same as the one used by Kormushin. Also, considering the on-going efforts on language revigoration, neither of these orthographies is simple enough to be easily acquired by people whose knowledge of the language is rudimentary at best.

For the scholarly audience, however, Kyalundzyuga & Simonov is likely to remain the ultimate source on the Udeghe lexicon. For comparative Tungusic studies, its special importance lies in the fact that it records the southeasternmost Amur Tungusic language. The southwesternmost language, Nanai, has long been relatively well described, and with the recent publication of the *Uiruta go jiten* of Jiro Ikegami (1997) the last word has also been said on the northeasternmost language, Orok. This leaves only the three intermediate Amur Tungusic languages – Kili, Ulcha and Oroch – insufficiently documented. It is unlikely that the latter will ever be described on a comparable level, but this loss is perhaps not fatal for the understanding of Tungusic.

Juha Janhunen