

as sanctuaries, but also telegraph offices in Persia! He surveys the Ka'ba, the Dome of the Rock, and shrines at Kūfa, Karbalā', Mashhad, Ardabil, Balkh, Ashkelon, and Samarqand, and the final section on tombs and cemeteries contains much unfamiliar material. Unlike the World of Islam Festival, which was a passing event, Michael Rogers's text deserves a long life; of the many books inspired by the Festival, his has two special claims to distinction—it is just about the least expensive, and it is also one of the few likely to provoke serious thought.

JOHN CARSWELL

Rece: 83 Nov. 1975 an.  
 GERHARD DOERFER: *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit. Bd. 4: türkische Elemente im Neupersischen (Schluss) und Register zur Gesamtarbeit. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur [in Mainz]. Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission, Bd. xxx) (V), 640 pp. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1975. DM 162.*

In an article published in 1959, Professor Doerfer, announcing the publication of this work, stated that the material collected by him amounted to some 2,400 entries, which would be dealt with in a book of 400–600 pp. The work, now completed, contains 2,167 entries occupying no fewer than 2,600 pp.

In this fourth and final volume, the entries from *gāf* to *yā* (1707–1945) are followed by additional entries (1946–2135), addenda and corrigenda (pp. 318–489), and indexes. The addenda and corrigenda begin with a list of the reviews of this work, additional bibliography, and further entries from the *Anandrāj* (2137–67).

As in the previous volumes, there are several mistranslations and misreadings.

*dāvārī barhāst* does not mean 'ist ein Prozess entstanden' (p. 59) but 'litigation came to an end'; *rāmī* (p. 59) in a thirteenth-century text cannot mean 'Osmane'.

For *ki az qablī yabgū* 'der vor dem yabyu' (p. 127), read ... *qibal-i*, meaning 'on behalf of the *yabgū*'.

For *gunda* (p. 2), *gūšan* (p. 145), *unbūh* (p. 146), *zarbuzan* (p. 146), *raqm* (p. 153), *sahimnāk* (p. 163), and *burda* (p. 181) read *gunda*, *gūšan*, *abbūh*, *zarbzān*, *raqam*, *sahmānāk*, and *burda*.

For *ramma* ... *kalla*, *murg* (p. 210), *tang* (p. 212) read *rama* ... *galla*, *marg*, *tunuk*.

As before, Doerfer is most unfortunate in his *izāfas*, with consequent errors both of omission and of commission. Regarding the *izāfa* as the most difficult problem of the whole of Persian syntax (p. 493), D. seems not to realize that his inability to grasp this point—which

is certainly important but not really all that difficult—leads him into translations which make no sense. I content myself with two examples.

For *amirān v bahādūrān sar karda bar habar bāšand* 'die Emire und Bahadure (ihre Streitmacht) ordnen und wachsen sein sollten' (p. 79), read *bahādūrān-i sarkarda* 'the leading amirs and bahādūrs should be watchful'.

*az raf'i nikābati vāriyatalāši 'ālamī dar mihādi amn v amān asūda hāfir* ... *bāšand* 'vor der Aufhebung des Schutzes seiner weltweiten Existenz mögen sie auf dem Ruhsitz der Sicherheit beruhigt sein' (p. 307). Here the *izāfa* (added to a pronominal suffix!) is superfluous: read *vāriyatalāš*. If such a word as *vāriyat* had ever existed (see below), then the translation would be as follows: 'by removing the damage of his existence, the entire world may rest in the cradles of security'.

In my previous reviews of this work I did not dwell upon the many faulty scansion of Persian (and Turkish) verses quoted therein, although it was obvious that D. is not acquainted with the rules of prosody. But it is one thing not to know the rules, and another thing to distort the scansion of verses established by others. D. reads (p. 76): *dar yarlīgi gammi tu zi das yāsāhāyi saft*. Even if D. is unaware that the Arabic *gamm* is pronounced both in classical and modern Persian as *gam*, he should not have changed the reading of the text established by Minorsky, in which the spellings are *yarlij* and *yāsa* and not *yarlij* and *yāsā*. Thus D. turns an indifferent hemistich into bad prose. On the same page, when quoting two Persian verses together with my German translation of them, he adds the plural suffix *-hā*, to *bāj* in the last hemistich, which spoils the metre. In a verse of Nāsir-i Khusrāu, which ultimately goes back to the *Farhang-i Nāsiri*, D. reads the word *ایک*

'mit ziemlicher Sicherheit' as *اینل* (p. 125).

The proposed spelling does not occur in any Persian text. All reliable MSS of the poems of Nāsir-i Khusrāu in this place have *ایک*. The title *ināl* is known to and used by this poet

always with a prosthetic *y-* as *yināl* (ینال), cf. *Divān-i Nāsir-i Khusrāu*, ed. M. Minavi, no. 146, l. 19, no. 152, l. 25, no. 189, l. 44.

D. throughout his work uses the Persian dictionaries for two purposes: (a) to give the meanings of the entries collected from the historical texts; and (b) to register all Mongolian and Turkish words embodied in these dictionaries. For this volume in addition to the *Burhān-i qāfi*, Vullers, and Steingass, he makes use also of the recently published dictionaries of 'Alavi and Mu'in, and a treatise of Shu'ār. D. regrets that he could not make full use of the 'eighteenth-century' *Farhang-i Anandrāj*, which he describes as one of the most if not the most excellent among the Persian dictionaries (this work was actually compiled in 1888, and printed already the next year; the Tehran edition was published in 1956). Before examining some of the entries in this volume, I think a few brief remarks about the nature of the Turkish elements in

Persian lexicons will not be out of place. A sizeable proportion of the Turkish words first appear in the *Farhang-i Ibrāhīmī*, compiled in 1473. This work is divided into sections (*bābs*) arranged according to the letters of the alphabet, and each section further divided into subsections (*faṣls*) according to the final letters of the entries. Apart from Turkish loan-words, which are not recognized as such and are hence arranged together with Persian words, the Turkish material of this work consists of the Turkish words appended separately to the Persian *faṣls*, so that in this work, which runs to almost 1300 pp. (India Office Library, MS 3052), the Turkish entries, amounting to 700 words, appear in 120 separate small islands. The partial alphabetical order of this work indicates that the author did not know Turkish and that his Turkish material was copied from a written source or sources. The practice of including Turkish words separately in a Persian dictionary was followed in the sixteenth century in the *Mu'ayyid al-fudalā'* (compiled in 1519) and in the *Madār al-afādil* (compiled in 1593). In so doing, each author of these three lexicons was in fact combining two distinct dictionaries in one work, granted that the Turkish part was only of a modest size. Although this somewhat unusual practice was abandoned by later lexicographers, odd words from this once separate source subsequently found their way into various Persian lexicons. It was Captain Roebuck, who in preparing an edition of the *Burhān-i qāfi'* added to it in an appendix words not given in the *Burhān* and drawn from various other sources. Included in this appendix were also all the Turkish words with initial *y-* (apparently to restore the balance in favour of the entries with initial *y-*, which are scarce in Persian) appearing in the *Farhang-i Ibrāhīmī* and its sixteenth-century successors. From there these words were taken and integrated fully in alphabetical order in the works of Vullers and Steingass. D., unaware of the development of Persian lexicography and its problems, includes in his work words from Vullers and Steingass which derive ultimately from that section of the *Farhang-i Ibrāhīmī* which is to all intents and purposes nothing but a Turkish glossary. Considering them all to be Turkish loan-words, only on one occasion does he indicate that the word is 'wohl nur Fremdwort'. As these words are 'Turkish words', so that there is no justification at all for including them in this work, I give here a bare list of them, adding only a few remarks in square brackets, whenever D. in his reading or interpretation seems to be manifestly in error.

1809. *yalqūz* 'allein, einsam'.  
 1836. *yarisqī* 'Fledermaus'.  
 1840. *yertāš* 'a fellow-citizen'.  
 1842. *yrtqī* 'yartaqī' read: [*yartīqācī* 'merciful'].  
 1843. *yaralqan* 'creator'.  
 1853. *yaramsaq?* *yaramsiq?* 'wertlos? Heuchler? Heuchelei?' *tū?* *yaramsaq?* 'treu?' *yaramsiq?* 'dumm'. [In the *FI* the definition is *sālis* 'deceiver', so read: *qurumsaq* 'deceiver', cf. Rad., II, 937.]  
 1857. *\*yazuq* 'Sünde'.

1858. *\*yazuqunz* 'unschuldig, sündlos'.  
 1859. *\*yazuqluq* 'Rabe, Krähe' *tū?* [the word actually means 'sinner', and is a well-known epithet for the 'crow'].  
 1860. *\*yazuqlī* 'sündig, Sünder'.  
 1869. *yajšiliq* 'Wohltat'. [The meaning in the *FI* is *bahšīš*, cf. Vullers: 'donatio, largitio'; read: *bajšiliq* < *bajš* 'gift'.]  
 1870. *yajšiliqci* [read: *bajšiliqci* 'generous person'].

There are two more entries deriving from the *FI* through the intermediary of Mu'in and the *Anandrāj*.

1958. *ušuq* [read: *ašiq* 'ankle-bone'].

2163. *yürakli* 'tapfer'.

D. includes from the *Anandrāj* some 30 entries (2137-67). The source of 22 of them, as the author indicated, is the *Ghiyāth al-luḡha* (compiled in 1826). Had D. known and consulted this work, which is available in print, he would have noticed that his 20 entries from this dictionary derive from a Turkish source, and as such have no place at all in a book dealing with the Turkish elements in Persian.

D. makes a complete muddle of the entries provided by Shu'ar.

1991. *belā dik belā*. D. translates *belā* as 'so' with a question mark. In order to make sense we must add the word *čugundur* which appears in D.'s source but which he left out, and read: *belā dig belā čugundur* 'such a beetroot for such a pot'. This is a well-known Persian proverb, see Halm, *Persian-English proverbs*, 77, where the anecdote from which this proverb originates is also given.

1995. *būdūr ki* 'es ist dies, folgendes?' In order to make sense we must combine this with the entry 2118, *vardur* 'es gibt' and read *būdūr ki vardur*. D. again not realizing that this also is a Turkish sentence used in Persian, deals with it in two separate entries. The meaning will be: 'take it or leave it'.

2124. *yālgūzak*: this word which puzzles D. means in Persian 'loner, lone wolf', see Jamshīdī-pūr, *Farhang-i amthāl*, 289.

2113. *yohla* 'probiar mal'. This Persian slang word is an adjective and means 'care-free', see Rahmatī, *Farhang-i āmiyāna*, 131.

2046. *sanji* 'Kolik'. D. translates Shu'ar's explanation *halatī gair az dard* as 'schmerzloser Zustand'; read: 'a condition other than pain' or 'distinct from pain'.

On single entries.

1753. *nacak* ~ *nācah* 'eine Art Streitaxt?'

D. on the evidence of the *Burhān* considers these as two variants of the same word. Here we have two different words. The Persian word *nācah* is already attested in Bayhaqi, whereas *nācāk* is a mis-spelling for Turkish *biçäk* 'knife'. The *Farhang-i Jahāngiri*, *Burhān*'s source, gives the latter word with a quotation from Sūzani and deduces the meaning from the context. The MSS of Sūzani's *Divān* have at this point *biçäk*. (The anomalous *biçäk* in Rūmī (III, 4174), quoted by D. from Nicholson under 721, is due to the fact that it rhymes with Qur'anic *azbahak*.)

1776. *yalaqan* 'Hiebmesser'. This word does not in fact appear in the text of the *BQ* (composed in 1652), but in the footnotes of its editor. The definition of this word in the *Sanglakāh* is translated by D. as 'eine Art sehr

grosses Messer, womit man auf jemaenden (*kas*) einhaut'. For *kas* read *kamar*, which is to be read clearly in the text used by D., and translate 'a sort of big knife that one wears on the belt'.

1796. *yāsīy* 'eine Art spitzer Pfeil'. Vullers quotes from the *Farhang-i Jahāngiri* verses in which this word occurs. One of the poets is named as Manūchiri, whom D. identifies as Manūchihri of Dāmaghān (d. 1040-1), so that he comments 'also sehr früh belegtes Wort'. Since this verse is not to be found in the *Divān* of this M., I am inclined to attribute this verse to 'the second Manūchihri of Persian literature', to borrow a term used first by the late M. Qazvini, namely Shams al-Din Ahmad b. Manūchih Shast-kula (died 626/1228-9). He was famous for his poem describing *tutmac*, see Rāvandi, *Rahat al-sudūr*, 57-8. It is in this poem that we find also *qazjan* and *yahni*, words dealt with by D. (nos. 1390, 1830).

1945. *???tilmiši* '?'. This word appears in Natanzi: *dar ziri dust u pāy tār u mār gardanida* *???tilmiši kardand*. D. states that in view of the absence of diacritical points in the beginning of the word, there are 2,304 possible ways of reading it. This puzzling word surely is *tilmiši* (< Turkish *tıl* 'to cut into pieces'). It occurs in an unpublished poem of Pūr-i Bahā: *dar zir-i pāy-i dawlataš avarā tilmiši*, where *tilmiši avarān* corresponds to Natanzi's *tilmiši kardān* 'to cut into pieces', with the extended meaning of 'to destroy utterly (under foot)'.  
2029. *čang* 'krumm, gebogen'. This word which puzzles D. is indicated as an 'Ādhari' word in Mu'in. Here, however, the term Ādhari, *al-Ādhariyya* of the Arab authors, refers to the ancient language of Ādharbāyjan before the advent of the Turks, and not, as D. thought to the Turkish language of that region. The elements of true Ādhari constitute a thin layer in the current Turkish of Ādharbāyjan. Mu'in's source for *čang* is Navvābi's article in *NDAT*.

2053. *šondog?*. D. under this entry gives the summary of a letter of Dr. E. Neubauer in which are enumerated the names of 10 musical tones, mentioned in the works of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Marāghī. D. in order to obtain the 36 tones mentioned by Mu'in (although the latter in fact speaks of 360 = *sišad u šašt*, not of 36) leaves aside without any justification the first, and presumes the existence of four variants for each of the remaining nine tones. 'Abd al-Qādir in fact speaks of 360 Chinese tones and mentions the name of 'some'—in fact ten—of them (cf. *Maqāšid al-ahān*, ed. T. Binish, 129).

2075. *qušsuz* 'unglücklich' (wohl az [i.e. Ādharbāyjanī]). The word is taken from Mu'in, who refers to the Persian translation of an article by Yaltkaya devoted to the Turkish elements of Rūmi's *Mathnavi* and *Divān*. Neither this nor a previous study of the Turkish words in the *Mathnavi* by C. Salemann (*Mélanges Asiatiques*, x, 1890) is included in D.'s bibliography. The Turkish elements in Rūmi collected by these authors and supported by quotations of verses in Arabic script amount to no fewer than 120 entries as opposed to the 29 words indicated as Turkish by Nicholson,

and used by D. in his work. This word occurs only in Rūmi, and is not known in Ādharbāyjanī Turkish.

2119. *vāriyat* 'Existenz'. The word occurs together with and as a synonym of *nikāyat*. This is an obvious misreading, read: *va ažiyyat* 'and harm'. The same author who uses *nikāyat u ažiyyat* here, elsewhere in the same work puts these two in reverse order: *ažiyyat u nikāyat* (cf. BM MS Or. 3388, fol. 249a).

2158. *qazmāz* 'Dienerin'. D. is unable to identify this word, and suggests that it might be a mis-spelling for *qirnaq*. This word first appears in the *Laṭā'if al-luḡat* (BM Royal B.XIX, 224a) a special dictionary for the *Mathnavi* of Rūmi. In the *Mathnavi qazmāz* rhymes with *qāz* (III, II, 2191), so that the possibility of a 'Verschreibung' is out of the question. The meaning *kaniz va hidmatkār*, a mistaken deduction given in the *LL*, is from the context. The word *qazmāz*, which means 'steady, unbending', is in fact a personal name, used by Rūmi also in his *Divān* (ed. Furizānfar, IV, 222, v, 82). These examples and that of Khāqāni (ed. 'Abd al-Rasūli), 863, clearly show that this word is a personal name used for men. D. reads *balāruk* (*palāruk*, *palālak*) 'Indian steel, a sword made of this' of the *Anandraj* as *balāruk* and compares this with Turkish *bilāzük* 'bracelet' (p. 434). This is untenable both on phonetic and semantic grounds.

This book, in spite of all its shortcomings which are mainly due to its author's inadequate knowledge of Persian and his consequent inability to comply with the requirements of a thorough investigation of the sources, will at least partially serve its purpose. The historian who consults this book in order to ascertain the use and meaning of technical terms in Persian historical writings will find, in addition to satisfactory answers to his queries, also quotations from other sources containing the same terms and bibliographical data, etc.; the fact that D.'s readings and translations are not always correct will not be of much consequence to him. Had D. confined himself only to this purpose, his work would have been a less uneven and more manageable book. On the other hand, however, the indiscriminate and uncritical addition of entries from dictionaries and from sources other than historical texts, especially in the three 'Turkish' volumes, makes this work, I am regretfully obliged to say, a chaotic conglomeration of words and phrases which are not always Turkish and not necessarily used in Persian. In view of this, users of this work who are not historians would be well advised to consider all the Turkish entries as suspect unless they are supported by *reliable* quotations from Persian prose or poetry.

In his 'Schlussbemerkung', in which he adorns his prose with such gems as 'ein Opportunist, ein alter Nazi, ein Säufer' (only to say that he did not use these expressions with regard to his colloagues), D. dwells at length on a point raised by me in my review of the first volume of this book, and insists that 'das Wort "Herrscher" prinzipiell sowohl einen König wie auch eine (regierende) Königin bezeichnen kann'. As an example he refers to

the word *kāh* in the *Farhang-i Jahāngiri*: 'Auch eine Braut kann *kāh* "Herrscher, König" genannt werden'. It is after this 'conclusive evidence' that he adds: 'Vielleicht wäre es nützlich gewesen, wenn sich GANDJEI einmal in den persischen Quellen umgesehen bzw. ein persische Gewährsmänner gowandt hätte'. The *Farhang-i Jahāngiri* (ed. Afifi, 396) gives under the word *kāh*, together with the well-known meanings of this word, a special meaning with quotations from Khāqāni and Sanā'i. This is *dāmād*. The word *dāmād*, contrary to what Professor Doerfer thinks, means in Persian 'Bräutigam', and not 'Braut'.

T. GANDJEI

MARY BOYCE: *A reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. (Acta Iranica, 9. Troisième Série. Textes et Mémoires, Vol. II.) x, 196 pp. Téhéran, - Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1975. (Distributed by E. J. Brill, Leiden. Guilders 40.)

A considerable number of the Manichaean fragments in Iranian languages, which were discovered early this century, have since been published, mainly in Hebrew or roman transliteration with German or English translation. The necessity of having readers, dictionaries, and grammars for each of these languages has long been felt. The publication of the present *Reader* in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian fulfils one of the desiderata of students of Iranian studies, and is greatly to be welcomed. The editor has gathered in this volume almost all the texts that had already been published in scattered publications, arranged them according to subject-matter with necessary corrections and improvements on the previous readings, and retransliterated them, where necessary, in Roman script. The numbering of the paragraphs, as arranged by the editor, the appropriate grammatical notes, and copious elucidative remarks on religious matters, facilitate the reading and comprehension of the texts.

In the introduction the editor gives a concise summary of Mani's life and teachings, a description of the manuscripts, and an analysis of the Manichaean alphabet and orthography. Unfortunately (presumably because of the additional cost) no actual fragment in Manichaean script is reproduced. On the phonetic value of the letters the following additional remarks may be made.

p. 15: on 'the editor states: 'An unetymological short initial vowel can be represented facultatively by either ' or ', e.g. 'šw-, 'šw-, 'šm'h, 'šm'h'. It may be added that these two letters as prothetic vowels (respectively *a* and *i/e*) always occur before clusters beginning with the fricatives *s* and *š*, namely *sk*, *sp*, *st*, *šk*, *šm*, and *šn*, e.g. 'skwh (Parth.), 'sp's/'sp's, 'st'rg/'st'rg, 'škwš (MPers.), 'šm'h/'šm'h, 'šwšr/'šwšr. They are also occasionally used before the cluster *fr*, but this usage seems

to be confined to the Parthian words, e.g. 'fry'ng (beside *fry'ng*), 'frdwm (cf. MPers. *prtwm*/*frtwm*), 'frdynt, 'fry'r (cf. MPers. *pry'r*), 'fryšg (beside *fryšg*), 'plwšk (written in Pahl. script in *Bract Anāriq*, 46, cf. Man. MPers. *prwšg*). The Zor. Pahl. form 'plwšk is probably a borrowing from Parthian).

p. 16: on *nn* representing *ŋ*, it may be added that this nasal sound was probably not a distinctive phoneme, but rather an allophone of *n* before *g*.

p. 18: on the OIran. *x* see Benveniste, *BSL*, LXIII, 1, 1968, 61, who considered it not as a unique phoneme but as a group of two. It is, however, probable that by at least the late Sasanian period it was a single phoneme, as in classical Persian.

The texts are conveniently arranged according to subject-matter in 18 sections, beginning with the 'Prose texts concerning Mani and the history of his church'. The signature of each text, together with references to previous publications, is given in the footnotes. Six fragments (pp. 29-38), some in MPers. and some in Parth., are also wholly transcribed, in order to help beginners to become acquainted with the pronunciation of words. In addition, many words, phrases, and sentences are given in transcription in the footnotes. There is a generally high standard of accuracy and consistency in transcription, but minor lapses occur. The following have been noted.

p. 36 (text e 6, l. 2, p. 37, l. 2); p. 37 (f 1, l. 6 and n.) and p. 50 (q 9, n.): *argaw* according to the system of transcription adopted by the editor (see p. 16 on *g*) should be *aryaw* (as correctly in p. 44 (m 2, n.) \**aryawisf*).

p. 36 (e 6, l. 4); p. 122 (hr 2, n.): for *awišād* read *awišād* < \**abišāta*; cf. Henning, *Verbum*, 194, 33.

p. 38 (f 2, l. 4), p. 91 (ag 1, n.) and other cases: for *ad* read *aš* (< *hadā/hada*), cf. the editor's remark on *d*, p. 16.

p. 38 (f 2, l. 12): for *kad* read *kad* as in other cases in the *Reader* e.g. pp. 35, 36 (e 4, 5, 6), p. 48 (q 2, n.), etc.

p. 38 (f 2, n.): for *šiwahr* read *šiwahr* as in the text and p. 107 (ax 1, n.) and p. 130 (ce 1, n.).

p. 38 (f 2, l. 6): read *anēš* as in the footnote.

p. 43 (m 1, n.): for *tigr* read *tigr* (< *tigrā*).

p. 40 (e 3, n.): read *frazend* as in p. 53 (e 3, n.) and cf. *āzend* p. 30 (a 5).

p. 48 (q 1, n.): read *frayōšāh*, cf. *niyōš*. p. 35 (e 3) and *abyuš* p. 52 (r 6, n.).

p. 48 (q 2, n.): read *mary* (< *margu*).

p. 49 (q 3, n.): *āyad* should be *āyad* as in p. 35 (e 3) and p. 162 (cv 20, n.).

p. 88 (ad 4, n.) and p. 180 (dj 3, n.): read *nēki/nēkiš*.

p. 136 (ce 1, n.): *apdiš*, p. 171 (do 5, n.) and p. 138 (ef 2, n.) *apdes*, but p. 39 (g 2, n.) *abdesū*. On the evidence of Sogd. *pš'ys-* (< \**upa-daišay-*, *GMS*, 549), it is probable that the original proverb was *upa* rather than *abi* (suggested by Ghilain, *Essai*, 61). In this case the Parth. forms should be *abdes*, *abdiš* according to the principle adopted by the editor, p. 16.

p. 180 (dj 6, n.): read *ēn* instead of *īn*.  
pp. 180, 181 (dk 1, 2, n.): the opt. ending in *zānendīš*, *kāhendīš*, and *istānendīš* should be