A fourth chapter discusses romance as part of a study of Indian explorers beyond the ‘borders’ of 'India': two concepts that might have been discussed more fully. Romanticism here appears to mean not so much a preference for imagination over formalism, but rather chivalric or heroic stereotypes. Confusingly, given that introduction, the story of the secret explorations of Tibet and elsewhere is shown to be one of Indian valour and European computation, in which nonetheless leading European contemporaries defended the reliability of Indian observations.

The fifth chapter opens with a bold claim that late nineteenth-century historians were mainly nostalgic for ‘original moments’, and then turns unexpectedly to a discussion of the ‘black hole’ of Calcutta. Chronologically, this makes a kind of sense in that Curzon, by re-creating Holwell's monument, is seen as ‘mapping’ as well as reinterpreting this story as part of the topography of the city and indeed for an imperial tourist's itinerary. This is not exactly nostalgia, it might be thought; and thematically, as suggested above, the chapter is rather remote from the main subjects of this book.

The conclusion notes the uses and representations of history and the symbolism of control, in colonial maps. Those represented in the Imperial Gazetteer of 1909, say, showing archaeological sites and political territories at successive periods, but also languages, religions and peoples, and geology, climate and economic features, might have been a good peg on which to hang a more natural fifth chapter.

Several maps and illustrations are usefully included, though it is a pity that their reproduction was not less murky.
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Annemarie Schimmel (1922–2003) certainly lived an academically productive and successful “leben als one-woman-show”. This autobiography, published just four months before her untimely death, will satisfy the curiosity of those – and many more when the mooted English edition appears – who encountered this woman whose passion for Morgenlandfahrt was kindled during her precocious childhood.

As with all celebrated orientalists, Schimmel started young, fifteen to be exact, when she began studying Arabic, inspired by the eastern verses of Goethe, Rilke and Rückert. Her Syrian instructor found her to be so infatuated with the language that he also taught her about Islamic culture. Idyllic days in Erfurt, involving two advancements beyond her age group for the only-child who was born to middle-aged parents, ended with the Nazis consolidating power and pressing youth into unpaid Arbeitsdienst across the countryside. Her resourceful mother, a fine lady remembered by many colleagues, managed to have her daughter transferred to Berlin University to study with von Gabain, Hartmann and Schaeder. Here she also became Kühnel’s research assistant at the neighbouring museum. Obtaining her first doctorate in 1941 at the age of 19 (the academic year having been compressed into trimesters), Schimmel was employed as a translator in the Foreign Office, and submitted her Habilitationsschrift on the very day when the ministry was evacuated to Saxony. That day was also the last time that she saw her father alive, a postal worker unable to handle a shotgun yet forcibly thrust, along with other untrained civilians, against the approaching Red Army, and killed near Ketzin. Not exactly the stuff of legend, Schimmel left Berlin with a typescript of her Habil. thesis, Nicholson's
edition of the Dhírá copied out in long hand, and some Arabic texts. Come Armistice Day she was incarcerated, but some months later she was released by American troops occupying Marburg, where, barely aged 24, she delivered her inaugural address as Professor of Arabic and Islāmis. In 1954 she acquired a second doctorate at Marburg under the famed historian of religion, Friedrich Heiler. There followed a stint in Turkey as the only non-Muslim woman at Ankara’s theological faculty; then back to Bonn, and finally on to Harvard (1966–92) to fill the first western position endowed exclusively for Indo-Muslim studies.¹

This is an enjoyable and informative memoir. Some telling comments should dispel off-heard notions that Schimmel was naïve or lacked judgement: summing up the linguistic skills of research candidates in her Near and Middle East Department at Harvard as “not exactly brilliant—in most cases” (p. 185); highlighting Bahrain as one of the most relaxed and “international” places of the Islamic world (p. 212f.); or recalling that if Benazir Bhutto had concentrated on “Indo-Muslim history” and “Urdu”, instead of “hockey” and “American history”, it would have stood her in better stead later as premier (p. 277). (Although a fluent native speaker, Pakistanis do ridicule Bhutto’s Urdu diction). But Schimmel always found Bombay “melancholy, which left me puzzled” (p. 289).

Schimmel eschewed commenting on the contemporary situation of the lands that she researched or visited. She was neither ignorant nor apologetic but simply perceptive to and at the same time as sensitive of, expressing or receiving censure. Doubtless this stemmed from an aversion to the invidious nationalistic of her teenage years: “A German girl does not learn Arabic!” (p. 42). But she did not overlook recording the stellar contributions of Jewish scholars such as Lichtenstädter “tante Ilse”, Ettinghausen, Horovitz, and Rosenthal, recently deceased, who was Schaeder’s most brilliant pupil (p. 191f.). To be sure there were personal tragedies but “intensive work” was a constant “remedy” for healing life’s intimate and emotional aches (p. 45). And till the end she did not let the spiteful salvo fired by Grass and Habermas among others (including, shamefully, Rotter—painful to any teacher) in the months leading up to the conferment of the 1995 German Book Trade Association’s Peace Prize, affect her dignity. A profound vein of gratitude runs throughout these reminiscences towards her parents, teachers, students, colleagues, friends, and her Maker for a life of rich and enjoyable learning and teaching. Only towards the conclusion is a personal aside aired: “One does not speak about disappointments, tears and human problems; it is nobody’s concern” (p. 327). Such reticence and magnanimity is instructive in itself.

There are a few typographic errors; Prince Hassan b. Talal’s mother-in-law and wife should be spelt as Shaista and Sarvath respectively (p. 217). As far as memory serves me, Shaista Ikramullah’s doctoral thesis on Urdu literature, submitted to SOAS in 1941, was the first by a Muslim woman and the earliest in that subject. Read Tinnel not “Timlan” for the town located near the Atlas Mountains, Morocco (p. 227); and the Sītara-ye Imātāz, of which Schimmel was a recipient, is one, but not the “highest”, of the civilian awards of Pakistan, which is the Nishan-e Pakistan (p. 304).

Finally may I be permitted an anecdote here concerning the naming of the Khayaban-e Annemarie Schimmel along Lahore’s Canal Bank in 1982? On p. 42 a photograph is included with the sign spelt as pronounced Khayaban in Urdu. Briefly, Sir Muhammad Iqbal’s academic residence in Heidelberg was appositely commemorated by the dedication of an Iqbalstrasse along the banks of the Neckar, also eulogised in a poem by its namesake. Schimmel had, therefore, requested that Pakistan reciprocate by honouring the memory of Goethe, whose influence on Iqbal was of considerable significance. But Pakistan went one better by naming a thoroughfare in honour of Goethe and the continuing stretch

¹ A Nizam’s readership in Urdu subverted by that Hyderabad ruler had existed at SOAS before the 1939–45 war. The appointment of either Jan Marek, a Czech, or Alessandro Bausani, an Italian leftist, at the height of the Cold War was unthinkable.
across the canal after her. A blimpish Punjabi major was later remembered as enquiring, "Annemarie Schimmel I have heard of, but who is Goethe?"
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Standard, Indian, journalistic and even purportedly ‘scholarly’ accounts of the emergence of the mass uprising in Kashmir tend to portray it as an externally inspired ‘Islamic fundamentalist’ movement against the supposedly secular Indian state. This is, of course, a misreading of a very complex phenomenon. While the religious aspect obviously cannot be ignored, Kashmiri Muslim resentment against Indian rule cannot be said to be simply a result of inherent antagonism between Islam and Hinduism or between Muslims and Hindus as such. For one thing, the very notion of the Indian state (against which the Kashmiri movement for self-determination defines itself) as ‘secular’ is questionable. Furthermore, the argument that the Kashmiri movement is in essence an ‘Islamic’ or a Muslim ‘communal’ one ignores the fact that, long before the Islamists entered the scene, the movement was led largely by secular elements, such as the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front, which, while advocating independence for Kashmir, were opposed to the notion of an ‘Islamic’ state, at least of the kind proposed by Islamists active in Kashmir today such as the Lashkar-i Tayyeba and the Jama’at-i Islami.

Understanding the roots of the Kashmiri movement requires one to take a historical perspective, examining the changing contours of Kashmiri identity over time. This is precisely what author Chitrakala Zutshi sets out to do in this well-researched book. She questions the notion of ‘Kashmiriyat’ as a unified cohesive vision of Kashmir’s past that ignores, perhaps deliberately, crucial internal differences and contradictions of religion, sect, caste, class, region, language and ethnicity. Zutshi’s particular focus is on how the notion of Kashmiriyat came to be developed over time in response to wider social, cultural, economic and political developments in Kashmir. In the process, she examines how key Kashmiri leaders sought to balance their commitment to Islam, on the one hand, and to the notion of a Kashmiri nation, on the other.

The notion of a well-defined Kashmiri identity, Zutshi argues, was not the original product of Kashmiri nationalist minds, but, instead, owed much to colonial discourses on Kashmir pre-dating the rise of Kashmiri nationalism. From the seventeenth century, European travellers wrote about the ‘happy vale’ of Kashmir, where, as they saw it, Muslims and Hindus alike were rather lax in their religious commitments and where, unlike in other parts of the subcontinent, the two communities lived amicably together. Zutshi claims that this romanticised picture, while true to some extent, ignored crucial internal differences that seriously challenge the notion of Kashmiri religious syncretism and the argument that communitarian differences were relatively marginal in Kashmir.

Closely examining pre-colonial, colonial and Dogra records, as well as the writings of Kashmiri Pundits and Muslim spokesmen, Zutshi traces the complex process of the construction of a distinct Kashmiri Muslim identity. She argues that Sikh rule in Kashmir, under which the Muslim peasantry suffered considerable hardship, naturally led to a growing stress on the Muslim aspect of the identity of the Kashmiri Muslim majority, which, in turn, functioned as a means to articulate dissent and protest. This was carried further under the Dogra regime, which increasingly relied on orthodox brahminical