

appropriate for a stand-alone volume), and cumulative specific contextualization of the individual volume's narrative contexts (as appropriate for each volume separately, as part of the growing set). The five-page "Note on the text and translation", however, remains standard through the four volumes published so far, and the owner of the completed set will presumably have to be content with seven iterations of this selfsame analysis (rather than, say, a cumulative discussion of the matter). When there is so much to be said on the subject, and when Lutgendorf is so clearly the person to say it, this seems a wasted opportunity.

There is some inconsistency in those two old chestnuts of transliteration from Devanagari, the showing of inherent "a" and the representation of vowel nasality (as in the belt-and-braces *kāmjī*, Vol. 4, p. 308). A discussion of the two words *byākula* and *bikala* (Vol. 3, p. xiv) has them as "two variants on a Sanskrit adjective" while they are in reality separate words reflecting Sanskrit *vyākula* and *vikala* respectively. These small nods towards editorial matters are mentioned with the eagerly awaited forthcoming volumes in mind.

Rupert Snell

CENTRAL ASIA

LAUREN GAWNE and NATHAN W. HILL (eds):

Evidential Systems of Tibetan Languages.

(Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs, 302.) 472 pp. Berlin:

Walter de Gruyter, 2017. £91. ISBN 978 3 11 046018 6.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000181

In the 1930s, the term "Bodish languages", from Tibetan *Bod* "Tibet", was coined by Robert Shafer as a linguistically more satisfactory way of referring to what Tibetologists called "Tibetan dialects". These distinct languages derive from Old Bodish or "Old Tibetan", of which Classical Tibetan is the earliest written exponent. East Bodish languages form a sibling subgroup which derives from a sister language of Old Bodish. However, Shafer also used "Bodish" in yet another sense, i.e. to denote the stage ancestral to both these branches. The obvious solution for this terminological ambiguity would be to repurpose Shafer's now defunct higher-order label "Bodic" to designate the taxon comprising both Bodish and East Bodish.

Instead, Nicolas Tournadre coined "Tibetic languages" to denote Shafer's Bodish minus East Bodish. In this volume, Lauren Gawne and Nathan Hill just write "Tibetan languages". Some Drenjongke speakers in Sikkim might not object to their language being called "Tibetic" or "Tibetan". However, applying either label to Dzongkha sits less well in Bhutan, a nation which has waged several wars against Tibet. The sole native speaker of a Bodish language contributing to this volume was nonplussed to discover after the fact that his native language had been categorized as a "Tibetan language". In English parlance, the adjective *Tibetan* is construed as pertaining to the country Tibet. Since both Sikkim, historically a Tibetan ally, and Bhutan have existed as nation states independently of Tibet, Shafer's conventional term "Bodish" remains preferable.

The volume begins with a 37½-page discussion on evidentiality by Hill and Gawne, who, quoting from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, credit Pāṇini with being the first to observe the grammatical marking of evidentiality. Shiho Ebihara studies Tibetan *snañ* "shine, seem, appear" and its usage as a sensory evidential in Western

Archaic, Central, Kham, Amdo and Shar lects. To capture the meaning of *snañ*, she draws a semantic map, following Haspelmath. I fail to see how Ebihara's drawing is more illuminating than the English glosses that I have provided above. In 33½ pages, Gawne whisks her readers past categories of meaning in various Bodish languages to which she collectively affixes the label "egophoric", a term coined by Claude Hagège, who beginning in 1974 introduced such terms as *logophorique*, *anthropophorique*, *égophorique* and *médiaphorique*. Gawne also takes a fleeting peek at seemingly similar categories of meaning elsewhere in the world in an attempt to arrive at a conceptualization of egophoricity as a typological phenomenon.

In 35 pages, Tournadre provides a typological sketch of evidentiality in well-documented Bodish languages. "Core categories" of meaning which he identifies include sensory, assumed, hearsay/reported, inferential and epistemic, which he then further subdivides. Comparing categories of meaning in various languages, he ventures to make generalizations regarding evidentiality as a grammatical phenomenon whilst advancing the hypothesis that egophoricity represents the final stage in the evolution of evidential systems. Hill's 28½-page study focuses on perfect experiential categories and the semantics of inference and direct evidence. Hill's sensitive treatment illustrates the language-specific meanings of grammatical categories in individual languages. Beyond Bodish, Hill observes that categories of perfect experiential meaning in other languages likewise each show their own language-specific interaction between direct evidence and inference.

In 23 pages, Guillaume Oisel derives the modern Lhasa Tibetan relative deictic system from the Middle Tibetan personal deictic evidentials *soñ* and *byuñ*, which in that earlier stage of the language still contrasted with the relative deictic verbs *phyin* and *hoñs*. A 37½-page study dating from 1975 by Yasutoshi Yukawa, who died in 2014 at the age of 73, treats the meanings of Lhasa Tibetan evidential categories. The morphological simplicity of the system is contrasted with the unfamiliarity for non-Tibetans of the meanings of these categories. Yukawa's study distinguishes between the Type I auxiliaries *yöö*, *'yöö-ree*, *duu*, *yoñ* and *čuy* and Type II auxiliaries *yin* and *ree*, and their corresponding negative, polar and non-polar interrogative forms. His valuable exposition was translated from the Japanese by Hill. In her 33-page study of diaspora Tibetan, Nancy Caplow distinguishes evidential markers expressing current vs. past perception, personal vs. conscious knowledge, "happened to me", "guess", "think", "seems", general state, reported situation and inferences based on current perception, personal knowledge or unspecified evidence.

Purik is spoken in Kargil by some 100,000 Shia Muslims. Marius Zemp, who wrote a brilliant grammar of Purik, provides a 36-page overview of the evidential categories in this language, where equative *yin* is not contrasted with some other copula. This exposition is replete with apt examples, lucidly explained. The Drenjongke language of Sikkim is also referred to by the Indo-Aryan exonym *Bhūṭiyā*. In his 53-page study of copulas, Juha Yliniemi calls the language both "Drenjongke" and "Bhutia". Yliniemi distinguishes equative *ĩ*, negative equative *mẽ*, existential *jò?*, negative existential *mè?*, sensorial *du?*, negative sensorial *mĩndu?*, neutral *bè?*, negative neutral *mẽmbè?*, interrogative *bo ~ mo* and negative interrogative *mẽmbo*. After 34 example sentences, the greater part of his study is devoted to a comparison between the Drenjongke categories and those of Dzongkha and Lhasa Tibetan.

Gwendolyn Hyslop and Karma Tshering provide a 15-page synopsis of Dzongkha epistemic categories in terms of speculative, mirative, inferential, egophoric, alterphoric, hearsay and evidential notions. Zoe Tribur provides a 55-page synthesis of three large studies of Amdo Tibetan evidential markers by Jackson Sun, Felix Haller and Shiho Ebihara. In 22 pages, Hiroyuki Suzuki illustrates the use of over a dozen evidential categories in the moribund Khams dialect spoken

in the three hamlets comprising Žollam. In her 14½-page instalment, Chirkova finally acknowledges that Dwags-po (or *Báimǎ*, as she calls the language in Mandarin) is a Bodish language, so no longer kowtowing to Sūn Hóngkǎi's view that Dwags-po is not Bodish but represents some altogether distinct subgroup within the Trans-Himalayan language family. Copyediting could have been more attentive, for typographical errors such as “Geo-linguistic” (p. 55), “Standand Tibetan” (p. 311) are not infrequent.

George van Driem
University of Bern

JAMES DUNCAN GENTRY:

Power Objects in Tibetan Buddhism: The Life, Writings and Legacy of Sokdokpa Lodrö Gyeltsen.

(Brill's Tibetan Studies Library.) xiv, 514 pp. Leiden: Brill, 2017. ISBN 978 90 04 33019 1.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000193

On recent fieldwork in a Tibetan area, I snapped a photo of a painted image on the outside of a temple and sent it to an artist friend. She responded via text: “What does it mean?” I thought this was an interesting question, given its installation as part of an active religious site. Surely it's not what it *means*, but rather what it *does* that piques one's curiosity. To those who study ritual and material culture – not only but especially in the Tibetan cultural area – an emphasis on the activation or function of objects through construction, application and circulation feels more appropriate than any discussion of significance. And yet, this work by James Duncan Gentry is the first major volume to address ritual materials – or objects – as active elements of the dynamic social, political and intellectual network in which Tibetan Buddhism has been established and cultivated.

In *Power Objects*, Gentry articulates an essential lexicon for material-centred discussions of Tibetan ritual activity through the literary record of Sokdokpa Lodrö Gyeltsen (Sog bzlog pa blo gros rgyal mtshan, 1552–1624), thus-named “Mongol-repeller” and ritual master of the rNying ma order. Via the material cultural vocabularies of contemporary thinkers like Bruno Latour and the region-specific explorations of scholars such as Dan Martin and Sokdokpa himself, Gentry explores how ritual materials mediate relationships between political institutions and religious authorities, individuals and their social context, experience and knowledge, and non-humans and their manifestations. This mediation occurs as objects shape and are shaped by the flow of power and charisma through social, political and ritual actors, becoming agents in their own right.

The structure of the book is roughly chronological, presenting the social, historical and institutional setting into which Sokdokpa asserted his expertise as a ritual master in the volatile political and sectarian arena of late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Tibet. Gentry explores the legacy of Sokdokpa's teachings, writings and practices through the master's literary oeuvre, his critics and his lasting influence on other key figures in regional history, including Lha btsun nam mhka' 'jigs med (1597–1653), who was instrumental in the establishment of Sikkim's Buddhist institutions, and the fifth Dalai Lama, Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtso (1617–82). Though at heart a thorough and compelling literary study, Gentry's work puts issues of