

First, there is no introduction to the cross-referencing system, so the reader has to discover its intricacies by hit or miss. For example, the motifs in the story summaries are listed directly in bracketed text or notes marked by asterisks; however, the explanation for this system is found 270 pages later, in the Narrative Index. (The cross-references indicate whether the motif is found in the Arabic text but not the English summaries, and whether it occurs in one or both of the twin English plot summaries of volumes II and III.)

Second, the Source References are listed by country of origin, and then only alphabetically. When the Comparative Index refers us to *Les Narbonnais* and *The Romance of Horn*, we might well guess (correctly) that *Les Narbonnais* is from France (due to the language of the title) and look for it in that section. It is far less obvious that *The Romance of Horn*—which is not English, German, or Dutch—will also be listed under France, and alphabetized under the letter “T,” for “The”! So while the country-by-country organization of the Source References provides ample evidence of the geographical spread of this survey, it may considerably frustrate those who actually attempt to use it.

Third, this work is designed primarily for the reader working from the tale summaries and seeking cross-references; however, motif indices are also commonly used by scholars seeking comparative information about a particular motif and who will not choose to read the complete tale summaries. The cross-referencing system is far less effective when used in this manner. The Narrative Index, which lists the motifs alphabetically, is highly idiosyncratic and includes neither an overview of the general layout nor sufficient internal cross-referencing to aid the reader. Many topics can be found only by carefully searching the entire Index (“Rescues,” for example, are primarily glossed under “N” for “nick of time”). Uneven coverage is a feature of all indices but seems particularly evident in some cases: for “Companions” we find but a single category (remains outside) and for “Battle” only three (between giants and ghouls; by bridge; triangular), while the “Man of Wiles” is accorded 135 categories, most with multiple entries, and “Disguise” includes 68.

It must be said, however, that all such indices are cumbersome at first and grow easier to use with familiarity. The cross-referencing of so much information is an astonishing accomplishment, one for which scholars will be grateful to Lyons for years to come. And for a body of scholars who have mastered the foibles of Brockelmann’s impenetrable *Geschichte*, adapting to Lyons’s system should prove not only feasible but, in the end, quite rewarding.

#### ERRATUM

JOHN W. LIVINGSTON, “Western Science and Educational Reform in the Thought of Shaykh Rifa‘a al-Tahtawi,” *IJMES* 28, 4 (November 1996).

Due to a printing error on page 559, in the third line of the poem written by Tahtawi in Paris the word “light” should read “night.”