As far as I can tell, the English translation of quoted passages (from several works) is for the most part accurate. It is regrettable that Shihadeh (pp. 159, 165) translates *thakhīn* (solid, dense) as "three-dimensional" without explanation (in a private communication Shihadeh explained that *thakhīn* expresses the third dimension, i.e., "depth," and is used here by Avicenna as a kind of abbreviation for expressing the two other dimensions as well. However, Avicenna normally uses *ʿumq* to designate the third dimension of "depth"). Another small quibble is the use of the same translation for different terms, e.g., "fragmentation" for *infikāk* (pp. 159, 165, first occurrence) and for *tafrīq* (p. 165, second occurrence). The use of an alternative translation for one, e.g., "partition," would have made the difference in vocabulary in the original all the more clear.

This volume is an important contribution to a better understanding of the development of philosophy in the Islamic world of the twelfth century. We now have at our disposal an excellent edition of a text that had only been available in manuscript, as well as a valuable study that situates it in a broader framework and highlights a few of its major doctrinal views. Some topics still require scrutiny, but Shihadeh has given us a serious basis for further research.

Jules L. Janssens
KU Leuven

---

Muḥammad Amīn b. Mīrzā Muḥammad Zamān Bukhārī (Ṣūfīyānī), *Muḥīṭ al-Tavārīkh (The Sea of Chronicles)*. Edited by Mehrdad Fallahzadeh and Forogh Hashabeiky. Studies in Persian Cultural History, vol. 4. Leiden: Brill, 2014. Pp. ix + 112 + 388 (Ar.). $216, €167.

*Muḥīṭ al-tavārīkh* (The sea of chronicles) is a general history (that is, a history of Islam and Muslim dynasties since creation down to the author's time), divided into ten chapters (sg. *bāb*). The final and most original *bāb* is dedicated to the history of the Ashtarkhanid dynasty in the city of Bukhara and its ruler Subḥān-Qulī Khān (r. 1680–1702) down to the year 1699, when, apparently, the author was in his sixties. The Ashtakhanids, also known as the Janid or the Tuqay-Timurid dynasty (depending on scholars' view of the dynasty's founders or point of origin), ruled parts of Central Asia from the cities of Bukhara and Balkh during the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries. They promoted and patronized considerable historical writing, mostly in the Persian language, and the work before us is both a characteristic and an unusual example of that patronage.

The study of Central Asia's history, particularly of the period between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries, still suffers from a dearth of scholarly interest, and the majority of our written evidence for that time frame is scattered in archives throughout Eurasia, unedited and unpublished. And yet, in recent years we see growing—and laudable—efforts to publish text editions of both narrative and documentary sources from that era, efforts that have been undertaken mostly by Japanese, Uzbek, Kazakh, and Iranian scholars, displaying impressive international collaborations. Probably the most notable recent publication of this type is Mansur Sefatgol's edition of *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, an important eighteenth-century Manghit chronicle, published in Tokyo in 2015. Indeed, institutions such as the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa affiliated with Tokyo University of Foreign Studies or the Department of Islamic Area Studies at the University of Tokyo; Daik Press in Almaty, Kazakhstan; the al-Beruni Center for Oriental Manuscripts at Tashkent State Institute of Oriental Studies in Uzbekistan; Miras Maktoob Research Center in Tehran; the International Institute for Central Asian Studies in Samarkand, and others have been actively contributing to this wider endeavor. To these we may add materials published in India, mostly related to Mughal history, that also concern Central Asia, directly or indirectly, during the centuries discussed here (for example, recent publications at Rampur Raza Library include the *Dīvān* of Ẓahīr al-Dīn Muḥammad Bābur).

This edition of *Muḥīṭ al-tavārīkh* appeared in Brill's Studies in Persian Cultural History, an important series that typically does not publish text editions. The editors, Mehrdad Fallahzadeh and Forogh Hashabeiky of the Department of Linguistics and Philology at the University of Uppsala in Sweden,

showcase their expertise in these two fields (linguistics and philology) in this publication, and although neither claims to be a Central Asian historian, the result is nonetheless valuable and effective. Fallahzadeh had worked previously on a text edition and a translation of a seventeenth-century Persian translation of a thirteenth-century Sanskrit treatise on music (published under the title *Shams al-aṣvāt: The Sun of Songs by Ras Baras* [Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 2012]). *Muḥīṭ al-tavārīkh* also includes an unexpected portion dedicated to music, which may explain this editor's initial interest in this particular work.

*Muḥīṭ al-tavārīkh* survives in five manuscripts in Paris, Tashkent, St. Petersburg, Bukhara, and Medina, of which the first three were accessible to the editors. The editors describe each of the manuscripts at some length and provide samples in facsimile. They trust the Paris manuscript (186 fols.)—the oldest of the three (copied in 1861 in Bukhara)—the most, despite the absence of a preface (*dībācha*) and the fact that the manuscript begins only with the ninth *bāb*. The Tashkent manuscript was copied a year after the Paris one and also suffers from significant lacunae. The St. Petersburg manuscript was copied even later, probably in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century, and includes the most complete preface, but otherwise is the most incomplete, and has passages in the margins, written in a different hand, describing historical events later in the eighteenth century. The editors demonstrate that these three specimens probably were not copied from the same manuscript and this has affected their approach in a "reconstruction of the archetype" text, namely, the edition before us. Ultimately, this publication is, in fact, an edition of the ninth and tenth *bāb*s based primarily on the Paris manuscript, with the added preface based primarily on the St. Petersburg manuscript.

Regarding the author's identity, the editors decided to follow a note (not made by the author, it seems) in the margins of the first folio of the Paris manuscript that identifies the author as one Muḥammad Amīn b. Mīrzā Zamān Bukhārī. Conversely, in the St. Petersburg manuscript—the only manuscript that features an intact preface—the author introduces himself as Muḥammad Amīn Kīrak-yarāqchī (Kīrak-yarāqchī, the author's moniker, refers to his position in charge of the royal armory and provision stores; this is also how most of the scholars working on this period have known him). Additional self-references, present in all three manuscripts, make it clear that his name was Muḥammad Amīn, the son of Mīrzā Muḥammad Zamān, who hailed from the Ṣūfīyān quarter in the city of Bukhara. Other information about the circumstances of the manuscript's production indicates that the work was composed at the behest of Ibrāhīm Qūshbegī, a high official in Subḥān-Qulī Khān's court. Apparently, the author based his composition on thirty-seven historical works, going back to early chronicles by the likes of al-Ṭabarī and al-Kindī (both in their later Persian translations), and ending with his contemporary, Maḥmūd b. Amīr Walī.

Having checked random passages of the edited text edition against a microfilm of the Paris manuscript (Bibliothèque nationale, Supplément Persan 1548, described—with some errors—by Edgard Blochet in his *Catalogue des manuscrits persans de la Bibliothèque nationale*, 1: 472), it seems to me that this text edition is very reliable. Discrepancies among the manuscripts are carefully noted by the editors in the scholarly apparatus, although generally when the editors had to choose a variant from the three manuscripts, they most frequently relied on the Paris one. Given the unfortunate lack of access to the Bukhara manuscript, their choices make sense.

The editors successfully identify the sources for different parts of the work, and they have been able to confidently single out instances where the author copied or abridged previous works. At the same time, the most challenging task has been to recognize sources from the author's own lifetime, many of which are likely to remain unknown. The editors describe the styles and formats of each chapter, including the unusual treatise on music theory and musicians that unexpectedly appears in the middle of the ninth *bāb*, borrowed and abridged, it seems, from a different text by a musician in Imām-Qulī Khān's (d. 1642) court. The editors suggest that this rather unusual appearance is a testament to the artistic tastes of the author's patron. Most of the rest of the text is dedicated to describing internal political intrigue in Bukhara, Bukhara's relations with Balkh, and the ongoing conflicts with Khorezm. What seems to interest the editors more than the mere historical events are linguistic aspects, particularly what they consider as the growing separation of Tajik and Persian, and the increasing influence of Turkic on Persian vocabulary. At the same time, several statements made by the editors

about the general state of the Persian language in Central Asia at the time—for example, "the Persian language was beginning to lose its status as a literary and official language" (p. 22) or "[the work was written] during a period of linguistic transition" (pp. 23 and 75)—perhaps need to be treated with caution. In giving the reader examples of orthography and grammatical features and comparing them with modern Persian, the editors demonstrate where their interests lie. They conclude that the text's basic grammatical structures bear a very close resemblance to modern Persian, but style, vocabulary, and orthography are quite different.

*Muḥīṭ al-tavārīkh* is an important work that has been under-consulted by scholars. The availability of a text edition, including thirty-nine pages of useful indices, will likely increase the work's usage and offer more scholars who previously had little access to the manuscripts the chance to open another window into Central Asia's fascinating history. Indeed, more scholars should dedicate the time and effort to publish text editions of valuable sources that still remain in manuscript form, often difficult to access. The editors have rendered our field a great service.

Ron Sela
Indiana University, Bloomington

---

*Jews and Islamic Law in Early 20th-Century Yemen*. By Mark S. Wagner. Indiana Series in Sephardi and Mizrahi Studies. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2015. Pp. xi + 208. $75 (cloth); $29 (paper).

Yemeni Jewry has been the topic of a rich array of ethnological, cultural, halakhic, linguistic, and historical studies, in which leading scholars have examined the relations between Muslims and Jews in both the Middle Ages and the modern era. This research—of which much is based on the written and oral testimony of Yemeni Jews—has shed light on material and spiritual aspects of Yemeni Jewry. Their impressive breadth is evident in the bibliographies compiled by Joseph Tobi (Jerusalem, 1975) and Yehuda Razhabi (Jerusalem, 1976), and in many additional works that cannot be enumerated here.

The volume under review continues in the path of these studies and focuses on the relationship between Islamic law and the Jews of Yemen in the twentieth century, against the political and cultural background of the time and as reflected in the activity of three prominent Yemeni Jews: Sālim Saʿīd al-Jamal (1916–2007), Ṣāliḥ al-Ẓāhirī (1901–1986), and Sālim Manṣūra (1916–2007). These men (the author refers to them as rabbis) served as intermediaries (also his term) between the legal and public arms of the Islamic establishment and the Jews, effectively practicing as lawyers within the Islamic legal system. All three belonged to the Dor Deah movement (whose members were known as *dardaim*) founded by Rabbi Yiḥyah Qafiḥ, which espoused a rationalist approach in the tradition of Maimonides, aspired to spread his doctrine throughout Yemen, and opposed Kabbalah. (It might have been appropriate to dedicate a separate discussion in the book to Kabbalah; see p. 84 and especially p. 94.) But each worked in a different way toward the attainment of the goal and made a different contribution, as the author notes during the course of the book and in its conclusion (pp. 151–56). All three had connections with the Islamic establishment, but ultimately their efforts failed (see, e.g., p. 122). As the author stresses—perhaps a bit too often (pp. 11–12, 69, 119, 145)—they were experts in Sharia and in Arabic and often made use of their knowledge of Sharia in a provocative way. Recognizing that the Islamic legal tradition is not consistent in its treatment of Jews, they attempted to maneuver within the law and make use of its internal disagreements to procure equal rights for the Jewish minority (see, for example, p. 119). The author describes their enterprise under five headings, each allotted its own chapter: (1) The Islamic Judicial System and the Jews, (2) Changing God's Law, (3) Muslim Jews and Jewish Muslims, (4) Concord and Conflict in Economic Life, and (5) Intercommunal Violence and the Sharia. An introductory chapter (pp. 1–15) describes, among other things, the governmental structures in Yemen (the regime of the Zaydi imam Yaḥyā Ḥamīd al-Dīn and his son Aḥmad after the end of Ottoman control in