

who came to dominate the church in Russia at the end of the seventeenth century. At this point, Plokhy has arrived at the foundations of later Russian and Ukrainian identities.

Curiously, Plokhy pays little attention to language, a subject that dominated (if not even obsessed) discussions of nationality for most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. His brief (p. 45) reference to the subject does not do justice to the linguists, especially those in the West who regard the existence of a single vernacular language (however defined) in Kiev Rus' as relatively obvious. The language issue was always the basis of claims, Soviet and otherwise, for the three-from-one theory, and it is misleading to downplay its importance in the historiography.

It is impossible to do justice to a work of this range and complexity in a brief review. Plokhy's command of the literature and sources is impressive. He sometimes neglects the earlier historians in the West such as Reinhard Wittram, Vladimir Vodoff, and A. V. Soloviev, an omission that leads him occasionally to reinvent the wheel. Not all his arguments convince, but he presents a pathbreaking and rewarding account of a topic crucial to modern historians. In his sources, correct faith, the Polish-Lithuanian constitution, and the character of the Orthodox tsar were the main issues, not nationality, and his ability to tease out assumptions about national identity from them is truly masterful.

Yale University

PAUL BUSHKOVITCH

NAOMI STANDEN. *Unbounded Loyalty: Frontier Crossing in Liao China*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 2007. Pp. xiii, 279. \$53.00 (US).

WHERE WAS 'CHINA' in the tenth century? How were borders and boundaries conceived, especially in places and at times when political authority was, at best, tenuous? More particularly, how did people who lived in this period of incessant warfare and political realignments understand what it meant to be 'loyal' (*zhong*)? In posing and answering these seemingly innocent questions, Naomi Standen, a historian of middle-period China, not only challenges her readers to re-examine some of their much-cherished assumptions about boundary and identity but also – unintentionally, perhaps – raises important issues concerning the nature and limitations of the extant sources.

The period between 907, when the once-powerful Tang dynasty (618-907) came to an end, and 1005, when the treaty of Shanyuan helped bring about a century of relative peace between the succeeding (northern) Liao and (southern) Song regimes, has until recently not received much attention in Western scholarship. Wang Gungwu's *The Structure of Power in North China during the Five Dynasties* (1963) remains, to an extent, a useful starting point for research (although Standen's own survey of the field in her forthcoming chapter in volume V of the

Cambridge History of China should likely take its place). This relative neglect is unfortunate, especially as it is widely acknowledged among historians that the Five Dynasties period (907-60), brief as it might be, marked a major turning point between early imperial and later imperial China.

In revisiting this momentous if chaotic period in the history of China, Standen's aims are twofold. First, given the nationalist framework that has been dominant, especially in Chinese scholarship, in the study of the Five Dynasties period, what insights could one derive, Standen asks, if one were to re-examine the sources by having first removed one's modernist, ethnocentric lenses? Put differently, how should the history of this transformative period be reconceived if one were *not* to assume that what we think of as ethnic categories – Kitan, Han, and others – were the most important identifiers for people who lived in the tenth century? Second, as a corollary, if we as historians were *not* to impose onto the period the relatively rigid moral framework of later imperial times (in which one's morality was more likely to be questioned if one chose to serve more than one master), how should we make sense of the political choices people made in the tenth century? It is by raising – and answering – these questions, in Standen's view, that historians may better appreciate the main features of the transformations in middle-period China.

To find out how people in the tenth century conceived borders and boundaries as well as how they understood what it meant to be loyal, Standen sets as her task to compile and examine cases of border crossing (225 in all) that are recorded in the extant (Chinese) sources. The book is divided into two sections. The first, which comprises three chapters, sets out to reconsider the concepts of border, ethnicity, and loyalty, as well as to examine the types and patterns of border crossing over the course of the tenth century. The second section, which consists of three chapters and a conclusion, is mostly devoted to case studies of choices by individual 'crossers'. Standen's main argument is that, whereas in the early half of the tenth century – when there were present in the eastern end of the Eurasian continent multiple centres of power – it was the allegiance of individual commanders and regional officials that, by and large, determined the location of political boundaries; by the eleventh century – when only the Liao and the Song remained as rivals – it was the agreed-upon political boundary between the two powers that now gave meanings to what it meant to be loyal. In fact, as Standen would argue, this shift in emphasis on what constituted *zhong* was one of the major transformations in middle-period China.

Although Standen's arguments are on the whole persuasive, the sources she relies on, and the reading strategy she employs, do deserve further reflections. Given the limited range of the sources available for the study of the Five Dynasties, it is certainly justifiable – indeed, wise – on the part of Standen to focus on comparing and contrasting how particular individuals or events are represented in different accounts over time. But such an approach, I believe, deserves a fuller explanation and analysis. Standen's discussion on the nature and transmission of the

available sources (pp. 35-40) is illuminating, but since much weight in her analysis is placed on the changes in context in which the sources were compiled, a fuller treatment would have made what is already an important book a more satisfying read.

University of British Columbia

LEO K. SHIN

CHRISTOPHER TYERMAN. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. Cambridge MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006. Pp. xvi, 1,023. \$35.00 (US).

THIS IS AN extensive and enormously vigorous account of the crusades. The learned author, Christopher Tyerman, is well aware of the controversies into which he is entering. His brisk, even pugnacious, style is a pleasure to read, suggesting that the book will be enjoyed by the general public as well as specialists. But the specialist, the crusader anorak, will hardly be disappointed, because this is no lightweight production. On the contrary, virtually all who write about the subject will now have to take account of it.

The introduction offers a brief but perceptive sketch of Europe and the Mediterranean world, with a vital emphasis on their militarization and the emergence in both of dominant, often alien, armed elites. Tyerman is of one mind with most modern writers in believing that the last twenty years of the eleventh century were crucial in the development of the notion of meritorious warfare, and like them he sees this as arising out of an interaction between events like the *reconquista* and the evolution of papal policy. While he is prepared to consider that Peter the Hermit may have had some independent role in the origins of the crusade, he locates responsibility in the person of Urban II. Tribute is paid to the dynamism of the notion of penitential warfare, but Tyerman dismisses the idea that Urban envisaged a militarized pilgrimage, forcibly expressing a strong preference for the notion that the pope was declaring a Holy War to be waged by a *militia Christi*. This is perhaps a rather simplistic view, given the widespread attestation of what Raymond of Aguilers called 'the pilgrim church of the Franks', and it may miss nuances of Urban's thinking, but the argument is clear.

More surprisingly, Tyerman sees Urban II as focused on the need to help the eastern Christians and to liberate Jerusalem, rather than any wider ambition to roll back Islam. It is hardly surprising, in view of the views expressed in his earlier work ('Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?', *English Historical Review*, cx (1995), 553-77 and elsewhere), that Tyerman presents a persuasive case for the rudimentary nature of crusading and its slow integration into ecclesiastical thought. Perhaps the main weakness in this discussion of the 'Idea of the Crusade' is an uncertainty about Holy War. For Tyerman, the crusade is the Christian notion of Holy War, but it is not clear how far he thinks Urban was drawing on