There are also places where the status of the text itself as a working draft – however carefully prepared up to that point – seems to show through. The famous tale of al-Kindī, in which a miserly landlord refers to the problems that arise when the tenant enjoys an unfettered right to receive visitors and entertain guests, will serve as a source for a few examples.

1. Among the landlord's many absurd complaints is a phrase referring to how, with many people coming and going, the *ʿatab* will break. For this Pellat has "les marches" (*Avares*, p. 117), and Serjeant understands the term in much the same way: "stair treads" (*Misers*, p. 68). But what the author means is "doorsteps", i.e. the wooden threshold at the foot of a doorway upon which people would tread as they enter or leave the house. This of course must be a heavy length of solid timber firmly set on the ground; it is meant to be stepped on, and while over the years it would become worn, it would not "break" except after a very very long time or under an enormous weight. But that is the point of the author. He is using the landlord's protests as a means of showing how a perfectly logical point, pressed to the extreme, simply becomes absurd.
2. Shortly thereafter the landlord has moved on to other points, including a lament at what will happen in the house, as Serjeant has it, "when there are lots of children and greater number of people" (*Misers*, p. 68), but what the Arabic actually says is rather more colourful – and typical of the author. In the Arabic the passage reads: *idhā kathara al-ṣubyānu wa-taḍāʿafa al-bawshu* (ed. al–Ḥājirī, p. 71). By *ṣubyān* al-Jāḥiẓ means specifically boys, to whom he routinely attributes all sorts of mischief and nonsense in his various works, and *al-bawsh* means not merely a large number of people, but more pointedly, a disorderly rabble. So a better translation would be: "when more and more boys show up and the mob increases"; Pellat (*Avares*, p. 117) catches some of this sense: "lorsque le nombre des enfants augmente, que la marmaille double . . . ."
3. Elsewhere the landlord moans about careless tenants and their misuse of water: the walls of his house are in danger from dripping water jugs and what Serjeant (*Misers*, p. 69) calls "bad management" (Pellat, *Avares*, p. 118: "que l'on s'organisait mal") in their drawing of water from wells. The Arabic is *sūʾal-tadbīr* (ed. al-Ḥājirī, p. 72), which in context is perhaps better rendered as "lack of due care". But still, what is al-Jāḥiẓ talking about? We have here a terse compressed phrase of the sort that the author adores, and which in translation requires an explanatory note; what he means is that people will draw up a full bucket from the well when the container into which they intend to pour the water will hold only part of that amount – the rest, due to their carelessness and lack of forethought, will simply overflow and splash everywhere.

Such cases are of course matters of nuance and illustrate how difficult it is to translate the *Bukhalā*', or indeed, any work by al-Jāḥiẓ. While this translation does not resolve every difficulty, it is a fitting memorial to the abilities of a great Arabist. Anyone who works in this period must also be grateful to the translator's colleagues for attending to the final preparation of the manuscript

Lawrence I. Conrad
University of Hamburg

Pour une Histoire de la Sérinde: le Manichéisme Parmi les Peuples et Religions D'asie Centrale D'après les Sources Primaires. By Xavier Tremblay. pp. vi, 337, map. Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001.
DOI: 10.1017/S1356186304244601

Tremblay indicates in his preface that the base of his research is the data collected in his carefully annotated appendices on Serindian toponyms (Appendix A, pp. 131–136), aristocratic languages in each location of this region in the first millenium CE (Appendix B, pp. 137–138), and the correlation of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186304244601 Published online by Cambridge University Press

language use to religion in the same period through the content of surviving primary texts (Appendix C, pp. 139–182). He states that, on the basis of this data, he could have constructed a number of different studies, but chose to limit this initial work to contextualising the origins, conditions, and demise of Manichaeism in the region. This subject is one desperately in need of investigation, and one is inclined to applaud any first effort in this direction, however meagre the results. In this case, Tremblay's Appendix E (pp. 189–245), a comprehensive and quite valuable set of bibliographies of Sogdian and Manichaean texts, is a valuable tool that in itself gives the book significance. The juxtaposition of the two categories of texts in this appendix fits Tremblay's thesis that the Sogdians were the primary carriers of religious culture to Serindia, be it Buddhist, Christian, Mazdean, or Manichaean, and this thesis is explored in the main body of his work (pp. 1–130).

After a brief treatment of historiographic issues (pp. 9–15), Tremblay establishes the context of Central Asian Manichaeism through a survey of the region's political and linguistic developments (pp. 17–46). He then turns to the data specific to Manichaeism, seeking to establish the relative chronology (pp. 47–84) and absolute dating of Manichaean remains (pp. 85–95). These first 95 pages, which are by far the strongest part of the book, build most directly on Tremblay's base of data, and handle their respective issues competently, even insightfully, with exhaustive footnoting. This material, when combined with the 115 pages of appendices, as well as the 90 pages of exhaustive indices, constitutes the bulk of the book, and represents a work to be celebrated and taken as a solid base for future research.

Apparently, Tremblay aspired to more, and in doing so he takes a 45-page misstep that the reader would do well to skip over. He analyses evidence for the popularity of Manichaeism in Turfan and its connections to political institutions of the Uygur regime (pp. 97–122), and seeks to identify distinctive traits of the religious character of Manichaeism in Turfan (pp. 123–130). But, although he diligently discusses the difficulties of these two tasks, he does not solve them, with the result that many of his original remarks come across as arbitrary interpretations of material that can be read in many different ways, when it is not outright contrary to Tremblay's ideas. Although I am obligated to provide a more detailed critique of this portion of Tremblay's work, I wish to reiterate that it should not undermine the significance of his achievement in the rest of his book.

Tremblay maintains, primarily on morphological and phonological grounds, that Sogdian Manichaeism arrived in Turfan between 650 and 700 CE as the last of the Sogdian-carried religions to reach the region, after Mazdaism, Buddhism, and Christianity (pp. 73–75). As there is little evidence of Manichaeism in Sogdiana itself, Tremblay affirms the widespread scholarly opinion that both Buddhism and Manichaeism were religions of the Sogdian merchant diaspora (despite the fact that Tremblay is aware of the sixth-century bullae of a Sogdian Manichaean bishop from Kanka in the vicinity of Tashkent published by Livsic, 93). Tremblay repeatedly characterises Manichaeism as the religion of "rich Sogdian merchants" (e.g. p. 111) and denies that it ever had any popularity among the common classes of Serindia. On the basis of the Parthian underpinnings of both Sogdian and Chinese Manichaean texts, established primarily by Werner Sundermann, Tremblay localises the base of the religion's Central Asian missionary efforts in Bactria, Margiana, and "Indo-Parthia" (pp. 94–95, 105–107), the latter of which he identifies with Gandhara (p. 105). Tremblay has made good use here of linguistic and historical information, and he is certainly correct that the northeastern crescent extending from Marv into eastern Iran and northern Afghanistan marks a region where all of the data is best explained. The perpetuation of Parthian as a living language should be looked for, however, not in Gandhara (where there is no evidence of such a local survival), but in the river valleys of Khurasan, from where Parthian nationalism raised its head in the revolt of Bahram Chobin in the late sixth century, precisely the time and place of the *Denawar* schism, which in turn seems to have initiated missionary expansion into Central Asia. Tremblay seems never to have considered the possibility of an initial Parthian mission into Serindia from this quarter, which actually would best explain the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186304244601 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Parthian roots of both the prose and liturgical literature of Sogdian and Chinese Manichaeism. Indeed, this would explain Tremblay's own point that the religion was somehow found among the Sogdian diaspora without having a substantial base in Sogdiana itself.

Tremblay's review of the little we know about the *Denawar* schism (pp. 123–126) is useful and competent. He correctly points to the enfeeblement of the Mesopotamian leadership under oppression as the probable root cause of the desire on the part of Manichaeans outside of Iran to take initiative into their own hands, rather than any significant doctrinal or ethical dispute. Yet Tremblay makes two basic mistakes in his treatment of this subject. First, he apparently has not consulted an-Nadim directly, but relied upon secondary summaries of him, and so says (as many others have) that an-Nadim speaks of the Manichaeans of Transoxiana breaking free of Mesopotamian control under the leadership of Šad-Ohrmezd (p. 123); in fact an-Nadim never mentions the Šad-Ohrmezd whose death in 600 CE marked the beginning of an era for Central Asian Manichaeans (the identification of this figure as leader of the schism is due to Hans Schaeder, *Iranica* 79f.), and places the *Denawar* schism in Bactria, not Transoxiana. Second, he ascribes the enfeeblement of the Mesopotamian leadership to its persecution by and submission to "the Muslim enemy" (p. 126), when in fact the schism occurred before Islam even existed, probably at the time of the persecution by Khusrau I, and the advent of Islam in the region actually brought a relief of oppression and something of a Manichaean renaissance.

Tremblay's analysis of the relations between Manichaeism and the Uygur aristocracy would have benefited from some exposure to the modern field of religious studies, rather than relying upon clichés from the era of Gibbon that elite conversions are always for temporal reasons. So Tremblay simply asserts that the conversion of the Uygur ruler Bügü (Mo-ho) was "without doubt independent of any religious conviction" (p. 114). Like the Khazar adoption of Judaism in the same period, Tremblay suggests, the Uygur "conversion" was a means to maintain a separate identity from surrounding powers identified with other faiths (p. 112). Because of the pervasive role of Sogdians in the political apparatus of nearly every Central Asian state between 500 and 1000 CE, it had to be a religion found among the Sogdians. Here is where Tremblay's scenario runs into trouble. By his own interpretation, Manichaeism had nowhere near the popularity of Buddhism, Mazdaism, or Christianity among the Sogdian diaspora. While Buddhism may have been passed over because it was also the religion of the Chinese court, and so would have subjugated the Uygurs to Chinese interests, as it had the earlier Turk empires (pp. 111–112), Mazdaism and Christianity suffered from no such handicap, and Tremblay offers no explanation as to why they were likewise bypassed for the supposedly much less popular Manichaeism. This question is all the more pressing for Tremblay, who takes the time to catalogue the supposed defects of Manichaeism as a religion, basing himself largely on impressionistic remarks made by scholars of the 1930s who did not yet have enough information to form a coherent reading of the faith (pp. 120–121). His analysis of the relative popularity of the different religions comes across as wholly subjective, and contradictory. He goes to considerable length to demonstrate the popular nature of Sogdian and Turkic Buddhist texts from Turfan (glossing the existence of extremely dense doctrinal texts among this material), and then turns around and asserts that Buddhism was much less popular in the Sogdian diaspora than Mazdaism, a religion for which he is unable to cite any certain primary text recovered from Turfan (pp. 115–117 and pp. 200–202). Similarly in the case of Manichaeism, he claims that the textual remains point to a popular and practical side to the faith in its Serindian form (p. 130), yet never questions that it remained the creed of a tiny, urban (whatever that means in the oasis environment of Serindia), intellectual minority. He ascribes its value to its usefulness in diplomatic relations with China (p. 111), while contradictorily attributing to it an anti-Chinese programme (p. 113).

Tremblay's exploration of the events around Bügü Khan's conversion and later death is likewise unsatisfactory. On the former event, we have only two sources, the trilingual Qarabal*γ*asun inscription and the Uygur Manichaean text U72/TM276. He proposes to read the latter as a literary fiction that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186304244601 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1) conflates Bügü Khan with his assassin and successor Ton Baγa Tarqan, (2) pretends that the former was never killed, (3) seeks to erase from historical memory the latter's crime and the interruption of state support for Manichaeism, and (4) in this way to secure the good will of the ruler (Ton Baγa Tarqan himself or one of his successors) for Manichaeism once more (pp. 108–110). It is unimaginable that this convoluted literary scenario should be taken seriously as an alternative to the more straightforward interpretation of Larry Clark that Tremblay labours in vain to set aside, that is, that the text relates Bügü's final affirmation of the Manichaean faith after an initial lapse, and his issuing of the historical edict promoting the faith throughout the Uygur realm, both explicitly given in the text and closely correlated with passages in the Qarabalγasun inscription. Tremblay maintains that the latter inscription does not explicitly refer to a lapse by Bügü; but in the passage in question Bügü confesses – remarkably for such a public monument – that he struggled with the faith, and had to come back to it two or three times. He complains that Clark does not give due attention to the Tarqan who is cited twice in U72/TM276, and argues that this must be none other than the assassin Ton Baγa Tarqan. This argument not only contradicts Tremblay's theory that the text sought to gloss over Ton Baγa Tarqan's hostility, but it also is based on an impossible reconstruction of the text (Tremblay proposes to read Tarqan's name, of which only a final *w* survives, as [''lp]w t['r]x'n, regardless of the fact that the name Alp lacks the very letter *w* that is all that remains of the Tarqan's name in this text, and moreover did not form part of Ton BaγaTarqan's name, but was assumed as part of the same figure's throne name as khagan in 779). As Clark says (article cited, p. 103), there were any number of Tarqans drawn from the royal clan, and clearly this particular one was on his way out at the time of Bügü's decision in favour of Manichaeism, *ergo* he is unlikely to be the same Tarqan who was in power more than fifteen years later. Tremblay's identification of the Tarqan of the text with the events at the end of Bügü's reign cannot surmount the difficulty that the text relates the successful propagation of the faith in the face of the Tarqan's opposition, the very reverse of the circumstances involving Ton Baγa Tarqan.

On Clark's argument for an earlier flirtation with Manichaeism on the part of Bügü circa 755/6, Trembley ignores the evidence of the Uygur monuments recording military activity in Serindia involving the future Bügü Khan in 754–756, is carelessly overconfident about the issues surrounding the alternate name forms *Pwkw/Pwxwx* in the Uygur sources (which Clark carefully avoids using as a base for his argument), and misguidedly contends that there was no Manichaean *mozak* in Qoco in the 750s or 760s for Bügü to meet. This last argument is apparently based on the idea that the *mozak* who came to China from Bactria in 719 was the Jui-hsi encountered by Bügü Khan there in 762/3, ignoring the evidence of the Chinese Manichaean *Compendium* from 731 that administration of Manichaeism in China had since reverted to the subordinate authority of a bishop, so that the presence of a *mozak* in China in 719 was more of an anomaly than the norm. There probably was a *mozak* in residence in Qoco at the time of Bügü's military mission in the region in 755/6, whether or not the text U1 refers to events at this time, and Bügü must already have had an interest in the faith to explain the many pieces of evidence (collected by Clark) that show sponsorship and propagation of Manichaeism in the years before Bügü encountered the four Elect in the Chinese capital, as well as to account for his interest in rescuing them, as the Qarabalγasun inscription expressly states, from the state of anarchy that prevailed there. Conditions at the time of the sacking of Lo-yang were hardly conducive for Bügü's initial instruction in the faith.

On the demise of Manichaeism among the Uygurs, Tremblay once again seeks to stake out ground distinct from the position of Clark (as given in a series of still unpublished lectures). But at the end of his laboured exposition the reader finds a conclusion indistinguishable from Clark's, namely, that in the face of the growing threat of Islam, the Uygurs abandoned the minority Manichaean faith in favour of Buddhism, which was the religion of the general population in the core of their realm, i.e., Turfan (p. 120).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186304244601 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In working through Tremblay's arguments, the reader must contend with many errors and inconsistencies, often in the space of a single page, as when, for example, he identifies Manichaean calendars from 988, 989, and 1003 as dating to the reign of Köl Bilgä Tänri at the top of page 85, and proceeds at the bottom of the page to give 1007 as the first year of the same ruler, or when he refers to a Uygur embassy to the Chinese court in 805, with a footnote that fixes the date of the embassy in 807 (p. 111). He confusingly employs both the outdated IB and the current MIK catalogue designations for the holdings of the Museum für Indische Kunst in Berlin. He repeats old erroneous readings of Manichaean texts (e.g., *zhg 'γ m'ny* as "reincarnation", rather than simply "child" of Mani as an epithet of Bügü Khan, p. 112).

Tremblay is clearly much more at home in linguistic, social, and political history than in in-depth analysis of religion. His sporadic attempts to make substantive remarks about the content of Manichaeism are, therefore, often underdeveloped and poorly informed. He makes careless generalisations about Manichaeism (e.g., that the popularity of the religion among merchants could be explained by the Manichaean command to transience, which he takes to be general, rather than specific to the Elect, p. 114), many of which are simply contradictory (e.g., that Manichaeism is anti-aristocratic, and yet the religion of a tiny elite, p. 120). Loosely following Klimkeit's thesis on the consequences of Manichaean temporal success in the Uygur realm, Tremblay asserts that the *Sermon on the Soul*, evidently popular in Serindia, is "irreconciliable" in its pantheistic view of the cosmos with Mani's original (suppposedly anti-cosmic) gospel, ignoring his own awareness of Sundermann's conclusion that the *Sermon* probably was composed in Parthian within the first century of the religion, and therefore could not reflect any distinctively Serindian development of the faith (p. 127). Similarly, his identification of the Manichaeans as a "war party" at the Uygur court (p. 113) ignores Manichaean pacifism, and he can cite no evidence that would suggest a lapse in this pacifism in the Serindian context. In the end, he characterises Turfan Manichaeism as "neither theological, nor logical, nor moral, but astrological" (p. 130), a conclusion unfathomable to anyone with even a cursory familiarity with the Turfan remains of Manichaean literature. Such glib remarks do nothing to advance Tremblay's subject and show a lack of care behind this portion of his book, at odds with the meticulousness of the rest of his work.

Jason BeDuhn
Northern Arizona University

Oral Poetry and Narratives from Central Asia. By P. Marcel Kurpershoek. Vol. IV (A Saudi Tribal History – Honour and Faith in the Traditions of the Dawāsir). pp. xxx, 1001. Leiden, Brill, 2002.

DOI: 10.1017/S1356186304254608

At just over a thousand pages, Marcel Kurpershoek's fourth volume in the series that he has been producing since 1994 on the contemporary oral poetry and tribal narratives of southern Najd, is a work of great scholarship on its own. The four volumes together total over 2,300 pages – a meticulously researched labour of love that stands comparison in size and scope with Landberg's study of the oral poetry and prose of the Hadramawt, but goes further than that pioneering work in the detail of the essays which it incorporates on the practice and function of a tribal oral culture in its regional context. All that remains to be published now is the combined index and consolidated glossary to all four volumes, and a compact disc of some of the original recordings. It would be impossible to do justice to a work of this size in the space available for a normal review, so I will restrict my remarks to what makes this volume different from the others in the series, and what particularly interested me in it.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186304244601 Published online by Cambridge University Press