raises the question of how blackness – either abstractly or in reference to actual Black people – fits into how her respondents understand themselves as racialized subjects.

Forever Suspect also raises broader questions about citizenship and belonging. Is it possible to imagine an American society, or any society, without racialized citizenship? While reading I was struck by those respondents, mostly women, who expressed optimism and hope that through their own behavior they will shape others' views of Muslims. They believe that positive change can still be effected amidst the heightened Islamophobia pervading the United States, buttressed by the words and actions of the U.S. president. One wonders how far our systems of racialized surveillance will go before we might all act in opposition.

That such questions arose while reading this book speaks to its richness. *Forever Suspect* will remain relevant for how it challenges us as social scientists and other scholars who research Muslim Americans in new ways. In addition to its scholarly depth, it is a beautifully written ethnography that will appeal to both undergraduate and graduate students, as well as scholars in Sociology, Race and Ethnicity, and Islamophobia, among other disciplines.

DOI:10.1017/rms.2020.13

Jean Beaman
University of California, Santa Barbara

Heghnar Zeitlian Watenpaugh. *The Missing Pages: The Modern Life of a Medieval Manuscript, from Genocide to Justice* (Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019). Pp. 436; 26 ills. $30.00 cloth. ISBN 9780804790444.

With *The Missing Pages: The Modern Life of a Medieval Manuscript, from Genocide to Justice*, Heghnar Zeitlian Watenpaugh offers readers a creative and insightful approach to understanding the history of the Armenian Genocide and the destruction, dispersion, misappropriation, theft, and erasure of the cultural heritage of the Armenian people. Focusing on the long history of a single manuscript—that was, eventually, known as the "Zeytun Gospels," commissioned by the Armenian royal family of Cilicia and illustrated by Toros Roslin at an Armenian monastic complex in 1256—this book shows how the manuscript experienced distinct periods as a treasured object in different Armenian communities and geographies.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2020.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Watenpaugh tells the fascinating story of the medieval manuscript from its production in thirteenth-century Hromkla through the twenty-first century, and of the eight illuminated canon tables extracted from it during the Armenian Genocide, eventually making their way to the Getty Museum in 1994. Part thriller, part historical narrative, *The Missing Pages* is the first attempt at a microhistory of the simultaneous processes of cultural destruction, theft, and re-appropriation in the history of the Armenian Genocide. With this story, Watenpaugh shows how destructive the long-term and continued denial of the Armenian Genocide has been and can be to Armenian cultural heritage, even after more than a hundred years.

As she notes in her book, since 2010, when Watenpaugh penned an opinion piece for the *Los Angeles Times* on a lawsuit brought against the Getty Museum by the Western Prelacy of the Armenian Church of America (based in Los Angeles) for the return of the illuminated canon tables of the Zeytun Gospels, the author has applied her expertise as an art historian and Middle East specialist in the way that Edward Said suggested academics are compelled to act: to fulfill the role of the public intellectual. As Said explains, "knowing how to use language well and knowing when to intervene in language are two essential features of intellectual action;"[1] Watenpaugh's work in unearthing and telling the story of the Zeytun Gospels and its missing pages is a prime example of intellectual action. Thanks to the efforts of Watenpaugh and others, some of the objects that were stolen from Armenian individuals and institutions during the Armenian Genocide are slowly being recognized by the museums that house them. Their provenances are also being reconsidered as the theft and/or re-appropriation of Armenian cultural heritage during the Armenian Genocide become apparent. Watenpaugh's work in this vein – as a scholar and as a public intellectual – must be recognized and understood not only within the framework of the study of the Armenian Genocide and its recognition (by individuals, scholars, institutions, and governments), but also within the context of the recovery and return of Nazi plunder and more recent global conversations on looting and artwork in museums and the postcolonial world, and specifically within the context of the the Sarr-Savoy Report. Watenpaugh sheds light on the ways in which Armenians used the Holocaust restitution movement as a model and explains that "the Zeytun Gospels dispute, like the other cases of Armenian Genocide-era litigation, is part of the new wave of activism for genocide recognition through the courts" (277).

[1] Edward Said, *Representations of the Intellectual* (New York: Vintage, 1996), 15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2020.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Missing Pages is ambitious in its scope and written in a style that rests between the academic and the popular, linking itself to a new trend in scholarly circles that has its benefits in sharing scholarship and ideas with a wider audience. The book will surely serve as a bridge between scholars and individuals who are interested in museums and cultural heritage, as well as with those curious to read a uniquely-framed, general history of Armenians from the thirteenth through the twenty-first centuries.

Often times, when scholars write for a more popular audience, generalizations are made, nuance is pushed to the side, and creative license is taken. In the ambitious endeavor to balance scholarship with appeal to a wider audience, scholars can engage in a narrativizing of history that prioritizes style and linearity over content and complexity. In the case of Armenian history and the history of the Armenian Genocide, these kinds of tendencies can be worrying because of the precarious nature of Armenian history, due to the continued denial of the Armenian Genocide by some scholars and governments and a tradition of intentional erasure of Armenian history and cultural heritage in the Republic of Turkey.[2] In this regard, while creative vignettes serve well to draw readers into a story, they can also endanger authenticity if not buttressed by historical sources. In the same vein, the kind of small liberties Watenpaugh takes in imagining scenes or making grand generalizations might, in the end, be used to discredit this work, even the parts that stand on solid empirical ground; this is especially true for a book that is likely to inspire strong, politically-motivated reactions.

For example, early in the book, Watenpaugh imagines a presumably Turkish person saying, "By the time we are done, no Armenian will ever have lived in this place. No Armenian will ever have created art in this place" (10–11). While imagining someone who participated in the perpetration of the Armenian Genocide as having thought or said something like this is feasible, there are no known accounts to support this particular quotation. There are several citations the author might have used that *have* been attested, but which were perhaps avoided as they would not tie the backbone of her book together as neatly or dramatically. In a similar vein, some of Watenpaugh's descriptions of specific historical moments or experiences are not footnoted. i.e.: "Villagers clutched family Gospels and prayer scrolls as gendarmes herded them onto deportation caravans;" (31) "They saw it as a closed book with a glorious binding,

[2] See, for example, Talin Suciyan, *The Armenians in Modern Turkey: Post-Genocide Society, Politics and History* (London: IB Tauris, 2016).

https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2020.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whose power derived in part from its very inaccessibility to view;" (106) "Armenians realized that they had been swept up in an empire-wide, state-directed process and that their own dispossession was both one of its objectives and one of its motivations" (161). These creative descriptions may make for a more easily-legible text. Yet, considering the relatively robust culture of Armenian Genocide denial, writing about Armenian history without consistently offering detailed sources and substantiations seems like a luxury that hasn't yet been attained.

Generalizations and dramatizations of history are often viewed as an acceptable replacement for nuance when scholars write for more popular audiences, but sweeping statements can oversimplify the past such that it becomes *too* neatly legible in the contemporary moment, and, in the case of histories telling a "national" story, proof of the exceptional at the price of accuracy. For example, Watenpaugh suggests that "more than any other Christian tradition, Armenians revere the Bible" (41). While the Armenian Christian tradition does revere the Bible, how could one prove that Armenians revere the Bible *more* than another tradition? Watenpaugh does not provide a source. Similar oversimplifications of the medieval history of Armenians reveal themselves throughout the early sections of the book and point to the hurdles faced by modernists when writing about the pre-modern world. Watenpaugh explains that, in the first half of the thirteenth century, the Armenian King of Cilicia Hetum I (d. 1270) traveled through Anatolia, where he visited the "cities, forts, and holy sites of medieval Armenia, the mother country where his sovereignty did not extend" (57). While this statement is not untrue, it oversimplifies the relationship between the Kingdom of Cilicia and Greater Armenia and displays an understanding of "sovereignty" quite different to the ways in which Armenians (and others) in the region during the late medieval period understood authority and control.[3] Similarly, Watenpaugh

[3] Levon Ter Petrossian has shown that the Kings of Cilicia were considered "the kings of all Armenians (*hamayn hayutʻean tʻagaworner*)." See: Levon Ter Petrossian, *The Crusaders and the Armenians: a Historico-Political Study* (*Xačʻakirnerə ew Hayerə: Patma-kʻałakʻagitakan hetazotutʻiwn*), vol. 2 (Yerevan: Armenian Library of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2007), 206. For example, he notes that 13th-century chronicler Kirakos Gancakecʻi relates that when members of the Zakarid dynasty at Ani wanted to build and use transportable alters for their armies (patterned after their Georgian neighbors), the urban leadership of Ani decided it was necessary to request permission both from the Armenian Catholicos and from the King of Armenia. See: *Kirakos Gancakecʻi, Patmutʻiwn hayocʻ ašxatasirutʻeamb K.A. Melikʻ-Ōhanjanyani* (Erevan: Haykakan SSR Gitutʻyunneri Akademayi Hratarkchutʻyun, 1961), 166–169; Robert Bedrosian, *Kirakos Gandzaketsi's History of the Armenians,* (New York: Sources of the Armenian Tradition, 1986), 130–133. Similarly, with regard to geography and

https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2020.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

considers the earliest Armenian inscription from Zeytun (dated 1536) as conveying "Zeytun's self-perception of autonomy" (83) due to the fact that it "gives precedence to the Armenian Catholicos over the Ottoman sultan" (83). In fact, placing the Armenian Catholicos, before non-Armenian leaders was a long-standing convention in manuscript colophons and a regular occurrence in Armenian inscriptions. Also, several scholars have written about the complex web of power dynamics reflected in medieval inscriptions that shed light upon the divergent ways in which these inscriptions might be read.[4]

While Watenpaugh tells us, even with her book's title, that her text will move between the medieval and modern experiences of the life of the Zeytun Gospels, she does not explain the terms "medieval" and "modern" or their meanings in relevance to the specific contexts of Armenian history. While this is understandable in a popular history book, it becomes problematic in this particular study. On the one hand, the author intentionally juxtaposes the medieval and modern experiences of Armenians (associating the "medieval" with "chivalry," "tradition," and "custom" [80, 99, 116,] and the "modern" with "westernization" and "cosmopolitanism" [100, 119, 122, 133, 134]). On the other hand, she directly links medieval and modern Armenian experiences via unexamined, contemporary notions of nationhood, calling the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia "unambiguously Armenian" (242), explaining that Cilician Armenians were "secure in their identity," (243) and calling the Zeytun Gospels manuscript itself a "monument of national history" (262).

governance, as Robert Bedrosian has shown, for most Armenian scholar-clerics political boundaries were less important than the demographic ones, so much so that the thirteenth-century scholar Mxit'ar Goš created a new term to designate parts of Armenian-inhabited lands to the South of the "Armenian homeland": "meso-Armenia" (or, *mijnahayk'*). See: Robert Bedrosian, Armenia and the Turco-Mongol Invasions (Unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1979), 91, n. 161. *Arakk' Mxit'aray Goshi* (*The Fables of Mxit'ar Gosh*) (Venice: San Lazzaro, 1854) 160.

[4] See, for example, Avedis K. Sanjian, *Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts 1301–1480: a Source for Middle Eastern History* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1969), introduction and especially 8; A.S. Matevosyan, *Hayerên Tserakreri Hišatakarannerə, E-ZB dd.* (*Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 5th-12th centuries)* (Erevan: Haykakan SSR Gitut'yunneri Akademiayi Hratarkch'ut'yun, 1988), ZE-ZT. For inscriptions, see: H.A. Orbeli, *Divan Hay Vimagrut'ean, Prak I: Ani Kałak (Divan of Armenian Epigraphy, vol. 1: the City of Ani*), (Erevan: Haykakan SSR Gitut'yunneri Akademiayi Hratarkch'ut'yun, 1966), introduction and 134. On the relationship between the written and oral texts in Armenian inscriptions and the ensuing complexities of understanding power relations and centralities, see: Christina Maranci (2006) "Building Churches in Armenia: Art at the Borders of Empire and the Edge of the Canon", *The Art Bulletin*, 88:4, 656–675, DOI: 10.1080/00043079.2006.10786313. See, also, Timothy Greenwood, "A Corpus of Early Medieval Armenian Inscriptions." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004): 27–91. Accessed May 19, 2020. doi:10.2307/3591380. Greenwood investigates the webs of meaning projected and reflected by the inscriptions within a complex network of powers: Armenian, Byzantine, Persian, and Islamic.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2020.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Missing Pages encourages us to ask important questions by exposing the complicated relationship between the field of Armenian Studies, nationalism and the history and historiography of the Armenian Genocide. This book could offer a jumping-off point for the academic community to revisit the connections and disconnections between medieval and modern histories, this time within the specific context of Armenian history. Perhaps this is the moment for scholars of Armenian history to re-evaluate the linearity with which many seem to view medieval and modern Armenian histories within the context of the large body of relatively recent scholarship that has attempted to ask whether Medieval Studies can be postmodern, and how scholars might better evaluate the complexities of studying the medieval history of a people alongside or adjacent to their modern histories and lived experiences. Specifically, as scholars of Armenian history, we need to ask: is all Armenian history writing in the aftermath of the Armenian Genocide meant to be an act of justice? This is a question that Watenpaugh seems to ask implicitly in her book, especially in her analysis of the scholarship of Sirarpie Der Nersessian, the woman credited with the founding of Armenian Art History. In particular, Watenpaugh questions the "silences" in Der Nersessian's study of medieval Armenian Art with regard to the genocide that the academic had personally experienced (219–223).

In recent conversations amongst European medievalists, some scholars have pointed to unexpected similarities between the Annales school and the field of subaltern studies, showing that akin to scholars of subaltern studies, Annales historians aimed to write underrepresented histories that had been ignored or overlooked because of their marginality to the creation and establishment of a medieval located in the "appropriation purposes of the present."[5] Yet, when historians move easily and seemingly without intellectual pause between the medieval and the modern histories of Armenia and Armenians, do they not also risk participating in finding and locating the "unambiguous" nation in the medieval without historicizing the concept of the nation? On the other hand, might some consider this kind of history writing, in fact, postcolonial in its own right, because it challenges a Turkish nationalist gaze upon the medieval history of Anatolia and the connections between the medieval past and the present?

In the end, the questions that loom large in the background of *The Missing Pages* can serve as a guide towards meaningful conversations amongst

[5] Bruce W. Holsinger, "Medieval Studies, Postcolonial Studies, and the Genealogies of Critique," *Speculum* 77:4 (2002):2016.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2020.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholars who study the Armenian past: Is Armenian history writing in the aftermath of the genocide a reluctant participant in a cycle of nationalisms, thanks to the kind of violent nationalism that inspired the Armenian Genocide? What dangers to the history of Armenians do generalizations and narratives pose in the name of "justice?" Finally, should all historians and public intellectuals who study Armenian history possess similar notions of what "justice" means and how it relates to researching and writing about the past?

Watenpaugh's work not only provides us with a tantalizing narrative history of a venerated, nearly anthropomorphized, illuminated manuscript and its "missing pages," it also offers us a timely and critical opportunity to re-evaluate the field of Armenian Studies, and the relationship of that field to the history and historiography of the Armenian Genocide.

DOI:10.1017/rms.2020.2

Rachel Goshgarian
Lafayette College

https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2020.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press