temples, and let them write down the former law of Egypt until year XLIV of Pharaoh Amasis. The law of Pharaoh, temple and people let them bring here" (W. Spiegelberg, *Die sogennante demotische Chronik*, Paris, 1914, pp. 30ff.; A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, Chicago, 1948, p. 142).

When Darius was campaigning in Europe (ca. 515/13 B.C.), Aryandes sent an army under two Persians to support Pheretime, the mother of Arcesilaus, who had submitted to Cambyses and whom the Barcans had assassinated. The expedition lasted nearly a year and resulted in the subjugation of the Libyans; the Persians peneterated as far west as the Euseperides (Benghazi), and Libya was made into a Persian satrapy and named Putāya (Herodotus 4.146, 165, 167, 200ff.). Aryandes had been succeeded by Pherendates sometime before 492 (W. Spiegelberg, "Drei demotische Schreiben aus der Korrespondenz des Pherendates," *SPAW*, 1928, pp. 604ff.). According to Herodotus (4.166) "Darius had refined gold to the last perfection of purity in order to have coins struck of it; Aryandes, in his Egyptian government, did the very same with silver, so that to this day there is no such pure silver anywhere as the Aryandic. Darius, when this came to his ears, brought another charge, a charge of rebellion, against Aryandes, and put him to death." However, this seems to be a distorted tradition since no "Aryandic" silver is known (Parker, op. cit., p. 373 n. 5). J. G. Milne explained the tradition as follows ("The Silver of Aryandes," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 24, 1936, pp. 245-46): In the official coinage, the ratio of silver to gold was thirteen to one, but in Egypt gold bullion had a far higher value; by melting down gold coins (darics) and selling them as bullion, Aryandes made a huge profit. But in so doing, he committed the "treason" of destroying the royal figure borne on the coins, and was accordingly punished by death.

Bibliography: Given in the text.

(A. SH. SHAHBAZI)

ARYANS. *Definition of the term "Aryan."* The name "Aryan" (OInd. *árya-*, Ir. **arya-* [with short *a-*], in Old Pers. *ariya-*, Av. *airiia-*, etc.) is the self-designation of the peoples of Ancient India and Ancient Iran who spoke Aryan languages, in contrast to the "non-Aryan" peoples of those "Aryan" countries (cf. OInd. *an-árya-*, Av. *an-airiia-*, etc.), and lives on in ethnic names like *Alan* (Lat. *Alani*), NPers. *Īrān*, Oss. *Ir* and *Iron*. "Aryan" is thus basically a linguistic concept, denoting the closely related Indo-Aryan and Iranian languages (including Nūrestānī), which together form the Indo-Iranian or Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family, sharing a linguistic and cultural development separate from the other IE. tribes. The use of the name "Aryan," in vogue especially in the 19th century, as a designation of the entire Indo-European language family was based on the erroneous assumption that Sanskrit was the oldest IE. language, and the untenable view (primarily propagated by Adolphe Pictet) that the names of Ireland and the Irishmen were etymologically related to "Aryan." (For the Iranian attestations of the word, see H. W. Bailey on Arya above. For the etymological problems see also H. Siegert, "Zur Geschichte der Begriffe 'Arier' und 'arisch'," *Wörter und Sachen* 22, N.F. 4, 1941/42, pp. 73-99. M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* I, Heidelberg, 1956, pp. 49, 52, 79; III, Heidelberg, 1976, pp. 623, 633f.)

The Aryan parent language. The common ancestor of the historical Aryan or Indo-Iranian languages, called the Aryan parent language or Proto-Aryan, can be reconstructed by the methods of historical-comparative linguistics. The Indian group or Indo-Aryan (especially Vedic, the language of the Vedas), Avestan, and Old Persian show some remarkable correspondences, especially in the religious language (one could translate whole Av. sentences word by word according to the phonetic laws into correct Vedic). By comparison of the (Old) Indo-Aryan with the (Old) Iranian languages a Proto-Aryan language can be reconstructed, which must be counted as the most archaic of all IE. languages.

A number of exclusive innovations separate Indo-Aryan and Iranian from the other IE. language, e.g., (1) the merger of IE. $*a,e,o$ and $*\bar{a},\bar{e},\bar{o}$ into Indo-Ir. $*a$ and $*\bar{a}$ respectively (also in the diphthongs), (2) the development of IE. $*\partial$ into Indo-Ir. $*i$, (3) the change of IE. $*s$ after $*i,u,r,k$ into Indo-Ir. $*\check{s}$ (Ir. $*\check{s}$, OInd. $\dot{s}$), (4) the gen. plur. ending $*-n\bar{a}m$ in the vocalic stem classes, etc. In addition there are important correspondences in the vocabulary, especially in the field of religion and mythology, including morphological elements, such as suffixes and stem-formations, and phraseology. (See Chr. Bartholomae, "Vorgeschichte der iranischen Sprachen," in Geiger and Kuhn, *Grundr. Ir. Phil.* I/1, 1895-1901, pp. 1-151. A. Erhart, *Struktura indoiránských jazyků* [The structure of the Indo-Ir. languages] Brno, 1980.)

The Aryans in prehistoric times: their coming to India and Iran. The linguistic history and the history of their religion and culture indicate that the Aryans (Indo-Iranians) must originally have formed one single people. Only about the beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C. did their unity split up, when Indo-Aryans and Iranians went separate ways.

The first appearance of Aryans in history is about the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C. in the Hurrian empire of Mittani (in northern Mesopotamia), where Indo-Aryans at that time at least formed the aristocratic dynasty. It seems that individual groups of Indo-Aryans instead of going eastward to India came via Iran to the Fertile Crescent together with the Hurrians, to whom they soon became assimilated as to language and culture. Thus traces of their language have survived only in a few male personal names (royal names like *Artatama, Tušratta, Šattiwaza*), names of gods, and appellatives containing technical terms of horse-training. These are attested in cuneiform records of the 15th/14th, and perhaps even 13th centuries B.C. from the empire of Mittani and from later Syro-Palestinian states influenced

by it politically and/or culturally. (See most recently M. Mayrhofer, "Welches Material aus dem Indo-Arischen von Mitanni verbleibt für eine selektive Darstellung?" *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, Wiesbaden, 1982, pp. 72-90; idem, "The Earliest Linguistic Traces of Aryans outside India and Iran," *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute* 50, 1983, pp. 87-95).

The presence of Indo-Aryans in the Near East by no means proves the theory that the later Indo-Aryans of India migrated through those extremely western countries. Even less probable is the theory held previously by P. Kretschmer and recently by O. N. Trubachov that Indo-Aryan tribes once settled on the Black Sea shore, since their arguments are based upon the unreliable and speculative etymologies of a variety of names.

Also about the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C., the first Indo-Aryans seem to have penetrated into northwest India (the Panjab and adjacent regions) across the passes of the Hindu Kush mountains, from where they spread further after defeating hostile groups of peoples named Dāsa or Dasyu in Vedic texts. There is no evidence, documentary or archeological, of their routes to the Indian subcontinent and their earlier habitat, but we may assume that they came in several waves of immigrants, who spoke slightly different dialects. Thus the earliest groups may still have distinguished between *r* and *l* (from IE. *r and *l), whereas the dialects of the later groups of Indo-Aryans share with (most of) the Iranians the coalescence of *r* and *l* into *r*.

Most scholars consider Central Asia, i.e., roughly the Eastern Iranian steppes of ancient Sogdiana, Chorasmia, and Bactria and the adjacent area to the north of them (between the lower Volga and Kazakhstan) as the original habitat of the nomadic Proto-Aryans. Two important facts speak for this theory: (1) In contrast to other Iranian territories, there seem to be no reliable traces of a non-Aryan, i.e., a pre-Aryan population in that region, (2) several East-Ir. geographical names attested both in Avestan and Old Persian texts are also found in Old Indo-Aryan sources, e.g., Av. *Harōiuua-*, Old Pers. *Haraiva-* "Areia," cf. OInd. *Sarāyu-*, name of a river; Av. *Harax̌aitī-*, Old Pers. *Harauvati-* "Arachosia," cf. OInd. *Sárasvatī-*, name of a river, etc. Theories concerning still earlier times are based on too scanty evidence and need not detain us here.

The Indo-Aryans seem to have left the Proto-Aryan homeland about 2000 B.C.; according to R. Ghirshman they went in two groups: the first reached Northern Mesopotamia, the other passed between the Karakum Desert and the great Central Desert, the Dašt-e Kavīr, over Koppa Dāğ into Northern Afghanistan, and over the Hindu Kush into India.

The immigration of the Iranian tribes into the Iranian plateau and the adjacent areas must be dated considerably later than that of the Indo-Aryans, according to the common opinion. The scanty historical evidence and archeological remains suggest that it took place through a succession of numerous (groups of) tribes, each tribe speaking its own variety of the Iranian language. The

earliest groups contained the "Western" Iranians (Medes and Persians), whose migration is generally placed at the end of the 2nd millennium B.C. (11th or even 10th cent.). However, their exact routes are very hard to establish. There are two possibilities: (1) They went north of the Caspian Sea, crossed the Caucasus and the Armenian Highlands and then went southeast; (2) they came directly from the steppes in the north or northeast, crossed the Dašt-e Kavīr, to be brought to a halt only by the Zagros mountains. Last apparently came the "Eastern" Iranians, who in historical times were settled in the region extending from Margiana and Bactria to Arachosia and Balūcestān.

The Medes are for the first time attested in 836 B.C. in an Assyrian inscription of King Salmanasar III (who fought against the *Matai*). They must have settled in Central Iran, especially in the region around Hamadān, where several archeological sites like Godīn Tepe, Bābā Jān Tepe, Tepe Nūš-e Jān and Tepe Sialk preserve evidence about them. The Persians are first attested some years earlier (843 B.C., which is the date of the first definite evidence for Iranian settlement in Iran proper), under the name *Parsuaš* (Iranian *$Pārsva-$). They apparently have to be located to the south and west of Lake Urmia. For the following two centuries one then finds a succession of reflexes of the name-forms *$Pārsva-$ and *Pārsa-*, which is stepped chronologically as well as locally: Under the Assyrian King Tiglath-pileser III the *Parsuaš* region is probably to be sought more to the southeast, in the central Zagros, and under Sanherib (691 B.C.) they are allies of the Elamites and to be located near the Baktīārī mountains. In 639 B.C. Assurbanipal destroyed the Elamite kingdom and marched against Cyrus I, who, we are told, ruled over both *Parsumaš* and *Anšan* (i.e., Tall-e Malīān, which means that by then the Persians had almost reached their historical home in Fārs.)

Unless we have to reckon with several tribes of the same name, this evidence can be interpreted as reflecting the Persians' movement from northwest Iran to their final home, thus providing the main argument for a northwestern invasion route. The arguments in favor of a northeastern (or easterly) invasion route, on the other hand, directly from the steppes, with the flat open country of northeast Iran as a natural gateway for nomadic invaders, are (1) similar migrations in later times, (2) the ceramic evidence (e.g., T. Cuyler Young, Jr.; see bibliography), (3) the linguistic affinities between Old Persian (which is a Southwest-Iranian language in the traditional view) and the Northeast-Iranian Sogdian language. The main objection to this hypothesis is that the archeological evidence would then imply that the Eastern Iranians in Central Asia originally came from the Iranian plateau in the west!

Further theories about these various prehistoric migrations must remain guesswork. They may, e.g., have taken the shape of infiltrations of smaller groups or real mass movements. Several archeological cultures in the Central Asiatic steppes, which have been thoroughly investigated by Soviet archeologists in the last decades

(especially the Andronovo culture), may be of Indo-European peoples. However, whether the Andronovo culture or any others are connected with the Proto-Aryans or the Proto-Iranians (or some specific Iranian tribe) can not yet be determined.

Aryan culture and religion. The linguistic similarities between the Old Iranian texts, particularly the Zarath-ushtrian *Gāθās* (the oldest part of the Avesta), and the Old Indian Veda (especially its oldest part, the Rigveda or Ṛgvedasaṃhitā, are quite striking and much closer than those between any other two Old Indo-European languages. These similarities concern not only pho-nology, morphology, and single words, but also com-pounds and entire phrases (cf. e.g., Vedic *uttānáhasta-mánasā* [Rigveda 6.16.46 etc.] = Gathic Av. *nəamŋhā ustānazasta-* [*Y.* 28.1] "with hands outstretched in reverence;" Vedic *hrdā́ mánasā* [Rigveda 1.61.2 etc.] = Gathic Av. *zərədāčā manaŋhāčā* [*Y.* 31.12] "with heart and mind"). It has rightly been stressed that such correspondences in idiomatic phrases bear testimony to not only linguistic affinity, but also spiritual and cultural community. In particular B. Schlerath has demonstrated how Vedic and Avestan when compared are able to illuminate each other, thus e.g., in his studies on OInd. *kṣatrá-*, Av. *xšaθra-*, Old Pers. *xšaça-* "rule, reign, sovereignty" (*Das Königtum im Rig- und Athar-vaveda*, Wiesbaden, 1960, pp. 128-31) and OInd. *ásu-* Av. *ahu-* "life" ("Altindisch *asu-*, awestisch *ahu-* und ähnlich klingende Wörter," *Pratidānam. Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to F. B. J. Kuiper,* The Hague and Paris, 1968, pp. 142-53, especially pp. 152f.). The common elements of the Vedic and Avestan poetic phraseology inherited from Proto-Aryan are most systematically collected in B. Schlerath, *Awesta-Wörterbuch. Vorarbeiten* II: *Konkordanz,* Wiesbaden, 1968, pp. 148-64 (to be supplemented by J. Duchesne-Guillemin, "L'étude de l'iranien ancien au vingtième siècle," *Kratylos* 7, 1962, pp. 1-44, especially pp. 33-36; É. Benveniste, "Phraséologie poétique de l'indo-iranien," *Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou,* Paris, 1968, pp. 73-79).

Both the Indo-Aryans and the Iranians are rather conservative peoples, which means that a good number of their original common beliefs and customs lived on into historical times, perhaps more in Iran than in India, since the geographical and climatic conditions of the regions inhabited by the Iranians on the whole were more similar to those of the Proto-Aryan habitat. This homogeneity of the two Aryan peoples is seen most clearly in matters of religion, mythology, and cult, and is still reflected in their oldest and most archaic texts, though religious reforms, mainly that of Zarathushtra, have caused more or less important changes. This is the case of Indo-Ir. **daiva-*, which has preserved its original meaning "god" in OInd. *devá-*, but has become "demon" in Iranian (Av. *daēuua-*, Old Pers. *daiva-*).

To the common, inherited traditions of the Indo-Aryans and Iranians belongs the common political, social, economic, and religious terminology, which is almost exclusive to these languages. Suffice it to men-

tion OInd. *kṣatrá-*, Av. *xšaθra-*, Old Pers. *xšaça-* "rule, reign, sovereignty;" OInd. *sénā-*, Av. *haēnā-*, Old Pers. *hainā-* "(hostile) army;" OInd. *kṣétra-* "landed pro-perty, soil," Av. *šōiθra-* "homestead," and the charac-teristic tripartite classification of human society into three groups, as in OInd. *brāhmaṇá-* "priest," *kṣatriya-* "warrior," and *vaiśya-* "clansman;" Gathic Av. *zaotar-* "priest," *nar-* "man, warrior," and *vāstar-* "pasturer," but Young Av. *āθrauuan-/aθaurun-* "priest," *raθaēštā-* "warrior," and *vāstriia- fšuiiaṇt-* "fattening pasturer" (cf. especially É. Benveniste, "Traditions indo-iraniennes sur les classes sociales," *JA* 230, 1938, pp. 529-49).

Since most of the sources available to us are religious texts, their common religious terminology (in the widest sense of the word) is what is best known of the Old Aryan languages. This common heritage is reflected, among other things, in the names of abstract concepts, such as the leading religio-philosophical concept of Indo-Ir. **ṛta-*, Vedic *ṛtá-*, Av. *aša-*, Old Pers. *ṛta-* "truth, rightness, divine order based on truth;" or cult terms, such as Vedic *yajñá-*, Av. *yasna-* "sacrifice" (Indo-Ir. **yazna-*, Vedic *mántra-*, Av. *maṇθra-* "priestly utter-ance" (literally: instrument of thought, i.e., formulated meditation, Indo-Ir. **mantra-*), or the priestly titles Vedic *hótar-*, Av. *zaotar-* (Indo-Ir. **zhautar-*) and Vedic *átharvan-*, Av. *āθrauuan-/aθaurun-*. To the Proto-Aryan pantheon there belonged gods of various charac-ter, some who symbolized aspects of nature or natural forces (like sun, moon, water, fire, wind, etc.), and some who were personified or deified abstract ideas (like Vedic *Mitrá-*, Av. *Miθra-*, Indo-Ir. **Mitra-* "god Treaty," derived from the Indo-Ir. appelative **mitra-* "pact, treaty"). Cultic gods are, e.g., the Fire (Vedic *Agni-*, but Av. *Ātar-*) and the Indo-Ir. **Sauma-*, Vedic *Sóma-*, Av. *Haoma-*, originally a plant from which an intoxicating drink was pressed. Both Fire and Soma (etc.) play important parts in the sacrifice and symbolize aspects of the sacrifice itself. Also inherited from Proto-Aryan is the mythological First Man, Yama, son of Vivasvant (Vedic *Yamá-*, son of *Vivásvant-*; Av. *Yima-*, son of *Vīuuaṇ'haṇt-*), who reigns in the realm of the dead. The close relationship between the oldest Indo-Aryan and Iranian languages and literatures finally entails methodological consequences. In fact, Proto-Aryan religious terms and ideas can not be reconstruc-ted by simply projecting only Vedic data into the Proto-Aryan period; they also have to be confronted with the Avestan evidence (cf. most importantly P. Thieme, "The 'Aryan' Gods of the Mitanni Treaties," *JAOS* 80, 1960, pp. 301-17; and T. Burrow, "The Proto-Indoaryans," *JRAS*, 1973, pp. 123-40).

It can not be doubted that the Aryans possessed a poetic tradition (mainly religious poetry cultivated by the priests themselves) and a poetic language, of which fixed formulas and metrical patterns survived in Vedic and Iranian literature. As a matter of fact, both the Veda and the Avesta themselves contain allusions to earlier hymns and singers, such as references to the pride of a singer to have made a song "as never before," Vedic

āpūrvyam, Av. *apaourvīm* "without a previous one, i.e., without precedent." The evidence indicates that there were songs of praise with shorter, basically octosyllabic verses, beside recitative gnomic poetry with basically hendecasyllabic verses already in Proto-Aryan times. However, to what extent mythological themes and motives (as, e.g., the Yama legend) originate from that period, remains an open question.

See also Arya; Indo-Iranian Languages.

Bibliography: K. Jettmar, "Zur Wanderungs-geschichte der Iranier," *Die Wiener Schule der Völkerkunde/The Vienna School of Ethnology*, Horn-Wien, 1956, pp. 327-48. T. Cuyler Young, Jr., "The Iranian Migration into the Zagros," *Iran* 5, 1967, pp. 11-34. D. Stronach, "Achaemenid Village I at Susa and the Persian Migration to Fars," *Iraq* 36, 1974, pp. 239-48. R. Ghirshman, *L'Iran et la migration des Indo-aryens et des Iraniens*, Leiden, 1977. I. V. P'yankov, "K voprosu o putyakh proniknoveni-ya iranoyazychnykh plemyon v Perednyuyu Aziyu (On the problem of the ways of penetration of Iranian tribes into western Asia)," *Peredneaziskiĭ sbornik* III, Moscow, 1979, pp. 193-207. *Ètnicheskiye problemy istorii Tsentral'noĭ Azii v drevnosti (II tysyach-eletiye do n.è.)/Ethnic Problems of the History of Central Asia in the Early Period (Second Millennium B.C.)*, Moscow, 1981 (contains a number of important relevant articles by linguists and archeologists, inter al. by M. S. Asimov, B. G. Gafurov, V. I. Abaev, E. E. Kuz'mina, B. A. Litvinskiĭ, È. A. Grantovskiĭ, B. and F. R. Allchin). For systematic, though outdated, treatment of the culture and home-land of the Proto-Aryans see F. Spiegel, *Die arische Periode und ihre Zustände*, Leipzig, 1887, Also still useful are W. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur im Alter-tum*, Erlangen, 1882, and O. Schrader, "Aryan Religion," in J. Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* II, 1909, pp. 11-57.

(R. SCHMITT)

'ARŽ, DĪVĀN(-E), the department of the adminis-tration which, in the successor states to the 'Abbasid caliphate in the Islamic East, looked after military affairs, such as the recruitment and discharge of sol-diers, their pay allotments, their training in the military and equestrian skills, the procurement of arms and mounts, the periodic inspection of the troops' weapons and their preparedness or otherwise for battle (the specific meaning of the term *'arž*), etc. The institution of the 'arž or inspection of the army (Arabic *'araḍa* "lay open, reveal to view") must be distinguished from the parallel use of *'arž* in the Islamic East in the sense of "presentation of a request, petition," synonymous with *'arž-e ḥāl*, a procedure which appears at various times, and especially in the post-Saljuq period, at various Iranian and Indo-Muslim courts.

The military *'arž* (the form *este'rāž* is also found) must have its roots in the pre-Islamic past of Iran, very probably in the time of the Sasanians and perhaps in those of the Arsacids and Achaemenids. The early

Islamic writers Dīnawarī and Ṭabarī (qq.v.) both give what purport to be accounts of the Sasanian *'arž* procedure, with armored cavalrymen who formed the backbone of the army filing past the inspecting official, who scrutinized their mounts, their personal equipment and weapons; even the emperor himself was not exempt from this rigorous parade of inspection (see Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser*, pp. 247-49; Nöldeke was probably unduly sceptical about the authenticity of this information).

In the early 'Abbasid caliphate, it was the *dīvān al-jayš* "department of the army" which regulated military affairs and which became increasingly complex and far-ranging in its operations as the caliphs came to depend on professional and mercenary troops instead of, as earlier, tribal levies. At the 'Abbasid *'arž*, the caliph or his representative the vizier acted as *'ārež* or inspecting officer. We possess, for instance, an account from Helāl al-Ṣābī of an *'arž* at Baghdad by the caliph al-Mo'tažed and his minister 'Obaydallāh b. Solaymān b. Wahb in 280/893, in which the soldiers had to undergo practical weapon training tests; cf. W. Hoernerbach, "Zur Heeres-verwaltung der 'Abbāsiden. Studie über Abulfarağ Qudāma: Dīwān al-ğaiš," *Der Islam* 29, 1949/50, pp. 257-90, and H. Busse, "Das Hofbudget des Chalifen al-Mu'taḍid billāh (279/892-289/902)," *Der Islam* 43, 1967, pp. 17-20.

As with many other administrative organs and procedures, the autonomous and then independent states which arose in Iran from the 3rd/9th century onwards modeled their military infrastructures and their inspection patterns on those of the 'Abbasids. Since the basis of these states was essentially military, we note the appearance in many of them of an official—in the cases of such Turkish-dominated states as those of the Ghaznavids and Saljuqs, usually a civilian member of the Iranian bureaucracy—with the specific title of *'ārež*. This functionary usually enjoyed a very close relationship with and easy access to the ruler; this intimacy emerges from the *mojalladāt* or official memoirs of the Ghaznavid chancery official Abu'l-Fažl Bayhaqī (q.v.), in which the author's personal enemy, the *'ārež* Abū Sahl Zawzanī, is portrayed as in many ways the evil genius of Sultan Mas'ūd (see M. R. Waldman, *Toward a Theory of Historical Narrative. A Case Study in Perso-Islamicate Historiography*, Columbus, Ohio, 1980, pp. 92, 96-97).

A department of military affairs under its *'ārež* is mentioned as having been set up by the Saffarid adventurer Ya'qūb b. Layt when he carved out his vast if transient military empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran in the second half of the 3rd/9th century. Inspec-tions, *'orūž*, were combined with pay parades, and we find again the Sasanian topos of the emir himself having to submit himself for inspection before the *'ārež* when Ebn Kallekān describes how 'Amr b. Layt would step forward for scrutiny on these occasions (see C. E. Bosworth, "The Armies of the Ṣaffārids," *BSOAS* 31, 1968, pp. 544, 549-51 = *The Medieval History of Iran, Afghanistan and Central Asia*, London, 1977, no. XVII).