in *Akkadica* 123 (2002), pp. 163–81; and in various preliminary reports by Vanden Berghe listed in the Bibliography (see also p. 1).

2. Note that recent research regarding the accurate nature and chronology of "ED II" suggests that this period is in fact late ED I and early ED II; see a forthcoming article by Jean Evans on this issue.

3. For a summary of these provenance/provenience problems as related to Luristan, see O. White Muscarella *Bronze and Iron* (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1988), pp. 112–20 and nn. 3, 5; for the alleged Luristan-Mesopotamian contacts, see p. 117 and n. 6.

Oscar White Muscarella

SHAUL SHAKED. *Le satrape de Bactriane et son gouverneur: Documents araméens du IV^e s. avant notre ère provenant de Bactriane. Conférences données au Collège de France 14 et 21 mai 2003*. Persika 4. Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 2004. 62 pp., 6 black-and-white ills.

In no mean measure due to Nicholas Sims-Williams' singular, swift, and superb decipherment and interpretation of the *materia* in the Nasser Khalili Collection, the previous decade and half has witnessed, as one Iranist recently exclaimed, the "resurrection" of Bactrian studies. The first installment, an edition of sixty-eight legal and economic documents on cloth, parchment, and wood, appeared in 2000 (reviewed in *BAI* 14 [2000 (2003)], pp. 154–59), barely three years after Sims-Williams disseminated this spectacular discovery in his University of London inaugural lecture published as *New Light on Ancient Afghanistan: The Decipherment of Bactrian* (London, 1997). (It went out of print even before the booklet under review went to press and is absent in the bibliography. Unlisted too is his somewhat inaccessible *Recent Discoveries in the Bactrian Language and Their Historical Significance*, SPACH Library Series 4 [Kabul, 2004], a paper Sims-Williams delivered at Kabul University in the same month as Shaked's Paris lectures.) Two more tomes, keenly awaited, consist of an edition of a Buddhist text among missives, the bulk of this trove, and, later, a catalog of plates will also appear. It is assuredly a watershed in Central and South Asian studies not to mention Iranistics.

This Khalili corpus also contains Arabic and Aramaic finds from north-central Afghanistan. These Arabic and Aramaic investigations have been entrusted to two SOAS alumni, the Cambridge Semitist Geoffrey Khan and the Jerusalem Iranist Shaul Shaked respectively. The former are some thirty-two administrative and fiscal records, namely, tax quittances, cadestral surveys, and manumission and debt renunciation deeds dated between A.H. 138 and 160 (= A.D. 755/756–776/777). It will appear as G. Khan, *Arabic Documents from Early Islamic Khurasan*, Studies in the Khalili Collection 5 (London, forthcoming).

Our concern is the latter, an archive of forty-eight documents, chiefly letters, but also lists of provisions and tallies on leather and wood drawn up in *Reichsaramäische*, also "Official" or "Imperial" Aramaic. Shaul Shaked, with the collaboration of his long-time colleague Joseph Naveh, has co-edited these Aramaic documents of Bactria for the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum*. This booklet, predicated on two lectures imparted at France's most prestigious academy, is a preliminary report of Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, *Ancient Aramaic Documents from Bactria 4th Century B.C.E.*, CIIr 1.5.2 (London, 2005).

The generous glimpses afforded by Shaked, *paymānīg* as ever, are significant on two counts. First, this cache from an Achaemenid outpost is now the easternmost paleographic attestation of Aramaic. This revises our previous farthest evidence of it, both limited and epigraphic, known through those six Aśokan inscriptions from Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Aramaic script, as is known, was used for not only rendering Iranian translations of Middle Indo-Aryan (Gāndhārī Prākrit) there but served as far afield as the Tarim Basin in Xinjiang for the basis of a modified Kharoṣṭhī alphasyllabary to write the local Shanshan and Niya Prākrits. So the development of Kharoṣṭhī always supplied indirect evidence for the unproven presence of *Reichsaramäische* in eastern Achaemenid chancelleries. Second, based on internal dating, Shaked attributes this Aramaic archive to 353–324 B.C., a total of twenty-nine years, thus correspondence spanning about a generation. And most of these are from the fourth century B.C. during the successive reigns of Artaxerxes III, Darius III, Bessus-Artaxerxes V, and, finally, Alexander (p.

13). The hundred odd Bactrian documents, with the earliest dated A.D. 332 (DOC A), occur roughly half a millennium later with the latest in A.D. 771 (DOC Y), which period closes just over two decades of concomitant Arabic chancery practice.

Along with these Bactrian archives from the principalities of Rōb and Gōzgān, modern Rūī and Gūzgān (latterly *BAI* 15 [2001 (2005)], pp. 9–29), the Aramaic input now provides us the earliest *Quellenforschung* for a local history of Bactria. It also illuminates the hitherto unknown linguistic situation there prior to the Alexandrine settlement of the third century B.C. and confirms what that pioneer of Bactrian studies, W. B. Henning, maintained about the transition from Aramaic to Iranian writing being gradual and only completed where Iranian dialects were considerably spoken during the second century B.C. ("Mitteliranisch," *Iranistik*, HdO I.IV.1 [1958], pp. 30–32). But the icing is that these Aramaic documents are in "la même langue, la même écriture, la même orthographe, et le même style que les documents araméens d'Égypte achéménide. En dépit de l'énorme distance séparant l'Égypt de l'Afghanistan, la terminologie officielle est elle aussi à peu près identique . . ." (p. 12).

Quite in the spirit of those Elephantine Aramaic papyri (*apud* Driver 411–408 B.C.) modeled on Neo-Babylonian scribal conventions, these Aramaic letters—actually drafts ("brouillons") containing numerous corrected slips and traces of previous writing in the nature of palimpsests—consist of instructions dispensed by Akhvamazda, a satrap to his gubernatorial subordinate named Bagavant in Khulm, a site located not far from the present-day frontier town of its namesake straddling the Afghan-Uzbek border. Another set of missives, in fragmentary state and between other Persian administrative officials, appears unrelated (and unspecific about hierarchical ranking) to those supposedly dispatched to Bagavant. What is plain is that the onomasticon betray neither Semitic nor any other Iranian linguistic provenance save Old Persian (p. 24). Given the chronology, it would be potentially instructive to contrast the Aramaic records against a Babylonian set of equally late Achaemenid-early Seleucid texts from Harvard's Semitic Museum published by Matthew Stolper, *Late Achaemenid, Early Macedonian and Early Seleucid Records of Deposit and Related Texts*, *ANNALI* Supplement 77, 4 ( Naples, 1993). But already apparent is that these letters, written for the most part in correct, normal Aramaic, do go towards explaining the transition from Middle to Late Aramaic *despite* the evidence being extremely early from the end of the Achaemenid epoch. Moreover, select grammatical features in this fourth-century Achaemenid Aramaic aid in clarifying the idiosyncratic forms of certain heterograms or arameograms later evinced in Middle Iranian writing systems (pp. 25–26). The standard treatment is in Henning cited *supra,* but for an indispensable analysis of the topic now consult P. O. Skjærvø, "Aramaic in Iran," *ARAM* 6 (1995) [1997/1998]), pp. 283–318, wherein he rightly reminds us that western, middle "heterographic Iranian" remnants between the first century B.C. and third century A.D. larded with Aramaic complements are ostensibly Parthian but essentially an "unskilled Aramaic" displayed by those with a questionable understanding of it.

As in the western realms of the empire, the Aramaic scribal tradition here too adopts Babylonian month-names, which appear thereafter in the earliest dated Bactrian documents between the second and sixth century A.D. and replaced by their Bactrian equivalents between the seventh and ninth century. The Zoroastrian substratum is conspicuous in not only theophoric names but also offerings earmarked for the *Yasna* ritual ("*yšt*") and the wind *yazata*, Vāta ("*wty*") (p. 46). Rather surprising is a mention of "*dainā*," the twenty-fourth day of the Zoroastrian month, in a provision list (C3). Shaked contends that it is the first indication of a Mazdean calendrical tradition in official usage by the imperial administration (p. 47). I might point out that Shahrokh Razmjou, a colleague at the University of London's UCL Institute of Archeology, recently inquired about the names of two Achaemenid months conflated with the identity of two deities receiving oblations in yet unpublished Elamite records among the Persepolis Fortification Tablets. See his "Khodāyān nāshenākhteh dar taqvīm-e hakhāmanishī," *Nāme-ye Irān Bāstān* 3.1 (2003 [2004]), pp. 15–34. Further, the typically Bactrian cult of veneration of the Oxus yields no less than eight anthroponyms in these documents (pp. 47–48). Certain proper names, however, allude to divinities unidentifiable at present, as for example, Vača(h)dāta, "crée par la Parole" (p. 48). In such

a mongrelized milieu of eastern Zoroastrianism as Bactria, one might hazard detecting a calque inspired, albeit at several removes, on Vācaspati, "lord of speech," an epithet for the Hindu preceptor of the gods, Bṛhaspati.

Burzine K. Waghmar

ÉTIENNE DE LA VAISSIÈRE AND ÉRIC TROMBERT. *Les Sogdiens en Chine.* Études thématiques 17. École française d'Extrême-Orient. Paris, 2005. 444 pp., color and black-and-white ills.

*Les Sogdiens en Chine*, edited by Étienne de la Vaissière and Éric Trombert, presents articles based on papers given at the international colloquium "Les Sogdiens en Chine—Nouvelles découvertes historiques, archéologiques et linguistiques," held at the National Library, Beijing, on April 23–25, 2004 (see *BAI* 15 (2001), 151ff.). A number of papers discussed the then-recently (2003) excavated Northern Zhou tomb of Shi Jun (Wirkak) and his wife, located in the environs of X'ian, as are those of An Qie and Kang Ye (see Sun Fuxi in this volume, p. 54). The tomb of Lord Shi is located 2,250 meters west of the tomb of An Qie, *sabao* of Tongzhou during the Northern Zhou dynasty, while that of Kang Ye, buried in 569 (discovered in 2004) is located only 150 meters north of that of An Qie. Other tombs, for example that of Yu Hong, also figure in the discussions, an expected result of the colloquium, since the tombs are the "hot" topic in Sogdian studies.

Étienne de la Vaissière, "Les Sogdiens en Chine: Quelques rèflexions de méthode." This introduction to the volume synthesizes the various topics discussed and provides useful commentary. The questions posed to the colloquium were basic ones: How does one identify a Sogdian in a Chinese context and how did Sogdian characteristics come to persist there? Again, how does one know that a figure attested in the Chinese sources as a Sogdian actually was a Sogdian? Certainly, Sogdiana was known in China, as note Wirkak's funerary epitaph, published in this volume by Yutaka Yoshida, which contains the term "Sogdikestan," or Sogdian land. Actually, Sogdians are best identified by their family names, reflecting their towns of origin, which from the fifth to eighth century were given to Sogdians by the Chinese: Kang for Samarkand, An for Bukhara, etc. The term *hu* can be enigmatic, as it was first applied to the northern nomads and then to oriental Iranians, including the Khotanese, Bactrians, and Khorezmians, as well as Sogdians. The Sogdian tombs yield a good deal of information concerning Sogdians in China. That of Wirkak (or Shi Jun) not only contains an epitaph referring to Sogdiana but also presents elements of Manicheism that predate its introduction to China by almost a century.

Yang Junkai, "Carvings on the Stone Outer Coffin of Lord Shi of the Northern Zhou." Yang Junkai, the excavator of the Shi Jun tomb, describes the detailed scenes carved on the exterior walls of the sarcophagus, which include four-armed protector gods, Zoroastrian deities, hunts, banquets, caravans, and depictions of travel, ceremonies, and ascension to the heavens. Among the elements of note are a riderless horse under a canopy, horses with Sasanian-type curled-tip wings, and figures holding rhytons. The most distinctive are Zoroastrian, including priest-birds who wear *padam*s over their mouths and tend the sacred flames (Oktor Skjærvø, apud F. Grenet and P. Riboud, *BAI* 17 = symbol of Sros) and a depiction of the crossing of the Chinvad Bridge, where the souls of the dead are judged. The latter is compared by the author to the so-called animal pen shown on the Miho funerary couch, and both the Miho couch and the sarcophagus of Shi Jun are said to reflect Sogdian funerary practices and beliefs regarding the soul's journey to Heaven.

Yutaka Yoshida, "The Sogdian Version of the New Xi'an Inscription." Shi Jun's tomb, erected by his sons, uniquely carries both Sogdian and Chinese versions of his epitaph, which appears above the entrance door. The Sogdian inscription, ably deciphered by Yutaka Yoshida, is given in full, then notes on the text and the translation, the commentary, and, last, detailed linguistic and philological notes. In brief, the inscription states that the family of Shi Jun was from Kish and that Shi Jun, actually named Wirkak, obtained the title of *sabao* of Kachan (Liangzhou) from the emperor. He died in