

Therefore, this book represents an invaluable and authoritative source and a permanent record of this particular type of documentary evidence for the late medieval history of central Asia.

Maria Subtelny
University of Toronto
and
Robert D. McChesney
Department of Middle Eastern Studies
New York University

Spirituality in the Land of the Noble: How Iran Shaped the World's Religions, Richard C. Foltz, Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2004, ISBN 1-85168-336-4, xiv + 204 pp., map, glossary, bibliographic essay, index.

The subtitle of this tidy, economical volume is an overdue declaration that squarely challenges the classicists and Islamicists of academia. Some among the latter are plainly obscurantist while others of that guild scarcely veil their aversion towards Iranian and other pre-Islamic adherents.

Richard Foltz, despite undeniable sincerity, has not redressed this “out of sight and under-appreciated” record (p. xii). Such an effort entails a lifetime’s study: a Darmesteter or a Bausani would have disseminated their findings in *Festschriften* or *rivisti* before gathering them up in an *œuvre*. Bausani, a veritable titan in the fullest Renaissance sense, argued admirably—notwithstanding some highly personal viewpoints—in his *Persia Religiosa da Zaratustra a Babâ’u’llâh* (Milan, 1959). What Foltz has culled and set down appears as a scissors and paste effort bereft of any distillation of ideas. For instance, how and when did the practice of five times daily prayers—absent in the Qur’an and formally canonized by a *hadith* a century after Muhammad—become a pillar of Islam (p. 118)? Some detailed explanation of this and other salient transmissions from Iranian religions would be instructive, thereby vindicating the book’s subtitle. Yet his unequivocal narration is commendable for he eschews extolling or faulting the past and evenly highlights the bigotry and bias of Iranian and American officialdom (159–74; 184 n.4). A useful text for freshmen and post-9/11 lay readers, it should also be studied by those in the Foreign Office and its flat-footed State Department counterparts who, as far back as 1951, were found lacking our “experience or the psychological insight” in matters Persian (FO 371/91540). And having axed posts in Oriental philology and civilizations, obtuse deans are now in a sad fix in these superficially data-rich yet analysis-poor times, given the outcry for a “humanist” and sophisticated appreciation of ancient, complex societies. Our governments now desperately seek Pashto, Baluchi and Kurdish skills, languages whose teaching is now virtually non-existent.

Only select aspects can be discussed here (simplified transcription adapted for non-specialists):

P. 12: The mystique associated with heptads—and triads for that matter—cuts across the Near Eastern cultural gamut and Iranian “influence in later cultures” is untenable. Consider the hypostatizing of abstractions by the ancient Egyptians of *maat* “order,” *hu* “creative will,” *sia* “perceptiveness,” to which one could add magic, power, sight, and hearing; also note the *utukki limnuti* of the Sabaeans of Harran.

P.13: Old Persian *arta*, Sanskrit *rta*, and Avestan *asha* literally mean “truth” and are not cognate with English “right.” It can, by implication, denote order or right.

P. 14: *Athaurvan* or *athravan* in Avestan but “*atharvan*” only in Sanskrit; *varuna* is akin to “authoritative word,” not “an individual oath”; and read *drug* here and throughout as “falsehood” instead of “chaos”; *fravashi* means “guardian angel,” not “ancestor spirit” or “departed souls” (p. 29). Prayers and oblations are offered not to the *fravashi* but the *fravashi* of the soul. See Mary Boyce, *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London 1979), 15.

Pp. 15–16: *Yasna* always means “worship,” not “sacrifice.”

P. 16: The *barsom*, originally tamarisk stalks, utilized in modern day Zoroastrian ceremonies is of metal rods, not “wires.”

P. 20: Although the Sasanids commonly referred to their faith as *veh din* “the Good Religion,” they frequently utilized *den mazdesn* “Mazda worship(ping) religion.” Moreover, Mazda is not the “*abura* [lord] of wisdom” (p. 24): he is “Lord Wisdom,” or Wisdom personified (correctly on p. 175). It is often incorrectly surmised that this appellation is a genitive construct for a deity possessing wisdom. Ilya Gershevitch rightly pointed out that it signified “creator/giver of thought,” evinced from the Gathic infinitive *mazda-* “to give thought to” (*Iran*, XXXIII [1995]: 6).

P. 21: *Gathas* are simply “songs,” not “poems” or “verses,” and Zarathustra does not render “camel-manager”! The compound name may mean “he who leads old camels.” Sir Harold Bailey (*Transactions of the Philological Society* [1953]: 40f.) had proposed that it might have originally conveyed “he who drives camels.”

P. 25: *Aeshma* “fury” (cf. *kheshm*) is not the “polar opposite of Ahura Mazda” and therefore called *Angra Mainyu* “maleficent spirit.” It is a distinct fiend that shares epithets with *Angra Mainyu* such as *dush.khvarenah-* “possessing an evil glory” and *duzhdā-* “evil-thinking” (Louis Gray, *The Foundations of the Iranian Religions* [Bombay 1929], 186).

P. 29: *Videvdad*, often incorrectly defined as code or “laws against demons (*daevas*),” is actually “law of those who reject the *daevas*.”

P. 32: Had Foltz perused A. D. H. Bivar’s important monograph on Mithraism, listed in the bibliography (p. 187), he would not have omitted acknowledging how Bivar has now ingeniously proven the Iranian provenance of the Graeco-Egyptian deity, Sarapis.

P. 33: *Yazata* is wrongly translated here as “deity-worshippers [*sic!*]”; correctly on p. 25 as “(being) worthy of worship.”

P. 39: Parsi contributions not just to Indian but south Asian economic and public life have been significant, as Foltz rightly observes. It might be pointed out that Jinnah's wife, Ruttie Petit, as well as his Bombay-based personal physician, Jal Patel, were Parsis. The last-named, with accustomed Zoroastrian rectitude, refused to divulge the *Quaid's* fatal tuberculosis condition which, had Mountbatten or Nehru's congress got wind of it, would have led to the delay if not rescission of India's partition in August 1947; Jinnah died in September 1948. It took another Parsi, Field Marshal Sam Maneckshaw, to redraw the subcontinent's map when he led India to victory in the third Indo-Pakistan war of 1971 and the birth of Bangladesh. Jinnah's half-Parsi daughter, Dina, married a scion of the distinguished Wadia family, also Parsis, whose ancestors had been master shipbuilders for the British over seven generations. It was aboard the *HMS Minden* docked in Chesapeake Bay that one Francis Scott Key arose to "dawn's early light," and felt moved to jot "The Star Spangled Banner" on an envelope.

P. 40: Besides the London-based "World Zoroastrian Organisation" founded in 1980, also note that the Zoroastrian Association of Europe established in London, 1861, is Great Britain's and Europe's oldest Asian community organization. Is Foltz serious about an online "Spenta University" conferring degrees in Zoroastrian studies? Courses in Zoroastrianism and Iranistics have been offered at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London, since 1921. A *Parsee Community Lectureship*, arguably the first ethnic initiative ever of its kind at a Western university, was subvented in 1929 but later lapsed. A new post known as the *Zartoshty Brothers Lectureship*—eventually with additional funds to be a full professorship—was established in 2000. This makes SOAS the only institute of higher education in the world offering a B.A. in Zoroastrian studies. See the notices in *SIS News*, 30, 2 (2000): 7 and *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān*, 1, 2 (2001–02): 81–82; and my "Iranica at SOAS: A Brief History," *FEZANA Journal*, 14, 3 (2001): 25–27.

P. 50: The *Fravardigan* is a solemn time of remembrance and not a "springtime celebration," which is *No ruz*. (Correctly described on p. 73 as an "all-souls" memorial service.) The *jasbn-e fravardegan* and *epagomenae* close the year. The origin of the Jewish Purim from it and the connection between the "trial by water" among the ancient Iranians as well as the ritual baptism of Mandaeans and other Gnostic sects (p. 51), merits qualification.

P. 59: Foltz rightly observes how the cosmopolitan Ottomans welcomed Sephardic and Persian Jews in contrast to the Safavids whose reign witnessed organized massacres of Sunnis and forced conversions of Jews and Zoroastrians. But of all the three "world" Islamic empires, it must be acknowledged that the Mughals were rulers of the richest, most creative and most religiously diverse populace of the Islamic ecumene. For the wretchedness of life under the Qajars, a footnote should have cited here Napier Malcolm, *Five Years in a Persian Town* (London, 1905); almost any page will do.

Pp. 60, 168–69: The precariousness of Iranian Jewry after 1979 is well known. Foltz, who has consulted the State Department's religious freedom annual report,

should have also pointed out from its yearly human rights survey that Jews are forbidden to leave the Islamic Republic for travel as a family and that a member is always made to stay behind, a restriction reminiscent of the former Soviet bloc.

P. 63: The rise of Buddhism must be ascribed to the backlash and the philosophical ferment within post-Vedic, Brahmanical religion (broadly subsumed under the rubric of Hinduism) during the sixth-fifth centuries B.C. It has nothing to do with "being in an environment where Aryan and indigenous South Asian cultures had been mingling for nearly a millennium." What analogy exactly can be drawn from comparing this "cultural environment" to the "common heritage" of the "Iranian plateau"?

P. 71: Nothing suggests that Buddhists writing in Sogdian and Khotanese "avoided the term *deva*." In Manichaean, Christian, and Buddhist Sogdian texts one regularly encounters *dyw-* and Khotanese *dywa-* "demon"; Khotanese royal titles contained the term *deva-* and the honorific *deva-putra* "regent" (cf. *shah-pur*). It is also found in onomastics, as for example, Dewastich, the ill-fated Sogdian ruler hounded by the Arabs.

P. 72: Sanskrit has "Mitra" but in Avestan it is Mithra.

P. 84: Sogdian is not an "Iranian dialect" but an eastern Middle Iranian language. And Yaghnobi is not a direct "modern variant" of it but a vestigial descendant of a local patois that historically evolved earlier from Sogdian.

P. 89: Ought one to really compare whether the Sasanids were more tolerant than the Arabs or vice versa in an historical epoch when co-existence, not tolerance, defined the web of human relations? Tolerance, even in our putatively magnanimous age, is displayed more in the breach than in the observance. After listing the fiscal, sartorial, and economic disabilities of *dhimmis*, and stating elsewhere that the Sasanids—who recognized and welcomed Christianity even prior to Constantine—persecuted Christians only during periods of political tension (pp. 80ff.), Foltz concludes that the Arabs were more tolerant. Amongst several scholars who have demonstrated otherwise, two are: the Arabist Edward Sachau, "Von den rechtlichen Verhältnissen der Christen im Sassanidenreich," *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische sprachen an der K. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin, Westasiatische Abteilung*, 10 (1907): 79f.; and an Armenologist, James Russell, "The Advocacy of the Poor: the Malignant Sasanian Order," *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*, 53 (1986): 123–41.

P. 106: It is my contention that for too long scholars have ignored the anti-cosmic, pessimistic correspondences between Manichaeism and Jainism, a casteless atheism whose followers, like the Manichaeans, were enjoined to avoid the killing or destruction of all elements, for even vegetables, books, or micro-organisms are sentient creatures. Mani, it must be remembered, visited Gedrosia; a region inhabited by Jains until the arrival of the Arabs and could have been considerably influenced by these doctrines not found in Buddhist or other Gnostic teachings. Both groups practiced vegetarianism and the Jain laity economically supported their monks just like the *Electi* had been by its Auditors. Both

creeds considered vegetarianism and procreation as regrettable. Both were obsessed with liberating the soul enmeshed in intrinsically evil matter that incrementally expands by thoughts, words, and actions thus defiling the luminous soul (Jainism) or hampering the progress of light particles towards their celestial abode (Manichaeism). Yet, paradoxically, even as Sogdian Manichaeans and Indian Jains frowned upon agriculture and the quest for worldly pursuits as sinful, they were some of the most successful mercantile communities of the Silk Road and ancient India respectively; even to this day in the case of the latter.

P. 108: The Manichaean Sogdian text describing the sojourn of Mar Gabryab, a disciple of Mani, in Armenia and his successful conversion of its monarch is fanciful, and is perhaps attributable to an older apostolic tradition. See James Russell, "A Manichaean Apostolic Mission to Armenia?" *Proceedings of the Third European Conference on Iranian Studies*, Pt. 1, ed. Nicholas Sims-Williams (Wiesbaden, 1998), 21–26. The historically attested conversions occurred when Armenia became Christianized under Tiridates III in AD 314.

P. 167: "[S]everal international Zoroastrian conferences in the 1990s" did not take place in Iran, save one in Teheran, 1996.

P. 179 n.1: "Pamiri [*sic!*]" is not a "contemporary Iranian language." The Pamir family consists of several unwritten linguistic subgroups and their dialects, such as Roshani-Shughni, Wakhi, Ishkashmi-Zebaki-Sanglichi, Yazghulami and Sariqoli.

P. 183f. n.1: "*marja'-e taqlid*" is better translated as "source of emulation" than "model of imitation."

Some remarks on the bibliographic essay: spell in consonance with the style employed as *Encyclopædia Iranica* (passim); Alessandro Bausani, *The Persians* (London, 1971) is indispensable in any list of general works on Iran (p. 185). Foltz's *Religions of the Silk Road: Overland Trade and Cultural Exchange from Antiquity to the Fifteenth Century* (London and New York, 1999) is helpful but marred by inaccuracies, for which see the review in *Circle of Inner Asian Art Newsletter*, 11 (June 1999): 37–39. Bayard Dodge's translation of Ibn Nadim's *Fihrist* is inaccurate and should be used with caution (p. 186). Disregarded *s.v.* Zoroastrianism (p. 187) is Mary Boyce, *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London, 1979; repr. 2001 [2002]), which is still the finest one-volume introduction, and James Russell, *Zoroastrianism in Armenia* (Cambridge, MA, 1987). Originally a SOAS doctoral dissertation, it is the definitive study about pre-Christian Armenia. (One cannot help comparing the remarkably similar description, on p. 38, of the cypress allegedly planted by Zarathustra and felled by Caliph Mutawakkil, with that in Boyce, *Zoroastrians*, 158.) Additionally, Foltz should have at least cited the important publications of R. C. Zaehner as a guide to further reading because a 2002 reprint is available of *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism* (London, 1961). Besides Sven Hartman and the unlisted classic of E. Kulke, *The Parsees in India: A Minority as Agent of Social Change* (Munich, 1974), now consult also Jesse Palsetia, *The Parsis of India: Preservation of Identity in Bombay City* (Leiden, 2001). Ronald Emmerick (d. 2001) was, not "is the major

contemporary scholar” of Iranian Buddhism (p. 189); and general surveys on Iranian Buddhism do exist, of which Foltz seems unaware: David Utz, *A Survey of Buddhist Sogdian Studies* (Tokyo, 1978) and Ronald Emmerick, *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan* (Tokyo, 1979; rev. exp. edn. 1992). Why cite French and German literature on Mazdakism in a general work and not the standard essay by Ehsan Yarshater in the *Cambridge History of Iran* III (2) (Cambridge and New York, 1983), 991–1024? Readers’ attention is directed to *A Zoroastrian Tapestry: Art, Religion Culture*, ed. P. Godrej and F. Punthakey Mistree (Ahmedabad and Cliffedgeway, NJ, 2002), an opulent (seven kgs!) tome of scholarly essays accompanied by over 1,200 illustrations on Zoroastrian heritage from antiquity to the early twentieth century. No study of the Iranian revolution is complete without mentioning Michael Fischer, *Iran: From Religious Dispute to Revolution* (Cambridge, MA, 1980); equally judicious and unlisted is Hamid Dabashi, *Theology of Discontent: the Ideological Foundation of the Islamic Revolution* (New York, 1993). Finally, given the author’s sporadic understanding of Iranistics and Iranists, it is rather rich to assert that Mary Boyce’s scholarship is “intensely colored” (p. 187).

Burzine K. Waghmar
SOAS, University of London

Lessons in Islamic Jurisprudence, Muhammad Baqir as-Sadr, trans. and introd. Roy Parviz Mottahedeh, Oxford: Oneworld, 2003, ISBN 1-85168-324-0, pp. 200, index.

Lessons in Islamic Jurisprudence far outstrips in importance the run-of-the-mill translation in Islamic studies. In a remark that could apply to many published works in the field, Mottahedeh reports that he had produced an initial translation that was in an important way inadequate: “I immediately prepared a translation which I considered accurate but which was almost entirely unintelligible to the intelligent lay reader.” As he explains, this was in large part because of the lack of suitable received terms to express the technical terminology of Islamic jurisprudence in English, a quite complex and vexing problem (pp. viii–ix). Drawing on extensive reading in Western and Islamic jurisprudence, Mottahedeh revised his translation thoroughly, arriving at many new and more satisfying English renditions of Islamic legal and hermeneutic terms. The result is not merely a more readable translation of this particular textbook of Islamic jurisprudence but also a major advance in our understanding of the terminology of Islamic legal theory.

Lessons in Islamic Jurisprudence is the translation of the opening volume of *Durus fi ‘ilm al-usul* by Muhammad Baqir al-Sadr (1935–1980), a prominent member of the scholarly al-Sadr family. This family, which has roots in Lebanon, has produced dozens of influential scholars over the last two centuries, primarily in Iraq, but in Iran and Lebanon as well. Muhammad Baqir al-Sadr grew up in Kazimiyah, the large Twelver suburb of Baghdad, and then relocated to