Egyptian rebel Achoris (c. 390 BC), and strongly support a hypothesis of systematic Persian development of agriculture in the oasis. Mirjo Salvini provides a critique of the widely-current supposition that *qanāt* construction was known already to the Urartians in the eighth century BC. He gives a detailed description of the open canals supplying the fortress of Van, and emphasizes that there were neither traces of underground channels, nor need of them in this region of generous rainfall. Remy Boucharlat describes some of the underground channels (Ar. *falaj*) existing in Oman, distinguishing them from the typical Persian *qanāts* drawing from a deep-lying aquifer, in that they tap water from the bed of a subterranean stream. The latter system is more readily conceived; and some of the examples in Oman can be dated, from the associated habitations, to the period of Iron Age II, which presumably predates the Achaemenid in Iran. So the hypothesis is shown as conceivable that *qanāt* operation could have been invented first in Oman, and later taken up, elaborated and diffused by the expanding Achaemenid Empire. (One wonders whether the distinction between such dating categories as ''Iron Age'' and ''Achaemenid'' in Middle Eastern archaeology may sometimes reflect the disciplinary background of the writer more than a real separation in time, the prehistorian being reluctant to invoke a dynastic term unless there are obvious finds of cultural materials).

Throughout this work there is recognition of the inherent difficulty of establishing a date for underground channels. Unlike a *building*, which can be dated from the comparison of objects on its floor-levels with those beneath its foundations, a *qanāt* is excavated into the surrounding soil, and its dredging and cleaning over time means that any incidental debris may postdate its construction, or be stratigraphically confused. True, where a *qanāt* has been dug through archaeological deposits rather than the natural soil (as through Elamite levels at Malyan), a *terminus post quem* is established. Where the system serves ancient settlements in an isolated area, it may reasonably be assumed it was constructed for their benefit. The matter is not so clear in areas of Iran where cultivable land was repeatedly resettled, and there is no indication which period the works were intended to serve. Dating of habitations along the course of the channel can be indicative, though these may reflect different periods, and the presence of some might be fortuitous. However a site designated MQ4 at ʿAyn Munāwīr (p. 124–5) revealed spoil heaps of clay evidently excavated from the adjoining channel. On top of these was a habitation, in the rooms of which were found demotic ostraca relating to the management of the water-supply, one dated to year 29 of Artaxerxes I (= 436 BC.) This certainly provided a clear date *ante quem* for the channel system. There has been so far little archaeological investigation of the *qanāt* systems in Iran, the exploration of which requires the expertise of a mining engineer, and considerable equipment. The systematic investigation of such a network, with examination of any brick linings and visible toolmarks is certainly desirable.

A. D. H. Bivar

Zur Sozialterminologie der iranischen Manichäer. Eine semantische Analyse im Vergleich zu den nichtmanichäischen iranischen Quellen (Iranica 5). By Iris Colditz. pp. xii, 454. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2000.

This impressive well-written book on selected social terms in Manichean texts in Parthian and Middle Persian contains an introduction, a chapter on the historical and social context of the Manichean texts, a chapter devoted to each of six central terms (MP./Parth. *āzād*; MP. *bannag*, *bandag*, Parth. *bandag*; MP. *(i)škōh*, Parth. *iskōh*; MP. *tuwān*, *tuwānīg*, *tuwāngar*, Parth. *tāwag*; MP./Parth. *wuzurg*; and MP./Parth. *wispuhr*), a chapter on the use of social terms in the Manichean texts, a collection of as yet unpublished Manichean fragments quoted in the book, an index locorum, an index of topics and names, a table of abbreviations and a bibliography.

The book is based on Colditz's doctoral dissertation of 1994 in Berlin, which concentrated on the

Manichean literature in Middle Persian and Parthian and which has now been augmented by substantial information from Zoroastrian Middle Persian texts in particular. The title is somewhat more comprehensive than the book, since the use of the equivalent social terms in Sogdian is not studied in detail, though reference is made to these and indeed also to Manichean texts in Coptic. The book concentrates on the Manichean terminology in the context of the Sasanian empire in space and time. There are many reasons for this, the most compelling being that most of the Parthian and Middle Persian Manichean fragments found in Turfan were not composed there and reflect instead the realities of various areas of Iran during the Sasanian period (p. 9ff.). Colditz also draws attention to the use of social terms in late texts from Turfan that describe the Uigur court, but these are a small distinct group. Similarly, the Sogdian Manichean texts, being in the main translations or adaptations of Western Middle Iranian originals, indirectly reflect the same Sasanian background though here too there are exceptions. A second compelling reason is the possibility of comparing the Manichean texts with other texts from Sasanian Iran, in particular, the Middle Persian Zoroastrian literature but also the Parthian and Middle Persian inscriptions (p. 6). Here, of course, the Zoroastrian Middle Persian material dominates since a comparable body of Parthian material is not available.

The introduction contains a survey of the Manichean and non-Manichean literature. Reference should have been made to *Draxt Asurīg* since material from this unique and archaic text is quoted and Nawwābi's edition is included in the bibliography.

The following chapter on the historical and social context of the Manichean texts endeavours to pinpoint the social groups the Manichean missionaries attempted to win over. It reviews Sundermann's contributions in this area in particular but Colditz is rightly less sceptical about the historicity of the persons mentioned by name (p. 35, n. 42).

The following six chapters deal with social terms ranging from the general to the very specific. Each chapter starts with the etymological and semantic development of the terms covered, putting these in their Old Iranian background. Then the contexts (social, legal and religious where appropriate) in which the terms are used is presented. Two summaries, of the use in non-Manichean and in Manichean texts, round off the presentation. In the summary statistics are given for the use in the Manichean texts. In the case of the Parth. word *driyōš* (p. 205) it would have been more useful to have the statistic earlier in the discussion of the word (on p. 201).

The division into and the contrast between the non-Manichean and the Manichean material serves two purposes: It allows a depiction of the social realities in Sasanian Iran as presented in the Zoroastrian texts and the inscriptions and allows an evaluation of how far the Manichean texts pick up these realities and re-use them in the Manichean religious literature. Colditz can point to a series of interesting discrepancies between the two main source groups, of which I will pick out a few. She can point to a complex distribution of the terms for "poor" as used for a believer (in the Manichean case mostly for the Hearer) in both literatures (p. 174ff). She establishes that the use of *wuzurg* "big" in a religious context is peculiarly Manichean but that this usage enters late Zoroastrian texts (pp. 266−268; 290ff). Interesting is the illustration that in some Manichean texts terms of address fitting for worldly rulers are applied to deities (pp. 348, 356). She establishes that the Manichean terminology did not significantly distinguish between Manichean Hearers and non-Manicheans (p. 371). She also shows that the Manichean tripartite social scheme is not a genuinely social one but simply the result of placing a religious system at the heart of the description (pp. 371−373).

In the last chapter the terms discussed are set in relation to each other giving quite a complex scheme for the social structure of Sasanian Iran that is contrasted to the simple pyramid structure set up by Klíma (p. 366). Colditz points out that even terms that can refer to the same social groups are not used as synonyms, rather they indicate different perspectives (p. 366) and so provide a multi-faceted view of society. In the Manichean sources Colditz establishes a more archaic use of various social terms than in the Zoroastrian and legalistic sources (p. 367). This is surely to a certain extent

true but it is equally possible that the Manichean use of these terms in parables and similar contexts simply reduces their meaning to significant basic components and ignores further differentiations that may well have existed when the Manicheans composed their texts.

All the texts (even Sogdian ones) are quoted in transcription for which the reader will be grateful. The Manichean texts are characterised for language and genre and those texts not previously published are included in transliteration on pp. 377–389, an impressive body of material. The quotes represent, as a rule, only those parts of the fragments that are relevant to this study. Most of the texts on pp. 377–389 are transcribed, translated and commented upon in the body of the work, so that the transliteration simply has the purpose of presenting the original. Also included here are quotes from fragments that have not been dealt with in the text; for these the transliteration has to stand on its own, no further work on these passages is presented. Since neither the context nor, in some cases, the full sentence is preserved or presented, we have here a somewhat provisional stage of publication. In suggesting some alternative readings etc. I do not in any way want to seem to disparage Colditz's commendable achievement.

M67 in line 7 (not 6): *ʾnd(rwʾ)z (.)z* seems to be a stretched *ʾndrwˮz* where the scribe first wrote *z*, corrected it to *ʾ* and then wrote another *z*.

M81 end of line 4: *ʾwṯ*, second word in line 5: probably *(dw)*.

M88 II + 91 I has two blank lines after 3b/. In line 3a *w(x)ʾn* is unlikely, rather *w(x)rn* "meal", cf. MPB *xwaran* and Parth. *ˮwxrn*. In 8b rather *(wy)nʾrʾd*. On p. 378 n. 9 Colditz opens the very interesting question of whether M91 I and II have been properly separated.

M92: Colditz identifies a duplicate in M898 but assumes (on p.378 and 202) variants between the two texts. This is unnecessary as the traces in M92 agree with the text in M898.

M98 II R 2a *ʿskwh(γ)[yn]*. For this unprecedented reading reference is made to Sundermann, KG, 173 but there nothing is to be found. The alternative reading suggested in the footnote is preferable.

M158 I: The remark that ''/v/1−6/ = M329b/1/'' is a misunderstanding of Boyce's *Catalogue* where it refers to M158 II.

M226 is, as Colditz suggests in n.23, written in columns, of which only one per side is preserved. L.1−2: *(w)ʾdʾg (rʾ)š(t) /2/ [ʾ]wd*.

M231, line 6, last word: *ny(šʾn)*.

M235: The first two words are *(d)wdyγ ˮγd*. The last word is *zʾd /3/ mwrd* divided between two lines and like *ʿsṯʾw(γ)š(n)* (sic) in l.2 a Parthian word in this Middle Persian text.

M389 V 11: *cy* is a lapsus for clearly visible *ʿγ*.

M398 V? 4: *hrwyn* instead of *ḥwyn*.

M468a: V i 6 should be R i 15. The other line numbers change accordingly. Instead of *(bw)γγd* in line 9 (recte 18) possibly *(p)[r](w)γd* which occurs in the same phrase in R ii 1 (unpubl.) of the same fragment. Line 13 is actually V i 13.

M500f: Gaps at the end of lines 10−12 are not indicated. I suggest 10 *[ʿspγxt]*, 11 *[xwdʾγ]* and 12 *[zʾwrʾn]* followed by *[xwdʾγ]* at the beginning of 13 which is lost. Colditz has the last two words but places them in the lost line 13 without marking them as conjectures. L.12: *(zʾ)wr*. The part duplicate M1571 A 1−4 (not A 2−4 or I A 1−5) is to be corrected accordingly.

M501p: On p. 130 Colditz suggests *karēnd(?)* for the gap in l.6. This should be *kunēnd* <kwnynd>, but enough paper is preserved for the lower part of <k> to have been visible. The second word in l.8 is *hʾd*.

M502tf B 3: The alternative reading *wyspwγḥ* (p. 351 n.133) is preferable.

M644 V? 3 seems more plausible than MacKenzie 1994, 193, but in l.4 MacKenzie's *k)wny(š)[nʾn* shows a clear <k>.

M653 R ii 4: *tyswc*, 5: apparently *ˮzʾrγd* instead of *ˮz (q)ryd*.

M719: On p.235 n.73 Colditz suggests a new *wʾγ* "strength" besides the old *wʾγ* "lamentation".

She reinterprets two passages to the new meaning without considering the possibility of an opposing pair for the second passage at least. In M719 she assumes that *wāy* must mean something similar to *⋆tāwagīh*, itself partly reconstructed. The text has *tʾw[* and enough of the paper under the word is preserved to exclude <g>. A possible reconstruction is *tʾw[ʾn*, attested in MPB as "compensation, obligation" (MacKenzie, CPD, 82). In l.6 the text has *bʾ bw(x.)[* (with a trace that fits neither <t> nor <s>). All this would allow a tentative translation of the fragmentary passage as "(be/become/became) free of lamentation/complaint (*wʾγ*) and obligation for ever".

   M726 V i 24: *[sʾ](r)dʾr.*

   M743 A 8: *ʾwṯ* and 10: *xnw(s)[.*

   M756 9–10: *{brγg}<bdγg>{?} wzrgγ/(ft) °(k)γ ʾc.*

   M779 was published in Yoshida and Sundermann, "Bäzäklik, Berlin and Kyoto", *Orient* 35, 1992, 119–134.

   M824a A 1–4 is in fact M824b (l.2 *(wr)gʾn*); only B 1–6 is from M824a.

   M1201 V 9a second word: *ʾw.* 9b: *[dʾrγ](nd)* is impossible, the fragment has *](p)d* or *](s)d*; 10a end: probably *ʾ](n)[d](r) nk[m](b)[γ]d* (or plural -*[γn]d*).

   M1305 A 3: *ʾ](p)wrγhʾnd.*

   M2079/ is apparently M2080/. A 4: read *[pṯ]ʾb* (but there is not enough space for *hr(wγn) [2–3]*, possibly just *hr(w)?*), 5: *(pṯ)ʾb* and cf. M81/V/1–2/ (unpubl.) for a similar text.

   M5500+5502 B ii 6: *nrγs(p)[.*

   M5700 II R ii 8–13 seems to be V i 8–13. L.10: poss. *wʾ(γ)wg:n* 'hunters', l.12: poss. *[hʾm]γʾdgʾn* 'partners' (not otherwise attested).

   M5785 I V 8 *hyš:n* is a lapsus for *nyš:n* (accordingly delete the asterisk on p.231; there the reference to Waldschmidt/Lentz refers not to this text but to the partial duplicate in M369 R 1–3); II R 16: delete the asterisk here and on p.97 (Despite n.171 the present stem is attested in M533 R 5b as *wžynyd* (Boyce 1952, 443)). The last word in l.16 may be *(ʾ)[w](d)*. The translation (p. 97) should reflect the parallelism of the text: ". . . you free them . . ., so that you may choose your (own) religion/religious community below and so that you may gather/bring together your (own) limbs, – those, whose nature was freed –." The last part may be a gloss.

   M7260 R i 6: *hmg* (slightly smudged) rather than *hmγg* (making p.309 n.255 obsolete).

   M8250 R 2: *hγb) bw(γ)[d].*

   M8700 I V ii 26: instead of *ʾc* the text has an elaborate line filler in the form of a h followed by a vertical stroke.

   MIK4976a R ii 9 last word is read as *zm* with a subscript dot, transcribed on p.296 as *⋆zām* and translated '*⋆Führung*'. This is unnecessary. The dot belongs to the line below (fitting nicely with Colditz's conjecture *šhr[γʾrγh*), the word is *zm[* with space for one letter to the margin and more if the word is written into the margin. Probably *zm[γg].*

   The index of quotations and the index of topics and names is a great help in accessing the mine of information Colditz has included on the terms and related matters covered by this book. This book will be welcomed by those interested in Manichaeism and by students of the languages and the social history of Iran.

<div align="right">Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst</div>

Afghanistan: A New History. By Martin Ewans. pp. 239. Richmond. Curzon, 2001.

Surprisingly perhaps for a society apparently so deeply rooted in tradition, the state of Afghanistan is a relatively modern creation, which developed out of the empire established by the military leader Ahmed Shah Durrani in the mid-eighteenth century. It is the state which is the principal focus of this