

Book Reviews

Jean Chalon, *Le lumineux destin d'Alexandra David Néel* (Paris, Librairie Academique Perrin, 1985), 487 p., illus., plates.

Finally a full length, clearly authoritative biography of Alexandra David-Neel has been published. It is by Jean Chalon, issued by the Librairie Academique Perrin in France. It was composed with the help of Marie-Madeleine Peyronnet. She was with Alexandra David-Neel for the last 10 years of her life. Peyronnet still lives in Samten Dzong, the place David-Neel built with earnings from her publications.

Alexandra David-Neel is the most interesting of the past generation of western Tibetanists. Though she died in 1969, almost 101 years old, her books are still published world-wide. Her audience is surely greater than that of any other Tibetanist. While primarily a popular writer, her basic information is earthy and has been directly observed. She is not, as are some other writers for a wide audience, painful to read for those who have direct knowledge of Tibet. Nor are her publications just for the coffee table.

The book gives an intimate view of her life. One learns about her still unpublished material. One also learns about her early liason with Jean Haustont, with whom she lived for several years just before the turn of the century, and continued to see prior to and after her marriage. Jean Haustont opened a music school in Nanking in 1912. That was shortly after Alexandra herself had left on her 1911-1924 soujourn in Asia.

While one may regret that biographies of Tibetanists are not written by Tibetanists, this biography does give some indication of her studies and other details not to be found in her own books. One learns about her relationship with Elisee Reclus and Sylvain Levi. There is interesting information on her relationships with a variety of cultists, orientalist, Tibetanscholars and those politically involved with Tibetan affairs. One learns of her psychological reactions as others, such as Giuseppe Tucci, began to overlap into what she considered her domain of serious popularization. One does not leave this biography with quite the same feeling of missing out on just the information pertinent to Tibetan studies that one has, for example, with the biography of William Woodville Rockhill by Paul A. Varg.

Despite the book's almost 500 pages, it reads with unabated verve. That is possibly because Jean Chalon cites Alexandra's own words and descriptions for many of the concepts and events with which she was involved. There is only one serious lack in the book. The bibliography merely cites her books, and not the long list of articles which Alexandra David-Neel wrote on a gamut of topics throughout her long life. Her

English articles in the *Asia Magazine*, for example, show that she was politically more perceptive than many whose academic reputations seem not to have suffered from their often erroneous views. Possibly her strength was her realization of the power wielded by illusions over realities.

Braham Norwick
New York City

Wolfgang Friedl. *Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft und materielle Kultur in Zanskar (Ladakh)* (Sankt Augustin, Germany; VGH Wissenschaftsverlag, 1983), xxviii + 160 pp., plates.

The object of this publication is the documentation of the material culture of Zanskar (Southern Ladakh) within the context of social institutions and traditions that have been subject to the impact of modernity for the last few years. The author expects far reaching changes in these areas over the coming years, and therefore sees his work as a contribution toward preserving a waning phase of Himalayan and Tibetan civilization. The findings are based on the author's observations made during his stays in Zanskar in 1977 and 1979, where he lived for most of the time in Zangla, a petty kingdom located in the northern part of Zanskar. Several people from Zanskar and a monk from Leh served as informants who interpreted to Friedl what he had observed.

In a brief introduction, Friedl talks about the methods he opted for, his informants, and the publications on Tibetan civilization in general and the West Himalayan in particular that are available and known to him. The second chapter, less than five pages in length, describes the landscape, climate, and history of the region. The third deals with the societal organizations; the fourth with "house and agriculture"; the last with the traditional crafts practiced by Zanskaris. In his conclusion Friedl points to the recently established elementary school as the motor of change, but also at the increasing traffic and commerce which brought an end to Zanskar's traditional isolation. Of great value are 78 drawings illustrating the various tools and techniques for manufacturing the material goods essential for a traditional life style in Zanskar. A few photographs enhance the visual appeal of the book.

To document a waning phase of a little known civilization is always a welcome contribution to scholarship, regardless of the actual quality of a publication. But aside from these merits Friedl's book is marred by a number of faults. The most severe impediment is that he has obviously no knowledge of Tibetan. Thus, most of the Tibetan terms he uses to identify numerous objects are misunderstood or misspelled common Tibetan words, and not characteristic terms. For instance, Friedl gives *ago* for "elder brother, elder brother-in-law, elder brother of one's

wife" and *agu* for "father's elder brother" (both p.11), but fails to recognize that both "terms" are nothing but the common Tibetan word '*a khu* which usually refers to one's paternal uncle. The result is confusing as a reader not knowledgeable in Tibetan will think there is a difference between *agu* and *ago* where there is none. Twenty years ago, Snellgrove had already pointed out that anthropologists working among Tibetan-speaking groups are well advised to learn literary Tibetan, at least to some extent, so that they will avoid the most severe of such distortions.¹ Later this was repeated by M. Goldstein and others.

This lack of Tibetological knowledge affects other parts of Friedl's book too. With regard to script and literature among the Zanskaris, Friedl remarks that "the people of the investigated area do possess their own script and literature, but very little has remained. It is the Tibetan script and literature." He obviously omitted to look into the shrine rooms of Zanskari families which are filled with dozens of precious manuscripts some several centuries old, and he seems unaware of the amount of Tibetan literature available to us. His representation of about 900 years of Ladakhi history is more than inadequate (on less than one page), in particular as the publications of L. Petech and D. Schuh were released before Friedl's book was printed. But there are also methodological flaws in the book, such as when Friedl says "no relative" of a family with a newly born child is permitted to cross a water course or come close to a *lha tho*, whereas only members of the same *pha spun* (kind of clan) are required to observe this rule.

Misunderstandings, based on a deficient appreciation for traditional Tibetan and Buddhist civilization, abound on every page. For instance, on p. 7f Friedl observes that the nuns of Chomo-Ling (which means "nuns' convent") care mainly for the king, but also fulfill some religious functions, "as much as they are permitted to do so as nuns". Anyone with some knowledge of Buddhism will know that aside from a few minor exceptions, nuns and monks have equal rights and duties according to the *vinaya*. What Friedl observed, i.e. the obvious inequality of nuns and monks in Zangla, is typical for Ladakh, but not for Tibetan civilization in general.

Once in a while a patronizing tone affects the writing, for instance, when the crown prince of Zangla is labeled "verwestlicht" (westernized). Furthermore, the joy of reading this work is severely hampered by numerous typos, the general negligence with which the typescript was prepared, and the clumsy style employed. To sum up, it is sad that this worthwhile project, including all the work carried out by the author as well as his endurance of enormous hardships, is obscured by so many deficiencies.

Eva K. Dargyay
University of Calgary

1. Snellgrove, D.L. "For a Sociology of Tibetan Speaking Regions", *Central Asiatic Journal* XI, 1966, 199-219

David P. and Janice A. Jackson, *Tibetan Thangka Painting: Methods and Materials* (London and Boulder, Shambala publications, 1984), 186 p.

As the title precisely indicates, this book deals with the methods and materials of thangka painting, which is most probably the best known and most appreciated form of Tibetan art in the West. Until now, however, the main interest in studies of thangkas focused on the subjects expressed by them: their iconography. Little attention has been paid to the material and technical aspects of this art. Under these circumstances, this book is a most welcome contribution and fills a gap in our knowledge.

The first chapter ("The Artistic Wealth of Old Tibet") places thangka painters amongst the other craftsmen and defines the material and spiritual background of their work. From the second chapter onwards the authors follow the "six steps" required to create a thangka. The "six steps" are depicted in eleven chapters:

1. Preparation of the painting surface (Chap. Two),
2. Establishment of a design on that surface by means of a sketch or transfer (Chap. Three: "Composition"; Four: "Sketching and the Theory of Iconometry"; Five: "Iconometric Practice and Further Techniques of Sketching"),
3. Laying down the initial coats of paint (Chap. Six: "Pigments"; Seven: "Colour"; Eight: "Techniques of Paint Preparation and Application"; Nine: "Brushes"),
4. Shading (Chap. Ten),
5. Outlining (Chap. Eleven), and
6. Finishing touches (Chap. Twelve: "Finishing Details").

In each chapter the relevant techniques are described step by step in a very pedagogic way and are illustrated by precise and neat drawings as well as by reproductions (regrettably all in black and white) of thangkas. Some pictures show the thangkas "in situ" in Tibet and the painters at work, thus giving a lively touch to the subject. Each chapter is followed by an abundant corpus of notes, most of them referring to original Tibetan treatises on the subject. The description of the materials and techniques is minute and very detailed, but it is never tedious because of the lively first hand information the authors pass on to the reader. They deal not only with the past tradition but also with its present state, relating how the painters are coping with new materials in their countries of adoption.

What is really remarkable in this book is a rare and harmonious blend of the authors' literary knowledge of the subject, acquired

through the reading of numerous original Tibetan texts (hitherto unexplored) on one hand, and on the other, the first hand knowledge of the methods and materials which they learned from many thangka painters (the names of some twenty artists who helped the authors while preparing this study are listed in the preface, p.1).

(It is not out of place to mention here one of the co-authors' previous works which can be read with much benefit as a more "literary" complement to the present study: Thubten Legshay Gyatsho, *Gateway to the Temple* (Tr. by David P. Jackson). *Bibliotheca Himalayica*, Series III, Volume 12, Kathmandu, 1979. In particular, "The origin of the art of painting and sculpting images" and "Body proportions of the sacred figures", pp.55-72.

In the text, all the Tibetan technical terms are given in italics between brackets and they are properly explained and translated into English. This arrangement, which is quite thoughtful and shows at the same time the authors' mastery of the subject, makes the book easily readable for anyone interested in the subject without, however, requiring prior knowledge of the Tibetan language. All the technical terms are gathered together at the end of the book in an extremely useful glossary which gives each term its literary spelling, approximate pronunciation and definition. The other appendices include a study of iconometry through Tibetan sources (Appendix A: "Iconometric Controversies and Sources"), a page on how to obtain the right pigments if one is interested in painting oneself (Appendix B: "Resources"), and examples of the most frequent motifs and symbols (Appendix C: "Motifs and Symbols drawn by Robert Beer"). In this respect, we can add two recent Tibetan works: *A New Approach to the Practice of Tibetan Art*, compiled and published by Jamyang, Mussoorie, 1982, and *Principles of Tibetan Art* (2 vols) by Gege Lama, a master painter of the Karma Gardri school (Darjeeling, 1983).

The Jacksons' extensive knowledge which is presented here is valuable and useful for the student of thangka painting and the 'amateur', as well as for the Tibetologist. For the student, the book can be used as a manual which can complement, but of course not replace, a teacher. For the 'amateur', it is an extensive and handy introduction to this form of art. Finally, for the Tibetologist it is an authoritative reference book on the subject and further, because of the numerous notes and the wide range of topics covered, it also helps him or her in developing a better understanding of Tibetan culture.

The authors deserve high praise for having produced a book of quality which represents the sum of what is presently known on the materials and methods of thangka painting. By virtue of the amount and ac-

curacy of the information presented in it, this study will remain as an authority for all future students of thangka art.

*Françoise Pommaret-Imaeda &
Yoshiro Imaeda
Thimphu/Paris*

Josef Kolmaš, ed., *Chinese Studies on Tibetan Culture* (New Delhi, International Academy of Indiana Culture, 1983), 50 + 456 pp.

The reader might be deceived somewhat by the title of this volume. It is not a collection of diverse essays by Chinese Tibetologists, but rather a complete reprinting of the *K'ang-Tsang yen-chiu yüeh-k'an* ("Hsi-k'ang — Tibet Research Monthly"), the first journal ever brought out that was exclusively devoted to the field of Tibetan Studies. The *K'ang-Tsang yen-chiu yüeh-k'an* was published in Szechwan between 1946 and 1949, and during its brief period of publication was an extremely important forum for Tibetological activity in China. Among the names of the authors who published in the journal one will find those of some rather well-known Tibetanists active in the Republican era such as Jen Nai-ch'iang and Liu Li-ch'ien; among the topics covered one finds areas as diverse as Tibetan literature and Tibetan ethnology. Of particular interest is the attention given in a number of the articles to the region of Khams (i.e., the Republican province of Hsi-k'ang). Taken together, the republication of the entire run of the *K'ang-Tsang yen-chiu yüeh-k'an* is a fitting reminder that Tibetan Studies was an active field in China well before the present period.

The contents of this volume have already been made public: Dr. Kolmaš published a very detailed introduction as well as author, title, and subject indices for the entire run of the *K'ang-Tsang yen-chiu yüeh-k'an* in *The Journal of the Tibet Society*, vol. 1 (1981). The introduction and indices are included in the volume under review as well; however, the reader may have some difficulty in locating this volume, for the publishers appear to have brought out only a limited number of them. This is a pity, for there are a number of articles that are not simply curios from an earlier era of Tibetological activity, but useful studies. Nevertheless, we may be grateful that the volume will at least be available in a number of libraries; that much could not have been said for the *K'ang-Tsang yen-chiu yüeh-k'an* until now.

The *K'ang-Tsang yen-chiu yüeh-k'an* was put out entirely in Chinese. The quality of printing (at least in so far as we may judge on the basis of the copies acquired by Dr. Kolmaš) was uneven, and this is reflected in its reproduction in the present volume. However, having examined at first hand Dr. Kolmaš' original copies, I can state that the reprinting

has been skillfully done. There are many places in the original copies where thin paper, light printing, or excessive ink has made the text difficult to read. The general legibility of most of the reprinted text is therefore surprising. We may note too that the present volume reprints two pages of the journal on each of its own pages.

Chinese as a language for primary and secondary research in the field of Tibetan Studies is coming to be used more and more widely. This republication of the entire run of the *K'ang-Tsang yen-chiu yüeh-k'an* is therefore all the more welcome. Perhaps this increasing use of Chinese by Tibetologists will spark a further reprinting (in a larger quantity) of the present volume.

Elliot Sperling
Indiana University

Per Kvaerne, *Tibet: Bon religion* (Leiden, Brill, 1985), xii + 34 pp., 47 black-and-white plates.

Every small addition to the literature on the largest of Tibet's minority religions is welcome, but doubly so when the addition is accomplished by pairing the leading perfectionist in scholarly publishing with the research talents of Per Kvaerne, one of those elite few professionals who could, if they wished, claim the title of 'Bonologist.' Bon religion is a phenomenon that frustrates easy categorizations. Is it Buddhist or non-Buddhist? Does it hold an unbroken lineage from the pre-Buddhist religion(s) of Tibetan yore? Was it imported from China, the Tarim Basin or Persia and, if so, was it Buddhist(-ic) before or after its introduction to Tibet? All these are difficult questions, leading Tibetans to only partial or half-satisfying answers. Enlightenment will dawn, if it will dawn at all, only when many avenues of approach have been explored and tested and detailed studies, both philological and ethnological, utilizing the largest possible range of sources, have been brought to publication.

The book under review fulfills my own best-case scenario for a workable and ultimately, I think, a most fruitful approach. That is to leave to one side all the clashing categorical monoliths that presume some functionalistically unified system overarched by an over-imperative word "Bon." The best point of departure is in the present, in particular aspects of traditions going under the word "Bon" as they occur in particular instances of practice. The structurally opposite alternative would comprise a series of variations on the theme of the quest for the historical Lord Shenrab. There is no harm in trying, perhaps, but the prospects for answers that will prove themselves over the long term appear dim at best.

The work is divided into four chapters. The first is a general discussion of Bonpo identity. Here there are many echoes of the author's previous writings. This chapter may, in fact, be thought of as a summary of those writings. The second chapter undertakes to find an etymology for Bonpo rituals for the dead in Tibetan imperial history and in the *Gzer-myig*, one of the rediscovered biographies of Lord Shenrab. The third chapter briefly describes the setting for the particular instance of practice observed by the author. The last and most substantial chapter describes the funerary ritual with its iconographic details (as illustrated in the plates) while closely following the Tibetan text. The text of this book might be called the perfect marriage of philology with anthropology (both working better when they work together) and the photographs, if the metaphor is not yet overloaded, would be their wedding album.

The plates alone make this book a good acquisition for every research library and Tibetological collection, but the highly informed commentary by Per Kvaerne make it into a sourcebook of permanent reference value. Still, I may wish to question the wisdom of placing plate IIa at the beginning of the section of plates even though the "human sacrifice" portrayed there is more than adequately accounted for in the text (pp. 9-10) simply because casual browsers may (and do) get the impression that human sacrifice is (or has been) an important component of Bon religion. In other words, its prominent presence in the book would seem to fuel unduly the same sectarian paranoias that Kvaerne has so admirably defused here and in previous articles. Aside from the switched picture captions to plates XLVIIa and XLVIIb, one looks in vain for the "errors and imperfections which remain" promised in the Foreword. This is a book for all those sentient beings who will ever give the Bon religion their serious attention, and my wish is that they will do more than just browse through the pictures.

Dan Martin
Indiana University

Li Jicheng, *The Realm of Tibetan Buddhism* (San Francisco, China Books and Periodicals, 1985), 224 pp., 159 color plates.

This volume attempts, in the words of the publisher, to outline the "origin, development, canonical texts, meditative practices, and, in particular, the works of art related to Tibetan Esoteric Buddhism."

First, it must be said that the book is definitely of great aesthetic interest. It contains photographs of superb quality, attractively presented and entirely in color, of Tibetan art, and is not simply another collection of thangkas and bronzes — exemplary works in the categories of

stone and wood carving, clay molding, and ritual objects also appear. The paintings and statuary that are shown include some unusual works, such as a bronze lotus with petals that open into a deity's mandala (from Sakya monastery, pp. 84, 85), embroidered thangkas of Vajrakilaya (p. 99) and Śamvara (p. 67), beautifully detailed frescoes of lokapalas and dharmapalas from Drepung (pp. 160-165), and a painting of Guru Rinpoche as rainbow body (p. 27). There are as well photographs of a few major monasteries and of religious services.

The presentation of the text, however, does not match that of the art. One cannot help but notice numerous annoying misprints, which unfortunately detract from the work as a whole. There are misspellings of Tibetan words (by any system of transliteration), and an inexplicable shift back and forth between Tibetan transliteration and pseudo-Pinyin renderings of Tibetan names (king "Srong-btsan Sgam-po", but "Ramoqe" temple, for example).

From the standpoint of content, the text will reveal little to those familiar with any of the other surveys of Tibetan Buddhism. Much of what the author asserts (such as claiming the provenance of erotocentric Tantra to lie in Śaktism) is considered uncertain among western scholars. Minor mistakes abound. These are too numerous to catalog, but two typical errors may be mentioned: referring to the "completion" or "consummation" stage of contemplative practice as *utpannakrama* rather than *sampannakrama*, and relating that the Sakya hierarch Phagpa "commissioned by the emperor Shi Zu . . . formulated the new Mongolian language." Scholars can easily read through such slips, but the tyro should beware of relying on the book as a source of authoritative information.

Attempting to write an introduction to Tibetan Buddhism that is simultaneously balanced, thorough, and accurate is undeniably a difficult task; most such attempts, beginning with Waddell's, have been liberally perfumed with their authors' biases, and this volume is no exception. If, however, one accepts the book as an attractive and moderately informative presentation of Tibetan religious art, then it is a success. Indeed, the remarkable photographs may make it the finest of its kind.

Todd Gibson
Indiana University

Franz Michael, in collaboration with Eugene Knez, *Rule by Incarnation: Tibetan Buddhism and its Role in Society and State* (Boulder, Westview Press, 1982), xii + 227 pp.

Franz Michael is a professor emeritus at George Washington University with a background in Far Eastern studies but, it seems, little ac-

quaintance with Tibet or with Tibetan Buddhism prior to writing this book. He did, however, have a clear purpose in mind, deriving from his interpretation of Max Weber's work on rationalization and bureaucratization. Michael wishes to portray traditional Tibet as a successful example of a Weberian bureaucratic state which, unlike modern Western examples, unifies religion and politics.

There is no doubt that this view corresponds to a certain degree with the official ideology of the Lhasa government (*chos srid gnyis ldan*, etc.). It is also certainly true that Tibet had what could, in general terms, be called a bureaucracy. To assume, as Michael does, that Tibet was an effectively centralized bureaucratic state on the Weberian model is to go much further, and in my view at least much too far (cf. my "Tibet as a Stateless Society," *Journal of Asian Studies*, 41 (1982), 215-29). The problem is not that Michael takes one side in the debate, but that he is not even aware that there is a debate, and consequently interprets whatever he sees within the centralized model.

These deficiencies unfortunately have serious results. The opening chapters provide a superficial and occasionally confused account of Buddhism and of Tibetan history. The body of the book, an account of the Tibetan system of government concentrating on the first half of the 20th century, is more seriously flawed. While Michael's list of informants and assistants covers a wide range of Tibetans in India and the U.S., it is heavily slanted towards the Lhasa aristocracy and the Gelukpa establishment, and these people provided Michael with precisely the data he needed to support his views.

The result is a one-sided and naively Lhasa-centric view of Tibetan affairs. The Tibetan system of government, for Michael, is the rule of the Dalai Lamas from Lhasa. Other sources of power and authority are systematically minimized — in this respect, the book is almost a mirror image of C.W. Cassinelli and R.B. Ekvall's *A Tibetan Principality* (Cornell, 1969) with its one-sided emphasis on Sakya as against Lhasa. Ironically, Cassinelli and Ekvall's book is not even in Michael's bibliography, which is notable for its omissions (it includes none of Melvyn Goldstein's articles on Central Tibetan politics, for example). For Michael, the Tibetan aristocracy had been totally converted into civil servants (p. 45).

More critically, the decentralized and non-hierarchical elements within Tibetan society are largely ignored. In identifying "Tibetan government" with the Dalai Lama's administration, Michael both writes out of his account the significant proportion of the Tibetan population which was not in any sense under the control of Lhasa (much of Kham and Amdo, the Tibetans in present-day Nepal, etc.) and implies that Lhasa control was everywhere as immediate and direct as in the villages around Lhasa itself.

Yet, as Michael admits in a passage which contrasts notably with the general tone of the book, "the role of government in Tibet was very limited," there were "only perhaps five hundred to seven hundred officials for about three million people," and "[m]ost affairs were handled locally — within the communities, the villages, and the camps — chiefly by local headmen with more or less popular participation" (pp. 59-60).

The role of the "local headmen" reflects Michael's apparent inability to see politics and government except in terms of the handing down of decisions by authority. However, the general implication of this passage, that the Lhasa administration, for all its undoubted significance, was in no way parallel to the centralized government of an effective bureaucratic state, is surely correct, and undermines the thesis presented in the book as a whole.

It is difficult to recommend this book as a general text on the Tibetan system of government, particularly for those who are new to the subject. A good book on Tibetan government would be welcome, but *Rule by Incarnation* in no way fulfills that role. Yet it would be a pity to dismiss it altogether, since it does contain a variety of useful information about the functioning of the Dalai Lama's administration, much of it not readily available elsewhere. The book has a series of appendices containing translations by Lobsang Lhalungpa of such assorted items as Srong btsan sgam po's 16 principles, the "Last Testament" of the 13th Dalai Lama, two monastic charters and the well-known prayer to Mañjuśrī. There are also some pleasant photographs.

Geoffrey Samuel
University of Newcastle, NSW

Margaret Nowak, *Tibetan Refugees* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, Rutgers University Press, 1984), 200 pp.

To rephrase the sentiments expressed by Agehannanda Bharati,¹ Nowak's publication of the results of her 1977 fieldwork in Dharamsala has been eagerly anticipated. Her work as expressed in *Tibetan Refugees* is representative of the growing interest in the study of the process of culture change, particularly cultural persistence, among anthropologists. As such it is a refreshing departure from the preoccupation of many recent Tibetologists and their publishers who have taken a static, "all-or-nothing" view of contemporary Tibetan culture. Such works often leave the reader with the notion that refugee culture is an anomalous phenomenon, a residue of a fossilized culture destined to perish under the impetus of the 20th century. This genre of writing is akin to the older 'assimilation' model in anthropology which drew upon the

theme that groups in a contact situation only had two possible choices: assimilation or conflict.

In contrast, *Tibetan Refugees* is suggestive of a welcome movement away from the too-frequent exposés of the more sensational aspects of Tibetan culture. Nowak convinces the reader that the Tibetan refugee community is quite alive, struggling to find meaning through the often contradictory circumstances of wishing to remain ethnically distinct while facing the necessity of interaction with a modern, non-Tibetan world.

In this symbolic study, Nowak attempts to discover some of the root metaphors which suggest Tibetan cultural identity, and how these symbols have undergone change as the result of pressures of statelessness within India. According to the author, a key to understanding this process is the notion of 'liminality' generated by the political ambiguities of refugee status. Liminality defines a context from which new cultural strategies and innovations may be created, ones which may perhaps be more adaptable to novel circumstances. This liminal theme is heightened by the author's skillful interweaving of the sentiment of her own marginal position (an anthropological participant/observer, a single woman in India, and a Polish/American in the U.S.) with that of many young, alienated Tibetan refugees who strive to establish self-identity in a pluralistic context. Nowak contends that Tibetan cultural identity is maintained by the utilization of ambiguous symbols, ones which can easily be manipulated to redefine meaning in a changing social environment. The paramount symbol in this context is the Dalai Lama, who while representing both sacred and temporal aspects of Tibetan life, symbolizes a newly evolving metaphor of 'self-affirmation' (*rang-btsan*).

Nowak draws heavily from the theories of symbolic anthropologist Victor Turner and his predecessor, van Gennep, to describe a process by which new categories of meaning are ascribed to an existing social structure. Characteristic of this process are the stages of separation, liminality, and re-integration. In the refugee situation, separation (Nowak uses 'distanciation') has been accomplished through the actual displacement of Tibetans from their motherland. This crisis has resulted in a general social unease leading to the characteristic gray world of liminality.

While Nowak notes that she has extrapolated Turner's theories out of the ritual context from which they were originally derived, Turner himself has shown that this is valid for the analysis of culture change provided other factors appropriate to the liminal state are in operation. Failure to address these 'other factors' results in a weakening of the author's otherwise convincing argument. One such factor characteristic of liminal states is *communitas*, a Goffmanesque 'leveling' of social sta-

tuses which accompanies the disintegration of the old social structure. *Communitas* is itself a highly unstable state of affairs — whatever cultural innovation acquired in liminality is often quickly reabsorbed by the impetus of the pre-existing structure, albeit with certain change. The reader might find it difficult to find periods of *communitas* corresponding to the Tibetan diaspora. If the Tibetans are liminal by fact of the dissolution of their traditional social structure, then according to Turner, one would have expected periodic egalitarian *communitas* in the refugee communities. Similarly, is proximal dissociation by itself sufficient cause for general liminality among Tibetan refugees? In this sense, Nowak's analysis seems more characteristic of the old assimilation model of culture change.

What is particularly striking about the Tibetan refugee situation in northern India is not how they have changed, but how they have been remarkably resistant to these pressures. There appears to have been a very conscious effort by the Tibetan government-in-exile, from the onset, to preserve paramount Tibetan social institutions — especially the relationship between the laity and the clergy. The continuation of the patron/priest (*yon-mchod*) relationship may be the strongest factor in the continuing maintenance of Tibetan ethnic identity. It has been the template of Tibetan society, delineating a structure of statuses and roles, adjudicating the appropriateness of the performance of actors within this framework. The concern for the continuation of this traditional system was a high priority for the Tibetan refugee leaders, one which can clearly be seen in the efforts towards preserving important monastic lineages. Even the seemingly novel re-orientation of the patronage system to foreign Buddhist benefactors through an infrastructure of monastic outposts in the West is within Tibetan historical experience (e.g. Mongol, Manchu, and Chinese patronage).

Nowak's primary focus is perhaps her greatest strength — the changes within the younger Tibetan refugee generation. To this group marginality may certainly be ascribed, and the process of recombination, re-analysis of traditional values, and innovation characteristic of liminality can be seen more clearly than in older segments of refugee society. Yet one wonders about the uniqueness of this phenomenon when compared to adolescent groups around the world. It remains to be seen if these innovations will be incorporated into traditional Tibetan culture or if they will be merely deflected by the weight of twelve centuries of Tibetan cultural heritage.

What Nowak has expressed most clearly is that an active dialogue is progressing in Dharamsala between conservative elements of Tibetan culture and the innovative reactions to novel circumstances expressed by some elements of Tibetan society. In the context of Tibetan studies, *Tibetan Refugees* is a healthy departure from both the staid kinship dia-

grams of the anthropologist and the religious esoterica of other researchers.

P. Christian Klieger
University of Hawaii

1. "Reviews of Books," *Tibet Society Bulletin*, vol. 12 (1978), p. 49.

Dieter Schuh, *Grundlagen tibetischer Siegelkunde, eine Untersuchung über tibetische Siegelaufschriften in 'Phags-pa-Schrift* (Sankt Augustin, VGH Wissenschafts-Verlag, 1981 = *Monumenta Tibetica Historica*, Abteilung III, Band 5), x + 389 pp.

Sometimes one feels acutely the need for a thorough systematization of a long-neglected special field, in order to obtain a secure basis for further research. The work by Dr. (now Professor) D. Schuh can lay justified claim to fulfill one such wish, being the first scholarly and complete study of Tibetan seals after the old, disjointed and obsolete notes published by A.H. Francke, L.A. Waddell and E.H. Walsh in the *JRAS* for 1910, 1911 and 1915.

In a long introduction the author describes and explains all the seals available to him, with an adequate apparatus of reproductions, reconstructions and translations. He gives also, basing himself on first-hand information collected from old officials of the Dalai Lama government, an outline of the methods and working of the Tibetan chanceries. The seals serve for authentication, and no document is deemed valid without the impression of a seal. Every higher authority (Dalai Lamas, Panchen Lamas, other great incarnates, the regents, the council of ministers) possessed one, which was stamped on the documents with red or (for lower instances) black ink. The author carefully analyzes the square script employed on the seals, which is practically the same as the 'Phags-pa alphabet of 1269/70; in the case of seals granted by the Chinese emperor, Chinese, Manchu and Mongolian scripts are also employed.

The main portion of the work exemplifies the practical use of the seals at hand of thirty-one documents, each of them reproduced, transcribed, translated and commented upon; actually, the book can also be utilized as a manual of Tibetan diplomatic usage. A series of appendices contain nine additional documents, the most interesting of them being a short rescript issued by 'Phags-pa to the Sa-skye officials, dated the year of the Hare, which is almost certainly 1267; it belonged to the Bsam-gtan-gling monastery near Kirong. The only slightly disturbing feature is that neither the personal name nor the official title of 'Phags-pa are given. However, its authenticity is placed beyond any reasonable doubt both by its worn out and old appearance and (what is more

important) by the inner evidence of its formulae, which are exactly the same as those employed in the 14th century documents found at Zhvavu and published by the late Professor G. Tucci.

A bibliography of the relevant works, Tibetan and Western, and an index of persons and place names concludes the book.

The following remarks on points of detail are intended to supplement the rich information supplied by Professor Schuh.

P. 6 – Seal E3b is found also on a document issued by the Seventh Dalai Lama to the Italian missionaries, reproduced in L. Petech, *Missionari Italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal*, Rome 1952-1956, vol. IV, opposite p. 210. It is curious to note that even Professor Schuh was unable to find another instance of the use of, and of course to explain, the mysterious seal found on a document issued by Pho-lha-nas to the missionaries in 1741; up to now it has defied every attempt at decipherment.

P. 8 – Seal E4, with Chinese and Tibetan characters, bears the words “Seal of the Sixth Dalai Lama;” a Tibetan work, however, maintains that it should be attributed to the Seventh Dalai Lama. There is no contradiction in this. At first the Chinese, having withdrawn recognition from the Sixth Dalai Lama Tshangs-dbyangs-rgya-mtsho, and having accepted the deposition by the Dzungars of Lha-bzang Khan’s puppet, upon their enthronement of Blo-bzang-bskal-bzang-rgya-mtsho in 1720 simplified the issue by giving him the ordinal Sixth. This was of course in flat contradiction with the Tibetan numeration, and later the Peking government tacitly dropped their point. Theoretically, this particular seal could belong: 1) to the rightful Sixth, 2) to Lha-bzang’s puppet, and 3) to the Seventh in his early years.

P. 27 – Seal F, of the Smin-grol Nomin Khan, shows the title *ta’i gab shri*; this seems to be a rather odd corruption of the Chinese *ta kuo-shih*.

P. 63 – Che-chen Hong-tha’i-ji (also on pp. 77, 105, 171) is normally the title of the Urga incarnate, the Maidari Qutuqtu or Jebtsun Damba Qutuqtu. Am-nyer-po-che is the Amne Machen range in Amdo and ‘Dam-po-rong could be the Dam-ma’i-nang valley. See J.F. Rock, *The Amnye Ma-chhen range and adjacent regions*, Rome 1956.

P. 114 – These monastic estates in Gu-ge can be identified, as they were visited by G. Tucci in 1933. Ma-yang is the Miang of the maps. At Ri (Richoba of the maps) there is a monastery still depending from Tholing. Sar-sga is probably Sarang, with a small half-ruined *dgon-pa* depending from Tho-ling. See G. Tucci, *Cronaca della missione scientifica Tucci nel Tibet Orientale (1933)*, Rome 1934, pp. 175-183, 357-363, 363-366.

P. 330 – The monastery of ‘Bar-rta in Ldan-ma is listed in the *Vaidūrya-ser-po* (Lokesh Chandra edition, p. 258), but little information was available to its author. At the end of the 17th century the convent contained forty monks.

Luciano Petech
Rome

Addendum

The following Tibetan text should have been appended to the review by Dan Martin which appeared in *The Journal of the Tibet Society*, vol. 4 (1984), pp. 83-92. Please note that the passage of the review on page 92 which reads, "divergent reading *yi-ge-bzhi-pa* in line 12", should now read: divergent reading *yi-ge-bzhi-pa* in line 15.

ལྡོ་དཔལ་གྱི་རིལ་ཕྱིན་པ་མིས། །ཡིང་སྲུག་ག་ལྡོན་པའི་
 བསེལ་གྱི་བལ། །ཉི་ར་རོ་ཡི་གདན་སྟང་ན། །རྩི་བུམ་ཟེ་
 ཆེན་པོ་ས་ར་ཉ། །ཞལ་སྤར་མ་མ་མོང་བའི་གཟི་མདངས་
 ཅན། །བཙུན་མོ་གཉིས་ཀྱིས་མ་ཐའ་བརྟེན་ནས། །སྐྱུ་ལ་
 5 དུར་ཁྲོད་ཆས་ཀྱིས་བརྒྱན། །དགེས་པའི་ཞལ་རས་འཇུ་མ་
 མདངས་ཅན། །བྱ་བའི་བར་འོངས་སམ་ཞེས་ཀྱང་
 གསུངས། །རྩི་མཚོང་བ་དགའ་བས་མ་བཟོད་པར། །ལུས་
 ཀྱི་སྐྱུ་གཡོས་མཆི་མ་འབྲུགས། །ལན་བདུན་བསྐྱོར་ཞིང་
 བརྒྱུང་ཕྱག་འཚལ། །ཞབས་མ་ཐེལ་སྤྱི་བོར་སྤངས་ནས་
 10 ཀྱང་། །ཡུ་ཐུགས་རྩིས་རྩུང་ཞེས་གསོལ་བཏབ་པས། །ལུས་
 ལ་སྐྱུ་ཡི་བྱིན་བརྒྱབས་པ། །ཕྱག་དབང་སྤྱི་བོར་རྟེན་ཅམ་
 གྱིས། །ལུས་ཟག་མེད་བའི་བས་ར་རོ་བ། །སྤང་ཆེན་ཆང་

གིས་སྐྱོས་པ་བཞིན། །གཡོ་འགུལ་མེད་པའི་ཉམས་ཤིག་
 །ཤར། །ངག་ལ་གསུངས་གིས་བྱིན་བརྒྱབས་པ། །སྟོང་ཉིད་
 15 །སེང་གའི་ང་རོ་ཡིས། །ཡི་གེ་བཞི་པའི་དོན་གསུངས་པ། །
 །ལྷག་པས་མི་ལམ་མིས་པ་བཞིན། །བཟོད་དུ་མེད་པའི་
 །ཉམས་ཤིག་ཤར། །ཡིད་ལ་ཐུགས་གྱིས་བྱིན་བརྒྱབས་པ། །
 །ལྷན་ཅིག་སྐྱེས་པ་ཚོས་གྱི་སྐྱ། །འགྲོ་འོང་མེད་པའི་དོན་
 །རྟོགས་པས། །དུར་བྱོད་གནས་པའི་མི་རོ་བཞིན། །བསམ་
 20 །དུ་མེད་པའི་ཉམས་ཤིག་ཤར། །དོ་རྗེས་བདེ་ཆེན་དག་པའི་
 །གསུངས། །རིན་ཆེན་མགུར་གྱི་བུམ་པ་ནས། །ཚངས་པའི་
 །དབྱངས་གྱི་བདེ་སྐད་གྱིས། །སྤྱིན་བྲལ་ནམ་མཁའ་སྟོང་པའི་
 །དོན། །གནས་ལུགས་མཚོན་པ་དོ་རྗེའི་མགུར། །སྐྱེ་མེད་
 །རང་སྐྱེ་འདི་སྐད་ཐོས། །། །ན་མོ། །སྟོང་ཉིད་སྟོང་རྗེ་
 25 །དབྱེར་མེད་པ། །རྒྱན་ཚད་མེད་པ་གཉུག་མའི་སེམས། །
 །གདོད་ནས་དག་པ་དེ་བཞིན་ཉིད། །ནམ་མཁའ་ནམ་
 །མཁའ་སྐྱོར་བ་མཐོང་། །ཅུ་བ་བྱིམ་ན་གནས་པའི་ཕྱིར། །
 །ཡིད་གྱི་རྣམ་ཤེས་བཅོམ་དུ་བརྒྱུང་། །སྐོམ་པ་ཤེས་པ་ཕྱི་མ་



ཡིས། །སེམས་ལ་ལྟན་པ་གདབ་དུ་མེད། །སྐྱང་སྲིད་...
 30 སེམས་ཀྱི་རང་བཞིན་ཤེས། །གཉེན་པོས་བཅོས་ཏེ་སྐྱོམ་དུ་
 མེད། །སེམས་ཀྱི་གནས་ལུགས་དུན་དུ་མེད། །དེ་ཡང་མ་
 བཅོས་ངང་ལ་བཞག །དེ་དོན་མཐོང་ན་གོལ་བའི་ཕྱིར། །
 བུ་རྒྱུང་གདོལ་པའི་སྲོད་པ་ལྟོས། །ཤ་ཟ་སྲོན་པ་གང་དགས་
 མཐོང་། །སྟེམས་དང་བྲལ་བའི་སང་གི་བཞིན། །སེམས་ཀྱི་
 35 སྲང་པོ་ཡན་དུ་རྒྱག །བྱང་བ་མེ་ཏོག་རྒྱ་བ་ལྟོས། །འཁོར་
 བ་སྲོན་དུ་མི་ལྟ་ཞིང་། །སྲུང་ན་འདས་པ་ཐོབ་བྱས་མེད། །
 ཐ་མལ་ཤེས་པ་རང་ལུགས་དེ། །མ་བཅོས་སོ་མ་ཉིད་དུ་...
 བཞག །བྱ་བ་ནམས་ལ་ཁྱོད་མ་རྟོག །ཕྱོགས་དང་ཆ་ལ་མི་
 གནས་ཤིང་། །སྲོས་བྲལ་ནམ་མཁའི་དཀྱིལ་དུ་ལྟོས། ། །
 40 ཚོས་ཟད་སར་འཁྱོལ་བ་སྟོང་པོའི་དོན། །ལྟ་བའི་ཡང་ཕྱེ་
 ཕུག་རྒྱ་ཆེ། །སེམས་གནད་དུ་བསྐྱུན་པའི་བདེ་དོན་ཞིག །
 བྲམ་ཟེ་ཆེན་པོའི་ཞལ་ནས་ཐོས། ། །སྐྱང་ཅིག་དེ་ལ་
 གཉིད་ཀྱང་སད། །དེ་མ་བརྗེད་དུན་པའི་ལྷགས་ཀྱས་ཟེན། །
 མ་རིག་གཉིད་ཀྱི་སྐྱུན་ཁུང་དུ། །རིག་པ་ཡི་ཤེས་མཐོང་ཕྱེ



- 45 ནས། །སྤྱིན་མེད་མཁའ་ལ་ཉི་ཤར་ལྟར། །འབྲུལ་པའི་
 ལུན་ནག་སངས་ནས་ཐལ། །དུས་གསུམ་སངས་རྒྱས་
 ཞལ་མཇལ་ཀྱང་། །ཕྱིན་ཆད་དྲི་རྒྱ་མེད་དོ་སྟུང་། །སེམས་
 ཁོ་ཐག་ཚད་པའི་ཉམས་ཤིག་སྐྱེས། །ཡིད་འགྲུ་བ་ཟད་པ་
 རོ་མཚར་ཆེ། །། །ཞི་མ། །ཡི་དམ་མཁའ་འགྲོའི་ལུང་།
- 50 བསྟན་དང་། །སྤྲོ་མས་གསུངས་པ་ཟབ་མོའི་དོན། །ངག་
 སྐྱུ་མི་བདུ་བ་གསུང་ན་ཡང་། །དགུང་དོ་རུ་བ་མི་སྤྲི་
 ཐབས་མ་བྱུང་། །དུས་ད་རེས་ཅམ་ཞིག་མ་གཏོགས་པ། །
 སྤྱིན་ཆད་ངག་དུ་བཅོམ་མ་སྤྱོད་། །ད་ཕྱིན་ཆད་བརྟམས་སམ་
 རྣ་བར་ཉོན། །ང་སྤྱིན་ཆད་ཤལ་རི་བརྒྱུང་གི་མི། །མཇེལ་
- 55 བཤེས་གཉེན་མེད་གྲོགས་ཀྱང་མེད། །ལུས་ངལ་དུ་བ་
 བཀྲེས་པར་གྱུར་པའི་ཆེ། །བྱ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་གང་བྱས་སེམས་ལ་
 ཡོད། །དེ་མ་བཅེད་སེམས་ལ་ཤིན་ཏུ་གཅགས། །དྲིན་
 འཁོར་བར་ཐལ་ལོ་སྤྱིང་གི་གྲོགས། །ཇི་གོང་ན་བཞུགས་
 པའི་སྤྲོ་མ་དང་། །དངོས་གྲུབ་སྟེར་བའི་ཡི་དམ་ལྟ། །བར་
- 60 ཆད་སེལ་བའི་ཚོས་སྤྱོད་རྣམས། །མི་བདག་ལ་བཀའ་



བཀྲོན་མི་གནང་འཚལ། །དོན་འབྲུལ་པར་གདའ་ན་བཟོད་
པར་གསོལ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་སོ། །

CRITICAL APPARATUS

- 1 ལྷག་གེ་ལྷག་གེ་ BD || 2 ཡི་ : ཚི་ B || 4 བཏིན་ :
གཏིན་ C || 7 དགའ་ : དཀའ་ C | བཟོད་པར་ :
གཟོད་པར་ B || 9 བརྒྱུང་ : རྒྱུང་ A རྒྱུང་ BCD |
འཚལ་ : བཅལ་ ABCD || 11 ལྷ་ཡི་ : ལྷ་ཡིས་ ABCD ||
15 ཡི་གེ་བཞི་པའི་ : ཡི་གེ་མེད་པའི་ ABCD ||
16 ལྷག་པས་ : ལྷགས་པས་ ABCD || 20 རྫོང་ཞེས་ :
དེ་ཞེས་ ABCD || 24 །omit ABCD || 25 མེད་པ་ :
མེད་པར་ C || 26 ལྷ་མ་ལས་ : ལྷ་མ་ལས་ B ||
28 རྒྱུ་ : རྒྱུས་ C | ཡིས་པ་ : ཡས་པ་ B ||
33 ལྷོན་པ་ : ལྷོན་པ་ C | དགའ་ : དགའ་ AB ||
34 མཚོང་ : མོང་ BCD | ལྷོམས་ : ལྷོམས་ (?) A ||
-

- 36 བེད་ : བར་ C || 37 དི་ : ཉི་ B དར་ C ||
- 38 བཞག་ : ཞོག་ ABCD | ཉོག་ : ཉོགས་ AC ||
- 39 རྩོག་ omit ABCD || 42 རྩོག་ omit ABCD || 44 མཐོང་ :
 མཐོངས་ ABCD || 46 མངས་ མས་ : གམངས་ མས་ B ||
- 48 འགྲུ་བ་ཟད་པ་ : དགྲུ་བ་ཟད་པ་ C || 49 རྩོག་ omit
 ABCD || 50 ཟབ་མེད་ : ཟབ་མེས་ B || 52 མ་བྱུང་ :
 མེད་བྱུང་ D | མ་གཏོགས་པ་ : མ་གཏོགས་པར་ D ||
- 53 རྩོན་ : རྩོན་ A | ད་ : ད་ C || 54 རྣ་བར་ : རྣ་བ་
 C | རི་ : རིངས་ BCD || 57 ཡོད་ : ཡད་ (?) A ||
- 60 སེལ་ : སལ་ A || 62 ཞེས་གསུངས་སོ། :
 ཞེས་པའི་མགུར་གསུངས་པ་དང་ | ABCD ||
