

der Reihe “Estudos germânicos” des Fachbereichs “Deutsche Sprachen und Kulturen” der Universität Brasília. Es ist bedauerlich, dass dieser Beitrag zur NS-Geschichte der Vor- und Frühgeschichte bislang nur auf Portugiesisch veröffentlicht wurde. (An weiterführender Literatur zu Jacob-Friesen siehe u. a. G. Wegner, Auf vielen und zwischen manchen Stühlen. Bemerkungen zu den Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Karl Hermann Jacob-Friesen und Hans Reinerth. In: A. Leube [Hrsg.]: Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus. Die mittel- und osteuropäische Ur- und Frühgeschichtsforschung in den Jahren 1933–1945. Heidelberg 2002: 397–417; H. Steuer, Deutsche Prähistoriker zwischen 1900 und 1995 – Begründung und Zielsetzung des Arbeitsgesprächs. In: H. Steuer, Eine hervorragende nationale Wissenschaft. Deutsche Prähistoriker zwischen 1900 und 1995. Berlin 2001: 1–54.)

Claus Deimel

Dudrah, Rajinder, Elke Mader, and Bernhard Fuchs (eds.): *SRK and Global Bollywood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 355 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-946047-2. Price: £ 54.00

Why a book about Bollywood superstar Shah Rukh Khan? Shah Rukh Khan himself answers the question, in the introduction of the book, “I am primarily an entertainer ... I am blessed to have had the opportunity to touch hearts and bring smiles” (ix). Indeed, for millions Shah Rukh Khan – or as he is popularly referred to and as mentioned in the title of the book, SRK – has been Bollywood’s most successful face. SRK’s rise to stardom, which began in the 1990s, coincided with the liberalization of India’s economy and film industry. Born in Delhi, his parents, Meer Taj Mohammad and Latif Fatima, were considered progressive Muslims with Meer participating in India’s freedom movement against the British. The family emigrated from Peshawar, a city in the Northwest frontier of modern-day Pakistan, with Meer rumored to have walked the 585 miles to Delhi. SRK’s success came with the stupendous 1997 hit movie, “Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge” (DDLJ). Thereafter he emerged as the new hero representing a film industry where Indianness, for the first time, was visualized in global terms. Subsequently, SRK’s success and image was tailored to reflect an amalgam of urban, secular, Western, and cosmopolitan identities.

At the heart of Dudrah, Mader, and Fuchs’ well edited anthology is the unpacking of the phrase global Bollywood, an industry, similar to Hollywood, whose cultural products have come to function supranationally. Global Bollywood provides an example of cultural flows having eastern rather than Western provenance and, thus, as several contributors of the book argue, readers understand SRK not merely as a quintessential Indian film star but as someone whose image circulates in the global imagination. “Globalized polysemy and cosmopolitanism in regard to the star text of SRK,” Dudrah, Mader, and Fuchs write in the introduction, “is not limited to his representation of the NRI [Non-Resident Indian], but ... invoke signs of globalization in various contexts ranging from sports, gender, and nationhood” (xviii).

The book is divided in two sections: “Stardom and Globalized India” and “Fandom: Local Receptions and Digital Culture.” The first section, comprised of seven chapters, each focused on various aspects of SRK’s rise to stardom, is the best read. Of particular note is Dudrah’s essay, “Unthinking SRK and Global Bollywood” and Dwyer’s, “Innocent Abroad: SRK, Karan Johar, and the Indian Diasporic Romance.” Dudrah, carefully and meticulously, sets the theoretical stage for the rest of the section, by giving readers a working definition of global Bollywood and analyzing the phrase by providing media assemblage of two of SRK’s most popular films, “Billu Barber” and “Veer-Zaara.” He concludes, “these two films reveal how SRK’s star persona is produced and represented on-screen for local and global audiences simultaneously, while always with an eye and ear on the star’s actual relationships on- and off-screen” (21). SRK is not only a star but his star power is driven by his off-screen biography as a cosmopolitan, liberal Muslim who embraces economic globalization and marks the ascendancy of Bollywood in the international arena. Dwyer, in her chapter, is clear in locating the “meaning of SRK” as someone who represents the life of the super-rich Indian overseas, and also someone who provides an imaginary and “aspirational lifestyle for Indians [in India] who increasingly want to have an Americanized lifestyle, supplemented by servants and Indian food” (62). SRK’s success as an ultimate diasporic star truly represents, for Dwyer, the new post-1991 India where one could be Westernized “rockstar chic” but, also, fill the screen with emotionality akin of old Hindi cinema narratives. Two other chapters in this section which provide compelling analysis of two SRK films are those of Seth and Fuchs, “The Don’s World: Designing the Milieu of Shah Rukh Khan” and Gill’s, “*My Name Is Khan*: Reinventing the Muslim Hero on the Global Stage.” Both chapters present, in distinctive and engaging voices, in-depth studies of two films, “Don” and “My Name Is Khan.” In “Don,” Seth and Fuchs suggest, SRK’s image of high-tech hypermodernity is under the lens and what emerges are “visual-material symbols of economic transformation” exemplified by SRK’s on-screen use of Swiss watches, cocaine, dollar bills, and luxury cars, all clear markers of a global capital economy (76). In “My Name Is Khan,” SRK is the cosmopolitan Muslim man who, ideologically, stands against the vilification of global Islam and presents a narrative where “romance ... dictates the resolution of all issues” (125). SRK’s status as a Bollywood star of global proportions, writes Gill, allows “My Name Is Khan” to “present a mode of articulation to the question of the place of Muslims in the [post-9/11] world” (135).

The second section is comprised of seven chapters on reception studies of SRK and his movies among local and global audiences and the rise of global Bollywood in the age of internet connectivity. The chapters by Klien, Hirzer, and Acciari discuss the popularity of SRK among audiences in Trinidad, Peru, and Italy, respectively. Mader’s chapter titled “Shah Rukh Khan, Participatory Audiences, and the Internet” is one of the strongest chapters in the book wherein the author hones in on the idea of In-

ternet, as a complex global mediascape, allowing for the consumption of SRK at the global level hitherto unseen of any Bollywood star. The virtual Bollywood, signified by high interconnectivity, transcends regional and cultural boundaries and allows for a large and diverse SRK fan base. SRK is a complex interactive and co-creative star and media persona, writes Mader, he constantly tweets, posts on facebook, and gives innumerable interviews online. In these interviews, he shares his opinions on diverse subjects – sports, politics, filmmaking, and his personal life – thus, making him seem a “real person” rather than a distant, remote old-school celebrity (213). The making of SRK’s globalized polysemy, for Mader, is equally driven by an active and digitally empowered audience who contribute to the “reading and re-reading Khan” (214).

In the publishing world, Hollywood male stars and their biographies abound. There is now, in and outside of Western academy, an equally inexhaustible fascination with Bollywood and a growing demand for books such as this. The rising popularity of Priyanka Chopra, a frequent co-star of SRK, among American television audiences, has proven that Bollywood stars have gained global cultural currency. The authors in this book do not have a gauzy starstruck view or an uncritical adulation of SRK. Instead, they collectively present an even handed and uncompromising look at the rise of SRK as a star and Bollywood as an industry. “SRK and Global Bollywood” ought to be a much needed addition to their book collection for scholars and teachers across disciplines like film studies, anthropology, sociology, and english.

Shakuntala Rao

Fathurahman, Oman: Shaṭṭārīyah Silsilah in Aceh, Java, and the Lanao Area of Mindanao. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa; Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 2016. 139 pp. ISBN 978-4-86337-225-2. (Javanese Studies, 4)

The book by Oman Fathurahman is one of the few studies in Islamic scholarship devoted to the history and literary heritage of one of the main Sufi brotherhoods, Shaṭṭārīyah in Southeast Asia, precisely Indonesia and the Philippines. The Shaṭṭārīyah brotherhood *tariqah* originated in Transoxania where it was called ‘Ishqiyah. In the 15th century it was introduced to India by Shaykh ‘Abdullah (d. 1485), a descendant of ‘Umar Suhrawardi who is credited with having changed its name from ‘Ishqiyah to Shaṭṭārīyah, a derivation of *shattar* (the swift-paced). Having absorbed the mystical elements of Hinduism and Tantrism, the Shaṭṭārīyah *tariqah* is considered to be the most “indigenized” among Sufi brotherhoods. In the 17th century, it was introduced to the Archipelago, to Aceh from the Arabian Peninsula, so the North Sumatran school of Sufism dominated in Shaṭṭārīyah doctrine. Besides, the brotherhood played an important role in the process of Islamization on the Malay Archipelago creating the local form of mystical Islam.

Moreover, the study by Fathurahman touches on exactly the problem of Sufi chains of spiritual succession of Sufi masters, *silsilahs*. *Silsilahs* are of special signifi-

cance in providing the brotherhoods with cultural legitimacy and doctrinal authenticity. Besides, through their *silsilahs tariqahs* cross national, cultural, and time boundaries. The investigation is based on the studies of the primary sources from Aceh, Java, and the Lanao area of Mindanao, southern Philippines. It is not exaggerating to say that such approach of investigation is practically the first example of a scholarly work on Sufism in Southeast Asia. The author examines 33 manuscripts written in Malay, Arabic, Javanese, and Sundanese mostly in the 18–19th centuries. His study describes the peculiarities of *silsilahs* writing in traditions of different languages such as Arabic Malay and Javanese, and concludes that since the 17th century the Shaṭṭārīyah genealogy in Aceh, Java, and the Lanao area of Mindanao has been traced back through four lines of *silsilah*: 1) ‘Abd al-Rauf as-Singkili, 2) Ibrahim al-Kurani, 3) Shaykh Hasan al-‘Ajami, 4) Shaykh Saliḥ Khatib. All these lines descend to the prominent scholar from Medina, Shafi al-Din Ahmad b. M. al-Qushashi (1583–1660/1) and were introduced to the Malay world by the disciples of Ahmad al-Qushahshi from the Archipelago. So Fathurahman provides the scholarly version concerning the Haramayn origin of Shaṭṭārīyah *silsilahs* on Malay Archipelago in spite of the fact that Shaṭṭārīyah was widely disseminated and developed in Gujarat, Burhanpur, and Bengal in India. However, he mentions the point of view of Werner Kraus (The Shattariyya Sufi Brotherhood in Aceh. In: A. Graf, S. Schröter, and E. Wieringa [eds.], Aceh. History, Politics, and Culture. Singapore 2010: 201–226) underlining that Sufi ideas in Aceh, North Sumatra, were under the strong influence of Indian Tantrism. In this connection it is noteworthy to mention the article by V. I. Braginsky (The Science of Women and the Jewel. The Synthesis of Tantrism and Sufism in a Corpus of Mystical Texts from Aceh. *Indonesia and Malay World* 32/93.2004: 141–175) dealing with Shaṭṭārīyah Sufi doctrine and ritual practice in Aceh. He scrutinizes their syncretistic character and the influence of the elements of tantric Vaishnava-Sahajiya, mainly disseminated in Bengal.

Beyond any doubts, that the island of Sumatra deserves attention as the region which, spiritually and geographically, is connected to the problem of penetration of Islamic creed to Malay Archipelago, particularly, the Sufi ideas of Shaṭṭārīyah brotherhood. One of the main Shaṭṭārīyah spiritual chains dates back to the famous disciple of Ahmad al-Qushahshi from Aceh, ‘Abd al-Rauf as-Singkili (d. 1693). This study includes fourteen manuscripts in Malay and Arabic from Aceh which contain twelve *silsilahs* established in Aceh through the lines of ‘Abd al-Rauf and Ibrahim al-Kurani (d. 1689). Regrettably, the author does not mention the sources from Western Sumatra, the area where Islam was disseminated in the form of Sufi doctrine of Shaṭṭārīyah brotherhood by two disciples of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Rauf from Western Sumatra – Shaykh Burhanuddin (1646–1692) from Ulakan and Shaykh Surau Baru (d. 1695). The manuscripts in Malay composed by Shaykh Burhanuddin Ulakan and containing Shattariyah *silsilahs* are still preserved in Sufi *suraus* of Western Sumatra (Surau Simpang, Kabupaten Agama: