But if all Rājasūya rites were not necessarily repeated annually, still Heesterman's evidence amply shows that a fair number of constituting rites were: he points at the Anumati, etc., iṣṭis, the devikā iṣṭis, and the Vaiśvānara and Varuṇa iṣṭis, which are found described as though performed by an already anointed king. It is also very interesting that whereas the king is always simply referred to as yajamāna, in the Ratnin offerings he is called king. This point deserves stress. There the king is king indeed, with a complete court of consorts, dignitaries and familiars; if anything needs periodical confirmation, it is his relations with these functionaries on whom his dominion largely depends (svam anapakramiṇaṃ karoti "He renders himself safe from desertion," as the Śatapatha has it), and it is here that the yajamāna emerges, not as a hieratic shade enmeshed in the subtlest ritual complexities, but as a ruler in regal control (50 ff.).

Heesterman's interest in the aspects of embryonic growth and birth of the king produces a great number of revealing aperçus on formerly obscure rites. Most intelligently the author deals with the relation king-brahmin on the Maitrābārhaspatyam (60 ff.; cf. 226 ff.), which he convincingly views as a hieros gamos which will persist when the ancient hieros gamos between king and people recedes in importance as the ritual loses its public aspects; though here we may caution ourselves that we have the priest's version, which, as Heesterman points out, is an ideal model (4).

Very important are his remarks concerning the significance of numbers as principles of integrating disparate groups in a coherent and manipulable context, and especially of the last integer of the number, the series plus 1, in which 1 the continuity and reproducibleness of the series lies assured. He goes perhaps too far in stating that the number being neutral its size is irrelevant—one example, Viṣṇu's three steps becoming four can be explained differently as part of the extension of triads to tetrads where three are manifest, the fourth unmanifest—, but he rightly stresses the formation of the number (34 ff.) I am not inclined to follow him in holding that (29) "in Vedic thought time and space are not differentiated" (which would have curious consequences if taken literally): the frequent equation of the year and world(s) has its significance in the fact that during the growth of the year the worlds are produced until they are completely manifested in the complete year.

In a book so full of new ideas and insights—we may point at the interpretation of the recitation of the Śunaḥśepa legend (159 ff.), the game of dice (151 ff.), and the dakṣiṇā (165 ff.),—there will remain some that deserve further supplementation; but very many are as convincing as they are original. In order to make the work accessible to the non-Sanskritist, Heesterman has reduced the technical terminology, though not all Sanskrit could possibly be jettisoned. Historians of religion and anthropologists as well as indianists will find much new material and thinking. It is very much to be hoped that Heesterman, Caland's *praśiṣya*, will continue in a field for which he is so eminently qualified.

J. A. B. van Buitenen

University of Chicago

German-Persian Diplomatic Relations, 1873-1912. By Bradford G. Martin. Pp. 237. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1959.

Recent English historical works on post-Islamic Persia suffer from two corrigible defects. With few exceptions, such works are done either by a non-national, who lacks sufficient knowledge of Persian and Arabic languages; or they are done by a Persian student in an American university, and take the shape of his doctoral dissertation. The non-Persian finds himself baffled by the source material, or at least by what prominent portion of it which is composed in a cryptic calligraphy and an ornate style. By a sad irony, the Persian Ph. D. candidate who could cope with these difficulties finds himself largely restricted to secondary sources. His writing is condemned to be lacking in vital references to original documents, many of which lie unexamined in the dusty corners of the public and private libraries of his homeland.

Now in reading Martin's book one at first receives an impression that the author has enough knowledge of Persian for the task he sets for him-

rather an exaggeration. James Outram's *Persian Campaign in 1857* reports:

> In 1856-7 the island of Kharag was occupied by the British . . . British forces captured the port of Bushire on 10 the Dec. . . . the bombardment and occupation of Mohammerah, chiefly a naval operation [occurred] on 26th March.

Since Khuzistan and Fars are two vast provinces and Bushire and Mohammereh are only two small ports, the impression created by Mr. Martin's text deserves to be called erroneous.

(5) No mention is made of important facts already mentioned by Arnold T. Wilson in his book, *The Persian Gulf* (Oxford, 1928) that: (a) Until 1892, or even later, Great Britain sought to interest Germany in Persia, Mesopotamia, and the Persian Gulf in order to check Russian expansion southwards. The British Ambassador at Berlin urged Bismarck to stimulate German shipping in these areas. (b) The small Persian Navy was re-created by Nasir ad-Din Shah through German assistance, and the vessels themselves were purchased from Germany.

It is remarkable that any serious study of German-Persian diplomatic relations should overlook these points. Wilson's book is noticed only in the Bibliography, where we learn that it "contains much good material on the Persian Gulf, but is now somewhat outdated."

Let us now turn our attention to matters concerning translation and transcription.

(6) The author often uses Persian descriptive nouns and office titles as though they were proper names. It is common practice to use such well-known Persian nouns as "Shah" and "Saki" as designations for "The King of Persia," and "Cupbearer," but it is inexcusable to introduce unfamiliar ones into English without explanation. The reader cannot in any case know what the title means; and he may easily be misled into taking it as part of the proper name. There is no justification for Mr. Martin's saying, "Muhammad Ali, the Vali Ahd" instead of "Muhammad-Ali, The Crown Prince"; "Kamran Mirza, Naib as-Sultaneh" instead of "Kamran Mirza, the Prince Regent"; "Vali of Mosul" instead of "The Governor of Mosul"; "Mujtahed" instead of "the higher clergy of the Shias"; or for his speaking darkly of "ulama" (p. 93) when he intends "leaders of the Shias." Mr. Martin should at least have given the English equivalents in parentheses.

(7) As Gilbert Lazard in *Grammaire du Person Contemporain*, and Herbert H. Paper in his review of this book (published in this journal, vol. 79, no. 1) have both indicated, the final written *h* is, in most cases nothing but an indication of vowel *e*. Reliance on the writing system may give the erroneous impression that the final *h* is necessary when in fact it is never pronounced. In the text appear "Amin ad-Daulah," instead of "Amin ad-Daule"; "Nizam as Saltâneh," instead of "Nizam us-Saltane"; "Safarnameh-yi-Nasir ad Din Shah beh Uropa" instead of "Safarname-yi-Nasir ad-Din Shah be Eropa."

(8) In the text also some Persian compound proper names are written as though they were actually separate. For example, "Faith Ali Shah" stands instead of "Fath-Ali Shah," and "Husayn Quli" instead of "Husayn-Quli." If, in order to make pronunciation easier, we wish to separate such compound proper names, the use of the hyphen is required.

(9) The author himself uses both "Stambul" and "Constantinople," and "Persia" and "Iran."

In the reviewer's opinion, American writers should follow the British in avoiding the use of "Iran" when they want to talk about Persia. This admonition should especially apply to historical work which deals with the era preceding the foolish attempt of the Persian government to make herself known to the world as "Iran." "Iran" is too easily confused with "Iraq," and the government of Persia now accepts both the terms "Iran" and "Persia" in official correspondence.

(10) The following minor printing errors were discovered: p. 100, line five, read *no* instead of *to*; p. 102, line five *comma* instead of *period*.

In conclusion one ought to say that Mr. Martin's effort is no better and no worse than many others in the area of Persian studies. It is a capably presented and sometimes informative work that suffers from patent and corrigible defects. It leaves one convinced of the need for a change of strategy in the prosecution of Persian research; and anxious for another book which will deal with the later and most conspicuous area of German-Persian relations, *i. e.*, the periods of the First and the Second World Wars.

FARHANG ZABEEH
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA

self. However, the paucity of information based on Persian materials and the appearance of some glaring mistakes in translation and transliteration of Persian expressions, soon dispel this early optimism.

References to Persian sources are limited to a few Persian history books and printed materials, and do not include a reference to a single unpublished document. It is perhaps in apology for these deficiencies that Mr. Martin chooses to allude to the very real handicaps placed on historical research in Persia:

> Unfortunately it was impossible to draw very much on the Iranian Foreign Ministry Archives . . . it is difficult to locate specific items; whatever a search turns up is due to luck. Although the author was permitted to make microfilms, most of the material filmed turned out to be irrelevant to this study. It is hard to predict when, if ever, these archives will be opened to historians for general use. (p. 10)

Such complaints, though legitimate, do not constitute a sufficient excuse. Had Mr. Martin known more Persian, or had he solicited the assistance of a Persian scholar (as many French and English commentators have usefully done), he could assuredly have given a completer picture from the Persian side.

On the other hand, the author, so far as I can judge, does employ German documents to the fullest extent. In the light of his copiousness in this regard, one startling omission in his account of German diplomacy seems all the more strange: no mention is made of the policies and activities of the Germany Navy League, the most important organ of German imperialism before the First World War.

Turning now to problems of the historical, translational, and transcriptive accuracy of the text, reviewer must enter what seem to him to be several damaging criticisms. First, those that concern the history.

(1) On the first page of the Introduction an important mistake in the printing occurs. The text reads:

> In October, 1898, Kaiser Whilhelm II paid a visit to Sultan Abd al-Hamid at Constantinople. Shortly afterwards at Damascas the Kaiser announced that he wanted the three million Moslems of the world to regard him as their friend and protector . . . this statement of Wilhelm II was significant.

No source is given for the Kaiser's announcement, and his words are in fact wrongly paraphrased. His real statement, which, may be easily located in both J. Hohlfeld, *Die Reichsgeschichte in Dokumenten*, 1849-1926, 1927, vol. 1, and in Ralph Flenley, *Modern German History*, reads as follows:

> The Sultan and *the three hundred* million Mohammedans who reverence him as Caliph may be assured that the German emperor will ever be their friend. (p. 314, my italics).

We may notice also that the Kaiser is talking only about the Mohammedans who revere the Caliph, not about Persians who are mostly Shias and *do not* revere him.

(2) A more serious defect is that the author consistently uses the names of Shahs of Persia without giving after their name in parenthesis the dates of their birth and death. Nor is this necessary information even included in the index or appendices. As a result the sequence of events is often obscured. We learn for example about Muhammad-Ali Shah's conspiracy against the Constitutionalists (p. 100), and hear on the next page of "the Prime Minister Nasir al-Mulk" (*sic*). This treatment is misleading, because we are not informed that in the meanwhile Muhammad-Ali was dethroned by the Constitutionalists, that his infant son, Ahmad Shah, was proclaimed as a Constitutional Monarch, and that Nasir-al-Mulk was elected to be his Regent (and not his Prime Minister).

In the Index we find Nasir al-Mulk described as "Persian politician," and Azud as-Saltâneh as "Qajar Prince." It should be mentioned that they were both Regent, and the dates of their Regencies should be supplied.

(3) A similar confusion unfolds on page 92, where Mr. Martin talks about the "prolonged conflict of the Nationalists against the Qajar's." It would be more accurate to speak of a "prolonged conflict of the Constitutionalists against the absolute monarchy of Qajar's Shahs." That the opposition of the Constitutionalists was directed not at the Qajar dynasty itself, but rather against the absolutist form, is evidenced by the fact that their victory resulted in the proclamation of another Qajar as the constitutional Shah. And the term "Nationalist" is of course an improper substitution for "Mushrote-Kahan."

(4) The author writes, "British troops invaded Khuzistan and Fars (1856-7)" (p. 15). This is