

of Amaravati. It will feature modern replications in concrete of some of the ancient stone sculptures now in Chennai and London. The park will be a “pan-Buddhist” space, showcasing replicas of Buddhist shrines from around the world. We cannot know exactly how this new effort will end up, since changing state politics and funding shifts may well detour the plans.

It would be easy, Becker observes, to dismiss these new productions as modern tourist kitsch, but she takes a more charitable perspective. She is “sympathetic to the desire to make these sites accessible and engaging to visitors from across India and the world” (p. 282). Whether or not one agrees with this view, the modern developments around Amaravati and other sites of ancient Indian Buddhism are certainly worthy of the kind of scholarly attention Becker gives them. In *Shifting Stones, Shaping the Past*, Catherine Becker has provided us with valuable materials to reflect on the ways humans have chosen to animate Buddhist places of devotion, both ancient and modern.

RICHARD DAVIS
BARD COLLEGE

Iranisches Personennamenbuch, vol. 2: *Mitteliranische Namen*, fasc. 1: *Iranische Personennamen in manichäischer Überlieferung*. By IRIS COLDITZ. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, vol. 889. Vienna: VERLAG DER ÖSTERREICHISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN, 2018. Pp. 716.

This impressive collection, according to section 1 “Allgemeines” (pp. 5–6) and section 2 on the source material (pp. 6–15), contains all Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian, Bactrian, and New Persian proper names found in Manichean manuscripts, including figures in narratives from the Manichean myth, except names of demons. It also includes outdated, alternative, and “ghost” names in earlier editions. For the sake of completeness, non-Iranian names have also been included. The names are culled from “ca. 4700 text fragments” (p. 6), discovered at various sites [ancient temples] in the Turfan oasis in northeastern Xinjiang, but currently dispersed among almost a dozen collections in Europe and Asia. The texts date from the time of the domination of the Uigurs (744–840 and 866–1368), by the end of which Manicheism had long since ceded its supremacy to Buddhism (beginning of the eleventh century), with only small Manichean groups surviving into the thirteenth century; it is assumed, however, that many of the Middle Persian and Parthian manuscripts were copies of manuscripts from the third–sixth centuries (p. 7). A few dates are found in manuscripts from the eighth, ninth, and eleventh centuries (p. 8 n. 6). All the manuscripts in the Berlin Turfan collection have been included (<http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/index.html>), but from other collections only those published. From the *Nebenüberlieferung*, texts in several non-Iranian languages were mined.

Names of gods and demons are, surprisingly, not included other than when *part* of proper names, which leaves out the entire Manichean pantheon and pandemonium.¹

Section 3 (pp. 16–18) reviews preliminary work and the state of scholarship involving numerous scholars, highlighting the work of Werner Sundermann.

Section 4 (pp. 18–31) deals with proper names in Iranian Manichean texts: the problems of assigning names to a specific language (4.1), subdivided into Iranian names (4.1.1); hybrid names (4.1.2): names with elements from several Iranian languages (4.1.2.1) and with Iranian and non-Iranian elements (4.1.2.2), e.g., *Aryāmān-radn* with *radn* < Old Indic *ratna-* ‘jewel’; and non-Iranian names (4.1.3): mostly old Turkic and Semitic, some Indic.

Section 5 contains subsections on the forms of the names: names with one component (5.1), two components (5.2), divided into types of compounds according to the Indic classification (5.2.1, 5.2.2);

1. I take this opportunity to make known two additions to the pandemonium found in M8280/R/i/1–6/ right column (from the *Book of Giants*), where the two archons (usually called Šaklōn and Pēsūs) are called [*Dāw]it and Halaʔit (to be read thus, rather than Sundermann’s [1973: 76] *J(š)t hl(c)yt*). The two are known as Daveithai and Eleleth in the Sethian creation myth (*Apocryphon of John*); see, e.g., King 2006: 87.

then names containing a substantive plus a verbal noun (5.2.3);² dvandvas (5.2.4), e.g., *Šād-farrox* ‘happy (and) fortunate’; names made by inversion (5.2.5), e.g., the “inverse bahuvrīhi” *Āyat-farn* ‘(to whom) fortune has come’ (see on no. 3, below); substantives in apposition (5.2.6), e.g., *Ardaβān-wispuhr* ‘Prince-A.’; sentence names (*Satznamen*) (5.2.7), e.g., *Yazad-āmad* ‘god has come’; short names (5.3), e.g., *Dōšist* ‘most beloved’; cf. *Dōšist-Aryāmān*; hypocoristika made with various suffixes (5.4); (pro)patronymics (5.5); *Schein-Dvandvas* (5.6), e.g., *Bārist-xwarxšēd* ‘belonging to/dedicated to paradise and sun’; names with three or four elements (5.7), e.g., *Ohrmezd-bay-dād* ‘given by god-Ohrmezd’.³ In “Motive der Namengebung,” eight classes are distinguished (6.1–8), from theophoric names to names from the “Dichtersprache.”

Section 7 explains the structure of the dictionary. Abbreviations and bibliography cover pp. 86–167, the dictionary itself pp. 170–612, and indexes pp. 613–716.

The format of the entries is transliteration and transcription; B attestations with contexts and references to manuscripts (texts cited are not translated); P prosopography (at times quite extensive); D etymology (of both Iranian and non-Iranian words!), meaning, etc., with Uigur (and some Iranian) words being cited in Chinese characters plus pinyin, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Middle Chinese transcription; additional notes (only some entries).

Translations: many words are rendered in multiple ways, but without specifying on what contexts the different meanings are based.

Etymologies: Etymologizing names is often a haphazard undertaking, as abundantly shown here, where numerous alternative etymologies are proposed for many names. Often the discussions are very useful and interesting, although, not infrequently, all (or almost all) known ancient relatives are listed, which does not necessarily contribute to the understanding of the word. Etymologies are cited from all possible secondary, not always so reliable, sources, many irrelevant for the name at hand, which makes me a bit worried about non-Iranists citing from the book indiscriminately. Having checked a few cases, I have also noticed that C.’s compact presentation of the secondary sources does not necessarily do them justice (see nos. 206 and 470).

Despite these few blemishes, the book is bound to become an indispensable reference work, and we must be grateful to C. for undertaking this enormous task.

Remarks on a few lemmata:

No. 3 (p. 170) Sogdian *Āyat-farn* and no. 211 (p. 290) *Farn-āy[at]* (an “inverse bahuvrīhi” of *Āyat-Farn*): The etymology of *farn* is discussed only in no. 211, where C. quotes Old Persian **farnah* from Median *farnah*⁴ and gives the meanings ‘Glorie, Majestät, Glück, and Glücksglanz’, while Sims-Williams and Durkin-Meisterernst (2012: 81) have ‘glory, majesty; *voŭç*’ and, with personal pronoun, ‘(Your) Honor, (His) Majesty’. Whether *farn* is supposed to mean ‘glory’ in the sense of luminous ring or as in ‘fame and glory’ cannot be determined from the lemma. The meaning *voŭç* is only found as the first of the Soul’s five limbs/members. C. translates the name as ‘(to whom) luck (*Glück*) has come, the lucky one (*der Glückliche*)’, but Gunda-farr (cited in the same lemma) as ‘he who finds glory (*die Glorie*)’, rather than ‘he who finds luck/fortune’. From a quick look at the contexts, in both Manichean and Buddhist texts, *farn* is mostly related to/possessed by royalty and the Buddha (occasionally coupled with words denoting luminosity)⁵ and recipients of letters. It is therefore not unlikely that the word was mostly understood as ‘fortune’ as in the Bactrian deity *Farro* identified with the Greek *Tuchē*.⁶

2. Here names are included that are only etymologically classifiable as such: *Dāryāw*, *Zardrušt*, etc.

3. This name has four elements only in the sense that *Ohrmezd* is etymologically a compound (*Ahura Mazdā*).

4. She does not cite Skjærvø 1983 here (it is in the Bibliography as 1983a), where I, rightly or wrongly, argued that *farnah* was not a Median form.

5. In Manichean Sogdian M134iV/5–7 the Living Soul is characterized as “the *farn* and *āyār* (some kind of light) of the whole world” (Sims-Williams and Durkin-Meisterernst 2012: 6a), and in the Buddhist Sogdian *Dhyāna* text (line 172) *farn arđēp* renders Chinese 相光 *xiang guang* “the light of (the Buddha’s) *lakṣana* ‘mark’” (MacKenzie 1976: 62–63, 67, 85, 122).

6. Cf. Khotanese *phārra-*, which, together with *tsātāti-* ‘riches’, renders Buddhist Sanskrit *lakṣmī* in the *Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra* 10.40 (Skjærvø 2004, vol. 1: 210–11, vol. 2: 193), but also, like Buddhist Sogdian *farn*, denotes the stages toward becoming an Arhat.

No. 16 (p. 178) *Āzād-duxt*: The derivation of *duxt* ‘daughter’ from Old Iranian **duxti-* rather than (nom. sing.) **duxtā* (< **duxtar-*) may be a typo or reminiscence of Old Persian **duxšī* (see no. 205, p. 287).

No. 54 (p. 204) Weh-Ardašīr (name of town): Here the Avestan etymology of *weh* (spelled *why*) given after Bartholomae as Avestan “*vahiiah-, vaxiiiah-, vaṇhah-, and vaṇhiiiah-*” (where *vaṇhiiiah-* does not exist and *vaṇhah-* (!) and *vaṇhah-* are two spellings of the same word, depending on the mss.) is superfluous since Old Persian has the proper name Vahayaz-dāta- from **vahiyah-* + *dāta-*.

No. 59 (p. 207): Aryāmān, translated as ‘friend’ following Durkin-Meisterernst (2004: 53b), is only found as an epithet of Jesus and so is not actually a Middle Persian word for ‘friend’ (which is *dōst*). On Yišōc Aryāmān see no. 669 (p. 577).

No. 60 (p. 207) [and elsewhere] *fristom* and *frihstom* ‘dearest’ are unlikely forms of the superlative, which normally ends in *-istom*. The Manichean Middle Persian adjective *fryh*, *pryh*, *pryy*, Parthian *fryh*, *pry*, was, in my opinion, probably *fri* or *friy* from Old Persian **friya-*, Avestan *friia-*, and the superlative *friyistom* (*frištom*) and *frihistom*.

No. 72 (p. 212). The verb ‘to praise’ is Manichean Middle Persian *istāy-* (not *istay-*); cf. also no. 419 (p. 421), where C. has “av. *sta-*” for *stav-*.

No. 138 (pp. 246–47) Bārist-xwarxšēd ‘belonging to/dedicated to paradise and sun’: The phrase recalls Avestan *Yasna* 36.6 *barəzištəm barəzimanəm auuač yāt huuarē auuāci* “the highest of heights, as far as the sun has been said (to be).” As for the meaning of *bārist* ‘highest’, Durkin-Meisterernst (2004: 105) gives ‘the highest; height (= Paradise)’, but, as far as I can see, there is no context where a concrete meaning ‘paradise’ is required.

No. 199 (pp. 284–85) Drīst-rōšn: This should be *drīst-* from Old Persian **druvišta-*; Pahlavi has *drīst*, spelled *drwyst*, and *drust* (NPers. *dorost*), spelled *drwst*.⁷

No. 206 (p. 287): C. appears to prefer Henning’s interpretation of the name of the Buddha’s adversary as being borrowed from Semitic Dilbat to my Dēbat from Old Indic Devadatta (consigned to the note). Note that Dilbat (Venus) has no support elsewhere in the Manichean corpus, whereas Devadatta, the Buddha’s uncle is found as *tyβδʹty* in a parallel Sogdian list of adversaries of the prophets, as I have argued in detail (Skjærvø 1994: 241–44). Cf. no. 585 (p. 585), where C. cites Sundermann to the effect that the Buddha’s adversary was Devadatta (based on the Sogdian text). — C. condenses my argumentation (consigning it to the note), only ascribing to me the following explanation of the form: “*Dēvat(t) < Dēb(d)at/Debat(d)t/Dēva(d)t(?) < Skt. Devadatta*,” while what I said was: “The phonetic development of the word may have been *devadatta > deb(d)at* (cf. the Sogdian form *tyβδʹty*, which because of its initial *t-* and $\beta < v$ must be a loanword probably from another Parthian form) or *deva(dt)*.” I also compared the Khotanese form *Dīvata* (= Devadatta). I analyzed the clause *burd rask Dēbat pad tō kanīg kalān* as “Dēbat envied you, O great maiden.” I explained the change from the speaker, who is “the Boy,” that is Jesus the Boy, by the Boy’s strong link with the Maiden of Light, here Great Maiden, both of them members of the Third Evocation.

No. 214 (p. 291): Note that *farrox* ‘glücklich’ (related to *farn*) here is most probably ‘lucky’, not ‘happy’.

No. 232 (p. 304): *Gēhmurd* is not directly comparable with Avestan *gaiia marētān-* [not *marētān-*], as Mani changed the expected *-mard* to *-murd* ‘dead’, as he did in *Murdiyānag* from < **Martiyānī-*, the spouse of **Martiya-*, ancestors of mankind (cf. Skjærvø 1995: 274). In no. 347 (p. 383), *Murdiyānag* is derived from **Martiyānakā-* to account for the suffix *-ag*, but this is probably a Middle Persian innovation, common in Pahlavi to make feminines from masculine nouns. My restoration as **Martiyānī-* is based on the assumption that the suffix is that also seen in *ahurānī-*, ‘spouse of Ahura (Mazdā)’, referring to the heavenly and terrestrial waters.⁸

No. 258 (p. 317) Kay-farn: Add to the bibliography Skjærvø 2013, sec. I.

7. There are other short *i*’s where long *i* is expected, e.g., p. 466 (last line) Arabic *nysʹbwr* interpreted as Nisābūr (or Naysābūr) presumably for Nīsābūr; p. 577: *kanigrōšn* (line 6 from the bottom), but *kanig(-rōšn)* (4 lines from the bottom). I have the impression these may be typos caused by problems with typing long *i* (sometimes also other long vowels).

8. On feminine forms of adjectives in Pahlavi, see also Skjærvø 2016 [2018]: 173–74.

No. 294 (pp. 335–37) Kerdīr: Add to the bibliography Skjærvø 2016 [2018]. On Sundermann’s reading *qyr(d)[y](l)* (cited p. 336), see there p. 609b.

No. 367 (p. 396) Nāzūk: C. translates as ‘zart, zierlich, anmutig, jung’, but ‘young’ is obviously not an inherent meaning of the word, but something that can be said *about* a young, “tender,” person.

No. 421 (p. 424): The name of Mani’s father (Pattīg, etc.) still resists being etymologized. C.’s **pāti-takya-* from the root *tak-* ‘flow’ seems unlikely for phonetic reasons (one would expect **tačya-*). If “referring to baptismal practices,” one would at least expect a causative form of *tak-/tač-*.

No. 439 (p. 434) Rāymast: There is no Old Persian *rād-* ‘reason, cause’, only the isolated postposition *rādiy*.

No. 443 (pp. 436–37): *r’yūšn* is the name of a student in a list of twelve names (epithets), none of them particularly negative: Rōpas, Narīmān, Noxδār, *Sālār, Nby’ḥ, Yīšō’īg, Zōrmand, Abursām, Bōxtār, Aryān[šāh?]. In this context, none of the suggested etymologies makes any sense. Middle Persian *rāyīšn* ‘ordering’, or similar, always has long *-ā-*.

No. 470 (p. 451) Sadwēnā: Sundermann in an early article (1975: 305–6) tentatively (*vermutlich*) identified this name in a text also containing the names Paulus and Neron as a distortion of Seneca (the younger), Neron’s teacher, assuming (*vermutet*) an original form **synyk’* written in the ambiguous Pahlavi script or the Psalter script. — There is no evidence, however, that the Pahlavi script had reached its late “Book-Pahlavi” stage by the third–fourth centuries, and the Psalter script is not ambiguous, so C.’s presentation of Sundermann’s argument as based on the script sounds untypical of his customary caution. In fact, Sundermann discussed principally the historical-literary issues, recalling the apocryphal exchange of letters between Seneca and Paul (for which C. does not reference Sundermann). As for the orthographic issue, C.’s “Sundermann vermutet” is too strong for Sundermann’s query “Darf also sdwyn’ . . . angesehen werden?” followed by “[e]ine denkbare Voraussetzung” would be that the source might be a Syriac translation of a Middle Persian work written in Pahlavi script, perhaps from the late fifth century, which presupposes a lot of assumptions. Most of this entry, it seems to me, had been better consigned to a note.

No. 473 (p. 453) Srōšart-yān: Pahlavi Srōš ahlaw is a late substitution for Srōš-ahlīy (with the endings spelled unambiguously as *-yḏ* or, ambiguously, as *-y*) from Avestan *Sraoša- ašīia-* < *(*a*)*rtīya-*. The Manichean Middle Persian form Srōšahrāy may have been influenced by (Inscriptional) Middle Persian *ardāy*, perhaps also *ahlāyīh* (attested only in Pahlavi).

No. 572 (p. 507 note): In Skjærvø 1995c (244, 247), I suggested *wāsēnid* might be ‘donned’, i.e., ‘put on’ (a garment; from the root *vas-*, which C. discusses in the preceding text), not ‘geben, spenden’.

No. 580 (p. 510) Wāhman: Add to the bibliography Skjærvø 2013 (sec. X).

No. 613 (p. 528) Wēšparkar, etc.: From the way C. presents the evidence, one has the impression that Henning contested Humbach’s (1975) interpretation of *wyšprkr* as Wēšparkar from Avestan *Vayuš uparakariia-* (here consigned to the note, but followed by Sundermann 1979b). Henning’s interpretation, however, dates from 1948 (Henning 1948b) and is no longer considered to be a contestant.

No. 658 (pp. 554–55) Yam: Add to the bibliography Skjærvø 2008.

No. 689 (pp. 588–90) Zardrušt: The etymology of Spītāma as **spita-ama-* ‘with shining (lit. white) attack strength’ (p. 589) is, in my opinion, unlikely to be correct. The word counts three syllables, not four, which points to a **spita-Hma-* (cf. *djāmāspa-* four syllables), and the composition form of Avestan **spīθra-* (Old Indic *śvitra-*) is *spiti-*. It is also not certain the word means “literally” white, rather than ‘shining’. My own preference is to compare Old Indic *sphīta-* ‘fattened’: ‘with fattened strength’.

REFERENCES

- Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond. 2004. *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- King, Karen. 2006. *The Secret Revelation of John*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- MacKenzie, D. Neil. 1976. *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*. Acta Iranica, vol. 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas, and Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst. 2012. *Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. 1983. *Farnah: Mot mède en vieux-perse? Bulletin de la Société Linguistique* 79: 241–59.

- _____. 1994. Venus and the Buddha, or How Many Steps to Nirvana? Buddhist Elements in Manichean Literature. In *Iranian and Indo-European Studies: Memorial Volume Otakar Klíma*, ed. Petr Vavroušek. Pp. 239–54. Praha: enigma corporation.
- _____. 1995. Iranian Elements in Manicheism: A Comparative Contrastive Approach. Irano-Manichaica I. In *Au carrefour des religions: Mélanges offerts à Philippe Gignoux*, ed. Rika Gyselen. Pp. 263–84. Res Orientales, vol. 7. Bures-sur-Yvette: Groupe pour l'Étude de la Civilisation du Moyen-Orient.
- _____. 2004. *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ., Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.
- _____. 2008. Jamšid. In *Encyclopædia Iranica* XIV/5: 501–22.
- _____. 2011. Kartir. In *Encyclopædia Iranica* XV/6: 607–28.
- _____. 2013. Kayāniān I–XIV. In *Encyclopædia Iranica* XVI/2: 148–74.
- _____. 2016 [2018]. The Pahlavi Optative and Some Feminine Forms in -īy. *BAI* 28: 149–94.

PRODS OKTOR SKJÆRVØ
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Wonderful Things: A History of Egyptology. 2: The Golden Age: 1881–1914. By JASON THOMPSON. Cairo: THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN CAIRO PRESS, 2015. Pp. xiv + 374. \$39.95.

The second volume of Jason Thompson's projected three-volume history of Egyptology is as impressive as the first (*Wonderful Things: A History of Egyptology*. Vol. 1: *From Antiquity to 1881*. [Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2015]). Drawing on a wide range of published secondary and primary sources as well as extensive archival research, he engagingly recounts the history of the emerging discipline of Egyptology in both Europe and North America and in the field—Egypt.

Since Jaromir Malek's foreword and the author's introduction to vol. 1 have already situated *Wonderful Things* in relation to previous historiography, vol. 2's preliminaries are brief: a page each for the preface, a chronology of ancient Egypt, a map of ancient Egypt, and one of Nubia. The prefaces to both volumes explain that because even a limited selection of illustrations from the rich trove available would have overwhelmed the text, a supplementary volume of illustrations and a video series are envisioned. Even so, the reader loses a great deal by not having illustrations in near proximity to relevant portions of the text. Thirty-one pages of endnotes and thirty of bibliography—the separate bibliography for each volume is handy—conclude vol. 2.

Gaston Maspero's arrival as director-general of the Egyptian Antiquities Service in 1881 and his retirement in 1914 bookend vol. 2 and Thompson's "Golden Age" of Egyptology. The British occupation of Egypt in 1882 soon after Maspero's arrival reinforces the beginning date, and World War I—more than his retirement two months earlier—marks the end of the era in Egyptology and much else. Nevertheless, the periodization leaves one wondering whether the gold of Tutankhamun, whose tomb was discovered in 1922 and inspired the title *Wonderful Things*, should be cut out of Egyptology's "golden age."

Maspero's two terms as director-general (1881–86, 1899–1914) and those of three other Frenchmen during the interregnum—Eugène Grébaut (1886–92), Jacques de Morgan (1892–97), and Victor Loret (1897–99)—provide the chronological frameworks for about half of the chapters. The titles of chapters 6 and 7 highlight directors' tenures: "Loret's Interlude" and "The Return of Maspero," and chapters 1, 3, and 8 implicitly set their temporal limits by directors' tenures. These five chapters may be considered first.

Chapter 1 plunges directly into Maspero's succession in 1881 upon the death of Auguste Mariette, the founding director-general of the Antiquities Service. Maspero arrived amidst the financial and political turmoil which climaxed with Great Britain's colonial occupation of Egypt in 1882. Three of this chapter's leading actors reappear throughout the volume: Maspero, Flinders Petrie, and Britain's Egypt Exploration Fund (EEF). All made impressive discoveries during Maspero's first term. Without him,