



**HAL**  
open science

review of: **Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst 2004:**  
**Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian**  
**[Corpus Fontum Manichaeorum: Dictionary of**  
**Manichaean Texts III: Texts from Central Asia and**  
**China 1]. Turnhout: Brepols**

Agnes Korn

► **To cite this version:**

Agnes Korn. review of: Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian [Corpus Fontum Manichaeorum: Dictionary of Manichaean Texts III: Texts from Central Asia and China 1]. Turnhout: Brepols. *Orientalia Suecana*, 2005, 54, pp.206-212. hal-01340887v2

**HAL Id: hal-01340887**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01340887v2>**

Submitted on 24 Nov 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# ORIENTALIA SUECANA

An International Journal of  
Indological, Iranian, Semitic and Turkic Studies

VOL. LIV (2005)

Edited by  
GUNILLA GREN-EKLUND

in co-operation with  
BO ISAKSSON  
LARS JOHANSON  
BO UTAS

UPPSALA  
SWEDEN

and *Phl Rivāyat*) one can observe that when it is used alone without *be* it frequently expresses location, i. e. 'at, on' (Josephson, "The Construction *be* *ō* in Middle Persian" in <sup>GIS HUR</sup> *gul-za-at-ta-ra*, a *Festschrift for Folke Josephson*, Göteborg 2006). In choosing the verb *paywastan* to illustrate the function of *ō* the Phl redactor may be expressing this complicated situation.

In conclusion, the author has proved that he has an excellent grasp of a very difficult subject. He has demonstrated that the Phl translations have existed since the beginning of the Sasanian period, if not earlier, and have been tradited in both written and oral form. He has proven that the language of the oldest of our now extant translations goes back to the late Sasanian period. He has shown that they testify to an ancient tradition of philological and grammatical study with extensive knowledge of the morphology of the Avesta. All in all with the publication of this study the state of the art in Phl translation studies has been brought to a higher level.

Judith Josephson  
Gothenburg

Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Subsidia: Dictionary of Manichaean Texts III: Texts from Central Asia and China 1). Turnhout: Brepols 2004. Pp. xxix, 428.

The work under discussion has been written as part of the project *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. This project, which was first directed by Samuel Lieu at Macquarie University, Australia, and subsequently based at the Ancient India and Iran Trust in Cambridge / UK and directed by Nicholas Sims-Williams, aims to further the understanding of the Manichaean texts and facilitate the study of these "by providing a linguistic key to the complete corpus of Manichaean material" (<http://www.soas.ac.uk/departments/departmentinfo.cfm?navid=324>). So far, the project has resulted in a dictionary of Manichaean texts and citations in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin (Lieu et al. 1999). A Dictionary for the Manichaean Sogdian texts will follow soon.

The book under review is a dictionary for the published Manichaean literature in the Western Iranian languages of the Middle Iranian period (WMIr.), i.e. the Middle Persian (MP) and Parthian (Pa) literature. It consists of an introduction explaining the approach and aim of the work and the structure of the entries (pp. vii–xii), a list of abbreviations (pp. xiii–xvii), a bibliography (pp. xviii–xxix), the main section (pp. 1–388) and an English-WMIr. index (pp. 389–427).

The main section contains all words found in published WMIr. Manichaean texts. The lemmata (in Roman transliteration of the Manichaean script) are accompanied by transcription, English translation, notes as to whether the word is MP or Parthian or both, references to literature with discussions of the word and a list of the pertinent word forms with references to their attestations. As will be evident from the comments below, this book does not only lay an entirely new foundation for the study of WMIr. Manichaean texts. The data presented also open new opportunities for investigation in the whole field of Middle Persian and Parthian, and mark a major step forward in the study of Manichaean literature on the one hand and Iranian studies on the other. I take the opportunity to add a few marginal notes on some minor points; these are in no way meant to create the impression of intending to reduce the value of Durkin-Meisterernst's impressive achievement.

Until the publication of the present book, the glossary by Mary Boyce was the first and only dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian (MPM) and Parthian. This work (Boyce 1977), modestly entitled *Word-List*, is mainly intended to serve the immediate needs of students and teachers, and was written as a companion to the texts assembled in the *Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* by the same author (Boyce 1975). In order to keep the glossary

concise, Boyce omits many rare and unclear words and refrains from adding notes, references etc. Until now, those who wanted more information had to find their own way through the rather technical Iranological literature, digging MP and Pa word forms and discussion of these from text editions and a long list of specialised articles.

While the dictionary evidently owes a lot to Boyce 1977 (cf. also the author's note on p. xi), it is much broader in scope. A comparison of the two works immediately reveals the enormous increase in readily available information and the equally impressive progress made in the lexicography and philology of WM Iranian and to a certain degree also in the fields of morphology and syntax.

First, the dictionary lists **all** words occurring in hitherto published WM Iranian texts insofar as they are reasonably readable, including rare words and words the reading and/or meaning of which is somewhat unclear. This comprehensiveness is not only immensely useful for anyone studying WM Iranian texts, it also amounts to a significant increase in the knowledge of the WM Iranian lexicon. This might seem less important for Middle Persian since besides MPM, there is the vast Middle Persian Zoroastrian (MPZ) literature which constitutes an important source for MP words, and further items can be inferred from Old and New Persian. (Note, however, that the dictionaries available for MPZ, Nyberg 1974 and MacKenzie 1986, are again very concise.) No corresponding sources exist for Parthian, so the present dictionary advances the lexicography of Parthian by a remarkable degree. Every time one opens the dictionary, one will find some Pa words the existence and form of which have so far been unknown to most since they are not found in Boyce 1977, e.g. (to cite but a small handful of examples picked at random) *hwg* "pig", *jxm*, *jhm* "wound", *mwjd* "wages", *pcg* "cook (noun)", *pwrt* "bridge", *wl* "salty". Another convenience for the reader is that the dictionary includes names, titles etc. from languages other than MP and Parthian (chiefly of Turkic, Indic and Sogdian origin) which are found in the WM Iranian texts.

The many cross-references will likewise be much appreciated; they save a considerable amount of trouble and time as they point the user, confronted with a particular spelling variant, to the main entry. They are admirably complete; so far, I have not come across a single instance of a missing note, where one might have wanted a cross-reference.

Conversely, the author does not note words which are only preserved partially and ghost-words. For instance, one will not find an entry Pa 'y'g "place" quoted by Bailey 1979: 19b; it had been assumed to be present in the fragment M 104 R 12, but the word here is the usual Pa word *wy'g* (Andreas/Henning 1934: 882). Similarly, *ryšt* noted in Boyce 1954: 126 is not found under *t*, as this reading is supplanted by *ryšt* (for which cf. p. 304).

The English-WM Iranian index, which is the first glossary into WM Iranian apart from the English-MPZ list in MacKenzie 1986: 101–141, considerably contributes to making the lexical material accessible and will certainly be much used by readers.

Second, while Boyce 1977 usually gives only the stems, the dictionary lists all word forms attested for every lemma, and for every word form all passages in which it is found in published texts (quoting the number and line of the fragments). This will be a welcome help for all users dealing with a specific text, since there are a number of word forms which are written identically, and the dictionary helps to identify the word form occurring at a specific location according to Durkin-Meisterernst's analysis and the text editions he quotes. The data also permit morphological analyses (for instance, based on observations as to what kinds of forms are actually attested from which sorts of verbs) or syntactical investigations (e.g. starting from the lists of occurrences of conjunctions).

Durkin-Meisterernst has also made every effort to note which words and word forms are MP and which are Parthian; in the many instances of a word having the same form in MP and in Parthian, he consistently and conscientiously notes which word form in which attestation is MP and which is Parthian. This allows the reader to assess the relative frequency of MP and Pa word forms, which may lead to interesting conclusions. Although one should be cautious about using these numbers for statistical purposes, since many words are attested in a very small number of cases, these data are very relevant.

Thirdly, many entries include references to literature relevant for the WMlr. word, or short comments by Durkin-Meisterernst himself. Together with the references to the text editions quoted for the individual word forms, they constitute another treasure trove of information which was not previously available in collected form and provides a key to relevant treatments of the WMlr. lemmata. Checking the references, which admittedly requires a well-stocked library, will open up windows on discussions of various kinds, ranging from questions concerning the identification of the form and/or meaning of a given word to its grammatical features and history. For instance, there is a note in the entry *'spyxt* "bright" (p. 88) referring to Sundermann 1979: 99, which teaches the reader about the function of the word as a title and as a translation of a Syriac epitheton for Jesus ("the splendour") and points the reader to a discussion of the meaning, morphology and etymology of the word by Henning 1947: 46–47.

The entry MP *wnyr-* "to be arranged; prosper" (p. 344) presents a short survey of previous treatments of the word (e.g. the interpretation of the word as *winīr-* "zum Heil über jem. kommen" by Andreas/Henning 1934: 193 n. 4 and its revision by Henning 1954: 175 n. 1 as "to remain permanently, stay"); this allows readers to check for themselves the complexities involved here and to evaluate whether they would prefer the interpretation by Weber 1970: 73–76 (reading *winnīr-*) or the transcriptions *win(n)er-* (thus also Boyce 1977: 92) and *win(n)ēr-* suggested by Durkin-Meisterernst, obviously not following the assumption by Henning 1934: 206 and Weber that the verb derives from a preform with suffix *-ya-*.

Needless to say, the present book is by no means intended as an etymological dictionary of Middle Persian and Parthian, neither are the references meant to be systematic. However, the material offered does present a wealth of information relevant for etymological studies. Considering the fact that there is no etymological dictionary of Parthian and that the published etymological dictionaries of Persian are either seriously outdated (Horn 1893 for New Persian, Nyberg 1974 for MP, based on studies undertaken in the first half of the century) or incomplete (Ḥasandūst 2004 so far only treating *a-t* of the Arabic alphabet), the value of this collection cannot be underestimated.

Semitic loanwords are usually identified as such (e.g. *k'lyd* "shape", p. 201) while for Indic loanwords, the discussion in Sims-Williams 1983 is quoted (cf. e.g. *s'rt* "caravan", p. 306).

As mentioned above, the entries are accompanied by a transcription converting the transliteration of the Manichaean script into what may have been the pronunciation of the WMlr. words. The system of transcription is the same as in Boyce 1977, i.e. *b, d, and g* in postvocalic position are transcribed */b/, /d/, /g/*, respectively, where they derive from Old Ir. *p, t, k* and */β/, /δ/, /γ/* when they go back to OIr. *b, d, g*, though the difference is not marked in the Manichaean script for reasons of the inventory of graphemes used. Although it is not clear how long this difference was preserved, it is surely better to note it in order not to lose potentially relevant information. Durkin-Meisterernst likewise follows Boyce in transcribing those cases of MPM and Pa *y* and *w* as */e/* and */o/*, respectively (as suggested by MacKenzie 1967: 23–25), which go back to Old Ir. *a, e*, e.g. MPM *byn-* */benn-/* "bind", the suffix MPM, Pa *-yst'n* */-estān/* "-place", *frwx* */farrox/* "fortunate", *-wm* */-om/* (suffix of the ordinal numbers).

The transcription of the individual words is also largely based on the works of Boyce, in many cases deriving from published and unpublished opinions of Walter B. Henning. It will be appreciated that in a number of cases, and obviously for all words not transcribed by Boyce, Henning or Ghilain 1939, Durkin-Meisterernst presents his own reading or suggests alternative possibilities, e.g. Pa *pwrt* "bridge" (p. 287) transcribed "*/purt/, /purd/*?" and *ywg* "yoke" */yōg/* (in both cases, no transcription was offered previously). MP *my'n* "among, in the middle of" is transcribed */mayyān/, /mayān/* (p. 235, vs. Boyce 1977: 59 */mayān/*), the first rendering fitting the etymology particularly well since a stage *mayyān* seems to be indeed implied in the derivation of NP *mīyān* from OIr. *\*madyāna-* (Av. *maiḍiāna-*, OInd. *mād<sup>h</sup>ya-* "middle"). Ad *myr-* "die", the alternative of reading Pa */mir-/* is noted (p. 236, so far read */mīr-/* for both MP and Pa), *-i-* appearing quite possible for Parthian with regard to the short vowels in neigh-

bouring languages (Sogd. *myr-*, Balochi *mīr-*). Similarly, the reading /*kōš-*/ which is offered besides /*kuš-*/ (this variant being the one hitherto generally assumed) for MP *kwš-* “kill” (p. 215) opens the interesting possibility that this verb and /*kōš-*/ “struggle” might be (or at least derive from) one word, i.e. /*kōš-*/, past stem /*kušt*/ “struggle, fight, kill” (note that there is no past stem of MPM /*kōš-*/ “struggle”); this paradigm would then have split into (MPZ, NP) /*kōš-*, *kōšīd*/ “struggle” and /*kuš-*, *kušt*/ “kill”. For Pa *xwj* “pleasant, good” (p. 368), there is an alternative /*xuž*/ in addition to /*xōž*/ also noted in Boyce 1977: 100; the former would seem to match the etymology suggested by Sims-Williams 2000: 232–233 (PIE \**suǵh<sup>h</sup>-su-*) better than the latter. On the other hand, the alternative /*guxn*/ given for Pa *gwxn* “blood” (p. 168) seems somewhat less likely than the transcription /*goxan*/ assumed otherwise (which is also noted) if the etymology suggested by Schwartz 1982 is correct.

In passing, Durkin-Meisterernst corrects errors in previous works, e.g. Pa *fr'x* /*frāx*/ “broad, wide spacious” (p. 154) which is transcribed /*ffarrāx*/ in Boyce 1977: 39, surely induced by the very common word Pa, MP *frwx* /*farrox*/ “fortunate”; Pa *šwryn* “salty” (p. 320) which Boyce 1977: 85 transcribes /*šūrēn*/ while NP and other Ir. languages show that it is /*šōrēn*/; the existence of Pa /*kwš-*/ “strive, struggle” noted by Ghilain 1939 and Boyce 1977 seems rather questionable (p. 215).

Unlike Boyce 1977, Ghilain 1939 and MacKenzie 1986, the dictionary does not give a transcription of the past stems of MP and Pa verbs. In many instances, this can indeed be inferred from the present stem, but in a certain percentage of instances this is not the case. Owing to the ambiguities of the Manichaean script, a word like *ryxt* “poured” could theoretically be read /*rīxt*/, /*rīxt*/, /*rēxt*/ or /*raīxt*/; morphological considerations limit the choice to /*rīxt*/ and /*rēxt*/. The question of which alternative is to be assumed for MP and Parthian is relevant because it would be interesting to know whether MP and Parthian preserved an alternation of present stem /*ē*/ vs. past stem /*i*/ as known from Old Iranian, or whether this alternation had been regularised. For MP, the evidence of MPZ *ryxt*, which in the Pahlavi script implies a long vowel, and of New Persian *rēxt* strongly suggests the reading MPM *rēxt*, but the Pa verb need not have been identical to the MP one. As Balochi has (inter alia) *rīxt*, and since it does not seem likely that such a past stem might have arisen analogically, it is possible that Parthian may have had the form presumably found in the closely related dialect of (unattested) Middle Balochi. So it is a pity that Durkin-Meisterernst does not offer his opinion on whether he would rather follow Boyce 1977: 80 who assumes /*rēxt*/ for both MP and Parthian, or Ghilain 1939: 94 who reads Pa /*rīxt*/.

As noted above, the dictionary is based on the published WMir. texts (the chief part of which consists of the books published in the series *Berliner Turfantexte* plus a number of important articles by various authors, chiefly those by Henning). This statement requires modification in that the dictionary reflects Durkin-Meisterernst’s reading of these texts, which at a number of points differs from previous editions. The differences are usually explained by a note in the entry, so the basic study of a particular text will not meet with difficulties.

Moreover, Durkin-Meisterernst has published his reading of the texts on the internet (*MIR-TEXT*) for everyone’s reference. This web page, although not structured in the form of a data base, but in plain text, will prove extremely useful for other purposes as well, e.g. for questions like determining with which preverbs a given verb stem occurs. In this respect, it can be used to update the data in Ghilain 1939 and the reverse index in Boyce 1977. In addition, thanks to a digitalisation project of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, the photos of most relevant fragments can now be viewed at the pages of the *Digitales Turfan-archiv* so that everyone can compare the manuscripts themselves.

The strategy of basing the dictionary on published texts has the obvious advantage of enabling the user to check every aspect of the data and of the analysis applied to them by Durkin-Meisterernst and/or the text editions, which are consistently quoted in the dictionary and range up to the most recent edition (Reck 2004). One disadvantage (admitted by the author on p. vii) is that this approach might lead to incorrect conclusions where a given word (form) is only noted for MP or Parthian language although it may exist in the other one as well, or is indeed

even found in the unpublished material. Another consequence is that the previous literature is not entirely superseded in those points where it discusses material that is still unpublished. For instance, the author occasionally notes that he has not seen in any fragment a certain verb form quoted in Ghilain 1939 as “inédit”, e.g. (p. 215) *kwš’d* quoted by Ghilain 1939: 66. Conversely, those verb forms in Ghilain 1939 that are still unpublished and whose existence Durkin-Meisterernst does not seem to doubt are not quoted. No present stem is given, e.g., for the Pa past stem *°syst* “broken” (attested with preverb */ab ʔ*, p. 14, and */fra ʔ*, p. 156, without preverb in the derivative *systg*, p. 312) while Ghilain 1939: 83 has *°synd-*, fitting nicely with OInd. *c<sup>h</sup>inád-* / *c<sup>h</sup>ind-* on the one hand and Sogdian *°wsynd-*, Balochi *sind-* on the other.

As is the tradition in the study of WMir. Manich. texts, MPM and Pa words are not presented separately, but the dictionary lists the WMir. words alphabetically according to the transliteration. Any other arrangement would, indeed, be inconvenient since the MP and Pa Manichaean texts have been transmitted together, MP and Parthian often being found in one and the same text, e.g. fragments in Parthian with intermediate titles in MP (e.g. Reck 2004: 139–140), or entirely mixed texts (e.g. Reck 2004: 142, 146–148), hence a reader would need to attribute a given sentence or verse to one of the languages before consulting the dictionary. Moreover, in a sizeable percentage of cases, corresponding words have an identical form in MP and Parthian. On the other hand, the strategy of presenting MP and Parthian together in one list tends to mask differences which do or might exist between the two languages: in most cases where a word occurs in both languages spelt in the same way, it has been assumed that the meaning and the phonological (or phonetic) form is identical as well. As the transcription is in many cases inferred from Old Iranian, on the one hand, and from New Persian on the other, and since MP is much better known than Parthian, meanings and transcriptions have often reflected the New Persian form. While this is certainly reasonable for MP, it is not necessarily always adequate for Parthian (cf. the example of *ryxt* above).

One cannot help but admire the author’s handling of the huge amount of material presented in the dictionary. With this mass of data and its inherent complexity, it is evident that it is simply impossible to maintain complete consistency and that minor incongruencies are bound to remain. The following notes are thus only meant to highlight the level of discussion that the lexicography of WMir. has reached with the publishing of the book under review.

Pa *°wdjn* “rigour, harshness” is transcribed */udažan/* (p. 66) while *djn* “hot, spicy” is read */dažn/* (p. 138). Both words (not noted in Boyce 1977) are connected with Armenian *dažan* by Benveniste 1936: 206 (referred to by Durkin-Meisterernst for both entries, but not noted in his bibliography), which would speak for a transcription */dažan/* also for *djn*. It is not clear to me why the author would not follow Ghilain 1939: 51 in interpreting the *°w* in *°wdjn* as the prefix */ō ʔ*. Even if no pertinent verb is attested in Parthian, it might quite well have existed, taking into account that a verbal base *daž-* is known from other Ir. languages (e.g. Avestan, Balochi and Zazaki), and the assumption of */ō ʔ* would in my view seem preferable to an otherwise unknown element */u ʔ*.

For *°bwg* “co-wife” (p. 15), the transcription */aβōγ/* is presented. This is obviously taken from Henning 1940: 18 quoted in the entry (Henning interprets the word as MP while the dictionary has it as Parthian). However, in this article (as in some others) Henning transcribes the Mir. product of the OIr. voiceless stops *p, t, k* as */β/, /δ/, /γ/*. Since the dictionary follows a different policy (see above), one might expect a transcription */abōg/* (cf. Balochi *hapōg*).

*pyd* “father” is divided into two lemmata for Pa (p. 288) and MPM (p. 289), separated by the entry *pyd 2* (Pa) “meat, flesh”. If this is meant to hint at the somewhat differing use of the inflectional form *pydr* (for which cf. Sims-Williams 1981), one would expect a parallel treatment of the other family terms (*m’d* “mother” etc.), but these are not presented as two lemmata.

The transcription *xwarispēg* for MP *xwrspyg* “sun-bright” (p. 369) is at variance with MP *°spyg* “radiance” being rendered as */ispīg/* (p. 87); Henning 1934: 178 has *ispēg* and *xwarispēg* while other sources have *(xwar)ispīg* (e.g. Boyce 1977: 22, 101).

It is probably inevitable that the necessarily concise form of the notes is liable to render them occasionally somewhat cryptic for users who are not deeply enough acquainted with the mat-

ter. For instance, the note ad *w'xš* “ghost” (p. 336) “*wāxš* is MP” (quoting Sundermann 1981: 27 n. 6) might leave users wondering how to interpret the Pa occurrences of the word.

It is likewise obvious that with regard to the number of potentially relevant Iranological books and articles, the references offered are necessarily a selection of what might have been quoted, and everyone will surely have their own ideas which items could be added. Among these are e.g. Sims-Williams 2000 and Schwartz 1982 quoted above for *xwj* and *gwxn*, respectively. For MP *'w'hm'n* and Pa *'w'nm'n* “so-and-so”, Sims-Williams 1990 might have been mentioned. Gershevitch 1979: 141 treats the etymology of MPM *'hnwn-c* “now”, which he reads *ahnūn-č* (vs. *ahnūn-z* elsewhere, p. 34). A reference to Gershevitch 1998: 120–131 would seem appropriate for MPM *wynyg* “nose” (p. 356) even if one does not choose to subscribe to the conclusions; Gershevitch not only challenges the etymology hitherto assumed (OP *waina-*, MP *wēn-*, NP *bīn-* “see”), but also the transcription */wēnīg/* noted in all dictionaries, suggesting a derivation from *\*wī° + √an/* “breathe” and a transcription */wīnīg/* instead.

As to the bibliography, one might have facilitated access to the articles by MacKenzie and Sundermann by referring to the reprints in the volumes of their selected papers (1999 and 2001, respectively); the articles, some of which are otherwise hard to find, are not arranged chronologically in these collections. It is a bit unfortunate that the price (125 €) and the rather heavy paper on which the dictionary is printed render the book somewhat less handy to use.

Durkin-Meisterernst's book is a major achievement both with regard to the amount of material collected as well as the wealth and complexity of information it offers. Readers will surely appreciate the devotion which has gone into the collection of this amount of data. The dictionary makes the reading of a WMIr. text an entirely pleasant undertaking, the user being enlightened at every step by the hints contained in the notes and references pointing to a wealth of interesting related details. With the collection of data it presents, the book under review marks a great progress in WMIr and Ir. studies as a whole about which all those who are interested in Middle Persian, Parthian, Manichaeism, Iranian or Central Asian studies will undoubtedly be excited. In combination with the texts in *MIRTEXT* and the photos of the *Digitales Turfanarchiv*, the dictionary provides excellent new opportunities for research and teaching. It will surely inspire new works on the WMIr. texts and the MP and Pa lexicon.

The book will certainly find a permanent place on the desk of all those working with MP and Pa material. It will likewise prove to be an indispensable tool for all those involved in the study of Manichaeism and a major contribution to the advancement of Manichaean studies.

Agnes Korn  
Frankfurt am Main

## References

- Andreas, Friedrich C. and Walter B. Henning 1934: *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III*. In: *Sitzungsberichte der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, pp. 846–912 (= Walter B. Henning: *Selected Papers I* (*Acta Iranica* 14), pp. 275–339)
- Bailey, Harold W. 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge etc.
- Benveniste, Émile 1936: “Notes parthes et sogdiennes” (= “Notes III”). In: *Journal Asiatique* 228, pp. 193–235 (= *Études sogdiennes*. Wiesbaden 1979, pp. 120–162)
- Boyce, Mary 1954: *The Manichaean Hymn-Cycles in Parthian* (*London Oriental Series* 3). London etc.
- 1975: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (*Acta Iranica* 9). Leiden etc.
- 1977: *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (*Acta Iranica* 9a). Leiden etc.
- Digitales Turfanarchiv*: <http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/>
- Gershevitch, Ilya 1979: “The Alloglottography of Old Persian”. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society*, pp. 114–190
- 1998: “Balochi Audition and the Kurdish Rhinocrasis”. In: Gherardo Gnoli, Vitalij M. Gusalov and Adriano V. Rossi (eds.): *Studia Iranica et Alanica. Festschrift for Prof. Vasilij Ivanovič Abaev on the Occasion of His 95th Birthday* (*Serie Orientale Roma* LXXXII). Rome, pp. 105–139
- Ghilain, Antoine 1939: *Essai sur la langue parthe, son système verbal d'après les textes manichéens du Turkestan oriental* (*Bibliothèque du Muséon* 9). Louvain (réimpr. 1966)



- Hasandüst, Mohammad 2004: *Farhang-e rīše-šenāsi-ye zabān-e fārsī I: a-t*. Tehran 1383 h.š.
- Henning, Walter B. 1934: "Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente". In: *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 9, pp. 158–253 (= *Selected Papers I (Acta Iranica 14)*, pp. 65–160)
- 1940: *Sogdica*. London (= *Selected Papers II (Acta Iranica 15)*, pp. 1–68)
- 1947: "Two Manichæan Magical Texts, with an Excursus on the Parthian ending *-ēndēh*". In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, pp. 39–66 (= *Selected Papers II*, pp. 273–300)
- 1954: "The ancient language of Azerbaijan". In: *Transactions of the Philological Society*, pp. 157–177 (= *Selected Papers II*, pp. 457–477)
- Horn, Paul 1893: *Grundriß der neupersischen Etymologie*. Straßburg (repr. Hildesheim etc. 1988)
- Lieu, Samuel, Sarah Clackson and Erica Hunter 1999: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts I: Texts from the Roman Empire. Texts in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Subsidia 2)*. Turnhout
- MacKenzie, D. Neil 1967: "Notes on the Transcription of Pahlavi". In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30, pp. 17–29 (= 1999/I: 35–47)
- 1986: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London etc. (2nd ed.)
- 1999: *Iranica Diversa (Serie Orientale Roma LXXXIV)*. Rome, 2 vol.
- MIRTEXT: <http://www.bbaw.de/bbaw/Forschung/Forschungsprojekte/turfanforschung/de/MIRTEXT>
- Nyberg, Henrik S. 1974: *A Manual of Pahlavi II: Glossary*. Wiesbaden
- Reck, Christiane 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen – Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen (Berliner Turfantexte 22)*. Turnhout
- Schwartz, Martin 1982: "'Blood' in Sogdian and Old Iranian". In: *Monumentum Georg Morgenstierne II (Acta Iranica 22)*, pp. 189–196
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas 1981: "Notes on Manichaean Middle Persian Morphology". In: *Studia Iranica* 10, pp. 165–176
- 1983: "Indian elements in Parthian and Sogdian". In: Klaus Röhrborn, Wolfgang Veenker (eds.): *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981 (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 16)*. Wiesbaden, pp. 132–141
- 1990: "Persian *bahmān* 'so-and-so': An Ancient Survival?" In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 10–12
- 2000: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents*. Oxford
- Sundermann, Werner 1979: "Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos". In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6, pp. 95–133 (= 2001/I: 121–163)
- 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts, mit einem Appendix von Nicholas Sims-Williams (Berliner Turfantexte 11)*. Berlin
- 2001: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften (Serie Orientale Roma LXXXIX)*. Rome, 2 vol.
- Weber, Dieter 1970: *Die Stellung der sog. Inchoativa im Mitteliranischen*. Göttingen (PhD thesis)

Tomas Hägg and Bo Utas, *The Virgin and Her Lover: Fragments of an Ancient Greek Novel and a Persian Epic Poem* (Brill Studies in Middle Eastern Literatures, 30). Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2003. Pp. xii+278.

This book, authored jointly by a classicist (Hägg) and a Persianist (Utas), studies the remnants of a Greek romance and its transmission into medieval Persian. The texts in question are the first- or second-century Greek prose novel *Mētiokhos kai Parthenopē* (*M&P*), of which only scattered fragments exist, and the 11<sup>th</sup> century Persian verse romance *Vāmiq u 'Adhrā* (*V&A*) by the Ghaznavid court poet 'Unṣurī (d. after 1031), of which some 380 verses, plus additional testimonia, survive. The authors state that their primary objects are to provide critical editions (with translation and commentary) of the fragmentary remains of both works, to present "supplementary material directly pertaining" to both, to consider by what channels the story eventually arrived at the Ghaznavid court in eastern Iran (present Afghanistan) in the early 11<sup>th</sup>