own power. It did sometimes move and settle groups, but these were specific, focused, and limited actions. Overall, Kasaba argues, nomads increased in numbers "during the first half of Ottoman rule" (p. 37).

As borders with neighbors began to harden by the end of the 17th century, however, new approaches were needed. Nomadism and mobility became less an asset and more a potential weakness that needed to be contained. Therefore, the state more frequently implemented nomad resettlements, expanded the enrollment of tribal members as border guards, and tried to integrate tribes into special military units. As the author shows, these 17th- and 18th-century programs were but a weak foreshadowing of those to come a century later.

The author illustrates that in the 18th and especially the 19th centuries, an expanding state relied on and used the tribes as part of its increasing power. As he incisively states, nomadism faded, but tribalism remained. Tribes and state grew together in power over the course of the 19th century. Sometimes juggling, sometimes imposing, always negotiating, the state created and maintained a balance of interests that shifted over time. Thus, reliance on provincial forces that saved the empire in the 1820s differed sharply from the use of Hamidiye regiments as a supplemental, if regionally crucial, force in the 1890s. Kasaba's treatment of tribalism/nomadism and the state is simply excellent.

Although there were major refugee movements in the 18th century, these reached stupendous and at times unmanageable proportions only later. Here perhaps the author might have more explicitly linked the state's continuing reliance on tribes to its need for aid in dealing with the terrible insecurities brought by the refugee waves. In his closing pages, the author reminds us effectively, if too briefly, of the catastrophic events of the last days of empire, including the slaughter of the Armenians and the brutalities of the population exchange. He seems a bit rushed here, as in his cursory treatment of migratory labor, a subject on which he has written well elsewhere. Overall, however, this book is a truly fine achievement and is highly recommended.

ALI ANOOSHAHR, *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam: A Comparative Study of the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods*, Routledge Studies in Middle Eastern History (New York: Routledge, 2009). Pp. 208. $140 cloth.

REVIEWED BY ANNE F. BROADBRIDGE, Department of History, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Mass.; e-mail: broadbridge@history.umass.edu
doi:10.1017/S0020743810000656

In this ambitious comparative approach to the concept of *ghazā* (roughly, holy war), Ali Anooshahr seeks not to determine what *ghazā* meant and whether particular individuals lived up to the model of a *ghāzi* but rather how Muslim authors and rulers understood, created, and modified *ghāzi* rhetoric. He attempts to answer what role this rhetoric played in rulers' political self-expression through case studies of three men: Mahmud of Ghazna (d. 1031), the Ottoman Sultan Murad II (d. 1451), and Babur (d. 1530), founder of the Mughal Empire. To accomplish this, Anooshahr focuses on the interrelationships between texts in the creation and transmission of ghazi images, the ways authors and rulers understood and appropriated these images, the images' employment in propaganda campaigns, and the effect of these campaigns on audiences. Although he connects his literary discussion to historical events, he admits in the introduction that his intent is not to provide a historical narrative. The list of works consulted is impressively long, linguistically diverse, and chronologically and geographically wide ranging: histories, epics, poetry, and advice manuals in Persian, Turkish, and Arabic from the early Abbasid, Ghaznavid, Seljuk, Qarakhanid, Khwarazm-Shah, Ottoman, non-Ottoman

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743810000656 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Anatolian, and early Mughal worlds. The author also draws on letters written for Temür, Beyazid I, Mehmed I, Murad II, and Babur.

This book is ambitious not only because of its tremendous scope and the linguistic challenges of its sources but also because Anooshahr works squarely in the realm of human intent and understanding, even though these highly personal abstractions are rarely expressed clearly. By following a complex web of textual borrowings and influences, stated and otherwise, Anooshahr must guess what authors of histories, epics, letters, and advice manuals were trying to do (which was not always what they claimed to be doing). He also attempts to understand how previous works affected these authors' writing and how this writing in turn influenced the images rulers used to express themselves, their methods of self-presentation, and their actual behavior. One of his most impressive and creative feats is to locate what may be the autobiographical voices of rulers embedded in works written by others.

Anooshahr begins by describing the way Babur's familiarity with an established literary tradition on heroic *ghāzi* figures affected both his actions and his self-presentation in his famous memoir titled *The Baburnama.* Anooshahr situates Babur in the context of his ancestor Temür, whose highly sophisticated methods of self-presentation through literary and artistic propaganda were inherited by his descendants. Despite Babur's overall success with propaganda, he found Temür's legacy unhelpful in India and switched to a new rhetorical strategy by promoting himself as a *ghāzi* ruler, which allowed him to draw on a rich tradition of literature on *ghazā* dating back to Mahmud of Ghazna. After analyzing the influence of earlier works on *The Baburnama* and the variations within the book itself, Anooshahr taps an unexpectedly extensive amount of post-Babur literary evidence and convincingly measures the impact, reception, and success of Babur's propaganda campaign.

Anooshahr's second case study deals with Mahmud of Ghazna. Here he examines how ideas about austerity and dissipation used by al-Tabari and al-Masʿudi to critique the Abbasid caliphs were taken up by historians working under Ghaznavid patronage. The historians used these ideas to present the founder of the dynasty, Sebüktegin, as an austere and hardy yet compassionate convert to Islam. Anooshahr then analyzes Ghaznavid, Seljuk, Qarakhanid, and Khwarazm-Shah literary works to elaborate the theory of the triad of kings: an austere founder king who personally leads his men in *ghazā*, followed by a glorious monarch who oversees other *ghazi* warriors but rarely undertakes *ghazā* himself, and finally a dissolute ruler who fails to wage *ghazā* successfully and whose debauchery leads to the dynasty's downfall. Anooshahr traces the origins of this literary model to works by the Seljuk vizier Nizam al-Mulk and the Ghaznavid historian Bayhaqi, after which the triad of kings became a standard way to conceptualize rulers, dynasties, and the role of *ghazā*. Of particular interest is the way some authors and rulers tinkered with the triad, and with history, to avoid the last, inglorious phase (that of the dissolute dynasty wrecker). Anooshahr also details the active roles played by both Sebüktegin and Mahmud in the creation and dissemination of their images.

In his final case study on the Ottoman Sultan Murad II, Anooshahr sets the stage by charting the changing meanings of *ghazā* and the *ghāzi* king in letters written for the Ottoman Beyazid I (d. 1403) and the Mongol warlord Temür (d. 1405). He also uses Anatolian histories and their rhetorical concerns about the Mongols—who had preceded Temür into the region and on whose model Temür drew—to provide the literary background for Mongol elements within Ottoman concepts of *ghazā*. Anooshahr also describes another peculiarity of the Ottoman case: *ghazā* against Christians and the accompanying rhetoric. The author then moves to relations between the Ottoman sultans Mehmed I (d. 1421) and Murad II, on the one hand, and Temür's son Shahrukh (d. 1447), on the other hand, and meticulously maps the way definitions of *ghazā* changed (particularly on the Ottoman side and in light of the triad of kings model) as the sultans regained power and confidence in the postinterregnum years.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743810000656 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Anooshahr's study is a major contribution to scholarship. His comparative approach allows him to engage multiple fields at once, from Ottoman and Mughal studies to Ghaznavid history. He charts a new and critically important path in scholarly investigations of the ever-thorny and ever-compelling question of *ghazā*. His work will be indispensable to scholars interested in ideas, literature, and the creation of texts, as well as those seeking to develop a more sophisticated view of kingship, rule, and the subtleties of royal power in the Muslim medieval world. Critiques of this remarkable monograph must be few and slight. Because Anooshahr is working with abstract ideas, ambiguous evidence, and the elusive quarry of human understanding and intent, some of his conclusions will not be as convincing as others. In addition, this reader occasionally wished for details on the nuts and bolts of literary production. For example, when and where did rulers read (or have books read)? What did their exchanges with authors look like? What about those with chancellery officials and other rhetoricians? Despite these minor points, Anooshahr's work is persuasive, interesting, and groundbreaking. This thoughtful, highly erudite, and creative book is very impressive and doubly so because it is Anooshahr's first monograph. It will be fascinating to see what he does next.

ERIC TAGLIACOZZO, ED., *Southeast Asia and the Middle East: Islam, Movement, and the Longue Durée* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2009). Pp. 400. $27.95 paper.

REVIEWED BY ROBERT W. HEFNER, Institute on Culture, Religion, and World Affairs, Boston University, Boston, Mass.; e-mail: rhefner@bu.edu
doi:10.1017/S0020743810000668

Arab Muslims have traveled through Southeast Asian waters since the 8th century and played a role in the waves of Islamic conversion that swept the region from the 14th century on. Abiding by a different migratory logic, Southeast Asians who had studied in Mecca and Cairo played a major role in the reform movements that arose in urban Southeast Asia in the late 19th century. Notwithstanding these and other examples of extended contacts, Southeast Asian ties to the Middle East have been the subject of little sustained historical research. Originating from papers first presented at a conference in 2004 at the Asia Research Institute at the National University of Singapore, this edited volume confirms that the state of scholarship on this important topic is rapidly improving.

The book consists of the editor's introduction followed by thirteen chapters grouped into sections according to historical period: the first centuries of contact, the colonial age, the early 20th century, and contemporary trends. The editor's thoughtful introduction explains the book's background and ambitions, noting that the book's chapters focus on one of two themes: religious contacts between the two regions, or the manner in which changes in each region's political-economic infrastructure altered existing cultural flows. In the 20th century, Tagliacozzo concludes, many Southeast Asians have looked to the Middle East as demonstrating an "alternative modernity" (p. 11) to models offered by the West and postcolonial nationalism.

In the first chapter of the book's section on precolonial contacts, Michael Laffan provides a richly documented account of the terms used by Arab writers and travelers for insular Southeast Asia. He points out that during the first centuries of contact, Arab images of insular Southeast Asia were informed more by Greek sources and Malay toponyms than by firsthand accounts. However, these early tales gave rise to detailed awareness with the pilgrimage of Jâwa Muslims (i.e., Muslims from insular Southeast Asia) to Arabia in the 19th century. In Chapter 3, Timothy Barnard offers an analysis of ties between the Middle East and the Malayo-Indonesia world from the perspective of the Buginese lords who conquered Malay populations in the Riau archipelago (to the south of what is today Singapore). As their power

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743810000656 Published online by Cambridge University Press