ULRICH PAGEL and SÉAN GAFFNEY: *Location list to the texts in the microfiche edition of the Śel dkar (London) Manuscript bKa' 'gyur (Or. 6724)*. (Catalogus Codicum Tibetanorum, I.) xviii, 132 pp. London: British Library, 1996. £20.

The past few years have seen a considerable growth of interest in the history of the Tibetan collections of canonical Buddhist literature, the Kanjurs (*bka' 'gyur*). Until recently text-critical scholars had unavoidably to content themselves with whatever edition or editions they could lay their hands on, mostly without an appreciation of the relations between those editions, since the necessary information, and the materials needed for a more critical and philologically reliable treatment of the textual tradition, were for the most part simply not available. The Tibetan diaspora that began in 1959 brought with it new access to sources and resources, both literary and human, for the study of Tibet and Tibetan literature. It is one further result of this new accessibility that older materials long available but hitherto unappreciated are beginning to be re-examined. The so-called London Manuscript Kanjur is one such set of materials. The collection has, in fact, been available in London for almost a century, and was occasionally used, but its true importance was not suspected. The present publication of a catalogue of its microfiche edition indicates that the days of limited access to, and insufficient appreciation of this valuable source are numbered. There are several reasons why this is welcome news.

Traditional Tibetan canonical text materials may be categorized in several ways. First, of course, the texts which are held to represent the word of the Buddha are collected in the Kanjur (*bka' 'gyur*), while those which contain commentaries and so on are found in the Tanjur (*bstan 'gyur*). The Kanjur, although we use the word in English as if it were a singular, actually exists in many editions, none identical with another, in either arrangement or content. Some of these Kanjur collections are block-printed editions, the earliest of which was printed in Peking in 1410, others are manuscript collections. The manuscripts may even in some cases be copies of blockprint editions (the so-called Berlin manuscript Kanjur, for instance, appears to be a copy of the 1606 Peking print), and of course the blockprinted editions are based on earlier manuscript materials, although not necessarily those arranged into the form of a Kanjur *per se*. Some research has suggested that there may be, roughly speaking, Eastern (or Tshal pa) and Western (or Thems spangs ma) branches of a single textual tradition which, at least in legend, goes back to one 'original', archetypical proto- or Ur-Kanjur (the so-called Old Narthang), although the discovery of new materials and the continued investigation of those already available is creating some serious complications for this hypothesis. (Among the newly available materials is the Phug brag manuscript Kanjur, a catalogue of the microfiche edition of which was prepared by Helmut Eimer, *Location list for the texts in the microfiche edition of the Phug brag Kanjur* (Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior 5, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1993).

In addition to Pagel's informative introduction, and the list proper, the present volume also includes on pp. 1–9 a paper by Jampa Samten and Peter Skilling, 'On the date of the Sel dkar (London) Manuscript bKa' 'gyur (Or. 6724)'. This valuable study establishes 1712 as the year in which the London Kanjur was completed. It also shows that the Kanjur belongs to the Western or Thems spangs ma group, and is a copy, made at the Sel dkar chos sde, ultimately based on the original Thems spangs ma manuscript from Rgyal rtse. Pagel mentions (p. ix) that 'Peter Skilling ... discovered in the colophon of the *brGyad ston pa* volume a note saying that the current Sel dkar bKa' 'gyur was a copy of the rGyal rtse Them spans ma manuscript'. No further mention is made of this discovery, even by Samten and Skilling, but it was already referred to several years ago by Paul Harrison ('In search of the source of the Tibetan Bka' 'gyur: a reconnaissance report', in Per Kvaerne (ed.), *Tibetan studies: proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes 1992*, vol. 1, Oslo: Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, 1994, 295, and n. 5). Three other direct or indirect manuscript copies of this same manuscript original are known: the Ulan Bator, the sTog Palace, and the Tōyō Bunko manuscript Kanjurs, of which only the last two are available for study. Therefore, the London, sTog and Tōyō Bunko manuscript Kanjurs are valuable sources for a lineage of the Kanjur text tradition not generally taken cognizance of by scholars until rather recently.

According to Pagel, the original extent of the London Kanjur must have been 111 volumes, of which a few have been lost: 104 of these volumes are now available; 102 are kept in the British Library, and a further two volumes were discovered in the Bodleian at Oxford by Paul Harrison several years ago. Pagel suggests that the seven volumes still missing may have been lost in transit from Tibet to India, or within Britain itself, but does not say whether he investigated the possibility that the volumes may have been kept in India intentionally, as sometimes happened with collections acquired by the British Government in India.

The 'Location list' is not, nor does it pretend to be, a catalogue of the London Kanjur. Pagel informs us that such a catalogue is in preparation, and much of what we would like to know about this Kanjur will no doubt be discussed there. But for the time being, this list will be helpful in guiding scholars interested in whether and where a text is found in this edition, such information being essential to those comparing Kanjur traditions, for instance. The list will, of course, also be a great help to those who want to obtain copies of texts from the British Library. While individual fiches will not be provided, scholars may request copies of single texts on microfilm or paper at what is said to be a greatly lower cost than that charged in the past. All enquiries should be directed to the curator of the British Library's Tibetan

collection. The entire microfiche set is available for purchase for £2750/$4000 from British Library Publications, 41 Russell Square, London WC1, from which one may also order the catalogue. However, for those with a more limited budget, it might be more useful to know that copies of the complete set are owned by a number of institutions and libraries, including: Ōtani University, Kyoto, Japan; Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo, Japan; International Institute for Buddhist Studies, Tokyo, Japan; Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, Germany; Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, Germany; University of Bonn, Germany; Institut für Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Vienna, Austria; University of Washington, Seattle, USA; Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions, Carmel, New York, USA; University of Virginia, Charlotte, Virginia, USA. Several other sets were not purchased directly from the British Library, and I have been unable to learn where they are held.

A tremendous amount of care has obviously gone into the compilation of this work, which is also very neatly printed and bound. As a list, this volume is a fine, clearly organized, and easily usable work, insofar as I can determine without access to the microfilm collection that it catalogues. Nevertheless, the list does raise certain problems, and contains several errors which, although minor, are nevertheless worth correcting.

Pagel calls the manuscript in question the Śel dkar. In principle, of course, it does not matter what one calls an edition, as long as one is consistent. However, as a general practice, it makes more sense to refer to blockprint editions by their place of origin, and manuscripts by their current location. This allows us to speak, for instance, as we commonly do, of the London manuscript and the Lhasa blockprint, especially since we often do not know the origins of manuscript editions, which by their very nature are unique, and given that there may be many manuscript copies of one 'archetype', such as the Śel dkar. What is most important here, however, is that researchers agree as soon as possible on the sigla to be used so that when moving from one critical edition to another, the user is not constantly confused by the inconsistent sigla of different scholars. This problem may be easily illustrated. On page xiii of the present catalogue Pagel writes: 'In order to maintain a degree of conformity with previous publications of this type, it has been decided to model the lay-out and system of reference on the location list prepared by Helmut Eimer for the Phug brag bKa' 'gyur [op. cit.]'. This is fine, but one slip can cause considerable confusion. Eimer refers to the sTog Palace manuscript Kanjur with the siglum T. On page xv, Pagel states that he will call this Kanjur S—but in fact, in the catalogue proper he has referred to it, following Eimer, as T. Again, Pagel calls the Phug brag F, but it has also recently been called S, P and A, while F has been used for the Taiwan manuscript Kanjur, and P for Peking. Recently, there seems to have been some progress in this area. Paul Harrison informs me: 'On the matter of sigla, a meeting was held on this very question at the 7th IATS Seminar at Schloss Seggau, Austria, in 1995, and the results of the deliberations have been written up by Helmut Eimer and me in a short paper entitled 'Kanjur and Tanjur sigla: a proposal for standardisation', to be published in Vienna in one of the many *Proceedings* volumes from that conference.'

It is unfortunate that Sanskrit titles in the list, even those occurring in the incipit of the text, could not (for unstated reasons, p. xv) be included, although no doubt they will appear in the forthcoming full catalogue. Tibetan titles are given exactly as they occur, a good decision by the compilers. In the index, on the other hand, standardized titles, omitting *'phags pa* and *dpal*, have been used, again a good decision. The issue is well discussed (p. xvi). The index is very usable, although there are some oddities. As noted by Samten and Skilling (p. 2, n. 14), the volume which contains the last part of the Prajñāpāramitā, Khri sna tshogs *ka*, contains in addition the *Bhadracarīpraṇidhāna*, *Triskandhaka*, *Maitrīpraṇidhānarāja*, five copies of the *Vajracchedikā*, and two *dkar chags*. In the volume description and individual text entries (p. 108), and in the index, the *dkar chags* and the *Bhadracarīpraṇidhāna* are listed, but not the *Triskandhaka* or *Maitrīpraṇidhānarāja*. In the index, each of the *Vajracchedikā* copies, which have the serial numbers 667–71, is given a separate entry (with one, 668, misprinted as 768). The assignment of text numbers to supplementary texts like the *dkar chags* and additional copies of the *Vajracchedikā* is, however, perhaps not as misleading as might have been expected. Although the several missing volumes of the Kanjur have been assigned 'virtual' volume numbers, the individual texts contained in them were not given virtual text numbers, and the text numbers assigned by the list do not therefore reflect the hypothetical original shape of the Kanjur.

Three *dkar chags* are found with the Kanjur, the most important of which is reproduced on small but very clear and legible plates at the front of the volume. In fact, this is the only *dkar chag* which belongs to this Kanjur proper, although all three are discussed by Samten and Skilling.

One bibliographical item might be noted. Although it appears in the bibliography on page 10, neither in his brief mention on p. x of the 'handful of publications' on this Kanjur nor anywhere else in the volume does Pagel mention the undated 62-page typewritten 'List of contents of the Tibetan Kanjur in the British Museum (Or. 6724)' compiled by Eric Grinstead. The list is kept in the reading room of the Oriental and India Office Collections of the British Library, Pressmark J.21, but *samizdat* copies have circulated in xerox form for a number of years. This list must have been of great help in compiling the 'Location list', and the absence of any mention of it in Pagel's introduction is probably an oversight.

Finally, two very minor points may be corrected. On p. 2 the dating of the Tōyō Bunko (Tokyo) manuscript Kanjur to between 1858 and 1878 is attributed to H. Eimer. However, Eimer has only repeated the dates established in the only published list of this

Kanjur, that of Saitō Kōjun ('Kawaguchi Ekaishi Shōrai Tōyō Bunko Shozō Shahon Chibetto Daizōkyō Chōsa Bibō,' *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō*, 63, 1977: 1–62). The final word of Samten's and Skilling's study, p. 9, which mentions the 'Tokyo manuscripts' must be a misprint; there is only one Tokyo manuscript Kanjur.

JONATHAN SILK

MARILYN M. RHIE and ROBERT A. F. THURMAN: *Wisdom and compassion: the sacred art of Tibet. Expanded version.* 488 pp., map [on endpapers]. London: Thames and Hudson, 1996. £48.

The international exhibition of art under the title 'Wisdom and compassion: the sacred art of Tibet', was originally brought together in 1991 to coincide with the International Year of Tibet, and shown in San Francisco and New York. After its appearance in expanded form at the Royal Academy of Art in London in 1992 it has subsequently been displayed in Bonn, Barcelona and at several places in Japan. This 'coffee-table' volume, edited by the exhibition curators, displays the 160 art works from the original edition of this work, along with an additional 81 items from the Bonn incarnation of the exhibition.

The colour reproductions of the exhibits, principally *tangkas*, are often full page, with enlargements of details, and descriptive analysis is given. As with the exhibition, the exhibits are ordered to provide a journey into Tibetan Buddhist art, from Shakyamuni Buddha and the Arhats, through Bodhisattvas into specifically Tibetan figures from history and from the various sects and formulations such as Shambala. The pictures are accompanied by a text which gives an overview of Tibetan art, placing it in its religious and cultural context, and offering comments on aesthetics, chronology, style and technique, as well as providing a glossary and a somewhat brief bibliography.

Rather than completely revising the book for the additional Bonn material, this has been printed as an addendum after the original index, and given its own references and index, while the analysis, which is noticeably briefer, frequently refers back to the earlier part of the book. All this is somewhat confusing, and suggests a somewhat hasty approach, but does serve the purpose of incorporating some very worthwhile additions to the original material.

The analytical and historical approach is largely uncritical and might at times have benefited from some of the insights gained from the 'Mythos Tibet' conference which coincided with the exhibition in Bonn. But the focus is naturally on the art pieces themselves, which are beautifully displayed in high-quality reproductions. No one attracted to the subject can fail to appreciate the range of art displayed here and the unique culture from which it springs.

A. C. MCKAY

THOMAS T. ALLSEN: *Commodity and exchange in the Mongol empire: a cultural history of Islamic textiles.* (Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization.) xvi, 137 pp. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1997. £30, $49.95.

This short monograph is a *tour de force* of scholarly writing. It combines wide reading in the sources (Mongolian, Chinese, Persian, Arabic and Western) with great insight, philological investigation with deep analysis, all written in a clear—even engaging—style. This book will change the way we look at the history of the Mongol empire and Eurasian Steppe society in general. One could go as far as to suggest that it represents a major advance of our understanding of cultural transmission in the Eurasian continent as a whole.

As his central theme, the author takes what may appear at first glance to be a simple, perhaps trivial, matter: the consumption by the Mongol élite of luxurious cloth, especially *nasīj*, a gilded silk brocade. Certainly many students of the Mongol empire (this reviewer included) have encountered in their own reading in the sources the frequent mention of this and other types of rich textiles, without giving it much—if any—thought. It is to Professor Allsen's credit that he realized the central role that these textiles played in Mongolian political and cultural life, particularly when used as robes of honour and—to a lesser extent—in ceremonial tents of the ruler and his subordinates. What is more, in order to supply this need for such cloth, which was overwhelmingly of Middle Eastern provenance (or inspiration), the Mongols organized both its transport and production on an extremely wide scale, including the transfer of thousands of craftsmen from south-west Asia to Mongolia and China itself. The author thereupon launches upon an extended discussion on the cultural basis for the Mongol fascination with this type of cloth, and particularly, the great significance of gold in the political culture of the steppe. Finally, the whole subject is put into the wider perspective of cultural transmission. What is shown here may surprise some scholars of the Mongols, particularly those with an Eastern, i.e. Chinese, perspective. In the use of textiles, as well as various aspects of political culture, the Mongols drew upon a long established Inner Asian tradition, which to a large degree was ultimately derived from the Iranian world, be it nomadic or settled. The Chinese influence, here at least, was clearly secondary.

For the Mongol ruling group, one indication of imperial success was the ability to provide luxury items for both the imperial élite and wider circles among the Mongols. Primary among these items were sumptuous textiles, especially garments of gold brocade, symbols of the good life brought about by the Mongol conquests led by Chinggis Khan and his family. Most significant among these garments were the *jisün*, single-colour robes made from *nasīj*, which were frequently granted by the Mongol ruler to his immediate and wider entourage. These robes were often distributed in the many