

and flourishing trade was ransom slavery.

The twelve studies in this volume concentrate—in rather different ways—on these themes: the acquisition of war prisoners, kidnapping and ransom slavery. While the geographical focus lies on Hungary itself, the area under scrutiny extends from the Crimea to Malta. This guarantees a broad perspective in that the contributors do not only examine Christian slavery in the Ottoman Empire, but, using Western sources, also provide greater insight into the tribulations of Ottoman slaves in the Habsburg territory.

Several of the contributions show that they are based on analyses of one or just a few documents, treating the fate of single persons. These are titles like: “Miraculous escapes from Ottoman captivity” (Tringli), “A list of ransom for Ottoman captives imprisoned in Croatian castles 1492” (Nógrády), “Catholic missionaries as Turkish prisoners in Ottoman Hungary in the seventeenth century” (Tóth), “Ransoming Ottoman slaves from Munich (1688)” (Varga).

While many of the contributions treat individual cases of ransom slavery, the entirety of the articles gives an interesting insight into a kind of slavery that has—as was mentioned in the introduction—up to now not found the interest it deserves. In this sense the book enriches our knowledge of the relations between the Ottoman Empire and its neighbours.

Wolfgang-E. Scharlipp
Copenhagen

Veronica Veit (ed.): *The Role of Women in the Altaic World.*
Permanent International Altaistic Conference 44th Meeting,
Walberberg, 26–31 August 2001. Asiatische Forschungen
Bd. 152. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007. 335 pp.
ISBN 0571-320X.

The PIAC is a rather old institution in the field of Oriental studies. The tradition of dealing with such diverse topics as Turkish, Mongolian, Manchu etc. has been questioned, but it did not threaten the continuation of this conference, although the arguments against an “Altaistic” institution might not be unfounded, if the activities are

restricted to linguistic topics. It seems to be one of the strengths of the PIAC, that various aspects of the cultures of ethnic groups which are regarded as Altaic are being treated in the conferences. Nevertheless, there seems to be a change going on in the personal and topical composition among the contributors. Of the 37 contributions, only seven are dedicated to Turcological topics (in a wider sense) and only one of them concerns Turkey. The larger remainder concerns mainly Mongolistic themes, followed by Manchu and one article about Tokharian (which is a bit out of place here).

This concentration on Mongol topics might have several reasons. One seems to be that there are now many more participants from countries like Mongolia, China and the Central Asian Republics who take the chance of the "relatively new" open borders to be integrated into the international scientific community. Another reason might be—this is only a hypothesis—that Turcological research has always concentrated more on philological topics while Mongolian Studies, despite linguistic and literary research, have also always had an anthropological branch stronger than in Turkish studies. This could explain the distribution of the articles under the title of this conference.

In order to give an impression to the reader of the diversity of the contributions, we will give just three examples from different fields of Altaic studies: a linguistic example, one of literary history and one of history. An example of the first category is an article by Alpatov, about the different ways of speaking by women on one hand and by men on the other, in Japanese. The examples given show that women when speaking to men, for example, use formulations which express more friendliness than the male equivalents. The author of this contribution argues that this fact reflects the lower status of women in the society, compared to that of men. The contribution by Chmielovska is a short summary of "The Image of Woman in Turkish Literature in the Second Half of the 20th Century," which is a topic that could fill a whole book. An article from Mongol studies (Gol'man) deals with the role of women as they are described in Russian archives of the thirteenth century. These documents, which in principle deal with business and diplomatic relations between Moscow and the Mongols, give a clear picture of the power and self-confidence of Mongol women, at least of the upper class. (In this

context, I would like to draw attention to the detailed study of Karin Quade-Reuter: ...*denn sie haben einen unvollkommenenen Verstand—Herrschaftliche Damen im Grossraum Iran in der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit*; Aachen 2003).

These few examples demonstrate how manifold topics and fields of research in Altaic studies are. This leads us to the first point of criticism, which is not very serious. It would have been a definite help to the reader if the articles had been sorted into certain chapters, thus Mongolian contributions should be in one chapter, Turkish ones in another one etc. In this volume the articles are in alphabetical order according to the author's name, which is not a great help in such a book of collected papers. The second criticism is more serious. Something has gone wrong with the transcriptions in several articles. Before mentioning details, it should be taken into consideration that inconsistencies will mostly be due to the individual authors as their transcriptions are usually taken over without unifying them in the various articles. Thus we find the velar /g/ in different forms, once as *gh*, once as Greek *gamma*.

Another irritation is caused by the colloquial way of writing transcribed words. Why is *sh* used in "Shejere-i Terakime" for a sound for which a special Turkish transcription sign exists? Why is *j* used for a sound for which it is usually not used in Turkish; why is there no length sign above the *a* in "Terakime" (all 111ff)? Obviously this way of writing this title has been taken over from other secondary literature. This might be the decision of the author and a short explanation would have elucidated the matter.

Much worse is what happened to the article about "The Image of Woman in Turkish Literature..." by D. Chmielowska. Here we neither find the modern special Turkish letters, being slight variations of Latin letters, nor the very normal /ö/ and /ü/, resulting in the incorrect orthography of almost every name mentioned (one of the worst being "Furuznan" instead of "Füruzan"). Why does a publishing house with the reputation of Harrassowitz not pay attention to such obvious mistakes?

Wolfgang-E. Scharlipp
University of Copenhagen