

REVIEWS

KRÓLIKOWSKA-JEDLIŃSKA, Natalia: *Law and Division of Power in the Crimean Khanate (1532–1774) with Special Reference to the Reign of Murad Giray (1678–1683)*. Leiden: Brill, 2018, xxiv + 287 pp. ISBN: 978-9-004-36653-4.

The two first decades of the 21st century witnessed rapid progress in the field of the study of the Crimea in the early modern period. This phenomenon can be explained first of all by improvements in accessibility of post-Soviet (Russian and Ukrainian) and Turkish archives. As a result, scholars working in the area of Crimean Studies discovered a great number of new, hitherto unknown sources pertaining to the history of the Crimean Khanate, and also began publishing already known ones. Especially significant in this regard is the fact that scholars began analysing and translating such important corpus of sources as texts of the Crimean *sharia* court records (*şer'ıye sicilleri*), whose originals are kept in the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg.¹ At the same time, one should notice that these publications focus mostly on the history of the Crimean Khanate while the study of the Ottoman possessions in the Crimean peninsula (i.e. “Kefe province” or *Eyālet-i Kefē*) still remains at a very superficial level. Only one of the Crimea-related *defters* (i.e. Ottoman tax registers) was published so far (Inalcık 1996), while attempts to study *defters* from the 16th and 17th centuries date back to the 1970s and the 1980s (Fisher 1979: 215–226 and 1981:

¹ These sources became accessible to the scholars only since the beginning of the 1990s. This is why it was only recently that first translations and analyses of the *sicils* began to appear (Çavuş 2019: 117–141; Rustemov 2017; Stefaniak-Rak 2015: 65–78 and 2018: 109–127; Yaşa 2017 and 2018; Yılmaz 2009). Russian and Ukrainian scholars used *sicils* very seldom (Kizilov and Prokhorov 2011: 437–452).

135–170; Veinstein 1980). There is only one monograph focusing on the history of Kefe province from 1475 to 1600 (Öztürk 2000).

It is against this background that one should analyse the recent book by a Polish scholar, Natalia Królikowska-Jedlińska, which is dedicated to the analysis of law and division of power in the Crimean Khanate from 1532 to 1774, with special emphasis placed on the reign of the khan Murad Giray (1678–1683). Although the book focuses on the Crimean Khanate only, it also discusses relations between the Khanate and the Ottoman Empire. In addition, it analyses legal cases of Ottoman subjects (especially those from Mangup / Mangub judicial district), who used the Tatar courts of justice (pp. 206–210). The book is based on a variety of published and archival sources in European and Oriental languages with special attention given to the aforementioned Crimean sharia court records (*sicils*). One should also mention that the scholar worked in several European (Austrian, Bulgarian, Italian and Polish archives), which so far had seldom been used by students of Crimean history. The book contains references to the latest publications related to Crimean and Ottoman history in a host of European and Oriental languages.

There are several important research questions which the book attempts to answer. What were the limitations of the khans' power and authority as a judge and lawgiver? What were the titles and functions of the khans' officials? What exactly were the roles of the khans' deputies, *kalga* and *nuraddin*? What were the relations between the khans and tribal aristocracy (*beğs*)? How did the Crimean sharia courts function? What was specific about the Khanate's law and what was the social, economic and geographic background of the court users? Although there are quite a few studies on the general history of the Crimean Khanate, none of these pivotal questions has been properly answered so far.²

The book begins with the analysis of the historiography of the Crimean Khanate (pp. 1–16) and the survey of sources (pp. 17–38). For obvious reasons, special attention is given to the problems of understanding and correct the interpretation of the *sicils* (pp. 17–25). Then the author explains why the epoch of Murad Giray (ruled from 1678 to 1683), who was made a focus of her book, became a “groundbreaking period in the relations between the Ottoman Empire and its European neighbours” (p. 39). Królikowska-Jedlińska describes the khan's life prior to his ascent to the throne and then analyses two contradictory images of the khan that were formed by Tatar chroniclers—that of a pious Muslim warrior-*gazi* and that of a drunken troublemaker (pp. 41–52). It is especially interesting that according to some sources, he tried to replace the sharia legal system with Mongol law. For example, instead of the chief judge *kadiasker*, the khan appointed a new official *töre başı* who was supposed to apply a Chingisid law in the state. Nevertheless, this reform proved to be short-lived (pp. 42–43).

Chapter 2 is dedicated to the in-depth analysis of the khan's household, functions of his officials, deputies and the council. It is known that the Girays traced their origin to Chingis Khan. As a result, the khan's household combined both Ottoman and Golden Horde elements. For example, Khanate's most important official bore the

² Some of these issues are briefly analysed in Kizilov 2016: 53–63.

title of *vizier*; khan's household was divided into men's and women's parts (i.e. harem), while the titles and the functions of many officials were exactly the same as in the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand, the Khanate's most powerful noble families (*karaçı*) traced their origins back to the Golden Horde. They were headed by *beğs* "who extended a great influence over the khanate's policy and held significant power within its borders". One may also recall the fact that the khans continued the Mongol custom of levirate marriages. Many taxes (*tumanend*, *savga*, *buralka*, and *koluş-kalanka*) apparently also had Mongol origins.

The institution of the khan's deputies—*kalga* (first deputy) and *nuraddin* (second deputy)—was also of Mongol origin (p. 174). While it was clear that *kalga*'s domain was in Ak Mescid (today's Simferopol), the exact location of *nuraddin*'s seat remains unclear: according to some reports, it was located in Kaçı, according to others, in Bahçesaray, Süren or Bulganak (p. 80). *Kalga* and *nuraddin* both had separate households which were similar in their structure to that of the khan, but somewhat smaller. Their officials were also modelled on those of the khan save that officials of *nureddin* did not have any responsibilities during the time of peace and functioned only during the war. The *kalga* appointed his own *vizier*, *defterdar*, *divan effendi* and *kadı* who participated in his council (p. 73). The *nuraddin* also had a number of officials similar to those of the khan; his status depended largely on his relations with the khan, while the *kalga* enjoyed a permanent semi-autonomous position in the Khanate (p. 82).

Chapter 3 analyses the position of the Khanate's nobles and their relations with the khans. Crimean Tatar aristocracy or *karaçı beğs* were representatives of several important families or tribes (Şirin, Mansur, Argın, Seceut, Barın, and Kıpçak) who traced their origins back to the Golden Horde. The importance of each of these families in varied times depended on a number of factors, but it is believed that the Şirin *beğs* were the most influential among them. *Beğs* appointed their own *kalgas* and *nuraddins* and had the right to summon the general diet that was called *kurultay* in the vicinity of the Kara Su river, on top of Ak Kaya mountains (pp. 101–102).

Kurultays often resulted in important changes in the Khanate's internal and external policies, such as misplacement of khans, participation in military campaigns, etc. In addition to *karaçı beğs*, there also were nobles of non-*karaçı* origin such as Yaşlav / Yaşlav family and Dairs. Unfortunately, the sources remain rather taciturn regarding the status of the landholding of the Crimean tribal aristocracy. Królikowska-Jedlińska suggests that the extent of a *beylik*'s autonomy depended on the status of its owners, while the *beylik* of the Şirins, the most powerful *karaçı* family, should be considered the most powerful (p. 115). It is known that sometimes the *beğs* were strong enough to change the khan's policy or even to dethrone him.

One must say that this somewhat ambivalent and unclear character of relations between the khan and the *beğs* continued well into the 18th century. From my own research, I can say that there were two fairly large settlements where the situation of subdivision of authorities remained especially unclear: in the mountain fortress of Kırk Yer (Çufut Kale) and the town of Or (Or Kapısı)³ situated on the narrow isthmus

³ Also: Turkish and Tatar *Ferahkerman* (official); *Orqapı / Orqapısı* or *Oraqzi*; Slavic *Perekop / Przekop*.

connecting the northern Crimea with southern Ukraine. The former town was officially given to the Yaşlov *beğs*, apparently as a token of appreciation for their active role in the seizure of the fortress in the Middle Ages (Smirnov 1888: 104–106, 120–121). The *yarlık* (charter) of Bahadır Giray of 1637 is the oldest known document which confirms these rights. The *yarlık* of Devlet Giray mentions the appointment of Kutluş *bey* from the Yaşlov clan to the office of the governor of Kırk Yer (Çufut Kale) as late as 1773. However, it is not entirely clear how the Khan, *beys*, and local inhabitants (the Karaite Jews or Karaites) divided their administrative power in the town – in 1608 there still were representatives of the Tatar administration (a military garrison, and a *kadı*) there (Kizilov 2016: 53–63; Firkovich 1890: 62–66).

The situation is not entirely clear with the important town and fortress of Or either. The Ottoman traveller Evliya Çelebi called Or *beys* to be the first among the Crimean *beys*. According to his testimony, the town of Or was under the jurisdiction of *Or bey*. Nevertheless, somewhat later the traveller himself mentioned that *Or bey* received his salary from the town *emin* appointed by the khan. It seems that “Or bey” was, in fact, not more than a title (or position)—and not a product of hereditary pedigree. The title of *Or bey* was usually bestowed on one of the Khan’s relatives, appointed by the khan himself.⁴ According to de Peyssonel, in the 1750s in spite of the fact that *Or bey* was the governor of the fortress, there was also a large Ottoman garrison under the commandment of the *ağa* appointed from Istanbul (de Peyssonel 1787: 17). Again, it is not entirely clear how they divided their authorities in Or.

Chapter 4 analyses the judicial system of the Crimean Khanate. The territory of the Tatar state was divided, on the one hand, into judicial districts-*kazas*; on the other, it was divided between the lands of the khan and the tribal aristocracy. Although much is known about the proceedings in the Crimean courts and about functions of *kadı*’s officials (such as *naibs*, *katibs*, *zabits*, *muhzırs*, and the *beytülmal emini*), a number of issues remain unclear. For example, we still do not know what kind of education the *kadı*s received and what sort of career they could expect. It is also unclear whether the judges in the *beyliks* and the domain of *kalga* were appointed by the khan or by his deputy and *beğs*. Królikowska-Jedlińska suggests that there might have existed a kind of compromise: the judges might have been appointed by the khan, while the choice of particular candidates may have been made by *kalga* and *beğs* (p. 170).

Chapter 5 is devoted to the in-depth analysis of the law and its practical application in the Khanate’s sharia courts—those of *kadıasker*’s court in Bahçesaray and the Kara Su court. As Natalia Królikowska-Jedlińska observed, the law in the Crimea represented a very curious mixture of Islamic traditions and those of the Golden Horde and of the Ottoman Empire. The same principle functioned also in the system of the taxation: for example, *zakat* and *cizye* were canonical Muslim taxes, while *savga* (tax on the spoils of war) and *şişlik* (tax on sheep) were Mongol taxes. Although the scholar discusses the system of the Khanate’s taxation at length, she is forced to state that, unfortunately, “research on the tax system of the Crimean

⁴ A few times the title of *Or bey* was conferred on Şirin *beys* (de Tott 1785: 125; cf. [Tunmann] 1784: 331).

Khanate is still in infancy” (p. 181). A considerable part of this chapter is devoted to the detailed analysis of the Khanate’s system of private and criminal law, statistics, social and gender background of the litigants, their residential affiliation, and many other details. In private matters, Crimean courts usually followed the Hanafi doctrine; in criminal matters, the principle of private persecution was applied in cases such as homicide or bodily harm (p. 216).

In the conclusion, the author again emphasises the interesting character of what she calls a “fragile balance of power” between the main Crimean Khanate’s institutions and various social groups. In her opinion, the Crimean Khanate, to some extent, resembled the system of the limited monarchy which is known to us from several non-Islamic states of Europe. The scholar believes that it was in the second half of the 17th century that the Crimean khans no longer dared to oppose the Ottoman sultans and began to be fully controlled by the latter. In the 18th century, when the European powers came closer to the northern borders of the Ottoman Empire, the Crimea became “just one of many border provinces, threatened with secession or foreign conquest” (p. 223).

The Appendices (pp. 227–257) contain facsimiles, Latin transliterations and translations of several important documents, summaries of the cases judged at the khan’s council from 1678 to 1682 and a list of the officials recorded in the *sicils* during the reign of Murad Giray (pp. 227–257).

To conclude, Natalia Królikowska-Jedlińska’s book on the law and division of power in the Crimean Khanate is a revolutionary breakthrough in our understanding of the internal history of that country. It helps one to understand how the legal system of the Crimean Khanate functioned and what the balance of power was between the khan and tribal aristocracy. However, as the scholar herself acknowledged, many aspects of research of the Crimean Khanate’s history are still “in infancy”, largely because of the fact that not all of the Crimean sharia court records (*sigils*) have been published and analysed. Thus, it is very likely that further development of the study of the Crimea during the early modern period will be directed towards comprehensive research focused on this type of sources. One should also say that we do not have in our hands similar research dedicated to the relations and the balance of power between the Ottoman administration of the Crimea and the Khanate’s authorities. It is to be hoped that such studies will appear soon.

Bibliography

- ÇAVUŞ, Mehmet Caner 2019. ‘67 A 90 Numaralı 1077–1080 (1666–1670) Kırım Kadiasker Defterine (Şer’iyye Siciline) Göre Yahudilerin Sosyo-Kültürel Hayatı [The socio-cultural life of the Jews according to the Crimean kadiasker book (sher’iyye register) no. 67 A 90 1077–1080 (1666–1670)].’ *Vakanüvis – Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi / International Journal of Historical Researches* 4/1: 117–141.
- FIRKOVICH, Z. A. (ed.) [Фиркович, З. А. (изд.)] 1890. *Сборник старинных грамот и узаконений Российской империи касательно прав и состояния русско-подданных караимов*. Санкт-Петербург.

- FISHER, Alan 1979. 'The Ottoman Crimea in the Mid-Seventeenth Century: Some Problems and Preliminary Considerations.' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4: 215–226.
- FISHER, Alan 1981. 'The Ottoman Crimea in the Sixteenth Century.' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5/2: 135–170.
- INALCIK, Halil 1996. *Sources and Studies on the Ottoman Black Sea. Vol. 1. The Customs Register of Caffa, 1487–1490*. Cambridge, Ma.: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University.
- KIZILOV, Mikhail 2016. 'Administrative Structure of the Crimea before and after the Russian Annexation.' *Vostok / Oriens* 5: 53–63.
- KIZILOV, Mikhail and Dmitry PROKHOROV 2011. 'The Development of Crimean Studies in the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, and Ukraine.' *AOH* 64/4: 437–452.
- ÖZTÜRK, Yücel 2000. *Osmanlı Hakimiyetinde Kefe: 1475–1600*. Ankara.
- DE PEYSSONEL, Claude Charles 1787. *Traité sur le commerce de la Mer Noire. Vol. 1*. Paris.
- RUSTEMOV, Oleg [РУСТЕМОВ, Олег] 2017. *Кадияскерские книги Крымского ханства: исследование, тексты и переводы*. Симферополь: Медиацентр им. И. Гаспринского.
- SMIRNOV V. D. [Смирнов, В. Д.] 1888. *Крымское ханство под верховенством Оттоманской Порты*. Санкт-Петербург.
- STEFANIAK-RAK, Katarzyna 2015. 'Karaimi w szariackim sądzie na Krymie w XVII wieku [Karaites in sharia court in the Crimea in the 17th century].' *Almanach Karaimski* 4: 65–78.
- STEFANIAK-RAK, Katarzyna 2018. 'Księga sądowa – tom 10. jako źródło wiedzy o Karaimach z Krymu [Court register: volume 10 as a source of information about the Karaites of the Crimea].' *Almanach Karaimski* 7: 109–127.
- DE TOTT, François 1785. *Memoirs of the Baron de Tott on the Turks and the Tatars. Vol. 2*. Dublin: L. White.
- [TUNMANN, Johann 1784]. 'Der krimische Staat.' In: *A. F. Büschings große Erdbeschreibung. Vol. 4: Das asiatische Rußland und die krimische Tartarei*. Troppau.
- VEINSTEIN, Gilles 1980. 'La population du sud de la Crimée au début de la domination ottomane.' In: *Mémorial Ömer Lutfi Barkan*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient A. Maisonneuve, 227–249.
- YAŞA, Fırat 2017. *Bahçesaray (1650–1675)*. Ph.D. dissertation, Sakarya Üniversitesi.
- YAŞA, Fırat 2018. 'Did Kirazuy Have to Divorce Her Non-Muslim Husband? A Controversial Case of Apostasy and Conversion to Islam in the Bahçesaray Court.' *Al-Qalam* 8: 159–167.
- YILMAZ, Fehmi 2009. 'On Sekizinci Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Kırım'da Gayrimüslimler [Non-Muslims in the Crimea in the second half of the 18th century].' *Osmanlı Araştırmaları Dergisi Sayı* 33: 237–268.

Mikhail Kizilov

(Khamovniki Foundation for the Social Research, Moscow)

HOWARD, Douglas A.: *A History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, 393 pp. ISBN: 978-0-521-89867-6.

Since the publication of the *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches* by Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall in 1827, plenty of monographic works have been devoted to Ottoman history. Douglas Howard's present book seems to be a further attempt in this long series; however, this volume, with felicity in writing, carefully selected illustrations,

innovative edition, and scholarly approach is offering a comprehensive textbook on Ottoman history not yet seen.

The book has been partitioned into seven chapters, each covering a century according to the Islamic calendar. This peculiar periodisation is not the only means to represent the Ottoman society's sense of time and worldview. By applying this arrangement, the author set aside the traditional chronological partition marked by crucial events or turning points in a classical sense, in order to engage the experience of time itself as part of the story. Nevertheless, the structure of the volume is clear-cut and straightforward. Epochs covered by the chapters are as follows: The Ottoman Genesis (1300–1397), A Blessed Dynasty (1397–1494), A World View (1494–1591), Ambiguities and Certainties (1591–1688), The Global and the Local (1688–1785), Collaborations and Breakdowns (1785–1882), and Dissolution (1882–1924). A bibliography (pp. 328–356) and a general index (pp. 357–393) support the reader's orientation. Besides, apt editorial solutions facilitate the usage of the book. From among these, we must highlight the distinctly coloured pages of endnotes that come at the end of each chapter, enabling the reader to look up the relevant notes more easily.

Another feature of this innovative approach is that in contrast with detailed analyses of general historical events with a considerable proportion of chronological data—being more peculiar in traditional monographic works—, more emphasis was laid on the microhistorical relevances, repercussions, and socio-historical aspects of the global processes. Thus, by reading it, one can experience the Ottoman history—that is, the story—being unfolded rather than simply described. The basic level of the structure consists of well-outlined and compact, yet effortlessly interlaced thematic units. The framework of the history-telling is primarily characterised by these thematic glimpses of various layers of Ottoman history.

The volume is richly, yet proportionately illustrated. Carefully selected pictures presenting details of monuments, buildings, engravings, paintings, as well as early photographs complement the textual content. In many cases, selection of contemporary or near contemporary photographs from different collections ensure the authenticity in presenting historical scenes or monuments in the relevant chapters—especially those related to the late 19th century. Here we may refer to the first units dealing with the formative period of the Ottoman State. Here, the question of the *gazi*-rulers' legitimation is illustrated, among others, with a picture of one of the earliest monuments i.e. the Bursa inscription, incorporated in a textbox of its translation as well as precise modern historical cross-references (p. 30). Besides general explanations, captions mostly contain additional data concerning the origin and provenance of the illustration.

Diagrams and maps are also useful instruments in helping the orientation of the reader. Some minor inaccuracies emerge only in the case of the map on page 92. In this map, without any chronological data, Ottoman Hungary appears with a firm border-line unrealistically extended to the north, while along its western section, quite anachronistically, it overlaps the modern Hungarian–Austrian border actually valid only since 1920.

Each chapter includes a chronological table with the dates of the Ottoman rulers' reign during that period. A remarkable characteristic of the edition and the merit

of the book are the translated selections in textboxes taken from favourite Ottoman literary works highlighting the literary impressions and the spirituality of the relevant period. Among many others, Jalaladdin Rumi's *Mesnevi*, some passages from Yunus Emre, mystic poem of Sheikh Galib, *Hüsn ü aşk* (Beauty and love), as well as Evliya Chelebi's *Travlogue* have been invoked in these textboxes.

On several occasions, the author seemingly avoids discussing some traditionally more frequented episodes, while laying more emphasis on their peculiar aspects. For instance, events and turning points of Constantinople's Ottoman siege in 1453 are presented laconically; however, the consequences of the conquest pertaining to social, cultural, and economic fields are richly discussed on the relevant pages (pp. 64–73).

Another striking example of breaking with classical approach is the fact that Howard also dropped the option of dealing with the changes and developments of the early 18th century in traditional means, as even the term Tulip Period (Turkish: *Lale Devri*, introduced by the Turkish historian Ahmet Refik) is missing from the relevant chapter.

As far as the approach of 'showing the whole through focusing on a detail' is concerned, one may highlight the small, yet informative unit pertaining to the 17th-century Ottoman Scholarship, illustrated through the life and activity of the 17th-century polymath Mustafa ibn Abdallah, better known as Katib Chelebi (pp. 159–162). Some interesting details of his habit concerning coffee consumption is attached here (Box 4.5) providing also a good connection between the previous thematic unit about scholars and scholarship to the world of urban coffee houses.

Here, another example from the many is worth mentioning. In the last chapter, box 7.2 (pp. 281–282) offers an insight into the Ottoman census, which provides very informative glimpses of ethnic and religious relations of the late 19th century.

Within the given frames, the author succeeded to find an ideal balance between the fields of literal, socio-cultural and economic aspects of the evolution of the Ottoman realms. Carefully selected microhistorical details and mosaics contribute to the vivid presentation of the diverse layers of Ottoman history. These are the most striking features of the entire work, even if, in some cases, they do not supplement, rather substitute the presentation of more general motifs and courses of events. To illustrate this methodological characteristic we may refer to the fact that no significance was attributed to the emergence of the modern Ottoman press, including the first official Turkish newspapers, e.g. *Takvim-i Vekayi*, *Ruzname-i Ceride-i Havadis* etc., while a separate unit offers insight into popular literary culture in the late 19th-century Istanbul presenting a Karamanlı Greek, Theodor Kasap and the periodical published by him being devoted to satire on current political and social issues (pp. 261–262).

Taking everything into account, Howard's book is far from being a simple recapitulation, much more a handbook offering deeper insight and catching glimpses of many details and layers of the six-century-long Ottoman history. This publication can be warmly recommended as a useful textbook for general audiences as well as for graduate or undergraduate university courses.

Nándor Erik Kovács
(Department of Turkish Studies, ELTE University, Budapest)

PÉRI, Benedek: *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*. Leiden: Brill, 2018, xiv + 392 pp. ISBN: 978-9-004-36788-3.

The publication of a catalogue of Persian manuscripts is always a joyful occasion for the academic community working in this field. Catalogues are a fundamental tool playing a crucial role for researchers when approaching a particular collection or searching for a particular work. However, a catalogue can either serve as a list of entries that helps to identify books, or offers a much more comprehensive view of the collection as a whole, providing useful information for researchers looking at manuscripts beyond the identification of specific volumes. The newly published *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences* belongs to the second group. Even though the description of manuscripts follows the traditional arrangement of grouping works by subject, the editor has also included detailed information on the physical and literary characteristics of each handwritten copy, which renders a more nuanced idea to the reader about each codex. The included indexes containing not only titles and names of authors, but also names of scribes, owners and places of production of manuscripts are interesting and valuable additions to the publication.

Although the collection is not very large (it includes 170 works in 155 codices), the uniqueness of some of the materials described in this book has the potential to inspire further research in this field in the coming years. The catalogue includes an introduction offering some specifics about the works and a brief history of the collection. The origins of the library date from the initial donation of books by József Teleki in 1826 from which those in ‘Oriental’ languages were independently constituted as a collection only in 1949 by Lajos Ligeti. It was not until the mid-19th century when the first Persian manuscripts entered the collection. The first Persian volume to be incorporated into the library was the donation of a translation of Christian Psalms made by a Jesuit priest in the court of the Mughal emperor Jahangir (r. 1605–1627). A few decades later, a more considerable number of Persian manuscripts were added to the collection (p. 7). Another 40 Persian manuscripts entered the library as part of a larger collection numbering 491 manuscripts, including works written in Turkish and Arabic. During the first years of the 20th century, just over a dozen of Persian manuscripts entered the library. However, the largest acquisition occurred in 1926 when the manuscripts in the private collection of the Persianist Alexander (Sándor) Kégl (d. 1920) were donated to the library (p. 10). The individual donations of renowned scholars such as Vladimir Minirsky (d. 1966) and others have added new volumes to the collection that has not grown much in the last fifty years (pp. 13–14).

The majority of the manuscripts in the collection were copied between the 17th and 19th centuries, with only nine being dated to the 16th and two to the 15th century. The oldest manuscripts listed in the catalogue are two volumes copied in the first half of the 14th century. The first one (Perzsa O. 057) is an incomplete copy of the famous compendium of fables *Kalila wa Dima* translated from the original Arabic into Persian by Naṣr Allāh al-Munshī (d. 1187). The copy is dated 20 Shawwāl 719 AH [4 December 1319] by a scribe at an unknown place. Bahā al-Dīn Sulṭān

Valad (d. 1312), son of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273) and successor of his father as the supreme authority of the Mevlevi Sufi order in Anatolia, authored the second of these early works (Perzsa Qu. 08). This is a copy of the *Rabābnāmah*, a work composed in 1301 using the same metric as the famous work by his father, the *Mathnavī* of Rūmī. The work deals with different aspects of Sufism and offers some relevant information about the spiritual life of the order. This copy is dated Shawwal 743 AH [1343] but the full name of the scribe is illegible and no place of copy is provided.

The two manuscripts copied in the 15th century also deserve special attention. The first one (Perzsa O. 18) is a work on medicine entitled *Gulshan-i Zībā* written in verse dealing with basic concepts of medicine and diagnosis in two parts. This work was written by Luf Allāh Ḥālīmī (d. 1516) and dedicated to the Ottoman sultan Mehmet II (r. 1444–1446/1451–1481). An interesting aspect of this copy is that it was made during the author's lifetime and contains abundant marginal annotations that expand upon the concepts of the main text (pp. 148–149). The second work (Perzsa O. 049) dated in this period is a very interesting copy of the *Dīvān* of ‘Abd al-Rahmān Jāmī (d. 1492). According to the editor of the catalogue, this copy has some unique characteristics that make it stand out among many others that exist. Although the text is unfinished, it was copied in 1470, during the lifetime of the poet and before the author had produced the third and fourth editions of his own work. Further, it includes a preface different from those found in other early copies of the work, making this copy a unique testimony of the history of the work and the arrangement of the text made by Jāmī himself (p. 249).

The majority of manuscripts mentioned in the catalogue were copied in India or the Ottoman Empire, while only a small portion of them appear to have made their way to Hungary from Iran. Therefore, the majority of the collection would be of special interest to scholars of Ottoman or Mughal studies. However, this catalogue also serves as another testimony of the well-documented presence of Persian language beyond the Iranian world. Many of the manuscripts included in this collection date from the 16th century onwards, showing the relevance that literary genres such as literature, science and religion, written in Persian, had in those territories during the modern period. In addition, two works not written in Persian are included in this catalogue. One of them (Perzsa O. 81/2) is a mathnavi poem in Chaghatai Turkish by a poet called Ḥaydar (fl. 15th century), who dedicated his work to a grandson of Tamerlane (d. 1405). It is included in a multi-work volume together with a Persian work and despite having no date or name of scribe, multiple annotations and marginalia suggest that it was copied in the Ottoman Empire during the 16th century (pp. 187 and 229). The second of these non-Persian texts (Perzsa O. 104) is a compendium of three works by the 18th-century Ottoman poet Süleyman Neş’et Efendi (d. 1807), which combine texts in both Persian and Ottoman Turkish.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the catalogue includes descriptions of four illustrated manuscripts in the collection. The most remarkable is perhaps a 15th-century copy of the *Shāhnāma* of Firdawsī (d. 1020), containing sixteen miniatures that have been digitised and made available online by the ‘Shahnama Project’ at the University of Cambridge. The remaining three codices were illustrated in the 18th

century. These include a later copy of the *Shāhnāma*, a *Ḥamsa* of Niẓāmī (d. 1202–3) and a copy of the *Anvār-i Suhaylī* by Ḥusayn Vā'iz Kāshifī (d. 1504–5). In addition, standalone paintings belonging to fragmented works in the collection have been included in an anthology (Perzsa Qu. 02) that groups illustrated folios from different 15th- and 16th-century codices.

Overall, a very well designed catalogue that will facilitate access to an important collection located at an institution with a long-standing tradition in the field of Oriental studies. The best feature of this edition is that it is designed not only as a useful description of the holdings of the collection, but conceived as a tool for research in the field of manuscript studies. For example, special efforts were made to include the existence of marginal annotations, dedications or additional texts added to the manuscripts in subsequent periods after their composition. Similarly, works copied in the margins are included in the description of a manuscript but not catalogued as separate works. This editorial decision seems arbitrary, but, in reality, helps to better contextualise the history of a particular codex. In a time when digital catalogues have replaced the need for printing manuscript hand-lists or inventories, this edition is an excellent example of why it is still important to have specialists dedicated to the editing of fully descriptive catalogues. This approach that includes descriptions of text, paratext and codicological aspects, as well as bio- and bibliographical information, offers a much more comprehensive view of the collection, making it all the more suitable to further research in the field of manuscripts studies.

Bruno De Nicola

(Goldsmiths, University of London, UK
and Austrian Academy of Sciences, Austria)

LINROTHE, Rob and Heinrich PÖLL (eds.): *Visible Heritage. Essays on the Art and Architecture of Greater Ladakh*. Berlin, Delhi: Studio Orientalia, 2016, 45 black-and-white, 225 colour illustrations, 10 illustrated title pages; bound volume; viii + 272 pp. ISBN: 978-81-824502-7-8.

LINROTHE, Rob (ed.): *Seeing into Stone. Pre-Buddhist Petroglyphs and Zanskar's Early Inhabitants*. Berlin, Delhi: Studio Orientalia, 2016, 1 map, 3 black-and-white, 4 monochrome, 140 colour illustrations, 6 illustrated title pages, 1 DVD with additional 5 black-and-white and 138 colour illustrations; bound volume; xx + 211 pp. ISBN: 978-81-924502-8-5.

The first of these two publications, *Visible Heritage*, contains ten contributions from the 16th Conference of the International Association for Ladakh Studies, Heidelberg 17–20 April 2013. The volume is dedicated to the memory of André Alexander, who, deeply involved with conservation projects, especially also in Leh Old Town, passed away much too early at the age of only forty-seven. He had left an unfinished paper on *Alchi Tsatsapuri: Notes on the History of an Early Monument* (pp. 1–22), to which

Acta Orient. Hung. 73, 2020

the editors gave a finishing touch, and which is the first contribution after a very short introduction. The Tsatsapuri complex is located in the upper part of the village and consists of three buildings with the so-called Stupa Hall and the so-called Lama Residence forming the oldest part, dating possibly to the late 13th century, and the Dukhang forming a later addition. Alexander describes the three buildings in detail and concludes that the murals give evidence of a local painter school in its beginning, which is still quite rustic and lacks the refinement found in later times.

In *Lost and Gone Forever: Notes on the Demolition of the Red Temple of Hunder* (pp. 23–40), Noor Jahan Chunka and Gerald Kozicz point to the conflict between modern conservation concepts and the traditional Buddhist approach towards damaged structures, according to which depictions of deities deprived of eyes or hand gestures lose their religious value, and a temple that lost its images similarly can no longer fulfil its function. Decay is seen as a natural process and hence overpainting (according to the latest fashion) and rebuilding are traditional solutions. The Red Temple was part of a larger assembly of buildings, and the authors thus start somewhat unexpectedly with a description of the White Temple nearby. They have less to say about the Red Temple, describing the situation in 2011, a year before the demolition. However, the Red Temple had been in a poor condition since quite some time—in 2004, the reviewer had seen at least one bending wall and, as a result, a pile of shards from a mural that had come off—and it seems that the whole structure was in danger of collapsing. While in such a situation demolition might be the only option, one might, nevertheless, try and preserve statues and murals in a local, monastic or communal, museum or archive. None of this has happened in the case of the Red Temple; to the contrary, even the intact statues have been destroyed and replaced by new ones. The authors argue thus rightly that it is necessary to raise and spread awareness among the monastic (and lay) communities for the importance even of minor village temples, in order to prevent further losses. What the interested reader misses, however, is a more detailed assessment of the earlier content of the Red Temple. It is not fully comprehensible that the authors had no access to earlier descriptions or older photographs of the murals.

In recent years, Quentin Devers has rediscovered numerous forgotten historical sites, doubling or multiplying the number of such sites that were known before he started his research. In *Fortifications of Ladakh: A Brief Chrono-Typology* (pp. 41–64), he identifies changes in the architecture and location of forts that can be linked to the political development in Ladakh. Initially, forts were built on inaccessible high spots without secure access to water, indicating that sieges were not common. With the beginning of the second dynasty, large forts with secure access to water were built on lower elevations, guarded by watchtowers along the access slopes. Obviously, warfare had changed, and this can be linked to invasions from Kashmir and Central Asia.

In *The Munshi House in Leh: A Building History* (pp. 65–84), John Harrison, the architect involved in the reconstruction of the building gives a detailed account of the original plan of the house and its later extensions in the late 19th century, as well as of the restoration and conversion of the house into a communal arts and media

centre. Apart from its function as a place for various cultural events, the restored house demonstrates how the still existing historic buildings of Leh Old Town can not only be saved, but also be upgraded and put to new usages. Structural sketches accompany historic photographs of Leh Old Town, but it would have been helpful for anybody who had not yet seen the Munshi House, if an arrow had identified the Munshi House within the then densely built area.

Castles and Defensive Architecture in Purig: An Introduction, Survey and Preliminary Analysis (pp. 85–112) by Neil Howard is based on the author's much earlier research in 1987. Despite the limits he had faced, the author has come to the conclusion that the chronological sequence of building techniques matches that in Central Ladakh, and he has further documented structures which have been destroyed since then, as in the case of the Mulbekh Drukpa Temple, or which show the ingenious use of landscape features for defence purposes, as in the case of the Bodh Kharbu fort.

In Central Ladakh much research on art and architecture has focused only on the right side of the Indus river. However, as Gerald Koziacz in his contribution, *The Old Stupa of Matho* (pp. 113–130), demonstrates, there are also very interesting archaeological sites on the left side. The Matho Stupa, in particular, shows a very atypical use of space for the inner murals, which reach up to the top-most chamber and the closing stone slab. Together with the particularities of the now almost lost wall paintings, this must have contributed to an extraordinary visual experience. The outer frame of the stupa shows similarities with the older stupas between Upshi and Leh, which differ considerably from those of Alchi. This again indicates that the confluence of the Zaskar and the Indus once marked a boundary between different socio-cultural milieus.

Diana Lange in *Visual Representation of Ladakh and Zaskar in the British Library's Wise Collection* (pp. 131–168) draws attention to a collection of 'maps' with traditional depictions, made by a local artist between 1854 and 1860, possibly commissioned by some unknown Englishman. These 'maps' reach from Leh up to Lhasa, but only the western-most depictions show a dense annotation (on a separate sheet), apparently by the Englishman, with the typical deformations of the names, such as *kur* for *kar* (*mkhar*). With one exception, the depiction of a Hindu festival in Kullu, Lange presents only the maps relating to present-day Ladakh. Some of the annotations give interesting information, such as 'Village of Pipiting. where the governor resides' or 'Gunpa of Sānee said to have been originally built by Asōka [sic]', but the perhaps most interesting depiction is of Leh town, showing the palace, the Tsemo, the Kalon house, unfortunately not the Munshi house, the bazaar with the lower part being described as 'where all the Balti reside when they visit Lé', the areal of the Lhakhang soma, at that time the 'new residence of the thanadar [sic] of Lé', and a few more named and unnamed places. A separate depiction features the Sani monastery, seen from the western side, the famous stupa showing quite precise drawings of two figures with nimbus, nowadays hardly recognisable under the thick layer of whitewash. They were apparently enclosed in a garland- or cloud-like ornament. Below the two figures there would be the Wheel of the Law and the Endless Knot, likewise invisible today. On the left edge of the stupa would have been a stone slab with a standing figure, now apparently located elsewhere. These details should be of interest to all historians

and art historians. The artist of the ‘maps’ was in all likelihood a learned lama. His different names are mentioned, culminating in his most common appellation as ‘Kur-dun Chuizut’. If the latter element stands for *chos-mdzad*, then the first part, his ‘house name’ according to the Englishman, but perhaps rather the name of the village he came from, cannot refer to the ‘Kardung’ (Khardong) village north of Leh as suggested by Lange, as a possible alternative to Kardang in Lahoul, but only to a village in Zanskar or further east, where a final *s* may turn into an *i*.

Regrettably, the title of this contribution, following a common, but, nevertheless, inaccurate convention, would suggest that Zanskar does not belong to the political entity nowadays called ‘Ladakh’ or that Ladakh (actually pronounced as *Ladaks* in the core area) could have applied to all the rest. It would have been better to discriminate between the Indus valley (only parts of which were originally called by a name similar to ‘Ladakh’ or *La.dwags*) and the so-called Zanskar region. The latter consists of the *Stod* (or rather *Lhtot*) valley coming down from the northeast (its river consistently misnamed on all maps as ‘Doda’, inclusive the one given by the author on p. 138) and the two valleys of the Kargyak river coming from the south and the Tsarap river coming from the southeast, which flow together through the Lungnak valley up to the confluence with the *Lhtot* river. The *Zāhar sāfo* or Zanskar river takes this name only after this confluence, and while there are some minor villages and the two rather important villages *Ṭongḍe* (wr. *Stong.sde*) and *Zangla* (both missing in the ‘maps’) along its upper course, it flows for the greatest part through an inaccessible gorge. With the exception of *Sani*, *Pipiting*, and the unidentifiable ‘*Sāwōh*’ near *Pipiting* (but identified by Lange on her map, p. 138, with *Stara* above *Sani*, further up the *Lhtot* river), the artist (or the Englishman?) was apparently neither interested in the villages of the *Lhtot* valley nor in those along the Zanskar river, but concentrated on the Lungnak valley. Some geographical sophistication would have suited well the discussion of the lovely ‘maps’.

The contribution by Rob Linrothe, *Siddhas and Sociality: A Seventeenth-Century Lay Illustrated Buddhist Manuscript in Kumik Village, Zanskar (A Preliminary Report)* (pp. 169–202) is neither about particular *siddhas* nor about their relationship with social values or the society, but discusses an illustrated manuscript, which is interesting both for its compilation of texts and for its illustrations. Linrothe argues that the illustrations were made by expert artists, but in a comparatively ‘relaxed’ manner. The section on the 85 *Mahāsiddhas* shows several of them in rather acrobatic poses, which seems to be a particular feature of the ‘Zanskar’ region. Linrothe links and compares the depictions of the Kumik manuscript to those found in the ‘Phugtal’ monastery (the correct name is *Phukthar*, wr. *Phug.thar*, describing the founder’s ‘Liberation in the Cave’), reliefs on stone slabs in the *Manda* village, a depiction on a *Vajradhara* *thangka* in the *Ralagong* village, and the mural of the so-called second temple in *Sani*, concluding that the manuscript can be dated between the 16th-century murals of the *Stanba Lhakang* in ‘Phugtal’ and the paintings of the second temple in *Sani* dating from the early 18th century.

In *Trees-of-Life, Aquatic Creatures and Other Enigmatic Motives on Ladakhi Wood Art: What They Tell Us About Art History* (pp. 203–234), Heinrich Pöll argues

that early medieval Ladakhi art is the result of complex processes of creative and active appropriation rather than of passively received influences from Kashmir or even sole Kashmiri craftsmanship, as suggested by the hitherto one-dimensional explanations. The floral motives on several doorframes in Alchi, Mangyu, and Sumda Chung correspond to a Tree-of-Life motive, a pan-Indian artistic motive of fertility and prosperity, which was widely adapted in Buddhism and brought to Central Asia, from where it might have spread to Ladakh. Other artwork has parallels in the Kullu valley, while certain Gupta-type designs, especially the scroll-tailed fantastic creatures of the Alchi Sumtsek, may have been introduced via Western Tibet, or more specifically, the Satlej valley. Pöll concludes that the tripartite façades of the Alchi Sumtsek and some other temples were a Ladakhi innovation, creatively combining Kashmiri and even Classical Greek elements with elements of other, local or foreign, origins.

Despite this insightful analysis, Verena Ziegler in *The Life of Buddha Sākya-muni in the Byams pa lha khang of Basgo, Ladakh* (pp. 235–270) repeats the stereotype of the ‘Kashmiri-influenced style’ of the paintings in Alchi, from which the Basgo representations of the twelve acts from the life of the Buddha would differ. The latter, described in detail, would show certain features of similar depictions in Western Tibet, but also individual scenes or figures that have no counterpart or even cannot be interpreted. Unfortunately, this contribution shows some editing errors. Some of the references to the illustrations in the text do not match the number of the figures. The name of the Ladakhi king Tshewang Namgyal who appears in the donor panel for the renovation and/or furnishing of the murals of the temple is given in three different spellings: apart from the pseudo-Tibetanised form *Tséwang Namgyel*, with an unmotivated accent (pp. 236, 257), we also find *Tsewang Namgyel*, without the accent (pp. 257, 267), and *Tséwang Namgyal*, with at least the correct vowel (p. 259, caption of Fig. 20). All kings of the second Ladakhi dynasty are known almost all over Ladakh by the dynastic name *Namgyal*, with the vowel *a* in the last syllable. Why then is it necessary to give this name with the vowel *e* in correspondence to a more Central Tibetan pronunciation—but without the tones? Do the Tibetologists really not know or do they simply not care about the fact that Ladakh was an independent kingdom with an independent culture and an independently developing language for most of the time? Is it further really necessary to skip the aspiration of the first syllable of the personal name, given that interested readers would know that in this combination the *h* stands for an aspiration and not for a cluster *sh*? One may also ask why the inscription has to be given both in transliteration and in—toneless—Central Tibetan pronunciation, turning the *yab-sras* or ‘father-and-son’ duo, locally pronounced as *yapshras*, into *yapsé*, unrecognisable for Ladakhis? Would it then be necessary, at all, to give a transliteration instead of the fine Tibetan script?

The volume is beautifully designed. Each chapter has an introductory page taken from one of the illustrations that would follow, and by a magic hand each contribution ends on an even page. The only shortcoming is that the captions, which sit on the outer margin, are not always easily relatable to their corresponding illustrations across the page. Another regrettable feature, besides the lack of an index, is that the contributions are presented in the alphabetic order of the authors’ names. This leads

to a thematic disconnect so that Quentin Dever's and Neil Howard's contributions on the fortifications of Ladakh and Purig are separated by a contribution on private architecture, and contributions on religious and secular art will be found scattered arbitrarily all over the volume.

Compared to other volumes related to the various IALS seminars, the editors were able to release this publication relatively quickly, and the reviewer regrets that, by contrast, she could not get hold of—or rather hold on to—this volume, in order to give a timely review. She sincerely appreciates the publisher's courtesy to let her have a second review exemplar at the 19th IALS seminar in Choglamsar 2019. Several authors described their contributions as 'preliminary', and ongoing fieldwork may already have led to more refined insights. Quite certainly, Quentin Devers has been collecting more and more data on forgotten historical sites. Nevertheless, the volume will remain relevant, not least of all for its many high quality illustrations. It is also, sometimes directly, sometimes more indirectly, an urgent call for the preservation of a precious cultural heritage, and it will, despite its price (fair enough for an art volume aimed at a limited western readership), hopefully help to raise the awareness, and to instigate the care, of the Ladakhi people of all regions for their unique heritage.

I discovered the second publication, *Seeing into Stone*, at the book presentation at the IALS seminar 2019. It likewise deals with visual heritage, a timeless one, of a special kind, which is even more endangered, as most of the local people, not to speak of outsiders, such as army personnel, fail to understand its value: stone carvings that might look like any other kind of graffiti, applied without further purpose. Of course, this is a gross misperception, although it does not seem to be possible to reconstruct exactly what kind of purpose most of these carvings once served.

Linrothe cautiously always points to these ambiguities and uncertainties. In the introductory first part, *Definitions: Methods, Sites and Motifs* (pp.1–78), he also emphasises the incompatibility between approaches to rock art by a science faction, where interpretations are looked upon with despise, and an interpretative faction, whose members often let their imagination loose in order to link rock art with spiritual or shamanic practices. Linrothe tries to avoid both fallacies and starts with a description of what kind of motives are commonly found: which animals, what kind of humans or human activities, what kind of non-figural signs, and lastly the imported 'animal style' of the steppes.

In the second part, *Recognitions: Insights from Archaeology, Anthropology, Ethnography and Formal Analysis* (pp. 79–132), Linrothe draws upon whatever archaeological evidence is available to show that most of the early rock carvings in Zanskar can be associated with a non-sedentary hunter and gatherer culture. He points to the paradoxical fact that the ibex, which figures most prominently on the rock carvings, does not have an equal prominence in excavated animal food remains, such as bones, and, on the other hand, one does not have any rock carvings of, e.g., marmots. Linrothe thus thinks that the ibex must have had a symbolic value beyond being a priced food item, namely as signifying power, agility, or endurance of the animals (p. 104), and

then possibly also highlighting the corresponding even stronger power etc. of the hunter who masters them (p. 105). These inherent values have certainly been exploited when the ibex was chosen as the corporate insignia of the Ladakh Scouts (p. 114f.).

Nevertheless, the reason why ibex are more commonly represented on rocks than in archaeological remains might be much simpler. Marmots and even partridges are by all means easier to catch, even by children, but each of them does not yield much protein to feed a whole family. Ibex and blue sheep, or even wild yak, for that matter, yield more than enough meat for a single family, and having hunted down one or even more than one can lead to envy in a small hunter community. The ritual importance of the animals was certainly enhanced by the need to assuage such feelings of envy. In the Sham area of Ladakh, at least, hunters had the obligation to share the ibex meat with the other villagers—a tradition that had also led to cunning strategies of avoiding to show one's hunt. That such traditions, although no longer practised, were still known at the beginning of the 21st century shows how important they once must have been. Sharing of the hunt would further allow community feasting, which in turn easily leads to enrichment with religious significance. Evidence of such rituals is, in fact, available from the Brokpa or 'Dard' communities, as Linrothe himself shows (pp. 116ff.)

There are further reasons why looking at food remains alone, might not tell the full story about the significance of the animals. The mountain goats did not only yield meat, but also fur for clothes, beddings, and perhaps even shelters, but fur would not leave any remains. In the earliest stages, bones and horns were not necessarily thrown away with the food remainders, as they could have been put to better usages as tools and drinking vessels, and, apart from that, for ritual purposes, they might have been deposited elsewhere, even openly exposed in the mountains, where lammergeyers and wolves could have taken their share.

In any case, as Linrothe emphasises, early rock carvings defy our modern expectations of what and how depictions or even 'art' should tell us. These representations were possibly not meant to be closed compositions, and, certainly, later 'artists' added upon them. The third part: *Appropriations: Petroglyphs in Buddhist Retrospection* (pp. 133–168) deals with a special kind of addition and superimposition, the Buddhist stupa. It would seem that the Buddhist 'artists' were aware of the hidden 'power' of the rocks or their setting in the landscape and that they wanted to exploit this 'power' for the representation of their belief. In some cases, stupas were simply added, though often with the apparent intention to block the path of the ibex who is now facing it. Human figures that might have been warriors then appear as if in adoration of the stupa. But in other cases, the orientation was changed, with the possible intention to destabilise or even cancel the earlier representations. According to Linrothe, this may have been done 'with a sense of narrative and sequence', indicating 'a fundamental change in worldview' (p. 164). With this historical perspective, these 'artists' created the notion of a 'pivotal event or person around which everything is oriented: the life of the Buddha. The framed ibex is "BB" (Before the Buddha). The framing stupa is "AB" (After the Buddha)' (p. 165). This is best demonstrated with a big boulder at Alchi, given in its various orientations (Figs. 14.8–14.10). Linrothe

likens this to building an artificial museum for the ibex, making it something merely remembered or perhaps even something retrieved from oblivion.

A museum typically showcases artefacts out of their initial context, the artificial museum Linrothe evokes cancels the initial context, but in both cases, at least the visual heritage is preserved to a certain extent. Unfortunately, this way of dealing with a no longer remembered past has changed dramatically as demonstrated in the fourth part: *Conclusion and Termination* (pp. 169–194), where Linrothe deals with the ongoing defacing of rock carvings, be they Buddhist or pre-Buddhist, and even worse, with the careless and total destruction of entire rocks for house and road constructions. Linrothe also points to an almost parallel fate of the depicted animals, which, in the colonial period, were hunted down in great numbers, almost to extinction, just for fun.

Interpretation of rock ‘art’ certainly lies in the eye of the beholder. What the—in the majority—male scholars have interpreted as exaggerated male genitalia hanging straight down, might be seen by a feminist scholar as a birth scene (some rock carvings near Khalatse may rather point into that direction, given that the figures also seem to have quite large breasts)—particularly since, if masculinity is to be emphasised, one would expect to see erected phalli. But there might be even simpler explanations, such as the person in question wearing an animal skin, with the legs (or the head) hanging down. As shown in note 45, p. 90, this latter interpretation has been suggested at least by two scholars. In fact, a petroglyph in the Seeta valley, Pakistan, clearly shows a depiction of two women with bulbous bosoms and the same kind of a hanging something between their legs (Kalhor, 2012: 377, Fig. 5).

That male prejudices may mislead the interpretation and may even lead to manipulations has been indicated with respect to the famous Burzahom slate, which shows a hunting scene in which a female person is equally involved, using a spear, while the other, presumably male, figure uses a bow. Representations of the slate were manipulated, so that the bosom of the female disappeared, and a stroke between the legs was added (Albinia 2010: 265).

The Burzahom slate is presented by Linrothe in the correct version (Fig 8.1, p. 89), as he thinks that the slab shows a number of correspondences with petroglyphs in Zanskar and Ladakh, although he also thinks that the presence of a female hunter would distinguish the Burzahom slab from the rock carvings in Zanskar, implying ‘different cultures with different gendered roles’ (p. 90). The female reviewer (with feminist sympathies), on the other hand, wonders how many of the indeterminate figures or also of those with a presumably ‘hanging genital’ might not have been women, as well, especially when the body silhouette, resembling an hourglass, as, e.g., of the spear wielding person in Fig. 8.3, p. 91, may suggest a more female appearance. Would it not be possible that in small hunter societies, women were actually needed, perhaps not so much to spear down the animals, but to encircle them, block their escape, and/or chase them towards the archer? Linrothe, who is well aware of the inherited scholarly bias, acknowledges that ‘what we might take to be males in some Zanskar petroglyphs could as well be females’ (pp. 90, 92).

The interested reader may thus not always follow Linrothe's interpretations (e.g. a person said to be standing *on* an animal in the detail presentation of Fig 5.19, p. 52, may perhaps rather stand *behind* and *above* the animal, if one takes into account the fact that the boulder in question is densely populated with animals and one human being on top and one below, Fig. 3.6, p. 22). However, the reader's eye for minor details as well as his or her interpretative skills will definitely be sharpened by Linrothe's suggestions and the illustrations upon which these are based. One minor drawback is that one actually has to read the book with the laptop or computer opened, as Linrothe's arguments draw equally on the illustrations on the DVD as on those in the book itself.

The volume shows signs of haste. Some editorial errors, such as *Tungri* for *Tungri* (p. 43), *Dromkhar* for *rDo mkhar* (p. 53), '*Brog pa 'ka' brgyud* instead of '*Brug pa bka' brgyud*, and *bus al mkhan* instead of *bu sal mkhan* (both on p. 120), are rather funny, at least for those who know Tibetan. Somewhat more irritating is that some references to the illustrations are misleading: Fig. 4.6 should have been 14.6. (p. 160); Figs. 10.2 and 10.4 referred to on p. 36 should have been page numbers of the publication cited; Fig. 13.6 referred to on p. 96 as a depiction of a spring near Lingshed, turns out to be a drawing of a detail from a rock carving at Talpan, Pakistan (the same number on the DVD relates to another drawing from Talpan). Among the illustrations on the DVD, a couple are already found in the book. One also wonders why the publisher nowhere includes a description of the cover photos and the initial photos, something that has been done with care in the other volume. But these minor faults do not impact the overall positive impression that the book will leave on the reader's mind. Again, the price is somewhat forbidding for an ordinary Indian audience, and specifically for the people of Ladakh, but it is, nevertheless, hoped that this book helps to prevent further destruction of rock carvings in Ladakh (including Zanskar) and beyond.

References

- ALBINIA, Alice 2010. *Empires of the Indus. The Story of a River*. [1st American ed.] New York: Norton.
- KALHORU, Zulfikar Ali 2012. 'The Petroglyphs in Seeta Valley (Sindh, Pakistan).' In: B. L. MALLA (ed.) *International Conference on Rock Art, 2012: Understanding Rock Art in Context*. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, 366–393.

Bettina Zeisler
(Eberhard Karls Universität, Tübingen)

