

he considers undeniable: royal titles; the (still) difficult introductory phrase *θāti RN xšāyaθiya* “thus speaks RN, the king”; the phrase *vašna Auramazdāha*; and Darius’ claim that he accomplished everything in Behistun in “one and the same year.” The work ends with a discussion of the means by which Urartians may have influenced the Persians, dealing with the always thorny problem of the “Medes” as intermediaries.

P. Stein reexamines a badly weathered stone inscription written in Aramaic from Tayma that has long been thought to reflect Nabonidus’ “cult reforms.” This article relates some of his preliminary conclusions. He argues that the inscription is Achaemenid, probably dating to Artaxerxes I or II (or possibly Darius I). Rather than reflecting the establishment of a new cult, as has long been argued, in Stein’s opinion the text is more like a legal document; he draws parallels to Mesopotamian *kudurrus*.

M. P. Streck investigates case inflection in Neo- and Late-Babylonian dialects. This neatly organized paper attempts to understand the chronological changes in the *status rectus*, as outlined in GAG §63 1 (e.g., *-um* → *-u* → *-∅*). Beginning with the Graeco-Babyloniaica, he then examines the evidence for stems that end in a vowel, stems that end in a single (*einfach*) consonant, stems that end in a double (*lang*) consonant, stems that end in a consonant and feminine ending, and stems that end in two different consonants. He then examines attestations of the masculine plural, the *-ān*-plural, the *-ūt*-plural, the feminine plural, the “difficult cases,” and the Aramaic *-ījā*-plural. In the end, his summary tables are useful starting points for observing the various stages in the development of the final case vowel over time. Clearly, as Streck states, one will have to push his investigations further to account for regional dialects and more precise changes over time, but this article provides a very useful starting point.

Finally, C. Wunsch traces the history of the three-tiered family name, which is found in Neo-Babylonian legal and administrative documentation, and then relates such names to other aspects of Mesopotamian society: to class (only the upper class tended to use the three-tiered family name), to location, and finally to the influx of new people into Mesopotamia during the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods. She laments the lack of an up-to-date comprehensive study of names for these periods and produces what is effectively a primer for a future comprehensive study. It is a very useful short compendium, although one hopes (and I imagine she does too) that it will soon be superseded.

The contributions here showcase not only the work of the gifted cuneiformists upon whom Oelsner obviously had much influence, but also demonstrate that, like Oelsner, these scholars are successfully embracing approaches that go beyond the texts. The book is a fitting tribute to a very influential scholar.

MICHAEL KOZUH
AUBURN UNIVERSITY

The Hellenistic Far East: Archaeology, Language, and Identity in Greek Central Asia. By RACHEL MAIRS. Berkeley and Los Angeles: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS, 2014. Pp. xvi + 231, illus. \$85.

The Hellenistic Far East—Sogdiana, Bactria, Arachosia, Gandhara, and parts of India—retains a capacity to thrill: part Silk Road, Prester John fantasy, part Great Game derring-do, which it would be a pity to scrub away entirely. But the expansion of our evidentiary base in recent decades from almost nonexistent to paper-thin—the partial excavation of Ai Khanoum and Takht-i Sangin, the East Bactria Survey, the appearance of some Achaemenid and Hellenistic administrative documents, to name the highlights—now permits analysis in the modes employed with some success for the more traditionally central regions of the Hellenistic world. In this excellent, subtle book Rachel Mairs, one of the leading English-language scholars of Central Asia and northern India in the centuries after Alexander’s conquests, effectively demonstrates the region’s integration into the Hellenistic *oikoumenē* and, even more, its particular contribution to scholarly understandings of cultural interaction, ethnic identity, and the nature and depth of the changes wrought by the Graeco-Macedonian conquest.

The book is organized into four thematic chapters, preceded by a scene-setting introduction (pp. 1–26) and followed by a conclusion (pp. 177–88) that extracts major themes and an appendix (pp.

189–93) that provides text and translation of the Greek documents discussed in the book. (A couple of the recently discovered Aramaic satrapal documents are reproduced in translation in chapter 1, the Prakrit Besnagar inscription in transliteration and translation in chapter 3.)

The first chapter, “Administering Bactria: From Achaemenid Satrapy to Graeco-Bactrian State” (pp. 27–56), explores the nature of imperial administration in the region. Mairs shapes her argument around three textual dossiers—the late Achaemenid and early Hellenistic Aramaic documents, probably from the satrapal archive at Bactra; Greek receipt *ostraca* from Ai Khanoum’s treasury; and a couple of Greek parchments from the late third- and second-century Graeco-Bactrian kingdom—that together demonstrate a bureaucratic organization resembling that of other Achaemenid satrapies or Hellenistic kingdoms. Mairs’ analysis is concerned to demonstrate a fundamental continuity across the successive imperial regimes in both the forms and techniques of imperial governance and the modes of resource exploitation.

In chapter two, “Ai Khanoum” (pp. 57–101), Mairs concentrates her discussion on this single, well-excavated Graeco-Bactrian site, aptly termed a “scholarly celebrity.” The reader is led on a guided tour of the city’s main sites and institutions, with emphasis on routes of movement, construction materials and techniques, and architectural hybridity. A key claim, to which I shall return, is that the obviously “Greek” constructions—theatre and gymnasium—are a product of Hellenistic colonization, while the buildings with apparently Near Eastern features—the palace and the main temple—derive from the official architecture of Achaemenid Bactria. Mairs suggests that the city’s architecture should be treated as evidence of a more widespread and regionally distinctive Hellenistic-Bactrian *koinē* of the built environment.

Chapter three, “Self-Representation in the Inscriptions of Sōphytos (Arachosia) and Heliodoros (India)” (pp. 102–45), explores the possibilities and limitations of individual self-fashioning in the Hellenistic Far East. Mairs sets in counter-point two splendid epigraphic texts: an acrostic epitaph in highly stylized, poetic Greek for a certain Sophytos, son of Naratos, both Indian names; and the pillar of Heliodorus, son of Dion, ambassador of the Indo-Greek king Antialcidas, inscribed with a Prakrit votive dedication. Mairs eschews close literary analysis; rather, her intention is to provide the geographic, political, and sociohistorical contexts in which these texts can be read. In doing so, she persuasively discloses the inadequacy of “Greek” and “non-Greek” as personal as well as communal hermeneutic categories for our understanding of the region’s ethnic identities.

In her book’s final chapter, “Waiting for the Barbarians: The Fall of Greek Bactria” (pp. 146–76), Mairs promises only new shades of emphasis in her retelling of Graeco-Bactrian decline, but in fact delivers as sophisticated a discussion of the archaeology and historical texture of population movement and state collapse as I have seen. The chapter contributes both methodological and historical analysis: So, there is an important discussion of the archaeological diacritica for tracing population movements; and a more focused synthesis demonstrates from the occupation history of particular sites of imperial defense to the north of the Surkhan-darya valley—Derbent, Samarkand-Afrasiab, and Koktepe—periodic attempts by the Graeco-Bactrian kings and their Seleucid predecessors to assert control in the region. Here, as elsewhere in the book, Mairs is keen to undercut the image of the “barbarian nomad,” whose coming was cataclysmic: Emphasis is placed on the region’s double morphology, the profound integration of settled and nomadic populations, the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom’s employment of Scythians as a mercenary resource, and the decisive role of intramural Graeco-Bactrian leadership disputes in the state’s decline.

The Hellenistic Far East offers a cultural and institutional rather than a political or dynastic history of Graeco-Bactria; the close study of kings’ coins, the meat of the sub-discipline since its inception, is mostly bypassed. Mairs proposes a different kind of history, privileging a long-view, regionally deep hermeneutic over comparison with the neighboring and parent Hellenistic states. This treatment of the region in its own right, recognizing its particularities and incommensurabilities, can be enlightening: See, for example, the discussion of the site of Shortughai, the remarkable Harappan settlement some twenty kilometers northeast of Ai Khanoum (pp. 29, 36–37), or the evident continuity of the highly localized modes of agricultural irrigation (pp. 37–39). Conversely, Mairs is skeptical of the value of comparing Graeco-Bactrian domestic architecture to that of Delos or Olynthos (pp. 82–83).

At the same time, a mostly implicit, in places explicit, periodization undergirds Mairs' arguments: The book proposes two key historical moments, first, the creation of Achaemenid satrapal Bactria, when for the first time the region was incorporated into a stable pan-Near Eastern imperial system of rule, and, second, the satrapy's emancipation from Seleucid rule and emergence as an autonomous regional kingdom. As a result, the Alexandrian and Seleucid empires are all but absent from the weave of Mairs' arguments.

Certainly, this can provide a persuasive historical texture, as in the discussion of administrative continuity in chapter one; but on occasion it gives pause. Take, for instance, the Mesopotamian groundplan of Ai Khanoum's temple; Mairs proposes that the form derives from earlier Achaemenid satrapal traditions in Bactria. Despite good evidence for the deliberate employment of a hybrid or international style in the Seleucid empire's new settlements, such as at Failaka/Icarus and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, Mairs' Graeco-Macedonian colonists are allowed responsibility for only the most stereotypical of Greek buildings. The book, of course, acknowledges that there is as yet no material support for this hypothesized Persian background; it can only be hoped that future research will pin things down more clearly.

That is but a minor quibble. For, overall, the book's four chapters, really, self-standing studies of discrete historical questions, are united by Mairs' respect for the *ars nesciendi*. The analysis is consistently cautious and sensitive to the dangers of overenthusiastically combining disparate and scanty evidence, whether historical and archaeological data on imperial exploitation or Chinese and classical historians on second-century population movements. Moreover, the book very successfully combines a post-colonial vocabulary and sensibility with a keen awareness of disciplinary perspectives, assumptions, and limitations. Its clarity, sophistication, and accessibility will, if I am not mistaken, make the Hellenistic Far East freshly attractive and more widely accessible.

PAUL KOSMIN
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Historical Linguistics & Biblical Hebrew: Steps toward an Integrated Approach. By ROBERT REZETKO and IAN YOUNG. Ancient Near East Monographs, vol. 9. Atlanta: SBL PRESS, 2014. Pp. xx + 699. \$89.95 (paper).

This is a formidable book. It continues the authors' previous major effort to call for a fresh investigation of the dating of the original composition of the writings of the Hebrew Bible (Young, Retzko, and Ehrensverd 2008). That two-volume work raised questions about the general consensus on this issue. The present volume continues to challenge that consensus from the perspective of historical/diachronic linguistics. The massive response to their earlier work (especially represented in print in the 2012 *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* [hereafter DBH]) indicates that it was taken seriously (see here pp. 2–3 and nn. 12–15 for a survey of the enormous response, including multiple conference sessions).

The present volume also deserves serious consideration. In it the authors have marshalled extensive historical linguistic evidence and presented it systematically. The focus of the book is on the inferior nature of the evidence in the Masoretic text (hereafter MT) for the reconstruction of the history of ancient Hebrew on the basis of current critical scholarship and textual criticism of these writings and on the use of historical linguistic methodology in such an undertaking. Their conclusion is already anticipated in the introduction, where they propose “a new perspective on the language of Biblical Hebrew (BH): not only is the linguistic dating of biblical writings unfeasible, but the distribution of linguistic data in the Masoretic Text (MT) of the Hebrew Bible suggests that EBH (Early Biblical Hebrew) and LBH (Late Biblical Hebrew) are better explained in general by a model of co-existing styles of literary Hebrew throughout the biblical period” (HLBH, p. 2).

In the first paragraph of their introduction the authors very briefly summarize the so-called “maximalist” and “minimalist” controversy that reached a high point in the 1990s (and has not subsided until today), but they make no further reference to it. One of them did edit a volume of studies (Young 2003)