



CAMBRIDGE JOURNALS

[Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society](#) (2007), 17: 325-328  
Cambridge University Press  
doi:10.1017/S1356186307007286  
Published online by Cambridge University Press 26 Jun 2007

Following is a catalogue of selected Christian remains in Quanzhou. Mostly tombstones, the Quanzhou material is the largest corpus of Nestorian tombstones with inscriptions and imagery. Inscriptions are translated, iconographic features are explained, and many of the stones are published in colour plates at the end of the volume. Next is a chapter by Ken Parry with more analysis of the iconography. One is not surprised to learn that the crucifix is a major symbol of a Nestorian gravestone, but the combinations with Buddhist imagery, lotus flowers and *apsara*-like figures, are more intriguing. The cloud-shoulder of Buddhist-like figures is also a motif among these stones. Historians of art and culture will find tremendous potential for further research. This reviewer notices connections with Song and Yuan period imagery at the Buddhist cave-temple site Feilafeng outside of Hangzhou, on the one hand, and with Nestorian remains from the site Olon Süme, about 30 kilometers north of Bailingmiao in Inner Mongolia, on the other.

The final chapter is a study of Syro-Turkic inscriptions of the Mongolian period found in Quanzhou. Following it is an appendix of translations of epitaphs of the early fourteenth century in Uyгур and Syriac.

*From Palmyra to Zayton* is the result of an ambitious and exciting project. The juxtaposition is an example of comparative history at its best. Rather than seeking to globalise or generalise about Asia or the Silk Road, the volume instead focuses on two unique cities and their extraordinary epigraphic remains. Through thorough investigation of each, but in the same volume, a reader is challenged to learn from the one about the other. One is further challenged to follow this model and identify new juxtapositions of that complement each other as well as Palmyra and Zayton.

NANCY SHATZMAN STEINHARDT  
University of Pennsylvania

ZWISCHEN JÜDISCHER TRADITION UND WISSENSCHAFT. DER UNGARISCHE ORIENTALIST IGNÁC GOLDZIHÉR (1850–1921). (Lebenswelten osteuropäischer Juden, 10). By PETER HABER. pp. 265. Köln, Böhlau Verlag, 2006.

doi:10.1017/S1356186307007286

The father of Arab-Islamic studies, Ignaz Goldziher (1850–1921), probably would have been uncomfortable with the idea that within a century of his death so many scholars would be interested in his biography. But the publication of his *Tagebuch* by Alexander Scheiber (Budapest and Leiden, 1978) revealed the personal side of the scholar in a way that no one could have anticipated, and gradually attention was also drawn to the considerable corpus of scholarship he wrote in Hungarian and to the vast archive of his correspondence, now held by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. One thus might expect that a biography would ultimately appear, and the first such work is the present one by Peter Haber, comprising his 2005 Ph.D. dissertation in the Philosophical-Historical Faculty of the University of Basel.

The author points out in his Foreword that he will focus on Goldziher as an example of the process by which Jews were being assimilated – or rather, not being assimilated – into Hungarian society in the nineteenth century. He considers his subject to illustrate very effectively “the tensions between assimilation and tradition, between scholarly learning and religious zeal, and between private life and public office” (p. 9). In this connection he stresses the importance of Goldziher’s diaries and states that he will try to “read and interpret anew Goldziher’s diaries from the year 1890 to 1919”. Interestingly enough, he suggests that we think of Goldziher as the author of three diaries and not two. In addition to the *Keleti naplóm* (“My Oriental Diary”), which describes his study tour of the Arab East in 1873–74 (translated into English by Raphael Patai, Detroit 1987), he looks at the *Tagebuch* published by Scheiber and sees

in it two distinct documents: Goldziher's reminiscences of his first 40 years, committed to writing in 1890, and the subsequent diary additions to this text, which bring the story of his life down to 1919 (cf. pp. 10, 152–153, 179–180). Haber in fact makes the *Tagebuch* the central document around which all else in his account revolves, and he defends this *modus operandi* in a Prologue (pp. 19–34) that provides a post-modernist statement on the complexities of using and interpreting autobiographies and diaries.

The picture that Haber paints is a rich and varied one. The social setting for the different stages of Goldziher's life is sketched out with particular attention to the way all this would have looked to an eastern European Jew of the nineteenth century; Székesfehérvár, Pest, Berlin, Leipzig, Leiden, Istanbul, Damascus, Cairo – all are envisaged as Goldziher himself would have seen them. The political background, which actors at the time may not have perceived so clearly, is also examined. The life of the dedicated scholar is explored throughout, but Haber has also been on the lookout for the more personal side. One reads, for example, of the young Goldziher's infatuations with several girls he knew (pp. 110–111, 128), and of his homesickness and longing for his mother and grandmother when he first arrived as a student in Berlin (p. 109). The significance of events and contacts to his intellectual development is a constant theme. Goldziher himself had a keen sense for key influences and decisive moments, and Haber picks up on these very well while recognising that the formation of an individual's life and thinking are actually part of a continuous process.

Viewed as a whole, Haber's book tells a sad – almost tragic – story. Goldziher's life is presented as full of hopes, dreams and promise as a youth, and the first chapters of the book build up to the great adventures and exciting experiences of his student days in Germany and his Near East study tour in 1873–74 (pp. 109–151). By the time he returned to Hungary from Cairo Goldziher had serious prospects of becoming a professor at the University of Budapest at the age of 24. But all this was to prove to be “the long end to a short dream” (p. 152). The premature death of the liberal and reform-minded Baron József Eötvös (1813–71), the Hungarian Minister of Religion and Education, deprived Goldziher of crucial support, the professorship that should have been his went to another for political reasons (mixed with smouldering anti-Semitism), and in order to live Goldziher was obliged to accept a position as secretary of the Neolog congregation of Pest, a job which he resented and regarded as work any menial could do. As his fame grew he received many invitations to take up professorships in other countries, but he declined all these opportunities and remained in Hungary. Even an unpaid professorship did not materialise until 1894, and it took another decade before the chair he deserved was awarded to him. In the interim, what one sees in the *Tagebuch* is a tale of unending frustration – punctuated by moments of great joy and fulfilment, to be sure, but against a background of continual distress.

What is one to make of this? Haber's conclusion is that the publication of Goldziher's *Tagebuch* comprises a milestone in the debunking of the old historical myth according to which the Jews of Hungary, after the Compromise of 1867 and up until 1917, gradually assimilated into the culture of the Magyar majority in the country and enjoyed a kind of “golden age”. Haber argues that “assimilation”, however one understands the word, was not what was occurring, and that even the case for “acculturation” is problematic (pp. 222–230). Turning to the person of Goldziher, Haber regards him as a “marginal man”, a phrase coined by the pioneering American sociologist Robert Park (1864–1944) to denote “someone who is simultaneously a member of two or more groups, the characteristic standards of which persistently differ from one another” (p. 231). Such an individual finds himself caught between tradition, which comprises his background and reminds him of his duties towards it, and modernity, which offers him new possibilities but demands his loyalty as well. Goldziher's position as a marginal man, we are told, offers a useful model by which one can characterise the Jews of Hungary more generally (pp. 230–235).

But two questions seem to arise here. One is that of whether a researcher can write the biography of his subject on the basis of the latter's diaries. Haber does address this question and his reply is yes,

modern investigation into the character and use of such sources shows that they can indeed be exploited in this way. But surely one must look into each case individually, since diaries and autobiographical accounts can manifest great differences. It can be argued, for example, that Goldziher's *Tagebuch* was always intended as a record of his professional achievements and frustrations, a document that would set the record straight for his children and close confidants after his death. That is, its purpose was specifically to argue its author's greatness and undeserved marginality, as it were, so its very nature skews from the outset the image one gets of Goldziher as a scholar and a person; that is, it would be perilous to assume that it gives a representative picture of the author. And the *Tagebuch* is in no way a consistent record. Some years (1898, 1901 and 1903) are represented by only a single day's entry, and long gaps are not uncommon. Some entries are just reports copied out from a local newspaper. One entry may report on progress with a forthcoming book, while the next laments a death in the family. If there is a thread running through all this it is the emotional roller coaster of a trying academic career.

How does the *Tagebuch* stand in relation to other sources, one should ask. Haber has made use of an impressive range of modern studies, primarily in German and Hungarian (studies in other languages are cited in the Bibliography but not frequently used), but quite a few primary sources relevant to Goldziher's life seem not to have been consulted. The enormous corpus of Goldziher's unpublished correspondence, for example, has not been used to any significant extent, though this archive is full of insights from the more than 1,500 persons with whom he was in contact. In some cases – e.g. his correspondence with Theodor Nöldeke (1836–1930) – there is a complete record of the exchange of letters because the letters sent out by Goldziher himself were either returned after his death or were made available for copying. There are also rich insights to be gained, for example, from the recollections of colleagues and friends who knew him well, from the records of the University of Budapest, and from the municipal archives of his hometown of Székesfehérvár.

A few comparisons may serve to show the problems that can arise. Haber rightly notices that “in the world of Ignaz Goldziher's *Tagebuch* politics and social developments only very seldom play a mediating role” (p. 219), and specifically, he comments that the troubled times of World War I leave almost no trace in the *Tagebuch* (p. 216). But all this shows is that Goldziher was not using his diary to record his thoughts on such matters. In October 1914 he wrote an essay in Hungarian, “Válasz ‘A háború és a tudósok szolidaritása’ című körkérdésre” (“A Response to the Open Inquiry Entitled ‘On the War and the Solidarity of Scholars’”) that demonstrates that the impact of the war was very much on his mind. This conflict was also a major theme in his correspondence. And what of language? In the Hungary of Goldziher's day the use of German was a powerful symbolic act of great significance in both Jewish reformist circles and among the Magyar nationalists. What did it mean to Goldziher himself when he used German for all his major publications, and even in his diaries (despite the work's title, the entries in *Keleti naplóm* are almost always written in German)? There are hints in the *Tagebuch*, to be sure, but a meaningful discussion would have to include comments he makes in his letters and elsewhere as well.

A second question would be whether Goldziher's life can be understood at all without a full appreciation of his career as an Orientalist. The author does open his book with a clear denial of any expertise in Oriental Studies, but Goldziher's work as an Orientalist is simply too huge and important to be dismissed as standing outside the domain of the approach the author plans to adopt. Orientalist scholarship was, after all, the vehicle Goldziher chose for expression of his ambitions and dreams for himself, as a scholar and as a committed Jew. As Haber's book moves into the period of Goldziher's professional career as an Orientalist, where, as he himself notes (pp. 152–153), the *Tagebuch* no longer offers a clear narrative account, it thus seems to lose some of the order, focus and accuracy that characterise earlier chapters. Goldziher's *Der Mythos bei den Hebräern* (1876), his first extended monograph, gains frequent comment (pp. 137, 161–165, 187, 205) and seems to be regarded by Haber as his most important book, when in fact it has been the one of least enduring influence and importance.

His classic *Muhammedanische Studien* is erroneously entitled *Muhammedanische Schriften* four times in two pages (pp. 176–177), and its important connections with his earlier (1881) Hungarian work *Az Iszlám. Tanulmányok a muhammedán vallás története köréből* (“Islam: Studies on the History of the Muhammedan Religion”) are passed over in silence. The question of Zionism would seem to be quite important for an active reform-minded Jewish intellectual in Hungary in these times, and especially within the framework of Haber’s interests, but it is raised only in passing here and there and is never seriously discussed. Nothing is said either about Goldziher’s 1887–88 lecture series *A zsidóság lényege és fejlődése* (“The Essence and Evolution of Judaism”), although this disastrous enterprise is discussed in detail in the *Tagebuch* and greatly contributed to his decision henceforth to devote his work more exclusively to Islamic and Arabic subjects. The reader finds details on Goldziher’s deteriorating relationship with his former teacher Ármín Vámbéry (1832–1913), but without a verdict on what to make of Goldziher’s contradictory comments and sometimes bitter denunciations (pp. 77–96, 121, 197–198, 213–214). A close look at the professional writings of Vámbéry, however, would show that Goldziher, as a scholar of character and principle, had every reason to be upset. The influence of Abraham Geiger (1810–74) is acknowledged (pp. 114–115, 179) and the Haskala, or Jewish Enlightenment, is at least mentioned (p. 160), but in fact both were crucial to Goldziher’s intellectual and religious formation. Goldziher complains in the *Tagebuch* that once he became secretary to the Jewish reform community the only time he had for scholarship was in the evenings and during holiday periods, and Haber accepts this as fact (p. 159). But can this really be true? Goldziher wrote nine major and pioneering books on every aspect of Arabic and Islamic studies, edited Islamic and Jewish Arabic texts in poetry, literature, history and theology, and published hundreds of articles on themes ranging from the antiquities of Sinai to the proper way to teach mythology to students – many of these articles were practically monographs in themselves. It is at least worth investigating whether Goldziher’s tensions with his community leadership may have stemmed from a tendency to neglect his official duties for the sake of the academic work he considered to be far more important. Patai (“Introduction” to the *Oriental Diary*, 14) already raised this possibility 20 years ago.

The extent of the comments above should not obscure the fact that Haber’s book is a stimulating study full of rich fruitful insights and a seminal contribution to our knowledge of Goldziher’s life and career. Certainly it is an essential companion to the *Tagebuch*, which it often corrects and clarifies and almost always sets within a more cogent historical and social context. As a first monograph on an exceptionally difficult and complex topic, the sources for which are scattered all over Europe and in many languages, it is very impressive indeed. A scholar of Arabic and Islamic studies may well begin perusing this book with the feeling that he expected something rather different. Fair enough. But he will end with the clear conviction that this is one he really needed to read. Many readers will regret the lack of an index, for there is much here that will call for renewed consultation.

LAWRENCE I. CONRAD  
University of Hamburg

SIX MONTHS IN THE HIJAZ: JOURNEYS TO MAKKAH AND MADINAH 1877–1878. By JOHN KEANE. Introduction by WILLIAM FACEY. pp. xxvi, 42, 212, 212. Manchester and Beirut, Barzan, 2006.  
doi:10.1017/S1356186307007298

This is a reprint of two books bound as one, *Six Months in Meccah* (1881) and my *Journey to Medinah* (also 1881) by the adventurer John Keane, giving an account of his journeys in the years 1877–78. Other Englishmen had travelled in the Hijaz before him, among them Richard Burton and William Gifford Palgrave, while Charles Doughty was travelling in Arabian Peninsula at the same time as Keane.