author translates it as 'primordial matter' which is misleading; 'nature', explained as 'the primeval dynamic force' would be more accurate.) The paper by Philipp Maas (University of Vienna), 'Valid Knowledge and Belief in Classical Sāṅkhya-Yoga', shows that Patañjali used *pramāṇa* theories in order to create acceptance for the soteriological efficiency of Sāṅkhya-Yoga. The two papers of the section 'Language, Grammar and Belief', by Ashok Aklujkar (University of British Columbia), 'Grammarians' Leaving Logic at the Door', and by Hideyo Ogawa (Hiroshima University), 'Bhartṛhari on Unnameable things' have self-explanatory titles. The section 'Logic and Belief in Interpretation and Translation' has a piece by Diwakar Acharya (Kyoto University) on 'Major Points of Vācaspati's Disagreement with Maṇḍana' dealing among other topics with possible levels of Brahman realisation. Then follows a valuable annotated translation and commentary styled 'From the *Tattva-cintā-maṇi* by Gaṅgeśa: The *Kevala-vyatireki-prakaraṇam*' on negative-only inference by Stephen Phillips (University of Texas at Austin).

The richest section is on 'Logic, Reality and Belief in Buddhist Tradition'. There is room mostly just for the titles of these important and interesting papers. Horst Lasic (University of Vienna): 'A Hot Dispute About Lukewarm Air: Dignāga on *Āpta-vāda*'; Dan Arnold (University of Chicago): 'On (Non-semantically) Remembering Conventions: Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara on *Saṅketa-kāla*'; Vincent Eltschinger (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna): 'Studies in Dharmakīrti's Religious Philosophy: The *Cintā-mayī Prajñā*'; Klaus-Dieter Mathes (University of Hamburg): 'The 'Principle of True Nature' (*dharmatā-yuktí*) as a Justification for Positive Descriptions of Reality in Mahāyāna Buddhism'; Hiroshi Nemoto (Hiroshima University): 'Tsongkhapa on the Three Times: New Light on the Buddhist Theory of Time'. This paper rightly starts with the statement that time is not a substance existing apart from entities, but finishes with the Tsongkhapa's peculiar view of past, present and future. The last paper in this section is by Kaoru Onishi (Kansai University, Osaka), 'The *Bodhi-caryāvatāra* and Its Monastic Aspects: On the Problem of Representation'. It tries to correct some Western misconceptions of Śāntideva's masterpiece. The collection closes with one paper in the section 'Belief, Hope and Gambling' by Irma Piovano (CESMEO, Torino) entitled 'Sociological and Juridical Aspects of Dice-Play in Ancient India', a serious essay about a fortuitous addiction.

Every paper has, besides references in footnotes, an extensive bibliography and there is also a good general index. However, by far the best tool for using the book is the included CD with the searchable PDF file of the updated text of the whole book. It makes it into an excellent source for pursuing any theme covered by or touched upon in the book across its whole range. If this feature were adopted for all important research works in book form (which is just a pious wish), it would make the work of a researcher pursuing an individual topic across the board infinitely easier. kw19@soas.ac.uk

Karel Werner
School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Mapping the Chinese and Islamic Worlds: Cross-cultural Exchange in Pre-Modern Asia. By Hyunhee Park. pp. xxviii, 276. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
doi:10.1017/S1356186313000400

I approached this book with eager anticipation, hoping to learn a great deal from it. I am interested in maps and cartography, but have never researched this subject area, and know little about it. I have, however, had a long-standing interest in exchanges between China and regions to the west,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186313000400 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and expected to enlarge my understanding of this important field of study. Professor Park, I thought, should be able to teach me something.

"The earliest people to call themselves Chinese established the first Chinese states on the North China Plain along the Yellow River sometime between 1500 and 200 BCE. They called their states the "Middle Kingdom" (*zhongguo*) to contrast them with their "barbarian" neighbors, according to their world view" (p. 5). It was these statements that first brought me to an astonished standstill. Who were these people who called themselves "Chinese"? "Chinese" is, of course, an English term, not a Chinese one. This is not a simple quibble, for, even in the modern Chinese language, there is no single term for "Chinese". Chinese people may refer to themselves as *Zhongguo ren*, *Han ren*, or *Hua ren*. All these terms might be translated "Chinese" (although they have slightly different meanings, emphazising different aspects of being Chinese). Historically, the Chinese often referred to themselves as "people of the X dynasty". This was, indeed, the origin of the term *Han ren*, originally meaning "people of the Han dynasty". Modern Cantonese often call themselves *Tang ren*, with reference to the Tang dynasty (similarly, the famous monk Xuanzang is often referred to as *Tang seng*, the "Tang monk"). The name of the earliest, semi-legendary, Chinese dynasty, *Xia*, has, since early times, often been used to identify the Chinese, sometimes combined with the *Hua* of *Hua ren* (as *Huaxia*). To what extent people at this early period might have conceived of themselves as belonging to a group identifiable as "Chinese" is, however, a debatable question. I therefore find myself at a loss to know what Park means by "call themselves Chinese". There are similar issues surrounding the term *Zhongguo* and its popular translation "Middle Kingdom". Park is quite wrong to suggest that the term *Zhongguo* was used as early as 1500 BCE. It probably first came into use only during the Eastern Zhou period, after about 700 BCE; thus, for most of the period 1500 – 200 BCE, the term simply did not exist. When it did come into use, it did not mean "Middle Kingdom".

It is, in fact, quite extraordinary to find someone who avowedly wishes to challenge "the prevalent Eurocentric view of world history" (p. 1) using this term at all. To me, "Middle Kingdom" is inextricably linked to nineteenth- and early twentieth-century western accounts of China. It is a poor translation, for China was not a "kingdom", but an empire, and "central" would probably be a better word than "middle". It also needs to be pointed out that, in its original usage, during the "Spring and Autumn" (*Chunqiu*) period of Chinese history (c. 722 – 480 BCE), the term was plural. It meant the "Central States", and was used to designate those states of the divided China of the time that were considered to be the most central to the Chinese culture-area: states such as Jin, Wei, Qi and Lu (roughly situated in the modern provinces of Henan, southern Shanxi and eastern Shandong). This was not necessarily in distinction from "barbarians", for it also excluded states such as Yan, Qin and Chu, which lay outside the core area, and were apparently considered "semi-barbarian" (or, at least, less civilised and "Chinese"). During the Warring States (*Zhan Guo*) period, which immediately succeeded the Spring and Autumn period, the ruler of the state of Yan (which included the area around modern Beijing) is recorded to have referred to himself as "a barbarian (*manyi*) from the back of beyond".[1] This was an exaggeration, of course, but it is an indication of how states such as Yan were viewed. Park's "Middle Kingdom", contrasted with "barbarian" neighbours, is largely fictive. In reality, the view seems to have been that there was a core area of Chinese civilisation and culture, surrounded by states and groups of people, whose level of civilisation gradually diminished with distance from the centre. Even this is somewhat simplistic, as there were groups of people in areas between the various states who seem to have been considered "different" and less civilised.

A further example of Park's inattention to accuracy is her statement that the Yuan-period map from the *Jingshi Dadian* "survived by virtue of its insertion into a Qing period compilation, Wei Yuan's

[1]Sima Qian 司馬遷, *Shi Ji* 史記 (Beijing, 1959) : vii, *juan* 卷 70, p. 2298.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186313000400 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Illustrated Treatise on the Sea Kingdoms (*Haiguo tuzhi*, 1842)" (p. 100). Now, the *Jingshi Dadian* was lost long before 1842, at some time during the middle of the Ming period, so that the map was certainly not copied directly from it into the *Haiguo Tuzhi*, as Park implies. She simply omits to mention any further details of the chain of transmission, even though Wei Yuan himself stated that he copied the map from the great Ming encyclopedia, the *Yongle Dadian*.[2]

Again, according to Park, "Hülegü met defeat at the historic Battle of 'Ayn Jalūt in Palestine in 1260" (p. 127). Of course, he did not, because he was not there. She immediately goes on to say that, after this, the Islamic world "divided into two halves", the Ilkhanate in the east, and the Mamlūk state in the west. This extremely simplistic analysis entirely overlooks the Muslims of the Central Asian Chaghatai Khanate, and those who lived west of the Egyptian Sultanate in north Africa and Spain; not to mention the Muslims of northern India.

It would be possible to pick out and discuss at length many more similar issues in this book. Even more serious, however, are the outright errors. Discussing the map from the Yuan-period *Jingshi Dadian*, Park says that it "deviates considerably from earlier Chinese maps", specifically because "the mapmakers ... placed the south on top of [*sic*] the page. In this case, Islamic geographic thinking influenced Chinese cartography. *No earlier surviving Chinese map contains such an orientation*" [emphasis added] (p. 100). However, two of the earliest surviving Chinese maps, dating from about 170 BCE, and therefore long anterior to Islam, are oriented with south at the top.[3] It is truly extraordinary that Park could have overlooked this. Anyone with any knowledge of Chinese history and culture is surely aware of the great importance in China of the direction south. To the Chinese, for example, the magnetic compass does not point north, as Westerners usually think. In Chinese, the compass is called the "South-pointing Needle" *zhinan zhen*. In fact, Chinese maps of all periods, both before and after the Yuan dynasty, are variously oriented, with either south or north at the top. No significant change at all appears to have occurred during the Yuan period as a result of Islamic influence.

Then there is Park's claim that Arabic "had been the main language of learning in Iran under the Khwārazm Shāh dynasty" (p. 128). As authority for this, she cites Lazard, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. 4 (though, in the endnote, she gives "*Cambridge History of Islam*"). I have looked through Lazard's chapter,[4] but can find nothing in it about Arabic under the Khwārazm Shāhs: as far as I can see, it deals entirely with an earlier period, up to the eleventh century, and does not mention the Khwārazm Shāhs at all. Irritatingly, Park cites as her source the entire chapter (pp. "595 – 632"), thus making it very difficult to locate specific information. This appears to be a habit with her. She does exactly the same when citing Biran's chapter in *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: the Chinggisid Age*.[5] In this case, Biran is supposed to support the claim that the Mongol conquests "allowed large numbers of Iranian Muslims to migrate from Central Asia to Mongolia and China" (p. 97). Yet much of Biran's chapter is devoted to describing the various conflicts between Khaidu, the Chaghadai Khans, Khubilai Khaghan and the Khans of the Jochid *ulus*, which certainly did not help to make the routes across Central Asia safe and easy to travel. I am left with the impression that Park decided what she wanted to say, but could find no reference to support it, and therefore cited a complete chapter of twenty pages, in the hope that there might be something in it somewhere to justify her claim.

[2]Wei Yuan 魏源, *Haiguo Tuzhi* 海國圖志 (Changsha, 1998), i, *juan* 3, p. 65.

[3]J. B. Harley and David Woodward (eds), *The History of Cartography*, ii, Book 2, *Cartography in the Traditional East and Southeast Asian Societies* (Chicago and London, 1994), p. 41. It must also be noted that the *Jingshi Dadian* map actually has south at the top left-hand corner.

[4]G. Lazard, "The Rise of the New Persian Language," in *The Cambridge History of Iran,* vol. 4, T*he Period from the Arab Invasion to the Saljuqs*, (ed.) R. N. Frye (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 595 – 632.

[5]Michal Biran, "The Mongols in Central Asia from Chinggis Khan's invasion to the rise of Temür: the Ögödeid and Chaghadaid realms" in *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: the Chinggisid Age*, (eds) N. Di Cosmo, A. J. Frank and P. B. Golden (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 46 – 66.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186313000400 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Overall, this book is extremely disappointing. It is filled with easy assumptions, many of them dubious or just plain wrong, and exaggerated claims that are not supported by the sources that Professor Park cites. I began reading this book with the expectation of finding it enjoyable and absorbing. After just a few pages, it began to annoy me. I have to confess that, in the end, I never actually finished it.
s.g.haw@wadh.oxon.org

Stephen G. Haw
Independent scholar

Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries. By David Jongeward, Elizabeth Errington, Richard Salomon, and Stefan Baums. (Gandharan Studies, Volume 1). pp. 320. Seattle and London, Early Buddhist Manuscript Project, distributed by University of Washington Press, 2012.
doi:10.1017/S135618631300028X

This book is the first volume of 'Gandharan Studies', a new series edited by Richard Salomon. It springs from Salomon's long-standing Early Buddhist Manuscript Project (EBMP) and is conceived as an auxiliary to the publications of the EBMP. The new series will focus on the history and culture of Gandhāra and adjoining regions. Dedicating the first volume to Buddhist reliquaries is an auspicious beginning. This large-format book – an illustrated catalogue of 400 different reliquaries – is beautifully illustrated and sumptuously produced with many of its pictures in colour. The catalogue may be regarded as authoritative in that it includes virtually every known reliquary from Gandhāra preserved in Pakistan, Afghanistan, India, Japan, Australia, the USA, Canada and Europe. The catalogue covers public and private collections and also includes reliquaries that were published in the past but which are now untraced.

The book is organised into six chapters, each written by one of the contributors. David Jongeward covers the accounts of the Buddha's last days in literature and art (Chapters 1 and 2), and gives a typological survey of the reliquaries (Chapter 3). Elizabeth Errington provides an account of reliquaries in the British Museum (Chapter 4); this represents the fruit of a research project of many years that endeavoured, among other things, to coordinate the extensive notes of Charles Masson (1800–53) with the collections he made. Richard Salomon gives a general overview of reliquary inscriptions (Chapter 5) and Stefan Baums offers revised texts and translations of the inscriptions (Chapter 6). Reliquaries are nowhere actually defined in the book, so Baums's chapter deals with rather more than reliquaries and includes, for example, the Mathurā lion capital in the British Museum, not a reliquary in the ordinary sense of the word and not exactly from Gandhāra. The capital carries a confusing array of inscriptions recording that "outside the monastic boundary, a relic is established". This record was studied in detail by Harry Falk in 2011 and Baums offers his own reading, suggesting that this enigmatic sculpture has yet to yield all its secrets. This and many other aspects of the book will occupy and fascinate the interested reader for hours. There is no doubt that *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries* is a landmark publication, full of new information and an essential book for any library attempting to cover South Asian art history and archaeology, Buddhist history and the development of Buddhist religious practice.

Michael Willis
The British Museum, London

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186313000400 Published online by Cambridge University Press