

les ateliers français de ces savoir-faire orientaux se heurtait à de multiples difficultés. Il aura ainsi fallu près d'un siècle pour maîtriser la production de sel ammoniac, alors quasi-monopole égyptien.

De tels constats remettent fondamentalement en question l'idée d'un déclin de l'artisanat en Orient avant le XIX^e siècle, tout comme les théories de centres développés, diffuseurs de savoirs, et de zones périphériques fournissant des matières premières et disposant d'une main d'œuvre illettrée non qualifiée. A partir de quelques exemples d'adaptation de méthodes traditionnelles dans des pratiques scientifiques modernes, N.H. élargit le débat à la nature même des savoirs, aux interactions entre artisans et savants, à l'empirique et au théorique, au local et à l'universel.

Ce bref compte rendu ne peut fournir qu'un aperçu très sommaire de cet essai très dense et très solidement argumenté. Il ne concerne pas seulement les spécialistes de l'Égypte moderne ou de l'Empire ottoman, mais aussi ceux qui s'interrogent sur les fondements mêmes de notre monde moderne globalisé et connecté.

Michel Tuchscherer

Professeur Émérite, Aix-Marseille Université

B. DENİZ ÇALIŞ-KURAL:

Şehrengiz: Urban Rituals and Deviant Sufi Mysticism in Ottoman İstanbul.

xiii, 276 pp. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014. £65. ISBN 978 1 4724 2709 0.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X15001196

While interdisciplinary work is already rare in Ottoman studies, the relationship of literary production and literary networks to Ottoman social, political, religious and artistic history is overwhelmingly neglected. In this sense *Urban Rituals* is a novel contribution. It is based on the author's 2004 dissertation. Employing scholarship from three distinct fields of study: religious, literary and art history, the work argues that "melâmî ideals" were at the heart of certain "urban rituals" that took place in gardens and were manifested in a genre of poetry, namely *şehrengiz*.

In six chapters Çalış-Kural takes up a number of topics from the influence of the thirteenth-century sheikh Ibn al-Arabi on Anatolian Sufism to garden imagery in *şehrengiz* poems, to book paintings, to Ottoman landscape architecture. The book includes black and white illustrations as well as reconstructions showing the organizational principles behind visual depictions of gardens. The many spelling mistakes show that the book did not benefit from a thorough editing process. More importantly, it suffers from many methodological flaws and factual errors. In this review, I focus only on the use of evidence from literary works.

Çalış-Kural structures the book around a series of bold arguments: the Tulip Period was the climax rather than a starting point of modernization; the roots of the "development of self-consciousness and individuality" are found in the early sixteenth century; a streak of classical Turkish poetry functioned as a device through which poets with links to "heterodox" Sufi orders expressed liberating discourses against the Orthodoxy in the "Islamic" Ottoman state. Çalış-Kural establishes her argument in the distinction between state-sponsored gardens, and those frequented by Sufis; the former as sites of social control and the latter "open spaces for the liberation of individuals" (p. 1). According to this argument, during the 1720s, different social groups started to frequent state-sponsored gardens, challenging the

“hierarchy of the classical Ottoman cosmology”, described as an order that gives form to concepts of exclusion and inclusion. On the first page, the author states that “some marginal groups in the Sufi tradition asserted the importance of gardens as a source of inquiry for divine knowledge. Instead of using gardens as a symbol of the religion or the monarchy, they challenged the use of gardens” (p. 1).

The author’s unspecified use of terminology and theoretical categories weakens the main argument of the book. The most important example of this is the focus of the study: “*Melâmî*”. It appears as a separate sect in sentences such as, “*Melâmîs* rejected *zîkî*” (p. 54); “*Melâmî* thought openly entered the city of Istanbul...” (p. 55), and “*Melâmîs* valued each human being as a beloved reflection of God” (p. 232). It is very difficult to comprehend if the author relies on an abstraction as “*melâmî*-mindedness”, or commenting on historically defined particular practices. The ingrained nature of some practices and ideas categorized as *melâmîan* in Ottoman state formation is totally neglected for the sake of the argument, as the possibility of “monarchy” searching for divine knowledge is not considered at all, even though mystical tendencies of particular sultans, and their complex relationship with various Sufi sects, are attested by scholarship.

One of the major problems is that this book refers to few titles dated after 2000. The neglect of recent scholarship in Ottoman studies makes it sound dated and weakens its argument. For example, an annotated bibliographical study of scholarly work on the *şehrengîz* texts challenges the author, who complains about lack of work in the genre (Barış Karacasu, “Türk Edebiyatında Şehrengîzler”, *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 2007, 259–313).

It is also necessary to consult Mesihi’s original work in the edition of his *divan*, rather than selections quoted in a secondary source (pp. 108–114) (*Mesihî Dîvânı*, ed. Mine Mengi. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 1995). There are also flawed descriptions, leading readers to question the attention of the author to the sources and secondary literature: *gâzîs* were not Anatolian Türkmens (pp. 43 ff.), most of them were converts. *Hamzaname* is not about a “holy horse belonging first to Muhammed’s [sic.] uncle” but adventures of Prophet Muhammed’s uncle Hamza (p. 44).

In her discussion of eleven *şehrengîz* texts, the author, referring to common tropes and similes of Islamicate literary tradition, argues that this imagery reflects the contemporary *melâmî* tendencies. However, linking *şehrengîz* texts and poets to deviant religious orders due to imagery is erroneous since (1) this imagery governed all other forms of literature, not only *şehrengîz*, and (2) all poets, including sultans and religious leaders, used the same imagery for centuries.

While it is interesting to argue that these poets “performed” *şehrengîz* texts in solidarity with guilds, there is no evidence whatsoever for this. The author claims that one of the beauties cited by Mesihi in 1512 as a beautiful boy of Edirne was Hacı Bayram Veli, who had died in 1429 (p. 112): it is odd for a saint who died a century earlier to appear in a list of beautiful boys of Edirne. The author similarly identifies a boy named in Katib’s *şehrengîz* dated 1513 as Sarban Ahmed, a Bayrami poet who died in 1545 (pp. 116–7) without any evidence. The section on *şehrengîz* would definitely be improved through closer reading and investigation of the manuscript evidence, and inquiry in a wealth of scholarship on guilds. Many more *şehrengîz* texts have been edited and there has been an ongoing discussion of these city panegyrics that centred on the beautiful boys in the market place in Persian and Turkish literary traditions.

Perhaps its major shortcoming is the book’s uncritical reliance on binary oppositions, such as “Ottoman”/“*melâmî*”, Orthodox/Heterodox, Novelty/Traditional etc. In its current state it brings together evidence from different fields of study;

however, the methodological and factual shortcomings make it difficult to follow, and the arguments difficult to accept, especially in the context of innovative recent work within Ottoman studies.

Selim S. Kuru
University of Washington

SOUTH ASIA

LARS FOGELIN:

An Archaeological History of Indian Buddhism.

xii, 250 pp. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. ISBN 978 0 19 994823 9.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X15001202

This ambitious book promises much: a new understanding of the development of Indian Buddhism, repositioning the role of archaeology in that study, and developing the theoretical approach to the archaeology of religion. In pursuing these aims, it is both more and less than an “archaeological history of Indian Buddhism”. More, because it engages with the art historical and textual sources far beyond the level they are usually considered by archaeologists of South Asia, provides a genuinely new explanation of religious change within Indian Buddhism, and delivers a welcome injection of archaeological theory. Yet less, because it is far from comprehensive and prone to generalizations.

The introduction establishes Fogelin’s stance on a number of issues: what he means by archaeology *vis-à-vis* South Asian studies, the relationship between archaeological and textual evidence, and the archaeology of religion. We are also introduced to the main argument of the book – that contra traditional (textually derived) thinking, the Buddhist sangha was “domesticated” from the start and became ascetic over time with the invention of an ascetic tradition. It is proposed that the development of Buddhism can be explained in terms of an inherent tension within it between individual and communal desires.

Chapter 2 provides an engaging introduction to the multiple theories used to support and demonstrate this argument, from Marxism to semiotics and materiality. Fogelin argues convincingly for the necessity and value of applying a number of contradictory theoretical perspectives to the study of religion, which itself is inherently incoherent.

The next five chapters reconstruct a history of religious change within Indian Buddhism through the analysis of changes in architecture, iconography, symbolism, ritual and doctrine, all with reference to wider societal developments. Starting with the period *c.* 600–200 BCE, Fogelin argues that there was a dynamic tension between the individual and communal desires of the sangha, who inhabited monasteries, and the laity, who worshipped at stūpa complexes – defined as “pilgrimage centres” for the rest of the book. In doing so, Fogelin sets up an uncomfortably rigid division between these categories of Buddhist sites and two halves of the Buddhist community.

In chapter 4 we learn that between 200 BCE and 200 CE, pilgrimage centres (and thus the laity) became more geared towards egalitarian ritual, while changes in the design of chaitya-stūpas within monasteries reflect the gradual legitimization of the sangha’s religious authority. These ever-diverging trajectories are charted in chapters 5 and 6. The coincidental emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism, invention of a