
The “Silk Road” as we thought we knew it has been subject to “reconfiguring” for a good many years now, thanks in no small part to the prodigious efforts of Victor Mair, the convener of the symposium whose papers he and his colleague Jane Hickman (editor of the Penn Museum’s excellent Expedition magazine) have edited into this attractively presented book. The occasion for the symposium was the exhibition of artifacts excavated in Xinjiang which Mair organized and whose last stop on its U.S. tour was Philadelphia.1 It is difficult to imagine a more appropriate and distinguished group of presenters, whose papers are here published. Had Andrew Sherratt, to whom Mair offers a warm tribute at the end of his Introduction, still been alive, surely he would have participated. Had Toby Wilkinson (whose book is reviewed elsewhere in this journal) completed his Sheffield dissertation and come to Mair’s notice, surely he would have been considered, since he has a great deal to say about “reconfiguring” the Silk Road.

Yet I came away from the book somewhat puzzled as to its audience and, sharing some of the reservations expressed in Philip Kohl’s thoughtful concluding assessment, wondering how much of what is here really contributes to reconfiguring the silk roads. Not everything here is really new, some of it is very accessible for the general reader, and some is definitely not. There certainly is plenty to stimulate the imagination and much that quite appropriately leaves open many questions to encourage continuing research that may eventually provide some answers. One of the great virtues of the symposium and this volume is to bring together scholars with such a wide range of interests, extending from the Mediterranean world of late Antiquity back through pre-history to the era of the spread of major language families. Archaeologists, historical linguists, a textile specialist and historians all contribute to the discussion. Such multi-disciplinary perspectives are essential for any study of the complexities of Eurasian exchange.

The essence of J. C. Manning’s “At the Limits: Long-Distance Trade in the Time of Alexander the great and the Hellenistic Kings” is to insist any discussion of the silk roads (which were many and included importantly maritime routes) should not just focus on Rome and China. The earlier history of western Asia and northeast Africa are important, as the evidence for Eurasian exchange under the Achaemenids and Alexander’s successors makes very clear. Little of this is news, but to have it emphasized in this way is valuable.

The distinguished historian of Late Antiquity Peter Brown reminds readers how some of the most important early explorations of the Silk Road a century ago were inspired by the effort to find Late Antiquity along the Silk Road. Brown invites us not to see “the Silk Road either as a fascinating conservatory of exotic mutations of Western forms of art and religion on their long way across Eurasia, or as a corridor of trade, in a modern manner,” but rather to focus on the distinctive societies along it in the late antique period (p. 16). That is, we might think of the exchanges across Eurasia as creating “a magical Middle Ground — at once local and international — in which rulers and aristocrats met in an environment carefully constructed to be a world out of this world” (p. 18). He cites as examples of the kind of study which is needed the impressive recent books by Jonathan Skaff and Matthew Canepa.2 What emerged was a kind of “archaic globalization,” “a world still made up of local units without the extensive outreach of modern states.” (p. 20). The nuance here is important, for Brown clearly is avoiding the danger some fall into of wanting to read back into the deep past a globalization that is distinctive to the modern age.

One of the most intriguing of the essays is Victor Mair’s contribution on “The Northern Cemetery: Epigone or Progenitor of Small River Cemetery No. 5?” The artifacts from Xinjiang brought together in the Penn exhibition included ones from the Xiaohe (Small River) necropolis, about which Mair has also published a nice summary article.3 He reviews that material before laying out what for many readers indeed will be new, the discovery of another site some 500 km from Xiaohe in the Taklamakan, where the artefacts are strikingly similar to those excavated at Xiaohe.
There is an air of mystery here regarding this “Northern Cemetery,” concerning which there is as yet no official publication (and, given the disturbed and looted nature of the site, Mair suggests, there may never be one). He obtained information on it and some pictures (Figs. 3.2–3.7 in the excellent color insert) from respected archaeologists in Xinjiang but also was able to examine artefacts in private hands of individuals (looters? dealers in illegal antiquities?) whom he cannot name. It seems clear, as Christoph Baumer notes in his book (listed by Mair in his bibliography but not specifically cited with reference to the Northern Cemetery), that this must be the same place Baumer terms “Ayala Mazar” and concerning which he has several pages in that book, based on his own apparently unauthorized digging at the site in late 2009. Baumer had in fact reached the same conclusion about the close connection between his Ayala Mazar and Xiaohe. The issue here should not really be one of who gets credit for first discovery — though there is little doubt the Xinjiang archaeologists visited the site, already much disturbed, early in 2008 — since any knowledge of the artefacts from the two cemeteries would point to the same conclusion. But it is curious and no little disturbing to see such obvious tiptoeing around with regard to sources and what I would judge to be an understandable unwillingness to call attention to work (or looting) that occurred in circumstances clearly at odds with the rules which govern archaeological exploration in Xinjiang. One of the pressing desiderata if we are ever to get control of the archaeological data for early Eurasia is to put everyone on the same page in terms of identification and location of sites, even as it has become necessary to conceal or alter their actual GIS locations in the hope of deterring looting.

Mair’s conclusion here is no surprise, in that he has consistently argued for migration of Europoid peoples into the Tarim Basin from the north and west, and he promises soon a sequel to his book (co-authored with J. P. Mallory) on The Tarim Mummies which will bring the archaeological evidence for such migration up to date. In his scenario, the Xiaohe burials represent the “main trunk” of migrants, who then could have easily found their way from the Tarim River into the Keriyar River (which at that time would still have flowed probably all the way through the desert) and its still little analyzed sites in the region of the Northern Cemetery. This is an interesting, and as Mair emphasizes, hypothetical scenario, which certainly should encourage further exploration if it is to be proven.

Elizabeth Wayland Barber is one of the leading experts on ancient textiles who has in her earlier work devoted considerable attention to those excavated in Xinjiang. Her essay here (“More Light on the Xinjiang Textiles”) is a set of annotations correcting her catalogue entries for the Secrets of the Silk Road exhibition, which she wrote prior to having a chance actually to examine the rich collection of textiles that were included in it. To the degree that there is any general conclusion, it seems to be that a variety of weaves were produced in the various communities in early Xinjiang. Her article is illustrated with several good color photos.

Among the kinds of analysis needing further attention and with the potential for really helping to document the long-distance interactions across Eurasia is the study of domesticated plants. Michael D. Frachetti’s contribution here (“Seeds for the Soul: Ideology and Diffusion of Domesticated Grains across Inner Asia”) presents some of the most important preliminary results of the long-term archaeological project he has engaged in located in the foothills of southeastern Kazakhstan. In recent publications, he has argued that an Inner Asian Mountain Corridor passing along the slopes of the knot of mountains in the center of the continent was a crucial pathway of long-distance communication and may well have been route for the east-west or south-north transmission of important products and ideas. This then would be something of an alternative to the idea of the Silk Road and one that came into being well before the era associated with the concept enunciated first by Ferdinand von Richthofen.

The excavations at what was probably a seasonal camp of the mountain pastoralists at Begash has yielded “the earliest evidence of domesticated wheat and broomcorn millet in the Central Eurasian region” (p. 45), a discovery first reported back in 2010. The wheat presumably passed along this corridor from the north and west into China, and the millet moved in the opposite direction, since it is indigenous to East Asia. C-14 analysis for the discovery at Begash suggest a date of 2300–2200 cal BC. The scarcity of the grains and their having been found in burial contexts suggest that they were initially used for ritual purposes and had not yet become a part of the local diet. Frachetti concludes from this that in regions such as Begash, the local population was not just passively absorbing what many have come from the outside but was actively engaged in adapting it to the local culture and thus must be credited with a significant role in cross-cultural interaction that in the long term would have a fundamental impact in many areas of Asia (p. 45). He admits there is still a huge amount to be done to confirm his hypotheses about the Inner Asian Mountain Corridor, but what we have here to date is one of the most far-reaching of all the essays in this book if indeed we are to reconfigure our inherited ideas about Eurasian exchange.
David W. Anthony and Dorcas R. Brown have written a great deal about the domestication of the horse in the Eurasian steppes and use their essay here (“Horseback Riding and Bronze Age Pastoralism in the Eurasian Steppes”) to review, update, and somewhat refocus their earlier conclusions. Anthony’s 2007 book (The Horse, the Wheel, and Language) presents a closely argued case for a correlation between the development of new technologies of communication (horse riding; wagons) and the spread of Indo-Europeans across Asia. This article rests firmly on that interpretive foundation. What is of particular interest here first of all is the clear admission that there is a large gap between the earliest horse domestication and the “relatively recent” (ca. 900–400 BCE) emergence of mounted warfare (p. 55). Secondly, even though the authors still feel that there is a case to be made for the earliest horse domestication having occurred in the western steppes (at the so-called Yamnaya horizon, when there seems to have been a transition to a mobile pastoral economy), to date the only concrete evidence for it is at Botai (ca. 3600–3500 BCE) in northern Kazakhstan. “Domesticated horses might well have diffused from the western steppes to Botai during the middle 4th millennium BC, but it is remarkable that there is so little evidence for exchange between early Botai-Terek sites and the contemporary western steppe cultures” (p. 60). Along the way here, Anthony and Brown cast some doubt on the idea that something like Frachetti’s Inner Asian Mountain Corridor can explain certain kinds of cultural diffusion connecting areas of southern Central Asia with those far to the north (in particular, the so-called Afanasievo culture in the Altai). In their argument, the earliest east-west interaction was across the northern forest-steppe zone.

Their graphic display concerning the relative percentages of different animal remains at various excavation sites and how that changed over time (Fig. 6.2, p. A-15) is of some interest for summarizing the changes in herd composition. This is the kind of evidence which supports broader generalization about fundamental social and economic changes in the steppe world. As Philip Kohl rather bluntly reminds the reader (pp. 91-92), speculation on ethnic and linguistic identities though is largely just that (his target here is not just Anthony and Brown but also Mair and Mallory). Yet he detects a “more guarded” note here in what is said about such matters (p. 93).

J. P. Mallory’s article (“Indo-European Dispersals and the Eurasian Steppe”) addresses yet again the question of Indo-European origins, his emphasis here being that the “out of Anatolia” hypothesis some have advocated cannot be sustained when one looks at the alternative Eurasian steppe hypothesis. The specific issue he addresses is whether or not there is a “fault line” along the Dnieper River separating the Tripolye culture to its west from the Yamnaya to the East. He finds that arguments for the latter having developed out of the former to be unconvincing. His review of the sometimes obscure archaeological and linguistic evidence leads to what may seem a surprising conclusion. Even if one assumes that the populations in the Tarim Basin that he and Mair believe spoke an Indo-European language trace their origins to Indo-Europeans in the western steppes, then there is a disparity between language evidence in the East relating to such things as settled agriculture and the virtual absence of archaeological evidence for it in the alleged “homeland” in the West (p. 86).

In many ways, the best strategy for the general reader, who might pick up this book and admire the historical photo on the dust jacket of an camel rider against a backdrop of what likely is the ruins of Palmyra, would be to begin not by reading Colin Renfrew’s brief Foreword or Victor Mair’s Introduction, but rather by turning to the excellent summary and pointed critique of the various articles in Philip L. Kohl’s concluding comments. Then go back, read the book and finally re-read Kohl, who concedes that the essays “have posed many more questions than provided answers. Perhaps this is a healthy situation” (p. 94). He leaves us with the stimulating thought: “[O]n present evidence...the real Silk Roads began in the Iron Age at the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 1st millennium BC. In other words, there were no Bronze Age Silk Roads and, thus, the world of the Bronze Age steppes cannot be reconfigured on the basis of its later inhabitants” (p. 94).
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Notes
1. The catalog is Victor Mair, ed. Secrets of the Silk Road (Santa Ana, CA: Bowers Museum, 2010).


5. Mair tabulates (p. 31) C-14 dates measured on 27 August 2011, ranging from ca. 1950–ca. 1450 BCE, which fits his assumption that the Northern Cemetery should be dated somewhat later than Xiaohe. In his text though, Mair pegs the starting date for this evidence as 1800 BCE (p. 28). Baumer cites analogous dates (1890–1660 BCE), based on a hair sample he had removed that was tested separately on 11 March 2011 (*History*, p. 129 and n. 119).
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Oxford University Press deserves accolades for its vision of providing several series of books of differing lengths and formats intended for the general reader. One is its series with the generic “[X] in World History” titles, which contains a good many excellent volumes of interest to Silk Road enthusiasts. Another is this series of “Very Short Introductions,” “for anyone wanting a stimulating and accessible way into a new subject,” each book about the size of a smart-phone. When asked for an opinion by Oxford regarding James Millward’s proposal for a volume in this series, I recall giving it a thumbs-up. Millward, known for his books on Xinjiang, certainly has not disappointed me.

One of the commendable aspects of the book is his successful integration of the early history with modern concerns and experiences. He starts with the Silk Road festival events sponsored by the Smithsonian in 2002, later builds a chapter around what he encountered in the market in Urumqi (Xinjiang), and concludes with a review of “modern echoes” of the Silk Road, most of them the ways the term is invoked which of course for the most part have nothing to do with the earlier history of Eurasian exchange.

The point of these invocations of the modern world is not simply to draw in a reader oriented toward the immediate rather than the past. As Millward explains in a cover letter (with the letterhead “News from Oxford”) which accompanied the copy of his book I received, “we should think of the silk road... as an ongoing process whereby a pan-Eurasian cultural substratum has been created and enriched over millennia.” In many ways then, his book is the embodiment of a “reconfiguration” of the silk routes, taking the reader away from outdated concepts of a single East-West road, bookended by Han China and Rome, and existing only from about 200 BCE to ca. 1500 CE. Much of his emphasis is on exchanges across Eurasia (often, granted, impossible to document precisely as to direction and chronology) well prior to the Common Era, and in the end he addresses squarely the fact that important exchanges following the patterns established in earlier centuries continued well beyond 1500 and down into modern times. If the silk roads came to an end, it was mainly due to the intervention of modern technologies of the industrial and post-industrial age.

Another emphasis in the book is on the significance of political entities (“states” or their precursors) in promoting exchange. This may make parts of the second chapter, which compresses so much of the sweep of political history, somewhat tough slogging for some readers. I think figuring out how to connect Eurasian exchange meaningfully with the political history has always been something of a challenge; I am still not entirely comfortable with an emphasis on “empires.” Once this review is behind him though, Millward is free to move back and forth in the subsequent chapters, rather than feeling compelled to follow a strictly chronological framework. There is much to commend this approach, which will, however, keep the reader on his or her toes.

The thematic discussions in the subsequent chapters encompass a lot that has been missing in earlier efforts to survey the Silk Road. Ch. 3 (“The biological silk road”) ranges over material from DNA evidence to foodways, with a good choice of viniculture and dumplings as focal points to illustrate how products spread. Not the least of the attractions of this chapter is his quotation of poetry illustrating the cultural im-
portance of wine both in China and the Islamic world. While there are few illustrations in the book, the two included here are well chosen, one a Gandharan relief of a feasting scene, and the other the famous wine merchant figurine from the collection of the Seattle Art Museum.

Ch. 4 (“The technological silk road”) begins with a brief excursus on furniture and then develops in a sustained way the significance of silk, paper, medicines and military technology. Millward is careful not to insist on a definite direction of “borrowing” where one cannot in fact be demonstrated. Thus, for example, while he makes it clear that printing with moveable type came out of East Asia, he leaves open the question of the degree to which knowledge of that might have influenced Gutenberg. One of the more interesting sections of this chapter concerns the way in which the knowledge of smallpox vaccination developed and spread. I had not previously known about its early history in East Asia.

“The arts on the silk road” (Ch. 5) begins with a discussion of literary motifs and genres before moving on to music, visual arts and blue-and-white porcelain. The section on music, allows Millward to draw on material in which he has particular expertise, the pride of place being given to the widespread adoption of the lute and the techniques of sound reproduction which it allowed. I would have welcomed more on painting, but the choice of Islamic miniatures and the spread of a motif of rabbits serves well to make the point about how motifs traveled. In his discussion of the export of porcelain, it would have been of interest not only to point out how the Dutch developed their own industry under the inspiration of Chinese designs but to be explicit about how much of the “kraak” porcelain was ordered to meet specifications and actual designs sent by the Dutch to the Chinese kilns.

I can but rarely fault Millward for any of his choices here. He clearly has kept up on many of the most important subjects which are forcing us to revise entrenched stereotypes, at the same time that he conveys where there may be differing interpretations. I would beg to differ in his decision, while emphasizing the importance of pastoral nomads, to open with three long, quite negative quotations about them as a rhetorical device against which to develop the more positive assessment that follows. Edward Gibbon, after all, is even more famous for his equally disparaging comments on the Byzantines. Millward does have a tendency to set up the reader with an idea that he then proceeds to deconstruct and substantially “correct.” This runs the danger, I think (as I know from observing recently how high school students respond to the Mongols in their world history classes), of having the first impression trump the later, rational discussion of the real evidence. So I would have avoided a statement such as “Arguably, however, the greatest demographic legacy of the Mongols was not in making people, but in eliminating them” (p. 45), especially since it now seems certain that the traditionally cited accounts of the destruction of Otrar or Baghdad greatly exaggerate what actually happened. That said, Millward deals judiciously with another of the canards cast at the Mongols which blames them for the spread of the Black Death to Europe.

Some might wish he had devoted a more focused section of the book to the transmission of religious ideas. It is not as though the spread of religions is missing here — in fact he makes it clear that religions played a role as important as political structures in facilitating exchange. Along the way, we find examples of how Buddhist jataka tales were probably part of the channel for the development of secular literary motifs. I think though that there are some missed opportunities to show how the adoption of religious concepts in new environments often required substantial adjustment of the original ideas.

The book has notes clearly indicating key sources he draws on or quotes, many of them accessible on-line. He includes a well selected bibliography, recommendations for a few Internet resources, and an index.

Reading an excellent book like this one (or any in the Oxford series) is bound to raise some questions in this age of rapidly changing technology. I, for one, appreciate the commitment to old-fashioned paper and print, at the same time that the volumes are available as e-books (just think how many of these “short introductions” would fit on a Kindle!). What I am wondering though is whether Oxford might not take us a step further, recognizing that readers on their electronic devices might like to see more visual material. Would it not be nice for an author like Millward, sensitive to correlation of good visual examples with his carefully crafted text, to offer as a companion a much larger selection of images on a dedicated website maintained by the publisher?

— Daniel C. Waugh
University of Washington (Seattle)

Note: Some very minor corrections: If metals were coming out of Central Asia to the south, contributing to the making of the Bronze Age, surely what was being exported was tin, not the relatively ubiquitous copper (cf. p. 7). There is an obvious typo in the dates given for Gutenberg’s work on his Bible (p. 74); Richard Foltz, who wrote a much-cited little book on Religions of the Silk Road, is listed in the bibliography (p. 134) as Richard “Forbes.”
It is to the great credit of Rachel Ward that the small exhibition at the Courtauld Gallery, built around the unique Ilkhanid inlaid brass “bag” in its collection, took place. Alas, I missed it, though fortunately I have at least seen the bag [Fig. 1, and details, Fig. 2, next page] and some of the pieces which have been brought to bear to contextualize it. The exhibit (and its catalog) is an inspiring example of how the “biography of a single object” can serve to illuminate much broader historical and cultural matters. Accompanied by various lectures, a symposium and this book, the exhibition explored not only this remarkable piece of Islamic metalwork, arguably produced by the masters in Mosul in the first decade or so of the 14th century, but also shed considerable light on the aftermath of the Mongol conquest of the Middle East, the culture of the Ilkhanid court, and the survival and flourishing of craft traditions under their rule. The distinguished contributors here, apart from Ward, include, inter alia, Charles Melville, Robert Hillenbrand and Julian Raby. Raby’s essay is of particular interest for documenting the likelihood that, as in other cities that were allegedly destroyed at the time of the Mongol conquest, in fact Mosul and its renowned craft tradition of inlaid metalwork continued to flourish. Mosul metal craftsmen (or at least those who wished people to believe they were from Mosul, since this testified to their skill) produced important inlaid vessels for the Ilkhanid rivals in Egypt. For Mosul to have continued to produce work of the excellence and cost represented in the Courtauld bag hardly would have been possible had the city remained in ruins.

Fig. 1. The Courtauld bag prior to its recent cleaning and restoration. Photograph by Daniel C. Waugh.
The various essays draw generously on comparative examples, some from objects which were assembled to display with the Courtauld bag. Among them are the famous “Blacas Ewer” from the British Museum, another example of what is arguably Mosul inlaid metalwork, if from a slightly earlier period [Fig. 3], an inlaid basin now in the collection of the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin [Fig. 4], and various miniatures from contemporary illuminated manuscripts. Perhaps the most interesting of these is one of the pages from the so-called Dietz albums, in the given instance a painting showing a court scene and undoubtedly dating from the Ilkhanid period [Fig. 5, next page]. In it, next to the throne with the Khan and his consort stands a female attendant who holds a bag very much like the one which the Courtauld owns. It was an inspired decision to have Judith Pfeiffer write for the catalog an essay on the position of women in Ilkhanid elite culture, at least one of whom has poetry attributed to her, quoted here in translation. Other essays focus on the depictions associated with the royal hunt and with courtly musical entertainments, where there is a widely ranging iconography of such pursuits in both painting and metalwork. James Allan writes on the likelihood that images on Chinese silks were among the inspirations for the design on the bag.

The production values of the book are excellent. One can see the famous bag, carefully cleaned and restored

Fig. 2. Details of the Courtauld bag. Photographs by Daniel C. Waugh.

Fig. 3. The Blacas Ewer, dated 1232. Collection of the British Museum, Acc. no. ME OA 1866.12-29.61. Photograph by Daniel C. Waugh.

Fig. 4. Detail of the Berlin basin, 3rd quarter of the 13th century. Collection of the Museum of Islamic Art, Berlin. Inv. no. I.6580. Photograph by Daniel C. Waugh.
(and a technical analysis performed on its substance), with many close-up details of the individual scenes and decoration on it. Similarly, there are close details from the comparable metalwork and miniatures. In the case of the metal objects, this then helps document the stylistic similarities which point to the provenance and possible identity of the master craftsman who produced the bag.

If one could choose a single object to illustrate the positive side of Mongol rule, the Courtauld bag might well be the leading candidate.

—Daniel C. Waugh

University of Washington (Seattle)
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Kochevniki Evrazii na puti k imperii. Iz sobrania Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha. Katalog vystavki
[Nomads of Eurasia on the path to empire. From the collections of the State Hermitage.

This is the catalog for an exhibition held at the “Hermitage Center” in the Museum of the Kazan' Kremlin, 18 June 2012-31 March 2013. The incredible number of 749 objects illustrated here in excellent color photographs is explained in part by the fact that many are the small items which probably have long remained in the vast storerooms of the Hermitage Museum and rarely been seen in public. To be able now to see them is a cause for celebration. The flip side, of course, is that many of the best known and arguably most important objects for the cultures covered here were not included. Thus, for example, we do not find major objects from the Pazyryk tombs in the Altai or from the Xiongnu tombs at Noyon uul in Mongolia. The choices, however, are valuable for the inclusion of what in many cases are the ordinary objects of daily life, be it arrowheads, pottery, or parts of horse harness.

The organization here follows a rather loose chronology of successive cultures, starting well back in the first millennium BCE and coming down to the period of the Mongol Empire. There are also sections pertaining to a particular collection or find: e.g., the Siberian Collection of Peter the Great, the hoard found in Ukraine near Poltava that is associated with the Bulgar Khagan Kuvrat, and the very recently excavated Alan material from the Khilmalka II cemetery in the north Caucasus. The essays are uneven, some providing mainly a compact historical overview, others more intensively attempting to introduce key items from the exhibition pertaining to a given culture. It is not always clear what one should make of the objects which accompany each essay, since the caption entries contain only basic data and no interpretive discussion. For example, there is a large and amorphous collection (some 70 items) that somehow illustrates the culture of Turkic peoples beginning with the establishment of the Turk Empire in the 6th century, but the introductory essay discusses specifically only about 20 of them. What is one to think of the selection of objects from the Saltovo excavations which follows an essay that focused only on the history of the excavations at Sarkel? The Sarkel essay seems to have been an excuse for Z. A. L’vova to discuss what appears to be still very controversial evidence from a 17th-century text that contains what purports to be a 13th-century Bulgarian chronicle. The catalog tails off at the end, with a page on the Khitans and but two objects found in Mongolia which hardly suffice to illustrate much about Khitan/Liao culture.

The interpretive framework in the book swings from dated and rather negative views of “what nomads were all about” (the introductory essay by T. V. Riabkova) to very speculative assertions about their high level of understanding of mathematics and astronomy (the essay by L. S. Marsadolov). The results of recent
German-Mongolian excavations at Karakorum are barely acknowledged in passing, with the emphasis instead being on the work of Kiselev’s expedition in the late 1940s. Understandable, of course, given the fact that the Hermitage collection contains a good deal of what he found. But that is no excuse for salvaging his erroneous determination that he had found the remains of Khan Ögedei’s palace — we now know that the building was a Buddhist temple — by suggesting that probably the temple served as the palace or that the palace was built on the site of a temple. From K. V. Chugunov’s discussion of the Scythian material, one would never know that the excavation of the important burial at Arzhan 2 to which he devotes considerable attention was a joint project with the German Archaeological Institute.

The book’s value lies in its illustrations, not only for the objects themselves, but for the occasional drawings reconstructing the dress of those who were buried with the ornaments which have survived. Two double-page maps with indications of find spots and overlaid with thumbnails of key objects provide a vivid sense of the range of what the book encompasses.

—Daniel C. Waugh
University of Washington (Seattle)

This is the second sizeable Festschrift celebrating Boris Marshak, who is so highly regarded for his excavations at Panjikent and his widely ranging expertise on the Sogdians and the artistic culture of Central Asia and its broader connections. The volume published (in print and online) in 2006, Ėrı́n ud Anērān, contained the bibliography of his work up through 2004; a supplement to that impressive listing opens this new volume. The editors deliberately delayed publishing conference proceedings when it became possible to include a broader range of papers and participants. The articles here are in Russian and in English, with brief summaries of each provided at the end in the other language. Here is the table of contents, with descriptive annotations added for many of the contributions.

Oleg Grabar. “A Letter to the Organizers of the Conference” (p. 9)


Frantz Grenet and Claude Rapin. “Formirovanie etapy sogdiiskoi kul’tury” [The formation of the stages of Sogdian culture] (13–28). The authors review Marshak’s periodization, basically confirming its accuracy, though suggesting some emendations based on their ongoing excavations at Afrasiab and especially Koktepe, with its carefully studied stratigraphy.

Sergei B. Bolelov. “Remeslo drevnego Khorezm na rannikh etapakh razvitiiia gosudarstvennosti” [The craft production of Khorezm in the early stages of the development of the state] (29–44). Analyzes evidence that the craft production of the region has features which make it quite distinct from what is found in other areas of Central Asia.

Eleonora Pappadardo. “Ivory Rhytons from Old Nisa. Methodological Remarks” (45–59). Based on her work published as a monograph in 2010 (Nisa Partica. I rhyta ellenistici). She establishes eight style groups, illustrating their features with drawings; she concludes that simply treating them as examples of Hellenized works of art obscures the features which must be explained within the context of local artistic production.


Vladimir A. Livshits. “Parfianskie shutniki” [Parthian jokers] (71–76). Reinterprets the rock inscriptions found at Lakh-Mazar (southern Khorosan) not as religious inscriptions but rather crude and humorous graffiti left by caravaneers.

Nicholas Sims-Williams. “The ‘Lord’s Vihara’ at Kara-Tepe” (77–81). Evidence from an inscription on the wall of “Complex B” at Kara-Tepe which confirms V. V. Vertogradova’s reading of inscriptions on several fragments of clay jars from the site.

Aleksandr N. Podushkin. “Epigraphicheskie artefakty gorodishcha Kul’tobe” [Epigraphic artefacts from the site of Kultobe] (82–95). Places the as yet undeciphered inscriptions on baked bricks from this site on the Aris...
River in southern Kazakhstan in their archaeological context, arguing for a date around the turn of the Common Era and connecting them with the Kangju state rather than defining them as “ancient Sogdian” writing. Several color plates illustrate the article.

Erbulat A. Smagulov. “Kul’tovye postroiki khram-ovogo kompleksa na gorodishche Sidak (fužhnyi Kazakhstan)” [Religious structures of the temple complex on the site of Sidak, Southern Kazakhstan] (96–128). A detailed preliminary report from the excavations, including a discussion and illustration of the artefacts. Dating of the excavated material to the 7th–early 8th century, on the eve of the settlement’s destruction by the conquering Arabs.

Judith A. Lerner. “Yidu: A Sino-Sogdian Tomb” (129–46). The carved stone slabs are from a tomb dated 573 CE excavated in 1971 in Shandong Province. Lerner concludes the slabs served as the walls for a house-shaped sarcophagus made for a non-Chinese burial, most likely Xianbei in origin. The images are noteworthy for their various Zoroastrian elements. The analysis is illustrated with clear line drawings.

Valentin G. Shkoda. “V. I. Marshak i zhivopis’ Pendzhikenta (Metod issledovatel’ia)” [V. I. Marshak and Panjikent painting (his method of analysis)] (147–58).


Matteo Compareti. “Coronation and Nawruz: a Note on the Reconstruction of the Missing King at Afrasyab” (174–89) Interesting for comparisons with frontispiece painting in Istanbul Topkapi Saray album H.2152, suggesting possible completion of reconstruction proposed by Grenet and Ory for the upper part of the famous “Ambassadors” painting at Afrasiab. Also suggests Chinese parallels to the north wall images in that room.


Yutaka Yoshida. “Heroes of the Shahnama in a Turfan Sogdian Text. A Sogdian Fragment Found in the Lushun Otani Collection” (201–18) While the many Chinese Buddhist text fragments collected by Count Otani that now are housed in the Lushun Museum have been published, the Sogdian texts on the reverse of them are still needing analysis. Here a facsimile, transcription and translation, with copious annotation, of the text fragment 2LM20: 1480/22(02), which may be either a Manichaean or Zoroastrian work. An appendix includes a facsimile, transcription and translation of Sogdian fragment L59 (SI 5438) housed in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, St. Petersburg.

Pavel B. Lur’e. “O sledakh manikheizma v Srednei Azii” [On the traces of Manichaeism in Central Asia] (219–51). A thorough review of all the, as it turns out, sparse evidence for Manichaeism in Central Asia, where Central Asia is here defined in the narrow former Soviet sense of the four republics plus southern Kazakhstan. Xinjiang is not included. The English summary of this article is substantially longer than that for others in the volume.

Stefano Pellò. “A Paper Temple: Mani’s Arzhang in and around Persian Lexicography” (252–65). Explains how the term seems to be used both to refer to collections of Mani’s paintings and more broadly to assemblages of paintings which might be associated with a Central Asian Manichaean milieu.

Igor’ A. Kyzliasov. “Eniseiskaia runicheskaia nadpis’ s iranskim zaimstvovaniem” [A Enisei runic inscription with an Iranian borrowing] (266–94). Detailed new reading and analysis of an inscription on a cliff overlooking the Enisei River first discovered in 1982. It probably dates to the 10th century and is unique for including what seems to be the name of a Manichaean priest. Illustrated with close-up photos.

Iurii A. Piatnitskii. “Golgofa i chetyre raiskie reki: novoe serebranoe vizantiiskoe bluudo nachala VI v. v sobranii Ermizha” [Golgotha and the four rivers of Paradise: a new silver Byzantine dish of the early 6th century in the collection of the Hermitage] (295–330). An important purchase by the museum (with the encouragement of Boris Marshak), from a private seller in 2002. The Eucharistic plate is one of very few with seals which attribute its production to the time of Monophysite Emperor Anastasius I (491–518). On its face is a depiction of a cross on Golgotha with the four rivers of Paradise and what Piatnitskii identifies as the cave of Adam incised in the side of the mount. A detective work traced the probable find location of the plate to the Khashupsa fortress in Abkhazia, where there has been massive looting of this important but yet unexcavated site. While the author leaves to further research what exactly the plate may mean in the context of the religious debates of the time, he seems to feel it was deposited in Abkhazia prior to Emperor Jus-
tinian I’s reaffirmation of Orthodoxy beginning in the 520s. Among the few other vessels with the stamps of Athanasius is a huge silver platter found in the Sutton Hoo ship burial in England dating from the early 7th century [Fig. 1].

Fig. 1. Byzantine silver platter with stamp of Emperor Athanasius (491-518), unearthed in the Sutton Hoo ship burial in England. Collection of the British Museum, Acc. no. 1939,1010.78. Photograph by Daniel C. Waugh

Vera N. Zalesskaia. “K interpretatsii siuzheta na nestorianskom diskose iz sela Grigorovskoe” [On the interpretation of the subject on a Nestorian paten from the village of Grigorovskoe] (331–38). Marshak dated this dish (found in Perm’ guberniia in 1897) and another important one (depicting Jesus Navin before Jericho) to the 9th–10th centuries and argued from stylistic details that they were both made in Central Asia. There seems to be general agreement that they were produced in a Nestorian milieu. The new analysis here suggests the iconography of the Grigorovskoe paten is to be connected with the apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter.

Simone Cristoforetti and Gianroberto Scarcia. “Talking about Simurq and Tāq-i Bustān with Boris I. Marshak” (339–52). The first part, by SC, offers various considerations as to why the winged creature usually indentified as a Simurq (e.g., in the Rustam cycle at Panjikent) may be some other creature. GS’s contribution here concerns arguments for a late date for the Tāq-i Bustān grottoes and a connection between Bustān, a real uncle of the Sasanian ruler Khusro Parwiz, and the mythical Farhād of the Shahnama.

Dzhamal K. Mirzaakhmedov. “K sotsial’no-ekonomicheskim faktorom razvitiiia glazurovannoi kera-

miki Maverannakhra IX–XIII v.” [On socio-economic factors in the development of glazed ceramic of Transoxania in the 9th–13th centuries] (353–75). Examination of the changes in ceramic design, notably with increasing simplification and stylization, leading eventually to pseudo-epigraphic decoration. The author connects this with decline of the Samanids, decentralization and the apparent loss of functional literacy in Arabic on the part of the craftsmen. Excavations of several house units at Kuva, each with its own assortment of ceramics, provides a sense of some specific social contexts in which the wares were used by the 12th and early 13th centuries, with increasing numbers of the dishes showing signs of having been repaired. One finds increasingly the production of local ceramics imitating some of the costlier ones imported from Iran which may still have been available to the elite. Excavations also point to a shift in the economy away from dependence on trade to self-sufficient agriculture.

Asan I. Torgoev. “Remennye ukrasheniia Karakhaniidov (K postanovke problemy)” [Belt decorations of the Karakhanids (Toward the formulation of the problem)] (376–401). This is a pioneering effort to develop a classification scheme and chronological sequence for the evolution of Karakhanid belt decorations, according to shape and decorative designs. It is illustrated with a good many comparative drawings.


Ekaterina A. Amarchuk. “Dekorativnye nadgrobii Khorezma i Zolotoi Ordy” [Decorative cenotaphs of Khorezm and the Golden Horde] (408–30). A complete descriptive catalog of cenotaphs decorated with glazed ceramic tiles from Khorezm in the time when it was ruled by the Mongols of the Golden Horde. At the end the author discusses the problems created by the loose use of the term “majolica” to describe such tile work.

Ernst J. Grube. “Some Thoughts on the Longevity of Sogdian Iconography in the Muslim World” (431–49). Descriptive analysis of miniatures Nizami’s Khamsa, illustrating “The Last Meeting of Laylā and Majnūn.” The focus here is on explaining the depiction of a lion attacking a man on the outskirts of the camp where the lovers have met and swoon. Citing the inspiration from Boris Marshak to look for the origins of certain motifs of Persian miniatures in the earlier painting that has survived from Sogdiana, Grube identifies the motif with one depicting a Brahman killed by a Tiger (Panjikent, Room 1, Sector XXI). The article is illustrated with both black-and-white and color images.
and includes a descriptive catalog of the miniatures in question.

Eleanor Sims. “The Stephens’ Inju Shahnama Manuscript. Millennial Thoughts and a Tribute to the Late Boris I. Marshak” (450–60). Produced probably in Shiraz in the time of its last Ilkhanid ruler in 1352–53, the manuscript is on long-term loan at the Sackler Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution. A few of the pages are dispersed in other collections. It is important for documenting the early development of Shahnama illustration and the work of the artists at the Inju court, which is now a subject of increasing attention. The miniatures have elements that can be connected with pre-Islamic painting in Central Asia.

Antonio Panaino. “The Italian Scientific Mission in Tajikistan. The Case of the Yagnob Valley” (461–76). An overview of the multidisciplinary, multi-year Italo-Tajik expedition, which is documenting the language, historical sites and ethnography in the remote Yagnob area of the upper Zeravshan watershed, an area whose traditional culture is rapidly succumbing to the incursions of the modern world. The region has been known as the supposed last hold-out for the ancient Sogdian language, but apart from that is arguably of great importance for a good many yet unstudied historic sites. A goal of the project is to encourage local efforts to conserve what is left of historic traditions.


—Daniel C. Waugh
University of Washington (Seattle)

Published by the Bongard-Levin International Institute of the Classical World, these substantial and nicely printed volumes contain much of interest for those studying broadly pre-modern Eurasian history. While most of the articles are in Russian, with English summaries, some are in English. I can but single out here a few articles that I think should be of particular interest in Vols. I and II (the tables of contents for all the volumes may be found at <http://kronk.spb.ru/library/scriptaantiqua.htm>). Since Vol. III is a Festschrift for the distinguished specialist on Central Asia, Edvard Rtveladze, I provide a fuller account of its contents.

In Volume I, Andrei Iu. Alekseev’s article (pp. 73–89) on the previously unknown images of griffins on a leather object from the 4th-century BCE Scythian Alexandropol’ Kurgan is of interest for the comparisons with, inter alia, images on objects from the Pazyryk burials in the Altai. Mikhail Iu. Treister (pp. 90–146; available on-line at <https://www.academia.edu/1163605/M_Treister_Silver_Phalerae_with_a_Depiction_of_Bellerophon_and_the_Chimaira_in_Russian>) writes on silver phalerae with images of Bellerophon and chimaera from a Sarmatian burial in Volodarka, western Kazakhstan, which shed new light on the problem of the “Graeco-Bactrian Style.” He dates these phalerae with a terminus ante quem of the third quarter of the 2nd century BCE. The article includes comparison drawings and a number of excellent photographs, including several in the color insert of this volume. The Greek presence on the Black Sea and interaction with the steppe nomads is the focus of several articles. Having recently seen some of the Pontic tombs in Amasya (Turkey), I found Sergei Iu. Saprykin’s analysis/reconstruction (pp. 294–315) of a Greek inscription on one of them to be of some interest, as it commemorates the burial there of the highest priest of the capital of the Pontic kingdom. Even though much of what he covers has been widely known thanks to exhibition catalogs, Sergei V. Laptev’s generously illustrated survey (in English) of the masterpieces of the Classical and Hellenistic collections in the Miho Museum (pp. 345–66) provides a good introduction to this striking material, the selection both overlapping with and supplementing what is depicted on the museum’s own website <http://www.miho.or.jp/booth/html/plaart140902/smape.htm>. Each volume of this series includes a section on numismatics, the one here devoted to a long article by Aleksei N. Gorin (pp. 369–402; on line at <https://www.academia.edu/3849681/scripta_1_2011>) analyzing a recently discovered hoard of late Kushan
copper coins from the vicinity of Termez. The article is of value in part for his summary tables of the other hoards of Kushan and post-Kushan coins found in southern Uzbekistan, southern Tajikistan and along the Amu Darya in Turkmenistan.

In Volume II, the brief article by Galina B. Trebel'eva and her colleagues (pp. 94–101) introduces some of the results of a GIS modeling project for the archaeological topography of the Sukhumi region, where the database for the larger coastal region of Abkhazia now includes more than 800 monuments. The subject of Boris E. Aleksandrov’s critical text and analysis of an Akkadian version of a 14th-century BCE Hittite-Mittanni treaty (pp. 185–207) may seem remote from the interests of most readers of The Silk Road, but as he suggests, the history which this text helps reconstruct is very significant in the larger pattern of international relations in the period. Despite the fact that the main Hittite versions of the treaty have long been known (and are available on the Mainz website devoted to the Hittites), there is clearly much yet to be learned. Sviatoslav V. Smirnov’s political biography of Seleukos Nikator (pp. 257–90) updates the standard biographies by Grainger (1990) and Mehl (1986) with reference to Babylonian tablets discovered in the last two decades. The “Masterpieces of World Museums” section of this volume highlights the Hermitage Museum’s Siberian Collection of Peter the Great (pp. 329–54). Elena F. Korol’kova reviews the collection’s history and discusses a number of the most interesting items, including belt plaques with animal motifs. She emphasizes the collection’s importance (despite the lack of a precise provenance for the objects) for the early date at which it was assembled, thus providing some guarantee that it does not include forgeries. More than half of the excellent color photos in the insert to this volume illustrate her article; these images can be supplemented by the much more extensive coverage (mostly in black-and-white) in Sergei I. Rudenko’s Sibirskaiia kollektsiia Petra I (1962). Annotated Russian translations are an important part of this series. In this volume Mikhail D. Bukharin introduces and translates the reconstructed text of Book I of the treatise “On the Erythrean Sea” by Agatharchides of Cnidus, and Ivan Iu. Miroshnikov offers Russian readers an annotated translation of all the witnesses of the Gospel of Thomas, superseding the translation from the Coptic version published by S. K. Trofimova in 1972 (Miroshnikov’s article is on his web page at <https://helsinki.academia.edu/miroshnikov>.

The contents of Scripta Antiqua, Volume III (2014), subtitled: K iubileiu Edvarda Vasil’evicha Rtveladze. I have selectively added some descriptive comments.

Aleksandr B. Dzhumaev. “K iubileiu Edvarda Vasil’evicha Rtveladze” [For the jubilee of Edvard Vas’il’evich Rtveladze] (pp. 11–28).

Leonid M. Sverchkov, Wu Xin, and Nikolaus Boroffka. “Gorodishche Kizyltepa (VI–IV vv. do n.e.): novye dannye” [The settlement of Kizyltepa (6th–4th centuries BCE): new data] (31–74). Results of the excavations begun in 2010, after a long hiatus since the initial excavations of this site in Surkhandarya province. Details of stratigraphy; overview of artefacts, illustrated with a good many photos and drawings. The recent work re-assessed the function of what the first excavations had designated as the “citadel” dated to ca. the end of the 6th century BCE. After the settlement’s destruction, presumably by the Graeco-Macedonian forces in 328 BCE, a new lower city emerged below the ruins of the original massive structures.

Sergei B. Bolelov. “Kampyrtepa — antichnaia krepos’ na Okse: stratigrafia, periodizatsiia, khronologiia” [Kampyrtepa: an ancient fortress on the Oxus: stratigraphy, periodization and chronology] (75–132). This is a lengthy review of recent excavations, with a good summary of what one assumes is the current thinking about the chronology of the several layers at this important site, assumed to be the Hellenistic Pandoheion, established to protect an important crossing point on the Oxus no later than the last quarter of the 4th century CE. It continued as a major transit center between Balkh and points east and south.

Karl M. Baipakov. “Issledovaniia islamskoi arkheologii i arkhitektury v Kazakhstane” [The studies of Islamic archaeology and architecture in Kazakhstan] (133–42).


Aleksei A. Zavoikin. “Bosporskie greki i ‘aziatskie varvary’ v period arhaiika rannego ellinizma” [Bosporan Greeks and ‘Asiatic barbarians’ in the Archaic Period of early Hellenism] (164–96). Makes an interesting case for integrating studies of the Greek settlements and their “barbarian” neighbors if we are to understand fully the history of the Bosporan region.

Sviatoslav V. Smirnov. “Anabasis Antiokha I” [The Anabasis of Antiochos I] (197–203). Uses evidence from cuneiform tablets, numismatics and archaeology to reconstruct the history of an important eastern campaign of Antiochos I which left few traces in the narrative sources.
Igor’ V. P’iankov. “‘Kamennaia Bashnia’ na Velkom Shelkovom puti” [The ‘Stone Tower’ on the Great Silk Road] (204–19). P’iankov, who has written a substantial monograph on the Classical sources for the geography of Central Asia, argues that the famous “Stone Tower” most likely was located near modern Daraut-Kurgan where the Karategin enters the Alai Valley in Kyrgyzstan. Apart from the archaeological and textual evidence, he brings to the subject systematic travel over the possible routes for this segment of the Silk Roads. While he cites a range of studies in various languages, the most recent French contributions to this debate are not among them.


Anvar Kh. Atakhodzhaev. “Numismaticheskie dannye k politicheskoi istorii Sogdiany IV–II vv. do n.e.” [Numismatic data on the political history of Sogdiana 4–2 centuries BCE] (243–79). This is an expanded version of one accepted for publication in Revue numismatique. He addresses the disputed issue of whether Alexander’s Hellenistic successors exercised control over Sogdiana, bringing to bear new coin discoveries from Afrasiab to build on earlier analysis, especially that by Aleksandr Naimark. Atakhodzhaev provides formal descriptions of the coins with photos and drawings (the photos for the largest number of them are really too small to be of much value here). He tabulates the new material and juxtaposes it with evidence from other finds and from the written sources, arguing that during the 3rd century BCE, the Seleucids did control Sogdiana but then lost that control in the following century in the time of Diodotos. There is no numismatic evidence supporting the idea that Eucratides I exercised political influence in Sogdiana.


Aleksei N. Gorin. “Parfianskie monety Kampyrtepa” [The Parthian coins of Kampyrtepa] (302–29; linked to his web page at <https://independent.academia.edu/%D0%90%D0%BB%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%B0%B9%D0%93%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BD>). The Parthian period in the history of Kampyrtepa is the least well studied; coin evidence is crucial for filling in this lacuna. Gorin analyzes in detail a relatively small (and rather badly preserved) group of copper coins, distinguishing genuine ones from imitations. This evidence points to trade relations but not Parthian control over the middle Amu Darya.

Nikolaus Schindel. “A New Kushano-Sasanian Coin Type?” (330–40). Several different coin variants attributed to Wahram have been studied; here a new type is analyzed, which suggests there may be more than one provincial governor’s issue within this group.

Mikhail Iu Treister. “Klad serebrianykh ritonov akhemenidskogo kruga iz Erebuni” [The hoard of silver rhyta of the Achaemenid sphere from Erebuni] (343–424; on-line at <https://www.academia.edu/5517923/M_Treister_The_Hoard_of_the_Silver_Rhyta_of_Achaemenid_Circle_from_Erebuni_in_Russian>). The several striking Achaemenid silver objects excavated at Erebuni (Armenia) in 1968 have received much attention, most recently by David Stronach, with whose cooperation the author has used drawings and photos from his article published in 2011. Treister’s long article provides a full technical analysis of the objects (three of the rhyta) along with a careful comparison of them with analogous pieces. He suggests that the objects were crafted probably in eastern Anatolia and over a period from as early as the late 5th century through the first half of the 4th century BCE. They may have been buried around 330 BCE, which is also the date of an important hoard excavated at Pasargadae. The article is illustrated with a good many detailed photographs.

Anatoli R. Kantorovich. “Izobrazheniia losia v vostochnoevrepeiskom skifskom zverinom stile: klassifikatsii, tipologii, khronologii” [Depictions of elk in the East European Scythian animal style: classification, typology, chronology] (425–82). An interesting attempt to systematize the evidence regarding depictions of the Asian elk (in North America, a moose) in various objects found across Eurasia and dating from the 7th to early 3rd century BCE. He traces the development from relatively realistic images to increasingly abstract ones, where at first blush it would be difficult to discern any relationship to the earlier images. Some groups of the figures display a kind of syncretic combination of the cervid with a raptor. He provides a chronology for the different types and an interesting “genealogical” chart (p. 478). Each of his subgroups is illustrated with comparative photos and drawings.

Prilozhenie 1. Katalog nakhodok antropomorfnyh terrakotovykh statuetok Sredneaziatskoi Arkheologicheskoj Ekspeditsii [Appendix I. Catalog of the finds of anthropomorphic terracotta statuettes by the Central Asian Archaeological Expedition]

Prilozhenie 2. Tablitsy dannykh terrakotovykh statuetok Sredneaziatskoi Arkheologicheskoj ekspeditsii [Appendix II. Tables of the data for the terracotta statuettes of the Central Asian Archaeological Expedition].

This careful classification of the terracotta sculptures of Magiana excavated between 1980 and 2003 seems largely to be the work of Dvurechenskaia, who wrote her candidate dissertation on the material. Earlier analyses of comparative material (e.g., from Ay Khanum; inter alia, by Henri-Paul Francfort) have, she argues, glossed over some stylistic details, which are important for any effort to identify who may be depicted in the figurines. Dvurechenskaia and Novikov’s work here should serve as a basic reference work, with a minutely analyzed series of types, their details illustrated with photos and drawings.


The evidence here (generously illustrated with photos) testifies that Buddhist monuments of the Kushan period in Northern Bactria included narrative reliefs. The date of this group of sculptured fragments is the 2nd century CE.

Mikhail A. Shenkar’. “Boginia ili tsaritsa? K interpretatsii zhenskogo personazha na rel’efe Narse iz Naksh-e Rustama” [Goddess or queen? On the interpretation of the female personage on the relief of Narseh at Naqsh-e Rustam] (614–34; linked to his webpage at <https://dainst.academia.edu/MichaelShenkar>). Unlike earlier scholars, Shenkar argues that the figure in question is not a queen but a goddess, most likely Anahita.


This long article publishes for the first time numerous stucco fragments from the wall decorations of the well-known site of Varakhsha. The author argues they seem to have been part of compositions that imitated Iranian “garden carpets.”

Sergei V. Kulanda “North Caucasian Loanwords in Indo-Iranian and Iranian” (716–25).


— Daniel C. Waugh
University of Washington (Seattle)

Ol’ga Vasil’evna D’iakova has published extensively on the archaeology of the Bohai (Parhae) State (698–926), whose territories encompassed parts of what is now the Russian Far East, China, and Korea. The great virtue of her monograph is to provide a systematically organized descriptive catalog of its archaeological sites and to summarize her previously published classification of the pottery found there (crucial to any discussion of the composition of the population) and the nature of the fortress architecture, which similarly is important for delineating the historical development of the Bohai. She concludes that the Bohai state was multi-ethnic, developing initially out of the local Mokhe population, but then strongly influenced by an influx of people following the end of the Koguryo state. Chinese culture also then played an

— Daniel C. Waugh
University of Washington (Seattle)

O\l’ga Vasil’evna D’iakova has published extensively on the archaeology of the Bohai (Parhae) State (698–926), whose territories encompassed parts of what is now the Russian Far East, China, and Korea. The great virtue of her monograph is to provide a systematically organized descriptive catalog of its archaeological sites and to summarize her previously published classification of the pottery found there (crucial to any discussion of the composition of the population) and the nature of the fortress architecture, which similarly is important for delineating the historical development of the Bohai. She concludes that the Bohai state was multi-ethnic, developing initially out of the local Mokhe population, but then strongly influenced by an influx of people following the end of the Koguryo state. Chinese culture also then played an
important role in the evolution of Bohai culture and administration in the period when the Tang Dynasty exercised what seems to have been a loose protectorate over it. Somewhat vaguely, she refers to elements that might have come via Indo-Europeans who spread across Inner Asia, filtered through the contacts with the early Turks and their successors.

To write this history necessitates relying heavily on the primarily Chinese written sources; there seems to be little new here in what she does with them. If one accepts what turns out to be a relatively nuanced reading of what one might conclude from the archaeology regarding the ethnic diversity of the Bohai state, she is able to go beyond what others have done with its history. Her great strength in all this is the work she has done over several decades in excavation and survey archaeology and tracing routes of communication in the Russian “Primor’e” region east of the Ussuri River. This an area where V. K. Arsen’ev (of “Dersu Uzala” fame) undertook pioneering exploration over a century ago, work that she credits as retaining its value.

In cataloguing the sites, she summarizes the evidence from archaeology and in each case then provides a pithy conclusion as to whether the site is definitely to be associated with the Bohai or only probably can be connected with them. Complicating this is the unevenness of the scholarship (in Chinese, Russian, Korean and Japanese) and the fact that many of the sites have a much longer history of occupation. There is no evidence that the material has been incorporated into a GIS database. Those who would wish to consult her sources will be frustrated by the fact that she cites the non-Russian East Asian literature only by translations of titles and uses the standard Russian system of Cyrillic transcription for names. We get neither pinyin nor Chinese characters, which then also challenges the reader to figure out what the names of the Chinese locations are.

As her concluding chapter emphasizes, work on the Bohai has very much been the captive of nationalist politics. She has particularly strong words for the relatively recent and systematic Chinese effort to “incorporate” neighboring territories and peoples into a scheme where all roads lead to Han China. The Korean narratives likewise are problematic for their nationalistic slant. So we are left to understand that perhaps the Russian perspective offers the greatest objectivity. Of course one can imagine her own conclusions here will end up being roundly criticized for disputing the nationalist narratives, and one has to wonder a bit about possible unstated political motivations here, where there are still tensions regarding the borders between Russia and China in the Far East.

She suggests that to date there have been few syncretic works of substance in any language which have attempted to bring together all the information, textual and archaeological, to write the history of the Bohai. It is odd though that she ignores Johannes Reckel’s large monograph published in 1995 (Bohai: Geschichte und Kultur eines mandschureisch-koreanischen Königreiches der Tang-Zeit), perhaps because it is in German. She tends to rely rather heavily on often rather slim Russian treatments for the textual evidence and eschews an in-depth study of the culture. Nonetheless, future studies of the Bohai will need to consult her book and take into account her pointers about the direction for future archaeological exploration in these regions of the Far East if we are to gain a fuller understanding of the Bohai and liberate the scholarship from the blindered attempts to impose modern political boundaries on the evidence which transcends them. Among the desiderata is to try to unearth evidence about what happened to the Bohai after their state collapsed and its territories ended up under the control of the Khitans and others.

The book has a several page “summary” in English which is really a focused discussion of her conclusions regarding the ethnic history of the Bohai. There is also an English version of the table of contents. The insert of color plates is of good quality; there are numerous site maps for Bohai settlements, artefact drawings and maps.

—Daniel C. Waugh

University of Washington (Seattle)
Silk Road House <www.silkroadhouse.org>, which occupies a modest store front not far from the University of California campus in Berkeley, is the creation of Alma Kunanbaeva and Izaly Zemtsovsky, distinguished specialists on the literary and musical traditions of Central Asia. Over the years, the Silkroad Foundation has been happy to provide funding to support this non-profit organization in its goal of presenting to the public an impressive array of diverse ethnic cultural traditions. SRH offers lectures, concerts, art exhibits and much more and reaches out beyond the one location near the Berkeley campus. One of its most important recent contributions is the series of CDs and the one video DVD which are the subject of this brief note and which can be purchased from SRH. One can supplement the information provided with the disks by some of the essays linked to the SRH website (most by Kunanbaeva, a couple by Zemtsovsky). Accompanying each disk is a booklet that provides background on the performances and performers, Kunanbaeva the author of all but the one for Chelebi, written by Zemtsovsky. For Janabergenova and Rustembekov, there are translations of the lyrics, and for the latter’s performance of the epic, a detailed summary of its contents. The emphasis in the introductory texts is on the way in which the performers are direct heirs to an oral tradition whereby the musician learns at the feet of a master, rather than by some formal process of institutional musical education. Given what we are told in these biographies, we are to assume that the performances are an authentic evocation of tradition, even as it is also clear that tradition is a moving target. Performers may sing or play compositions handed down over generations but may also perform new compositions created in traditional fashion and in whose performance improvisation is expected. Having Rustembekov’s performance of the important epic Körughly is especially valuable, given how widely known it is across much of southern Central Asia.

Since both Janabergenova and Chelebi have formal academic positions (and the latter advanced degrees from Russian institutions), one does wonder to what degree that experience may have altered “tradition.” Here one thinks about what Theodore Levin documented in his Hundred Thousand Fools of God, which charted the difficult path he followed in trying to identify performers in Central Asia whose art had not somehow been corrupted by the cultural norms imposed by Soviet-era institutions. While it appears that there is precedent for solo performance of muğams, as Zemtsovsky’s notes indicate, they were conceived for ensemble. The solo versions of the pieces are indeed captivating, and one can appreciate his somewhat tongue-in-cheek reference to this music as “muğam Sebastian Bach.” It would have been interesting to learn something here about gender roles in traditional performance: is the current prominence of a talented woman performer like Janabergenova a relatively new phenomenon, an artefact of the liberation of women under the Soviet regime, or does it have deeper roots in a nomadic culture in which women’s roles were not constrained in the same way that might have been true of their urban counterparts?

The performer adjusts his or her presentation depending on the particular audience and venue. That is, audience response and cultural expectations are part of any performance. The recordings here at least in part reproduce programs the musicians presented where the goal seems to have been to a degree to anthropologize for the uninitiated from a broad repertoire, in some cases then mixing different genres and motifs. As the notes indicate, to some extent adjustments were made to accommodate an audience on whom some more complex or sophisticated elements might have been lost. The last of the disks listed has an interesting history, in that the recording was done in 1990 as part of a Smithsonian Folkways project. For various reasons, the material was never issued then and the tapes nearly lost. Two of the performers have since
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An Anthology of Kazakh Epic Songs and Dombra Kyuis (recording) and A Journey to Epic Qyzylorda: Three Kazakh Jyraus (video)
died. The accompanying video, which provides the best sense of how performances traditionally would have taken place, was filmed about a decade later in a yurt in the Qyzylorda region of southern Kazakhstan, the region from which much of the Kazakh music presented here comes. We might well wish to learn more about the differences to be found among regional traditions.

As with any music, its appreciation may take a bit of getting used to for the unpracticed ear. Even though the superficial impression may be that a lot is the same in song after song, in fact there are subtle progressions and differences. Certain of Janabergenova’s pieces are quite lyrical; in a song such as her lament for the disappearing Aral Sea, she conveys on the other hand a vivid sense of her anguish. The texts offer a lot of insight into Kazakh culture, many of them being didactic and challenging listeners to respect traditional social and family norms of conduct. A good many of them are musings on life from the perspective of elders who remind the listeners of the inevitabilities that come in old age. A few of the songs are overtly connected with Islamic belief; one might wish to know their relationship to Sufi traditions. One is struck by the degree to which lyrics evoke nature, animals both wild and domesticated, and do so in unexpected phrasing. Presumably those who are equipped to study more deeply the culture would have benefitted had the texts included transcriptions of the original Kazakh.

In reading and hearing so much wise counsel about values that should be shared and held in esteem across cultures, yet which, like the Aral Sea, seem threatened everywhere with extinction, this listener could not help but wonder to what degree the elites who are benefitting from the petroleum-fueled excesses of modern Astana or other locations in Kazakhstan really do care any more about this heritage. Assuming that the technology to play them will still be available to future generations, at very least what Kunanbaeva and Zemtsovsky are so lovingly preserving on these discs will be available long after the Aral Sea has disappeared entirely and some of the glittering façades of new buildings have been shuttered.

—Daniel C. Waugh
University of Washington (Seattle)