

JOURNAL
OF
ASIAN HISTORY

EDITED BY
DENIS SINOR

VOLUME 7

No. 2

1973

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, WIESBADEN

DENIS SINOR
(Indiana University)

NOTES ON THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF INNER ASIA I

The editor of any scholarly journal is well aware of the wisdom of the words expressed by the Preacher so long ago, to wit, that "of the making of many books there is no end" and he be forgiven for slightly altering the second part of the verse into "and much reviewing is a weariness of the flesh." And yet—to continue in the biblical vein—sitting by the dark waters of this endless stream of words an editor can observe better than most the flow of the current, he is able to discern its clarity or muddiness, and among the carrion and the driftwood he may and does find things of beauty and of lasting value. The review article of which this is the first installment aims at giving a general overview of recent trends and achievements in the field of Inner Asian historiography. Essentially it is based on books sent for reviewing to this *Journal* and hence it largely ignores articles and Soviet publications. The *Journal* does not receive review copies from Soviet publishers. Even so, and from the purely quantitative point of view, the scholarly output of recent years has been quite impressive. It seems obvious that there is an increasing awareness of the importance of Inner Asian studies in general and of its history in particular. But let the reader judge for himself.

General and the "Frontier."

Of the syntheses recently prepared, the most ambitious is certainly the *Geschichte Mittelasiens* edited by Bertold Spuler.¹ It is a collective

¹ Spuler, Bertold (Editor): *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. Erste Abteilung, fünfter Band, fünfter Abschnitt. *Geschichte Mittelasiens*. Mit Beiträgen von Karl Jettmar, Hans Wilhelm Haussig, Bertold Spuler, Luciano Petech, (Leiden—Köln, E. J. Brill, 1966), vii + 371 pp., bibliography, 125 Dutch guilders.

work in which no discernible attempt has been made to impose a general concept or to give an even approximately full coverage of Inner Asian history. In a one-page foreword Professor Spuler—whose name does not appear on the front page as editor of this volume but only as that of the whole *Handbuch*—explains why the Mongols of Mongolia, the Hsiung-nu, the Huns, and the Tanguts were omitted from this volume. There are four sections to the book: Karl Jettmar deals with Inner Asia and Siberia in the pre-Turkic period (pp. 1—105); Hans Wilhelm Haussig with the Avars, the Juan-juan, and the Hephthalites (pp. 106—122); Bertold Spuler covers the history of Inner Asia from the appearance of the Turks to the present day (pp. 123—310); and Luciano Petech gives a bird's-eye view of the history of Tibet (pp. 311—347). A good index and some very useful maps complete the volume.

Jettmar's approach is frankly archaeological; little use is made of the testimony of written sources. So what we receive is essentially a conspectus of Central Eurasian prehistory, from the Palaeolithic period to the time of the Sarmatians in the West and the Hsiung-nu in the East, although references are given to later data. Jettmar has a superb command of the relevant literature written almost entirely in Russian, and a common sense approach which shuns far-fetched hypotheses. His style is concise, factual, and the amount of information condensed on these pages, many of them set in very small type, is truly impressive. With some exaggeration one might consider Jettmar's chapter a very detailed, very intelligent analytical index of the archaeological literature of Central Eurasia. Such an approach is most suitable to the *Handbuch* and greatly increases the usefulness of this chapter. The absence of illustration in a work of this kind is surprising yet explicable. In view of the width and the depth of the material covered such illustrations would have little practical use and would only increase the already inordinately high price of the volume.

Professor Haussig is a distinguished Byzantinologist but seems to have been ill at ease in his assignment, the preparation of the second main chapter "Awaren, Shuan-shuan and Hephthaliten" of this book. He is unfamiliar with Chinese sources and even with the conventions that regulate the transcription of Chinese as witnessed by such monstrosities as the very spelling Shuan-shuan, which he uses. He is not more at home in Altaic linguistics and yet much of his text is taken up by impossible etymologies, e. g. when on p. 119 he links the title *qayan*

with the Mongol word *yaqai* "pig," or the *Jou-jan* appellation (spelled *Shou-shan* by Haussig) of the Juan-juan with the Mongol word *šočin* "stranger" (p. 118). He even postulates (p. 120) an Altaic **quru* "wolf" root which he equates with a Juan-juan family name, a completely gratuitous hypothesis. What a pity that Professor Haussig has not used his knowledge of Byzantine Greek to piece together some solid information concerning the history of the peoples his chapter was supposed to deal with.

Spuler's even-tempered "Geschichte Mittelasiens seit dem Auftreten der Türken" constitutes the bulk of this volume. It is an accurate, somewhat aseptic presentation of the political history of Inner Asia, from the beginning of the Türk empire in the 5th century A. D. to the present day. It is packed with facts, well documented, and rather conservative in its outlook and approach. It is probably the handiest presentation of the subject now available. The bibliography, more impressive than useful, does not seem to have a very organic relation to the text itself.

One cannot but applaud Professor Spuler's decision to include Tibet in the history of Inner Asia, where it properly belongs. His choice of asking Professor Petech to deal with the subject was equally fortunate. It is, however, a pity that so little space was given to such an important and neglected subject. In thirty-six pages, not even the expertise of Petech could provide more than an outline.

Another almost comprehensive history of Inner Asia is aimed at wider circles. Edited by Gavin Hambly,² it first appeared in German as part of the remarkable scholarly undertaking of the *Fischer Weltgeschichte*.³ However, as originally none of the eight collaborators wrote his share of the text in German, the later, English version may be said to constitute the original work. The German version—prepared by experts in the field—is accurate and reads well.

In the first four chapters of this book David Bivar examines the Greek, Indian, and Persian impact on Inner Asia, a topic barely touched upon in the *Geschichte Mittelasiens* edited by Spuler, where most of this period is covered by Jettmar. The two scholars differ also in their disciplinary approach. While Jettmar relies almost exclusively

² Hambly, Gavin (Editor): *Central Asia*. Volume XVI of Delacorte World History, (New York, Delacorte Press, 1969), xii + 388 pp., \$ 9.95.

³ *Zentralasien*. Fischer Weltgeschichte Bd. 16, (Frankfurt am Main, Fischer Bücherei, 1966), 365 pp.

on the results of archaeology, Bivar's mainstay consists of written sources, linguistics, and numismatics. He presents with great skill the entangled and controversial history of the Kushanas, Chionites, Kidarites, and Hephtalites, but the treatment given to the Türk and Uighur empires is far too perfunctory, a loss for the reader who does not consult any other work on Inner Asia.

Professor Hambly, the editor of this book, wrote the chapters on Tibet and on the Mongols. These constitute, on the whole, a competent and accurate presentation of Inner Asia's political history. Even the chapter entitled "Lamaistic Civilization in Tibet and Mongolia" (pp. 243—262) contains little else but narrative history. It would be churlish to pick out smaller mistakes but one is bound to say that Hambly writes Oirot for Oirat, i. e. he gives to an important Mongol empire the name of a small Turkic people. The mistake seems to have been tacitly corrected in the German version by the learned translator Professor Sagaster. It is unfortunate that this and some other corrections were not taken into consideration in the English version.

Of the remaining chapters, Chantal Lemerrier-Quelquejay is responsible for that dealing with the Kazakhs and the Kirghiz in the 15th to the 19th centuries; Mahin Hajianpur deals with the Timurid Empire and the Uzbek conquest of Mawarannahr; Richard Pierce traces the history of the Russian conquest; while Hélène Carrère d'Encausse examines the Russian Revolution and Soviet policy in Central Asia, and Alexandre de Bennigsen the Turks under Tsarist and Soviet rule. Alastair Lamb contributes a valuable chapter in Sinkiang under the Manchus and the Chinese Republic. Chapters 14 and 15, respectively by Professors Bennigsen and Pierce, overlap. It would have been better had the two chapters been amalgamated and entrusted to either of the two distinguished authors.

How should we now judge this work as a whole and what place should we assign to it in the growing historiography of Inner Asia? As a broad survey of Inner Asian history (with the exclusion of the *pre*-history), the Hambly book has much to commend itself. It is readable although uninspired, accurate on the whole although, with the exception of the chapters written by Bivar, not really scholarly. The amount of factual information embedded in the text will not overwhelm the laymen and yet may be of help to the expert. The book, perhaps mercifully, has no concept of its own and one even wonders whether its individual authors had any in connection with this book

beyond competently writing the wordage assigned to them. The book avoids the time-worn *clichés à la Harold Lamb* and, if for no other reason, it should be welcome on this account. It is the handiest beginner's book on Inner Asia at present available. As the running heads do not indicate the chapter number, and as the footnotes, grouped at the end of the book, are numbered separately for each chapter, the locating of a footnote is a frustrating task. Why not adopt the sensible solution of printing above the pages containing the notes the number of pages to which they refer?

Two more general histories of Inner Asia recently published should be mentioned. Grousset's *Empire of the steppes*, more than three decades old, has now appeared in an English translation.⁴ In a fairly detailed review article I have given my opinion of the re-edition of this work.⁵ It is now an outdated book but it "remains the most inspiring history of Inner Asia available in any language." My own *Inner Asia*⁶ is nothing but an oversized syllabus for American college teaching. I refer the reader to the numerous reviews⁷ that have dealt with it, and add—with a sigh of relief—that the first edition, marred by an inordinate number of misprints and misspellings, has been replaced by a second edition in which most of these have been eradicated. Apart from that only a few changes were made in the new version.

While blowing my own horn I might as well mention the second edition of an old book edited by me,⁸ in which (pp. 93—119) under the title "Central Eurasia" I first attempted to give a historical, somewhat impressionistic definition of Inner Asia. I continue to think that the term "Central Eurasia" describes more accurately the historical and

⁴ *The Empire of the Steppes: A History of Central Asia*. (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1970), XXX + 542 pp., \$ 17.50.

⁵ *Journal of Asian Studies*, XXX, 1971, pp. 633—638.

⁶ Sinor, Denis: *Inner Asia. History—Civilization—Languages. A Syllabus*, Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 96, (Bloomington—The Hague, 1969), Second, revised edition, 1971.

⁷ Igor de Rachewiltz in *JAOS* 92, 1972, pp. 162—163; Françoise Aubin, *L'Année sociologique* 20, 1969/71, pp. 283—284; B. S. Adams, *JRAS* 1971, pp. 72—73; Owen Lattimore, *Modern Asian Studies* April 1970, pp. 189—190; A. v. Gabain, *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher* 40, 1970, p. 262; Frank Huddle Jr., *HJAS* 30, 1970, pp. 279—281, and possibly others.

⁸ *Orientalism and History*, Second, revised edition, (Bloomington and London, Indiana University Press, 1970), xviii + 123 pp., \$ 4.95. Reviewed in *JAH* 6, 1972, pp. 133—134.

cultural entity with which we are here concerned and which constitutes the heartland of the Eurasian continent.

The term "heartland" is used by Mr. Stuart Legg as the title of a book of popularization which is not without merit.⁹ With its imaginary description of journeys and reconstructed dialogues this work lays no claim to scholarship but it makes for amusing reading and it is not grossly inaccurate. Relying on a small number of secondary sources Mr. Legg put together a pleasing evocation of the Inner Asian land and of its history to the end of the Mongol period.

The term "heartland" was coined, so it seems, in 1919 by Sir Halford Mackinder and applied to what in an earlier paper he had called the "geographical pivot of history." Mackinder's definition of the area has several weak points and would not be acceptable for specialists of Inner Asian history, yet in this field of research the historico-geographical delimitation of the subject has an uncommon importance. Somewhat unexpected but valuable help comes from an extraordinarily lucid and scholarly book by Dr. Alastair Lamb on *Asian frontiers*.¹⁰ The bulk of the book deals with the disputed areas, and they are many, of South and Southeast Asia, but it is far from irrelevant to our present concern. With a method that would meet the approval of the most rigorous French school teacher, Lamb begins with a definition of the terms he uses. He draws a clear distinction between a "boundary" which is "a clear divide between sovereignties" and has "as it were, length but not area," and a "frontier" which he understands to be "a zone rather than a line," or, in other words, "a tract of territory separating the centres of two sovereignties" (pp. 5—6). He also reminds us of the difference between a "demarcated" boundary and one that has only been "delimited."

Looking at the Asian landmass, Dr. Lamb recognizes three major lines of communications: a Siberian east-west water route utilizing the upper reaches of the rivers flowing into the Arctic, the steppe route with its southward-leading subsidiary roads, and finally, the east-west sea routes. He speaks of two other dominant physical features that have exerted influence on Asian history. The first of these is constituted

⁹ Legg, Stuart: *The Heartland*, (New York, Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 1970), 350 pp., \$ 8.95.

¹⁰ Lamb, Alastair: *Asian Frontiers. Studies in a Continuing Problem*, (New York—Washington—London, Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1967), 246 pp., bibliography, \$ 5.00.

of the major desert regions that line the southern flank of the steppe road and which "served as an insulation between the steppe and the southern maritime tracts." The second is the central mountain barrier which, in Lamb's view, "has tended to deflect historical pressures from its centre to its eastern and western edges. The result has been to create a wheel-like geopolitical structure with the Tibetan plateau as its hub. Nothing comes across Tibet; everything goes around it" (p. 16).

Much of all this has been said before, but the author states or re-states these and other facts clearly and appositely. In Dr. Lamb's view of Asian frontier issues, it is easy to see the importance of the role attached to Inner Asia. In fact, throughout much of the book the region looms larger than even the author himself seems to realize, although his excellent chapters entitled, respectively, "Chinese Frontiers in the Pre-Colonial Era" and "Russia, China and Mongolia," and much of the introduction, deal directly with Inner Asia. This is a fine, stimulating book which deserves to be widely known.

Covering much of the same ground, Francis Watson's *The Frontiers of China*¹¹ suffers from a comparison with Lamb's work. It is a basically accurate but somewhat shallow survey of the subject, giving much emphasis to the political problems of the first half of the 1960's. Its contribution to the understanding of the Inner Asian frontier is virtually nil, albeit several chapters deal with the western and northern marches of China.

In his aforementioned book Alastair Lamb defined three zones in the Asian geopolitical system, established around the mountainous hub of the Tibetan plateau its flanking ranges: those of the Soviet Union, of and China, and of South Asia. It is on the meeting point of these zones that Dorothy Woodman focuses her attention in *Himalayan Frontiers*.¹² Her approach is far from theoretical. What she writes is diplomatic history, and it is regrettable that it is based entirely on British or Indian sources written in English. Her bibliography of primary and secondary sources does not contain a single item written in any other language. The author should not be blamed for not using documents to

¹¹ Watson, Francis: *The Frontiers of China*, (New York—Washington, Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 224 pp., 8 maps, \$ 5.50.

¹² Woodman, Dorothy: *Himalayan Frontiers. A Political Review of British, Chinese, Indian and Russian Rivalries*, (New York—Washington, Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1969), xiii + 423 pp., Bibliography, \$ 12.50.

which there is no access, but one cannot help feeling that on the basis of the material available to her she could have presented a more objective view of the frontier history. She does not willingly distort historical facts, but she does espouse the bias of her lopsided source material. For Miss Woodman, the British and their Indian successors in imperialism are the good, if not blameless, guys, and the Russians and Chinese the bad ones. She is far too sophisticated, honest, and scholarly to have no colors on her palette other than black and white, and although on the Sino-Indian conflict she could not yet consult Neville Maxwell's revealing book, yet I think she is guilty of not trying to understand a point of view other than that of British (and Indian) imperialism. In general, she pays scant attention to the real *personae dramatis*, the local populations. The Tibetan point of view is left out of her considerations, and the Mongol-Tibetan treaty of 1913 is not even mentioned. It is in the material presented and not in its interpretation that the abiding value of this book can be found. From the narrower point of view of this review article, *Himalayan Frontiers* is valuable for the information it provides on roads, mountain passes, and lines of communication linking Inner Asia with the Indian and Iranian world.

It would be unfair to blame authors for not facing difficulties their chosen topic does not present. Yet, regardless of the ultimate value of the book produced, one cannot but applaud the performance of those who choose to tackle subjects which are based on sources written in a language other than English. Reliance on Chinese primary sources, including local gazetteers, is but one of the virtues that commend Professor Lee's book, *The Manchurian Frontier*.¹⁴ It is an interesting fact, not mentioned by the author, that most of the successful attempts to conquer the north or the whole of China were launched across the northeastern rather than the northwestern border. Their apparent military superiority notwithstanding, the peoples of the steppe seem to have been less apt to achieve and stabilize conquest than were the less impressive forest-dweller barbarians of Manchuria. The book does not concern itself with the general characteristics of frontiers, but rather is a specific study of the frontier that separated the Manchus

¹³ *India's China War*, cf. *JAH* 6, 1972, p. 197.

¹⁴ Lee, Robert H. G.: *The Manchurian Frontier in Ch'ing History*, Harvard East Asian Series 43, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1970), vii + 229 pp., Bibliography, \$ 8.00.

ruling China from their next of kin remaining in Manchuria. Lee describes the geographic and cultural foundations of Ch'ing frontier policy, the banner system, the bureaucratic administration of the region, and the gradual sinicization of the Manchurian frontier. This is a painstaking compilation containing much that is new but also much that has been said before, sometimes even better.

Here we touch at the book's weakest point, the author's almost complete ignorance of the western literature relevant to the subject. In the bibliography one searches in vain for the names of Erich Hauer, Erich Haenisch, Walter Fuchs, or, indeed, of Franz Michael. It is evident that perusal of the works of these distinguished scholars would have greatly improved Professor Lee's book. In a certain measure, it would have obviated the author's obvious ignorance of Manchu. His use of Manchu terminology is erratic. Most of the time he contents himself with giving the Chinese—and often outright mistaken—transcription of the Manchu term. Thus he gives *gusai* (instead of *gûsa*) as the Manchu term for "banner," not realizing that the final *-i* is what is commonly called the genitive and is justified only in compounds such as *gûsai ejen* "the master of the banner." The name "Butaha (hunting) banners" mentioned on p. 15 and elsewhere should read *butha* "the spoils of hunting or fishing," and it would have been useful to remark that they formed a pair with the *boigon* "landed" banners. To make a list of similar weaknesses would be both useless and ungracious, for these do not seriously impair the value of this book. In fact, they are but symptoms of what could be called Professor Lee's sino-centered view of the whole frontier problem and of the relevant literature. He views events and peoples through Chinese eyes and seems oblivious of the fact that both the Ch'ing and the people living beyond the willow palisades were Tunguz. To be sure, most of the Manchus became sinicized in the course of time, but references in Chinese sources to the effect that "practically everyone spoke Chinese" must be taken with a pinch of salt. They have the value of the tourist's or the G. I.'s testimony that in Italy "everyone speaks English." A passport written in Manchu in 1927 (!!) was, one must surmise, not written as a piece of linguistic exercise.¹⁵ By using the Chinese transcription or equivalents of Manchu names Professor Lee, quite unwittingly, creates the impression that the latter simply did not exist.

¹⁵ E. Hauer, "Ein Reisepaß in Mandchusprache aus d. J. 1927," MSOS.OS. XXXII, 1929, 153—56.

The same remark can be applied also to his sources. Nowhere would the reader find it indicated that the oft-quoted *Pa-ch'i tung-chih* is in fact bilingual and carries the Manchu title *Jakún gússai uheri ejehe bithe*. Had Professor Lee used the Manchu version, his terminology would have comprised Manchu titles and names and would have, I submit, been closer to reality than it now is. His already very respectable book would have become even better.

The frontiers of China and what lies beyond them play a central role in a splendid book edited by John K. Fairbank.¹⁶ If the emperor of China claims to be the ruler of the world, then foreign relations are to some extent internal affairs. In practice as well as in theory the twilight zone of the frontier is the space where the two are the least distinguishable and hence where it is the most important to have a clear understanding of the motives that governed policies as well as of the forces that were used to implement them. The book deals with China's foreign relations mainly under the Ch'ing dynasty and includes chapters on relations with Southeast Asia, the West, and other parts of the world that lie outside the scope of the present review article. However, the part given to Inner Asia is so important that it can be said without exaggeration that it constitutes a major contribution to our knowledge of the region.

Right at the outset, in the "Preliminary Framework," Professor Fairbank boldly focuses the reader's attention on the importance of Inner Asia: "The basic fault underlying the Sinocentric world order was the fact that it was not coterminous with the Chinese culture area. . . . the Inner Asian Zone was composed of peoples of distinctly non-Chinese culture. . . . Yet they could never be excluded from the Chinese world order because mounted bowmen from the Inner Asian grasslands . . . provided the dominant military force in the East Asian scene . . . From the Han to the Ch'ing periods, the non-Chinese warriors of Inner Asia played an increasingly important role in war and politics within the empire . . . (p. 3).

While references to Inner Asia can be found in most chapters, some of these have as their central theme China's relations with that region.

Chusei Suzuki's chapter (pp. 180—197, and notes on pp. 326—28)

¹⁶ Fairbank, John K. (edited by) with contributions by others: *The Chinese World Order. Traditional China's Foreign Relations*, Harvard East Asian Series 32, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1968), 211 pp., \$ 10.

is entitled "China's relations with Inner Asia: the Hsiung-nu, Tibet."¹⁷ The relations between the Hsiung-nu and the Han dynasty on the one hand and Tibet and the Ch'ing dynasty on the other were meant to illustrate the distinct nature of China's relations with countries which, in Professor Suzuki's assumption, were less ready to accept China's claim of cultural superiority than were Korea, Japan, or Vietnam. Within the framework of this book the two topics would have been better served had they been dealt with in separate chapters. Beyond suggesting, without really justifying it, a cyclical pattern in Chinese-Hsiung-nu relations, the chapter brings little that is new and worthy of attention, nor does it succeed in amalgamating the common lessons, if any, of the two historic examples cited. Professor Suzuki is either unaware of the existence of, or has chosen to ignore, the western literature dealing with his topics.

Such reproach could not be made to David M. Farquhar who produced a little masterpiece in "The Origins of the Manchus' Mongolian Policy" (pp. 198—205, and notes on pp. 328—337). Indeed, his essay deserves rebuke only because of its shortness: I would have loved to learn much more from Professor Farquhar. He has a superb mastery of Mongol, Manchu, and Chinese sources and in a modest, low-keyed manner he presents a new approach to his subject. These few pages contain the first attempt that I know of to establish the exact meaning of many Mongol and Manchu political and administrative terms. By clarifying the terminology, Farquhar establishes a solid basis for his opinion that the Manchus borrowed most of their political thinking from the Mongols. I fully agree with his view (p. 204) that "The Mongols of the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries would appear to bear much the same relation to the development of the early Manchu state as the Uighur Turks of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries bore to that of the early Mongols: they were transmitters of a great deal of higher culture, some of which was Chinese culture in foreign dress." I would even like to bring some further grist to his mill by pointing out that the Manchu term *doro* (in loose translation "law") is not only, as Farquhar points out, a descendant of Mongol *törü* (which he spells *törö*) but also of Turkic *törü*, well-known and used by the Uighurs.¹⁸

¹⁷ A major contribution to this topic by Professor Ying-shih Yü will be reviewed in the next installment of this review article.

¹⁸ This chapter can be complemented by Professor Farquhar's fine article "Some technical terms in Ch'ing dynasty Chinese documents relating to the

If Farquhar's short chapter is a splendid footnote on which history will ultimately rest, Joseph L. Fletcher's "China and Central Asia, 1386—1884" (pp. 206—224 and notes on pp. 337—368) is nothing less than a history of China's relations with Central Asia (N. B. not Inner Asia) in Ming and Ch'ing times. The truly impressive apparatus which buttresses every assertion can be taken as a welcome sign that we have here but the forerunner of a really comprehensive treatment of the subject. Professor Fletcher's familiarity with Chinese as well as Persian sources—not to mention the secondary literature written in almost any language—permits him to consider these events from the viewpoints of both parties. Further research, probably his own, will no doubt add many details to the picture he draws here, but I seriously doubt that his canvas will have to be altered measurably in the foreseeable future. Fortunately, in recent years the Ming and their relations with the rest of the world have been receiving increasing attention. The history of Ch'ing relations with Central Asia and the fascinating history of the khojas of Kashghar consists so far mainly of blank pages. Professor Fletcher's learned and imaginative chapter is a first and very promising step towards an authoritative presentation of the subject.

In this short attempt at summarizing what is most important from the Inner Asian point of view, I had to forego the discussion of many interesting points raised by other chapters. But, perhaps I succeeded in whetting my readers' appetite for reading this beautifully produced, reasonably priced, excellent book.

Pre- and protohistory

In Inner Asia, as elsewhere, archeology provides the bulk of the evidence pertaining to the earliest periods. For obvious reasons most of the primary material is recorded in Soviet publications more or less accessible following the hazards of book-trade. Fortunately, the demand for "coffee table books" makes it a paying proposition for publishers to produce lavishly illustrated works, a trend from which Inner Asian archaeology benefited in no small measure.

Probably the most welcome work in this field is S. I. Rudenko's book on the excavations of Noin Ula, translated from a Russian original *Mongols*, pp. 119—127 in *Mongolian Studies* edited by Louis Ligeti, (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970).

published in 1962.¹⁹ The barrows of Noin Ula, located in the northern part of Mongolia, have not received the attention they so richly deserve. Known by archaeologists since 1912, they were partially excavated in 1924—1925. Since that time, and until the publication of Rudenko's book, most of our information rested on a short pamphlet of Camilla Trever, published in 1932.²⁰ As the archaeologists who conducted the excavations are no longer alive, the nestor of Soviet archaeology, S. I. Rudenko, took upon himself to give a detailed assessment of the historical and cultural evidence presented by the material of Noin Ula. At the close of the excavations the finds were distributed between the Soviet Union—responsible for the organization of the excavations—and the Mongolian People's Republic, on whose territory these were undertaken. Rudenko's presentation is an inventory of the material deposited in Leningrad. Much of the material kept in Ulan Bator still awaits publication.

Rudenko aims at much more than a simple presentation of the finds, however. In eleven chapters he examines the various aspects of the culture represented by Noin Ula, from funeral customs through various aspects of daily life to the pattern of international relations. For the author the identity of the people of Noin Ula with the Hsiung-nu is beyond doubt. He ties archaeological evidence to the testimony of Chinese written sources and produces a synthesis which, on the whole, is fairly convincing. For reasons that Rudenko leaves unexplained, the tombs yielded very few human bones. However, the analysis of the hair remains shows clearly that the inhabitants of Noin Ula belonged to the Mongoloid race—the weightiest argument I know in favor of seeing Mongols or Proto-Mongols in the Hsiung-nu.

As I have mentioned elsewhere, the main weakness of Soviet studies in Inner Asian history lies in their inadequate use of Chinese sources. Rudenko's work is no exception to the rule. As Karl Jettmar rightly points out in his humane and erudite introduction (pp. 1—6), the Chinese material adduced by Rudenko comes from Bičurin's translations more than a century old, with no attempt made to supplement

¹⁹ Rudenko, S. I.: *Die Kultur der Hsiung-nu und die Hügelgräber von Noin Ula*, Übersetzung aus dem Russischen von Helmut Pollems, Vorwort von Karl Jettmar, Antiquitas, Reihe 3, Abhandlungen zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, zur klassischen und provinzial-römischen Archäologie und zur Geschichte des Altertums, Band 7, (Bonn, Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1969), 164 pp., LXXIII plates, n. p.

²⁰ *Excavations in Northern Mongolia*, (Leningrad, 1932).

it with other, newer evidence. For this German translation Prof. Martin Gimn took upon himself to provide the usual transcriptions for all the Chinese proper names, while Professor A. F. P. Hulsway traced in the original sources the references made by Rudenko to Bičurin's translations. In the process many smaller mistakes were corrected and some additional references supplied. This book is superior to the original in one more and important aspect. The technical quality of the illustrations, line drawings, and photographs is superb thanks mainly to the courtesy of Rudenko himself, who provided Dr. Pollems, the learned translator of the work, with original photographs. It is to be hoped that the great Soviet scholar saw his work appear in this elegant, scholarly German garb before he died on July 16, 1969.

Rudenko's classic work on the Pazyryk burials²¹ is now widely available in the beautifully produced, competent translation of M. W. Thompson.²² It incorporates the author's remarks to the original edition. Unlike the excavations of Noin Ula, those of Pazyryk have received wide publicity, articles about them appearing in magazines as widely read as the *Scientific American*. As is well known, thanks to a series of fortuitous circumstances, human bodies and much other organic material has been preserved in the Pazyryk barrows. Although plundered already in Antiquity, the burials contain enough material for Rudenko to attempt a fairly comprehensive description of the civilization which they represent. It is impossible to determine the exact date of the Pazyryk burials. Rudenko suggests the 5th century B. C. I would be tempted to ascribe them to the 4th or even to the 2nd century—but this is not the place to engage in controversy with the English version of a work two decades old. We should simply rejoice to see Rudenko's *opus magnum*—for it was he who had discovered and excavated the Pazyryk site—made accessible to those who either do not read Russian or have no access to the original work long since out of print.

Many of the humans buried at Pazyryk were Europoids, and many of the finds link the High Altai mountains with Achaemenid Persia.

²¹ Культура населения Горного Алтая в скифское время, (Москва-Ленинград, 1953).

²² Rudenko, Sergei I.: *Frozen Tombs of Siberia. The Pazyryk Burials of Iron Age Horsemen*, Translated and with a preface by M. W. Thompson, (Berkeley—Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1970), xxxvi + 340 pp., Bibliography, with 33 plates in color, 147 in black and white and 146 figures in the text, \$ 30.00.

There is thus some logical justification for mentioning here two works dealing with the archaeology of Central Asia, although both cover a time span reaching into the Middle Ages of Inner Asia: to the time of the Muslim penetration into the region. Although their approaches to the subject are different, there is a considerable overlap between the books of Aleksandr Belenitsky²³ and Grégoire Frumkin.²⁴ Belenickij—I use the Russian form of his name—follows the chronological sequence and divides his book into five chapters, “Prehistoric Central Asia,” “Central Asia in the Early Historical Periods” (Achaemenid and Greek periods), “Central Asia in the Kushan Period,” “From the Kushans to the Arab Conquest,” and one chapter dealing with some theoretical problems.

Frumkin divides his book according to the geographical distribution of the archaeological sites within the present day boundaries of the Central Asian Soviet Republics. As these are to a great extent arbitrary or, at best, reflect modern linguistic, ethnic, or political realities, their use for the purposes of prehistoric categorization is highly questionable. The book thus lacks an organic unity and becomes a sort of *catalogue raisonné* of the archaeological sites of Central Asia with only one chapter of less than four pages devoted to an historical excursus on the Kushan empire. However, neither in this chapter, nor elsewhere in the book can the reader hope to find an evaluation of the historical importance of the sites described.

Whenever possible, Belenickij attempts to set the archaeological evidence in the historical framework established with the help of written sources. He does so in a fairly superficial way and he is not helped by his translator unable to cope with the transcription of proper names. It would be easy to make some justifiable objections to many of Belenickij's statements, but it is more pleasing to dwell on the great qualities of his book.²⁵ To begin with, there are the superb illustrations,

²³ Belenitsky, Aleksandr: *Central Asia*, translated from the Russian by James Hogarth, *Archaeologia Mundi Series*, (Cleveland and New York, The World Publishing Company, 1968), 251 pp., 54 illustrations in color, 89 illustrations in black and white, \$ 10.00.

²⁴ Frumkin, Grégoire: *Archaeology in Soviet Central Asia*, *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Siebente Abteilung, III. Band, 1. Abschnitt*, (Leiden/Köln, E. J. Brill, 1970), XVIII + 217 pp., LXVII plates, 96 guilders.

²⁵ At this point it is worth mentioning that the book carries no indication of the title of its Russian original. It is possible, though not likely, that Belenickij wrote this book especially for the *Imago Mundi* series. If so the fact would have deserved mention.

including color plates of exceptional beauty. For these, if for no other reason, the book is already worth its very reasonable price. (Frumkin's book, of about the same size and with no color plates, costs more than twice as much.) But the book is also well written and covers a great variety of aspects of Central Asian history. The expert will easily distinguish between the parts in which he can rely on Belenickij's excellent, first-hand knowledge of the archaeological evidence and those in which the author follows somewhat uncritically opinions culled from secondary sources.

In comparison with Belenickij's book, Frumkin's work appears as a somewhat dull enumeration of sites and opinions, with no attempt at synthesis or even, so it would seem, at formulating original views. But it has a useful bibliography and, generally speaking, it is a helpful compass for anyone trying to find his way through the complex topography of Central Asian archaeology. Judging by these two books, the definitive historical assessment of the archaeological finds of Central Asia is not for tomorrow.

For a long time archaeology in general, and that of Inner Asia in particular, was haunted by the search for spectacular finds such as objects in gold, royal treasures, and jewelry of real artistic merit. While there is nothing wrong in the pursuit of such finds, it stands to reason that the material vestiges of less sophisticated civilizations deserve equal attention. It could be surmised that the boreal regions of Siberia would not harbor the ruins of cities comparable to those found in Iran. The trophy the archaeologist of the arctic regions can expect to display will seem modest compared with those of his colleagues working further south. The results of his endeavors will be seen in a cogent interpretation of finds, sites, and contacts rather than in the beauty of the objects found. For almost half a century Professor A. P. Okladnikov participated in and led archaeological surveys and excavations in the upper reaches of the Lena valley, in the territory of the Yakut A. S. S. R. A prolific writer, Okladnikov has published many books and scores of articles, many of which are not readily available in western libraries. We are thus, once more, indebted to Professor Henry N. Michael and the Arctic Institute of North America for the translation and publication of a major work of Soviet archaeology, that written by A. P. Okladnikov on the pre-Russian history of Yakutia.²⁸ The original

²⁸ Okladnikov, A. P.: *Yakutia. Before its incorporation into the Russian State*, Edited by Henry N. Michael, Arctic Institute of North America, Anthro-

appeared in 1955.²⁷ For the English edition the author wrote a special foreword (pp. XXIII—XXXVIII), which contains many interesting and new data.

The book is neatly divided into three parts. The first two deal respectively with the stone and the metal (bronze and iron) ages of the territory that is now Yakutia. The third part traces the early history of the Yakuts, from their origin to the end of the 17th century A. D. There is thus a change of point of view between, on the one hand parts I and II, and on the other part III. The first two deal with a land, the third with a people. This dichotomous approach in no way weakens the book, for the two perspectives open on the same subject. For parts I and II Okladnikov must rely on the results produced by archaeology. In part III he makes ample use of the testimony of Yakut folklore, of various components of Yakut culture, and even of the crucial evidence brought to the problem by the Yakut language.

In the chapters devoted to prehistory, Okladnikov pays particular attention to contacts which may have existed between the Lena region and other parts of the world. His well-substantiated theory that "The penetration to the west of individual groups of the ancient population of interior Asia, which had begun at the end of the Paleolithic . . . did not cease in later times, but, indeed, became stronger during the Neolithic, and took on more definite forms" (p. 129) is pregnant with consequences for the study of Uralic and Altaic linguistic relationship. These contacts continued during the Bronze Age (p. 168) and led to a remarkable similarity between the cliff drawings of Scandinavia on the one hand, and the middle Lena valley on the other. Okladnikov has also some interesting things to say about contacts with Arctic America. As many of his ideas are by now well known to the specialists, I will not further comment on them but will content myself with a few remarks on Okladnikov's view of the Yakuts' origin.

Although more "at home" in the Paleolithic and Neolithic than in later periods, Okladnikov gives an excellent summary of the facts which point to the southern origin of this northernmost of all Turkic-speaking peoples. While one might question the validity of some of

pology of the North, *Translations from Russian Sources*, Number 8, (Montreal—London, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1970), xli + 499 pp., Bibliography, \$ 20.00.

²⁷ Якутия до присоединения к русскому государству, (Москва-Ленинград 1955).

his statements, the picture he presents of the principal components of Yakut culture is reasonably accurate and convincing. There is but one point where I seriously disagree with his presentation. In his well-justified search for the southern ancestors of the Yakuts, Okladnikov turns his attention to the so-called Kurumchinsk culture, centered on the Baikal. "Reviewing the materials of the Kurumchinsk sites, Okladnikov writes (p. 306), "we may with fair clarity determine the general culture and way of life of this region's ancient population, the probable ancestors of the Yakuts." So far so good, but here Okladnikov takes a leap in the dark. For no apparent reason he attributes the Kurumchinsk culture to the Kurikans. They appear in the very title of chapter 1 of section II as the "southern ancestors of the Yakuts."

As a matter of fact, we know next to nothing about the Kurikans. Their name (*quriqan*) appears twice in the Old Turkic inscriptions but without any accompanying data. It has long been recognized that this name appears in Chinese sources transcribed as *Ku-li-kan*. However, the Chinese sources give but minimal information on this people, one of many tribes forming part of the T'ieh-le confederation. The vague geographical data, locating the *Ku-li-kan* "north of the Han Sea [whatever this may mean] and south of a lake" are virtually useless and the texts reveal nothing that can establish a positive link between this people and the bearers of the Kurumchinsk culture. A hypothesis as frail as this should have been put forward, if at all, with the greatest caution and a much better utilization of the relevant Chinese data. Okladnikov trusts Bičurin's obsolete translations and late 18th century sources far too much. Written more than a thousand years after the events, they should not be relied upon in this matter.²⁸

²⁸ In this instance Okladnikov was not well served by his translators, who render with a monstrous "Kuli-kang" the Chinese form of the Kurikan name (p. 318 *et passim*). In the original Russian text the name appears unhyphenated, an acceptable alternative, whereas the bisyllabic "kuli" followed by a hyphenated—"kang" goes against all sinological conventions. To make matters worse, both Okladnikov and the translators were misled or did not quite grasp the intricacies of the conventional Russian system of transcription. In it Chinese *-n* is transcribed НЬ (with the soft sign) and Chinese *-ng* with Н (without the soft sign). Okladnikov does not differentiate properly and uses Н to transcribe both nasals. Yet, in his quotes from Bičurin he maintains the correct ГУ.ЛИГАНЬ form, which is the equivalent of our *Ku-li-kan* transcription. The translators, perhaps to achieve uniformity, disregarded these correct forms and opted for the indefensible *-kang* transcription.

Another small point of criticism. The Russian abbreviation *CT* as used by Oklad-

These remarks, critical as they are, concern but one, small point of Okladnikov's masterly presentation of a complex subject. For many years to come it will be impossible to approach it without the expert guidance and the rich material offered by this splendid work.

Another major work using a multidisciplinary approach for the elucidation of a problem essentially prehistoric is László Vajda's study on pastoral civilizations.²⁹ Although accurate, the title is slightly misleading as the central topic of the book is the civilization of the reindeer. For all his great qualities, the author does not wear his scholarship lightly. This huge work, set in small print—with long passages set in even smaller print—with its endless footnotes and wide digressions would test the patience of all who cannot devote a leisurely year to its reading. Although some time has now passed since its publication, I have still not met anyone who, when hard pressed, would not confess that, well, he has not really read the book "completely". This reviewer must also plead guilty on this count. His weary eyes might have skipped a paragraph or two, his weary mind might not have fully digested every morsel of the superior, but fairly indigestible intellectual fare this volume represents. We are presented here with a wealth of information which cannot but prompt our admiration, yet we feel that less of it would have been more. We are told that a first version of the book was accepted as "Habilitationsschrift" by the University of Munich. The work as it now stands gives the impression that instead of being pruned, as it should have been, this first version was expanded, possibly by the addition of further data.

A long introductory chapter—which could almost have been published as a separate book—deals with the principal questions pertaining to the origin and age of pastoralism (*Hirtenkulturen*), and includes a survey of western ideas on pastoral peoples. Starting out with the race of the Cyclops, the learned author analyzes Platon's views of the subject, devotes nearly four pages, including one in very small print, to Titus Lucretius Carus of the 1st century B. C., and writes more than

nikov does not stand for статья "article" as the translators seem to think (p. 238 *et passim*) but for страница "page". These trifling remarks should not cast a shadow on the result of what must have been a gruelling task of translation. The English garb given to Okladnikov's work is worthy of its content.

²⁹ Vajda, László: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Hirtenkulturen*, Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institutes München, Herausgeber: Georg Stadtmüller, Band 31, (Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1968), 667 pp., Schrifttumsverzeichnis, DM 96,—.

two pages on Ibn Khaldūn's philosophical views, assuring any anxious specialist of reindeer breeding that, thanks to recent research, in his (Vajda's) view the concept '*asabiyya*' has now been satisfactorily explained. What we are not told is the connection, if any, between '*asabiyya*' and the reindeer or, indeed, pastoral nomadism. One cannot help feeling that here as in innumerable other passages, on page after page, the author's aim is *épater le bourgeois*. He really seems intent to ensure that from his extensive and obviously intelligent readings not a morsel should remain unutilized for the purposes of this book. Herodotus and Ortega y Gasset, Goethe, Stalin, appear in company of other, innumerable authorities (on what?) to bring their contribution to the monument *aere perennius* the author was preparing for himself. (The reviewer felt it necessary for the sake of his own reputation to use two foreign expressions in two consecutive sentences.) From Sino-Tibetan to Turkic, Finno-Ugric, Germanic, Slavic, etc. there is no language group, indeed one may think hardly any language, for which the author does not feel compelled to give—one would almost say "deliver"—an etymology, with the quiet, dignified authority of someone for whom the storehouse of human knowledge has yielded all its secrets. Although on p. 286 the reader is given some explanation on the language of the bees, mercifully no bee-etymology is proposed.

It stands to reason that in such a mass of material much is controversial and some statements, though relatively few in number, are mistaken. Yet, this review should not be guilty of that for which it reproaches the book under review, i.e. the irrelevancy of much of the material adduced and the slightly pretentious patronizing uncle-Vajda-knows-best style that pervades most of its pages. For this book is a major contribution to the subject.

Vajda's basic idea is simple and sound. He endeavors to give a detailed picture of the stone-age civilizations of northern Eurasia with special reference to any data relevant to the hunting and the domestication of the reindeer. Part V and VI examine evidence of reindeer hunting in respectively Europe and the Ural region and northern Asia. The main emphasis lies on the sub-neolithic and post-neolithic periods. The first, according to a brief definition hidden in a footnote on p. 160, is a "retardive Variante des Neolithikum." What Vajda really means with the term "Postneolithikum" I could not discover, although possibly there is some definition of it in another footnote. At any rate, the term is rather self-explanatory. For the neolithic period Vajda

establishes the negative fact that there is no evidence to show that any of the tribes living during that period in northern Eurasia specialized in the hunting of reindeer.

In part VII Vajda postulates a post-neolithic change in civilization (*Kulturwandel*) which brought about an extension of hunting activities in the forest zone. He is right in his statement that responding to the demands of an increasing fur trade the inhabitants of the taiga engaged in hunting on a scale that went beyond their own needs. In an article not yet accessible to Vajda I expressed this idea as follows: "In Central Eurasian economy the intrinsic value of fur is virtually identical with its exchange value. This is determined by demand, and as the interior demand for fur is predetermined by the number of hunters and thus virtually constant, the hunting for fur is a result of exterior demand."³⁰ Vajda's point that there was no external demand for products resulting from reindeer hunting (p. 291) is well taken.

In part VIII we reach the heart of the matter, the question of the domestication of the reindeer. With what seem to me convincing arguments the author places this event in post-neolithic times—tentatively in the second half of the first millennium B. C.—at the southern edges of the taiga. He has my full support for his view that the domestication of the reindeer followed that of the horse and, in fact, was patterned on it. Vajda is not quite clear—or I have been unable to follow him exactly—on the question concerning the identity of the first domesticators of the reindeer. Were they autochthonous, or at least fully established inhabitants of the forest belt who copied their neighbors of the steppe, or must we see in them inhabitants of the steppe, former horse breeders who, for one reason or another, settled in the taiga. I am sorry that, in spite of the wealth of his references, the author does not give his views on Leroi-Gourhan's old, succinctly expressed, and very tempting theory that invaders from the steppe were the first to domesticate the reindeer: "c'est leur passé d'éleveurs méridionaux qui est sans doute à l'origine de leur domestication du renne."³¹

Part IX deals with reindeer pastoralism in the tundra. While one

³⁰ P. 122, "Some Remarks on the Economic Aspects of Hunting in Central Eurasia," in *Die Jagd bei den Altaischen Völkern*, Vorträge der VIII. Permanent International Altaistic Conference vom 30. 8. bis 4. 9. 1965 in Schloß Auel, Asiatische Forschungen Bd. 26, Wiesbaden 1968, pp. 119—128.

³¹ André Leroi-Gourhan, *La Civilisation du renne*, (Paris, 1936), p. 44.

may disagree on some details, it seems clear that Vajda's basic interpretation is correct. "Das Rentierhirtentum geht also nicht auf spezialisierte Rentierjägerkulturen zurück, die es nicht gab, sondern auf die postneolitischen Pelzjäger-Kulturen der Tajga." (p. 418). That reindeer pastoralism on a grand scale is a speciality of the tundra is not only well known, it is also a consequence of natural conditions. The forest is not suitable for the herding of any animal in great numbers.

Part X is devoted to the study of the reindeer pastoralism of the Lapps. Again, Vajda's opinion that among the Lapps reindeer pastoralism replaced an economy formerly based on hunting seems well justified.

The bulky work ends with an *Anhang* in which seven separate questions are studied. I will comment on only one of them (No. 6) in which Vajda takes issue with Okladnikov's above-mentioned (cf. p. 194) theory of a westward migration from Siberia. According to Vajda such a migration is impossible for, among other reasons "Als eventueller Wanderungsweg solcher reiselustigen Mongoliden kommen aus verkehrstechnischen Gründen weder die Tundra noch die Tajga in Frage." (p. 527). If that were true it would mean that no migration whatsoever can take place in the forest belt since we can hardly imagine the taiga being a one-way street.

It would be possible to argue at length on this and scores of other statements of Vajda's book. Such controversies on minor points would but further obscure the great issues with which he deals most competently. His work resembles an overdecorated Christmas tree on which the glass balls and electric candles destroy rather than enhance the natural elegance of the pine. It is regrettable that what is undoubtedly a major work should be marred by an attempt at intellectual "overkill."

Much interesting material on the early civilizations of Inner Asia can be found in the collective work *Die Kulturen der Eurasischen Völker*, a curiously old-fashioned book, in presentation as well as in content.³² Let me hasten to add that "old-fashioned" is not meant pejoratively. To mention but the outside garb of this work, it is beautifully printed, tastefully bound, and the illustrations are excellent. For rea-

³² Wiesner, Joseph; Farkas, Julius von; Bogyay, Thomas von; Denecker, Rolf; Ränk, Gustav: *Die Kulturen der Eurasischen Völker*, Zweite Abteilung of *Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte*, (Frankfurt am Main, Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1968), 410 pp., Literaturverzeichnis, DM 134,—.

sons I cannot guess each of the four parts of the volume has separate pagination. Two of them—dealing respectively with Hungary and Finland—are not of our concern.

Under the very promising title "Völker und Kultur Nordeasiens" (47 pp.) Gustav Ränk offers very little that is interesting and even less that is new. It is a competent, rather lifeless presentation of the basic economy of northern Eurasia, the uses of the dog and the reindeer, clothing and housing, the social structure and the religious beliefs. It would be unfair to blame the author for dealing with so vast a subject in a space so restricted. Yet one cannot help feeling that by a more judicious choice of the material and by concentrating on a few essential topics he could have conveyed if not more, then at least more meaningful, information. Not surprisingly the best parts of this chapter are those dealing with subjects in which the author feels more at home: the civilization of the Lapps and the description of North Eurasian housing.

Professor Wiesner's massive chapter on "Die Kulturen der Reiter-völker" (192 pp.) is a substantial contribution to our knowledge. Although archaeology provides most of his material, the author deals principally with historical periods and peoples: Scythians, Cimmerians, Sarmatians, Parthians, Hsiung-nu, Huns, Avars, Bulgars, and Khazars. As can be seen, the chapter extends well into the medieval period of Central Eurasia and could, therefore, have been treated in the following installment of these "Notes." Wiesner's strength lies in the study of the western marches of Inner Asia in Antiquity. He is less at home in the archaeology of the Altai, where he follows Rudenko, or in the study of Hsiung-nu history, where he has to rely on often unreliable secondary sources. He is often too easygoing with linguistic evidence. It is not at all certain that the Huns spoke an "Old-Turkic dialect" (p. 147), there is no reason to see Turks in the Hephtalites, and, most definitely, the Chuvash are not Finno-Ugrians (p. 170). The title *jabgu* (and not *jagghu* as on p. 149, although this may be a misprint) cannot mean "Herr der Bogenschützen" and there is really no reason to believe Altheim when he reads on a Kushan coin the Hsiung-nu title *shan-yü*.

There are many similar mistakes in Wiesner's work, and many of his interpretations are either too daring or too superficial. For instance, there is considerable difference between stating, as he does (p. 152), that Attila's body lay in state in a tent "of Chinese silk," and the

sources which speak of a "silken tent." He also accepts the identification of the Juan-juan and the Ayars (p. 165). These and other critical remarks that could easily be formulated should not obscure the shining merits of this work.

In fact Wiesner has presented little less than a comprehensive cultural history of pre-Turkic Inner Asia. His chapter on Cimmerians and Scythians (pp. 28—76) is probably the best non-Russian summation presently available on the subject. It is regrettable, although the author cannot be blamed for this, that there are no footnotes. Thus it is sometimes impossible to follow to the sources some of Wiesner's more challenging statements. At the outset of this review I stated that there was some undefinable old-fashioned quality to this book. Wiesner's contribution, which constitutes its bulk, reminded me of Sir Ellis Minns' approach. Wiesner has a direct, simple style, avoids controversies and presents his subject with clarity and unobtrusive erudition. He deserves special praise also for the choice of the illustrations. Unlike in so many other books of this nature, they are not chosen to catch the eye of the reader or to embellish the volume. They perform their true duty in *illustrating* what the author has to say; they are an organic part of his presentation.

The first Altaic people appear late, very late, on the scene of Inner Asian history. It is good to remember that the first undeniably Turkic-speaking peoples do not appear before the 6th century A. D. and that the first Mongol text dates from the 13th century. To be sure, neither the Türks nor the Mongols were produced through spontaneous generation, and it is certain that their ancestry goes back as far as that of any other human group. The well-known difficulty of linking a language with a culture or a language even with skeletal remains cannot be overcome and, in the absence of linguistic monuments—texts, proper names—such connection will always remain hypothetical. The use of linguistic nomenclature in situations in which no linguistic evidence exists cannot be but hazardous.

The earliest linguistic data pertaining to Inner Asia are Indo-European. This simple fact would in itself justify close collaboration between the historian of Inner Asia and the Indo-Europeanist. But Indo-European data are not only ancient, they are abundant as well. The corpus of ancient Greek is quantitatively superior to the combined Altaic data from the earliest to modern times. The immense variety of old, abundant material in a variety of Indo-European languages gives

access to and information on a past which not even the wildest speculations of Altaic or Uralic linguistics can hope to reach. A recent book, *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*³³ will provide ample justification for what I have just said. It is a fascinating book, one that reminds this reader of the *Herman Hirt Festschrift* of 1936. Of the twenty-two articles that compose this volume some have direct bearing on Inner Asian proto- or pre-history.

Marija Gimbutas's contribution bears the title "Proto-Indo-European Culture: The Kurgan Culture during the Fifth, Fourth, and Third Millennia B. C." (pp. 155—197). According to her the fairly homogenous, so-called Kurgan culture in the Pontic and Volga steppes of the fifth and fourth millennia B. C. is the proto-culture of all later Kurgan cultures, in Europe as well as in the Near East. As "there was no other culture in the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods which would correspond with the hypothetical mother culture of the Indo-Europeans as reconstructed with the help of common words," she concludes that the "Kurgan culture seems the only remaining candidate for being Proto-Indo-European" (p. 156).

The chronological scheme of this culture comprises three main periods: Early Kurgan (Kurgan I), fifth millennium B. C.; Middle Kurgan (Kurgan II and III), fourth millennium B. C.; and Late Kurgan (Kurgan IV), third millennium B. C. Professor Gimbutas sketches the main characteristics of the Kurgan culture, predominantly pastoral, which originated on the steppes of the Lower Volga and Kazakhstan. As can be expected, her article poses many problems beyond those signalled by herself. The first of these concern the very early datations. These are based on carbon-14 analyses but I still doubt their accuracy. I know that it is not proper for someone engaged in human sciences to doubt the results currently proclaimed by natural scientists. Yet, as the latter constantly revise their own data and discard as rubbish what they proclaimed the day before to be "scientific" truth, I wait patiently for a revision of the results of carbon-14 analyses. Another problem is the very unity of the Kurgan culture. I am not entirely convinced that all the sub-cultures mentioned by Gimbutas may really

³³ Cardona, George; Hoenigswald, Henry M.; Senn, Alfred (Editors): *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans. Papers Presented at the Third Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania*. A volume in the Haney Foundation Series, University of Pennsylvania. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), viii + 440 pp., \$ 35.00.

be bracketed into an organic unity, and if they are, the final question, whether this relatively diversified culture can be linked to the Proto-Indoeuropeans still remains. Finally, is there sufficient evidence to show that the Kurgan culture originated in the steppe?

Some of these questions are posed and answered differently in a spirited article of Ward H. Goodenough, "The Evolution of Pastoralism and Indo-European Origins" (pp. 253—265). Much of what he says is based, as he himself points out, on the archaeological evidence mustered in Gimbutas' earlier works. I agree with him that pastoralism is not a product of the steppe but rather of the borderlands where steppe and forest meet. Such ideas were voiced by Owen Lattimore, according to whom "Pastoral nomadism . . . can be described as a line of specialization or partial specialization . . . Undoubtedly the main source from which nomadism of the steppe derived, was . . . agriculture—and agriculture of a particular kind, at the edge of the steppe, practiced by societies that were unable to specialize their agriculture further . . ." ³⁴

According to Professor Goodenough, the Kurgan cultures "originated about 3500 B. C. in an area bordering on the region occupied by Cucuteni and Tripolye peoples, who themselves practiced a mixed farming and herding economy" (p. 260). In her aforementioned article (p. 177) Gimbutas located in the same period (fifth millennium B. C.) the Kurgan I, Tripolye A and B₁, Pre-Cucuteni III and Cucuteni A finds. If all these are interconnected then it becomes a matter of preference to establish the direction in which the transmission of culture operated. Gimbutas postulates an east to west movement, while Goodenough envisages, as we have seen, a western origin of the Kurgan culture. "But," Goodenough asks, "is the homeland of the Kurgan cultures to be equated with the Indo-European speech community?" He finds it possible that the "the Kurgan I people were not the Proto-Indo-Europeans, but a subgroup among them" (p. 261). According to Goodenough, "archeological evidence is entirely compatible with the linguistic evidence in pointing to the North European Plain, or at least its eastern end in Poland and the western Ukraine, as the most probable home of the Proto-Indo-Europeans" (p. 262). He concludes that this explanation accounts "for the evolutionary background of pastoral

³⁴ *Inner Asian Frontiers of China*, (New York, 1940), p. 328. It is worth remarking that Goodenough does not cite Lattimore, just as "Inner-Asianists" are unlikely to be familiar with Goodenough's views.

nomadism as an adaptation of an older European transhumance to the more difficult environment" (p. 262).

For an outsider—among whom this reviewer must rank himself—it would be imprudent to take sides in the amiable and learned disputation in which are opposed the views here represented by, respectively, Gimbutas and Goodenough. Both theories are big with consequences for Inner Asian prehistory.

Linguistic paleontology is often, and in my opinion unsatisfactorily, used in Finno-Ugric and Uralic linguistics and virtually ignored by Altaists. Yet its importance for the study of Inner Asian prehistory is obvious. If used in conjunction with other evidence it can bring clarification to problems otherwise unattainable. Winfred P. Lehmann's introductory chapter "Linguistic Structure as Diacritic Evidence on Proto-Culture" (pp. 1—10) is a welcome restatement—with many new remarks—of the general principle of paleontology "that language may be used only as a diacritic, not as a primary source for reconstruction of early culture . . . The basic sources of the paleontologist must be texts and archaeological data. Deductions from language must be related to these, but not used as primary sources." (p. 2)

Most of the other articles of this challenging volume contain elements—factual or methodological—which the specialist of Inner Asian prehistory could use with profit. Among them I will single out George S. Lane's "Tocharian: Indo-European and Non-Indo-European Relationships" (pp. 73—88), as it is particularly relevant to Inner Asian studies.

Professor Lane's interest is directed towards "the LATER contacts which the bearers of the Tocharian language had with other linguistics groups, Indo-European and non-Indo-European." In his view the earliest affinities of Tocharian were those with Thraco-Phrygian and Armenian but it was with "Slavic speakers that the Tocharians had their last Indo-European contacts before the very late influence of the Iranians and Indians." Among the non-Indo-European peoples the Finno-Ugrians exerted some influence on the Tocharians. The contacts were prior to their eastward migration and they took place somewhere in central Russia, on the southern fringes of the territory occupied by the Fatjanovo culture.³⁵ Professor Lane is extremely cautious in

³⁵ A recent monograph on that culture: КРАЙНОВ, Д. А.: Древнейшая история Волго-Окского междуречья. Фатьяновская культура II тысячелетие до н. э., (Москва, Наука, 1972), 274 pp., P. 2. 85.

putting forward this hypothesis which, quite obviously, stands or falls on linguistic evidence. To me the latter does not seem very strong.

This is not the place to enter into linguistic arguments but I feel, as does the author himself, that a cultural contact over a long period of time would have resulted in numerous lexical borrowings. "Unfortunately for the thesis presented here," remarks Lane, "evidence of this sort is meagre."

If indeed there were contacts between Finno-Ugrians or Proto Finno-Ugrians and Tocharians, traces of them might be found in the former as well as in the latter's language. It is well known that the vocabulary of Finno-Ugric languages contains a number of ancient Indo-European loan words although there is considerable difficulty in locating in time and place the contacts that lead to such borrowings. An important contribution to this involved question is Eva Korenchy's book on the Iranian loan words in the Ob-Ugric languages.³⁶ It is impossible to do justice to this fine work on the pages of a journal devoted to history, nor would it be apposite to make here critical remarks of a purely linguistic character. It would seem that while some words were borrowed from Old Iranian others were taken from Proto-Iranian (*Uriranisch*) or even pre-Proto-Iranian (*Voruriranisch*). Of the forty-four loan words examined by Dr. Korenchy perhaps thirteen are traced to the period of the Finno-Ugric community and eight to that preceding the separation of the Ugric languages. It would seem that Iranian influence on the peoples living further north was prolonged, although not very marked. While interested in the historical implications of her linguistic research, Dr. Korenchy neglects the Altaic evidence which would provide a wider background to her study. It would also show that many of the Iranian words to be found in Ob-Ugric are attested also in Altaic, a fact which, surely, is of great consequence to their historical interpretation.

I should like to close these remarks on books received and pertaining to the pre- and protohistory of Inner Asia by mentioning a modestly produced but very useful publication by I. Fodor.³⁷ Entitled "Archaeo-

³⁶ Korenchy, Eva: *Iranische Lehnwörter in den obugrischen Sprachen*, (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972), 112 pp., \$ 5.00.

³⁷ Fodor István: *Vázlatok a finnugor őstörténet régészettéből*, Régészeti füzetek Ser. II No. 15, (Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1973), 121 pp.—German résumé: *Skizzen aus der Archäologie der finnisch-ugrischen Urgeschichte*, pp. 89—96.

"General sketches of Finno-Ugric prehistory" it is a well documented, clearly presented survey of recent, predominantly Soviet, research. It is a real thread of Ariadne in the labyrinth of Soviet archaeological publications.