in the sense of flight from the world because the Elects use their bodies to liberate the light trapped in the material world, i.e. they are very much interested in a ritualized contact with the world to this purpose. They keep this contact with the help of the Hearers who deflect from them the harm involved in the procurement of food and, in return, partake of the salutary powers of intercession possessed by the Elect.

BeDuhn positions this view of Manichaeism as a departure from a series of misunderstandings about the nature of Manichaeism that have dominated studies on this religion. He proposes an entirely ritualized view of Manichaeism and sees gnosis as playing only a minor role. He sees his study as an attempt to see Manichaeism as it was; ‘we moderns’, a returning phrase of his, should not pervert Manichaeism because this puts us ‘in danger of losing’ it.

In the impressive amount of material quoted in the book the author admirably surmounts the difficulties faced by any student of Manichaeism to transcend the piecemeal nature of the various sources in order to arrive at a coherent and consistent portrayal of what they actually mean. The frequent repetition and, sometimes, the piecemeal development of the argument in this repetition or even in the endnotes accompanying them is inevitable.

There are a number of small but irritating inaccuracies in the Iranian words quoted. Middle Persian and Parthian mānīstān ‘monastery’ (from the verb mān- ‘to dwell’) is consistently and falsely transcribed with -ı; pād (p. 133) is pad, the enclitic -m’n (p. 110) is ‘us’, not ‘me’; the quote on p. 137 (repeated on p. 150) should be pd ... p’d qft ‘hynd (lit. ‘they fell at the feet of ...’). Words from the Middle Iranian languages are quoted mostly in transliteration but those from the other languages in transcription; uniformity in this and consistent indication of the language being quoted would have made for better reading.

This should not detract from the value the book has as a significant study on the rationale of Manichaeism.

DESMOND DURKIN-MEISTERERNST

PHILIP HUYSE:

The trilingual inscription of Shapur I at Naqš-i Rustam was first discovered in 1939 by archaeologists excavating under the aegis of the Oriental Institute of Chicago University. Inscribed on two sides of the tower complex known as the Ka'ba-i Zardusht, the inscription gives a schematic account in Middle Persian, Parthian and Greek of Shapur's victorious wars against the Romans and of his administrative and religious policies at home. The text was later (1943) given its now more familiar title of Res Gestae Divi Saporis by the great historian of the Hellenistic and Roman East, Michael Rostovtzeff, on grounds of its similarity in grandiloquence and boastfulness with the well-known auto-obituary of Caesar Augustus in Ancyra. The outbreak of the Second World War meant that few scholars were available to utilize this major new historical source fully. An important article on the place-names in particular, however, was published by Professor W. B. Henning in this Bulletin (BSOS 20, 1939, 823–49) but the text did not become the subject of a major study in English until 1953 when Martin Sprengling published Third Century
Iran. Sapor and Kartir (Chicago)—a work which was not properly typeset and which enjoyed very limited circulation. Far more influential is the almost contemporaneous monograph by E. Honigmann and A. Maricq (*Recherches sur les Res Gestae Divi Saporis*, Brussels, 1953) and five years later Maricq himself published an *editio major* of the Greek text in the form of a journal article (*Syria* 34, 1958, 288–96). A detailed study of the historical information on the Romano-Persian wars given by the inscription was published by E. Kettenhofen (*Die römisch-persischen Kriege des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Wiesbaden, 1982.). The *SKZ* (as the inscription is more properly known) was studied along with several other early Sasanian royal inscriptions by M. Back in his substantial monograph (*Die sasanidischen Staatsinschriften*, Leiden, 1978). However, as all major Iranian inscriptions have been or are being (re-)edited and (re-)published in the established series the Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, the *Corpus* edition of this important inscription which carries with it the quasi-status of being the definitive edition (at least for one if not several generations of scholars) has been eagerly awaited.

The handsomely produced volumes under review constitute the most substantial and thorough effort to present this important trilingual inscription to a wide scholarly community as the text is of importance to both scholars of Iranology and of Roman history. Volume I contains the trilingual text laid out in three columns. This highly desirable layout, which is essential for the comparative study of all three versions of this text, is possible because although the format of this two-volume edition is A4 in concert with the other volumes of the Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum series, both volumes are bound on the short side which means that one needs to work on a very large desk if one wishes to consult both volumes at once. The format will also cause problems with library shelving as the spines of the volumes are unlikely to be made visible to the reader. One wonders if there are grounds here for the two volumes to be cased with the title clearly inscribed on the spine of the long-side of the case. The texts of the Middle Iranian versions are given in standard transcription and all three versions are accompanied by separate German translations. A standard set of paragraph numbers replaces the traditional division by line-numbering. This may cause some problems to students familiar only with the Greek version which is usually cited by line-numbers. However, the uniform paragraph-numbering will make the comparative study of the three versions of the text very much easier. The volume contains detailed glossaries to all three versions and includes much valuable information on historical geography. The very full introduction includes an important discussion on the history of the discovery of the inscription and the way in which the text and its various versions were composed.

The second volume contains the philological and historical commentary to the text. The editor’s thorough knowledge of Greek epigraphy and of Roman history makes his commentary a major contribution to the history of the period. As one would expect a lengthy discussion is devoted to the problematic section at the end of the account of the Second Campaign which mentions the capture of Dura Europos and of other cities of the Middle Euphrates after Shapur’s great victory at Barbalissos which is much further up-river. The date of the capture of Dura as indicated by coins found on the bodies of the besieged Roman troops could not be earlier than 256/7 but the main campaign which climaxed with the capture of Antioch took place almost three years earlier. The existence of a Roman military document dated to 254 and the presence of Sasanian (?) graffiti on the dipinti of the famous synagogue at Dura both suggest an initial Roman attempt to hold the city and its brief
occupation by the Sassanians before the final onslaught which is so well
reconstructed by the recent archaeological work of Pierre Leriche. It is not
impossible to postulate that Dura was a later conquest because it was
by-passed in the initial stages of the campaign but the isolated Roman
garrison withdrew after 254 and the city was briefly occupied by Sasanian
forces. The city was then re-occupied by fresh Roman troops from the
Danubian frontier brought to the region by Valerian. The elaborate defences
were the work of these battle-hardened professionals who were determined to
make Dura a strong-point. This meant that Shapur had no choice but to
‘take out’ the cities on the Middle Euphrates as far up-river as Circesium—
future site of a major Roman fortress under Diocletian—to remove this threat
to his flanks three years after his initial success and as he was preparing to
the Valerian’s counter-attack. Huyse’s commentary is supplemented by a
number of appendices. That on the origin of the author/translator of the
Greek version is particularly valuable and Huyse’s conclusion that he was a
Greek from Seleucia is entirely convincing. The second volume contains
photographs of squeezes of all the lettered panels of the inscription and the
standard of reproduction is extremely high.

This excellent edition of one of the most famous early Sasanian royal
inscriptions is likely to remain standard for some time to come. The prohibitive
cost of the two volumes, however, may mean that many scholars, especially
Roman historians, will continue to cite the inscriptions from the edition of
the Greek version by Maricq.

SAMUEL N. C. LIEU

JOSEF TROPPER:

_Ugaritische Grammatik._

(Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 273.) xxii, 1056 pp. Münster:
Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.

By any standards this book is the most complete reference grammar of
Ugaritic to date. The description of the Ugaritic writing system, phonology,
morphology, and syntax occupies no fewer than nine hundred densely printed
pages. The other hundred or so pages contain eight indexes, abbreviations
and a bibliography. But its most useful feature are the copious, and often
exhaustive, citations of relevant occurrences of the forms or constructions.
The following general observations will focus on the qualitative progress this
grammar has made when compared with its predecessors.

A grammar of a language such as Ugaritic, preserved almost exclusively
in consonant writing, will primarily aim to reconstruct forms and describe
their use in actual texts. The limited and sometimes damaged records make it
difficult to arrive at generalizations. In such cases, these efforts will at best
produce hypothetical forms whose value will remain somewhat provisional.
The grammarian may instead choose to leave moot points open, perhaps
adding brief comparative notes here and there. Unlike Gordon’s now classic
Ugaritic grammar, which follows the latter method, the work under review
has gone far in exploiting available resources, and the results are generally good.

A case in point is the description of the verbal system. Those who grew
up with Gordon’s grammar will recall that finer points concerning the time