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Abstract

The present work provides a detailed study of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15. The title ‘reward for sacrifice’ alludes to the feature that the Indo-Iranian ritual forms part of a system of *do-ut-des*. It is inspired by the aspect of the story related in Y 9.1–15, that the four personages who pressed Hōm before Zarašttru, were rewarded with the birth of a son for their efforts. The work provides a text-critical edition of the Pahlavi version based on six manuscripts of the Iranian Pahlavi Yasna copies (Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6, T55b) and of three manuscripts of the Indian Pahlavi Yasna (J2, K5, M1). While the transliteration and the variant reading are included in an Appendix, the main body of the thesis provides the transcription of the text and a translation together with a detailed commentary and an introduction. The present work goes beyond earlier studies by covering the glosses of the Pahlavi version as well as the translation of the Av. original, and by investigating the reception of themes of this text in Indo-Iranian and in later Zoroastrian literature.
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### Abbreviations

1) General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>Avestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY.</td>
<td>Era after Yazdgird III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE.</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du.</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn.</td>
<td>Footnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIr.</td>
<td>Indo-Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipt.</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind.</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inj.</td>
<td>Injunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurd. Sor.</td>
<td>Kurdish, Sorāni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marg.</td>
<td>Margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIr</td>
<td>Middle Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP.</td>
<td>New Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntr.</td>
<td>Neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv.</td>
<td>Old Avestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIr.</td>
<td>Old Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP.</td>
<td>Old Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opt.</td>
<td>Optative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oss.  Ossetian
Phl.  Pahlavi
Pl.  Plural
pres.  Present
sg.  Singular
Skt.  Sanskrit
subj.  Subjunctive
YAv.  Young Avestan
vb.  Verb
Ved.  Vedic
voc.  Vocative

2) Texts

AB  Āšär al-Bāqiya ‘n al-Qorun al-Xāliya
ASd  Artaxerxes, Susa, d
AWZ  Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag
DB  Darius, Bistun
DHR  Dārāb Hormazyār Rivāyat
DkM  Dēnkard Madan
DSK  Darius, Susa, k
FiÖ  Frahang ī Ōīm
FrW  Fragment Westergaard
H  Hādōxt Nask
HN  Hērbedestān and Nērangestān
HP  Hādōxt Nask Pahlavi
HR  Husraw ud Rēdag
IrBd  Iranian Bundahišn
KM  Kalila wa Dimna
KN  Kārnāmag ī Ardaxšīr ī Pāpagān
MB  Mu’jam al-Buldān
MBP  Mahābhārata, Poona edition
MHD  Mādayān ī Hazār Dādestān
PRDd  The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg
RV  Rig-veda
SdBd  Sad-dar Nasr Bundahišn
ŠB  Śrīmad Bhāgavatam
ŠE  Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānšahr
ŠNŠ  Šāyist Nē Šāyist
Vd  Vīdēvdād
VdIndS  Vīdēvdād Indian Sāde
VdIrs  Vīdēvdād Iranian Sāde
VdP  Vīdēvdād Pahlavi
Vd-sts.no.-A  Vīdēvdād, stanza number, Avestan original
Vd-sts.no.-P  Vīdēvdād, stanza number, Pahlavi version
VrIndP  Visperad Indian Pahlavi
VrIndS  Visperad Indian Sāde
VrP  Visperad Pahlavi
Vyt  Viṣṭāsp Yašt
Y  Yasna
YIndP(s)  Yasna(s) Indian Pahlavi
YIndS  Yasna Indian Sāde
YIrP(s)  Yasna(s) Iranian Pahlavi
YIrS  Yasna Iranian Sāde
YSkt  Yasna Sanskrit
Y-sts.no.-A  Yasna, stanza number, Avestan original
Y-sts.no.-P  Yasna, stanza number, Pahlavi version
Yt  Yašt
Zs  Zādsparam

3) Books, journals and collections

AcIr  Acta Iranica
AI  Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik
AiGr  Altindische Grammatik
AirWb  Altiranisches Wörterbuch
AO  Acta Orientalia
ArOr  Archív Orientální
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAI</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Asia Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOAS</td>
<td>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKhS</td>
<td>Dictionary of Khotan Saka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWAia</td>
<td>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlrPh</td>
<td>Grundriss der iranischen Philologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEW</td>
<td>Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal Asiatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
<td>Journal of Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kratylos</td>
<td>Kritisches Berichts- und Rezensionsorgan für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIV</td>
<td>Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln</td>
<td>Loğatnäma, Dehkhoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Philological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StIr</td>
<td>Studia Iranica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZII</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes on the present edition

The Avestan and Pahlavi texts are transcribed according to the systems suggested by Hoffmann (1970) and MacKenzie (1971), respectively. However, as regards MacKenzie’s system, in the following examples, the new scholarly trends are followed:

\(<ʾ> \text{ for } \ defective\) 
\(<ʿ> \text{ for } n \text{ in heterograms}\) 
\(<H> \text{ for } h \text{ in heterograms}\) 
\(<\H> \text{ for } A \text{ in heterograms}\) 

Phl. *mynwd (mēnōy)* rather than *mynw̱k (mēnōg)* 
Phl. *gytyū (gētīy)* rather than *gytyk (gētīg)*

In addition to the Avestan and Pahlavi texts, Arabic, New Persian and (Vedic) Sanskrit passages are studied in the commentaries when necessary. As far as the transcription of the Arabic and New Persian texts are concerned, the signs are built on MacKenzie’s system of transcription in the present edition. The reason is that while the phonetic values of Classic New Persian and Pahlavi are close, New Persian shares a similar alphabetic system with Arabic. Therefore, the phonemic values of the of the Arabic alphabet, which is a consonantal system, are drawn according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>New Persian</th>
<th>Old Persian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
<td>ﮏ ﮏ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the transcription of New Persian, it should be noted that there are four consonants ﮏ ﮏ ﮏ and ﮏ which are absent in Arabic. In the present edition, they are shown by \( p, \) \( č, \) \( g \) and \( ž \). Moreover, while the Arabic loanwords are written exactly as in Arabic,

\(^1\) For the transcription *mēnōy and gētīy* rather than *mēnōg and mēnōg* see Skjærvø (1995: 269, fn. 15; 2002: 30, fn. 7; 2009b: 480, fn. 8 and 481 fn. 12; 2011c: 63 fn. 33).
there are Arabic consonants which are alien in New Persian. These consonants are assimilated to their closest corresponding phonemes in New Persian as follows:

- ط، ط  are realised to /t/.
- ص، س  are realised to /s/.
- ح  is realised to /h/.
- ض، ز  are realised to /z/.²

Likewise, they are transcribed by t, s, h and z, in the present edition. The vowels in classic New Persian are similar to those of Pahlavi. However, they develop from Classic to Modern New Persian according to the following table:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classic New Persian</th>
<th>Modern New Persian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ī/ē</td>
<td>ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū/ō</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the present edition, the New Persian texts of the Šāhnāma, Garšāsbnāma, colophons and interlinear version of the Avestan original and its Zand together with the Zoroastrian New Persian passages of the Dārāb Hormazyār Rivāyat, Sad-dar Nasr Bundahišn and Zarātuštnāma are transcribed according to the Classic New Persian vowel system. Finally, the Devanāgarī script of the Sanskrit texts are transcribed according to the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>आ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² See Perry (2002).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit consonants</th>
<th>-V,-A⁴</th>
<th>-V,+A</th>
<th>+V,-A</th>
<th>+V,+A</th>
<th>+V</th>
<th>-V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guttural</td>
<td>क ka</td>
<td>ख kha</td>
<td>ग ga</td>
<td>घ gha</td>
<td>ङ n̥̄</td>
<td>ह ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatal</td>
<td>च ca</td>
<td>छ cha</td>
<td>ज ja</td>
<td>झ jha</td>
<td>ञ n̥</td>
<td>य ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retroflex</td>
<td>ट ta</td>
<td>ठ tha</td>
<td>ड da</td>
<td>ढ d̥ha</td>
<td>ण n̥</td>
<td>र ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>त ta</td>
<td>थ tha</td>
<td>द da</td>
<td>ध d̥ha</td>
<td>न na</td>
<td>ल la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labial</td>
<td>प pa</td>
<td>फ pha</td>
<td>ब ba</td>
<td>भ bha</td>
<td>म ma</td>
<td>व va</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Introduction
The present work provides a detailed study of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15 which itself is a translation accompanied by commentaries of its corresponding Avestan original. Y 9 is the first of the three chapters of the Hōm Yašt, a hymn to Av. haōma\(^5\) (= Phl. hōm), an Indo-Iranian deity who represents the embodiment of the sacrificial plant used in the chief Zoroastrian ritual, the Yasna. During the ceremony, twigs of the plant are pressed to extract its juice. As a result, the deity Haōma rewards worshipers with strength, victory, health, healing and knowledge.\(^6\) The opening stanzas of the Hōm Yašt (Y 9.1-2) is followed by Y 9.3-15 whose feature is described by Malandra (2004: 431) as follows:

‘From a text-critical perspective, it does not seem possible to trace the origin of these passages to Yašt passages, nor to derive the Yašt passages from them. Rather, this material appears to have been drawn from common oral sources, which all precede the redaction of the extant Avesta.’

The justification for choosing Y 9.1-15 as a text within Y 9 for edition is that it constitutes an independent subsection in Y 9. The first stanza of Y 9 describes the meeting of Av. zarağuštra- (= Phl. zardušt) with the deity Haōma while the former was reciting the Gāḫās and purifying the fire. In the Pahlavi version, the deity Mihr also attends Zardušt’s ceremony together with Hōm.\(^7\) In a conversation that develops between Zaraguštra and Haōma, the former asks questions to Haōma about the first four individuals who pressed him.\(^8\) Haōma instructs Zaraguštra that in addition to his father Av. pourušaspa- (= Phl. porušasp), there were three other figures who pressed Haōma in the past before Pourušaspa and they were granted with the reward of the birth of heroic sons. These fathers were, chronologically, Av. vīuuaŋ vhaṇ- (= Phl. wīwanghān), Av. āḍbiīia- (= Phl. āspiyān) and Av. Ṯrita- (Phl. srīd). The sons of Vīuuan'hant and Āḍbiīia were Av. yima- (= Phl. jam) and Av. Ṭraētaona- (= Phl. frēdōn), respectively. In contrast to the other fathers, two sons, namely Av. urwuāxšaiia- (= Phl. urwāxš) and Av. kōrasāspa- (= Phl. kirsāsp), were born to Ḟrita as a result of pressing Haōma.\(^9\) The title of this thesis, ‘reward for sacrifice’, is inspired by this aspect of the story and alludes to the feature that the ritual forms part of a system of do-ut-des, or exchange and reciprocity.

\(^3\) The diphthong aō < *au is the preferred spelling in manuscripts, giving better readings. See Hintze (2014a: 24); de Vaan (2000: 523-533).

\(^6\) For Haōma in the Indo-Iranian tradition see section 1.2.

\(^7\) For the occurrence of Mihr in Y 9.1 see Y 9.1 commentary 8 mihrō upāit zardušt and also, Y 9.1 commentary 12 ka hōm mad būd ā-ʒ mihr šnāsēd.

\(^8\) See Y 9.1-3, 6, 9, 12.

\(^9\) See Y 9. 4, 7, 10, 13.
The first hero, Yima, made by his rule animal, man, water and plant undying (Y 9.4). Moreover, during his reign there was neither old-age nor death, nor the demon-created envy and with a growth of a fifteen-year old,\(^{10}\) father and son each other went forth (Y 9.5). Ōraētaona appears as a hero who killed the dragon Dahāka. Interestingly, some manuscripts add a Pahlavi commentary according to which the dragon was fettered by Frēdōn rather than being killed by him (Y 9.8).\(^{11}\) As mentioned above, Ōrita had two sons rather than just one (Y 9.10). Urwāxšaiaia is described as a judge who according to Yt 15.28 was killed by Hitāspa. It is known from Yt 19.41 that his second son, Kirsāsp, killed the murderer of his brother.\(^{12}\) In the both Avestan and Pahlavi literature, Kārāsāspa is a major hero, however, committed the offence of slaying of the Fire according to Pahlavi Rivāyat and Zoroastrian Persian texts.\(^{13}\) In the Hōm Yašt (Y 9.11), he is described as the killer of the horned dragon. Zarāḫuštra is the last son who was born to Pūrušaspa. Zarāḫuštra recited the Ahunawar prayer and made in the earth all the demons, who previously, having the shape of humans appeared on this earth (Y 9.14-15). According to the Pahlavi commentary of Y 9.15, the demons before the recitation of Ahunawar by Zardušt were of two types:

1) Demons whose material bodies were transformable into their spiritual forms.
2) Demons who were unable to transform their material form into the spiritual shape.

While the demons of the first group are still able to do evil in the body of humans and animals, those of the second group were destroyed through the recitation of Ahunawar by the prophet.\(^{14}\)

The present edition consists of an Introduction in chapters and of a main part. The first chapter of the Introduction discusses the features of the Pahlavi version of the Avestan original and Indo-Iranian features of the plant-deity Hōm according to the Vedic, Avestan and Pahlavi literature. It also includes an overview of the poetic structure of the Yaštś in general and of the hymn to Hōm in particular. Finally, past scholarship on the Pahlavi version of the Avesta from the eighteenth century onwards is reviewed.

---

\(^{10}\) In Zoroastrianism, fifteen years old is the age of maturity after which men and women should not walk without the sacred girdle. See Vd 18.54.

\(^{11}\) For Frēdōn as a hero captor and hero slayer see Y 9.8 commentary 1 kē-ī zad.

\(^{12}\) See Y 9.10 commentary 5 urwāxš ud kirsāsp.

\(^{13}\) See Skjærvø (2011a).

\(^{14}\) See Y 9.15 commentary 1 pad dēw kirbīh.
The second chapter deals with the colophons of manuscripts collated in the present edition. These manuscripts are, of the Iranian Pahlavi Yasna (YIrP) Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6, T55b, and, of the Indian Pahlavi Yasna (YIndP) J2, K5 and M1. Of the six Iranian manuscripts, studied in the present edition, four contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš, dated 1495 CE. Hōšang Syāwaxš’s colophon is followed by another one in which the history of the compilation of the first bilingual Avestan-Pahlavi manuscript is narrated. However, while the colophons as they appear in Pt4 and Mf4 have been studied extensively, their text in the two other copies of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line,\(^{15}\) or G14 and T6, has not been investigated. They are studied here for the first time in greater detail. On the basis of an examination of the text of the colophons in these manuscripts, I suggest that the colophon as it appears in G14 and T6 has been corrected. Furthermore, I put forward a new filiation which differs from proposals by West (1896-1904), Dhabhar (1923), Tavadia (1944) and Cantera & de Vaan (2005). In addition to the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš, other colophons in Pahlavi (Mf4, G14, J2, K5, M1), New Persian (T6), Sanskrit (K5)\(^{16}\) and Gujarati (G14, F2, T6)\(^{17}\) which appear in the manuscripts are discussed.

The history of the transmission of the Avesta and Zand is discussed in the first section of the third chapter according to narratives attested in the Zoroastrian, Greek and Latin sources together with evidence from the manuscripts. In the section, the quality of the collated manuscripts in the present edition is also examined. As for the old YIndPs, their quality cannot be investigated because they were written by the same scribe in 1323 CE and no older manuscript is available for comparison. As far as possible corrections in the manuscripts are concerned, according to Anquetil-Duperron (1771), the Iranian priest called Dastur Jāmāsp Velāyati, arrived in India in the early eighteenth century. Reviewing the Vīdēvdād manuscripts, he declared that their Pahlavi version is too lengthy and inaccurate. As a result, he corrected them. He also had three students who, following his teachings, produced new copies different from their older counterparts. Cantera & Andrés-Toledo (2008) investigated the features of the corrected Vīdēvdād manuscripts. In the present edition, it is shown that the Iranian Pahlavi Yasna copies, written down after the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp, have the same features as the Vīdēvdād corrected codices. Apart from the corrected parts, the Iranian and Indian copies offer the same text with minor variations

\(^{15}\) The manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, which contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš, are called the copies of Hōšang Syāwaxš-line in the present edition.

\(^{16}\) The translation is after Goldman (in press).

\(^{17}\) Kerman Daruwalla kindly translated the Gujarati colophons upon my request.
which are mainly orthographic. For example, in Y 9.1 line 3, the verb *raft* is written by the eteogram *lpt* and the heterogram *SGYTWNT* in the Iranian and Indian manuscripts, respectively. In the following section, the methods of textual criticism are critically analysed. Considering the features of the Pahlavi manuscripts, the old Indian sister manuscripts J2 and K5, predating the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp, were nominated to serve as the base text. Of the two, the manuscript K5 was selected because while J2 is silent as to its source, in the colophon of K5, the scribe, Mihrābān Kayhusraw, names a manuscript of Rōstahm Mihrābān as the source of his copy.

The main part of this thesis consists of an edition and English translation of the Pahlavi version of the Yasna 9 stanzas 1-15 in transcription, based on YIndP K5.\(^{18}\) The Pahlavi text is preceded by the transcription and English translation of its corresponding Avestan original, based on the edition of Geldner. While the English translation aims at being as close as possible to the Avestan and Pahlavi original, this has not been always possible. For example, the literal translation of *kē ān tarsagāhīh kard* as “what respect was made to him” is incorrect in English. Therefore, it is translated as “what respect was shown to him” in the present edition. The Avestan original and Pahlavi version are followed by the commentary section in which different linguistic, ritualistic and mythological aspects of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15, as an independent text or in association with its Avestan original, are discussed in detail. It should be noted that the number of the linguistic studies outweighs that of the two latter ones. The reason is that on the one hand, many mythological aspects of the characters in the Hōm Yašt have so far been studied by scholars. On the other hand, connotation to the rituals are mainly attested in Y 9.1 and Y 9.14. Furthermore, although the focus of the present edition is on the Pahlavi version, on two occasions, long commentaries to the Avestan words *pourušaspa-* and *nmāna-* are provided. The reason for analysing the former is that the decision on the phonemic values of the vowels of the Avestan word can contribute into the edition of its Pahlavi counterpart whose phonemic values of the vowels as a loanword cannot be determined from the Pahlavi orthography of the variant readings attested in the manuscripts.\(^{19}\) Regarding *nmāna-* it occurs with *pourušaspa-* as gen. sg. *nmānahe pourušaspahe* in Y 9.13, translated by Phl. *andar mān ī porušasp* in Pahlavi. Studying two possible meanings of of *nmāna-* as “house” vs. “household”, its interpretation in the Pahlavi literature is investigated. The evidence favours

\(^{18}\) For the method of research see section 3.2.

\(^{19}\) See Y 9.13 commentary 2 *porušasp*. 
the former meaning or house as a physical construction in the both languages. Furthermore, it is suggested that the genitive case of nmnähe pourušaspehe in Y 9.13 agrees with an IE formula in the same case which identifies ancestry. Following this suggestion, the Pahlavi translation of genitives identifying ancestry is studied in Y 9.13 and Y 43.7 and it is shown that the Pahlavi translators rendered them correctly from the semantic point of view by the preposition andar and az, respectively.

The ensuing chapter is the Appendix in which the transliteration of the Pahlavi text and the variant readings of the six manuscripts of the Iranian Pahlavi and of the three manuscripts of the Indian Pahlavi Yasna are provided. Their readings are arranged in the text-critical apparatus according to the following order:

YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6, T55b; YIndP J2, K5, M1.

Obviously, although K5 serves as the base text, the variant readings of the Iranian manuscripts precede those of their Indian counterpart. The reason is that at the time of drawing the apparatus, following the scholarly consensus, it was assumed that the quality of the Pahlavi version of YIrPs surpasses that of their Indian counterparts. However, this consensus is mainly based on the interpretation of the colophons of the Iranian manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line and the better quality of their Avestan texts. By contrast, as mentioned above, the analysis in the present research suggests that the Pahlavi text of YIrPs is corrected.

1.1 The Avestan and Pahlavi languages

For the Iranian languages, scholars consider three developmental stages which chronologically are termed Old, Middle and New Iranian (Windfuhr 2009: 9). The earliest Zoroastrian texts in Avestan, an Old Iranian language closely related to the (Vedic) Sanskrit, were composed in the primary linguistic stage known as Old Avestan presumably in the mid-second millennium BCE. These Old Avestan texts petrified and were canonised, probably at an early stage, while the oral composition of new texts belonging to a later chronological stage continued and came to be classified as Young Avestan. These Avestan texts were in all likelihood transmitted exclusively in an oral setting until the advent of the Sasanians (224-651 CE) when they were written down in a consciously invented and extremely clear phonetic script reflecting the accurate recording of the recitatives (Skjærvø
The liturgical text of the Yasna with 72 chapters, or hāitis, constitutes one of the most important books of the extant Avesta. The Old Avestan texts, consisting of the Gāϑās, the Yasna Haptaŋhāti together with three short prayers, are embedded in the centre of the Yasna and are flanked on the either sides by the Young Avestan texts (Hintze 2007a: 1). As regards the grammar, the Avestan nouns maintain the Indo-Iranian declension system in which three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter), three numbers (singular, dual, plural) and eight cases (nominative, accusative, ablative, instrumental, dative, genitive, locative, vocative) exist. Like the Vedic language, the Avestan verbal system knows three numbers (singular, dual, plural), four tenses (present, imperfect, perfect, aorist), five moods (indicative, injunctive, subjunctive, optative, imperative) and two voices (active, middle). The language of some Avestan texts such as Y 12-15 and 58 are called pseudo-Old Avestan, or better: Middle Avestan, whose feature is described by de Vaan (2003: 8) as follows:

‘They show the lengthening of originally short Young Avestan word-final vowels. Here, we are clearly dealing with a much later, artificial development, which was intended to give the Young Avestan text an Old Avestan flavour’.

However, there are pseudo-Old Avestan forms which have no parallel either in the OAv or YAv texts. Proposing the term Middle Avestan, Tremblay (2006: 233-281) suggests that pseudo-Old Avestan texts show a middle stage from which YAv. developed. However, Skjærø (2009c: 45), being cautious about accepting Tremblay’s suggestion, states that:

‘On the one hand, the Old Avestan texts contain many elements that are clearly borrowed from or influenced by Young Avestan and, on the other hand, Young Avestan texts contain both elements that are imitations of Old Avestan (pseudo-Old Avestan) and later features introduced by the scribes (including from local spoken languages). This makes it a challenge to determine which of the sound changes we observe in our extant manuscripts already belonged to the ‘original’ two languages and which ones were introduced during the oral and written transmission of the texts. It renders even more problematic attempts to identify additional linguistic stages between Old and Young Avestan.’

By contrast, pointing out three forms which disagree with both OAv and YAv linguistic features, Hintze (2014a: 17-19) takes side with Tremblay. These forms are hā < *sa-s, the nom. sg. m. of the 2nd person demonstrative pronoun; gen. sg. aṣaihācā of the stem aṣa- and gen. sg. aṣauairiiascā of the stem aṣauairī-.  

20 For the tradition of transmission see section 3.1.
During the Sasanian (224-652 CE) and early Islamic periods, parts of the Avesta, including the long liturgical texts,\(^{21}\) were translated by Zoroastrian priests into Zoroastrian Middle Persian, or Pahlavi, a Middle Iranian language, which was the then vernacular koine and the ancestor of New Persian. These translations included commentaries on the passages of the Avesta. The original Avestan text of the Yasna and its Pahlavi translation and commentary of the liturgical texts, appear in bilingual manuscripts in a feature according to which Pahlavi translations and commentaries are inserted between short sections of Avestan phrases. This feature is remarkable in that there is only one known parallel outside the Zoroastrian tradition: The bilingual Prakrit-Aramaic regnal inscription of the Buddhist emperor Aśoka (r. 3rd century BCE).\(^{22}\) As regards the Pahlavi translation technique of the Avesta, Josephson (1997: 120-151) extensively studied it in the Hōm Yašt. Cantera (2004: 240-341) completed Josephson’s research by examining the Pahlavi translation technique of other Avestan texts, especially that of the Vidēvdād, Yasna, Yaṣts and Xwardag Abestāg. Josephson (1997: 154) summarises the Pahlavi translation technique of the Avestan categories as follows:

‘Av. is a language with a rich system of inflection and an extensive pattern of agreement. Phl. has a greatly reduced system of inflection and uses lexical items (prepositions and particles), word order (e.g. adjacency in noun phrases) and semantic context in addition to inflection to realize syntactic relations.’

The Pahlavi word order has been shown to result from a word for word translation of the Avesta original, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y 9.1</th>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>haōmō</th>
<th>upāiṭ</th>
<th>zaraḥuṣṭrōm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phl.</td>
<td>hōm</td>
<td>abar raft</td>
<td>ō zardušt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y 9.5</th>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>yauuata</th>
<th>xšaiiōiṭ</th>
<th>huuqββ̣ō</th>
<th>yimō</th>
<th>vīvanṭ̣hatō</th>
<th>puṣrō</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phl.</td>
<td>hamē tā ka</td>
<td>padīxšā būd</td>
<td>huramag</td>
<td>jam</td>
<td>ṫ wīwanghān</td>
<td>pus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) Long liturgical texts are the Yasna, Visperad, Vidēvdād and Vištāsp Yašt.

As the Pahlavi version is mainly a calque of the Avestan original, it usually disagrees with the Pahlavi SOV\(^{23}\) syntax, for example, the correct order of the two translations mentioned above is as follows:

* hōm ō zardušt abar raft
* hamē tā huramag jam [šēd] ī wīwanghān pus padixšā būd

However, the order is not always determined by the Avestan original. For example, as pointed out by Josephson (1997: 45), the order of the Avestan formulaic structure \textit{astuuaī̱tī̱īī̱} \textit{hunūta gaēdiīi̱ī} \textit{24} was changed in the Pahlavi version according to which \textit{astōmandăn gēhān}, translating \textit{astuuaī̱tī̱īī̱} and \textit{gaēdiīi̱ī}, respectively, are juxtaposed as \textit{astōmandăn gēhān}. Another example is the Pahlavi translation of \textit{Y 9.5 paṇca dasa fracarōī̱de pita pū̱drasca rao̱daēšuu̱a kataras̱ciṯ̄} in which the translation of \textit{rao̱daēšuu̱a}, or Phl. \textit{ārōyišn}, occurs after the Pahlavi translation of \textit{paṇca dasa}, or \textit{pānzdah sālag}:

\begin{align*}
\text{Av. } & \textit{paṇca dasa fracarōī̱de pita pū̱drasca rao̱daēšuu̱a kataras̱ciṯ̄} \\
\text{Phl. } & \textit{pānzdah sālag ārōyišn frāz raft hēnd pid ud pus kadār-iz-ē}
\end{align*}

In conclusion, the evidence suggests that the Pahlavi version is not entirely based on the order of the Avestan original and the Pahlavi exegetes maintained a limited degree of freedom. Unlike the Pahlavi translation, the commentary usually follows the Pahlavi syntax. However, for example the structure of the commentary \textit{xwarrahōmand dārēd xwēškārīh “the glorious has the duty”} in \textit{Y 9.4} is closer to the Pahavi translation as the expected syntax is \textit{*xwarrahōmand xwēškārīh dārēd}. This suggests that the commentary was borrowed from a lost Pahlavi translation of an Avestan verse. In addition, Avestan quotations or Avestan Pahlavicised forms occur in the Pahlavi version, for example:

\begin{align*}
\textit{Y 9.8 kō 9β̱m yim ahurām mazdām} \\
\textit{Y 9.11 xšuuaēpaia vaēnaiia barōšna} \\
\textit{Y 9.1 mihrō upāit zardušt}
\end{align*}

\(^{23}\) Subject, object, verb. 
\(^{24}\) It occurs in \textit{Y 9.4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13}. 
From the semantic point of view, having studied the Pahlavi version of the Avesta, Spiegel (1860: 69) argues that while there are several examples which show that the grammatical features of the Avestan original are expressed incorrectly, the Pahlavi version usually renders the original words correctly. Likewise, recent findings confirm Spiegel’s evaluation. In the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15, mistranslations of the Avestan grammatical categories also occur. For instance, the Avestan nom. sg. maššiiō in Y 9.3, 6, 9 and 12 is translated by the pl. mardōmān preceded by the preposition az “from, among” (Josephson 1997: 45). In Y 9.14, the nom. sg. srūtō is translated by ān ī nāmīg preceded by andar “in” (Josephson 1997: 55). Moreover, the superlative adjectives Av. taṇcištō “mightiest” and vorōvrajaštamiō “the most victorious” are expressed by the absolute Phl. tagīg “brave” and the comparative adjective pērōzgartar “more victorious” in Y 9.15. In the same stanza, the impf. 3rd sg. abauua “he was, he became” is also rendered by 2nd sg. dād ēstē “you have been created” (Josephson 1997: 56). By contrast, it is sometimes impossible to express the Avestan grammatical categories in Pahlavi. For instance, 2nd sg. impf. ăkornauuō in tūm zomērgūzō ăkornauuō višpe daēuua zarābuṣtra is expressed by 3rd pl. past kard hēnd in agreement with the grammatical subject harwisp dēw rather than the agent tō in the ergative construction tō andar zamīg nigān kard hēnd harwisp dēw (Josephson 1997: 56).

Finally, Spiegel (1860: 28-29) compares the similarities between the Pahlavi translations of the Avesta and the Aramaic version (targumim) of the Old and New Testaments. He suggests that the Targumim had a great impact on the development of the Pahlavi translations. These similarities are:

1) Both traditions show the word-by-word translations technique.

2) Both translations include comments and glosses.

Cantera (2004: 244-245), however, casts doubt on Spiegel’s suggestion by stating that the Pahlavi manuscripts display a mixture of features of the Indo-Iranian tradition and that attested in the Targum. As an example of the differences between the Pahlavi and Targum traditions, he mentions that while the Aramaic translations were written down to be recited in synagogues, the Pahlavi translations, representing the Zoroastrian scholastic tradition, are not ritual texts. For the Indo-Iranian features of the Avestan-Pahlavi texts, he compares

---

26 See Cantera (2004: 244-245).
27 For the Zoroastrian texts see section 1.4.
the similarities between the Rig-vedic Padapāṭha structure and the Avestan compositional and word-separating dot.  

1.2 Haōma in the Indo-Iranian and Zoroastrian Traditions

Av. haōma- (= Phl. hōm)/Ved. sóma- is the Indo-Iranian name of a plant and deity. In contemporary Zoroastrianism, the plant is regarded as a species of Ephedra (Kotwal & Boyd 1991: 16-17). In agreement with the age-old Indo-Iranian tradition, the plant twigs are pressed to extract its juice which is mingled with water and milk. In the Vedic mythology, Soma is consumed by Indra as a stimulant juice to smash the dragon Vṛtra:

RV 1.32.3 vṛṣāyamāṇo 'vṛṣīta sómaṃ trikadrukeṣu apibat sutaśya... Acting the bull, he chose for his own Soma. He drank of the pressed Soma among the Trikadrukas [= Maruts?] ...

Unlike the oldest Vedic text, the Rig-veda, haōma- is absent in the Old Avesta although its attributes namely dūraoša- “who averts perdition?” (Y 32.14) and mada- “intoxication” (Y 48.10) do occur in the Gāđās. They have been associated with rituals performed by Kauuis and Karapans who were the enemies of Zarašṭra according to the Zoroastrian tradition. Therefore, they have been traditionally regarded as two examples showing Zarašṭra’s opposition to the Haōma ritual (Rose 2011: 15). According to Y 32.14, Kauuis are yō dūraošom saocaiat “who burn Dūraoša”. However, as discussed by Flattery & Schwartz (1989: Part II, 106), the stanza only mentions the burning of Dūraoša (= Haōma?) by Kauuis and nothing is mentioned about the rejection of Haōma ritual by Zarašṭra. Furthermore, the relationship between dūraoša- in Y 32.14 and haōma- is uncertain because it is the direct object of the causative verb saocaiia- “to burn”. This concept can correspond to RV 4.21.6 in which Ved. durोśa- is the epithet of Agni “fire” (Kellens & Pirart 1991: 92). As regards Y 48.10, the verb ajīn and mūdra- in kadā ajīn mūdrōm ahiiā madahiīā “when-ajīn-mūdrōm-of this/his-intoxication” have been interpreted differently by scholars.

---

28 For a comparison between the Avestan texts and the Rig-vedic Padapāṭha texts see Cantera (2004: 329-336).
For example, translating *mūϑrm* as “booze-urine”, Puhvel (1987: 97) considers it as the object of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. verb *ajōn*.\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{quote}
Y 48.10 *kadā ajōn mūϑrm ahīiā madahīiā
yā angrīiā karapānō urūpaieiṇti

When will you crack down on this booze-urine
Whereby the mumbler-clergy wickedly bring on vomiting (Puhvel: 1987: 97).
\end{quote}

By contrast, Insler (1975: 290-291) derives *ajōn* from the verbal root *aj-* “to fear” cf. Gr. ákhomai. Moreover, he posits that as a hapax legomenon, *mūϑra-* is derived from the root *mū* “to be deluded, to fool” according to which he translates the passage as follows:

When shall they fear the folly of that intoxicating drink,
through the effects of which the Karpans …. torture (Insler 1975: 93).

Skjærvø (2004: 261-262, 268), on the one hand, interprets *ajōn* as the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. impf. of the root *jan* “to kill” and mentions that *mūϑrm* can be taken as both the subject or direct object of the verb. On the other hand, he draws attention to semantic difference between YAv. *maēsman-* “urine” and YAv. *mūϑra-* “dead matter, (evil) urine” and to a Vedic myth according to which the divine (Indra) urine, produced by the consumed Soma liquid, is described as fertilising. He mentions that to understand the meaning of the Gāthic *mūϑra-* , the mythology of its Vedic counterpart, Ved. *mūtra-* “urine” and YAv. *mūϑra-* should be considered (Skjærvø 2004: 265-268). He also shows that while according to Y 48.10, Karpans’ *xratu-* “guiding thought” leads to *duśɔ.xštavr*- “bad command”, the followers of the *duś.xratu-* “bad guiding thought” increase *aēšma* “Wrath” (Y 49.4). Moreover, the context of Y 48.9-12 compares the results of the rituals performed by *saošaiiṇ*- “savour, revitaliser” and those performed by Karpans (Skjærvø 2004: 274-277). Therefore, since in the Avesta, *aēšma-* is opposed by *sraoša-* , Y 48.9-12 describes that while the performer (*par excellence*) of the Haōma ritual enables Sraoša to smash Wrath, the ritual performed by Karpans is inefficient:\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{1}In conclusion then, it would seem that our text refers to the ritual myth of the haoma and the intoxication of the divinity, the victory over the forces of anti-fertility and the

\textsuperscript{34} The analysis of the verb *ajōn* as 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. has been refuted. See Skjærvø (2004: 259).

fertilizing of the world by means of the heavenly rain/urine/semen.  

Moreover, Skjærvø suggests that Haōma is encrypted in Y 29.7 since the ingredients of its ritual are attested; Av. āzuiti “for libation”, maṭra “sacred utterance” and xšuuīd “milk” (Skjærvø 2015: 420). Following Skjærvø, we may conclude that there are indications in the Gāhās that, rather than being opposed, the Haōma ritual is regarded as a weapon against the evil forces.

In YAv. and the Vedic texts, Av. haōma-/ Ved. sóma- is described as a yellowish mountainous plant whose twigs are pounded to extract its juice. This pressed plant, as a deity, is revered for imparting strength, victory, health, healing and knowledge. In some passages of the Avesta and Rig-veda, the adjective Av. maδa- and its corresponding Ved. mada- “intoxication” are also used to describe haōma-/sóma. For example:

**Y 10.8 vīspe ańiie maδānyhō**
*ašma hacīnte xruuī.druuō*
āaṭ hō yō haomahe maδō
aśa hacīte uruuāsmana
rōnjaiti haomahe maδō

Indeed all, other [forms of] intoxication are accompanied by the Wrath of the bloody club, but Haōma’s intoxication is accompanied by joyful Truth.

Haoma’s intoxication [weighs] light…

**RV 8.48.6. agnīṃ nā māhitāṃ sāṃ didīphaḥ prá cakṣaya kṛṇuḥī vāsyaso nah áthā hī te māda ā soma mánye revāṃ iva prá carā puṣṭūṃ ácha**

You have enflamed me like a churned fire. Make us conspicuous; make us better off. For now, in the exhilaration, Soma, I think of myself as a rich man. I shall advance to prosperity.

In the Avesta, the pressed Haōma also brings immortality. This is stated, for example in Vd 6.43 nōīṭ haōmō hutō axtiś nōīṭ mahrkō “the pressed Haōma has neither illness nor

---

death”. Likewise, Soma averts death. For example: RV 8.48.3 ápāma sómam amṛtā abhūma “We have drunk Soma, we have become immortal”.41

In the Pahlavi literature, the mythological White Hōm tree (Phl. gōkaren) grows in the mythical river Phl. ardwīsūr (IrBd 6.5). It is also the master of all plants and brings immortality: IrBd 16.5 u-š pad frašgird anōšagīh az-iš wirāyēnd urwarān rad ast “and they prepare immortality therefrom [i.e. the white Hōm] at the renovation of the universe. It is the chief of plants.”42 In the Vedic literature, the master of plants is also Soma (MacDonell 1917: 154). Apart from Haōma’s Indo-Iranian inherited features, the plant-deity plays an important role in the story of Zardušt’s birth as his Frawahr43 was embedded inside a twig of the plant Hōm:

Zs. Chapter 6. kū frawahr andar hōm u-š xwarrah pēm ī gāw be dahīhistan
His Frawahar being in the Hōm, his glory was consigned to the milk of the cow.44

Later, the twig was cut by the father of Zardušt, or Porušasp. Then, it was pounded and mingled with cow’s milk which carried Zardušt’s Glory (Phl. xwarrah) and the mixture was drunk by Dōgdōw, the mother of Zardušt,. As a result, his Glory was united with his Frawahr in the body of his mother (Amouzegar & Tafazzoli 1991(1370) 39-41).

1.3 **The metrical system of the Avestan Hymn to Haōma**

The Yašts are 21 hymns to the Zoroastrian deities. The hymn to Haōma, or the Hōm Yašt, constitutes Yt 21 which is also incorporated into the Yasna with 72 chapters in which it constitutes Yasna 9-11.45 As mentioned in section 1, Y 9 commences with a dialogue between Zaraϑuštra and Haōma when the deity attends Zaraϑuštra’s worship. Then, come stanzas 3-15 which list questions posed by Zaraϑuštra the seer to Haōma about fathers who pressed Hōm through which heroic sons were born to them. These fathers are Vīuuaϑhaŋt, Āϑβya, Ōrita and Pouruϑaspa to whom Yima, Ōraētāona, Kǝrǝsāspa and Zaraϑuštra were born, respectively. The core of the Hōm Yašt encompasses a series of prayers and eulogies.

---

42 The text is after Anklesaria (1956: 146-147).
43 The Zoroastrian concept which became blended with the notion of ruwān “soul” at the early stage of Zoroastrianism (Boyce 2001: 195).
44 The text is after Anklesaria (1964: 52, LXXXIV).
45 Hintze (2014c).
The last chapter, or Y 11, is about the curses of the cow, horse and Haōma on priests, warriors who do not treat them as prescribed in the religion (Kellens 1987: 37).

The composition of the Hōm Yašt is different from the other Yašts as it lacks the usual beginning and ending formula and in particular the ahe raiia which is the introduction of the formula concluding a Karde (Josephson 1997: 23). Apart from the Gāḏās, the Yašts are the only Avestan texts whose compositional structure is predominantly metrical. However, their irregular metrical nature has caused continuous scholarly debate. Geldner (1877) showed that the verse lines of eight syllables are dominant. Recent studies also confirm the octosyllabic structure of the Yašts. Regarding the Hōm Yašt, the metrical octosyllabic structure is mainly close to the Sanskrit anuṣṭubh (four times eight syllables), but there is no fixed number of verse lines per stanza. Other metres are gāyatrī (8 + 8: 8) and pankti (8 + 8 : 8 + 8 : 8). There are also examples of stanzas containing 16 (7+9 or 9 +7) syllables. As far as the first fifteen stanzas of the Hōm Yašt, studied in the present edition, are concerned, the metre of some verse lines which describe the question of Zaraϑustra from Ahura Mazdā in Y 9.1(c-d) is irregular:

\[
\begin{align*}
Y 9.1 & \quad \ldots \quad \text{ā dim pərəsat zaraϑuṣṭrō:} \quad 8 \\
& \quad \text{kō narə ahī (d) yim azəm:} \quad 8 \\
& \quad \text{vīspahe aŋhōuš āstuuətō:} \quad 8 \\
& \quad \text{sraēštəm dādarəsa:6} \\
& \quad \text{x'əhe gaiiehe:} \quad 5 \\
& \quad \text{x'ənuuatō aməṣəhe:} \quad 8
\end{align*}
\]

According to Pirart (2003: 158-162), the irregular metric verse lines in Y 9.1 have parallels in other YAv. texts, where they are, however, metrically regular: H 2.10 (= Vyt 57.2) yəm ʒ̕ yauua carātingm (8), kəhrpa sraēštəm dādarəsa (8) and Yt 8.11 ŝušuiqm x'əhe gaiiehe (8), x'ənuuatō aməṣəhe (8). On this basis, he corrects Y 9.1 sraēštəm dādarəsa x'əhe gaiiehe to *(kəhrpa) sraēštəm dādarəsa (yim azəm) x'əhe gaiiehe (Pirart 2003: 161). However, Kellens (2006: 275-276) mentions that the composer had the possibility to produce an octosyllabic metre by changing the place of sraēštəm:

\[
\begin{align*}
& *\text{kō narə ahī sraēštəm (8) “who-man-are (you)-the most beautiful (in the accusative case)}” \\
& \text{vīspahe aŋhōuš āstuuətō (8) “of all-the material-world”} \\
& *\text{dādarəsa x'əhe gaiiehe (8) “I see-in (of) one’s own sunny immortal life”}
\end{align*}
\]

46 For a review on the composition of the Yašts See Hintze (2014c).
Therefore, according to Kellens (2006: 276), it seems that in Yasna 9.1, like in the expression in Hādōxt Nask 2.10 kʰhrpə sraēštəm dādarəsə, the juxtaposition of the verb dādarəsa and sraēšta- is a stylistic and semantic feature which was more important to the composer than maintaining the metrical regularity. Another irregularity is the metre of the interrogative kəsə ḍwəm occurring in Y 9.3, 6, 9, 12. It is followed by octosyllabic verse lines, for example: Y 9.6 bitiiō haōma mašiiō (8) astuuaiiität hunūta gaēdiięii (8). However, the answer to kəsə ḍβqəm is also irregular in Y 9.4, 7 and 13:

\[
\begin{align*}
Y 9.4 & \ \text{vīuuagʰâ̊ məm paoiriiō mašiiō} \\
Y 9.7 & \ \text{āḍbiitō məm bitiiō mašiiō} \\
Y 9.13 & \ \text{pouru̯aspō məm tūriiō mašiiō}
\end{align*}
\]

By contrast, the metre in Y 9.10 ḍritō sāmanqəm səwuištō (8) ḍritiiō məm mašiiō (7), the answer to Y 9.9, is relatively regular according to which Kellens (2006: 277) reconstructs their corresponding regular octosyllabic formula as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Proper name + epithet (like sāmanqəm səwuištō)} \\
&\text{Ordinals (for example paoiriiō) + haōməm mašiiō}
\end{align*}
\]

In the Pahlavi version, the dividing manner of the Pahlavi translation and commentary shows that the Pahlavi translators knew the octosyllabic structure of the Hōm Yašt (Josephson 1997: 162).

### 1.4 The Zoroastrian Texts and Their Translations

Two Zoroastrian liturgical sets have been identified; the so called “short liturgy” and the “long liturgy”. The short liturgies (Xwardag Abestāg and Yašts)\(^{48}\) represent the cults recited by both the laity and priests. As mentioned above Yašts are 21 hymns in Avestan dedicated to the Zoroastrian deities. The Xwardag Abestāg, by contrast, alongside liturgies composed in Avestan (Niyāyišn, Gāh, Āfrīnagān, Sīh-Rōzag and Yašts), includes some other short

\(^{48}\) As pointed out by Hintze (2014c), ‘historically, however, the Yašts also formed part of a priestly high ritual, the Bagān Yasn, now lost, by way of their intercalation into the Yasna cum Visperad, along the model exemplified by the Vištāsp Yašt Sāde’.
texts which are composed in Pahlavi and Pāzand. The manuscripts may also contain short liturgies in New Persian, Sanskrit and Gujarati. Therefore, there is no codified text.\textsuperscript{49}

Unlike short liturgies, the long ceremonies are only performed inside the fire temple by priests who have undergone the purification ceremony, \textit{barašnūm}.\textsuperscript{50} There are five types of such liturgies as found in the manuscripts namely: 1) Yasna; 2) Yasna ī Rapihwin; 3) Visperad; 4) Vištāsp Yašt.\textsuperscript{51} The Yasna of 72 chapters, or \textit{hāiti}, is the base text of all other Zoroastrian high rituals. The recitation of 72 chapters of the Yasna plays an important role in the religious ceremonies. It is carried out by two priests early in the morning, or Hāwan Gāh (Hintze 2007a: 1). As mentioned above in section 1.1, the Yasna encompasses texts composed in Old Avestan and Young Avestan. Ahunawar, or Yašt Ahū Vairiō (Y 27.13), Ašam Vohū (Y 27.14), the five Gāϑās (Y 28-34, 43-46, 47-50, 51, 53), the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti (Y 35-41) and Airiiman, or Ā Airiīōmā Išīō, (Y 54) are in Old Avestan. By contrast, the following texts form the Young Avestan section of the Yasna:

Y 1-2: Introductory sections; Y 3-8: Drōn ceremony to Šrōš; Y 9-11: Hōm Yašt; Y 12-13: The confession of faith (Frauuarānē); Y 14-18: More invocations; Y 19: Commentary to Yašt Ahū Vairiō; Y 20: Commentary to Ašam Vohū; Y 21: Commentary to Yajhe Hāṯām; Y 22-27.12: More invocations; Y 42: A YAv text interpolated between OAv Y 41 and 43; Y 52: A YAv text interpolated between OAv Y 51 and 52; Y 55: Praises of the Gāϑās and the Staota Yesniia; Y 56: Short invocation of Sraoša; Y 57: Long invocation of Sraoša (Srōš Yašt); Y 58: Fšūšō Māϑra; Y 59: The stanza repeats Y 19 and Y 26; Y 60: Dahmā Āfritiš; Y 61: Glorification of some prayers; Y 62: Ātaš Nyāyišn; Y 63-69: Āb Zōhr; Y 70-72: Concluding praises.\textsuperscript{52}

The Yasna ī Rapihwin is a ceremony during which chapters 1 to 4, 6, 7, 17, 22, 59 and 66 of the Yasna celebrate \textit{rapihwin gāh}, or the noon-watch of the day (Hintze 2012a: 245). In the Visperad ceremony, the text of the Visperad with 22 chapters\textsuperscript{53} is incorporated into the text of the 72 chapters of the Yasna.\textsuperscript{54} The Vasperad serves as a basis for the Vištāsp Yašt.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{49} For short liturgies see Andrés-Toldeo (2015: 521-522).
\textsuperscript{50} The greatest purification ritual which lasts nine nights (Boyce 1975b: 111).
\textsuperscript{52} See Malandra (2006b); Andrés-Tooledo (2015: 520).
\textsuperscript{53} It ’supplements the Yasna with invocations and appeals to the patrons (\textit{ratu}-.’ (Kellens 1987: 38).
\textsuperscript{54} For the insertion formula see Malandra (2013).
\textsuperscript{55} Vištāsp Yašt includes 22 chapters. With the exception of the first two chapters and chapter 19 which contains the temptation of Zarathušttra, the text of Vištāsp Yašt deals with the purity laws. Chapter 1 narrates the account of the sixteen lands created by Ahura Mazdā, which were afflicted by the counter creation of Aŋra Maniiu. Chapter 2 describes the story of Yima (Kellens 1987: 39-40).
and Vishtāsp Yasht 56 ceremonies in which further ceremonies are celebrated by intercalating the Vīdēvdād or Vishtāsp Yašt texts (Cantera 2012: 280). The liturgical texts of the Yasna, Visperad, Vīdēvdād, Vishtāsp, Xwardag Abestāg and some Yašt texts have been translated into Pahlavi. The Pahlavi version of the Avesta is traditionally called the Zand. Manuscripts that only include the Avestan liturgical texts and the ritual instructions in Pahlavi, New Persian or Gujarati are called sāda “Simple”. By contrast, if the Avestan text is accompanied by its corresponding translation and commentary, it is calledexegetical which represents the scholastic tradition (Andrés-Toledo 2015: 522-523). However, the history of the exegetical tradition can be traced back at least to the Young Avestan period during which were composed Y 19, 20 and 21 which are commentaries on the Yaštā Ahū Vairiō, Ašam Vohu and Yağhe Hātām prayers, respectively (Hintze 2015: 36).

In addition to the bilingual Avestan-Pahlavi Yasna copies, three other types of theexegetical Yasna manuscripts have been distinguished so far:

a) Sanskrit: The manuscripts include the Avestan text which is accompanied by its Sanskrit translation and commentary.

b) Gujarati: In the manuscripts, the Avestan text and its Gujarati translation are written in Gujarati script.

c) New Persian: In the manuscripts, part or all of the Avestan text of Y 9-11 is translated into New Persian. Some Pahlavi manuscripts like T6, also provide an interlinear New Persian translation of the Avestan and Pahlavi version.57

Chronologically, the Pahlavi versions of the Avesta belong to one of the following periods: 1) the Sasanian; 2) the ninth and tenth centuries and 3) the late period (11-19th CE). The Pahlavi version of the Vīdēvdād belong to the first group. By contrast, the Pahlavi text of the Yasna shows the morphological features of the Pahlavi language of the ninth century (Cantera 2004: 231-239).58 However, regarding the Hōm Yašt, Josephson (1997: 164) draws attention to the translation of the Avestan preposition paiti which rather than the expected pad or abar is rendered in Y 9.30-32 by be, the common translation of paiti in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries.59 Such features stand side by side with the correct Pahlavi translations according to which Josephson (1997: 164) concludes that:

56 Vištāsp Yašt compromises some quotations from the Vīdēvdād (Kellens 1987: 40).
57 See Hintze (2012a: 245). For T6 see the website of the Avestan Digital Archive.
58 In addition to the Vīdēvdād, the Pahlavi versions of the non-liturgical texts of the Hērbadestān and Nērangestan show the features of Sasanian Pahlavi.
59 Y 9.30 Av. paiti ažōš zairitahe “against the yellow dragon” vs. Phl. be az ī zard “against the yellow dragon”; Y 9.31 paiti mašīhe drusatō sāstār “against the deceitful tyrant man” vs. Phl. be mardōm ī drūwand ī sāstār “against the deceitful tyrant man”; Y 9.32 paiti jahikaitīāi yātumaitīāi “against the body of the prostitute full
Thus, while the study of the Hōm Yašt does not give a clear answer to the question when the extant translation was made, it suggests that it contains passages representing the work of different translators who lived at different periods. It indicates that there may have been an old Phl. rendering of the Yašt upon which later translators built, but that subsequently there was a steady deterioration of all aspects of the work.’

Josephson’s suggestion also agrees with the history of the Zoroastrian written tradition according to which the first Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts were written in the late tenth century. Therefore, later features can be the result of later corrections.

It is generally assumed that Sanskrit version was produced based on the Pahlavi Yasna. It has traditionally been attributed to Nēryosangh Dhaval. However, the time of Nēryosangh is not mentioned in the colophons. As a result, scholars have put forward very different estimates about his time. For example, eighth and fifteenth centuries according to Meherjirana (1899: 9-10) and Haug (1884: 55), respectively. While the earliest Zoroastrian Gujarati texts date to the early fifteenth century, the oldest Gujarati manuscript with date at our disposal was completed in 1824 CE. The manuscripts, which include the New Persian translation of the Yasna, are also late as the oldest known manuscript was completed in 1707 CE (Hintze 2012a: 274).

Based on the origin of the manuscripts, they have traditionally been assigned into two groups: 1) Iranian and 2) Indian. Iranian manuscripts were either produced in Iran or copied from an Iranian manuscript in India whereas their Indian counterparts were copied in India from an Indian manuscript (Geldner 1886-1896: xiii-llv).

1.5 Previous Research on the Pahlavi Versions of the Avesta

The first comprehensive work on the Avesta was undertaken by N. L. Westergaard (1852-1854) followed by K. Geldner (1886-1896). Westergaard edited the Avesta based on the manuscripts which were brought to Copenhagen in 1820 by Rasmus Rask. Moreover, he collated manuscripts from private collections and various libraries in London, Oxford and Paris. Geldner continued Westergaard’s work and had access to 133 manuscripts which are around five times as many as Westergaard (Hintze 2012b: 420). As regards the Pahlavi

of sorcery” vs. Phl. be jeh-ē ī jādīg “against the body of a prostitute, the sorcer”.

60 For the completion date of the manuscripts associated with the copy of Hōşang Syāwaxš see Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 40)


62 According to my knowledge, no scholarly work has been performed on the features of the New Persian and Gujarati versions of the Avesta.
version of the Avesta, the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were divided between two views.\(^{63}\)

a) the traditional view, represented by J. Darmesteter and F. Spiegel, was that the Avesta can be understood with the assistance of the Pahlavi version. Following this view, Spiegel (1853-1858) published the first edition of the Avesta and Pahlavi versions of the Vidēvdād (volume I) and Visperad and Yasna (volume II) in which the Pahlavi version is reproduced in the Pahlavi script.\(^{64}\) L. Mills extensively engaged in translating the Pahlavi versions of the Avesta which were published in a series of articles between 1890-1914.\(^{65}\) Of his works five are dedicated to the edition of the Pahlavi version of the Hōm Yašt. In 1900, Mills edited the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15, followed by its English translation (Mills 1903c). In three separate articles, he also published the edition (Mills 1902) and English translation (Mills 1903a) of Y 9.16-32 together with the edition of Y 10 (Mills 1903b). One year later, the English translation of the Pahlavi version of Y 11-12 was published (Mills 1904: 495-512). During this period, the Parsi priest and scholar P. Sanjana (1895) also edited the Pahlavi version of the Vidēvdād (Vd 1-9, 19). An important step forward in the Avestan studies was Bartholomae’s (1904) *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* in which the vocabulary of Avestan and Old Persian is given. As regards the Avestan words, their corresponding Pahlavi and Sanskrit translations are also provided in transcription.

b) The followers of the Vedic view, represented by Geldner (1896), pointing out the mistakes in the Pahlavi translation of the Avesta, argue that the etymological approach and comparative studies with the Vedas are the most reliable guide to the Avesta.

The direction of the Avestan studies, during the first half of the twentieth century, was changed by Andreas’s theory. According to the Pahlavi book of the Dēnkard, the Arcasid king Valaxš made the first attempts at restoring the Avesta after the Alexander conquest.\(^{66}\) In agreement with the teaching of the Dēnkard, F. C. Andreas (1902)\(^{67}\) affirmed the existence of the Arsacid archetype and stated that the Arsacid Avesta was presumably written down in an Aramaic script similar to that of Pahlavi texts. Later, during the Sasanian

\(^{63}\) For a comprehensive review on the history of the Avestan studies in the nineteenth century see Cantera (2004: 65-75).

\(^{64}\) In addition to the Pahlavi version, the Avestan original is given in a separate section. Spiegel also translated the original Avestan of the Vidēvdād, Visperad and Yasna into German, mainly by considering the indigenous Pahlavi redactions. For Spiegel see Schmitt (2002).

\(^{65}\) For Mills’s works on the Pahlavi version of the Yasna see Cantera (2004: 70, fn. 74); Gropp (1991: 79, fn. 5).

\(^{66}\) For a discussion on the Dēnkard text see Cantera (2004: 106-113).

\(^{67}\) Andreas declared his theory at the International Congress of Orientalists held in Hamburg. In the following year, he published it entitled: *Die Entstehung des Awesta-Alphabetes und sein ursprünglicher Lautwert.*
epoch, it was mechanically transposed into the invented Avestan script by ignorant priests. He concluded that a philological approach is the only authentic way to understand the Avesta. For example, he posits that the Avestan letters e (ǝ) and ē (ē) are the ligatures of y-y-w and in the Arsacid Avesta they were spelled as either yo or yō or yu. He also suggested that there was no real dialectical difference between OAv and YAv with the exception of the lengthening of the final vowels in Old Avestan. Therefore, for example the gen. sg. ending -hyā (＼wHyā) and its vulgate YAv counterpart -he (＼wHe), according to Andreas, represent the original Arcasid -(a)hya. As a result, the work on the Pahlavi version of the Avesta was abandoned for about four decades in favour of studies aiming at reconstructing the suggested Arsacid copy.68

During this quiet period of Pahlavi studies in the West, Parsi scholars were mainly involved in the Pahlavi translations of the Avesta. For example, the first substantial study of the Pahlavi version of Yasna IX is M. Davar (1904). Unvala (1924) edits and translates the Sanskrit version of Y 9-11. However, in his work, the Sanskrit text in transcription is accompanied by its original Avestan and Pahlavi counterparts. T. Anklesaria (1949), gives the first full transcription and English translation of the Vidēvdād. B. N. Dhabhar (1927 and 1949) edits the entire Pahlavi text of the Xwardag Abestāg and Yasna, respectively. Like Spiegel, in Dhabhar’s edition, the Pahlavi texts appear in its respective Pahlavi script. Moreover, he completed his English translation of the Zand of the Xwardag Abestāg which was published posthumously (Dhabhar 1963).69

Andreas’s theory was refuted in independent studies by H. Bailey (1943), W. B. Henning (1942b) and G. Morgenstierne (1942). Briefly, his assumption of the mechanical transposition of the Avestan texts has been criticised as it ignores the complicated written and oral history of the transmission of the Avesta. Furthermore, on the one hand, it is unlikely to assume that the Avestan script, showing even the slightest nuances of the recitative, is an invention of ignorant priests. On the other hand, the existence of the Arsacid copy is uncertain. Moreover, it is impossible to explain the Avestan vowels ǝ (ǝ), ɔ (ɔ), o (ɔ), ʊ (ʊ), u (u), ū (ū) by Andreas’s theory according to which they are all derived from w. Andreas also suggests that ā (w) is the transcription of the Arsacid <ʾ>. However, it is shown that in Pahlavi the matres lectionis represent short vowels only in certain occasions. For example, the Pahlavi a is only expressed by w before <h>.

69 For a review on the studies on the Pahlavi version of the Avesta by the Parsis see Cantera (2004: 102-104).
In 1970, Hoffmann argues that the extant Avesta is the work of the Sasanian priests and a combination of both traditional and philological methods should be used to understand the Sasanian Avesta. His suggestion was widely accepted among scholars and as a result it led to the revival of the studies on the Pahlavi redactions of the Avesta. The reason is that the Pahlavi version carries important information about the composition history of the Avesta. Moreover, from the lost sections of the Avesta, there are commentaries which only occur in the Pahlavi texts. Therefore, serious academic works on the Pahlavi version of the Avesta gradually started again in the West from the late 1960s onwards. In 1968, G. Klingenschmitt, a student of Hoffmann, finished his doctoral dissertation on the bilingual Avestan-Pahlavi Dictionary, Frahangī Oīm. In 1969, Humber & Jamaspasa, translated the Avesta and Pahlavi versions of Vaēϑā Nāsk. The same scholars, in 1971, edited the bilingual Avestan and Pahlavi Pursisnīhā, followed by an English translation. Z. Taraf (1981) supplied the edition of the original Avestan of the Niyāyišn together with its Pahlavi and Sanskrit versions, based on the editions of Geldner, Dhabhar and Bharucha, respectively. Her edition is also accompanied by a German translation of the three versions, followed by a commentary. In 1985, Ph. Kreyenbroek edited and translated into English the Avestan and Pahlavi versions of the hymn to Sraoša (Y 56, 57; Yt 11) based on the Avestan edition of Geldner and Pahlavi edition of Dhabhar. In 1992, F. M. Kotwal and Ph. Kreyenbroek published their edition of the Avestan and Pahlavi versions of the Hērbedestān and Nērangestan. In 1997, Josephson studied the Pahlavi translation technique of the Avestan text of the Hōm Yašt.

As far as the present edition is concerned, according to the literature review, the following works have so far been devoted to the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15:

1) Spiegel’s (1858: 29-242) edition of the Pahlavi Yasna, based on the readings of YIndP K5.

2) Mills’s edition (1900: 511-528) and English translation (1903c: 313-324) of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15:

Mills (1900: 511-515) collated six books as follows: YIndP Pt4, J2, K5, M1,70 fragments of the Yasna from Haug’s collection, Spiegel’s edition and the manuscript 12a whose Pahlavi text is written in the Persian script. In the English translation of the text, short commentaries are also provided in the footnotes.

3) Davar’s (1904) edition and English translation of Y 9, based on the collation of mainly two (J2, K5) and occasionally three manuscripts (J2 K5, Mf4).

4) Dhabhar’s (1949) edition of the entire Pahlavi Yasna in its respective script, based on four manuscripts; Pt4, Mf4 of the YIrP group and J2, K5 of its YIndP counterpart. Like Mills’s edition, short commentaries are given in the footnotes.

5) Josephson’s (1997) study on the Pahlavi translation technique of the Avestan original of the Hōm Yašt. In her work, the Avestan original and its corresponding Pahlavi translation are provided together with their corresponding English translations. While the former is based on the edition of Geldner, the Pahlavi translation follows the text of Dhabhar’s edition. It should be noted that since the main purpose of the research was to investigate the Pahlavi translation technique, Pahlavi commentaries, with the exception of some short ones, are omitted in her edition.

Among the studies on the Hōm Yašt listed above, the common problem is that a detailed analysis of the history of the copies and the method of textual edition are wanting. Furthermore, new manuscripts are now available that their quality should be studied. Moreover, the old-fashioned transcriptions of the editions of Davar (1904) and Mills (1900) should be replaced by D. N. Mackenzie’s (1971) widely accepted system of transcription.

In conclusion, in the present study, the Pahlavi text of Y 9.1-15 is treated as an independent subsection within Y 9. It commences with a dialogue between Zaraϑuštra and Haōma when the deity attends Zaraϑuštra’s worship. Stanzas 3-15 list questions posed by Zaraϑuštra to Haōma about who pressed Haōma in the past and which reward was received

70 For Pt4, J2, K5, M1 see section 2.1 and 3.1.
for the pressing. Haōma states the names and says that heroic sons were born to them.⁷¹ Although the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15 is generally a calque of the original Avestan, the order of the former is not always determined by its Avestan counterpart. Unlike the Pahlavi translation, the Pahlavi commentaries usually follow the proper Pahlavi syntax. Exceptions could be related to the borrowed Pahlavi translations of Avestan texts which are lost.⁷² As for the poetic structure of the Avestan original of the hymn, the octosyllabic metre predominates in the Yašt and the dividing manner of its Zand shows that the Pahlavi exegetes were aware of its metrical structure.⁷³ Chronologically, the text of the Pahlavi version betrays the features of the ninth-tenth centuries Pahlavi. Nonetheless, Josephson adduces an example of the twelfth-thirteenth centuries Pahlavi which suggests that the text was the subject to some later interpretive activities.⁷⁴ The literature review of the past scholarship reveals that during the twentieth century, scholars mainly focused on the edition and study of the Avestan original. As a result, the Zand which shows the understanding of Zoroastrian priests of the Sasanian and early Islamic periods received little attention and even in these studies, an analysis of the transmission of the text is wanting.⁷⁵ Therefore, in order to justify conclusions in the present edition, the text is edited following a detailed study of the transmission of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15. Moreover, features of the collated manuscripts such as the geographical typology, date of completion, possible correction and contamination are analysed to evaluate their quality.

⁷¹ See section 1.
⁷² See section 1.1.
⁷³ See 1.3.
⁷⁴ 1.4See section 1.4.
⁷⁵ See section 1.5.
2 Description of the Manuscripts
The present edition of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15 is based on the collation of nine manuscripts called Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6, T55b, J2, K5 and M1. Of the manuscripts, Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6 and T55b are Iranian whereas J2, K5, M1 belong to the category of the Indian manuscripts. Traditionally, Iranian and Indian Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts are represented by Pt4, Mf4 and J2, K5, respectively. According to their colophons, Pt4 and Mf4 are descendants of a copy written down by Hōšang Syāwaxš in the fifteenth century. After the translation of the colophon of Pt4 by West (1896-1904), the manuscript received a particular attention by scholars because it is believed that the text is about the history of the compilation of the first bilingual Pahlavi manuscript. However, as discussed in section 2.1, the text of the colophons has been interpreted differently by scholars. Furthermore, while the manuscripts Pt4, Mf4 have always been evaluated according to their Avestan original, the quality of their Pahlavi version is unknown. In addition, in the present edition, the manuscripts G14 and T6 are collated. The reason is that although like Pt4 and Mf4, they contain the colophons of Hōšang Syāwaxš, neither their colophon nor their Pahlavi text has so far been studied. Moreover, the Pahlavi text of the Iranian manuscripts F2 and T55b is studied in the present edition, as the former is not a member of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line and the latter is an undated manuscript whose scribe is unknown. Regarding the Indian manuscripts, J2 and K5 are the oldest Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts at our disposal. Furthermore, I collate the readings of another Indian copy namely M1 since it is contemporaneous with Pt4, Mf4 and G14 which were produced in the eighteenth century. Therefore, the relationship between the Pahlavi version of M1 and the two old Indian manuscripts, together with the scribal traditions in the eighteenth century, can be studied.

2.1 The Colophons of Hōšang Syāwaxš in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6

Pt4 (fol. 2v-4v), Mf4 (p. 2-8), G14 (fol. 18v-21r) and T6 (fol. fol. 5v-8v) contain an Introduction which includes two colophons on Pt4 (fol. 3v line 1-16), Mf4 (p. 4 line 7-17, p. 5 line 1-6), G14 (fol. 19v line 4-14) and T6 (fol. 6v line 10-13, fol. 7r line 1-8). The first colophon mentions the name of Hōšang Syāwaxš as the scribe of the manuscript that is ancestral to the entire group. While in the colophon, the completion date of the manuscript

---

76 In addition to Pt4 and Mf4, YIrPs are also represented by Mf1 (Hoffmann & Narten 1989: 15). However, since Mf1 only has the Avestan text, it is not studied in the present edition.
77 For a discussion see section 3.1.
78 Facsimiles of the manuscripts Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b are available on the website of the Avestan Digital Archive. For Mf4 see Jamasp Asa & Nawabi 1976 (2535).
79 Unlike other manuscripts having folio numbering, in the Mf4 published facsimile, pages are numbered.
of Hōšang Syāwaxš is not stated, such a date is found in the third colophon of Mf4 (p. 599-600) according to which he completed the manuscript in AY 864 (= 1495 CE).\(^{80}\)

The second colophon provides details about the history of the compilation of the first Pahlavi Yasna manuscript. They have been studied by West (1896-1904: 84-85), Dhabhar (1923a: 90-93; Pahlavi text, 114-118; English translation), Tavadia (1944: 321-332) and Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 31-42).\(^{81}\) By interpreting the text differently, scholars have put forward significantly diverging filiations. Moreover, there is no agreement regarding the place of caesura between the two colophons.

Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 35, fn. 2-18) compare the variant readings of the Pt4 and Mf4 colophons and show that the textual divergences between the two manuscripts are minor. By contrast, as mentioned above, the text of colophons in G14 and T6 has so far not been examined. In what follows, the text of the colophon in Pt4 is reproduced while the variant readings of Mf4, G14, T6 are recorded in the footnotes.\(^{82}\)

Pt4 fol. 3r line 21) … nibišt
fol. 3v line 1) rāy pad hamuskārišnīh pěrōzgar man dēn bandag\(^{83}\) hōšang
2) syāwaxš šahryār baxtāfrīd šahryār az\(^{84}\)
3) paččen hērbed mihrābān spandād mihrābān\(^{85}\)
4) ō az paččen hērbed\(^{86}\) māhpānāh\(^{87}\) ʾāzādmarī i\(^{89}\)
5) panāh ī az kāzerōn rōstāg įiyōn mard\(^{90}\) nēk
6) abarmāndīg\(^{91}\) pad dēn ud ruwān abēgumān uš kāmag
7) frārōn ō\(^{92}\) yazdān wehān rōstāhm i\(^{93}\) dād ohrmazd
8) nōgdraxt ī az farrōx būm ī spāhān az rūddasī
dōstāg az waržuk deh abestāg az paččen-d\(^{94}\)

\(^{80}\) See the Mf4 description.

\(^{81}\) West’s translation is based on the text of the colophons in Pt4. By contrast, Dhabhar translates the text of the colophons in Mf4. Tavadia provides a detailed description of the Introduction and the colophons of Pt4 and Mf4. However, the original Pahlavi text is wanting in his work. Cantera & de Vaan edit the text based on the colophons in Pt4. They also give the variant readings of Mf4 and manuscript readings of the edited words in the footnotes.

\(^{82}\) The variant readings of the colophons recorded in the footnote are provided in transcription rather than transliteration. Therefore, insignificant variations such as nibišt: Pt4, Mf4, T6 npšī vs. G14 npšī are not indicated.

\(^{83}\) Mf4 writes hērbed after bandag.

\(^{84}\) Mf4 G14 T6: ʾāy az (L MN)

\(^{85}\) G14 T6: kē ābān spēndād kē ābān (MNW ʾbʾn’ spyny’dʾi (T6: spyny’dʾ) MNW ʾbʾn’).

\(^{86}\) T6: deest.

\(^{87}\) Mf4: māhp (mʾhp).

\(^{88}\) Mf4: deest.

\(^{89}\) G14 T6: deest.

\(^{90}\) T6: mard ī (GBR ʾ).

\(^{91}\) G14: ud abarmāndīg (W ʾbilmʾnykʾ).

\(^{92}\) Mf4 ud ʾ (W ʾ).

\(^{93}\) G14 T6: deest.

\(^{94}\) G14 T6: deest.
10) ud zand az paččēn-e\(^{95}\) anōšag farrbay srōšayār xwēš
11) ráy nibišt ēstād jādag\(^{96}\) anōšag ruwān māh-
12) ayār \(^{97}\) farroxzād \(^{98}\) az ham bēšāzwār\(^{99}\) awestān\(^{100}\)
13) az kāzerōn\(^{101}\) rōstāg anōšag ī man\(^{102}\) māhwindād ī \(^{103}\)
14) narmāhan\(^{104}\) \(^{105}\) wahrām mīhr az ham\(^{106}\) paččēn paččēn-e\(^{107}\) az
15) zwāyišn ī pērōzgar abunasr\(^{108}\) mārdsād ī šābuhr
16) az\(^{109}\) farrox būm ī \(^{110}\) šīrāz

The colophons text as interpreted in the present edition is as follows:\(^{111}\)

1) For similar deliberation, I, victorious servant of the religion, Hōšang
2) Syāwaxš Šahryār Bakhtāfrīd Šahryār, wrote (= nibišt fol. 3r line 21) it from
3) the copy of Hērbed Mihrābān Spanddād Mihrābān (and)
4) that \(^{1}\) from the copy of Hērbed Māhpanāh son of Azādmard,
5) protector\(^{2}\) of the region of Kāzerōn like a good
6) heir (?), without doubt about religion and soul and with an honest desire
7) for the good gods. Rōstahm, son of Dād-Ohrmazd
8) Nōgdraft\(^{3}\) from the blessed land of Spāhān from the Rūd-Dasht (?)
9) region from the town of Waržuk (?), the Avesta from a copy
10) and Zand from another copy\(^{4}\) for the possession of the immortal Farrbay Srōšayār\(^{5}\)
11) had written\(^{6}\) for the sake of\(^{7}\) the immortal souled Māh-
12) ayār son of Farroxzād from the same salubrious\(^{8}\) district
13) from the region of Kāzerōn, (and) \(^{9}\), the immortal Māhwindād son of
14) Narmāhan Wahrām Mihr. From the same copy, (I wrote) a copy
15) at the request of the victorious Abunasr Mardshād\(^{10}\) son of Šāhpuhr
16) from the blessed city Šīrāz.

\(^{95}\) G14 T6: deest.
\(^{96}\) G14: jādag ud (jʾık w).
\(^{97}\) G14 T6: deest.
\(^{98}\) G14 T6: deest.
\(^{99}\) G14 T6: deest.
\(^{100}\) G15 bīšāpur (byšʾpwdí); T6: nēšāpuhr (nyšʾʾp̄hwí).
\(^{101}\) T6: xujstʾn (xwjstʾn) \(^{9}\) : The reading x is shown by the diacritic dot above ʾ. As discussed in the present section, xujestān is the corrected variant of awestān.
\(^{102}\) G14: kābuhl (kʾp̄hwí); T6: ḥšūyš. In the New Persian version, it is rendered by kābol (kšš).
\(^{103}\) G14 T6: az (MN).
\(^{104}\) G14 T6: deest.
\(^{105}\) G14 T6: ranāhān? (lmʾhʾn).
\(^{106}\) Mf4: deest.
\(^{107}\) G14 T6: deest.
\(^{108}\) G14 T6: ābānsar (ʾp̄ʾnʾšl).
\(^{109}\) Mf4: ī az.
\(^{110}\) G14: deest.
\(^{111}\) My translation builds on that of Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 36-37) and Tavadia (1944: 325). However, wherever my translation is very different from that of other editions, it is discussed in the commentary.
1) Line 4 ḏ “that”

Phl. ḏ in the manuscripts is spelled as ’L “to”. However, as a preposition its occurrence before az “from” is semantically problematic. Therefore, with Cantera and de Vaan (2005: 35, fn. 5) it has been taken as a corrupt form of ṣy (’LH) “that” in the present edition.

2) Line 5 panāh “protector”

By interpreting panāh “protector” as the short form of the personal name [māh]panāh, Tavadia (1944: 325) reads line 4-5 hērbed māhpānāh ī azādmard ī panāh as hērbed māhpānāh ī azādmard ī [māh]panāh “Hērbed Māhpānāh son of Āzādmard son of [Māh]panāh”. He mentions that the grandsons are sometimes named after their grandfathers. However, his interpretation is entirely hypothetical and it is not supported by any of the manuscripts readings.

3) Line 7-8 rōstahm ī dād ohrmazd nōgdraxt “Rōstahm, son of Dād-Ohrmazd Nōgdraxt”

Through the addition of ‘son of’ (line 7) in brackets before Rōstahm son of Dād-Ohrmazd Nōgdraxt, Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 36) mention that he was the father of Māhpānāh Āzādmard, described as line 5 panāh ī az kāzerōn rōstāg “the protector of the region of Kāzerōn”. Slightly different form Cantera & de Vaan, panāh ī az kāzerōn rōstāg ... “the protector of the region of Kāzerōn…” is associated with Rōstahm, son of Dād-Ohrmazd Nōgdraxt through the insertion of ‘who was’ and ‘viz.’ in brackets before Rōstahm, by West and Dhabhar, respectively:

“Māhpānāh son of Āzādmard, son of the protector of … (who was), Rōstahm, Dād-Ohrmazd” (West 1986-1904: 85).

“Māhpānāh son of Āzādmard, (son) of the protector of … viz., Rōstahm, Dād-Ohrmazd” (Dhabhar 1923a: 115).

While Dhabhar writes ‘son’ in brackets, West probably interprets that the second ī (line 4) in māhpānāh ī āzādmard ī panāh expresses the possessive relationship between Māhpānāh Āzādmard and Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd.

Tavadia (1944: 325) suggests that Rōstahm, son of Dād-Ohrmazd Nōgdrakht belongs to the second colophon. According to his interpretation, Rōstahm wrote the first bilingual manuscript. Therefore, as regards the first colophon, the two following filiations have so far been suggested by scholars:
1) The model of West, Dhabhar and Cantera & de Vaan:\textsuperscript{112}

Ms. Hōšang Syāwaxš Šahryār Baxtāfrīd Šahryār

\[
\downarrow
\]

Ms. of Mihrābān Spanddād Mihrābān

\[
\downarrow
\]

Ms. of Māhpanāh Āzādmard son of Rōstahm

Dād-Ohrmazd Nōgdraxt

2) The model of Tavadia:

Ms. Hōšang Syāwaxš Šahryār Baxtāfrīd Šahryār

\[
\downarrow
\]

Ms. of Mihrābān Spanddād Mihrābān

\[
\downarrow
\]

Ms. of Māhpanāh Āzādmard [Māh]panāh

In contrast to the interpretations of West, Dhabhar and Cantera & de Vaan, Tavadia’s suggestion is entirely based on the manuscript readings and no hypothetical words are incorporated into his translation to relate Māhpanāh to Dād-Ohrmazd. Tavadia’s suggestion is also supported by considering the meaning of \textit{xwēš rāy} and the verb \textit{nibišt ēstād} as discussed below.

4) Line 9-10 \textit{abestāg az paččēn-ē ud zand az paččēn-ē} “the Avesta from a copy and Zand from another copy”

Regarding the Pahlavi sign \textdegree after \textit{abestāg az paččēn} and \textit{zand az paččēn}, West (1896-1904: 84-85), Dhabhar (1923a: 115) and Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 36) take it as the indefinite article \textit{ē} and translate the phrase as “Avesta from one copy and Zand from another\textsuperscript{113} copy”. Dhabhar (1923a: 115) and Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 36) assume that the name(s) of the scribe(s) of the two separate Avestan and Pahlavi manuscripts is unmentioned. By contrast, West (1896-1904: 85), interprets that \textit{abestāg az paččēn ē} “Avesta from one copy” and \textit{zand az paččēn ē} “Zand from another copy” were the

\textsuperscript{112} The filiation of Geldner (1886-1896: xxxiv) agrees with the interpretation of West.

\textsuperscript{113} Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 36) translate the second \textit{ē} as one(ther) rather than another.
productions of Māhayār Farroxzād and of Māhwindād Narmāhān Wahrām Mihr(abān), respectively:

“the Avesta from one copy and the Zand from another copy (which were) the production of the glorified Māhayār son of Farroxzād, from the same salubrious place of the district Kāzerōn, (and of) me, the immortal Māhwindād son of Wahrām.”114

Although, West transcribes the Pahlavi sign ī as ē rather than the ezāfa ī “of”, he associates the manuscripts with their suggested scribes by adding ‘which were’ hypothetically in the brackets. Later, Dhabhar (1949: 7) takes side with West by mentioning in the introduction of his Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad that ‘Farrbay wrote his manuscript from two separate copies, 1) the Avesta text from the manuscript of Māhayār Farroxzād and 2) the Pahlavi text from the manuscript of Māhwindād Narmāhan Wahrām Mihr[abān]’. By contrast, Tavadia (1944: 325) reads the Pahlavi sign ī as the ezāfa ī “of”:

(Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd) “had written for himself the Avesta from the copy of the Blessed Dādag Māhyār Farrōxzād … and the Zand from the copy of the blessed Farrbay Srōšayār.”115

Tavadia (1944: 330) suggests that the scribe probably forgot to write dādag116 māhayār farroxzād after abestāg az paččēn ī. Therefore, he wrote the name of the scribe in margin. Later, the second scribe misplaced it after nibišt ēstād. It is obvious that Tavadia’s suggestion is entirely hypothetical. As far as the transcription of the Pahlavi sign ī as the indefinite article ē or the ezāfa ī is concerned, it is impossible to draw a decisive conclusion according to the Pt4, Mf4 palaeography. The reason is that in their colophons, the manuscripts do not differentiate between ē and ī, for example ē in paččēn-ē (fol. 3v line 14) and ī in anōšag ī (fol. 3v line 13), māhwindād ī (fol. 3v line 13) and narmāhān ī (fol. 3v line 14):

114 Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 37-38) write that West ‘concludes that Franbay son of Srōšyār had copied the manuscript from one Avestan and one Zand copy, both produced by Māhayār son of Farrōkhzād’. Their interpretation of West’s translation is according to his insertion of (which were) in brackets (line 11). However, their suggestion is incorrect because Cantera and de Vaan do not consider that West also adds (and of) before “me, the immortal Māhwindād son of Narmāhan” in brackets (line 13). Later in the same article, they mention that West assumed Māhayār Farrokzhād and Māhwindād Narmāhan Wahrām Mihr[abān] as the scribes and Avestan and Pahlavi manuscripts, respectively (Cantera & de Vaan 2005: 39).
115 My translation from German.
116 Tavadia reads jādag “for the sake of” as the first member of the proper noun dādag anōšag ruwān māhayār farroxzād. See my commentary to jādag.
By contrast, the Pahlavi sign after abestāg az pačēn and zand az pačēn is omitted in G14 (fol. 19v line 10) and T6 (fol. 7r line 3-4). According to the variant readings of Y 9.1-15, collated in text-critical apparatus, and those of the colophon provided in the footnote above, G14 and T6 sometimes delete the ezāfa ī. For example, in line 4, 7, 12, 13 and 16 of the colophon. Regarding the palaeographical feature of ī, pačēn-ē (line 14) is deleted in the colophon of G14 (fol. 19v line 13) and T6 (fol. 7r line 7) after ham pačēn. Therefore, its palaeographical feature in the colophon of G14 and T6 cannot be studied. However, in Y 9.1 (line 28), while ē(w) “one” is written by in Pt4 (54v line 5), Mf4 (p.146 line 17), it is represented by in G14 (fol. 52v line 10), T6 (fol. 43v line 12). In Y 9.2, the indefinite article ē is also given in the margin of the manuscripts G14 and T6 and like Y 9.1, its palaeography is similar to that of ī.

Therefore, the evidence from G14 and T6 favours the reading ī because while the ezāfa is often omitted in their texts, in the two occasions in Y 9.1, 2, ē(w) is written. However, the texts of G14, T6 are not as reliable as those of Pt4, Mf4 because as discussed below, they have possibly been corrected by their scribes. Furthermore, the reading the Pahlavi sign as

---

117 The commentary including ē is absent in Pt4, M4.
the ezafa ī is problematic because the names of their related scribes occurs several words after abestāg az paččēn ī ud zand az paččēn ī. In conclusion, considering the grammar of the Pahlavi language, ī is considered as the correct reading of the Pahlavi sign in the present edition.

5) **Line 10-11** anōšag farrbay srōšayār xwēš rāy “for the possession of the immortal Farrbay Srōšayār”

Phl. farr (pln) in farrbay is transcribed as farnbay in the mentioned scholarly works. However, based on the rn > rr development, pln has been taken as a historical writing and it is transcribed as farr in the present edition.

Regarding xwēš rāy, Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 38) show that meaning “for the possession of”, it usually indicates the addressee or patron of the copy in the texts. Therefore, they translate anōšag farrbay srōšayār xwēš rāy as “for the possession of the immortal Farrbay, son of Srōšayār”. By contrast, West (1896-1904: 85) and Dhabhar (1923a: 115) had considered Farrbay son of Srōšayār as the scribe of the first bilingual manuscript by translating lines 9-11 abestāg az paččēn ē anōšag farrbay srōšayāryār xwēš rāy nibišt ēstād as follows:

“The immortal Farrbay son of Srōšyār had written a copy for himself, the Avesta from one copy and the Zand from another copy.” (West 1896-1904: 85).

“The immortal Farrbay Srōšayār had himself written a copy, the Avesta from one copy and the Zand from another copy.” (Dhabhar 1923a: 115).

While Dhabhar translates xwēš rāy as “himself”, West renders it as “for himself”. Likewise, Tavadia (1944: 325) translates xwēš rāy as “for himself”. However, he associates it with the Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd (line 7) who is the scribe of the first bilingual manuscript according to his interpretation:

Rōstahm (son of) Dād-Ohrmazd (son of) Nōgdrakht … had written for himself the Avesta from the copy of the … and the Zand from the copy of … 118

Regarding the translation of xwēš rāy, that of Cantera and de Vaan is based on the meaning of the expression in parallel examples. As a result, Farrbay Srōšayār cannot be the

---

118 My translation from German.
scribe who produced the first bilingual manuscript as suggested by West and Dhabhar. Moreover, Dhabhar’s translation as “himself” does not render rāy.

6) **Line 11 nibišt ēstād** “had written”

Regarding the translation of the verb nibišt ēstād, except for Cantera and de Vaan (2005: 36), other scholars translate it as active. Moreover, Cantera and de Vaan consider Māhayār Farroxzād as the first scribe of the bilingual manuscript:

“The Avesta has been written from one copy and the Zand from one (other) copy for the possession of the immortal Farrbay, son of Srōšayār, as a production (?) of the immortal Māhayār, son of Farroxzād, from the same salubrious district from the region of Kāzerōn.”

However, as discussed below, jādag is rendered as “for the sake of” in the present edition because its translation as “as a production of, the production of” is problematic. Therefore, while Māhayār Farroxzād cannot be taken as the scribe of the first bilingual manuscript, only remains one candidate who is Rōstahm Dād Ohrmazd (line 7). With this interpretation, he is the subject of the 3rd sg. past perfect nibišt ēstād in the ergative construction. The evidence also agrees with Tavadia’s interpretation. It should be noted that while Cantera & de Vaan discuss the translations of West and Dhabhar, they do not examine Tavadia’s translation. The only problem with the present interpretation is that since two words, or abestāg ... zand, are the objects of the sentence, the form nibišt ēstād hēnd is expected. However, the text is late and it is possible to find New Persian-like constructions. It is also corroborated by the defective texts of the colophons of Hōšang Syāwaxš in which, as discussed below, the influences of New Persian are noticeable.

7) **Line 11 jādag** “for the sake of”

The reading and translation of preceding anōšag ruwān māhayār ī farroxzād is debated among scholars. While West (1896-1904: 84-85) and Dhabhar (1923a: 115, fn. 6) read d’tk “production” and j’tk “for the sake of, for the preserving of the memory of”, respectively, Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 38) mentioning that the form d’tk is unknown.

---

119 For Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmzsd see commentary 3) Line 7-8 rōstahn ī dād ohrmazd nōgdraxt.
120 For examples of the change of the ergative constructions to their accusative counterparts in Pahlavi under the influence of New Persian see Skjærvø (2009a: 228).
choose the spelling $j'\text{tk}$ and the translation “production”. However, none of the scholars examine the problematic word in detail. By contrast, Tavadia (1944: 329-330) studies the word in Pahlavi and New Persian. He shows that in the Zoroastrian New Persian texts, $j\text{ada}$ denotes “for the sake of” especially in association with deceased ones. Furthermore, he points out that $j\text{adagih}$ in the third Pahlavi colophon of Mf4 has been translated as “for the sake of”. He also compares the word with the Pahlavi legal terms such as $j\text{adag-gow}$ “intercessor”.\(^{121}\) However, at the end, reading $d\text{adag}$, he interprets it as the first member of the proper name D\text{adag} M\text{ahayar} Farroxz\text{ad}. As a proper noun, although Phl. $j\text{adagih}$ or $d\text{adagih}$ may occur in IrBd. 35A.8 $\text{ud man farrbay xw}\text{anend d}\text{adagih i a}\text{sawahi}\text{st} “\text{and I Farrbay whom they call D\text{adag} son of A}\text{sawahi}\text{st”}$, the form $d\text{adag}$ has no parallel in the Pahlavi and Zoroastrian New Persian literature. By contrast, by translating $j\text{adag}$ as “for the sake of (a deceased person)” the sequence of $xw\text{e}\text{s r}\text{ay nibi}\text{st est}\text{ad jadag}$ makes sense. The reason is that $xw\text{e}\text{s r}\text{ay}$, indicating the addressee or patron of the manuscript, is preceded by $farrbay sr\text{o}\text{shayyr}\text{ar}$ carrying the epithet $a\text{n}\text{o}\text{shag}$. By contrast, $j\text{adag}$ is followed by $m\text{ahay}$$\text{ar}$ $farrroxz\text{ad}$ which is described as $a\text{n}\text{o}\text{shag ruw}\text{an}$. Therefore, it implies that the scribe wrote the manuscript for the possession of the $a\text{n}\text{o}\text{shag}$ “immortal (= living)” Farrbay Sr\text{o}shayyr and for the sake of the $a\text{n}\text{o}\text{shag ruw}\text{an}$ “immortal souled (= deceased)” M\text{ahayar} Farroxz\text{ad}.

8) **Line 12** $b\text{e}\text{sazw}\text{ar}$ “salubrious”

The Pahlavi $\text{b}$$\text{e}$$\text{s}$$\text{a}$$\text{z}$$\text{w}$$\text{ar}$ in $\text{a}z$ $\text{h}$$\text{a}$$\text{m}$ $\text{b}$$\text{e}$$\text{sazw}$$\text{ar}$ occurs in the following context:

11) $j\text{adag an}$$\text{o}$$\text{shag ruw}$$\text{an}$ $m$$\text{a}$$\text{h}$-$
12) $a$$\text{y}$$\text{ar i farrroxz}$$\text{ad i a}$ $\text{h}$$\text{a}$$\text{m}$ $\text{be}$$\text{sazw}$$\text{ar}$ (Tavadia: $\text{weh}$$\text{sha}$$\text{puhr}$”) $\text{a}$$\text{wes}$$\text{t}$$\text{an}$
13) $a$$\text{z}$ $\text{k}$$\text{a}$$\text{zer}$$\text{o}$$\text{n}$ $\text{r}$$\text{o}$$\text{st}$$\text{ag}$

11) for the sake of the immortal souled M\text{a}h-
12) ay\text{ar} son of Farroxz\text{ad} from the same salubrious (Tavadia: Wehsh\text{apo}uhr) district
13) from the region of K\text{a}zer\text{o}n,

Tavadia (1944: 325) reads $\text{b}$$\text{e}$$\text{s}$$\text{a}$$\text{z}$$\text{w}$$\text{ar}$ as $\text{weh}$$\text{sh}$$\text{apo}$$\text{uh}$, the other pronunciation of “the city B\text{i}$$\text{cha}$$\text{puhr}”. However, the preceding $h$$\text{a}$$\text{m}$ “same” casts doubt on Tavadia’s interpretation as the name of the city B\text{i}$$\text{cha}$$\text{puhr} is previously unattested to need the anaphor $h$$\text{a}$$\text{m}$ “the same”.

9) **Line 13** $\text{m}$$\text{a}$$\text{n}$ “I”

\(^{121}\) See the section on T6 description
The Pahlavi sign precedes māhwindād ī narmāhān ī wahrām mihr. Dhabhar (1923a: 116) regards L (man) “I” as a corrupt form or an abbreviation of lwbʾn (ruwān) “soul” which in combination with anōšag means “immortal souled”. By contrast, Tavdia (1944: 325) leaves untranslated. Regarding the reading of the interpretation of Dhabhar who takes it as the abbreviated form of ruwān is entirely hypothetical. Furthermore, there is no parallel example of such an abbreviation as far as I know. Therefore, is transcribed as man “I” in the present edition.

10) Line 15 mardšād “Mardšād”

All of the collated manuscripts obviously spell šʾtʾ (šād). Although Cantera and de Vaan (2005: 35-36) transliterate it correctly, they transcribe the word as šāh. However, they do not explain the reason for their correction of šād to šāh.

As regards the filiation of the second colophon, according to West (1896-1904: 85), Farrbay Srōšayār produced the first bilingual copy:

Ms. of Māhwindād Narmāhān (Phl. text) — Ms. of Māhyār Farroxzād (Av. text) — Ms. of Farrbay Srōšayār

Likewise, Dhabhar (1923a) takes Farrbay Srōšayār as the first producer of the bilingual manuscript:

X1 (Av. text) — X2 (Phl. text) — Ms. of Farrbay Srōšayār — Ms. of Māhwindād Narmāhān Wahrām Mihr

However as mentioned above, the meaning of xwēš rāy preceding Farrbay Srōšayār casts doubt on their interpretation. Furthermore, the translation of jādag as “the production of” through which West considers Māhayār Farroxzād and Māhwindād Narmāhān as the copyists of the separate Avestan and Pahlavi texts is entirely hypothetical and not based on the evidence from the Pahlavi language.

---

122 See Pt4 (fol. 3v line 15), Mf4 (p. 5 line 5), G14 (fol. 19v line 14), T6 (fol. 7r line 8).
123 West does not draw the filiation of the colophon but Geldner’s (1896: Prolegomena xxxiv) genealogical tree is based on the translation of West.
124 Dhabhar does not draw a genealogical tree and the filiation is drawn by my according to his translation.
According to Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 37-8) the first colophon, showing the usual regressive chronology, is written by Hōšang Syāwaxš Šahryār Baxtāfrīd. By contrast, the second colophon, starting from \textit{abestāg az pačēn-ē ud zand az pačēn-ē}, is written by Māhwindād son of Narmāhān son of Wahrām Mihr whose name occurs in the middle of the second colophon (line 13-14):\footnote{For the filiation see Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 40).}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzcd}
X1 (Av. text) \arrow[swap]{s}{Ms. of Māhayār Farroḵzād} & X2 (Phl. text) \\
& Ms. of Māhwindād Narmāhān
\end{tikzcd}
\end{center}

However, as discussed above, the rendering of \textit{jādag} as “as a production of” is problematic. Furthermore, Tavadia’s suggestion is left undisussed in their article.

Different from the proposal of West, Dhabhar and Cantera & de Vaan, Tavadia (1944: 332) considers Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd Nōdrakht and Māhwindād Narmāhan as the first producer and copyist of the bilingual manuscripts, respectively:

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzcd}
Ms. of Dādag Māhayār Farrōḵzād (Av. text) \arrow[swap]{s}{Ms. of Farrbay Srōšayār (Phl. text)} & Ms. of Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd Nōdrakht \\
& Ms. of Māhwindād Narmāhān
\end{tikzcd}
\end{center}

As mentioned before, the evidence supports Tavadia’s suggestion that the first bilingual manuscript was a production of Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd Nōdrakht. However, Tavadia’s interpretations of \textit{dādag} and \textit{xwēš rāy} are problematic. With Tavadia’s suggestion, Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd and Māhwindād Narmāhan are interpreted as the first and second scribes of the bilingual Pahlavi texts in the present edition. By contrast, as regards the scribes of the Avestan and Pahlavi texts, it seems that their names are left unmentioned because as stated above, the Pahlavi sign \(
\text{_adj}
\) should be read as the indefinite article \(ē\) rather than the \textit{ezāfa ū}. Therefore, the following filiation is suggested in the present edition:
A comparison between the different interpretations shows that it is impossible to produce a semantically meaningful translation without incorporating hypothetical words and verbs, which have no counterpart in the original text, into it. The reason is that, as mentioned above, the text of the second colophon is only governed by a single verb. Tavadia (1944: 324-325) seems to have a convincing explanation for the problematic colophons. He mentions that the colophons of Pt4 and Mf4 in the Introduction are defective and while the sentences are incomplete, it is also difficult to decide where a sentence ends and how it is related to its following sentence. He also notices that the other colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš in Mf4 has an Arabic loanword; *tamām* and shows the influence of New Persian in *tamām šud* “completed”. Moreover, the correct *farrōxīh* and *pērōzīh* are replaced by *farrōxīg* and *pērōzīg*, respectively in the third colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš appearing in Mf4.126 By contrast, the text of Introduction section shows the features of a correct classic Pahlavi text. Therefore, he suggests that the colophons may have been late insertions by Hōšang Syāwaxš in the Introduction section. All of these different possibilities show that the colophons are more ambiguous rather than historically important and the manuscripts attributed to Hōšang Syāwaxš are to be evaluated according to their Pahlavi Yasna texts, as discussed in section 3.1.

As far as the origin of scribes is concerned, according to Pt4 and Mf4, they come from western parts of Iran:

Hērbed Māhpānāh Āzādmard: Kāzerōn
Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd: Spāhān
Māhayār Farrōkhzād: Kazerōn
Abu-Nasr Mardshāh: Shiraz

In G14, the names of the cities agree with those attested in Pt4, Mf4 with two exceptions: In G14 (fol. 19v line 12), *bēšāzwār* “salubrious”) in *bēšāzwār awestān az kāzerōn rōstāg* is attested as *bīšāpur* “the city

126 For the colophon see the Mf4 description.
Bīšāpu(h)r”. Furthermore, in the same line, kʾclwn “Kāzerōn” is spelled as kʾp̄uhl “Kabul” in G14:

G14 (fol. 19v line 12). az ham bīšāpuhr awestān az kābul rōstāg
(Māhayār Farroxzād comes) from same Bīšāpuhr place of the district Kābul”.

The phrase seems to be corrected in G14 because Bīšāpuhr, located in the modern Iranian Fārs province and Kābul in the modern Afghanistan are not geographically related together. Moreover, with the reading bīšāpuhr, the occurrence of the preceding ham “same” then, would be inexplicable as Bīšāpuhr has not been mentioned previously in the text.

In T6, which provides the interlinear New Persian translation of the colophon text, more cities are identified with those in eastern Iran:

Hērbed Māhanāh Āzāmdard: T6 (fol. 6v line 13) كابول “Kābul”)
Rōstahm Dād-Ohrmazd: Spāhān.
Māhayār Farrōkhzād: T6 (fol. 7r line 6) كابول “Kābul”).

Moreover, ham bēšāzwār awestān (سدوهدسپناه) “the same salubrious region (of)” in Pt4 Mf4 appears in T6 (fol. 7r line 6) as ham nēšāpur xujestān (Ham نشآپورخوجستان) “the same Nēšāpur Xujestān”. Likewise, it is translated in the interlinear New Persian version as ham nēšāpur xujestān (Ham نشآپورخوجستان), both of which, nēšāpur and xujestān, are located in Khorasan.127

Like G14, the text of T6 seems to be subject to the re-interpretation according to scribe’s mindset.129 The reason is that in fol. 6v line 13, the word in the Pahlavi version is spelled apparently as kʾclwn (kāzerōn) while in the New Persian version كابول “Kabul” is given. Furthermore in fol. 7r line 6 كابول? “Kābul?” is probably the corrected variant of the original كابول. As mentioned before, nēšāpur xujestān (Ham نشآپورخوجستان), is the variant reading of كابول. However, it is a misreading because the name nēšāpur xujestān

---

127 The reading x in xujestān is shown by one diacritic dot above ی. Three diacritical dots are placed above ی to indicate ی.
129 G14 and T6 are closely related. See T6 description.
“Nēšāpur Xujestān” does not occur before to need the anaphor *ham* “the same”. In G14 (fol. 19v line 5-6), T6 (fol. 6v line 12), the name of the famous scribe *mihrābān spandād* (or *spandyād* in YIndP J2, K5) *mihrāban* is also written as *kē ābān spendāt kē ābān* “who is Ābān Spandāt who is Ābān”:

Pt4 fol. 3v line 1) ... *pērōzgar man dēn bandag hōšang*
2) *syāwaxš šahryār baxtāfrīd šahryār az*
3) *paččēn hērbed mihrābān spanddād mihrābān* (G14 T6: *kē ābān spandāt kē ābān*)

1) “I, victorious servant of the religion, Hōšang
2) Syāwaxš Shahryār Bakhtāfrīd Shahryār, (wrote it) from
3) the copy of hērbad Mihrābān Spanddāt Mihrāban (G14 T6: who is Ābān Spendāt who is Ābān).

In conclusion, the evidence suggests that the meaning of the colophons was even unclear in 1780 and 1842 CE when G14 and T6 were completed by Indian priests who were the descendants of the famous Māhayār Rāna, namely Kāwūs son of Suhrāb son of Rōstam and Suhrāb son of Frāmarz son of Suhrāb, respectively. Compared to G14, T6, the colophons in Pt4 and Mf4 are less corrupt. However, although G14 is contemporaneous with Pt4 and Mf4, it is unclear whether or not the latter ones were also written down by Indian scribes.

### 2.2 The Manuscripts of the Iranian Pahlavi Yasna

a) Pt4: The manuscript has 283 folios, measuring 33.93 × 20.6 cm and written 21 lines per page. The completion of the manuscript is dated around 1780 CE according to the family tradition of Dastur Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana (Hintze 2012a: 253). Mills (1893: 519) mentions that:

‘According to its introduction, page 2, we gather that D (or Pt4) were written down in 1780 by Dastoor Kavasji Sobraj Mihi rāna.’

Assuming that Mills’s Sobraj is the typo for Sorabji, Dastoor Kavasji Sorabji Mihirji-rāna, the scribe of Pt4, is probably the father of Sohrābji son of Kāušji Sohrābji Meherjirāna who copied F2 (completed in 1814 CE). It is exciting because as discussed in section 3.1, while Pt4 is corrected, F2 shows the traces of contamination. However, unlike Mills’s report, in the introduction of Pt4, the name of Kavasji Sorabji Mihirji-rāna does not occur.

---

130 See sections on G14 and T6 description.
b) Mf4: The manuscript has 357 folios\(^{131}\) and it was copied shortly after 1780 CE. The folios are 28 × 18.3 cm, written 17 lines to page. (Hintze 2012a: 254). In addition to the common colophons with Pt4, G14, T6 written by Hōšang Syāwaxš as discussed in section 2.1, Mf4 has another colophon which was produced by the same scribe. It was transcribed and translated by Dhabhar (1923a:117-118) and Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 40-41):

\[
\text{Mf4 (p. 599 line 6) yašt zand tamām šud andar farrōxīg ud pērōzīg andar}
\]

7) rōz ī wād ī hudāhag māh amurdat pērōzgar sāl ī
8) 864 pas az yazdgird šāhān
9) šāh man dēn bandag hōšang syāwaxš šahryār ī
10) baxtāfrīd šahryār ī wahrām ī husraw šahag
11) anōšagruwān nibišt ud frāz hišt xwēš ī
12) xwēš rāy ud yazdandān xwēš rāy har kē
13) xwānād ayāb hammōzdād ayāb paččēn az-iš\(^{132}\)
14) kunād jādagīh ī man nibištār pad patet bawēd
15) tā-sān awišt afriṅ kardārtar bēm nē ahlawdād
16) kē-s nām ī man u-s awestarēd ka-š
17) awestarēd u-s hamēmāl ham pad
Mf4 p. 600 line 1) dādwar ī dādār ī ohrmazd
2) be dānad har kē ōy huṣyār bāṣad zi bahr ī mēnovān dar kār bāṣad

6) The Zand Yasna was\(^{133}\) completed in prosperity and victory on
7) the day of the beneficent Wād, the month of the victorious Amurdad, the year
8) 864 after Yazdgird, King of
9) Kings, I, the servant of the religion, Hōšang Syāwaxš Šahryār son of
10) Baxtāfrīd Šahryār son of Wahrām son of Husraw-Šāhag
11) Anōšagruwān wrote\(^{134}\) and published it for my
12) own possession and for that of my offspring. Everyone who
13) reads it or teaches it or makes a copy of it,
14) will be in Repentance for the sake of me, the writer,
15) so that I may perform blessing to them. No(t worthy of) charity
16) (is) he who stains my name, when he
17) stains (it) I shall be his adversary before
Mf4 p. 600 line 1) the judge, the creator Ohrmazd.\(^{135}\)
2) Everyone who is conscious knows (that) he should work for the sake of spiritual
beings.\(^{136}\)

\(^{131}\)Jamasp Asa & Nawabi 1976 (2535) who published the Mf4 facsimile in 2 volumes give page numbers (vol. 1, p. 2-400; vol 2, p. 401-720) rather than folio numbers.

\(^{132}\)Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 41) read “ușr” as u-š “and it”. However, the context suggests that it should be read az-iš meaning “of/from it” as correctly appears in their translation.

\(^{133}\)The use of šudan originally meaning “to go” as an auxiliary verb in Pahlavi is late (Nyberg 1974: 188). Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 41) translate šud as “is”. However, the past tense auxiliary verb is translated as “was” in the present study.

\(^{134}\)Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 41) translate the simple past nibišt as “have written”.

\(^{135}\)The translation is after Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 41).

\(^{136}\)My translation.
As discussed in section 2.1, the colophon shows the influence of New Persian. Furthermore, the closing text in p. 600 line 2 is a poem in New Persian which is absent in the translations of Dhabhar (1923a: 118) and Cantera & de Vaan (2005: 41).

There is also a New Persian colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš in DHR according to which he completed his Pāzand text in 747 Pārsī:

Figure 4. Dārāb Hormazyār Rivāyat, p. 368.

DHR 368 line 7) nivištam man dēn banda hōšang syāvaxš u šahryār baxtāfrīd bahrām xusraw šāh
8) anōşīrvān nivištam andar farroxān bām ī šarafābād ....
12) ēn nivištam fa rōz-ī mānšaresfand māh
13) mīhr sāl haftsad-u čihīl-u haft ī pārsī
14) pas az yazdjird šāhān šāh
15) nivištam

7) I, the servant of the religion Hōšang Syāvaxš and? Šahryār Baxtāfrīd Bahrām Xusraw Šāh
8) Anōšīrvān wrote. I wrote in the blessed land of Šarafābād .
12) I wrote this on the day of Mansaresfand, the month
13) Mihr, the year seven hundred and forty-seven Parsī,
14) after Yazdjird, King of Kings.
15) I wrote.¹³⁷

¹³⁷ My translation.
The comparison between the two colophons, written down by a single scribe, shows that there is a difference of 97 years between the completion date of Mf4 in AY 864 and that of the Pāzand text in 747 Pārsī (= AY 767).

However, in DHR 371, there is another colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš according to which he completed a Pāzand text in AY 847:

Figure 5. Dārāb Hormazyār Rivāyat, p. 371.

Line 3) … man dēn banda hōšang syāvaxš šahryār vahrām xusraw sāh nōšīrbān
4) nivištam …
7) mihr pērōzgar sāl haštsad-u čihil-u haft sālī pas az yazdgird sāhān sāh ōrmazdān
3) … I, the servant of the religion, Hōšang Syāvaxš Šahryār Vahrām Xusraw Šāh Nōšīrabān
4) wrote … (in the month of)
7) victorious Mihr, the year eight hundred forty-seven years after Yazdgird, King of Kings, son of Ōrmazd… .

In addition, there are colophons which were produced by Šāpur Jāmāsb. For example:

DHR 372.

(line 6) … nivištam man dēn banda sāpur
7) jāmāsīb šahryār baxtafrīn šahryār bahrām nōšīrvān …
9) nivištam anadr rōz
10) xurdād mihr māh qadīm-u sāl haštsad-u čihil-u haft yazdgirdī šahryār andar maqām

138 My translation.
šarafābād ...

6) … I, the servant of the religion Šāpur
7) Jāmāsb Šahryār Baxtāfrīn Šahryār Bahrām Nōšīrvān wrote …
9) I wrote on the old day
1) Xurdād, month Mihr and year eight hundred forty-seven Yazdgirdī, the king, in the place of Šarafābād … \[139\]

It seems that like Hōšang Syāwaxš, Šāpur Jāmāsb is also a grandson of Šahryār Baxtāfrīn (or Baxtāfrīd) Bahrām (or Vahrām). Therefore, Hōšang Syāwaxš should be contemporaneous with Šāpur Jāmāsb. According to DHR 372, the completion date of Šāpur’s text (AY 847) agrees with that of T6 (AY 864) and DHR 371 (AY 847). As a result, the date 747 Pārsī should be a mistake. Moreover, in T6 (p. 599 line 10-11), DHR (368 line 7) and DHR (371 line 3), Hōšang’s genealogy goes back to Xusraw Šāh Anōšīrvān. It is replaced by Nōšīrvān in Jāmāsb’s colophon (DHR 372 line 7). Since šāh is not attested alone as a proper name, therefore, Phl. anōšagruwān/NP. nōšīrvān “of immortal soul” is probably the epithet of xusraw šāh “king Xusraw” and the family claimed to be descendants of the Sasanian king Xusraw I (r. 531-579 CE) who carried the epithet Phl. anōšagruwān > NP. nōšīrvān after his name. Finally, in T6, -ag in line 10 husraw šāhag is to be regarded as the suffix with affective connotations.\[140\]

c) G14: The size of folios is 30.2 × 21.8 cm. The manuscript was completed in AY 1149 (1780 CE) and it is related to the family of Hōšang Syāwaxš. G14 has the Avestan text and Pahlavi version of Sīrōza (folios 1v-16r) and Yasna (folios 17v-198r) (Hintze 2012a: 253-254).\[141\] In addition to the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš Šahryār which was discussed in section 2.1, the scribe of G14 also adds his colophon as follows:

G14 fol. 21r line 6) ēn daftar fradom andar hindūgān dastōr kāvūs
7) pus dastōr suhrāh pus dastōr rōstam pus dastōr mānak
8) pus mihrnōš az pušt ī māhayār rānān andar kasabak ī nōgsārīg
9) andar rōz hordād ud māh ī farrōx frawardīn sāl abar 114-10
10) 9 yazdgirdīg sāhān šāh ī ohrmazdān nibišt ēštād ī
11) abar ō ōy nibēsēd xub frazām kāmag hanjām bawād pad
12) yazdān ayarih

\[139\] My translation.
\[140\] For the usage of the suffix -ag with affective connotations see Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 157, §297).
\[141\] According to the folio numbering of the website of the Avestan Digital Archive, the Sīrōza appears in fols. 2v-17r and the Yasna section starts from fol. 18v. So far, Y 0.1-9.32 have been uploaded onto http://avesta-archive.com/ (Accessed online on 31/03/2017). Collating the manuscript readings from the published facsimile on the website of the Avestan Digital Archive, I follow its folio numbering in the present edition.
6) This manuscript first (was written) in India. The priest Kāwus
7) son of the priest Suhrāb son of the priest Rōstam son of the priest Mānak
8) son of Mīhrnōš a descendant of Māhayār Rāna had written (it) in the town of Nawsārī
9) on the day Hordād and the blessed month Frawardīn, the year 114-
10) 9 of Yazdgird, King of Kings, descendant of Ohrmaz. Who
11) writes for the sake of him (scribe), may he be of good fortune (and) successful
12) through the assistance of the Yazds.\textsuperscript{142}

d) F2: The manuscript provides Avesta and Pahlavi texts, accompanied by the
interlinear New Persian translation, in 2 volumes (volume 1: Folios 1-116 and volume 2:
Folios 117-268). The folios are 29.8 \times 23.5 cm and are written 15 lines to page. The scribe
is Dastōr Sohrābji Meherjirāna who copied it in Samvat 1870 (= 1814 CE) (Hintze 2012a:
254). The vol. 1, which includes Y 9, has two colophons in Gujarati as follows:

Colophon 1. Fol. 1r. line 1) āe pahl[avi] sāth[ni] ijaśne-nu daftar pehl-lu samvat 1870
2) na sālama roj 10 māh 1 la. dastur [so]hrābji kāuš
3) ji bin sohrābji meherjirānā-e potāne vaste
4) lakhine āmpurnā kidhu che ane e daftar dastur era
5) cji surābji meherjirānā-nu che ae upar koino chāpo
6) nathi
1) This register of Yasna with Pahlavi, (was completed) in first Samvat year 1870
2) on day 10 month 1. The scribe priest Sohrābji Kāuś-
3) ji son of Sohrābji Meherjirāna has written for himself
4) and finished it. And this register belongs to priest Era-
5-6) cji Suhrābji Meherjirāna. There is no stamp of anyone on it [i.e. no one else has a
right on it].\textsuperscript{143}

Colophon 2. Fol. 116v. line 1) āe pahl[avi] sāth[ni] ijaśnimu daftar pehla dastu(r) sohrā-
2) bji kā[us]jji bin dastur so[hrā]bji meherjir[ānā-e] po
3) tāne vaste samvat 1870 nā varśma roj 10 mah 1 lakhi
4) ne tamām kidhu-che ane ae daftar eracji sohrā
5) bji meherjirānā-nu che
1) This register of Yasna with Pahlavi, 1\textsuperscript{st} priest Sohrā-
2) bji Kāušji son of Dastur Sohrābji Meherjirānā
3) has written for himself. In Samvat year 1870 on day 10 month 1
4-5) he has finished and this register belongs to priest Eracji Sohrābji Meherjirānā.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{142} My translation.
\textsuperscript{143} I would like to thank my colleague Kerman Daruwalla for transcribing and translating the Gujarati
colophon.
\textsuperscript{144} I would like to thank my colleague Kerman Daruwalla for transcribing and translating the Gujarati
colophon.
According to the colophon of the second volume, it was also completed by the same scribe on the 17th day of the 6th month of 1879 Samvat (Dhabhar 1923b: 1, no. 2). As discussed in section 3.1, although F2 is an Iranian manuscript, it is contaminated i.e. it has readings that are typical of YIndPs.

e) T6: Like F2, the New Persian translations of the Avestan original and its Pahlavi version appear beneath the lines of the main text. T6 has 299 folios, measuring 30.2 × 24.1 cm. Moreover, the folios are written 13 lines to page (Hintze 2012a: 254). As discussed in section 2.1, the colophons of Hōšang Siyāvasḵ Śahryār Baxtāfārīd Śahryār is also present in T6. In addition, T6 has two colophons in New Persian and Gujarati:

T6 fol. 295v:

این کتاب ایزشنه بروز مبارک اردهبهشت امشاهیند و ماه مبارک سفنداردام امشاهیند سنه
یکهزار و پانزده یزدجردی کاتب الحروف کمترين موده سهاراب این دستور فرامرز این دستور سهاراب
ابن دستور رستم از نسل دستوران دستور ماههار راشع

5) این کتاب در روز مبارک یوردباهیشتر امشاهسدام امسپندام سال 1211
6) یک هزار و یازده در یزد جرده کاتب ال هورف مبده سهراب ابن دستور فرامرز ابن دستور سهاراب
7) ابن دستور رستم از نسل دستوران دستور ماههار راهان

The New Persian colophon is peculiar as the completion dates, written in numbers (1211) and in words (one thousand and eleven), show a difference of 200 years. However, the completion date in the Gujarati colophon concurs with that written in numbers in its New Persian counterpart, or AY 1211:

T6 fol. 1r line 1) یاک یزدجیرد کاتب ال هورف مبده سهراب ابن دستور فرامرز ابن دستور سهاراب
2) ابن دستور رستم از نسل دستوران دستور ماههار راهان
3) سان 1149 یزدجیرد دستور کاوشی سهاربی مهربیران خانه
4) ناسری ما ایه؟ ۱۴۶ ناکال حیت تی بارثی سان 1211 یزدجیرد
5) دستور سهاربی فرامزی مهربیران خانه لاکی اپی چه

My translation. The colophon has also been transcribed by Andrés-Toledo, published on http://avesta-archive.com/colofones/view/14. However, he omits the date written in words and transcribes sana and nasl mistakenly as sar? and sun?, respectively.

146 A word is illegible.
1) The Yasna (Avesta-Pahlavi) with Pahlavi ritual instructions and with Persian translation. From Hošang Šīvākš’s written original, a copy in the year 1149 of Yazdgard by Dastur Kāvusji Sorābji Meherjirāna was copied in Navsari. From that one in the year 1211 of Yazdgard Dastur Sorābji Frāmji Meherjirāna has written and given as a gift.²⁴⁷

According to the Gujarati colophon, T6 is a direct descendant of G14. The data of the text-critical apparatus of the present edition also show the close relationship between G14-T6.

f) T55b: The copy has two incomplete versions: Avestan-Sanskrit and Avestan-Pahlavi. The manuscript has 144 folios and the folios 58r-113v offer the Avestan original and Pahlavi translation of Y 7.19-Y13.8.²⁴⁸ It measures 28.4 × 19.8 cm and the folios are written 15 lines per page (Hintze 2012a: 258). This is the only collated manuscript in the present edition without colophon. T55b was regarded as a YIndP manuscript.²⁴⁹ However, in my unpublished MA dissertation (Khanizadeh 2013: 27-33), it was suggested that it belongs to the group of YIrPs. Independently and almost at the same time in September 2013, the website of the Avestan Digital Archive also moved T55b from the category of YIndP manuscripts and placed it under that of YIrP.

2.3 The Manuscripts of the Indian Pahlavi Yasna²⁵⁰

a) J2: The manuscript J2 measures ca. 27 × 22 cm. It was written in AY 692 (= 1323 CE) in the city of Cambay by Mihrābān Kayhusraw in response to the request of the merchant Čāhil Sangan. The manuscript has 385 folios, written 15 lines to page. (Hintze 2012a: 255). The colophon appearing in fol. 383v of the manuscript is as follows:

J2 fol. 383v line 3) wahman māh frawrdīn rōz sāl ī 692
4) yazdγirdīg man dēn bandag hērbed zāt mihrābān
5) ī kayhusraw mihrābān ī spandyār mihrābān marzbān
6) hērbed nibišt pad yazdān kāmag bād

²⁴⁷ I would like to thank my colleague Kerman Daruwalla for transcribing and translating the Gujarati colophon.
²⁴⁸ The folio numbering of the website of the Avesta Digital Archive is different from Dhabhar (1923b: 129) and Hintze (2012a: 258) according to whom the Pahlavi Yasna appears in fols. 89-144. Collating the manuscript readings from the published facsimile on the website of the Avestan Digital Archive, I follow its folio numbering in the present edition.
²⁴⁹ See Dhabhar (1923b: 129); Hintze (2012a: 258).
²⁵⁰ Facsimiles of the manuscripts J2, K5 and M1 are available on the website of the Avestan Digital Archive. J2 and K5 had also been published by Mills (1893) and Barr (1937), respectively.
7) wahīzag kē man dēn bandag be būm hindūgān mad ham andar
8) sāl 692 yazdgirdīg man dēn bandag hērbed zād
9) mihrābān ī kayhusraw ī mihrābān ī spandyād ī mihrābān ī
10) marzbān hērbed nibišt az bahr čāhilag sangan ud čāhil ī wahm[an]
11) bahrām kambayīg nibišt xwāstār ham az xwand[ārān]
12) ēn nibišt ī abar xwānīhēd čāhil rāy pad anōšag ruwān arznī[g]
13) dārēd čāhil az xwēš uzēnag pad-iš kard man nibištār ham az bahr[r]
14) ruwān an[ōšag ruwān čāhil sangan ud az bahr ruwān pidar xwad
15) kū-š wahišt bahr ī anōšag jāwēdān ruwān garōdmānīg bād

3) Day Wahman, month Frawardīn, year 692
4) of Yazdgird, I, the servant of the religion, Hērbed-born Mihrābān
5) son of Kayhusraw Mihrābān son of Spandyār Mihrābān Marzbān
6) Hērbed wrote. May it be according to the will of Yazds151.
7) It was in the movable month that, I, the servant of the religion, came to the land of Indians. In
8) the year 692 of Yazdgird, I, the servant of the religion Hērbed-born
9) Mihrābān son of Kayhusraw son of Mihrābān son of Spandyād son of Mihrābān son of
10) Marzbān Hērbed wrote (the manuscript) for the sake of Čāhil Sangan and Čāhil Son of Wahman
11) Bahrām of Cambay. I am a requester to the readers,
12) this manuscript which is read, (the reader) should consider Čāhil worthy (of a prayer for his) immortality of the soul.
13) Čāhil defrayed the expenses for it from his own (wealth). I am the writer for the sake of
14) the soul of the immortal souled Čāhil Sangan and for the sake of (my) own father
15) so that heaven may be the share of his immortal eternal Garōdmānic soul.152

In line 6, as far as selection between bawād and bād with w absorption, is concerned,153 it is impossible to decide according to its spelling by the heterogram YḤWN-ʾt. However, the reading bād is favoured in the present edition because in line 15, the subjunctive verb is spelled as bʾt'.

In line 7, the preposition be, showing direction, in be būm hindūgān mad “came to the land of Indians” is borrowed from New Persian.154 It should be noted that the text of the lines 11-15 of the colophon of J2 agree with that of the lines 2-6 of the second colophon of K5 fol. 327v:

---

151 Unvala (1940: 121) translates yazdān, the plural of yazd, as the singular “god”.
152 The translation is after Unvala (1940: 121). He translates the simple past nibišt (line 6), mad (line 7) and nibišt (line 10) as “have written, “have come” and “have written”, respectively.
153 For baw-/b- see Sims-Williams (1989: 259).
154 The expected preposition in Pahlavi is ō. For the preposition be in New Persian see Windfuhr & Perry (2009: 441).
In line 11, whlʾm is transcribed as bahrām in the present edition instead of wahrām usually given in the transcriptions of the classic Pahlavi texts. The pronunciation of b and the development of w > b are confirmed by the colophon of J2 sister manuscript, or K5, in which the word is spelled as bʾhlʾm (fol. 326v line 3, fol. 327v line 12, 13).

In line 12, kē is edited to ka “when” by Unvala (1940: 121, fn. 3). However, the phrase ēn nibēg kē xwānīhēd “this manuscript which is read” is semantically meaningful and does not need any edition. Regarding xwānīhēd (KLYTWN-yh- yat)\textsuperscript{155} in line 12, Unvala (1940: 121), reading xwānīhand, translates it as active “(they) recite” which is not a proper translation of the verb with the passive suffix -īh.\textsuperscript{156} Moreover, the occurrence of rāy as the postposition marking direct objects in čāhil rāy pad anōšag ruwān arzānīl[g] dārēd shows the influence of New Persian.\textsuperscript{157}

As regards line 14 pidar xwad, Unvala (1940: 121) edits pidarān [ī xwad] “(my) own forefather”. In the manuscript, however, the text appears as below:

\textsuperscript{155} The spelling of the verb is similar to that in the recurring text attested in K5. See the K5 description, colophon 2 Figure 7.

\textsuperscript{156} For the passive construction see Durkin-Meisterernst (2013: 229, §467).

\textsuperscript{157} For rāy see Skjærvø (2009a: 233); Windfuhr (2009: 33-34); Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 354, §753).
As it is shown, unlike Unvala’s edition adding *xwad* in the brackets, *hwt* (*xwad*) occurs in the manuscript although the last letter, representing *t*, is very pale. Furthermore, Unvala’s suggestion of the plural *pidarān* is unlikely because the spelling ‘*BY-\tl hwt* (*pidar xwad*) “(my) own father” is also corroborated by the parallel text in K5 (fol. 327v line 6) spelling ‘*BY-\tl Y NPŠH* (*pidar \ti \xwēš*).

In line 15, Unvala (1940: 121) translates *kū-\š wahišt bahr \i anōšag jāwēdān ruwān garōdmānīg bād* as “that they (in manuscript sg.) may be the participants of heaven (and) always having their soul in the Garōdmān.” However, not only there is no evidence to confirm that the 3\* sg enclitic pronoun -\š, occurring after *pidar* “father”, replaces the plural -\šān but also in the colophon 1 of K5 (fol. 326v line 11), written by the same scribe, the 3\* pl -\šān is correctly attested in *u-\šān ruwān* “their soul”. It shows that the scribe distinguished the difference between -\š and -\šān. Unvala’s translation of -\š as “they” is probably based on his interpretation of *pidarān* as a plural noun. Moreover, translating *garōdmānīg* as “in Garōdmān” (= *andar garōdmān*) is incorrect because the local preposition *andar* “in” is absent in the text and Phl. *garōdmānīg* is an adjective rather than a noun. Therefore, in the present study, *garōdmānīg* is translated as “Garōdmānic”.

b) K5: The manuscript K5 measures 27.3 × 22.2 cm and it has 328 folios of which the first folio is missing. Folios 1-91 have 17 lines per page while folios 92-327 have 15 lines to the page (except folio 188 which has 16 lines). Like J2, the manuscript K5 was copied by Mihrābān Kayhusraw for Čāhil (Hintze 2012a: 255). The manuscript has three colophons; two in Pahlavi and one in Sanskrit as follows:

Colophon 1, fol. 326v line 1) *rōz āsmān māh day wahīzag kē man dēn bandag hērbed zād*
2) *mihrābān \i kayhusraw \i mihrabān \i spandyād \i mihrābān \i*
3) *mazrbān \i bahram dazūk rōstāg ciyōn pahlūmagān mard*
4) *stāyišn xwābar az ahlāyīh ahlawdom az yazdān ān*
5) *\ti meh ohrmazd abar stāyišn xwānam kū-\š az ān*
6) î wēš stāyišn abar kunam wahīzag abar sāl î 6
7) 92 yazgdīrdīg sāhān sāh ohrmazdān man dēn bandag î
8) mihrābān kē mad ham andar hindāstān shahrestān kāmbayt
9) ēn kurāsk az dast hērbed rōstahm mihrābān nībišt
10) az xwāndārān ēn nibēg xwāyišnīg ham kē amāh rāy
11) pas widard pad patet ayād dārēnd u-šān ruwān
12) garōdmānīg bād

1) Day Āsmān, the movable month Day. I, the servant of the religion, Hērbed-born
2) Mihrābān son of Kayhusraw son of Mihrābān son of Spandyād son of Mihrābān son of
3) Marzbān son of Bahrmān (of the) village Dazūk, like the best man, recite
4) the praise of the beneficent, the most righteous in righteousness among Yazds, the
5) great Ohrmazd. That means: From the
6) many praises, I perform (a praise) to him. In the movable month, in the
7) year 6-
8) Mihrābān, King of Kings, the descendant of Ohrmazd, I, the servant of the
religion,
9) wrote this book from the hand written of Hērbed Rōstahm Mihrābān.
10) I desire from those who read this manuscript that
11) they should remember us in the Repentance after (our) passing away. And their soul
12) may be Garōdmānic.158

Unlike J2, in K5 Mihrābān Kayhusraw mentions his source, or the manuscript of
Rōstahm Mihrābān. In line 9, the word kurāsk “book” is comparable with the Aramaic loan
word in Parthian kulāst “miscellany, collection”.159 In line 10, the expected kū “that” is
replaced by kē “who”. The replacement could be due to the scribal confusion between Phl.
kē and NP. kalke (κέ) “that”.160 Moreover, the phrase kē amāh rāy pas widard pad patet
ayād dārēnd “that they should remember us in the Penitentiary prayer after (our) passing
away” (line 10-11) shows the influence of New Persian because of the direct object
postposition rāy.161

Colophon 2, fol. 327v line 1) frazaft pad drōd ud sādīh ud rāmišn frazāmēnīd ēn
kurāsk az bahr
2) čāhil sangan kambāyṭīg nībišt xwāstār ham az xwāndārān
3) ēn nibēg abar xwāniḥēd čāhil rāy pad anōšag ruwān
4) arzānīg dārēd čāhil az xwēṣ162 uzēnag pad-iš kard man nībištār

158 The translation is after Unvala (1940: 129). He translates the simple past mad (line 8) and
nibišt (line 9) as “am come” and “have written”, respectively. He also translates garōdmānīg bād as “may reside in the
Garōdmān”. For a discussion on the translation of garōdmānīg see the section on J2 description.
159 See Durkin-Meisterernst (2013: 92-93). I would like to thank Leon Goldman who drew my attention to
Durkin-Meisterernst’s article when I was working on the etymology of kurāsk.
160 The pronunciation of a and e is dialectical (Windfuhr & Perry (2009: 429).
162 In the manuscript, it is spelled as npštn. However, Unvala (1940: 130, fn. 6) suggests convincingly that
5) ham az bahr ruwān ōy anōšag ruwān ċāhil sangan az bahr
6) ruwān pidar ā xwēš kā-š wahišt bahr anōšag
7) jāwēdān ruwān garōdmānīg bād
8) rōzānamag be nibēsam az bahr ċāhil kambāyīg nīyāgānān
9) har kē ēn kitāb xwānēd dārēd dāst ōyshān ahlaw kun[ēd]
10) māh amurdat rōz frawardīn sangan ċāhil rōzag
11) māh day rōz frawardīn ċāhil wahman ād[ur]163 rōzag
12) ādur māh frawardīn rōz wahman bahrām rōzag
13) ādur māh frawardīn rōz bahrām adur ċāhil rōzag
14) māhūr rōz anagrān dārag ċāhil rōzag
15) māh day ādur mālān164 sangan rōzag

1) Completed in welfare and joy and pleasure. It is completed. This book was written165 for
2) ċāhil Sangan of Cambay. I am a requester to the readers,
3-4) this manuscript which is read, (the reader) may consider ċāhil worthy
(of a prayer for) immortality of the soul. ċāhil defrayed the expenses for it from his own
(wealth). I
5) am the scribe (of this manuscript) for the sake of the immortal souled ċāhil Sangan
(and) for the sake of
6) the soul of my father that he may be a partaker of heaven, (may he be) immortal,
7) his soul (may be) immortal (and) Garōdmānic.
8) I write down the register of the days (of deaths) for the sake of ċāhil of Cambay (and)
ancestors.
9) Everybody who reads, keeps (or) kept this book, he may be made righteous.
10) Month Amurdat, day Frawardīn, anniversary of Sangan ċāhil.
11) Month Day, day Frawardīn, anniversary of ċāhil Bahman ādur.
12) Month ādur, day Frawardīn, anniversary of Bahman bahrām.
13) Moth ādur, day Frawardīn, anniversary of Bahrām ādur ċāhil.
14) Moth Tir, day Anagrān, anniversary of Dārag ċāhil.
15) Month Day, day ādur, anniversary of Mālān Sangan.166

Unvala (1940: 130) reads the passive xwānīhēd (line 3) “was read” as the active xwānand
“(they) read”167 but in the manuscript the verb is clearly written as xwānīhēd (KLYTWN-yh
-yf):

---

since npētn (nibištan) “to write” is semantically meaningless in the context of the colophon, it should be edited
to NPŠH (xwēš) “own”.
163 The reading ādur is uncertain because while in the manuscript, ’t is only written, it is also crossed out by a
horizontal line.
164 It is written with the Avestan letters for ā and ā.
165 Unvala (1940: 130) translates the simple past nibišt in the passive sense as “is written”.
166 The translation is after Unvala (1940: 130-131).
167 Unvala is not consistent in transcribing the Pahlavi verb as in J2 he reads the same spelling as xwānīhand
“they recite”. 
---
In addition, in line 3, the direct object postposition ṭāy shows the influence of New Persian. Furthermore, in line 7, Unvala (1940: 130) translates the adj. garōdmānīg as “in Garōdmān”, rather than “Garōdmānic” in the present edition.\footnote{Lines 2-7 are repeated in J2. For a discussion see the J2 description.}

In line 9, Unvala (1940: 130) reads har kē ēn kitāb xwānēd dārēd ayād ī ōyšān ahlaw kun[ēd] “Everybody who reads or keeps this book should render their memory pious”. The text of K5 in line 9, however, appears as follows:

While Unvala’s reading ayād “memory”, spelled as ’bydʾt in Pahlavi, is unlikely, the word is to be read as dʾšt (dāšt) “held”. With the latter interpretation, dāšt is the last verb in a series of verbs whose subject and object are har kē “Everybody” and ēn kitāb “this book”, respectively. Moreover, the Arabic loanword in New Persian, or kitāb “register, book”, is another example, alongside the object postposition ṭāy (line 3), confirming the influence of New Persian.

In fol. 328r lines 1-12 appears the Sanskrit colophon which has been transcribed and translated by Goldman (2018: 5) as follows:

K5 fol. 328r line 1) samvat 1379 varṣe mārgga śudi 8 budhe pāsī  
2) saṃ 692 varṣe māha dai roja āsmān adhyeha  
3) stamabhātirthe sulatāna śrī gayāsaddīne rājyaṃ paripam  
4) thayaṭṭyevaṃ kāle erānjamīdeśāt sāma  
5) yāta pārasījñātīya ācārya kaisusravasuta  
6) acāryamihiravānasya bahutaraṃ mānaṃ kāgalaṃ  
7) likhāpanamca pradāya pārasī vyava sāmgaṇasuta  
8) vyava cāhilena punyārtham etasya pārśvāt idam  
9) pustakam likhāpitam | iyasniłādāmā | yah ko’  
10) pi pustakamidam rakṣati | pathati tena vyava cāhi  
11) lasya pūrvajānām muktāmanām tathā etasya nimi
12) *ttam punyam karanīyam* ǁ

[Copied] in the year Śaṁvat 1379 on Wednes[day], the 8th of the bright half of the month in the month of Mārga[śirṣa], in the Parši year 692, the month Dai, the day Asmān, here today in Stambhatirtha (= Cambay) at the time when Sultān Śrī Gayāsadīn is exercising his royal authority. Thus, the trader Cahil, son of the trader Saṁgan, a Parši, having sent a letter (written with) the greatest respect and a perquisite for writing, caused this manuscript, namely the īyasna (=Yasna) with its jaṁda (=Zand), to be copied *at his own expense (?)* for merit’s sake by Ācārya Mihravan, son of Ācārya Kaikhusrava, belonging to the Parši community and coming from the land of Iran.

Whoever protects [and] recites this manuscript, so on account of him merit is to be accrued by the trader Cahil [and] his liberated ancestors.

c) M1: The manuscript contains Y 0.6-72.5 and it is a descendant of K5. It also measures 17 × 11.5 cm and has 768 folios, written 13 lines to page by two hands. The second hand commences from folio 697v (Hintze 2012a: 256). The Pahlavi colophon, written by the scribe called Kāwuṣ son of Frēdōn in AY 1103 (=1734 CE), is attested in folios 765r to 768v as follows:\footnote{169}

M1 fol. 765r line 5) *pad nām ī dādā[r]*
6) ohrmazd
7) frazaft *pad drōd ud šād-
8) īh ud farroxiḥ ud rāmišn-
9) īh *pad nēk dahišnīh*
Fol. 765v line 1) *xūb murwāg abestāg*
2) yazišnīh abāg ma'nīg
3) zand nibištam *ud frāz-
4) hištam man dēn bandag*
5) *mowbed kāwus ibn ī wahištūg*
6) dastūr frēdōn *dast-
7) ōr wahman bahrām frāmarz*
Fol. 766r line 1) *andar rōz mubārak day-pad-
2) ādur ud az māh farrox*
3) ādur sāl *bar*
4) 1103
5) □ □ □ □
6) *pas az sāl man ba-
7) y yazdgird sāhān sāh*
Fol 766v line 1) *šahryārān nibišt-
2) e šude andar kišwar*
3) hindōān dar bandar *mubārak*
4) surat har kas kē
5) xwānād *ayāb hammōzād*
6) ayāb paččēn az-iš kun-
7) ād ruwān man nibištār*

\footnote{169 The interlinear New Persian translation of the Pahlavi colophon is also provided in the manuscript.}
Fol. 767r line 1) rāy pad nēk nāmīg ud
2) ahlaw ruwānī[h] ud kirbag
3) ud mizd ham bahrag kun-
4) ād u-š rā\(^{170}\) pad gētīyīh
5) tan husraw ud pad
6) mēnōy ruwān garōdmānīg
7) bād agar nām man nibištār
Fol. 767v line 1) rā awestarēd ayāb abgan-
2) ēd ayāb ayād nē
3) kunēd u-š rā pad
4) gētīy ēn dusraw ud
5) pad mēnōy ruwān druward
6) bād u-š rā hamēmāl
7) ham pad dādwār dādār
Fol. 768r line 1) ohrmazd pad hanjaman\(^{171}\) isat
2) wāstar zarduštān
3) xwāysišīg ham kê
4) čiyoŋ ēn bande dar
5) nibištan dast gāhīg
6) nē dāšt ham
7) škastag ēn nibištāg
Fol. 768v rāy mu āf framāyēnd pad yazdān ud amahraspandān kāmīh bawād\(^{172}\)

Fol. 765r line 5) In the name of the creator
6) Ohrmazd.
7) Completed in welfare and joy
8) and happiness and pleasure
9) in good luck (and)
Fol. 765v 1) auspiciousness, the Avesta
2) the Yasna with the translation,
3) the Zand. I wrote and
4) and launched (it), I, the servant of the religion,
5) the priest Kāwus son of the heavenly
6) priest Frēdōn (son of) the priest
7) Wahman Bahram Frāmarz,
Fol. 766r line 1) on the blessed Day-pad-
2) Adur day and from the auspicious month
3) Adur, year
4) 1103
5) □ □ □
6) after the year of my lord,
7) Yazdgird, King of Kings,
Fol. 766v line 1) son of Šahryār. It is written
2) in the land of
3) Indians in the blessed port
4) of Surat. Everybody, who

\(^{170}\) Here and in fol. 767v, lines 1, 3 and 6, the text spells l'.
\(^{171}\) As the reading of \(\text{hanjaman}\) is unclear, \(\text{anjumān}\) is based on the corresponding New Persian \(\text{anjūmān}\).
\(^{172}\) Fol. 768v is not uploaded on the website of the Avestan Digital Archive. Therefore, its text is copied from Unvala (1940: 51) who writes neither the folio nor the line number.
5) reads it, or teaches it,  
6) or makes a copy from it,  
7) should make my soul, the scribe,  
Fol. 767r line 1) participant in the good fame and  
2) in the righteousness of the soul and in the good deed  
3) and reward.  
4-5 And the renowned body (may be) for him in the material world and in  
6) the spiritual world, (his) soul may be Garōdmānic.  
7-Fol 767v line1) If he stains my name, the scribe, (or) throws it away (in oblivion),  
2) or does not mention it,  
3-4 may the ill-famed body (be) for him in the material world and  
5) in the spiritual world may (his) soul be deceitful,  
6-7) and I am his opponent before the judge, the creator  
File 768r line 1) Ohrmazd, before the assembly of Isad-  
2) wāstar son of Zarduşt.  
3) I desire  
4-768v) as this servant has not got the skill in writing they will pardon the shortcoming  
[lit. breaks] of this manuscript. May it be according to the will of the Yazads and the  
Amshāspands.\(^\text{173}\)

There are several Arabic loanwords in the colophon, coming from New Persian: 1)  
maʿnīg “meaning” (fol. 765v line 2) which is the Pahlavicised form of the Arabic maʿnī, 2)  
ibn “son” (fol. 765v line 5), 3) mubārak “blessed” (fol. 766r line 1; fol. 766v line 3) and 4)  
muʿāf kardan “to pardon” (fol. 768v). In fol. 766v line 1-2, nibištē šūde (YKTBWN-st-yh)  
and bande (bndyh) in fol. 768r line 4, are the Pahlavicised forms of the New Persian  
nivišta šuda (نوشته شده) in which the final h (\(\text{ی}\)) represents the New Persian suffix a derived from  
*-ka > Phl. -ag > NP. -a (\(\text{ی}\)). The spelling -yh (e) rather than -ah (a) is also dialectical.\(^\text{174}\)  
It should be noted that in M1, št in nibišt(tār) is replaced by st which also seems to be  
dialectical. The direct objects ruwān man nibištār (fol. 766v line 7) and nām man nibištār  
(fol. 767r line 7) are marked by the direct object postposition rā(y,) (fol. 767r line 1, fol.  
767v line 1) that, as mentioned before, it is a feature of the late New Persian-like Pahlavi  
texts. In fol.767r line7 and fol. 767v line 6, ŶḤWWN-ʾt can be transcribed as either bawād  
or bād. In the present edition, it is shown as bād because of the reading of the interlinear  
New Persian translation bād (باد) and the reading bād with w absorption in the Pahlavi  
colophon of the older Indian J2 manuscript as discussed above. In fol. 768r line 4, dar is  
transcribed instead of andar “in” because it is represented by the heterogram BBH (dar),  
originally meaning “door” in Pahlavi. The occurrence of dar, showing the development Phl.  

\(^{173}\) The translation is after Unvala (1940: 52-53).  
\(^{175}\) See Windfuhr & Perry (2009: 429).
andar > NP. dar “in”, is another example of the influence of New Persian on the Pahlavi text of the colophon of M1.¹⁷⁶

Unvala (1940: 51) giving kirbag ud mizd (fol. 767r line 2-3) in his transcription, translates it as “the reward of good deeds”. However, Phl. ud “and” cannot be interpreted as the ezāfa ṯ “of”. The spelling of the vertical stroke l as W (ud) is confirmed by its corresponding interlinear New Persian translation u (ṣ) “and”.

¹⁷⁶ For the omission of the initial a in New Persian see Mazdapour (2011 (1390): 180-182).
3 Tradition of Transmission and Method of Research
3.1 Tradition of Transmission

It is mentioned in the Dēnkard VIII that the Sasanian Avesta was divided into 21 nask-s “bundles”. Moreover, a Pahlavi translation of this Avesta was probably available since the description of the Dēnkard is based on the Pahlavi version (Gignoux 1996: 288). Until the late 20th century, it had been assumed that the extant Avestan texts are the remnants of the Sasanian Great Avesta. Kellens (1998), however, rejects this relationship. He suggests that the Avestan texts at our disposal, including the Yasna, are liturgical texts reaching back to the Old Iranian period. By contrast, as pointed out by Hintze (2014a: 7), ‘while Kellens’s conclusions on the antiquity of the rituals incorporated in the extant Avesta have been widely accepted, the question of the relationship between the Dēnkard and ritual Avestas still remain open’.

The manuscripts provide evidence for both an oral and a written tradition of the Avestan texts and their Zand. As is now widely understood, the oral tradition has always played an important role in Zoroastrianism. In particular, as discussed above in section 1.1, the Avesta was both composed orally and transmitted orally until it was written down probably during the late Sasanian period. From then on, the oral tradition has continued in an unbroken line alongside the written one up to the present day. That the oral tradition was regarded superior to the written one emerges from a passage in the Dēnkard V (DkM. 460.6-8) where wāz gōwišnīh “oral tradition” is considered to be of greater legitimacy than its written counterpart.\footnote{For a translation see (Amouzegar & Tafazzoli 2007 (1386): 88).} The oral tradition is explicitly referred to in the Pahlavi text of Husraw ud Rēdag according to which pages had to memorise the Avesta and Zand in the priestly schools:

HR 8-10. pad hangām ō frahangeštān ďād ham
    ud-am pad frahang kardan saxt ŏštāft būd ham
    ud-am yašt ud hādōxt ud bayān ud juddēvdād hērbedīhā warm
    gyāg gyāg zand niyōxšīd ēstād
    ud-am dibīrīh ŏwōn
    kū huwasp nibēg ud ray nibēg
    bārīk dāniōn kāmagkār hudast
    frazānag az-iš ham

In due time, I was given to the school
and in my study, I was very diligent.
I memorised the Yašt and the Hādōxt, the Bayān and the Vīdēvdād like a Hērbad
and passage by passage heard the Zand.
And my scribal ability was such
that I am a good writer and a swift writer,
with keen understanding, successful, skilful
and learned.¹⁷⁸

However, the influence of the oral tradition is mainly present in the Sāde manuscripts
whose study is beyond the scope of the present research.¹⁷⁹ As for the written tradition of
the Avesta and Zand, the Dēnkard III (DkM 405.11-21), relates a legend according to which
the interrogation between Zardušt, his first disciples and the First Teachers (pōryōtkēšān)
was written down under the king Wištāsp. Then, a copy of it was committed to ganj i šspyk’n
(šāhīgān?) “Treasure of Lords?”¹⁸⁰ Later, several copies of it were produced to be
circulated over the country and a copy was also sent to ganj nibišt “Fortress of Writing” to
be kept there. It should be noted that while the localization of ganj i šāhīgān is unmentioned
in the sources, the Pahlavi text of the Šahrestānīhā ī Ērānšahr 2-5, associates the treasury in
which the Avesta was kept with the city of Samarkand:

ŠE 2-5 pad kust ī xwarāsān samarkand šahrestān kāūs ī kawādān bun fragand
syāwaxš ī kāūsān be frazāmēnīd
kay-husraw ī syāwaxšān anōh zād
u-š warzāwand ātaxš wahrām anōh nīsāst
pas zardušt dēn āwurd
az framān ī wištāsp sāh 1000 ud 200 fragand pad dēn dibūrīh pad taxtagīhā ī zarrēn kand
ud nibišt ud pad ganj ī ātaxš nihād
ud pas gizistag skandar sōxt ud andar ō drayāb abgand

In the Eastern direction, the foundation of the city of Samarkand was laid by Kāūs, the
son of Kawād.
Syāwaxš, the son of Kawād, completed it.
Kay Husraw, the son of Syāwaxš, was born there
and he set the miraculous Wahrām fire there.
Then, Zardušt brought the Religion.
By the order of the king Wištāsp 1200 chapters in the Avestan script were engraved on
golden tablets,
and written and deposited in the treasury of that fire (temple).
And then, the accursed Alexander burnt and threw it in the sea.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸ The text is after Bailey (1943: 160). For texts emphasising on the importance of memorising the Zand see Bailey (1943: 158-161).
¹⁷⁹ For recent results on the tradition of the transmission of the Avestan texts in the Sāde manuscripts see Cantera (2012a: 279-346).
¹⁸⁰ In the Dēnkard, it is spelled as šspyk’n (DkM 405.19, 406.1); šp’n’ (DkM 406.9, 649.19); špyk’n’ (DkM 412.4-5, 412.22). For a review on different scholarly interpretations of the word see Hintze (2008: 147, fn. 2), and also Shaki (1981: 115, fn. 2).
¹⁸¹ The text is after Daryaee (2002: 13, 17). According to the Dēnkard V (DkM 437.16-23), the teachings of the vizier Jāmāsp were also kept in ganj ī xwadāyān “Treasury of Lords” in addition to the Avesta and its Zand.
In other Pahlavi texts, diz ī nibišt is placed in Staxr:

AWZ 1.12-18 ud ēn dēn čiyōn hamāg abestāg ud zand ī abar gāw pōśīhā ī wirāstāg pad āh ī zarr nibišt tag andar staxr ī pābagān pad diz ī nibišt nihād ēstād ṧy petyārag ī wad-baxt ī ahlamōg ī druand ī anāg-kardār aleksandr ī ḵrōmāyīg ī muzrāyīg mānišn ī abar āwurūd ud be sóxt

And this scripture namely all the Avesta and Zand had been written with gold water on prepared cowhide and disposed in Staxr ī Pābagān in the Fortress of Writing. The wicked, wretched, heretic, sinful, maleficent Alexander the Roman, resident of Egypt, took (them) away and burnt.182

Regarding the alleged Achaemenid copy of the Avesta and Zand, like AWZ 1.12-18, other Zoroastrian sources refer to its existence. For example, according to the Dēnkard IV (DkM 412.3-5), Dārāy ī Dārāyān kept two copies of the Avesta and Zand in the Fortress of Writing and Treasury of ṣpyk ’n’ (šāhīgān?) as it had been revealed to Zardušt.183 According to the Dēnkard III (DkM 405.21-406.2), after Alexander’s invasion, one of the manuscripts in the Fortress of Writing was burnt and the second copy ō yōnāyīg uzwān be wizārd “was translated into the Greek language”.184 Later, the Arsacid kind Valaxš is said to have ordered to collect the Avesta and Zand which either were left in the nibišt tag “written” form or had survived through uzwān abespārisnīg “oral transmission” (DkM 412.5-11).

The mentioned stories of the existence of a written Avesta even in pre-Achaemenid times are all legendary as there is no evidence that such a written Avesta ever existed. The first Iranian language which was committed into writing is Old Persian whose script was probably invented around 520 BCE under Darius I.185 Furthermore, the Avestan script is mainly based on fully developed cursive form of the Pahlavi script and the latter reached its final development between the fifth and seventh centuries CE.186 However, a historical component in the account of the Dēnkard could be that the Achaemenid Avesta was accompanied with its Zand. The reason is that although Zand means the Pahlavi version of the Avesta including commentaries, the YAν texts of Y 19-21 are commentaries to the Yaϑ Ahū Vairiiō, Ašǝm Vohū and Yejhe Hātām prayers, respectively.187 Furthermore, as

---

182 The text is after Wahman (1986: 77, 191).
183 For a translation of DkM 412.3-415.3 see Shaki (1981: 118-121).
184 For a translation see de Menasce (1973: 379).
185 For Old Persian script see Skjærvø (2009c: 47, 52-53).
mentioned above, the Pahlavi texts claim that a copy was kept in Staxr in Pārs. The existence of an Avestan version redacted in Pārs agrees with the studies of Hoffmann according to whom the present Avesta is highly influenced by the Achaemenid dialect of the province of Pārs.188 Regarding the existence of a written version of the Avesta during the late Achaemenid, Arsacid and early Sasanian periods, although it cannot be ruled out, the present written version of the Avesta cannot be dated sooner than fifth-seventh centuries due to palaeographical evidence as mentioned above.189

Non-Zoroastrian sources on the transmission of the Avesta during the Arsacid and early Sasanian periods are contradictory. The Greek writers Pausanias, living in the second century, Eusebius of Caesarea (260-340 CE), the Manichaean Kephalaion book in Coptic and the Latin author Pliny (23-79 CE) refer to the Avesta copies. Pausanias reports the existence of a manuscript from which a Lydian Zoroastrian priest read the prayers in the Fire Temple. Eusebius also refers to the sacred collection of the Zoroastrian scripture. According to the Coptic Kephalaion, Zaradēs (= Zardušt) had not written a book but his students wrote a book after him. Pliny cites Hermippos’s account according to which Zoroaster, living 6000 years before Plato and Aristotle, had written two million verses. By contrast, the bishop Basilios of Caesarea of Cappadocia mentions in a letter sent to the bishop Epiphanius of Constantia in 377 CE, that the folk of magi, who came from Babylonia to Cappadocia, did not possess books. Moreover, some Syrian Christian authors mention that the Zoroastrian tradition is purely oral. However, the authenticity of these reports is questioned. For example, it is possible that the Greek alphabet was used by the Lydian priests to write down their text. Furthermore, the story of Pliny is legendary. Regarding the Manichaean account, it could be based on a similar Zoroastrian story which was later attested in the Dēnkard as mentioned above. The reports of Basilios and other Christian authors are also unreliable because they are obviously hostile towards the religion of magi. Furthermore, they were not well acquainted with the Zoroastrian teachings and rituals. For example, Basilios mentions that the followers of magician did not have teachers of the faith.190

According to the Pahlavi account, during the Sasanian period (224-651 CE), several attempts were made at restoring the canon. Tansar, the high priest of the first Sasanian king of kings, Ardaxšir, is said to have chosen one version of the Avesta. Under Ardaxšir’s son,

188 For a review of Hoffmann’s works on the dialect of the Avesta see Hintze (1998: 154 and 154, fn. 40-42).
Šāpuhr, the dispersed Avestan nibēgīhā “books” in Rome, India and other places on non-religious subjects were also added to the religious material. These texts were on bizeškīh “medicine”, star gōwišnīh “astronomy”, ċandišn “movement”, zamān “time”, gyāg “space”, gōhr “substance”, jahišn “accident”, bawišn “becoming”, wināhišn “decay”, jadag wihrīh “transformation”, gōwāgīh “logic” and abārīg kirrōgīh “other arts”. Furthermore, a copy was given to the Treasury. In the reign of Šāpuhr son of Ohrmazd, the high priest Ādurbād son of Māraspand chose a version of the Avesta which was accepted by other priests as the canon (DkM 412.11-413.8). Its correctness was proved by the ordeal of the molten bronze according to the following story:

AWZ 2.10-13 ādurbād ī māraspandān kē-š pad-iš passāxt ī pad dēn kard rōy ī widāxtag abar war réxt ud čand dādestān ud dāwarīh abāg jud-kēšān ud jud-wurrōyišnān be kard Ādurbād ī Māraspandān about whom the ordeal according to the religion was performed: Melted copper was poured on his breast, and he held several processes and (passed) judgement (on) the unbelievers and heretics.¹⁹¹

However, the appearance of Mazdak and his teachings of the community of property and women were troublesome (DKM 6.17-22). According to ZWY 2.2-4, after overcoming his heresy, Husraw II held another council in which it was decided to ban teaching the Zand to the laity.¹⁹²

As far as the existence of a written version of the Avesta and Zand during the Sasanian period is concerned, Cantera (2004: 229-230) argued that at least, a written Pahlavi translation of the Vidēvdād had probably been produced. It is based on the Pahlavi translation and commentary of hāmō.šiiāoḏna in Vd 4.43 hāmō.šiiāoḏna tē pascaēta bauuainte “your deeds then become the same”. In the Pahlavi version, hāmō.šiiāoḏna is rendered by ham-t wināh in ham-t wināh awēšān pas bawēnd word for word translation: “same-your-offence-their-then-become” in which ham correctly translates Av. hāmō and -t corresponds to tē. Obviously, the co-occurrence of -t “your” and awēšān “their” is semantically problematic. Pointing out the problem, Bartholomae (AirWb. 1804) had suggested that the original ham-t was read later as ka (’MT) “when”. As a result, awēšān is a late secondary intrusion into the sentence to render tē. The Pahlavi translation is also followed by a commentary on offence opening with ka-šān “when their”. Following Bartholomae’s suggestion, Cantera (2004: 229-230) examined ka-šān which corresponds to

¹⁹² For an edition and a translation of ZWY 2.2-4 see Rezania (2012: 486-487).
the Pahlavi translation ham-t /ka. He concluded that the interpretation of ʾka as ka rather than the correct ham-t in the commentary is explainable by assuming the existence of a written translation to which the commentary opening with ka (ʾMT) (ʾka) was added before the final codification based on the wrong interpretation of ham-t. However, Cantera’s (2012a: 279-346) recently published article casts doubt on his aforementioned suggestion. There reason is that such features can also be the result of a late collation process.

It is also possible that a written tradition of the Avesta existed in Sogdiana. The reason is that a ninth or tenth century Sogdian document, kept in the British Library, contains the famous Ašom Vohū prayer adapted to the local dialect. Evidence suggests that such a tradition, cannot be dated before the time of Māni living in the third century CE because the prayer is written in the Manichaean script.193

According to the Dēnkard III (DkM 407.10-408.15), the Avesta and Zand were scattered after the Arab conquest of Iran for the second time after Alexander’s invasion, but Ādur Farrbay son of Farroxzād reunited the dispersed texts which were passed down to his son Zardušt. Unluckily, due to a bad accident happened to him, the texts were dispersed again but Ādur Bād son of Ėmēd re-collected them. He also added new texts to the collection which was called the Dēnkard of 1000 chapters by him.

Regarding the transmission of the Pahlavi version of the Hōm Yašt, as mentioned in section 1.4, it has the features of the Pahlavi language of the ninth and twelfth or thirteenth centuries. Nonetheless, evidence suggests that either an oral or a written version of the Sasanian Zand of the Hōm Yašt should have existed. The reason is that as mentioned in section 1.4, the Zand of the Vidēvdād and Hērbedestān have the features of the Sasanian Pahlavi. One of the commentators of the both texts was Rōšn whose name also appears in Y 9.2 as the interpreter of dūrōsīh “averting perdition”:

\[ \text{rōšn guft hād aōsīh pad hōm bawēd} \]

“Rōšn said, ‘that is that imperishableness is through Hōm’.

Historically, the compilation of the known bilingual Pahlavi manuscripts, containing the Hōm Yašt, goes back to the tenth or eleventh century according to the colophons of the manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line attested in the IrPY Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6.194

194 For the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš see 2.1.
However, as discussed below in the present section, although the Iranian manuscripts contain such an important colophon, they are late and their Pahlavi version is corrected. By contrast, the oldest manuscripts at our disposal are YIndP J2 and K5 written down in AY 692 (1323 CE). The problem with the two manuscripts is that their quality cannot be determined as they were produced by a single scribe. Regarding the readings of J2 and K5, they show the variant readings according to the following table, based on the text-critical apparatus of Y 9.1-15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza-line number</th>
<th>J2</th>
<th>K5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.1-4&lt;sup&gt;195&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>gāh (g's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.1-7</td>
<td>ka ('MT)</td>
<td>ka-š ('MT-š)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.1-7</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>kē (MNW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.2-1</td>
<td>ēy ('LH)</td>
<td>deest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.2-8</td>
<td>xwarišn xwarišn (hwlsn'), hwlsn'</td>
<td>xwarišn (hwlsn')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.3-3</td>
<td>tō (LK)</td>
<td>tō hōm (LK hwm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.3-6</td>
<td>kard kū (krt' YK)</td>
<td>kard (krt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.4-15</td>
<td>rōšn (lwšn')</td>
<td>hād rōšn (HWH-t lsn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.4-22</td>
<td>xward ('STHN-t')</td>
<td>xwarišn (hwlsn')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.5-2</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>būd (YHWWN-t')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.5-5</td>
<td>būd hād (YHWWN-t HWWN-d)</td>
<td>būd (YHWWN-t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.5-8</td>
<td>burzōy ēdōn nēk būd ēiyōn pus (bwlcwk 'ytwn' nywk YHWWN-t cygwn pws)</td>
<td>burzōy (bwlcwk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.6</td>
<td>ābādīh (ʾpyṭyḥ)</td>
<td>nēkīh (nywkyh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.7-7</td>
<td>ka ('MT)</td>
<td>kū (MNW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.7-7</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>zād (LYDYDWN-t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10-1</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>ēg-iš ('DYN'-š)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10-6</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>būd (YHWWN-t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10-11</td>
<td>čē ō (MH 'w')</td>
<td>ō ('w')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10-11</td>
<td>mad (mt')</td>
<td>ān mad (ZK mt')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10-12</td>
<td>ka ('MT)</td>
<td>ka az ('MT MN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10-20</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>guft (gwpt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10-21</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>māhgušnasp (m 'hgwsnsp')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.11-1</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>az ('c')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.11-22</td>
<td>tazīd (tcyt')</td>
<td>deest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.13-1</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>ēy ('LH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.13-2</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>ahlaw ('hlwb')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.14-2</td>
<td>deest</td>
<td>weh (ŠPYL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.15-10</td>
<td>kū ('YK)</td>
<td>čē (MH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.15-15</td>
<td>kē (MNW)</td>
<td>deest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>195</sup> The line numbers are according to the line numbering of the present edition.
As the scribe of the old Indian J2 and K5 is the same person, namely Mihrābān Kayhusraw, it cannot be assumed that the variant readings represent two different traditions. Furthermore, while in J2, Mihrābān Kayhusraw is silent as to his source, in the colophons of K5 he writes that it was copied from the manuscript of Rōstahm Mihrābān. As long as there is no evidence to the contrary, it reasonable to assume that Mihrābān Kayhusraw also used the same source for his J2 manuscript. It should be noted, however, that the table excludes minor variant readings such as ī, ud or insignificant spelling discrepancies. For example, in Y 9.4 line 7 according to the present edition, J2 and K5 spell pus “son” as pws and BRH, respectively. As a result, the variant readings listed above show that the manuscripts are not very faithful copies of the original source and the scribe probably used his memory alongside the original copy in compiling the manuscripts. The variant readings also suggest that in the fourteenth century, the quality of learning the Zand by heart was impaired. Regarding the latest witness of YIndP collated in the present edition, Geldner (1896: Prolegomena, xxx) mentions that M1, written in 1734 CE, is a descendant of K5. His suggestion concurs with the preliminary results of the text-critical apparatus of the present edition which shows a close relationship between the Pahlavi version of the two manuscripts.

As far as the Pahlavi texts of YIrPs especially those of Hōšang Syāvaxš’s family are concerned, the extant manuscripts date from the late eighteenth century onwards. They were copied after Dastur Jāmāsp Velāyati arrived in India. He came from Kerman to Surat around 1720s to solve the dispute among Parsis about issues concerning Padām and the burying of corpses. In Gujarat, after examining the Indian Pahlavi Vīdēvdāds, Jāmāsp declared that the Indian Pahlavi version is too lengthy and inaccurate. He corrected the Pahlavi text and he also trained three priests, namely Dārāb from Surat, Jāmāsp from Nawsari and a priest from Baruch who subsequently followed his teachings. Although Anquetil-Duperron gives no information about the Yasna manuscripts, it is possible that the mentioned movement also influenced the Zand of the Yasna. In Jāmāsp’s post-arrival Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts, Cantera & Andrés-Toledo (2008: 91-99) identify three features of the revised Zand:

1) Some commentaries are shortened or omitted in Jāmāsp’s post-arrival Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts.

196 See section 2.1 and 2.2.
197 See Anquetil-Duperron (1771: Vol. 1, 326-327); Cantera & Andrés-Toledo (2008: 82-83).
2) The prepositions and adverbs can be missing if they are thought to have no corresponding Avestan word.

3) Some glosses are added which are absent in older manuscripts.

A preliminary comparative study with the readings of Y 9.1-17 illustrates that YIrPs of the Hōšang Syāvaxš-line, all of which were copied after 1720, share the same features with those Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts which were copied after Jāmāsp’s arrival.

Regarding feature 1, some commentaries are omitted which are present in pre-1720 manuscripts of the YIndP. In addition to commentaries, the omissions can extend to the Pahlavi translations of the original Avestan in YIrPs. For example, in Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b, the Pahlavi commentary and translation [ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmist šustan] gāhān srāyišnīh, corresponding to Av. ātrəm pairi.yaoḏaθṇtəm gādāsca srāuuaiąntəm are omitted (see Y 9.1 commentary 2).

In Y 9.1, YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b omit tan in hād gyān tan pad frārōnīh amarg kard ēstēd “That is: The life, the body, through righteousness, was made immortal” (see Y 9.1 commentary 13).

In Y 9.7, Phl. was is omitted from the commentary xānag az abarmānd ī pidarān was būd in G14 and T6 (see Y 9.7 commentary 3).

In Y 9.16, Phl. zarrēn gōn “golden coloured”, the translation of Av. zairi.gaonō, is shortened to zarrēn “golden” in Pt4 (fol. 60v line 1), Mf4 (p. 159 line 9), G14 (fol. 58v line 6), T6 (fol. 50v line 1) and T55b (fol. 77v line 5).

As to the second feature, in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6 and T55b, the dative expressing preposition ō is omitted in the translation of Y 9.3 ųmō haōmāi, or Phl. namāz (ō) hōm, while in J2 and K5, ō is attested (see Y 9.3 commentary 1).

In Y 9.8, the dative expressing preposition ō is deleted in wattar ō gēhān, rendering Av. ayəm gaēḍūuuiō, in YIrPs (see Y 9.8 commentary 6).

Regarding the third feature, in Y 9.1, the Avestan quotation miθrō z(a)iṭ zaraθuəstrəm is attested in YIrP Pt4, F2 and G14-T6, in the margin, at the end of the Avestan text of Y 9.1c and at the end of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1c, respectively. The evidence suggests

---

198 The Phl. ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmist šustan appears in the margin of G14. It shows that the Pahlavi sentence is separated from the main Pahlavi text.

199 The preliminary results of the text-critical apparatus suggest that T55b is closely related to Pt4. However, in the available incomplete manuscript starting from Y 7.19, the colophon of Hōšang 1 Syāvaxš is wanting.

200 F2 is an Iranian manuscript written after the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp. However, it does not have the colophon of Hōšang Syāvaxš.
that because of the proliferative feature of the long commentary, the Avestan quotation from a lost text is incorporated into the text of the mentioned Iranian manuscripts. (see Y 9.1 commentary 12).

At the end of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1, the late corrupt Phl. *amarg kard jān [ī xwēš rāy] pad stāyišn [ī ohrmazd]* renders Av. *amōrōza gaiiehe stūna* in YIrP G14 and T6 (see Y 9.1 commentary 15).

In Y 9.2, the Pahlavi translation and commentary *[kē tīs-ē] xwāhēd ay spitāmān ud frāz man rāy*, corresponding to *ā mām yāsan’ha spitama frā mām* are added in the Pahlavi version of YIrP G14, F2 and T6 (see Y 9.2 commentary 5).

In Y 9.8, the commentary *kū band kard* is inserted between *kē-š zad* and *az ī dahāg* in YIrP Pt4 (superscr.), G14 and T6. Furthermore, in Pt4 the object postposition *rāy* is added in margin after *dahāg* under the influence of New Persian (see Y 9.8 commentary 1).

In Y 9.8, *hazārwizōstār* is explained by the commentary *hazār mard rāy zār dāšt* in the margin of YIrP Pt4 and T55b (see Y 9.8 commentary 3).

In Y 9.8, the superscript commentary *abāyēd ā-š kard* is added at the end of the Pahlavi version in YIrP Pt4 (see Y 9.8 commentary 10).

In Y 9.11, the superscript commentary *kū kard ud abāz dāšt ud dūr kard* is inserted after *kē-š zad* in YIrP Pt4 (see Y 9.11 commentary 1).

In Y 9.11, associated with *kū dō pā būd*, the commentary *az ān gyāg be gurēxt* is added in the margin of YIrP Pt4 and T55b (see Y 9.11 commentary 11).

In Y 9.16, the commentary *kū tīs ī ō ōy dahē* is added between the Pahlavi translation *weh hōm ī hudāg* and the following commentary *kū pad frārōnīh dād ēstē* in YIrP Pt4 (superscr. fol. 59r line 14), G14 (fol. 58r line 14 - fol. 58v line 1) and T6 (fol. 50r line 7-8).

In Y 9.16, the commentary *kū hōm xwarēnd andar yazīshn ud hōm drōn ud čānīg be xwarēnd* takes place above the line and in the margin of YIrP Pt4 (fol. 59v line 3) after *ka-t xwarēnd*.

In addition, there are other examples suggesting that YIrPs have been corrected:

a) As mentioned in section 2.1, the colophons of YIrP G14 and T6 are corrected.

b) In Y 9.1, Av. *upāt “went”* is rendered by *pēš raft* in YIrP Pt4 in contrast to the *lectio difficilior abar raft* in other manuscripts (see Y 9.1 commentary 1).

c) In Y 9.1, the pahlavicised *mtlwk (mihrō) “Mihr”* is interpreted as *mad “came”* and *rōy “face”* in YIrP Pt4, F2, T6 and T55b (see Y 9.1 commentary 8).

d) In G14 and T6, the order of the Avestan original *huuarōx darōsō mašiānqm* and its Pahlavi translation and commetary *xwarēd nigerišntom az mardōmān [būd hučašntom]* is
different from that of the other copies (see Y 9.4 commentary 4).

e) In Y 9.4, the number 2 is added at the beginning of the corrupt Pahlavi translation of Av. *anhaosomn* in YIrP G14 and T6 to express the Avestan dual number (see Y 9.4 commentary 7).

f) In Y 9.7, *ēd* in YIrP G14, F2, T6 and YInd J2, K5, M1 is replaced by *ō* in YIrP Pt4, T55b and *ō ēd* in YIrP Mf4 (see Y 9.7 commentary 2).

g) In Y 9.8, Av. *aš.aəŋhəmn* is translated in the YIrP Pt4, G14 and T55b by *ōzōmand* in contrast to *was ōz* in the other collated manuscripts (see Y 9.8 commentary 4).

h) In Y 9.10, *dād* “rule” is corrected to mean *gad* “mace, weapon” in YIrP Pt4, F14, F2, T6 and T55b. Moreover, *tāzīg* and *turk* appear as the plural *tāzīgān* in YIrP Pt4, G14, T6 and *turkān* in YIrP Pt4, G14, F2 and T6. Furthermore, the 3rd sg. ind. *dārēd* is replaced by 3rd pl. subj. *dārānd* in YIrP G14 and T6 (see Y 9.10 commentary 13).

i) The sections c and d of Y 9.11 (according to the present edition) merge together in G14 and T6. Furthermore, the verb *xwist* is corrected to *xwāst* in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b (see Y 9.11 commentary 11).

j) In Y 9.12, Phl. *hōm*, rendering Av. *haoma*, is replaced by *hād* in YIrP Pt4 and T55b (see Y 9.12 commentary 1).

k) In Y 9.14, the ergative construction *tō fradom zardušt ahunawar frāz srūd* is corrected to the accusative *tō fradom zardušt ahunawar frāz srūd hē* under the influence of New Persian in YIrP Pt4, G14 and T55b (see Y 9.14 commentary 3).

l) In Y 9.14, the ergative construction *kū-t yašt ī nāwar kard* is corrected to *kū-t yašt ī nāwar kard hē* under the influence of New Persian in YIrP Pt4, G14, T6 and T55b (see Y 9.14 commentary 4).

m) Davar (1904: 14) had also suggested that YIrP Mf4 is corrected, stating ‘as to Mf4, though it often gives the better preserved text, I am inclined to think that the copyist has, at times, meddled with the text.’

n) As noted by Zeini (2014: 28) in his unpublished dissertation on *The Pahlavi Version of the Yasna Haptanghāiti*, the Pahlavi version of the manuscripts attributed to Hōšang Syāwaxš ‘seems to show a larger degree of variation compared to the Avestan text’.

Furthermore, the study of diacritical marks among the Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts shows that in YIrPs, a systematic set of diacritic marks are recruited to represent /j/, /š/, /x/, /y/.\(^{201}\)

---

\(^{201}\) The diacritical marks of Y 9.1-4 are studied among YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6, T55b and YIndP J2, K5, M1 in my unpublished Master dissertation (Khanizadeh 2013: 39-55).
These factors should be considered in choosing a proper research method. For the relationship between YIrP Pt4, Mf4 and G14, written in 1780 CE, although the colophon of Hōshang Syāvaxš appears in all of them, they bear the traces of independent priestly correction activities. Regarding the other Iranian manuscripts, the preliminary results of the text-critical apparatus point to a close relationship between YIrP Pt4 and undated T55b on the one hand and G14 and T6 on the other hand. However, as shown above, the marginal or superscript texts in Pt4 are sometimes absent in T55b. Regarding F2, although it is a YIrP, its spellings and orders occasionally agree with those of YIndPs. For example, in Y 9.1 line 15, ēd rāy in the Iranian manuscripts contrasts with ēd rāy čē in YIndPs together with F2 and as mentioned above in Y 9.3 line 2, YIrPs have namāz hōm, but YIndPs and F2 write namāz ō hōm. Finally, the names and a short description of the manuscripts collated here, together with a summary of the preliminary results according to their internal and external evidence (variant readings, date of completion and names of scribes) are summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Other features</th>
<th>Preliminary results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>Pt4</td>
<td>1780 CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>It belongs to the Hōshang ī Syāvaxš family.</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mf4</td>
<td>1780 CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>It belongs to the Hōshang ī Syāvaxš family.</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G14</td>
<td>1780 CE</td>
<td>Kāwus Suhrāb Rōstam Mānak Mihrmūš Meherjirāna</td>
<td>It belongs to the Hōshang ī Syāvaxš family.</td>
<td>Corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>1814 CE</td>
<td>Sohrābji Kāuṣji Sohrābji Meherjirāna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Contaminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T55b</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Corrected. Closely related to Pt4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

202 See section 2.1.
203 See text-critical apparatus.
It should be noted that the phrase ‘closely related to’, in the right column refers to spelling similarities between the collated manuscripts\textsuperscript{204} and it does not necessarily indicate the direct genealogical relationship between two copies. For the genealogical studies of the manuscripts, the methods derived from the phylogenetic analyses in biology have recently been suggested. However, these studies are beyond the scope of the present edition.\textsuperscript{205}

In conclusion, six different periods for the transmission of the Zand can be distinguished:

1) The oral composition of the Zand during the Sasanian period. It is also possible that a written version of it was produced.

2) The production of the first known bilingual Avestan-Pahlavi manuscript in the tenth or eleventh century.

3) From the tenth to the thirteenth centuries, the Pahlavi text was the subject to some minor interpretive activities.

4) In the fourteenth century, the Zand was mainly transmitted in written form but traces of the oral transmission are also noticeable.

5) In the eighteenth century, the period of revisions starts, represented by the corrected YIrP Pt4, Mf4 and G14 copies. By contrast, the only Indian copy, or M1 (1734 CE), is closely related to K5 (1323 CE).

6) After revisions, scribes reproduced faithful copies of the corrected ones. For example, YIrP T6 (1842 CE) which is a copy of G14 (1780 CE) and YIrP T55b, although undated, is very close to Pt4 (1780 CE). An exception is F2 (1814 CE) in which the text of the old tradition is collated with the contrasting corrected one.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Indian & J2 & 1323 CE & Mihrābān Kayhusraw Mihrābān Spandyār Mihrābān Marzbān & - & Quality unknown. \\
\hline
K5 & 1323 CE & Mihrābān Kayhusraw Mihrābān Spandyār Mihrābān Marzbān & - & Quality unknown. \\
\hline
M1 & 1734 CE & Kāwus Frēdōn Wahman Bahrām Frāmarz & - & Closely related to K5. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{204} See text-critical apparatus.
\textsuperscript{205} For methods of building genealogical trees between manuscripts see Cantera (2012a: 279-346).
3.2 Method of Research

While in scholarly works on the Zand, the methodology of edition is usually left undiscussed, the methods of textual criticism in the field of Avestan studies are borrowed from the field of Classical and Biblical studies in which different approaches to textual criticism have been developed. Furthermore, in the editions of the Zand, the evaluation of manuscripts is mainly based on the external evidence from their Avestan original and colophons rather than the internal evidence from the Zand itself.\(^{206}\)

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, scholars of Avestan studies adopted the Lachmannian, or stemmatic, theory with slightly different methodologies in their editions of the Avesta. For example, while Geldner mainly followed the readings of the oldest witnesses, which were the manuscripts of Mihrâbân Kayhusraw, Hoffmann believed that philological analyses are necessary for the reconstruction of the Sasanian archetype (Cantera 2012b: 461-462).\(^{207}\) The theory is associated with Karl Lachmann who declared that a firm basis based on manuscripts should be established for an edition. According to his method, the genealogical relationships of codices should be clarified prior to the edition. Thereafter, the aim of the edition is to reconstruct the archetype based on the readings of the best and the oldest copies of different genealogical groups.\(^{208}\)

By limiting the number of the collated manuscripts, the Lachmannian method is applicable in the edition of the Greek and Latin texts with their strong and solid written tradition. By contrast, only around 28 Pahlavi Yasna copies are currently known. Furthermore, as mentioned before, the existence of an archetype from which all manuscripts are derived is uncertain. Moreover, the traditional binary division of the manuscripts into the Iranian and Indian groups is based on the analysis of their Avestan original according to the Lachmanian theory. By contrast, the results of the present edition show that the Lachmannian is inadequate to do justice to the complex transmission of the Pahlavi Yasna. For example, according to the results presented in section 3.1, the Pahlavi version shows six phases of textual development which cannot be explained by the common Iranian-Indian grouping of manuscripts. Moreover, according to the colophon of YIndP J2 and K5, they

\(^{206}\) See the section 1.5.
\(^{207}\) Hoffmann himself edited no Avestan text but his suggestions were widely accepted by scholars.
were written down by an Iranian scribe. Therefore, it can be concluded that all manuscripts are ultimately Iranian.  

A non-eclectic method is the diplomatic method, suggested by Bédier (1928) according to whom, all orthographic features of a manuscript, without introducing any critical edition should be given. In the field of Avestan studies, with the diplomatic method, Brockhaus (1850) reproduced the text of the Videvdād Sāde P1.  

Recently, Zeini (2014) also reproduced the Pahlavi text of Pt4 in his unpublished PhD thesis on *The Pahlavi version of the Yasna Haptanahāiti* according to the diplomatic method as he claims. However, in his edition, the Pahlavi version of Pt4 is emended in cases of obvious spelling mistakes (Zeini 2014: 27) which makes his edition closer to the copy-text method as discussed below. Although the diplomatic seems to be the method of choice with regard to the Sāde manuscripts, by adopting it in the present edition, the fact is ignored that at least the written tradition outweighs the contrasting oral one in the transmission of the Pahlavi version of the Yasna.

To restrict the editorial judgements of the Lachmannian method, a new theory emerged in the early twentieth century called the copy text method. It was first employed by Ronald McKerrow and later developed by Walter Greg. In the copy-text method, the editor chooses one copy as the best text and s/he only emends the text when the reading is substantially erroneous. At the beginning, the scholars of the copy-text method were very conservative. For example, McKerrow, chose the second edition of Nashe’s *The Unfortunate Traveller* in 1904 as his copy text and emended it only at obviously erroneous points (Tanselle 1994: 1-2). However, scholars gradually accepted greater freedom. For example, Greg, in his article “The Rationale of a Copy Text” in 1950, supports editorial freedom. He states that it is ‘disastrous to curb the liberty of competent editors’. He also adds that the judgement of an editor is likely to bring us closer to what the author wrote.’ (Greg 1950: 32-34).

According to the features of the available Pahlavi Yasna texts at our disposal, in the present edition, the preferred method for the edition is the copy-text method. The reason is that the relationship between the liturgical Avestan texts and their Zand, on the one hand, and the Sasanian Great Avesta, on the other hand, is dubious. Furthermore, the linguistic

---

209 In the field of Biblical studies, likewise, Lachmann’s method has been criticised because in almost every case the manuscripts are categorised in two groups. See Bédier (1928); Vaganay (1986).

210 For the use of the diplomatic method in the edition of the Avestan manuscripts see Cantera (2012b: 460-461).

211 As far as I know, no edition has been claimed to be done in the field of Avestan studies according to the copy-text method.

212 See section 3.1.
features and contents of the Sasanian Hōm Yašt are unknown. Therefore, the aim of the present edition is to edit the text according to historical and linguistic available evidence. To choose the base text, the external and internal evidence of the manuscripts should be analysed. The most important external evidence, as discussed above, is the completion date of the Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts and the correction movement which started after the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp Velāyati in India. The internal evidence also corroborates that the Pahlavi version of the Iranian manuscripts, postdating the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp, is corrected. Therefore, in the present edition K5 serves as the base text because as the oldest Yasna manuscript alongside J2, it predates the arrival of Jāmāsp. Moreover, unlike J2, its source, or the copy of Rōstam Mihrābān, is mentioned in its colophons.\textsuperscript{213} The Pahlavi version is also compared with its Avestan original, based on Geldner’s edition. The Avestan and Pahlavi text of each stanza are followed by the commentary section in which are discussed:

1) my editions, if the manuscripts attest different variant readings.
2) my translations, if they are very different from that of other editions.
3) mythological aspects of Y 9.1-15 in a wider range of the Zoroastrian and Indo-Iranian mythology.
4) Similarities between the ritualistic aspects of the hymn on the one hand and traditional and contemporary performance of the Yasna ritual on the other hand.

However, minor spelling differences are not discussed in the commentaries. For example, the spellings of \textit{tarsagāhīh} in Y 9.3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13. The reconstructed illegible words in K5 or corrected spellings are marked by the superscript + on the top left of the word in the transliteration section of Appendix. The transliteration is accompanied by an \textit{apparatus criticus} offering variant readings of the collated manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{213} See section 2.1.
4 Text and Commentary
4.1 Y 9.1

1 (Y 9.1aA) hāwuanām ā ratūm ā
2 haōmō upāït zarāḍuṣṭrom
3 (Y 9.1bA) ātrām pairi yaoždaŋṭom
4 gāḍāsca sraūuaiiántom
5 (Y 9.1cA) ā dim porṣat zarāḍuṣṭrō
6 kō narā ahī (miḍrō zaiiāt zarāḍuṣṭrom)
7 (Y 9.1dA) yim azom vispahe aŋhūš
8 astuuatō srāñṭom dādarōsa
9 x’aehe gaiiehe x’anuatō amæahe

1 (Y 9.1aA) At the morning watch,
2 Haōma approached Zarāḍuṣtra
3 (Y 9.1bA) as he was purifying the fire
4 and chanting the Gāṅā.
5 (Y 9.1cA) Zarāḍuṣtra asked him:
6 “Who, O man, are you (Mithra should be known to Zarāḍuṣtra).
7-8 (Y 9.1dA) whom I have seen of all the material world as the most handsome
9 in one’s own sunny immortal life?”

1 (Y 9.1aP) pad hāwan radīḥ
2 /pad hāwan gāh/
3 hōm abar raft ō zarduṣṭ
4 (Y 9.1bP) pad ātaxš [gāh] pērāmōn yōjdaṛēnišnéh
5 [ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmist šustan]
6 gāhān srāyišnéh
7 [ka-š ḁn ašom vohū sē guft kē fravarānē ō pēš]
8 (Y 9.1cP) u-š az ōy pursīd zarduṣṭ
9 kū ḍe mard hē
10 /hād nē pad yašt i fradom bawēd az pēš paydāg
11 u-š dānist kū hōm ōh rasēd
12 ka mad būd à-š pursīd abāyist
13 mihrō upāït zarduṣṭ
14 ān paydāg kū-š śnāxt
15 ēd rāy ē ḁn zamān abāg yazdān wēš būd ēštād
16 u-š yazd āšnāgtar būd
17 hād u-š ēn fragard warm būd
18 u-š abāyist rāy abāg hōm ul guft
19 ast kē ēdōn gōwēd hād ohrmazd guft ēštād
20 kū har dō ōh rasēd
21 /ka hōm mad būd à-š mihr śnāsēd/
22 (Y 9.1dP) kē man az harwisp axw
23 /i astomand ham nēktar did hē
24 ēt-ān i xwēš gyān nēk kard ēštēd amarg
25 /hād gyān tan pad frārōnēh amarg kard ēštēd
26 nē ēdōn ciyōn awēšān kē gōšt i jam jud
At the morning watch,
[at the morning time],
Hōm went towards Zardušt
while at the fire [stand], he was around, making (the fire) pure,
[when he desired to wash the fire-stand]
(while) reciting the Gāϑās,
when he recited the Aṣ̌əm Vohū three times which precedes the Frawarānē,
and Zardušt asked him
that: “Who, O man, are you?”
That is: It was clear from before that (he) is not at (his) first Yasna ceremony
and he knew that Hōm would arrive in the usual way.
When he had come then he wanted to ask him,
Mihr approached Zardušt.
It is clear that he knew him
since he had been with more Yazds at that time
and the Yazd was more known to him.
That is: He knew this chapter by heart
and because of his desire, he spoke with Hōm.
There is one who says thus: ‘Yes, Ohrmazd had said
that: They both arrive in the usual way
(and) when Hōm had come (to Zardušt), then he knows Mihr.
Whom I saw better than all material world,
since your life has been well-created, immortal.”
That is: The life, the body, through righteousness, was made immortal,
not like those who devoured the meat (provided by) Jam
and they, bodily, had become immortal,
as far as apart from (one’s) body, everybody is immortal,
The pillars of life are non-removable].

1) Line 3 Y 9.1aP abar raft “went towards”

With the exception of YIr Pt4, the Avestan preverb upa- in upāŋ “approached” is rendered in the collated manuscripts by Phl. abar “up, on(to)”. By contrast, in Pt4 (fol. 54r line 3), a word or grapheme is crossed out at the end of the line while in the margin, Phl. pēš (L’YN’) “near” appears as the translation of the Avestan preverb:
The unique marginal gloss together with the crossed out word or grapheme in Pt4 suggests correction, probably under the influence of New Persian. The reason is that the preverb *abar*, while being productive in Middle Persian and Early New Persian as *bar* (بَر), gradually becomes unproductive. Therefore, the scribe of Pt4 corrects *lectio difficilior* Phl. *abar raft* to *pēš raft* which is also still used in modern Persian. The suggestion agrees with the late time, or 1780 CE, in which Pt4 was copied.

2) **Line 5-6 Y 9.1bP** *ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmist šustan gāhān srāyišnīh* “when he desired to wash the fire-stand and (while he was) reciting the Gāthas”

In YIrP G14, F2 and YIndP J2, K5 and M1, the commentary *ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmist šustan* occurs in the following context:

Y 9.2 *pad ātaxš [gāh] pērāmōn yöjdahrēnišnīh [ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmist šustan]*

*gāhān srāyišnīh*

The commentary to *pad ātaxš [gāh] pērāmōn yöjdahrēnišnīh* is followed by the word for word translation of the Avestan original *gāhāsca srāuuaiiāntom*, or *gāhān srāyišnīh* “and (while he was) reciting the Gāhās”. While Av. *gāhāsca srāuuaiiāntom* is present in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, T6 and T55b, its corresponding Pahlavi translation and preceding commentary are absent in their Pahlavi versions. The deletion of the commentary-translation in the Iranian manuscript of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line seems to be the result of correction

---

214 For Middle Iranian preverbs which become unproductive in New Persian see Ahmadi-Givi (2001 (1380): 853-860).

215 The preliminary results suggest that the Pahlavi version of the extant manuscripts of Hōšang ī Syāwaxš, written down after the arrival of Jāmāsp Velāyati, share similar features with those of Jāmāsp’s post arrival corrected Pahlavi Vidēvdād copies. See section 3.1.

216 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
because it is present in another member of the line, or G14, which is also closely related to T6. Moreover, the deletion of the commentary agrees with a feature of the corrected manuscripts postdating the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp in India according to which, as discussed in section 3.1, some commentaries in the older manuscripts are shortened or omitted. Therefore, in the present edition, the Pahlavi commentary ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmist šustan and the Pahlavi translation gāhān srāyišnīh, corresponding to gādhēscā srāuuaiiantom are employed.

As far as the continuity of the Zoroastrian traditions is concerned, the commentary agrees with the directions of the contemporary Yasna ritual according to which after pressing out the Hōm juice, the chief priest, Zōt, should wash the fire-stand (Unvala 1928: 203, fn. 2 4a). In the text on mēnōy nāwar “the spirit Nāwar,” which appears after VrS K7b, written by Rōstam Mihrābān in 1288 CE, the washing of the fire-stand is also mentioned:

K7. ka adurgāh kāmēd šustan naxust dast pad pādyāb be kunišn u-š ātaxš ud barsom be nigērīšn u-š yatāhōwairyo 7 be göwišn u-š az nōg dast pad pādyāb abāz kunišn u-š xšnaoḏra ahurahe mazdā tarōidite tā fāraštōtom be göwišn u-š az nōg dast pad pādyāb abāz kunišn ud ašom vohū 3 frauwarāne ēe gāh ākerd āthāh ō ahurahe mazdā puṭra tawu ātārš puṭra ahurahe mazdā xšnaoḏra tā gyāg pad mān i ātaxšn ud ka mān i wehān ḫawēd tawu ātārš puṭra ahurahe mazdā xšnaoḏra tā gyāg u-š wāz az ān i parāhōm kard frāz gīrīšn u-š ādurgāh pad 3 ašom vohū frāz sōyišn

When he (the priest performing the initiation Nāwar ceremony) desires to wash the fire-stand, first, he should make the hand (pure) through the Pādyāb ritual and he (should) look at the fire and Barsom and he should recite 7 times the Yatāhōwairyo prayer and he should again make hand (pure) through the Pādyāb ritual and he should recite xšnaoḏra ahurahe mazdā tarōidite up to fāraštōtom and he should again make the hand (pure) through the Pādyāb ritual and (recite) ašom vohū three times (followed by) frauwarāne, whatever watch he keeps it. Āthāh ō ahurahe mazdā puṭra tawu ātārš puṭra ahurahe mazdā xšnaoḏra up to the end (should be recited) in the abode of fires, and when he is in the house of the faithful tawu ātārš puṭra ahurahe mazdā xšnaoḏra up to the end (should be recited) and he must take the Bāj from one who prepared the Parāhōm and should wash the fire-place with (the recital) of 3 ašom vohū. 219

3) Line 7 Y 9.1b ka-š ān ašom vohū sē guft kē frauwarānē ō pēś “when he recited the Asham Vohū three times which precedes the Frawarānē”

217 For correction see section 3.1.
218 Nāwar is term for the initiation ceremony into the priesthood and the first Yasna in the ceremony is dedicated to mēnōy nāwar “the spirit Nāwar”. For a discussion on nāwar and mēnōy nāwar see Y 9.14 commentary 4 kā-t yašt i nāwar kard.
Phl. ka-š ān ašom vohū sē guft kē fravwānē ō pēš is a gloss on gāhān srāyišnīh “(while he was) reciting the Gāhās”:

\[
gāhān \text{ srāyišnīh} \\
[ka-š ān ašom vohū sē guft kē fravwānē ō pēš]
\]

The phrase ka-š ān ašom vohū sē guft kē fravwānē ō pēš identifies reciting the Gāhān with chanting the ašom vohū prayers. It agrees with the Zoroastrian tradition according to which, three Ašom Vohū and one Frawarānē are to be recited by Zōt, while washing the fire-stand (Unvala 1924: 2-3, fn. 24d). As stated in the previous commentary, the text on mēnōy nāwār “the spirit Nāwar” also proves the antiquity of this Zoroastrian practice. In conclusion, the two commentaries, ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmιst šustān and ka-š ān ašom vohū sē guft kē fravwānē ō pēš explain that the meeting of Hōm and Zar dušt as attested in Y 9.1 took place in the Yasna ceremony when Zardušt, as a Zōt, was purifying the fire-stand and reciting the sacred prayers.

4) Line 10 Y 9.1cP hād “that is; yes”

The Pahlavi verbal form hād, 3rd sg. subj. of ah “to be” functions either as a verb or as a particle in the Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts. As the verb, the subjunctive hād “so be it”, translates Av. šišīt, 3rd sg. opt. of ah. For example:

Y 40.4A. aḏā x’āētūš
aḏā varvēnā
aḏā haxēmām šišīt

Likewise (grant us) families,
Likewise communities!
May thus be the fellowships.\(^{220}\)

Y 40.4P. ēdōn xwēš
ud ēdōn wālun
ēdōn hambrādag ā-m hād [kū-m dahād] …

Likewise, my own (be to me) ([he may grant it to me]),
and likewise, the community (be to me) ([he may grant it to me]), likewise, the fellows be to me, [he may grant it to me]…\(^{221}\)

---


Moreover, hād occurs as a particle in the Pahlavi commentaries. Skjærvø (2010: 182-190) examines contexts in which the particle hād occurs. He argues that in standard Pahlavi hād is spelt as ḤWH-‘t’ when it functions as the 3rd sg. subj. verbal form, but it is spelled as HWH-‘t’ when it is used as the particle. According to him, HWH-‘t’ without the phonetic complement represents an archaism as compared to the spelling of hād (HWH) in the third century Pahlavi inscriptions in which it denotes the subjunctive mood (Skjærvø 2010: 183).

The manuscripts of the Pahlavi Yasna, however, show no systematic distinction in the spelling of the particle and the finite verbal form, as both are indiscriminately spelt as ḤWH-‘t’ and HWH-‘t’. For example, Pt4 (fol 159r line 16) and J2 (fol 220v line 8) write HWH-‘t’ as the translation of the Avestan verb x́iiāt.

In the commentaries, the article hād either introduces a new commentary or occurs in the commentary after the verbum dicendi Phl. guftan “to say”, citing the comment of a known or an anonymous authority. In the former use, hād introduces commentator’s interpretation of the Avestan word or phrase. For example:

Y 9.1A kō narə ahī
Who, O man, are you

Y 9.1P kū kē mard hē
hād nē pad yašt ī fradōm bawēd az pēš paydāg
That who, O man, are you?
That is: It was clear from before that (he) is not at (his) first Yasna ceremony.

Skjærvø (2010: 184-190) studies the use of hād, attested after the verb guftan. According to his interpretation, it denotes the agreement with the preceding statement which is followed by an additional statement to restrict the original one (Skjærvø 2010: 187). Accordingly, he translates the particle hād after the verb guftan as “yes”, “yes and (also)”, “yes but (only)” and “yes, that is so” (Skjærvø 2010: 184-190).

As far as the Sanskrit version is concerned, it translates the particle hād as the interjection aho “oh!” or the adverb kila “indeed”. There are also several examples according which hād is left untranslated or written by the neuter relative pronoun yat. For example:

Y 9.2P. guft hād ahōšīh pad hōm bawēd

222 See Unvala (1924: 5).
(Rōšn) said: ‘Yes, imperishableness is through Hōm.’

Y 9.2Skt. uvāca yat aksayatvam hūmena bhavati

(Rōšn) has said that imperishableness is through Hūma.  

In the New Persian version, the particle hād is rendered in a variety of ways, including zāher čēne (ظاهر اینکه) “it seems that” (T6 fol. 43r line 7), drust ast ke (درست است که) “it is correct that” (T6 fol. 43v line 3), zāher (h)ast ke (ظاهر هست/است که) “it is clear that” (T6 fol. 44r line 4; fol. 47r line 11; fol. 47v line 11; fol. 48r line 3; fol. 48v line 4; fol. 49v line 8; fol. 51r line 1, 10; fol. 64r line 7), hast ke (هست که) “it is that” (T6 fol. 45r line 2; fol. 45v line 6; fol. 48r line 6, 7; fol. 53r line 10), bāšad ke (بایش که) “it should be that” (T6 fol. 45r line 4) and zāher šude ke (ظاهر شده که) “it has become obvious that” (T6 fol. 46r line 10).  

As far as the translation of hād in the Pahlavi Yasna is concerned, the evidence examined so far suggests that depending on the context and the position of hād in the commentary, it may be rendered as “that is (so), it means” for the hād, introducing redactor’s interpretation of the Avestan word or phrase and “yes”, “yes and (also)”, “yes, but also” and “yes, that is so”, for when hād introduces direct or indirect speech after the verb guftan.

5) Line 11 Y 9.1cP u-š dānist “and he knew”

In YIrP Pt4, the superscript ėn “this” appears after the 3rd sg. past dānist according to which u-š dānist ėn means “and he knew this”. However, ėn is absent in the other collated manuscripts, especially those of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line, T55b which is closely related to Pt4, and also the old YIndP J2 and K5. Therefore, since the reading ėn seems to be added by the scribe of Pt4, it is not employed in the present edition.

6) Line 11 Y 9.1cP ōh rasēd “would arrive in the usual way”

The particle ōh is spelled in YIrPs and their Indian counterparts with the heterogram KH and etegogram ‘w’, respectively. Phl. ōh, corresponding to Av. ahuādha “in that manner”, always occurs before the verb and it has usually been translated as “thus, in that manner”. However, these translations have been criticised by Skjaervø (2010: 194-199) arguing that

---

224 The New Persian translations of hād occurring in Y 9-11 are from YIrP T6 (fol. 43r-70v).
225 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
the reference of the particle is ‘unclear or altogether missing’. He, therefore, suggests the translation “in the usual way” for the particle that ‘does not seem to refer to anything nor does it enter into comparisons’. With Skjaervø, ōh is translated as “in the usual way” in the present edition.

7) Line 12 Y 9.1cP pursīd “to ask”

Phl. pursīd in K5 and M1 replaces pursīdan, occurring in the other collated manuscripts. The infinitive in Pahlavi can either end in -tan > Ir. *-tanai or -t > Ir. *-tai. Therefore, from the grammatical point of view, both readings pursīdan and pursīd are correct. Following the reading of the base text K5, pursīd is employed in the present edition.

8) Line 13 Y 9.1cP mihrō upāit zardušt “Mihr approached to Zardušt”

The sentence mihrō upāit zardušt is attested in all the collated manuscripts. In his translation of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1-15, Mills (1903c: 314 and 314, fn. 4) reads the phrase as mitrōk xūp aīt zartūšt “the good one of Mitra is Zardušt,”. By contrast, Davar (1904: 27) mentions that this is the Pahlavised form of the Av. *miθrō upāiť zaraθuštrəm. As a result, he translates it as “Mihr came to Zarathushtra”. According to his interpretation, سکم mtr' should be transliterated as mtlwkʾwpʾyt. The spelling mtlwkʾ instead of the Phl. mtr' confirms the Pahlavised form of the sentence. It should also be noted that the alternative reading mihrō xūb ast “Mihr is good” is semantically meaningless in the context of Y 9.1. With Davar’s reading, the formulaic structure of mihrō upāiť zardušt is similar to that of Y 9.1 haōmō upāiť zaraθuštrəm “Haōma approached Zarathushtra”. The reading mihrō upāiť zardušt is also confirmed by the context of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1 which is about the meeting of Zardušt with Hōm and Mihr. However, no consensus existed neither about the meaning nor about the reading of the Pahalicised form in later periods. In YIrP Pt4, F2, T6 and T55b, the copyists consider mt and lwk as two words. It is confirmed by the subscript New Persian translations of رسید (mt), as روي، “arrived”, روی (lwk) as “face” and خوب as “good” in F2 (fol. 51v line 2) and T6 (fol. 43r line 9-10). Separating رسید and روی by a vertical dotted line, Pt4 (fol. 54r line 12) also writes خوب روی “of good face” in the margin as the translation of رسید روی.
Furthermore, it has been suggested that mihrō upāit zardušt corresponds to mihrō z(a)iitāit zardušt according to which upāit in mihrō upāit zardušt is the misspelling z(a)iitā in the manuscripts.  

However, it is unlikely to assume that zaaiiāt (TAyaz)229 can be the variant reading of the Pahlavicised form upāit (PT4).230

9) Line 15 Y 9.1cP ēd rāy ē “since”

In the manuscripts YIrP F2 and YIndP J2, K5 and M1, ē “what, which; for, because” appears after ēd rāy while it is absent in the other copies. The problem with the editorial judgement is that both formula ēd rāy and ēd rāy ē meaning “because, since” occur in Pahlavi (MacKenzie 1971: 30). In the present edition, Phl. ē is employed because it is attested in the base text K5 and its sister manuscript J2.

10) Line 16 Y 9.1cP būd “was”

The verb būdan “to be, to become” is attested as the 3rd sg. pres. bawēd (YHWWN-yt) in YIrPs with the exception of F2 in contrast to the 3rd sg. past būd (YHWWN-uj2: bwt) in

---

228 See Spiegel (1861: 52); Davar (1904: 27).
229 Av. mihrō zaaiiāt zardušt is discussed in Y 9.1 commentary 12 ka hōm mad būd ā-š mihr šnāsdēd.
230 For the Avestan phrase see Y 9.1 commentary 12 ka hōm mad būd ā-š mihr šnāsdēd.
YIndPs together with the Iranian manuscript F2. In a wider range of context, the enclitic u-“and” connects -š yazd āšnāgtar būd (YIndPs + F2)/bawēd (YIrPs – F2) with the preceding sentence governed by the the periphrastic perfect verb as follows:

ēd rāy čē ān zamān abāg yazdān wēš būd ēstād u-š yazd āšnāgtar būd/bawēd.

As far as choosing between bawēd and būd is concerned, sentences governed by the periphrastic perfect verbs are usually connected with those governed by the verbs in the past tense, for example:

**KN 1.11 har sē šab xwamn čiyōn dīd ēstād pēš ī āyšān guft**
The dream of each three nights as he (i.e. Ardawān) had seen (it), he related (it) before them (sleep interpreters).  

**AWZ 26.16-17 u-m dīd ruwān ū zan-ē kē-š uzwān pad gardan hamē kešīd ud az andarwāy āwēxt ēstād u-m pursīd**
And I saw the soul of a woman whose tongue was pulled far out of her neck (= throat) and she was suspended in the air and I asked …

Therefore, in the present edition, with the reading of the base text K5, other YIndPs and YIrP F2, būd is employed.

**11) Line17 Y 9.1cP u-š ēn fragard warm būd “he knew this chapter by heart”**

In the commentary of Y 9.1, the Iranian manuscripts Pt4, G14, F2, T6 and T55b write:

*u-š ēn fragard ūy (LH) bawēd*
And this chapter (Hōm Yašt) is to him.

By contrast, the following sentence appears in the Indian manuscripts J2, K5 and M1 together with YIrP Mf4:

*u-š ēn fragard (Mf4 bawēd)*...
And he knew (Mf4 knows) this chapter (Hōm Yašt) by heart.

---

231 My translation. Edition by Anita (1900: 3).
Mills (1900: 518), Davar (1904: 15), Unvala (1924: 4) and Dhabar (1949: 56) edit ᵇʰ. Moreover, Davar (1904: 15) and Unvala (1924: 4) translate it as “soft” which is based on the transcription of the Pahlavi word ṛḥ as *narm* (*nlm*). However, its corresponding form is attested in New Persian as the noun *barm* “memory” and the verb *barm dāštan* (*برم داشتن*) “to know by heart”. Therefore, it is transcribed as *war* in the present edition.

A possibility of reconciling the readings *'LH* and *wlm* could be that *'LH* is the consequence of copyist's mistake in which a stroke was added after ṣ (*m*) and the letter became ṡ. However, since the variant reading *'LH* occurs in all of the Iranian manuscripts with the exception of Mf4, it should be associated with scribal correction.

The second difference is the verb. Iranian manuscripts write the present tense verb *bawēd* while the Indian manuscripts attest the past tense *būd*. In a wider range of context, the Pahlavi sentences *u-š yazd āšnāgtar būd/bawēd* (see Y 9.1 commentary 10 on *būd*) and *u-š ēn fragard warm būd/bawēd* are preceded and followed by sentences governed by the perfect and past tense verbs, respectively:

\[
\text{ēd rāy čē ān zamān abāg yazdān wēš būd ēstād} \\
u-š yazd āšnāgtar būd/bawēd \\
hād u-š ēn fragard warm būd/bawēd \\
u-š abāyist rāy abāg hōm ul guft
\]

As shown above, the Pahlavi commentary describes an event in the past, therefore, with YIndPs, *būd* is employed in the present edition.

12) **Line 21 Y 9.1cP** *ka hōm mad būd ā-š mihr šnāsēd* “when Hōm had come (to Zardusht), then, he knows Mihr”

In YIrPs F2 and T6, *ka “when, if”* is replaced by kā “that”. According to the context of the sentence *ka/kū* (F2, T6) *hōm mad būd ā-š mihr šnāsēd* “when/that means (F2, T6) he had come (to Zardusht), then he knows Mihr”, both readings are possible. However, apart from F2 and T6, in the other copies, especially the older YIrPs of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line (Pt4, Mf4, G14) and old YIndP J2, K5, *ka* is attested. Furthermore, considering *ka*, the sentence follows *ka ... ā- “when/since … then”* formula which is another reason for

---

234 For corrections in YIrPs see section 3.1.
235 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in Ay 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
choosing ka over kū in the present edition.\footnote{For ka ... ā- see Nyberg (1974: 108-109).}

Regarding the verb, mad in ka hōm mad occurs with the auxiliary verb būdan “to be” which appears as the 3rd sg. present bawēd in YIrPs in contrast to 3rd sg. past būd in YIndPs. The sentence ka hōm mad bawēd/būd is connected by ud “and” with the preceding sentence, providing 3rd pl. pres. rasēnd “(they) arrive” in the following context:

\[\text{kū har dō ŏh rasēnd} \]
\[\text{ka hōm mad bawēd (YIrPs) / būd (YIndP) ā-š mihr šnāsēd} \]

As far as the meaning of the past participle + bawēd is concerned, Nyberg (1974: 283, 7:10) translates it as the future perfect according to which \(kū \text{ har dō ŏh rasēnd ud ka hōm mad bawēd} \) (YIrP) ā-š mihr šnāsēd means “that means: They both arrive in the usual way and when/since Hōm shall have come then he knows Mihr”.\footnote{Passive constructions can also be formed by baw- (Skjaervø 2009a: 232). However, in the present example, it is evident that the verb madan “to come” is intransitive.}

Regarding the construction past participle + būd attested in YIndP, Nyberg (1975: 283, 7.9) states that the related construction kard būd has the perfect and plusperfect meaning. Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 376) also mentions that PP + būd denotes the present perfect tense. Although the reading of YIrPs better fit the context, it is unclear whether they write the original reading or the corrected one.\footnote{For correction see section 3.1.} Therefore, with the reading of the old J2, K5, predating the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp in India, būd is employed in the present edition.

As regards šnāsēd, the verb of the subordinate clause appears as šnāxt “knew” in YIrPs G14, F2 and T6. However, such a reading is absent in the related YIrP Pt4 and Mf4 together with the old YIndP J2 and K5. Therefore, in the present work, the reading šnāsēd is employed.

As far as mihr is concerned, Mills (1903c: 314) translates it as “arrived” in “when Hōm had come Zardušt recognises(-sed) him (as being himself who had) arrived”. Likewise, Davar (1904: 15) reading mad, renders it as “(have) come” in “when he knew (him) (to have) come” (Davar 1904: 28). It should be noted that while the spelling of YIrP Pt4, Mf4, T55b and YIndPs can be interpreted as either mad(an) or mihr, YIrP G14, T6 and F2, obviously read mad:
It is obvious that the reading of G14, F2, T6 and the translations of Davar and Mills as ā-š mad šnāsēd word for word translation “then-him-came-knows” are problematic from the semantic point of view. It explains why both scholars added explanations in the brackets to make their translations understandable.

Another possibility is to read the clause as ā-š madan (mtn’) šnāsēd “then he (Zardušt) knows his coming”. It agrees with the reading of T55b in which d is shown by the diacritic ʌ.\textsuperscript{239} However, the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1 is about the meeting of Zardušt with two deities namely Hōm and Mihr rather than Hōm alone. The presence of the two deities is also insisted by the preceding har dō ōh rasēnd “they both arrive in the usual way”:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kū har dō ōh resēnd} \\
\text{ka hōm mad būd ā-š mihrmadan šnāsēd}
\end{align*}
\]

Furthermore, ā-š mihr šnāsēd corresponds to Av. miθrō zaiiāt zaraθuštrəm “Mitθra should be known to Zarathuštra”, as discussed below.\textsuperscript{240} Therefore, unlike Mills and Davar, the Pahlavi word is interpreted as mihr in the present edition.

Regarding the Avestan phrase miθrō zaiiāt zaraθuštrəm, Geldner (1886-1896: I, 39 and

\textsuperscript{239} I discuss the diacritic mark of the [d] pronunciation in my unpublished MA dissertation Khanizadeh (2013: 51-52).
\textsuperscript{240} Analysing 2zan “to know”, Bartholomae (AirWb. 1559-1660, fn. 4) also mentions that ān paydāg kū-š šnāxt (see Y 9.1 line 14 in the present edition) corresponds to miθrō zaiiāt zaraθuštrəm. It seems that in the Pahlavi commentary, ka hōm mad būd ā-š mihr šnāsēd is itself a gloss to mihrō upāi zardušt ān paydāg kū-š šnāxt corresponding to *miθrō upāi zaraθuštrəm and miθrō zaiiāt zaraθuštrəm, respectively.
39 fn. 7) omits the phrase in his edition but notes that the Yasna Sāde manuscript P6\(^{241}\) has *mihrō.ziiaṭ*. However, he considers the manuscript as ‘without the value of text criticism’ (Geldner 1896: Prolegomena, xii). Likewise, Josephson (1997: 41) and Pirart (2004: 59) delete the Avestan phrase in their editions of Y 9.1.

While the position of the phrase is not fixed, *zaiiaṭ* is spelled differently in codices which write the Avestan phrase. The scribe of Pt4 writes *mihrō.ziiaṭ zaraushtrəm* in the margin and probably marks its place in the main text (fol 54r line 16) before *ast kē edōn gōwēd hād ohrmazd guft ēstād* by the inverted “+” appearing before *ast*:

**Figure 14. The suggested place for the Avestan phrase in YIrP Pt4 (fol. 54r line 16).**

G14 and T6 write the variant *mihrō.zaiiaṭ zaraushtrəm* at the end of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1c following ā-s *mīhr šnāsēd*. In F2, the Avestan phrase *mihrō.ziiaṭ zaraushtrəm*, following *kō narə ahī (F2 ahe)*, is incorporated into the Avestan original:

**Figure 15. YIrP F2 (fol. 51r line 12).**

By contrast, the Avestan text is absent in YIrP Mf4, T55b; YIndP J2, K5 and M1. As regards *z(a)iiiaṭ*, Pt4 and F2 read *ziiaṭ* in contrast to *zaiiaṭ* in G14 and T6. A comparison between the the Avestan text of the Sāde manuscripts shows that it is absent in the Iranian

\(^{241}\) P6 is not available on the website of the Avesta Digital Archive.
Sāde MZK4 ML15284, F3A, and ML15285. In the Indian Sāde manuscripts B3 245 (fol. 31v) K11A 246 (fol. 45r) L17 247 (fol. 46r), the phrase is attested as miϑrō zauiāt zaradhuṣṭrəm, miϑrō ziṭāt zaradhuṣṭrəm and miϑrō ziṭāt zaradhuṣṭrəm, respectively, in margin while its place is marked after the Avestan kō narə ahī in the main text by the “ʌ” and “v” signs. For example, the place of the phrase is probably shown by “ʌ” and “v” in fol. 31v line 7 of the manuscript B3:

Figure 16. YIndS B3 (fol. 31v).

In the Indian Sāde manuscripts Bh5 248 (fol. 35v lines 2-4) and G97 249 (fol. 38r lines 7-8), the phrase is written as maiϑrō ziṭāt zaradhuṣṭrəm and maiϑrō ziṭāt zaradhuṣṭrəm, respectively, in the main text after Av. kō narə ahī. It seems that the phrase is borrowed from a lost Avestan text because:

1) As stated above, while the Avestan quotation is absent in some manuscripts, its place

242 The date of completion is unknow but it must be completed before AY 1192, or 1823 CE (Hintze 2012a: 246).
243 The manuscript completed in AY 1247, or 1878 CE (Hintze 2012a: 247).
244 The manuscript has no colophon but it must be completed before AY 1262, or 1893 CE. (Hintze 2012a: 247).
245 Although the manuscript is undated, it seems to be the oldest known Yasna Sāde manuscript (Hintze 2012: 250).
246 The manuscript contains the Yasnā Sāda, Sīrōza and Vasperad Sāde. According to its Sanskrit colophon, the Vasperad was completed in AY 1030, or 1661 CE (Hintze 2012a: 248).
247 According to its Persian colophon, the manuscript was completed in AY 925, or 1556 CE (Hintze 2012a: 247-248).
248 An undated manuscript without the colophon (Hintze 2012a: 250).
249 The year of the completion is illegible (Hintze 2012a: 250).
is not fixed among the manuscripts writing it.

2) While the sentence seems not to be an integral part of the Avestan original, a detailed description of the meeting of Zardušt and Mihr is attested in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1, corresponding to the Avestan phrase. As regards the Pahlavi version, the long commentary of Y 9.1 shows the features of proliferativity which is the scholastic intention to include inconsistent texts.\footnote{For proliferativity see Cabezón (1998: 5).}

Therefore, following the base text K5, the Avestan phrase is not employed in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1 in the present edition. However, as it seems that the phrase corresponds to ān paydāg kā-š šnāxt and ā-š mihr šnāsēd which are part of the commentary section occurring after the Pahlavi translation kē mard hē, it is placed at the end of the Avestan version of Y 9.1c after kō narō ahē, in the brackets.

As far as the scholarly translations are concerned, reading ziiā, Pirart (2004: 322) edits it as the compound miϑrō.ziiā. He interprets the form as the abl. sg. of miϑrō.ziā- “qui prive Miϑra (de la part sacrificielle)”.\footnote{“one who deprives Miϑra (of the sacrificial share)”.} In his view, the second term of the compound is from the root ziiā “to damage”. Pirart (2004: 59, fn. 11) also translates miϑrō ziiā zaraduštaraṃ as “loin de celui qui prive Miϑra (de la part sacrificielle qui lui revient) à Zaraduštra”.\footnote{“far from who deprives Miϑra (of the sacrificial part which belonged to him) to Zaraduštra”.} Interpreting Miϑra of IE *mei “to exchange”, according to him, the Avestan sentence also means “loin de celui qui fait dévier l’échange (que le ritual établit entre les mondes) à Zaraduštra”\footnote{“far from who diverts the exchange (which the ritual establishes between the worlds) to Zaraduštra”.} (Pirart 2004: 59, fn. 11). He also compares miϑrō.ziā- with the same stem occurring in Yt 10.82:

\begin{verbatim}
Yt 10.82 yeŋhe hazanrəm yaoxtšinəm
fradaqat ahurō mazdā
baēuwarō doi̞ranaŋm vidōi̞gre
āq abiiō doi̞rābi̞iō
aištiasca yaoxtšibiō
spasiieti miϑrō.ziām
miϑrō drujo̞mca ...
\end{verbatim}

On whom Ahura Mazdā a thousand perceptions,

(conf)ered

(and) ten thousand eyes for seeing all-round,

Then, because of these eyes

and perceptions

he spots the infringer of the

\footnote{\textsuperscript{250} For proliferativity see Cabezón (1998: 5).}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{251} “one who deprives Miϑra (of the sacrificial share)”.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{252} “far from who deprives Miϑra (of the sacrificial part which belonged to him) to Zaraduštra”.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{253} “far from who diverts the exchange (which the ritual establishes between the worlds) to Zaraduštra”.}
contract and the man false to the contract …

Apart from Yt 10.82, the compound miϑrō.ziiā- also occurs in Y 61.2 as the infringer of contract:

Y 61.3 ... hamistaiiaēca nižbərətaiiaēca
miϑrō.ziiqmcə miϑrō.drujmcə

... (we encourage Ahuna Vairīa, Asha Vahiṣṭa, Yeṯhē Ḥāṭṭām and Dahmā Āfritiṣ) to suppress and to carry away the one who infringes the contract and the one who is false to the contract.

While miϑrō- in miϑrō.ziiā- is traditionally translated as “contract”, Pirart leaves the reason for his interpretation of miϑra- as the ritual exchange between (the material and spiritual) worlds undiscussed. Furthermore, miϑrō.ziiā- is not associated with haōma- in the Avesta. In addition, in both Y 61.2 and Yt 10.82, the compound miϑrō.ziiā- appears together with miϑrō.druj-. Such is not attested in Y 9.1. It should be noted that the closest phrase to the ritual exchange and the sacrificial share of Haōma occurs in Y 11.5:

Y 11.5 yō məm taṭ draonō zināṭ vā
trofiiāṭ vā apa vā yāsāiti
yaṭ mē daṭat ahurō mazdā
aḵauu ahaŋharōne maṭ
hīzuuā hōiūmaca dōiūrm

Whoever damages, steals or takes away from me the share which the righteous Ahura Mazdā gave to me, both jaws with the tongue and the left eye.

In the above passage, Haōma threatens those who do not give his sacrificial share, but unlike the suggested stem miϑrō.ziiā-, the Avestan verb zināṭ “damages”, governing two accusatives namely məm and draonō, takes place without miϑra-.

From a different point of view, miϑra- can be interpreted as the nom. sg. of miϑra-“(deity) Miϑra” which agrees with the suggestions of Haug (1862: 177, fn. 1), Spiegel (1861: 52, fn. 3), Bartholomae (AirWb. 1659) and Gershevitch (1967: 269, note 118). While Haug

254 The text is after Gershevitch (1967: 112-113).
256 See AirWb. 1186; Gershevitch (1967: 113).
(1862: 177, fn. 1) translates the Avestan sentence as “May Miϑra favour Zaraϑuϑstra”, he provides no explanation for his translation of the verb as “may favour”. Bartholomae (AirWb. 1659, fn. 2) associates zaiia with the root 2zan “to know”. It should be noted that the stem zaiia- cannot be attributed to the root 1zan “to beget, to give birth” because there is no reference neither in the Avesta nor in other Zoroastrian texts that “Miϑra was born to Zaraϑuϑstra”. By contrast, Ahura Mazdā creates Miϑra as the worthiest to be venerated:

Yt 10.1 mrao ahurō mazdā spitamāi zaraϑuϑstrāī aἀaṭ yaṭ miϑrōm yim vouru.gaoiiaoiīm frādaqm azām spitama aἀaṭ dim daqm avāntōm yesniīata avāntōm vahmiīata yaϑa māncīt yim ahurōm mazdqm

Said Ahura Mazdā to Zaraϑuϑstra the Spitamid: ‘When I created grass-land magnate Mithra, O Spitamid! I made him such in worthiness to be worshiped and prayed to as myself, Ahura Mazdā’.

Although Bartholomae analyses the verb, he does not translate the phrase but Gershevitch (1967: 269, note 1183) interprets the sentence as the active “Miϑra knew Zaraϑuϑstra”. However, apart from miϑrō zaiia zaraϑuϑstrōm, in other occurrences, the transitive present stem of 2zan is formed through the attachment of the ending nā/-n to the root zan (Kellens 1984: 179). Therefore, zaiia- should carry a different meaning from that of the transitive present stems zanā/-zan-. It is possible that zaiia- is the passive stem from the same root in the zero grade, to which the suffix -iia- is attached. Similarly, its passive counterpart zaiia- “to be born” from the homonymous root 1zan “to beget, give birth” is well attested in the Avesta (AirWb. 1657-1658). Regarding the active ending -a, it should be noted that the passive forms take both active and middle endings. The active ones especially appear in the 3rd sg. subjunctive (Kellens 1984: 129). For example:

Yt. 13. 50. kahmāi nō taṭ dāϑrōm daiiāthaghe anhat x’airiŋn ajitāmnom yauuaēca yauuaētāēca

To which of us will be given such an offering which, while being eaten, will be undiminishable to him for ever and ever

258 The text is after Gershevitch (1967: 74-75).
In addition, although from the IE *ḣph3-je/o*-260, the passive stem *zāiia- is expected, the shortening of -āiia- > -aiia- occurs in the Avesta.261 The subjunctive mode is also characterised by the lengthened -a- in zaiiāt which denote the meaning “should be known”.

The interpretation of mišra- as the deity Mišra and zaiiāt as “should be known” also agrees with the context of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1 which is about the meeting of Zardušt with both Hōm and Mihr. According to its Pahlavi version, mihrō upāit zardušt “Mihr approached Zardušt”. Then, the text continues, explaining how Zardušt knew Mihr:

Y 9.1P mihrō upāit zardušt
ān paydāg kū-š šnāxt
ēk rāy čē ān zamān abāg yazdān wēš būd ēstād
u-š yazd aśnāgtar būd
hād u-š ēn fragard warm būd
u-š abāyist rāy abāg hōm ul guft
ast kē ēdōn göwēd hād ohrmazd guft ēstād
kū ēh dō ōh resēnd
ka hōm mad būd ā-š mihr šnāsēd

“Mihr approached Zardušt”
It is clear that he knew him
since he had been with more Yazds at that time
and the Yazd was more known to him.
That is: He knew this chapter by heart
and because of his desire, he spoke with Hōm.
There is one who says thus: Yes, Ohrmazd had said
that: “They both arrive in the usual way
(and) when he (Hōm) had come (to Zardušt), then he knows Mihr].”

The occurrence of the name of the deity Mišra in the context of Y 9.1 could be seen in connection with god’s exercising jurisdiction over the ceremonies performed at the morning time (Boyce 1969: 27). For example:

DkM. 793.13-15. ud gāh ī yazišn ī mihr ī frāx göyōd ud rāmišn xwārom mēnōy
abērtar pad hāwan radīh
And the time of the worship of Mihr of wide pastures, and of the spirit of the pleasure of eating is mostly in the morning watch.262

Furthermore, the occurrence of the name of Mihr at the beginning of the Pahlavi version

---

260 For the IE root see IEW. 376 and Beekes (1973: 147).
262 My translation.
of the Hōm Yašt, when Hōm approaches Zardušt at the morning time, suggests a relation between Mihr and Hōm. Their coincidence could be explained through common features they share such as being strong, victorious and mighty smashers of the evil. Apart from the Hōm Yašt, the term Miϑra appears together with Haōma in the Mihr Yašt where Haōma worships the god:

Yt. 10.88. miϑrəm vouru.gaoiiaoitīm...jayauruaŋhəm
yım yazata haōmō
frāmşiš baēšaziiō srīrō
xšaŋriiiō zairidōiërō
barzištē paiitī barəzahi
haraiiitiiō paiitī barəzaiiā̃...

Grass-land magnate Mithra we worship…
whom glowing Haōma
the healer, beautiful,
majestic and golden-eyed
worshipped on the highest peak
of Harā the high… 264

The name of Zaraϑuštra also occurs together with Miϑra, where Zaraϑuštra is seen invoking Ahura Mazdā, Miϑra and Sraoϑa (Vd 19.15). In conclusion, the examined evidence favours zaiiā as the 3rd sg. of the passive stem zaiia- in the subjunctive mode. It also agrees with the reading of YIndS B3, the oldest Sāde manuscript at our disposal.

By contrast, the New Persian commentaries, attested in YIrP Pt4, T6 and F2, interpret the Avestan phrase in a different way:

Figure 17. YIrP P4 (fol 54r).

263 For a comparison between Haōma and Miϑra see Boyce (1970: 80).
264 The text is after Gershevitch (1967: 114-115).
Pt4 fol. 54r marg. *zāhir dānam ka zartušt ham*

I obviously know that I am Zartušt.\(^{265}\)

**Figure 18.** YIRP T6 (fol. 43v line 5-6).

T6 fol. 43v line 5 *hōm javāb dād ka zāhir dānanda-u ārāyanda-yī dēn tō hastē ay zartušt*

Fol. 43v marg. *tō-rā az rōz ī azal az hokm ī izadān dar yašt? yād mē-kunam-u mi-xvānam*

Fol. 43v line 5 *Hōm answered that obviously, you are who knows and adorns the Religion, O Zartušt!*

Fol. 43v marg. *I remember and recite you from the beginning in the Yašt according to the order of Yazds.\(^{266}\)

**Figure 19.** YIRP F2 (fol. 51r line 11-12).

F2 (fol. 51r line 11) *va zāhir nō rasīd nazdīk-ī man*

Fol. 51r line 12 *? zartušt? mē-kunam*

Fol. 51r line 11 and it is obvious that he approached me fresh.

Fol 51r line 12 *? I perform ? Zartušt.*\(^{267}\)

The different New Persian translations show that no consensus existed among the scribes about the meaning of the Avestan phrase. However, of the three New Persian versions quoted above, that of Pt4 is the closest to the meaning of the Avestan phrase, suggested in the present edition, but the 1st sg. ending *-am* in *danam* “I know” and the verb *ham* “I am” have no counterpart in the Avestan phrase. In addition, in all of the New Persian translations, Av. *miϑrō* is left untranslated.

\(^{265}\) My translation.

\(^{266}\) My translation.

\(^{267}\) My translation.
13) Line 25 Y 9.1dP hād gyān tan pad frārōnīh amarg kard ēstēd “That is: The life, the body, through righteousness, was made immortal”

Phl. tan, in hād gyān tan pad frārōnīh amarg kard ēstēd is absent in YIrP Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b. In Pt4, although it is absent in the main text, it appears in the right margin written down by pale letters:

Figure 20. YIrP Pt4 (fol. 54v line 3).

The absence of Phl. tan “body” describing gyān “life”, agrees with one of the features of the corrected manuscripts according to which some commentaries or glosses are shortened or omitted if they seemed to be unnecessary.268 In the present edition with the reading of the old YIndP J2, K5, tan is employed.

Furthermore, in YIrPs Pt4 (in marg.) Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b, the adverb ā “then” appears after frārōnīh in hād gyān pad frārōnīh (ā) amarg kard ēstēd in contrast to YIrP F2 and YIndPs in which the adverb ā is unattested. Although the adverb ā “then” is usually attached to an enclitic pronoun, it can also occur alone. For example:

ŠNS 2.20 ka-š nasāy-ē az bērōn pad xumb-ē abāz ēstēd kē-š may andar ā xumb rēman may pāk

If a carrion stands from outside on a jug in which is wine, then, is the jug impure (and) wine pure.269

As far as editorial judgement is concerned, the text is semantically meaningful with and without the adverb but in agreement with the old YIndP J2 and K5, ā is omitted in the present edition.

14) Line 28 Y 9.1dP 28 tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg “as far as apart from (one’s) body, everybody is immortal”

The Pahlavi phrase tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg appears in the following context:

---

268 For correction see section 3.1.
269 My translation.
hād gyān tan pad frārōnīh amarg kard ēstēd
nē ēdōn čiyōn awēšān kē gōšt ī jam jud
u-sān andar tan amarg kard ēstād
tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg

That is: The life, the body, through righteousness, was made immortal, not like those who devoured the meat (provided by) Jam and they, bodily, had become immortal, as far as apart from (one’s) body, everybody is immortal.

The meaning of tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg shows a break from its preceding nē ēdōn čiyōn awēšān kē gōšt ī jam jud u-sān andar tan amarg kard ēstād according to which everybody’s body became immortal by eating the meat provided by Jam. Probably, tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg denotes that after the period of immortality although tan “body” became mortal, other faculties of human were remained immortal.270 According to Y 26.4 (=Yt 13.149), at least five immortal elements namely ahu- “vital strength”, daēnā- “vision”, baodah- “perception”, uruuan- “soul” and frauwaṣi- “choice” can be enumerated. The reason of their immortality is that those of the deceased first teachers, hearers and righteous men and women are worshipped in the stanza.271

15) Line 29 Y 9.1dP amorōza gaiiehe stūna “The pillars of life are non-removable”

In all of the collated manuscripts, the Avestan phrase amorōza gaiiehe stūna is attested unanimously following the Pahlavi commentary tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg “as far as apart from (one’s) body, everybody is immortal”. Regarding stūna, due to the existence of both stūnā- f. and stūna- m. meaning “pillar” (AirWb. 1608), it is either nom. sg. of the former or inst./voc. sg. or nom. pl. of stūna- masculine. For example, translating the phrase as “O imperishable pillar of life”, Haug (1862: 177 and 177, fn. 2) interprets stuna as the voc. sg. declension of stūna-:

yim azəm vīspahe aŋhāuš
astuuatō sraēštōm dādarōsa
x’āhe gaiiehe x’anuuaṭō amōṣahe
[amorōza gaiiehe stūna]

Who appearest to me

270 The period of immortality is considered as 300 and 150 years by MX 61.18 and the Pahlavi version of Vd. 2.41, respectively. For Jam See Skjærvø (2012: 501-522).
The finest in the whole material world, 
having such a brilliant, immortal form of your own 
[O imperishable pillar of life]

However, Haug’s association with the Avestan original is problematic because the function of the Avestan quotation in the Pahlavi version is to substantiate the Pahlavi translation or commentary. For example:

Vd 1.18P. pānzahom az gyāgān ud rōstāgān ā-m pahlom frāz brēhēnīd
man kē ohrmazd ham
kē haft hindūgān
[u-š haft hindūgān ēd kū] 
sar xwadāy haft ast
ēd-iz nē gōwam kū haft rōd
čē ān az abestāg paydāg
haca ušastara hinduua auui daošatarəm hindūm
ast kē ēdōn gōwēd
har kišwar-ē ēk ast] ...

Then, I fashioned forth the fifteenth of places and settlements as the best, I who am Ohrmazd, which is Haft-Hindūgān.
[And being Haft-Hindūgān is this (the number) of chief is seven.
This is also I do not say that it has Seven-Rivers.
For, that is known from the Avesta: 
From the down-side river to the evening-side river.
There is one who says:
One (chief) is for each region] … 272

Therefore, according to the context of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1, it seems that stūnā-“pillar” should be related to tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg. As discussed in Y 9.1 commentary 14, the Pahlavi phrase denotes that after the period of immortality although tan “body” became mortal, the other faculties of human were remained immortal. As a result, stūnā is taken as the nom. pl. of stūna- m. “pillar” in the context of Y 9.1.

While gaiiehe is obviously gen. sg. of gaiia- “life”, the meaning of amorza is debated. Haug (1862: 177, fn. 2) translates it as “imperishable”. Although Haug does not explain his translation, it should probably be similar to Bartholomae’s explanation as discussed below. By contrast, Darmesteter (1898: 258) translates amorza and the phrase by conjecture as “marrowless” and “the column of life [made] marrowless”, respectively, but he adds no

272 The text is after Moazami (2014: 40, 41 and 41 fn. 3).
comment to his translation. He also leaves the reason of the incorporation of the verb “made” into his translation undiscussed. In addition, as mentioned by Davar (1904: 39, fn. 47), the meaning does not fit the context. Reading amərəza as amərəca, Bartholomae (AirWb. 143) interprets amərəca as nom. pl. of amərək- “indestructible”. However, his suggestion is unlikely because amərəca is absent in manuscripts. Furthermore, kṷ in IE.

*melk* > Av. marək only develops to either /k/ or its allophone [c] before the front vowel e or i in Avestan. The phrase is left untranslated in Mills’s (1903c: 315) work. Translating amərəza as “unsustained”, Davar (1904: 29 and 29, fn. 47) compares the phrase with Yt 10.71 mərəzuca stůnō gaiiehe in which mərəzu- is rendered by him as “stain, filth”. He also compares amərəza with the Pahlavi interpretation of mərəzu-, or āhōg “sin, defect” (Davar’s translation), in the compound mərəzu.jīti-, occurring in Vd. 19.26 and 29. In contrast to Davar’s suggestion, Bartholomae (AirWb. 1174), interprets mərəzu- in the context of Yt 10.71 as “vertebra; neck and back” (AirWb. 1173-1174). The meaning of mərəzu- as “vertebra” is also confirmed by Henning (1942a: 242). Likewise, Gershevitch (1967: 106-107) translates Yt 10.71 yauuata aēm nijaiṇti mərəzuca stůnō gaiiehe mərəzuca xā uštānahe as “until he smashed even the vertebrae, the pillars of life even the vertebrae, the springs of vitality”:

\[
\begin{align*}
Yt\ 10.71.\quad & yō\ frāštacō\ hamərəϑādā\ a
\hspace{1cm}
\upda.haxtō\ ä.manaỹha
\hspace{1cm}
\hadhra\ nairiia\ hqm.varəsta
\hspace{1cm}
stiia\ nijαιnti\ hamərəϑā
\hspace{1cm}
nəēdə\ maniie\ jān\vā
\hspace{1cm}
nəēdə\ cim\ xṇəṃ\ sadaiieiti
\hspace{1cm}
yauuata\ aēm\ nijaiṇti
\hspace{1cm}
mərəzuca\ stůnō\ gaiiehe
\hspace{1cm}
mərəzuca\ xā\ uštānahe
\end{align*}
\]

as he (= Vərəϑrəyn = boar) catches up with the opponent(s) beset by passion, simultaneously by manly valour, he knocks them (lit. opponents) down with a toss (of his head). He does not even think he has struck, nor has he the impression he is hitting anybody, until he has smashed even the vertebrae, the pillars of life even the vertebrae, the springs of vitality.274

273 See Hoffmann & Forssman (1996: 100); For the IE root see LIV. 434-435.
274 The text is after Gershevitch (1967: 106-107).
Like Davar, Pirart (2004: 59, fn. 16) compares the phrase of Y 9.1 with that of Yt 10.71. Leaving the phrase untranslated, he only discusses it briefly in the footnotes. However, Pirart (2004: 59, fn. 16) rightly points out that it is difficult to connect mǝrǝzu- with amǝrǝza. The reason is that the development of u- stems to words ending in alif, or ‘’, only occurs in Middle Iranian. Such developments, for example Av. nasu- > Phl. nasā, should be sought in the lengthened -ā-, found in the declension of u- stems like nom. pl. nasāwːā rather than a shift from u- to a- stems. Therefore, the development of Av. mǝrǝzu- > Av. mǝrǝza is unlikely.

There are also other factors which cast doubt on the semantic relation between two phrases attested in Y 9.1 and Yt 10.71. For example, stūnō in Yt 10.71 is acc. pl. of stun-, related to the preceding verb nijaŋti. By contrast, as mentioned above, stūna is either nom. sg. of its feminine stem or inst./voc. sg. or nom. pl. of stūna- masculine. Furthermore, in contrast to mǝrǝzu in Yt 10.71, amǝrǝza is negated by the negation prefix a and if it is associated with mǝrǝzu-, its meaning “invertebrate, without vertebra, or non-neck” would be semantically problematic. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is only the lexical resemblance between amǝrǝza and mǝrǝzu.

While relating amǝrǝza to mǝrǝzu- is unlikely, the plausible stem with which amǝrǝza can be associated is amǝrǝzā-. Considering the suggested stem, amǝrǝzā- would be a hapax legomenon of the root marz to which the negation suffix a and the primary suffix a- are attached. The formation follows the Indo-Iranian word formation rule according to which the zero grade of a- stems, making adjective, occurs mainly in roots with the short or long vowels i, u, ə (AiGr. II 2, 69, §22-22a). However, it should be noted that although such formations in zero grade often denote the sense of either an agent noun or a present participle (AiGr. II 2, 69-73, §22b), in the context of Y 9.1, as translated by Bartholomae (AiWb. 143) and Haug (1862: 177, fn. 2), it should be interpreted as an adjective denoting capability.

One of the meanings of IE *h2merg > AV marz is “to touch, to rub” but from the semantic point of view, amǝrǝza- from the root marz “to touch, to rub” is problematic. The reason is that amǝrǝza gaiiehe stuna means “the pillars of life are non-touchable”. Moreover, the verbal stem marzā- in Yt 10.95 and Yt 14.21 means “to sweep across”.

---

275 For a discussion on the development of OIr. -a- stems to MIr -a see (Gershevitch 1967: 221, §71).
276 See AiWb. 143, 1608; Gershevitch (1967: 107).
277 See AiWb. 1152-1153; EWAia. 324-326; Cheung (2007: 180-182); LIV. 280-281.
278 For Yt 10.95 see Gershevitch 1967: 120-121. In Yt 14.21, Vṛṣṇa sweeps across the canyons of mountains, (he) sweeps across the summits of mountains, (he) sweeps across the depths of valves, (he) sweeps across the tops of plants.
which again disagrees semantically with the context of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1. The other possibility is to consider another meaning of IE *h₂merǵ, or “to wipe (off), to clean, to pick”, which appears for example in Ved. mårśti “s/he wipes, s/he cleans”, Oss. mærzyn/mærzun “to wipe, to clean”, Kurd. Sor. mālīn/māl “to wipe off” or Gr. ἀμέργω “I pick”. It seems that the semantic component of “to remove (something by touching or scrubbing)” is present in all uses of this verb. Furthermore, the meaning “to remove” is also corroborated by the corresponding Sanskrit root marj which can also means “to sweep away, to remove” (McDonell 1893: 233). With this interpretation, amǝrǝza- in the context of the last Pahlavi commentary of Y 9.1 means as follows:

\[
\text{hād gyān tan pad frārōnīh amarg kard ēstēd} \\
\text{nē ēdōn ŝiyōn awēšān ē kē gošt i jam jud} \\
\text{u-šān andar tan amarg kard ēstād} \\
\text{tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg} \\
\text{amǝrǝza gaiiehe stūna} \\
\text{tā be az tan har kas-ē amarg} \\
\text{amǝrǝza gaiiehe stūna}
\]

That is: The life, the body, through righteousness, was made immortal, not like those who devoured the meat (provided by) Jam and they, bodily, had become immortal, as far as apart from (one’s) body, everybody is immortal, The pillars of life are non-removable.

In association with the preceding Pahlavi commentary, it denotes metaphorically that although the gyān “life” of people became mortal after committing the offence of eating the meat provided by Jam, it is impossible to take the other faculties. Therefore, since the translation of amǝrǝza as “non-removable” rather than “non-touchable” better fits the context of Y 9.1, the former is chosen in the present edition.

As far as the Pahlavi translation of the Avestan phrase is concerned, it is left untranslated in the manuscripts with the exception of the G14, T6 and F2 in which amǝrǝza gaiiehe stūna is followed by the Pahlavi translation and commentary amarg kard jān [ī xwēš rāy] pad stāyišn [ī ohrmazd] “he made [his] life immortal by praising [Ohrmazd]”. It is evident that because of the postposition rāy, expressing the object of the sentence in New Persian, the Pahlavi phrase is late. Furthermore, amǝrǝza and stūna are misinterpreted as amarg

---

279 See EWAia. 324-326; Cheung (2007: 180-182); LIV. 280-281. 
“immortal” and *stāyišn* “praising”, respectively. In F2 (fol. 51v line 15) and T6 (fol. 43v line 13), the following interlinear New Persian translation of the Pahlavi phrase is also provided:

\[
\text{va bē marg kardē (karda) jān xvēš rā az stāyišn kard (kardan) hormazd}
\]

and made your life (F2 his life) immortal because of worshipping Ohrmazd.²⁸¹

---

²⁸¹ My translation.
4.2 Y 9.2

1 (Y 9.2aA) āaṭ mē aēm paitiaoxta
2 haō摩 ašaua dūraošō
3 (Y 9.2bA) azem ahmi zaraṭuštra
4 haō摩 ašaua dūraošō
5 (Y 9.2cA) ā mām yāsaŋ'ha spitama
6 frā mām hunauuaŋ'ha x'arōstē
7 (Y 9.2dA) aoi mām staomaine stūiδi
8 yāda mā aparacīg
9 saošitāntō stauuqn

1 (Y 9.2aA) Thereupon answered me,
2 the righteous Haōma whose destruction is difficult:
3 (Y 9.2bA) 'I am, O Zarāṭuştرا,
4 the righteous Haōma whose destruction is difficult.
5 (Y 9.2cA) Hold me, O Spitama,
6 press me out for drinking.
7 (Y 9.2dA) Praise me for praising,
8 like subsequent
9 saviours will praise me.

1 (Y 9.2aP) ē man ōy passōx guft
2 hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš
3 [hād dūrōśih ēd kū ōš az ruwān ī mardōmān dūr darēd
4 rōśn guft
5 hād aōših pad hōm bawēd]
6 (Y 9.2bP) an ham zardušt
7 hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš
8 (Y 9.2cP) ān i any man hun ē xwarišn [xwaišn rāy be hun]
9 (Y 9.2dP) abar man pad stāyišn stāy [andar yazišn]
10 čīyōn man pas-iz
11 südōmand stāyēnd [ā-ś ān ī tō tō rāy]

1 (Y 9.2aP) He answered me,
2 the righteous Hōm who averts perdition,
3 [that means: Averting perdition is this that he keeps perdition far from the soul of men.
4 Rōśn said,
5 'that is that imperishableness is through Hōm'],
6 (Y 9.2bP) 'I am, O Zarduşt,
7 the righteous Hōm who averts perdition.
8 (Y 9.2cP) That means that press me for drinking, [for drinking, press me].
9 (Y 9.2dP) Praise me in the worship [in the Yasna ceremony]
10-11 like the saviour will praise me after this. [Then, that is thine, for thee].
1) Line 1 Y 9.2aP ṽ man ṽ y passōx guft “He answered me”

While ṽy, corresponding to Av. aēm, is absent in YIndP K5 and M1, it appears after man in the K5 sister manuscript, or J2, and YIrPs. Although it is absent in the base text K5, in agreement with the Pahlavi word-for-word translation technique of the Avestan original, ṽy is employed in the present edition. This would be in keeping with Greg’s (1950: 29) definition of the principles of the copy-text in which substantive readings found in a text of similar substantive authority as the chosen one can be selected.

2) Line 2 Y 9.2aP Phl. dūrōš “who averts perdition”

Interpreting Av. dūraoša- as “who averts perdition”, the Pahlavi commentators associated dūro with Phl. dūr “far”:

Y 9.2a ... dūrōšīh ḫd ṽ oš az ruwān mardōmān dūr dārēd...

...The concept of dūrōš is that he keeps perdition far from the soul of men...

As the cognate of the Ved. durōṣa-, the Avestan word appears once in the Gāϑās (Y 32.14) but its association with Haōma is uncertain.282 By contrast, in the Hōm Yašt, it is obviously the epithet of Haōma. Bartholomae translates it as “dem das Verderben fern bleibt, Todwehrer” (AirWb. 751-752). Bartholomae’s interpretation entails that the first syllable of Av. dūraoša- is Av. dūra- adj. (= Ved. dūra-) ‘far’. Flattery & Schwartz (1989: Part II, 130) accept this interpretation and argue that the short vowel, /u/ in the Sanskrit word durōṣa-, is the result of popular etymology. As a result, they translate it as “averting perdition” which is similar to the interpretation of the Pahlavi commentators. The problem is that while in the Sāde and Pahlavi manuscripts, short and long vowels are frequently confused, the vowel quantity is usually faithfully preserved in the Vedic sources (Hoffmann 1987: 51).

According to another explanation suggested by Gershevitch (1974: 45-76), the first element of the compound is to be compared with the Baluchi word dōr “pain”. Therefore, the compound would mean “pain-killer”, whereby dōr would function as the object of aoša “killing, destroying”. Reconstructing the first element as *dūra-, Bailey (1936: 95-97) suggests that it is derived from dvar “to run” according to which dūraoša- means “from whom destruction flees”. However, dūraošom is trisyllabic in the Gāϑās and with all of the

282 For a discussion on dūraoša- in Y 32.14, see section 1.2.
mentioned suggestions, *dura (a)ušǝm* would be tetrasyllabic. Bailey (1957: 41-59) also argues that /u/ in *dūra* was lengthened because of the confusion between the short and long quantities /u/ and /ū/. He suggests that the word comes from the verbal base *dur*—“to pierce” attached to the double suffix Old Iranian *auša*- (Av. *aʊša*; Skt. *ṣa*) meaning “pungent, sour, pained, causing pain”. As a parallel example of the suffix *auša*- in the Iranian languages, he refers to Khot. *-ūš*, however, the existence of the Khotanese suffix was questioned by Degener (1989: 182) according to whom it may have been extracted from one or two words which happened to end in this sequence of sounds. The quantity of /r/ in *dur* can also be compared with the Sandhi variant *dur* from Ir. **dus* in Vedic. However, this is not found in Avestan, where we only have the variants *duš* and *duž*. According to Hoffmann (cited in Humbach 1957: 300), the form *dūraoša*- results by dissimilation of *duž-auša*-.

It should be noted that although a Sandhi variant *dur* is not found elsewhere in Avestan, it could in fact be attested in Middle Iranian: cf. Bactrian ḥroumno, ḥroumvo, ṭḥroumvo [*drumrn*] noun “enemy” < *duš-manyu-, Av. *dušmainiu* (Gershevitch, 1979: 65 note a), where Gershevitch considers Indian influence: ‘the fact that in Indian the prefix regularly is *dur* may also have played a part’. The variant *dur* could also be present in Manichaean Bactrian *drwfr* [*drufrar*] adj. "unfortunate" (prefix *drw-* "bad" = ḥrou-, ḥroun-in ḥroumno, ḥroumvo "enemy", cf. Parthian *dwšfr* ‘unfortunate’) (Sims-Williams 2009: 245-268) and ḥroumno/ḥroumvo "enemy" < dur + ṭman (Sims-Williams 2007: 83). Therefore, it seems that associating *dūr* with Ir. *dus* is less problematic than the other interpretations, discussed above.

The second element *aʊša*- has usually been translated by scholars as “death” or more specifically “destruction by fire”. Therefore, deriving the compound from Ir. *dus-auša*- the Avestan term *dūraoša*- is translated as “whose destruction is difficult” in the present edition.

3) Line 5 Y 9.2aP hād “that is”

In YIndP J2, hād is replaced by *ay “that is”. Although both readings are semantically meaningful, in agreement with the base text K5, hād is employed in the present edition.

---

283 See Kellens (1996: 595-596); Kellens & Pirart (1990: 260). Unlike Kellens & Pirart who count the syllables of the stem, the declined form *dūraošom* is attested in the present commentary. The reason is that stems never occur in the texts.

284 See Humbach (1957: 300).

4) **Line 6-7 Y 9.2bP** an ham zardošt hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš “I am, O Zardušt, the righteous Hōm who averts perdition”

In Y 9.2, Av. azǝm ahmi zaraϑuʃtra haōmō aʃauua dûraoʃō “I am, O Zaraϑuʃtra, Haōma whose destruction is difficult” is translated as follows in the manuscripts:

YIrP Pt4, G14, Mf4, F2, T6, T55b:

an (ʼNH)\(^{286}\) ham zardošt hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš

I am, O Zardušt, the righteous Hōm who averts perdition.

YIndP J2, K5, M1:

hōm (HWM)\(^{287}\) ham zardošt hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš

(I) am Hōm, O Zardušt, the righteous Hōm who averts perdition

Dhabar (1949: 56) edits in agreement with the Iranian manuscripts, but Davar (1904: 16), Josephson (1997: 29) and Mill (1900: 519) choose the second reading. Josephson (1997: 162) compares it with Y 11.7 in which hōm is repeated:

Y 11.7 ān ī ān hōm sūr [kū hōm drōn be paydāgēn]

“about the meal of Hōm’s [Reveal Hōm’s share]”

However, the difference between the text of Y 9.2 and that of Y 11.7 is that while an/hōm in the former corresponds to Av. azǝm, the repeated hōm in Y 11.7 occurs in the commentary. Josephson also suggests that the repeating style has parallels in Y 10.3-5 in which Phl. rust estē translates Y 10.3 Av. urūōuʃua; Y10.4 Av. raoδahe and Y 10.5 Av. raose. Furthermore, the past tense is repeated in Y 10.10-12:

Y 9.10 Phl. be dād hē translating Av. nidaδaʃ
Y 9.11 Phl. be burd hē translating Av. vibarən
Y 9.12 Phl. be rust hē translating Av. viraoδahe\(^{288}\)

\(^{286}\) For example: Pt4 (fol. 54v line 11)

\(^{287}\) For example: K5 (fol. 60v line 13)

\(^{288}\) For the Avestan and Pahlavi texts and their English translations see Josephson (1997: 91-94).
However, the examples of the repeating style in the Pahlavi translation of Y 10 are correct cognates of the Avestan original although the grammatical features of their corresponding Avestan words are expressed incorrectly. By contrast, in the Indian manuscripts, Av. azǝm is left untranslated in Y 9.2. Elsewhere in the same publication, Josephson (1997: 153) correctly argues that Pahlavi translators’ first goal was to translate the original Avestan text by employing the closest corresponding Pahlavi word and to maintain the word order of the Avesta. Furthermore, her analysis of the Pahlavi translation of the Hōm Yašt shows that while mistranslations of the Avestan grammatical forms are common in the Pahlavi version, there is no consistent erroneous translation of the Avestan words (Josephson 1997: 164). Therefore, since the first Avestan word is the nominative personal pronoun azǝm “I”, the corresponding Pahlavi word must be a translation of it. As a result, in the present edition the reading 'NH is favoured over hwm. The reading of the Indian sister manuscripts J2, K5 and M1, closely related to K5, could be due to the misinterpretation of ʃr as ʃr.

5) Line 8 Y 9.2cP ān ī any man hun ő xwarišn [xwarišn rāy bē hun] “That means that press (me) for drinking, for drinking [press me]”.

In what follows the manuscripts spellings of the suggested reading an ī any in the present edition are shown:

a) Y IrP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pt4 (fol. 54v line 14)</th>
<th>Mf4 (p. 147 line 10)</th>
<th>G14 (fol. 53r line 4)</th>
<th>F2 (fol. 53r line 4)</th>
<th>T6 (fol. 44r line 8)</th>
<th>T55b (fol. 69r line 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>كيذ چن</td>
<td>كيذ چن</td>
<td>كيذ چن</td>
<td>كيذ چن</td>
<td>كيذ چن</td>
<td>كيذ چن</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Y IndP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J2 (fol. 81r line 15)</th>
<th>K5 (fol. 60v line 15)</th>
<th>M1 (fol. 157r line 5-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مارسمن</td>
<td>مارسمن</td>
<td>مارسمن</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pahlavi ZK Y ZK Y occurs with minor variations in YIrP T6 as ZK ZK Y and YIndP K5?, M1 as ZK W ZK Y. Regarding the spelling of K5? and its descendant M1, ud does not
fit the context of Y 9.2 from the semantic point of view:

\[ hōm^{289} \text{ ham zardušt} \\
\text{hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš} \]
\[ ān ud \]
‘I am Hōm, O Zardušt,
the righteous Hōm who averts perdition,
that and/that means and.

As regards the reading of YIrP T6, it is a late manuscript of the Hōšang ī Syāwaxš-line and the descendant of G14. Therefore, it is not as important as Pt4, Mf4 and G14 in editorial judgements. Therefore, in the present edition, in agreement with the reading of J2 (sister manuscript of the base text) and YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14 and F2, ZK Y is employed.\(^{290}\) This would be in keeping with Greg’s (1950: 29) definition of the principles of the copy-text in which substantive readings found in a text of similar substantive authority as the chosen one can be selected.

As far as the reading of ZK Y in ZK Y ZK Y man hun ō xwarišn [xwaišn rāy be hun] is concerned, the first ZK Y should be read as ān ī “that is that” or “that means”, introducing the new commentary. As far as the transcription of the second ZK Y is concerned, it should be noted that in addition to ān ī, it can also as the heterogram ZK-ŷ (any) replace ’HRN-ŷ (any) in the manuscripts.\(^{291}\) In combination with pronouns, any implies ‘a partly distinctive, partly emphasising sense’ (Nyberg 1974: 16). For example:

DkM. 604.7-8. ohrmazd tō dānē any amahraspand hēm ...
(Ohrmazd) thou knowst that we are (only) Amahraspands …

The formula any man has also a parallel in the following early Jewish New Persian fragment from Dandān-Uiliq:

\[ čōn any man pa tō u-m(ard) darum yakē kā(r) \]

\(^{289}\) For hōm see Y 9.2 commentary 4 an ham zardušt hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš.
\(^{290}\) In the editions, Mills (1900: 519) gives ZK Y ZK Y (ān ī ān ī), Davar (194: 16) edits ZK ZK Y (ān ān ī). However, as mentioned above, ān ān ī is only attested in the late YIrP T6 manuscript which was not at Davar’s disposal. By contrast, Josephson (1997: 42-43), omitting one ZK Y, edits it as ān ī man “mine” according to which ān and man translate the Avestan preverb ō and the accusative pronoun man: ān ī man xwāhēd spītāmān [ō xwarišn rāy] be hun “Fetch that which is mine, O Spitama, extract [me] for drinking”. It is obvious that Josephson’s reconstruction has no parallel in the manuscripts.

\(^{291}\) For the reading of ZK Y as any in Pahlavi language see Salemann (GIrPh I/1, 294).
\(^{292}\) My translation.
As otherwise I to you, and I have a man, one work\textsuperscript{293}

Therefore, the second heterogram is interpreted as \textit{any} in the present edition. In addition, in YIrP Mf4? G14, F2 and T6, the following commentary-translation appears after ān ī \textit{any man} (ō):

\begin{quote}
...[kē tis-ē] xwāhēd ay spitāmān ud frāz man rāy ...

... [for whom, (who) wants a thing], O Spitāmān and for my sake ….
\end{quote}

In YIrP Mf4 the phrase appears corruptly in the text above the crossed out \textit{hun hun} (in Avestan script) in p. 147 line 10, but kē tis-ē and the vocative particle ay “O” are absent and the reading of \textit{nA}lPXp in the margin is obscure:

\textbf{Figure 21.} YIrP Mf4 (p. 147 lines 9-11).

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure21.png}
\end{center}

In YIrP G14 and T6, the Pahlavi phrase [kē tis-ē] xwāhēd ay spitāmān ud frāz man rāy (T6 \textit{hun}) occurs in the left margin of fol. 53r and fol. 44r, respectively:

\textsuperscript{293} See Utas (1968: 129-130).
Figure 22. Left: YIrP G14 (fol. 53r); left: YIrP T6 (fol. 44r).

The marginal phrase is probably associated with ān (ī) any man  ámb in the main text by “ʌ” in G14 (fol. 53r line 5) and “ဗ” in T6 (fol. 44r line 8), corresponding to “v” in its margin, respectively:

Figure 23. Left: YIrP G14 (fol. 53r line 5); right: YIrP T6 (fol. 44r line 8).

In F2, the phrase [kē tis-ē] xwāhēd ay spitāmān ud frāz man rāy is written by pale letters in the left margin of fol. 52r, marked by the asterisk (*). Likewise, its place in the text is probably marked by the same pale asterisk (*) in fol. 52r line 7 after ān ī any man:

Figure 24. YIrP F2 (fol. 52r. line 7).
Figure 25. YIrP F2 (fol. 52r). An asterisk appears at the beginning of \([kē tis-ē]\) xwāhēd ay spitāmān ud frāz man rāy.

The Pahlavi xwāhēd ay spitāmān and frāz man rāy corresponds to Av. ā … yāsaŋ‘ha spitama and frā mām, respectively:

Y 9.2A ā mām yāsaŋ‘ha spitama
frā mām hunawuŋ‘ha x‘arōstē

YIrP Mf4? G14 F2 T6: Y 9.2P ān ā any man [ō kē tis-ē] xwāhēd ay spitāmān
ud frāz man rāy hun xwarišn xwaišn [rāy be hun]

In addition, in the manuscripts G14, F2 and T6, any man “for me” is glossed by the commentary kē tis-ē “to whom (who wants) a thing”, following man ō. 294 In the present edition, the mentioned commentary-translation is not employed. The reason is that they are absent in the old YIndP J2, K5 and YIrP Pt4 which is related to G14, T6. 295 Moreover, with regard to Mf4, either the corresponding corrupt and incomplete text is added by a second hand after crossing out the previously written words hun hun or the scribe was uncertain about the authenticity of the Pahlavi translation-commentary or while he did not know it by heart, it was also absent in his source. It should also be noted that as discussed in section 2.1 and 3.1, the Pahlavi text of the YIrPs, especially that of G14 and T6 are corrected.

Omitting [kē tis-ē] xwāhēd ay spitāmān ud frāz man rāy, YIrP Pt4 and its closely related T55b write \(w\) before hun (hun):

294 As discussed, the reading of Mf4 is obscure.
295 See section 2.1.
Figure 26. YIrP Pt4 (fol. 54v line 14).

Pt4 Y 9.2, fol. 54v line 14. ān ī any mān ʾōh (ʼw’) hun (hun: Superscript) xwarišn xwarišn rāy be hun

“That means, press me in the usual way, drinking, for drinking press me.

The Pahlavi reading hun “press” is confirmed by the superscript hun written in the Avestan script. Therefore, the preceding ʼw’ should be considered as the particle ʾōh “in the usual way” rather than the preposition ū “to” because while the occurrence of the preposition ū before hun is semantically meaningless and ungrammatical, ūh always takes place before verbs.296

In YInd J2, the heterogram ḾN is preceded by the Pahlavi ʾw which can be transliterated as either ʼw’ for the preposition ū or hwn for the 2nd ipt. hun “press”:

Figure 27. Right: YIndP J2 (fol. 81r line 15); left: YIndP J2 (fol. 81v line 1).

J2 Y 9.2 fol 81r line 15 ān ī any mān ū (or hun) ? ḾN xwarišn xwarišn rāy fol 81v line1 be hun

If the preceding word to ḾN (ūh?) is considered as the verb hwn (hun), the occurrence of the particle ūh after hun is unlikely. Moreover, if ʾw’ is transcribed as ū, the occurrence of ū ? ūh is semantically meaningless. However, as a corrupt heterogram, ḾN can represent the preposition ū. The suggestion is supported by the reading of its sister manuscript YIndP K5 together with YIndP M1 in which ḾN is replaced by the heterogram ʾL representing ū:

Figure 28. YIndP K5 (fol. 60v line 15).

296 For ūh see Skjærvø (2010: 183).
K5. Y 9.2 fol. 60v line 15. ān ī any man ŏ (or hun) ŏ xwarišn rāy bē hun

Therefore, it is certain that according to K5, ḥun should be read as hun because while the meaningless sequence ŏ ŏ has no corresponding word in the Avestan original, hun renders imperative hunauvanja “press”. It should be noted that in J2, ḦN, corresponding to ḧL in K5, is written as Ḧ rather than ḦL. The first Pahlavi stroke (l) could have been originally the final stroke of the preceding word ḥwn'. As a result, the Pahlavi sentence in YIndP J2, K5, M1 is transcribed as follows:

ān ī any man hun ŏ xwarišn xwarišn (deest K5 M1) rāy bē hun

That means, press me for drinking, press for drinking.

In conclusion, although the reading of the both YIrP (ōh hun) and IndYP (hun ŏ) can be adopted in the present edition, the reading of the Indian manuscripts, or hun ŏ is preferred because they represent the oldest collated manuscripts, written down before the eighteenth century during which the Pahlavi texts were corrected. Moreover, apart from YIndP K5 and M1 in which xwarišn appears once, in the other collated manuscripts, xwarišn is repeated:

Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2: xwarišn xwarišn rāy
K5 M1: xwarišn

In the present edition, unlike the reading of the base text K5, xwarišn is repeated because it forms the repetition style with ān ī any in ān ī any ... xwarišn xwarišn. It should be noted that the repetition style has parallels in the Hōm Yašt (Josephson 1997: 162). Therefore, in agreement with the reading of the majority of manuscripts, especially J2 (the sister manuscript of K5), xwarišn xwarišn is employed in the present edition. This would be in keeping with Greg’s (1950: 29) definition of the principles of the copy-text in which substantive readings found in a text of similar substantive authority as the chosen one can be selected.

As far as the translation of the Avestan verb is concerned, Josephson (1997: 43) translates ā ... yāsan'ha as “fetch” which is based on Bartholomae’s suggestion (AirWb.

---

297 See section 3.1.
298 The preliminary results show that IndPY M1 descends from IndPY K5.
1288-1289) of the preverb ā added to the root yās “to desire, to want”. However, Bartholomae’s suggestion of the verbal root yās has been challenged and it is widely accepted now that the present stem ā … yāsa- is the inchoative formation of the root yam “to hold”.299 By contrast, the Pahlavi version of YIrP G14, F2 and T6 translates ā … yāsan’ha by ān ī… xwāhed according to which, as stated above, the preverb ā is represented by ān ī “that means” and xwāstan “to desire, to want” translates yāsa- “to hold”.

6) Line 9 Y 9.2dP yazīn “Yasna ceremony”

Instead of yēšn (yazīn), YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b write yēšn (īzišn) which shows the late? ya- > ī- development. Another similar example is the development of yazd to īzad.300

300 See Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 139, §252).
4.3  Y 9.3

1 (Y 9.3aA) āṭ aoxta zarāṣṭrō
2 namō haōmāi
3 (Y 9.3bA) kāsə gowm
4 paoiriiō haōma mašiiō
5 astuvaññiīiīiī hunūta gaññiīiīiī
6 kā ahmāi ašīs ṣrṇāuui
7 ēč ahmāi jasaṛ āiiaptüm

1 (Y 9.3aA) Thereupon, Zaraṣṭra said:
2 ‘Reverence to Haōm,
3-5 (Y 9.3bA) Who, O Haōma, as the first mortal pressed you for the material creature?
6 What reward was granted to him?
7 What boon came to him?’

1 (Y 9.3aP) u-š guft zardušt
2 kā namāz ō hōm
3 (Y 9.3bP) kē tō
4 fradem hōm az mardōmān
5 andar astōmandān gēhān hunīd hē
6 az ān tarsagāhīh kard
7 [ān nēkīh kū tā-ṃ bawād]
8 ēč ō ōy mad ābādīh

1 (Y 9.3aP) and Zardušt said
2 that: ‘Reverence to Hōm,’
3-5 (Y 9.3bP) who, as the first one, O Hōm, among men pressed you in the material world,
6 from that respect was shown
7 [that goodness so that it will be mine],
8 what prosperity came to him?’

1) Line 2 Y 9.3aP kū namāz ō hōm “that: Reverence to Hōm”

As regards the preposition ō, it expresses the Avestan dative case in the Pahlavi translations of the Avesta. However, it is absent in the translation of dat. sg. haōmāi in YIrPs in which hōm occurs alone. By contrast, in YIndPs, Av. haōmāi is rendered by Phl. ō hōm “to Hōm”. It appears as ō hōm in the editions of Mills (1900: 519), Davar (1904: 16) and Josephson (1997: 44) whereas Dhabhar (1949: 57), omitting ō, writes hōm.

As far as YIrPs are concerned, in T6 (fol. 44r line 12, 13), both Av. haōmāi and Phl. hōm are translated by the interlinear NP. ay hōm (او هومن) “O Hōm” which could suggest that in YIrPs, it was interpreted as the vocative. Moreover, as discussed in section 3.1, the preposition omission in YIrPs is a feature of Jāmāsp’s post-arrival corrected manuscripts.
Therefore, associating the omission of the preposition ō in YIrPs with correction, Av. haōmāi in Y 9.3 is translated by Phl. ō hōm in the present edition.

It should be noted that namāz (ō) hōm, translating namō haōmāi, also occurs in Y 10.17. Josephson (1997: 101) edits namāz hōm in her edition of Y 10.17 and in the commentary to the dative case, she mentions that it is an example which shows that the dative case at the beginning of the verse can occur without the preposition (Josephson 1997: 127). However, the distribution pattern of the preposition ō in Y 10.17 is like that of Y 9.3 because while ō is omitted in YIrPs, it is present in YIndP J2 (fol. 103r line 1), writing namāz ō hōm. In K5, due to the poor condition of fol. 76r, the text of Y 10.17 is illegible, but it is written as namāz ō hōm in its closely related copy M1 (fol. 199r line 12). Therefore, Y 10.17 namāz hōm is another example of correction by the omission of preposition in YIrPs, postdating the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp Velāyiati.

2) Line 3 Y 9.3bP tō “you”

In YInP K5 and its closely related M1, hōm is added after tō in kē tō (hōm) fradom hōm az mardōmān andar astōmandān gēhān hunīd hē “who, as the first one, O Hōm, among men in the material world pressed you, (O Hōm)?”. By contrast, it is absent in J2 (K5 sister manuscript) and their Iranian counterparts. While fradom hōm corresponds to paoirītiō haoma, the first hōm in K5 and M1 does not have an Avestan counterpart. In addition, the same formulaic structure occurs in Y 9.6, 9 and 12 in which hōm is not written after tō in K5, M1. Therefore, it seems that the incorporation of hōm after tō into the sentence in K5 was a scribal mistake which was copied by the scribe of M1. As a result, in agreement with J2 and YIrPs, the sentence is edited as kē tō fradom hōm az mardōmān andar astōmandān gēhān hunīd hē in the present edition.

3) Line 5 Y 9.3bP andar astōmandān gēhān “in the material world”

Av. gaēḏā- is rendered in Pahlavi by passim pl. gēhān, derived from *gǣēih₃, “to live”. As its main meaning, Bartholomae (AirWb. 476-479) translates the Avestan word as “being, material being, creature”. However, in some occasions, gaēḏā- can (secondarily) mean “world”. For example, when it occurs with vispa- “all” or astuawaitī- in astuawaitī- gaēḏā-

301 See Pt4 (fol. 69r line 9); Mf4 (p. 183, line 8); Y 10 is absent from G14; T6 (fol. 64r line 1); T55b (fol. 95v line 12-13).
302 For the relationship between K5 and M1 see section 2.1 and 3.1.
303 See AirWb. 476-479; Kent (1953: 182); Nyberg (1974: 82); LIV. 215.
“material gaēϑā-” (AirWb. 477-478). Likewise, in the editions of the Hōm Yasht, gaēϑā- in astuuaiti- gaēϑā- is translated by most scholars as “world”. Although gaēϑā- in the mentioned Avestan formula can be translated as “world” and “creature”, in the following example, the translation of Av. gaēϑā- as “world” is problematic:

Y 34.3 at tōi miiazdom ahūrā
nomāŋhā ašāicā dāmā
gaēϑā vispā ā xādrōī
yā vohū ṣraostā manāŋhā
ārōī zī hudāŋhō
vispāiš mazdā xšmāuasū sauūō

Then, O Lord, we, all creatures (worlds?), give an offer to you
by reverence and through the Truth
under (your) rule.
whom you nourished through the Good Thought.
Indeed, the salvation be granted to the beneficent man
By all those among your kind, O Wise one.305

The Gāthic verse challenges the interpretation according to which OAv. vispa- gaēϑā- means “all world”. The same conclusion most probably applies to YAv. gaēϑā- aṣahe, which is usually translated as “creature of the Truth” by scholars.306 The evidence agrees with the suggestion of Lommel (1930: 104) who while interpreting gaēϑā- as “world”, rightly insists that “world” must be understood in its narrow sense referring to what flies and crawls, or living beings. He also adds that the development of the meaning of the word from “creature” to “world” starts from the Young Avestan period. However, the beginning of the semantic development should be later than the Young Avestan period because OP. gaiϑā- means “living personal property, cattle” (Kent 1953: 182):

DB. 1.64-66 adam niyaçaṟayam kārahyā abicariš gaiϑāmca māniyaça v’hištca tyādiš
gauṁṭaḥ hya magus adinā

I (Darius) restored the pasture land of the people and the cattle and the household slave
and together with the houses of which Gaumāta, the magus, deprived them.307

304 For the occurrences of astuuaiti- gaēϑā- in the Hōm Yašt see Y 9.3; Y 9.4; Y 9.6; Y 9.7; Y 9.9; Y 9.10; Y 9.12; Y 9.13. For translations see Darmesteter (1898); Wolff (1910); Josephson (1997); Pirart (2004).
307 The Text is after Kent (1953: 118, 120).
Moreover, in the Pahlavi version of Vd 18.65, gēhān, is glossed by gōspandān “small cattle” which shows that by the insertion of the gloss, it is intended to insist that the meaning of Phl. gēhān as the translation of Av. gaēϑām “fold” is different from its common meaning in Pahlavi as “world”.\(^{308}\)

Vd 18.65A. tāsca tē mraomi spitama zaraϑuštbra jaϑbštara ...

yaϑa vohrkṣm azrd.daiōm gaēϑām auui frapatāiti

And I tell you, O Spitama Zarathustra, about those (who) are worthier to be killed … like the hunting wolf which attacks the fold.\(^{309}\)

Vd 18.65P. awēsān cē rāy ṏō gōwam spitāmān zardušt kū zaništntar hēnd cīyōn ...
gurg wiškar dahińh kā ṏō gēhān fraz pātēt [ō gōspandān]

and those (females) I say to you, O Spitāmān Zarāuštra, are more worthy of smiting than … the wolves of wilderness who fall upon the world [upon small cattle].\(^{310}\)

Therefore, Av. gaēϑā- in astuuaitī- gaēϑā- is translated as “creature” in the present edition rather than “world” which has a broad sense of anything made of matter. By contrast, as mentioned above gēhān obviously denotes “world (of creatures), earth” in Pahlavi. For example:

Vd. 2.19Phl u-ś ēn gēhān pad sē bār ān and jam be kard

He, Jam, made this earth, larger by three times.\(^{311}\)

As far as Av. astuuaitī- f. is concerned, from the etymological point of view, it means “provided with bones” (Hintze: 1994: 411). However, in Old and Young Avestan, astuuant- in astuuant-ahu- formula is contrasted with manahīa-ahu- “mental or spiritual, existence”. It shows that from the Old Avestan time onwards, its meaning extended to describe the material existence and beings.\(^{312}\) Therefore, in the present edition, it is translated as “material”.

In the Pahlavi version, Av. astuuaitī- gaēϑā- is rendered by astōmandān gēhān. Mills (1903: 316) and Davar (1904: 30) translate it as “corporeal world” and “material world”, respectively. By contrast, Josephson (1997: 45) argues that the Avestan adjective

---

\(^{308}\) For the meaning of gēhān in Pahlavi see Durkin-Meisterernst (2004: 169); Nyberg (1974: 82); MacKenzie (1971: 36).


\(^{311}\) Edition and translation by Moazami (1949: 54-55). In the Avestan original, “the earth” is given by zam-.

\(^{312}\) See Y 28.2; Y 43.3; Y 57.25; P 40.
astuuaiṭīiāi is substantivised by the plural sign -ān in Pahlavi and consequently, she interprets astōmandān gēhān as the ezāfa construction “the world of material beings”. However, it should be noted that the adjective of plural nouns in Pahlavi can occur either singular or plural, marked by -ān (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014: 203, §424). Therefore, considering astuuaiṭī- adj. in the Avestan original, Phl. astōmandān is interpreted as the adjective, meaning “material” in the present edition.

Regarding the translation technique of the dative case in astuuaiṭīiāi gaēḍiīāī, it is expressed in the Hōm Yašt by the preposition andar “in”. The translation technique agrees with the usual Pahlavi translation of the Avestan place names in dative and genitive cases.313 To study the Pahlavi translation of astuuaiṭī- gaēḍā-, its occurrences in the Avesta together with its corresponding Pahlavi translations are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avesta314</th>
<th>Pahlavi315</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.8; Y 57.24</td>
<td>acc. sg. (aoi yām) astuuaitūm gaēḍqm abar ā astōmandān gēhān “to the material world”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.3; Y 9.4; Y 9.6; Y 9.7; Y 9.9; Y 9.10; Y 9.12; Y 9.13</td>
<td>dat. sg. astuuaitiīāī ... gaēḍiīāī andar astōmandān gēhān “in the material world”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 65.9; P 12</td>
<td>dat. pl. gaēḍābīiīō astuuaitibīīō andar gēhān ī astōmand “in the world which is material”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vd 2.1, 39, 42; Vd. 2.39, 42, 43; Vd 3.1, 7, 12, 15, 16, 30, 36; Vd 4.2, 5, 11, 18, 21, 55; Vd. 5.5, 8, 9-11, 15, 22, 27, 33, 35, 39, 41, 43, 45, 50, 53, 57; Vd. 6.4, 6, 8, 10, 26, 28, 30, 42, 44, 47; Vd 7.1, 3, 5, 9, 23, 36, 45, 53, 70; Vd. 8.4, 12, 14, 23, 26, 27, 31, 41-69, 81-97, 106; Vd 9.1, 43, 47, 49, 54; Vd 10.1, 3; Vd 11.1; Vd 12.2; Vd 13.4, 12, 17, 20, 24, 29, 35, 36, 41, 50; Vd 14.1,</td>
<td>gen. pl. gaēḍanām astuuaitinām ī gēhān ī astōmandān “of the world which is material”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

314 For texts see Geldner (1886-1896). For the Pursišnīhā see Jamaspasa & Humbach (1971). For the Hādōxt Nask see HP F12B.
315 For the Yasna see Dhabhar (1949). For the Vīdēvdād see Moazami (2014) and also Anklesaria (1949). For the the Pursišnīhā see Jamaspasa & Humbach (1971). For the Hādōxt Nask see the HP F12B.
As it is evident from the table, unlike the Yasna in which gen. pl. *gaēϑanqm astuuaitntqm* is consistently translated by *andar gēhān ṭ astōmandān* “in the material world”, it is rendered by *ī gēhān ṭ astōmandān* “of the material world” in the Vīdēvdād and Hādōxt Nask. The reason is that *gaēϑanqm astuuaitntqm* is preceded by voc. *dātar ṭ “O creator* which makes the translation *dādār andar gēhān ṭ astōmandān* “O creator in the material world” semantically meaningless. Consequently, it can be concluded that following the Pahlavi translation techniques of the Avesta, the Pahlavi translators also considered the meaning of their translations.

4) Line 6 Y 9.3bP *az ān tarsagāhīh kard* “from that respect was shown”

While YIndPs write *az ān tarsagāhīh kard* “from that respect was shown”, in YIrPs, it appears as *kē ān tarsagāhīh kard* “what respect was shown to him?”. However, elsewhere in Y 9, Av. *kā ahmāī aṣ̌iš ərənāuuī* is rendered unanimously by *kē ān tarsagāhīh kard* in the manuscripts. The Pahlavi translation of YIndPs in Y 9.3 should be understood in association with its following commentary:

Y 9.3P *az ān tarsagāhīh kard*
ān nēkīh kū tā-m bawād

from that respect, was shown,
that goodness so that it will be mine.

As shown above, in YIndPs, *tarsagāhīh* is associated with *nēkīh*. As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, the reading of the base text K5 and its sister manuscript J2 is employed in the present edition.

---

316 For the Pahlavi sentence and its translation see Y 9.6 commentary 2 *kē ān tarsagāhīh kard*.
4.4 Y 9.4

1 (Y 9.4aA) āat mē aēm paitiaoxta
2 haōmō ašauna dūraošō
3 (Y 9.4bA) viuuaũ'hā mgr paoiriō mašiiō
4 astuualiōtii hūnūt gaētiāi
5 hā ahmāi ašiś ornāuui
6 tāt ahmāi jasaq āiiaptśm
7 (Y 9.4cA) yāt āe pudrō us.zatiata
8 yō yimō xšaētō huuqĪbō
9 (Y 9.4dA) x'taroneţ'hastomō zātanqm
10 huuara darosō maštianqm
11 (Y 9.4eA) yāt kōrōnaq ājhe xšaērāda
12 amarśanta pasu.vīra
13 aşhāosēme āpa.uruuaire
14 (Y 9.4fA) x'airiiqtn x'arōqtm ajiianmōm

1 (Y 9.4aA) Thereupon, answered me
2 the righteous Haōma whose destruction is difficult:
3-4 (Y 9.4bA) ‘Vuuaŋ’hant, as the first mortal, pressed me for the material creature.
5 This reward was granted to him,
6 this boon came to him,
7 (Y 9.4cA) that a son was born to him
8 who is the splendid Yima of good flocks,
9 (Y 9.4dA) the most glorious one of those born,
10 the one looking like the sun among the mortals,
11 (Y 9.4eA) who made by his rule,
12 both animal and man immortal
13 both water and plant un-drying.
14 (Y 9.4fA) The consumable foods were undiminishing.

1 (Y 9.4aP) ō man ōy passōx guft
2 hōm ī ahlaw dūrōś
3 (Y 9.4bP) wīwanghān man fradom az mardōmān
4 andar astōmandān ēhān hunīdam
5 ōy ān tarsagāhīh kard
6 ō ōy mad ābdāh
7 (Y 9.4cP) ka az ōy pus ul zād
8 kē jam ī šēd ī huramag
9 (Y 9.4dP) kē xwarrahōmandtom az zādān būd [xwēškārtom]
10 xwarāshed nigeršntom az mardōmān būd [hučasntom
11 hād xwarrah ast ī xwēškārīh
12 ud ast ī pad tan ī mard
13 ān ī pad tan ī jam
14 hamdādestān būd hēnd kū xwēškārīh
15 hād rōsn guft
16 hād xwarrah ēd ast ī pad tan ī mard
17 xwarrahōmand dārēd xwēškārīh ān rawāg kunēd]
18 (Y 9.4eP) kēš kard pad ān ī ĭoy xwadāyīh
19 amarg pah uḏ wir
20 ahōšišn uḏ āb uḏ urvar
21 [kū ān ī nē abāyist hušk nē hušk]
22 (Y 9.4fP) xwarīsūn xwarān anubesīšn
23 [kū ka ĭw xward būd ĭw mad būd]

1 (Y 9.4aP) He answered me,1
2 Hōm who is righteous (and) averts perdition:
3-4 (Y 9.4bP) Wiwanghān as the first one, among men pressed me in the material world2.
5 The respect was shown to him,
6 the prosperity came to him,
7 (Y 9.4cP) when a son was born from him,3
8 who is the shining Jam of good flocks,
9 (Y 9.4dP) who was the most glorious one of those born, [the most dutiful one].
10 (He) was the most looking like the sun one among men, [the most benevolent one]. 4
11 That means: Glory is the proper action5
12 and which is in the body of man
13 (and) which is in the body of Jam.
14 (They) have been agreeable (to each other) which is the proper function.
15 Know that Rōšn said:6
16 ‘Yes (and) the glory is this which is in the body of man.
17 The glorious has the duty to make that current’],
18 (Y 9.4eP) that he made by his rule
19-20 animal immortal and man non-dying and (he made by his rule non-dying) water and plant.7
21 [That means: What was not desired to be dry, (was) not dry].8
22 (Y 9.4fP) Food, while being eaten, was undiminishing.9
23 [When one had been consumed another one had come].

1) Line 1 Y 9.4aP ő man ĭoy passōx guft “He answered me”

In YiRP T6, ēdōn “thus, so” appears at the beginning of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.4, preceding ő man. However, it is absent in other manuscripts. Considering the absence of the word in its related manuscripts YiRP Pt4, Mf4, G14317 of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line,318 and old YiNdP J2, K5, ēdōn is to be associated with scribal correction.

2) Line 4 Y 9.4bP astōmandān ġēhān “material world”319

One of the features of YiNdP K5 and its closely related M1 is the unnecessary or

---

317 According to the T6 colophon and the results of the text-critical apparatus, T6 is a descendant of G14. See sections 2.2 and 3.1.
318 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
319 For a discussion see Y 9.3 commentary 3 andar astōmandān ġēhān “in the material world”.
erroneous incorporation of the ezāfa ĕ into the sentences. The examples of this feature in the first fifteen stanzas of Y 9 are listed as follows.\textsuperscript{320}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza</th>
<th>YIndP K5, M1</th>
<th>YIrPs + YIndP J2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.1 line 2</td>
<td>ĕhāwan ĕ gāh</td>
<td>ĕhāwan gāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.4 line 4</td>
<td>astōmandān ĕ gehān</td>
<td>astōmandān gehān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.6 line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.7 line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.9 line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.10 line 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.12 line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.13 line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.7 line 3</td>
<td>ĕāspyān ĕ man dudīgar</td>
<td>ĕāspyān man dudīgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.11</td>
<td>ĕān ĕ āhanēn ĕ dēg frāz spurd\textsuperscript{321}</td>
<td>ĕān ĕ āhanēn ĕ dēg frāz spurd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.14</td>
<td>ĕān weh ĕ dāūtī</td>
<td>ĕān weh dāūtī\textsuperscript{322}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the present edition, although the base text is K5, in agreement with J2 (K5 sister manuscript) and YIrPs, ĕ is omitted in the mentioned examples.

3) Line 7 Y9.4cP ka az ĕōy pus ul zād “when a son was born from him”

Phl. ka “when” renders Av. yat̰ “that”. In addition to Y 9.4, the mentioned formulaic structure and its corresponding Avestan original occur in Y 9.7, 10 and 13. In the manuscripts, ka is occasionally replaced by kē “who” as follows:

Y 9.4 ka: YIrP Pt4, Mf4, T6, T55b; YIndPY J2, K5, M1 vs. kē: YIrP G14, F2.
Y 9.7 ka: YIrP Mf4; YInd J2 vs. kē: YIrP Pt4, G14, F2, T6, T55b; YIndP K5, M1.
Y 9.10 ka: YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6, T55b; YIndP J2, K5, M1 vs. kē: YIrP F2.

While from the semantic point of view, both readings are possible, following the base text YIndP K5, ka is employed in the edition of Y 9.4, 10, 13. By contrast, in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.7, yat̰ is represented by kē in the present edition.

\textsuperscript{320} For variant readings see text-critical apparatus.
\textsuperscript{321} The ezāfa ĕ after dēg cannot be interpreted as the indefinite article -ē because āhanēn dēg is preceded by ĕān ĕ “the”.
\textsuperscript{322} In J2, weh is absent. See Y 9.14 commentary 2 weh.
4) Line 10 Y 9.4dP xwaršēd nigerišntom az mardōmān būd [hučašmтом] “(he) was the most looking like the sun one among men, [the most benevolent one]”

With the exception of G14 and T6, the Avestan original xwarṇaghaustmō zātanqm huarār. darsō mašiānqm and its Pahlavi translation and commentary occur together in a same section (Y 9.4d in the present edition). By contrast, changing the order, xwarṇaghaustmō zātanqm is separated from its Zand kē xwarrahōmandtom az zādān būd [xweškārtom] in G14 and T6. Moreover, Av. huarār. darsō mašiānqm and its Pahlavi translation are moved from the near beginning of section d (according to the present edition) to the end of the section in G14 and T6. The following table summarises the differences between G14, T6 and the other manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YIrP Pt4, M4, F2, T6; YIrP J2, K5, M1</th>
<th>YIrP G14, T6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.4cA) yat ṭ hē puθrō us.zaiiata</td>
<td>(Y 9.4cA) yat ṭ hē puθrō us.zaiiata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yō yimō xšaētō huvarqβō</td>
<td>yō yimō xšaētō huvarqβō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>xwarṇaghaustmō zātanqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.4cP) ka az ōy pus ul zād</td>
<td>(Y 9.4cP) ka az ōy pus ul zād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kē jam ī šēd huramag</td>
<td>kē jam ī šēd huramag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.4dA) xwarṇaghaustmō zātanqm</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huarār. darsō mašiānqm</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.4dP) kē xwarrahōmandtom az zādān</td>
<td>(Y 9.4dP) kē xwarrahōmandtom az zādān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>būd [xweškārtom]</td>
<td>būd [xweškārtom]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwaršēd nigerišntom az mardōmān būd</td>
<td>xwaršēd nigerišntom az mardōmān būd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[hučašmтом]</td>
<td>[hučašmтом]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hād xwarrah ast ī xweškārīh</td>
<td>hād xwarrah ast ī xweškārīh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ud ast ī pad tan ī mard</td>
<td>ud ast ī pad tan ī mard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ān ī pad tan ī jam hamdādestān būd hēnd kū xweškārīh</td>
<td>ud ān pad tan jam hamdādestān būd hēnd kū xweškārīh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hād rōsn guft</td>
<td>rōsn guft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hād xwarrah ēd ast ī pad tan ī mard</td>
<td>hād xwarrah ēd ast ī pad tan ī mard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwarrahōmand dārēd xweškārīh ān rawāg kunēd]</td>
<td>xwarrahōmand dārēd xweškārīh ān rawāg kunēd]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

323 Pt4 (fol. 55r line 12-21); Mf4 (p. 148 line 15-17; p. 149 line 1-8); F2 (fol. 52v line 10-15; fol. 53r line 1-5); T55b (fol. 70r line 3-15; fol. 70v 1-2); J2 (fol. 82r line 10-15; fol. 82v line 1-5); K5 (fol. 61r line 17; fol. 61v line 1-5). For variant readings of the Avestan original see the manuscripts available online at http://avesta-archive.com/. For variant readings of the Pahlavi version see text-critical apparatus.

324 G14 (fol. 53v line 7-14; fol. 54r line); T6 (fol. 44v line 11-13; fol. 45r line 1-6). For variant readings of the Avestan original see the manuscripts available online at http://avesta-archive.com/.

325 G14 kē.

326 G14 ud ān.

327 G14 T6 ud xwaršēd.
The unique order of the closely related manuscripts G14 and T6 must be associated with correction. The reason is that it is absent in the other manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line. Moreover, as discussed in sections 2.1 and 3.1, there are other pieces of evidence showing that these two manuscripts are corrected.

Regarding the translation technique of Av. *huuarədarəsa*- “looking like the sun”, the simple adjective is rendered in the Pahlavi version by the superlative *nigerišntom* “most looking like the sun”.

5) Line 11 Y 9.4dP *xwarrah ast i xwēškārīh* “Glory is the proper action”

According to the commentary of Y 9.4d, Glory is defined by the proper action which is in the body of man. Similarly, in the following passage from the Dēnkard book III, the proper action is related to Glory:

DkM. 343.19-21  
*hād dādār dahišn ò kār dād dahišn kāregar hēnd dādār u-šān xūb rawāgīh kār pad xwarrah xwēškārīh pad xwarrah... .*

That is: the creator set the creation for action. (The creatures) are the performers of the creator and good-currency of their action is due to Glory (and) the proper function is because of Glory.

The Zādsparam also agrees with the context of the Dēnkard and Y 9.4 where we find the following passage which implies that the proper function is connected with Glory and the body:

Zs 3.75 *ciyōn ġowīhēd pad dēn kū kadār pēš būd xwarrah ayāb tan u-š guft ōhrmazd kū-m xwarrah pēš dād pas ò ān dād estēd xwarrah tan dād kū xwēškārīh brēhēnīd u-š tan bē ō xwēškārīh dād*

As is said in the Scripture: What was prior, the Glory or body? Thereupon, Ohrmazd said to them that: ‘I first produced the Glory. After the Glory has been produced for it, I created the body which is proper action, and he (Ohrmazd) created the body for the proper action.”

---

328 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōşng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.22.1.
329 My translation.
331 The text is after Anklesaria (1964: LXXX).
6) **Line 15 Y 9.4dP** had rōšn guft “know that Rōšn said”

Since in the base text K5 and its closely related M1, had precedes rōšn, it is employed in the present edition.

7) **Line 19-20 Y 9.4eP** amarg pah ud wīr ahōšišn ud āb ud urwar “animal immortal and man non-dying and (he made by his rule non-dying) water and plant”

The Pahlavi amarg pah ud wīr ahōšišn ud āb ud urwar is the translation of the Avestan amaršahta pasu.vīra anjanaošnəm āpa.uruaire “(who made by his rule) both animal and man immortal, both water and plant un-drying” in which pasu.vīra and āpa.uruaire are dvandva and the adjectives amaršahta “immortal” and anjanaošnəm “undrying” are dual. The spelling of the action noun ahōšišn “immortal, non-dying, undrying” in the manuscripts is as follows:

- **a) YIrP:**
  - Pt4 (fol. 55v line 4)
  - Mf4 (p. 149 line 12)
  - G14 (fol. 54r line 3)
  - F2 (fol. 53r line 7)
  - T6 (fol. 45r line 9)
  - T55b (fol. 70v line 6)

- **b) YIndP:**
  - J2 (fol. 82v line 8-9)
  - K5 (fol. 61v line 11)
  - M1 (fol. 159r line 12)

As regards the Iranian manuscripts, associating with NP. xōšidan “to dry”, the word was interpreted as “undrying” by the scribes of T6, T55b and probably by copyists of the other Iranian copies. The reason is that the initial x < h is shown by the diacritic dot above ـ in T55b. Furthermore, the word is translated by the inerlinear NP. ū axōšišn ya’ni nē xušk mē-šud “and axōšiš means that it was not being dried” in YIrP T6.

As shown above, the word is spelled similarly in YIrP Pt4, M4 and T55b in which ی
can translate either the Avestan negation prefix a- or the dual number. In T55b, the New Persian superscript AGMENT “no”, written above 鲟, confirms the former, or axōšišn “undrying”. Moreover, from the semantic point of view, 鲟 cannot be interpreted as 2 because dō hōšišn “two drying” is obviously a mistranslation of Av. anhaošēmne “two undrying”. By contrast, YIrP G14 and T6 write the word with minor variations according to which 鲟 or precede it, respectively. Furthermore, while G14 writes hōšišn, it appears as ahōšišn in T6. According to the Pahlavi palaeography, 鲟 and 鲟 often express the negation prefix and dual number, respectively, according to which the reading of G14 and T6 would be as follows:

G14 a ud? dō hōšišn “non and? two drying” vs. T6 ud dō a ahōšišn “and two non-undrying”.

However, like T55b, is it also possible to read 鲟 as the negation suffix. As a result, 鲟 should be interpreted as 2, expressing the dual number. Following the latter interpretation, the reading of G14 and T6 would be dō ud? ahōšišn “two and? undrying” and ud a 2 ahōšišn “and non two undrying”. However, with the exception of dō ud? ahōšišn, the other possible readings are problematic because while the negation suffix cannot be separated from the negated word, dō a ahōšišn and ud a 2 ahōšišn are semantically meaningless. As mentioned, the only possible reading is dō ud? ahōšišn “(water and plant are) two and? undrying”. Nonetheless, in its parallel text attested in the Dēnkard VII, the variant ahōšišn appears:

DkM 595.18–20 u-š kard pad ān ī ōy xwadāyīh xwadāyīh335 amarg pah ud wīr ud ahōšišn āb urwar... .

Moreover, in F2, the unique variant ahōšišnōmand takes place. But, for the editorial judgement, the manuscript is not as important as the old Indian manuscripts and its Iranian counterparts of the Hōšang ī Syāwaxš-line. The variations in the Iranian manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line336 also suggests the possibility of scribal corrections.

334 For negation prefix see Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 150, §283).
335 Phl. xwadāyīh is repeated.
336 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
In YIndP J2, although the Pahlavi word can be transcribed as either *ahōšišnīh* or *ahōšišniš*, the latter is obviously wrong. For the editorial judgement between *ahōšišn* and *ahōšišnīh*, it is impossible to draw a decisive conclusion but in agreement with the majority of the manuscripts including the base text K5, *ahōšišn* is chosen in the present edition.

The other variation among the manuscripts is the position of *W (ud) “and”* which appears before *ahōšišn* in YIrP:

\[
\text{YIrP } kē-š kard ān ī ṭy xwādāyīh}
\text{amarg pah ud wīr}
\text{ud ahōšišn āb ud urwar}
\]

“that he made by his rule
animal and man non-dying,
and un-drying water and plant”.

By contrast, in YIndP, the conjunction *ud*, by separating *ahōšišn* from āb ud urwar, relates it to the preceding sentence:

\[
\text{YIndP } kē-š kard ān ī ṭy xwādāyīh}
\text{amarg pah ud wīr}
\text{ahōšišn ud āb ud urwar}
\]

“that he made by his rule
animal non-dying and man
*ahōšišn, and water (non-dying) and plant (ahōšišn)”

It should be noted that since *ahōšišn* is associated with wīr “man” in YIndPs, it was probably interpreted as “immortal, non-dying” rather than “non-drying” by their scribes. As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, in agreement with the base text, *ahōšišn ud* is employed in the present edition and *ahōšišn* is translated as “non-dying”.

8) Line 21 Y 9.4Pe kū ān ī nē abāyist hušk nē hušk “That means: What was not desired to be dry, (was) not dry”

Phl. ī in ān ī is replaced by *KN (ōh)* in YIrP F2 and it is omitted in YIndP J2. However, following the ān ī “that is, the” formula and in agreement with the reading of the base text K5, ī is employed in the present edition.

The Pahlavi verb *abāyist* also appears differently in the manuscript. While in YIndPs, 3rd sg. past *abāyist* appears, in their Iranian counterpart 3rd. sg. pres. *abāyēd* occurs. For
example:

YIrP Pt4 (fol. 55v line 4):  vs. YIndP K5 (fol. 61v line 12):  .

Moreover, the reading of YIrP F2 (fol. 53r line 8) is unclear. The following word hušk is also deleted in YIrPs with exception of Pt4 (fol. 55v line 4) in which it appears as the superscript pale word. As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, in agreement with the reading of the old YIndP J2, K5, kū ān ī nē abāyist hušk nē hušk is employed in the present edition.

9) Line 22 Y 9.4P xwarišn xwarān anabēhišn “food, while being eaten, was undiminishing”

In YInd J2, xwarān “food” is replaced by xward “(he) ate”. However, it is obvious that 3rd sg. past xward does not fit the context. Furthermore, xwarišn is attested in J2 sister manuscript, or K5, in agreement with which xwarišn is employed in the present edition.
4.5 Y 9.5

1 (Y 9.5aA) yimahe xšaðre auruuahe
2 nōi aotom āŋha nōi garmām
3 (Y 9.5bA) nōi zaurua āŋha nōi məʁəišuʃ
4 nōi araskə dačwən. dātə
5 (Y 9.5cA) paŋca dasa fracaroiišde pita
6 puðrasca raoðaεšuwa katarasçiŋ
7 (Y 9.5dA) yauuata xšaiiʃiʃ huwaθbō
8 yimō vivaŋj hato puθrō

1 (Y 9.5aA) At the rule of swift Yima,
2 there has been neither cold nor heat,
3 (Y 9.5bA) there has been neither old-age nor death,
4 nor demon-created envy.
5 (Y 9.5cA) With a growth of a fifteen-year old, father
6 and son, each, walked about,
7-8 (Y 9.5dA) as long as Yima of the good flocks, son of Vivahvant used to rule.

1 (Y 9.5aP) pad ān i jam xwadāyiĩh i arwand
2 nē sarmaŋ būd nē garmāg
3 (Y 9.5bP) nē zarmān būd ud nē margiĩ
4 ud nē arešk i dēwān dād
5 [hād hamāg būd be az wīnāh abāz dāst ēstād hēnd]
6 (Y 9.5cP) pāndah sālag ārōyišn frāz raft hēnd pid
7 ud pus kadār-iz-ē
8 [hād burzōy pad stāyišn i pusar guft
9 kū pus ēdōn nēk būd pid
10 pid ēdōn nēk būd ēryōn i pus]
11 (Y 9.5dP) hamē tā ka padixšā būd
12 huramag jam i [šēd] wīwanghān pus
13 [ēn tis ēdōn būd]

1 (Y 9.5aP) At the rule of the swift Jam,
2 there was neither cold nor heat,
3 (Y 9.5bP) there was neither old-age nor death
4 and nor the demon-created envy.
5 [That is: there was everything but they were kept from offense].
6 (Y 9.5cP) With a growth of a fifteen-year old, father
7 and son each other went forth1.
8 [That is: Burzōy said in the praise of the son2
9 that the son was as good as the father
10 (so), the father3 was as good as the son],
11-12 (Y 9.5dP) all the while that [the splendid] Jam4 of good flock, son of Wīwanghān
was the king
13 [this matter was so].
1) Line 6 Y.9.5cP frāz raft hēnd “went forth”

Av. fracarōiϑe “walked about” is translated by the 3rd pl. past ind. frāz raft hēnd “went forth” in Pahlavi. Although in Avestan the ending -ϑe functions as 3rd du. middle, it is originally a 2nd du. mid. ending. As regards the mood, it has been taken as the ind. pres. rather than opt. pres. by scholars. For example, de Vaan (2003: 349) rejects the phonetic development *-aēϑe > -ōiϑe in view of other instances such as gaēϑā-, gaēϑiia- and maēϑana- in which the mentioned development is absent. He suggests that probably -ōi-, derived from *-ai-, ‘has been retained in front of 2nd du. -ϑe- as a characteristic of the 2nd pl./2nd du. vs. *-ai- in the 3rd plural’.

As the ind. verb, Av. fracarōiϑe is preceded by the perfect ā̊ŋha “was” and followed by another verb in opt. mood, xšaiiōiϑ “(he) may rule”, describing all together an event in the past. Therefore, it has caused different interpretations. For example, Josephson (1997: 47-48) translates all verbs as the past tense; ā̊ŋha “was”, fracarōiϑe “walked about” and xšaiiōiϑ “exercised his power”. By contrast, Pirart (2004: 64, fn. 45, 48) mentions that fracarōiϑe and xšaiiōiϑ replace inj. *fracaraētmi and inj. *xšaiiaθ, respectively. However, Prirart’s suggestion is entirely hypothetical and is not supported by any of the manuscripts readings.

As far as the occurrence of the ind. fracarōiϑe in the past context is concerned, it has a parallel in Y.9.10 in which 3rd du. ind. us.zaiiōiϑe occurs in yaft hē puθra us.zaiiōiϑe uruwxšaiioθ korasāspasca “that two sons were born to him (Θrita), namely Urwāxšaiiai and Kōrasāspa”. Therefore, the ind. verb is translated as the past “went about” in the present edition to agree with the context of Y.9.5. In the Pahlavi version, the Avestan dual number of fracarōiϑe is represented by 3rd pl. auxilliary verb hēnd because Pahlavi only distinguishes between the sg. and pl. numbers.

As regards xšaiiōiϑ, it is known that the opt. ind. in the past context functions as optativus iterativus. However, Gonda (1956: 63-65), with regard to Y.9.5, suggests that optative may also have a potentialis sense:

“I would consider this use as follows: Here the person speaking is not able, or does not wish, to envisage the process as actual; he has no personal knowledge of Yima’s reign and wishing to be cautious and guarded in his statements he leaves some room for contingencies”.

338 See Reichelt (1909: 638, §308); Martinez & de Vaan (2014: §37, 102).
Accepting Gonda’s suggestion, Hoffmann (1976: 617) mentions that in addition to \(xšaiōi\), \(gərwzaēta\) (Yt 17.57, 58, 59) and \(fracaraēta\) (Yt 13.107) have also the same sense. However, in Y 9.5, \(xšaiōi\) in \(yauuata xšaiōi huuq\(\text{θ}β\)\(\text{o} yim\(\text{θ}v\)\(\text{v}v\)\(\text{h}\)\(\text{t}\)\(\text{h}\)\(\text{t}\)\(\text{o}\) can be translated as either “(as long as Yima) used to rule” or “(as long as Yima) is supposed or believed or traditionally held or said to have ruled”. Since in the past context, the pres. opt. often expresses optativus iterativus, \(xšaiōi\) is translated as “used to rule” in the present edition. By contrast, in the Pahlavi version \(xšaiōi\) is rendered by the simple past \(pādixšā būd\ “(he) was a king”.

2) Line 8 Y 9.5cP burzōy \(pad stāyiśn ī pusar guft\) “Burzōy said in the praise of the son”

Y 9.5 describes the rule of Yima as a time during which “with a growth of a fifteen-year old, father and son, each, walked about”:

\[Y 9.5 panca dasa fracarōi\(\text{θ}e pita\) pu\(\text{r}h\)rasca ra\(\text{daēši\(u\(u\)a katara\(\text{sc}i\(\text{θ}\})\}

The Avesta original is followed by the Zand in which \(bwlc(w)k\) occurs after \(hād\):

\[pānzdah sālag ārōyiśn frāz raft hēnd pid ud pus kadār-iz-\(ē\) [hād \(bwlc(w)k\) pad stāyiśn ī pusar guft kū pus ēdōn nēk būd pid pid ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn ī pus]\] With a growth of a fifteen-year old, father and son each other went forth. [That is: \(bwlc(w)k\) said in the praise of the son that the son was as good as the father (so), the father was as good as the son]

While YIrPs write \(bwlc\), YIndPs attest \(bwlcwk\). In addition, YIndP J2 provides a unique commentary, different from that of the other manuscripts as follows:

\[pānzdah sālag ārōyiśn frāz raft hēnd pid ud pus kadār-iz-\(ē\) J2 fol 83r lines 8-11 [hād ud \(bwlcwk\) ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn pus pad stāyiśn ī pusar guft kū pus ēdōn nēk būd pid ud pid ī ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn pus]\] J2 fol 83r lines 8-11 [That is, and \(bwlcwk\) was as good as the son. In the praise of the son, it is said]
that the son was as good as the father
and, the father was as good as the son.]

In J2, ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn pus occurs twice at the beginning and at the end of the commentary while in the other manuscripts, it is only present at the end of the commentary. However, the reading of the Pahlavi word in J2 is semantically problematic because bwlcwk as the proper noun must be considered as the father of the son. But, it is obvious that while the text is about the glorious period of Jam during which everybody was young, father and son only occur as two examples of young people. Furthermore, the name of the father and son, living in the reign of Jam, are not mentioned in Pahlavi. Therefore, since in the J2 sister manuscripts, K5, ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn pus is absent after bwlcwk, the variant reading of J2 should be associated with scribal correction or mistake.

Nēryosangh, in his Sanskrit version of the Yasna, gives the dvandva composition pūjāvinayakau “reverence and respect” as the Sanskrit translation of bwlc(w)k (Unvala 1924: 12-13). In the interlinear New Persian version of F2 (fol. 53v line 4) and T6 (fol. 45v line 6), bwlc is translated by zibdār (زیدار) “beautiful” and lāyeq va zibdār (لایق و زیدار) “eligible and beautiful”, respectively. However, it is obvious that the New Persian and Sanskrit versions provide neither the proper semantic nor etymological translations of the Pahlavi word because none of the translations agree with the meaning of the word bwlc(w)k which is undoubtedly derived from the root OIr. *barz “to be high”.

Associating bwlc(w)k with pid ud pus, Mills (1903c: 318) and Davar (1904: 17, 33-34) translate it as “grand” and “splendid”, respectively. It is obvious that Mills provides a free translation of the Pahlavi word. Davar (1904: 17, 33-34) suggests that it is the gloss to ārōyišn, translating the Avestan loc. pl. raađaēšuua “in growths”. To explain his suggestion, Davar mentions that the order of the original Avestan paṇça dasa fracarōīde pita pūdrasca raađaēšuua katarasciṭ is not retained in pāṇzdah sālag ārōyišn frāz raft hēnd pid ud pus kadār-iz-ē as ārōyišn should have occurred after pus. Although Davar is right in stating that the Pahlavi redaction disagrees with the usual translation technique, there is no evidence to show that the Pahlavi word appearing several words after ārōyišn, is the gloss to ārōyišn. Furthermore, while the meaning “grand” is usually rendered by wc(w)lg (wuzurg), it is never implied by bwlc (burzag) in the Pahlavi literature as far as I know. It is possible to interpret burzag as “high”. However, although OIr. *brz-aka- occurs in Sogdian and Khotanese as βrzʾk- (brzē) “long” and balysga- “high”, respectively, in Middle and New Persian, adjectives denoting height from the root *barz usually appear as buland “high, tall”, burz
“high” and bālāy “height”.  

By contrast, it seems that the gloss hād bwlc(w)k pad stāyišn ī pusar guft follows the usual commentary beginning formula according to which the commentaries are introduced by using the verb guftan “to say” in two ways: 1) ast kē ēdōn gōwēd “there is one who says”, if the commentator is anonymous; 2) the name of the commentator is followed by guft “said” (Cantera 2004: 207-208). As far as hād bwlc(w)k pad stāyišn ī pusar guft is concerned, it follows the second formula:

the name of the commentator + guft “said”

hād bwlc(w)k pad stāyišn ī pusar guft pus ēdōn nēk būd ī pid ...

Interpreting bwlc(w)k as the name of a Pahlavi commentator, the next problem is that whether the word should be edited in agreement with YIrPs as bwlc(w)k “Burzag” or with their Indian counterparts as bwlc(w)k “Borzōg, Burzōy”. As far as the first reading is concerned, burzag (OIr.*bhrz-aka-) as a proper name occurs in New Persian. Although such a name is uncommon, it occurs at least twice in DHR (Vol II, 153) as the name of a priest from Kerman. For example:

be šahr andarān bod be rēš-i spēd/māvindād-i hōšang-u burzak umēd
zi burzak umēd dō pus yād dār/syāvaxš meh kehtarīn šahryār

In the city, with the white beard/were Māvindād son of Hōšang and Burzak son of Umēd. Remember the two sons of Burzak son of Umēd/(who are) Syāvaxš as the older and Šahryār as the younger (son).

As for bwlc(w)k, it corresponds to burzōy (پرزوری), burzō (پرزور) and burzōya (پرزوریه), occurring several times in the early New Persian and Arabic sources. Therefore, the spelling of bwlc(w)k must be historical according to which it is transcribed as burzōy in the present edition. Nöledeke (1888: 4-31) investigates the Iranian names ending in -ōy and -ōya in the New Persian, Arabic, Greek, and Aramaic texts. He shows that -ōya (ویه) is an Arabic pronunciation of the Middle Persian suffix -ōy, making hypocoristic names. He confirms the Middle Iranian origin of the suffix -ōy by giving examples of the Iranian names in the Armenian, Greek and Syriac sources which end in ōy (Nöledeke 1888: 8-16). In addition, the

341 For the names in the New Persian and Arabic sources see Justi (1895: 74). For burzōy, a Sasanian physician and the translator of the Sanskrit texts into Pahlavi see de Blois (1990).
The name of burzōy (bwrzy) appears in the Syriac text of the Christian martyrs as the name of a Christian master in the seventh century (Hoffmann 1880: 93). Rastorgueva and Molcanova (1981b: 195, §8) derive the suffix -ōg from *(a)va-ka. Moreover, like Nöledeke, they suggest that the suffix originally had the diminutive sense (Rastorgueva and Molcanova 1981a: 70, §7). By contrast, Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 161, §309) states that the formation of the suffix -ōg is unclear in the Western Middle Iranian languages. As far as *b̥r̥z-va-ka > burzōg > burzōy > burzō is concerned, it, at least, agrees with the rules of the Indo-Iranian word formation according to which the suffix -va is attached to the zero grade of the verbs (Jackson 1892: 226, §819). In addition, the suffix -ka forms hypocoristic names (AiGr. II 2, 517, §361b). Moreover, the three stages of the suffix development of -ōg > -ōy > -ō are attested, for example in the Pahlavi historical spelling bwlcwk, burzōy in the Šāhnāma (ed. Bertels, vol. VIII, 248, v 3342) and burzō, the name of a composer of the Persian Rivāyat in the 17th century (Justi 1895: 74).

In conclusion, the evidence shows that bwlc or bwlcwk is the name of an Avesta exegete. In the present edition, following the reading of the old YIndP J2, K5, burzōy is chosen.

As regards burzōy, the most important Sasanian figure who can be identified with the Avestan commentator is burzōy, the physician, living during the reign of Husraw I (531-579 AC), who translated Pañcatantra from Sanskrit into Middle Persian which is known in Arabic and New Persian as Kalila va Dimna. In the introduction of the text, found in all non-mutilated Arabic and old manuscripts, burzōy describes his father as a military man and associates his mother with the houses of the greatest scholars of the Zoroastrian religion:

KM. 79

\begin{quote}
\text{إن أبي كان من المقاتلة و كانت أمي من عظام بيوت الزمازمة}
\end{quote}

\text{inna 'bi kāna min al-maqātila wa kānat ummi min 'üzma' boyuti az-zamāzima}

My father was from the military and my mother from the houses of the greatest scholars of the Zoroastrian religion.\footnote{See de Blois (1990: 24-33).}

Furthermore, Burzōy states in his autobiography that at the beginning ‘I came to hold medicine in contempt and to long for religious studies’. However, later, he becomes suspicious to the legitimacy of all religions saying: ‘In none of them (religions) I find that degree of honesty and rightmindedness which would induce rational persons to accept their words and be satisfied with them’ (de Blois 1990: 26). Therefore, it is unlikely that the

\footnote{My translation.}
Avestan commentator was the same person as the physician of the court of Husraw I.

The second nominee could be the Sasanian king Bahram V who, according to the Šāhnāma (ed. Bertels, vol. VII, 422, v 2071), went as a unanimous messenger from Iran to the court of the Indian king, Šengol and introduced himself as Burzōy:

Gar az nām pursē-yam burzōy nām/cenin xvāndam šāh-u ham bāb-u mām
if you ask the name, (my) name is Burzōy/king, father and mother called me such.\textsuperscript{344}

However, it is obvious that Burzōy was Bahrām’s fake name in the court of Šengol. Furthermore, no king is reported to be an exegete of the Avesta.

The third possible candidate, according to the Muʿjam al-Buldān, is a Zoroastrian from the city of Buxārā whose name according to Justi (1895: 74) is recorded in the manuscripts as either Burdzbih or Burzōy:

MB. Vol I, 35

Yansibo ilā buxārā xalqon kaširon min ’ima fi fonuni šattā minhom imām ’hl ’l-hadīṣ ’bu ’abd-’llāh muḥammad ibn ismāʿil ibn ʿabīrāhīm ibn muqayrat ibn burdzbih (or burzōy) wa burdzbih majusi ’slama ’lā yadi yamān ’l-buxārī

Many Imams in different fields are assigned to Buxārā; among them is the traditionalist Imam Abu Abd-Allah Muhammad ibn Ismail ibn Ibrahim Muqairat ibn Burdzbih (or Burzōy) and Burdzbeh (or Burzōy) was a Zoroastrian who was converted to Islam by the hand of Yamān al-Buxari.\textsuperscript{345}

However, it unclear whether or not Burzōy from Buxārā was a priest because \textit{al-majus} is a general term in Arabic denoting “Zoroastrians” (Ambros 2004: 310). Moreover, converted people are infamous in the Zoroastrian literature. For example, the accursed Abālīh.\textsuperscript{346} Therefore, it is unlikely that the name of Burzōy from Buxārā was recorded in the Zoroastrian texts as a commentator.

Thus, the Avestan commentator, Burzōy, cannot be identified with any of the characters mentioned above. However, the evidence shows that Burzōy was a common name in Iran. For example, Justi (1895: 74) reports seven characters called Burzōy, living from the sixth to seventeenth century. Therefore, Burzōy, the Avestan commentator of Y 9.5 according to

\textsuperscript{344} My translation.

\textsuperscript{345} My translation.

\textsuperscript{346} See Chacha (1936).
YIndPs, is probably a new figure, unrelated to the known ones.

3) **Line 10 Y 9.5cP** *pid “father”*

Lines 9-10 appear as follows in the Iranian manuscripts with exception of F2:

\[ YIrP \text{ Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6, T55b: kū pus ēdōn nēk būd pid ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn ī pus]^{347} \]

By contrast, in YIrP F2; YIndP J2, K5 M1, *ud pid* appears between *kū pus ēdōn nēk būd pid* and *ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn ī pus*. For example:

\[ YIrP \text{ K5 (fol. 62r line 7-8): kū pus ēdōn nēk būd pid ud pid ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn ī pus} \]

The mentioned passage has two sentences, both of which are governed by the verb *būd*. It is also obvious that the both sentences need a subject. However, the second sentence in the Iranian manuscripts is left subjectless. Without a subject, *ēdōn nēk būd čiyōn pus* “was as good as the son” is incomplete. It seems that the deletion of one *pid* is due to correction according to which it was considered as the erroneous repetition of former *pid*.\(^{348}\)

4) **Line 12 Y 9.5dP** *jam ī [šēd] “splendid Jam”*

The manuscripts G14 and T6 write *jamšēd (yımšyt)* as the Pahlavi form of the Av. *yima-,* probably influenced by its corresponding univerbed form *جةمشید* (= Phl. *jam ī šēd*) in New Persian. By contrast, the form appears as *jam ī šēd* in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, F2, T6, T55b and YIndP J2, K5, M1. In the present edition, employing *jam ī šēd, šēd “splendid”* is interpreted as the gloss to *jam.*

\(^{347}\) For minor variations see text-critical apparatus.

\(^{348}\) For correction see section 2.1 and 3.1.
4.6 Y 9.6

1 (Y 9.6aA) kasə 9βaṃ
2 bittiō haōma mašiiō
3 astuuaiiiiiāi hunūta gaēδiiāi
4 kā ahmai ašiš ṽrṇāuui
5 eŋ ahmaii jasaŋ aiiaptəm

1-3 (Y 9.6aA) Who, O Haōma, as the second mortal pressed you for the material creature?
4 What reward was granted to him?
5 What boon came to him?

1 (Y 9.6aP) kē tō
2 dudīgar hōm az mardōmān
3 andar astōmandān gēhān hunūd hē
4 kē ān tarsagāhīh kard
5 [ān nēkīh kū tā-m bawāḍ]
6 ud ēō ōy mad ābādīh

1-3 (Y 9.6aP) Who, as the second one, O Hōm, among men in the material world pressed¹ you,
4 what respect was shown to him?²
5 [That goodness so that it will be mine],
6 and what prosperity³ came to him?

1) Line 3 Y 9.6aP hunīd “pressed”

Phl. hunīd in the ergative construction hunīd hē, renders 3rd sg. inj. hunūta “pressed”. In YIrP Pt4 (fol. 56r line 4), the subj. pres. hunād (hw’n-’i)³⁴⁹ replaces hunīd. However, elsewhere in Y 9.3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, hunūta is correctly translated in Pt4. Therefore, it seems that hunād in Y 9.6 is to be regarded as a scribal unintentional mistake rather than a correction.

2) Line 4 Y 9.6aP kē ān tarsagāhīh kard “what respect was shown to him?”

The Pahlavi sentence kē ān tarsagāhīh kard is the translation of Av. kā ahmāi ašiš ṽrṇāuui. The words kē ... tarsagāhīh render Av. kā ... ašiš and Phl. ān “that” translates dat. sg. ahmāi “to him”. As far as the verb is concerned, the Avestan passive ṽrṇāuui “was granted” of the root ar “to grant”³⁵⁰ is translated by kard “did, performed” in Y 9.6 and

³⁴⁹ For hunīd see Hülsemann (1978: 135f).
elsewhere in Y 9 where ārṇāuuī recurs. In addition, the present stem of the root ar and its Pahlavi translation are attested in Y 52.3 and Y 56.3-4:

Y 52.3A ... yāṣanō mazištāsc vaḥištāsc sraēštāsc aṣaiīō ārṇāuuante

(Good retributions and good rewards and better leaders) as the greatest and the best and the most beautiful rewards, will be granted to us.

Y 52.3P ... ētyōn amāh mahist ud pahlom ud nēktom tarsagāhīh kunēd

(The better donation and better respect) like the greatest and the best and the most beautiful respect, are shown to us.

Y 56.3A ... vaŋhuiĭāscā aṣ̌ōiš yasnāi yā.ə ūraėcā ārṇāuuataēcā ...

and (May Sraoša be here) for the worship of good Reward that has been granted to us that will be granted to us ...

Y 56.3P ... ud pad hān ī weh tarsagāhīh yazīśn kē amāh kardār hēm

[yazīšn kū-mān tuwān bawād kardan pad tarsagāhīh]

ka ūh kunēm ā-mān ...

(May there be hearkening for the worship of the good waters, and for those and (of those) who are the good male and female beings, who are Amahraspands of good reign, the beneficent), the good and for the worship with good respect, whose performers we are.

[an act of worship which may it be possible for us to perform with respect], when we perform it in the usual way ...

As mentioned above in Y 9, the -i passive form ārṇāuuī is translated by the past stem kard. In Y 52.3 and Y 56.3, the Avestan 3rd pl. subj. middle ārṇāuante and 3rd sg. subj. mid. ārṇāuuataēcā are rendered by 3rd sg. pres. ind. kunēd and 1st pl. pres. ind. kunēm, respectively. Therefore, the evidence shows that the verbs from the root ar “to grant” are translated in Pahlavi by kardan “to do, to perform”.

As far as the passive ārṇuuntu is concerned, the ending -i is attached to the present stem. Although such passive verbs are usually formed by the attachment of -i to the aorist stem,

351 Av. kā ahmāi aṣiš ārṇuuntu occurs in Y 9.3, 6, 9, 12 and its answer hā ahmāi aṣiš ārṇuuntu appears in Y 9.4, 7, 10, 13.
353 My translation. The reason for translating kardan governing tarsagāhīh as “to show” appears at the end of the present commentary, also see section 1. Edition by Dhabhar (1949: 229)
354 The text is after Kreyenbroek (1985: 72-73).
355 In the Pahlavi version of Y 56.3, niyōxšišn translates sraoša-.
356 The text is after Kreyenbroek (1985: 72-73). The Avestan and Pahlavi texts are repeated in Y 56.4 with minor variations.
there are isolated verbal forms in Young Avestan whose passive -i forms are made of other stems, i.e. jaini from the present stem jan of the root jan “to kill” and āiđi from the perfect stem ād- of the root ad “to say”. Since both jaini and āiđi are found in Yt 19.92-93 and Yt 8.46, respectively, lacking the Pahlavi version, it is impossible to study their Pahlavi translation technique. By contrast, OAv. auucī and vacī from the root vak “to say”, cəuuīšī of the root cis “to gather” and srāuuī from the root srauu “to hear” are translated in Pahlavi as follows:358

Y 36.6A. ... yāti huuarā auucī ... [= Y 27.15]  
(We now declare, O Ahura Mazdā, that this light here) was called the sun.359  
Y 36.6P ... kū ān ī xwaršēd guft ...  
... (the light) which was called the sun ... 360

In the above example, 3rd sg. passive aor. auucī “was called” is rendered by the Pahlavi past tense guft which can be translated as either “said, called” or “was said, was called”. However, according to the agentless kū ān ī xwaršēd guft, it should be interpreted as the passive.

In the Pahlavi version of Y 43.13, 3rd sg. passive aor. vacī “was said” is rendered by the 3rd sg. ind. past guft “said, announced”:

Y 43.13A ... tōm mōi dātā  
darogahiī yaoš ...  
vairiūś stōiś yā Ḯbahmī xṣaṛroī vacī  
... give (Ahura Mazdā) this  
of the long life to me, ...  
that of a chosen existence which was said (to be) under your rule.361

Y 43.13P ān ō man dahēd [mizd]  
pad dagr-rasiśnīh ī gyān [pad tan ī pasēn]...

357 Kellens (1984: 45, fn. 3) points out that since the formation of -i passive from the perfect stem is unlikely, it is better either to emend āiđi to āide, according to the reading of the Yašt manuscript J10, or to interpret it as the 2nd ipt. pres. of the stem ā-i- “to come”.
358 See Hoffmann & Forssman (1996: 228, §133.3) and Martinez & de Vaan (2014: 89, §32.1c). Moreover, mraoī in Y 32.14 which is conventionally regarded as the -i aorist form, has been challenged by Humbach (1959: II, 37) according to whom the aorist stem of the root mṛū is supplemented by the root vac “to speak”. Therefore, Pahlavi translation of mraoī is not discussed in the present edition. For the translation technique of the aorist verbs see Cantera (2004: 289-290).
pad kāmag ēstād u-š ēd ĕ tō xwadāyīh guft ...

He gives it [reward] to me,
in a long arriving of life, [in the final body] …
He stood at (your) wish and this is that he announced your lordship … 362

In contrast to Av. vācī, the Pahlavi verb guft in Y 43.13 governs an active sentence whose agent is the enclitic pronoun -š. In Y 51.15, c̄wāūišī “was promised” is translated by čāšīd “taught”:

Y 51.15A ... tā vō vohū manaŋhā ašāicā sauūāiš c̄wāūišī
… because of it (Zarašuštra’s promise), (the award) has been promised to you all with abundance by Vohu Manah and Aša.363

Y 51.15P ... ān ĕ ašmā wahman pad ahlāyīh sūd čāšīd [kū sūd pad frārōnīh kunēd]
Whman taught the benefit to you through righteousness
[That means: He makes benefit by honesty].364

A comparison between two versions of Y 51.15 shows that while the inst. sg. ašāicā “and with Aša (Truth)” is rendered by pad ahlāyīh “through righteousness”, the inst sg. vohū manaŋhā “with the Good Thought” and inst. pl. sauūāiš “with benefits” are given in the Pahlavi versions as wahman “Good Thought” and sūd “benefit” without a preposition, expressing the Avestan instrumental case. Therefore, it seems that wahman and sūd are to be considered as the subject and object of the verb čāšīd “taught”, respectively. Regarding the translation of ašmā as oblique, corresponding to Av. vō “to you”, it should be mentioned that as discussed below, the Avestan dative can also be expressed in Pahlavi by placing the words near the beginning of the verse.

As far as Av. srāuuī “was famed, was heard” is concerned, it occurs in Y 45.10 and Y 53.1:

Y 45.10A tōm nō yasnāiš ārmatōiš mimarzō
vō qnmōnī mazdā srāuuī ahurō ...
I shall give presents to him for us with the worship of right-mindedness, the Wise who was famed in soul, the Lord … .

Y 45.10 Pān in ṣoy yazišn amāh pad bowandag menišnīh hamēšag menišn kē pad any nāmīh srūd ēstēd xwaday in dānāg …

By the worship, we (are) in right-mindedness, eternal-mindedness, who was proclaimed with another name, Wise Lord … .

Y 53.1A vahištā tīštī srāuūī zarāduštrahē …

The best wish of Zarāuštra Spitāma was heard … .

Y 53.1P pahlom xwāhišnīh sraw in zaradušt …

The best wish (is) the word of Zaradušt … .

According to the Pahlavi version of Y 45.10, Av 3rd sg. passive aor. srāuūī “was famed” is translated by srūd “recited, proclaimed” in combination with the auxiliary ēstēd in a passive context. By contrast, in Y 53.1, srāuūī “was heard” is rendered by the Pahlavi noun sraw “word”. Apart from Y 45.10 and Y 53.1, srāuūī also appears in Y 32.8:

Y 32.8A aēšąm aēnaŋhąm vīuuaŋḥušō srāuūī yimasci …

Even Yima of Vīuuuaṅhaṅtr was tried for these sins … .

Y 32.8P awēšān [dēwān] kēnīg [wināhgār] an i wiwanghānān jam srūd …

Jam son of Wiwanghān was proclaimed by those [demons], malicious [offender] … .

In the Pahlavi version of Y32.8, srūd “proclaimed” in awēšān [dēwān] kēnīg [wināhgār] an i wiwanghānān jam srūd (word for word translation): “them-[demons]-malicious-[offender] that-of-son-of-Wiwanghān-Jam-proclaimed” could be interpreted as either a passive or an active verb. But since the context is about the trial of Yima and awēšān … kēnīg corresponds to gen. pl. aēšąm aēnaŋhąm, therefore, the sentence should be agentless and consequently, the passive translation of the verb seems to be more justifiable.

Finally, in FīO. 215, 3rd sg. passive aor. vərədī “(s/he) was grown” is translated by wālīd ēstē “(you) were grown, (you) may be grown”.
According to the above examples, the Pahlavi translations of -i passive forms outside the Hōm Yasht can be summarized as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avesta</th>
<th>Pahlavi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 36.6 auuācī “was called”</td>
<td>guft “was said, was called”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 43.13 vācī “was said”</td>
<td>guft “said”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 51.15 cəuuīšī “was promised”</td>
<td>ċāšīd “taught”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 45.10 srāuuī “was famed”</td>
<td>srūd ēstēd “was proclaimed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 53.1 srāuuī “was heard”</td>
<td>sraw “word”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 32.8 srāuuī “was tried”</td>
<td>srūd “was proclaimed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FīO vərədī “(s/he) is grown”</td>
<td>wālīd ēstē “(you) are grown”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table, in four out of six instances (Y 36.6; 45.10; 32.8; FīO. 215), -i aorist passive verbs are rendered by the Pahlavi past tense verbs in passive sentences. In two examples (Y 43.13, 51.15), the Pahlavi past tense guft and cāšīd “taught” are transitive. In Y 53.1, srāuuī “was heard” is rendered by the Pahlavi noun sraw “word” and in the last example from FīO. 215, 3rd sg. vərədī is given by 2nd sg. wālīd ēstē “(you) are grown”. In conclusion, according to the evidence, the translation of -i passive aorist verbs is inconsistent in Pahlavi and it seems that translators did not know the function of the ending -i.

Regarding the Phl. ān, translating dat. ahmāi, in kē ān tarsagāhīh kard in Y 9.6 and other stanzas with the similar formulaic structure, Josephson (1997: 127) states that:

‘Sometimes the dative case encoding a word is not rendered by a preposition. In these passages dative case is indicated by the positioning of the word near the beginning of the verse where it stands unmarked.’

Therefore, ān is translated as “to him” in the present edition. Moreover, Phl. tarsagāh, literally meaning “the consciousness of fear or awe”, is regularly used to render the Avestan common noun aṣi- “reward”. It has been interpreted as “obedient”, “pious”, “respectful”, “devoted”, “reverent”, and “reverential” by scholars. Its abstract noun or tarsagāhīh,

---

372 Y 9.3, 9 and 12.
occurring in Y 9.3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, is also interpreted as “obedience”, “devotion”, “reverence”, “respect”, “veneration”, “piety”, “dutiful, submission” and “consideration”. Based on the Av. ašī-, Josephson (1997: 44) translates it as “reward”. In the present edition “respect” is chosen while it is also possible to replace it with other interpretations. Since kē ... tarsagāhīh kard can no longer be translated “what respect was made” in English, it is translated by “what respect was shown” in the present edition.

3) Line 6 Y 9.6aP ābādhīh “prosperity”

Elsewhere in Y 9, Av. āiiapta- has consistently been translated in the collated manuscripts by ābādhīh which also renders Av. vohu- in vīspa- vohu- “all good (things)”. However, in Y 9.6, ābādhīh only occurs in J2. It is replaced by nēkīh in YIrP Pt4, F2, T5b and YIndP K5, M1. By contrast, in YIrP G14 and T6, nēkīh ud ābādhīh appears. Writing nēkīh, Mf4 writes ābādhīh in the margin of p. 153:

Figure 29. YIrP Mf4 (p. 151 line 3).

As regards the editorial judgement, all of the mentioned variant readings semantically fit the context, however, as mentioned above, ābādhīh is the expected translation of Av. āiiapta-. Furthermore, the question ud čē ő ōy mad ābādhīh/nēkīh in Y 9.6 is answered by ud ő ōy mad ābādhīh in Y 9.7. Therefore, the reading of J2, or the sister manuscript of the base text K5, is employed in the present edition. This would be in keeping with Greg’s (1950: 29) definition of the principles of the copy-text in which substantive readings found in a text of similar substantive authority as the chosen one can be selected.

374 See Davar (1904: 30); Mills (1903c: 319); Dhabhar (1949: gloss 94); MacKenzie (1971: 82).
375 For the Pahlavi translation of vīspa- vohu- see Cantera (2004: 180).
4.7 Y 9.7

1 (Y 9.7aA) ānt mē aēm paitiaaxta
2 haōmō ašauua dūrāošō
3 (Y 9.7bA) āṭbīiō mām bītiō mašīō
4 astuuaaṭtiāī hunūta gaṭṭiāī
5 hā ahmāi ašī ṣrānāuui
6 taṭ ahmāi jasaṭ aiiaptām
7 (Y 9.7cA) yaṭ hē puḍrā us.zaiata
8 visō.sūriiāī ṣraētaonō

1 (Y 9.7aA) Thereupon, he answered me
2 the righteous Haōma whose destruction is difficult:
3-4 (Y 9.7bA) Āṇḍīiia, as the second mortal, pressed me for the material creature.
5 This reward was granted to him,
6 this boon came to him,
7 (Y 9.7cA) that a son was born to him,
8 Ṣraētaona of powerful clan.

1 (Y 9.7aP) ō man ōy passōx guft
2 hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrō
3 (Y 9.7bP) āṣpiyān man duḍīgar az mardōmān
4 andar astōmandān gēhān hunīd ham
5 ōy ān tarsagāhī h kard
6 ud ō ōy mad ābādīh
7 (Y 9.7cP) kē az ōy pus ul zād
8 kē abzārwis frēdōn
9 ĥād abzārwisīh ēd būd kū
10 xānag-ē az abarmānd ī pidarān was būd
11 ān-ī ī dahāg pad stahmakīh abāz grift
12 u-š xwadāyiīh ēd xwēšāwandīh paydāg nē būd ōy dāšt]

1 (Y 9.7aP) He answered me,
2 Hōm, who is righteous (and) averts perdition:
3-4 (Y 9.7bP) Āṣpiyān as the second one among men pressed me in the material world.
5 The respect was shown to him,
6 and the prosperity came to him,1
7 (Y 9.7cP) that a son was born from him,
8 who is Frēdōn of the powerful clan.
9 [That is: Being of powerful clan was this that2
10 there was a house (full of) many (instruments) from the inheritance of ancestors3
11 that which Dahāg had taken with violence
12 and his lordship is this: He preserved the relativeness which was not obvious].
1) Line 6 Y 9.7bP ō āy mad ābādīh “the prosperity came to him”

In YIrP Pt4, Mf4 and T55b, āy is followed by ān, making the sentence ō āy ān mad ābādīh. It seems that as a gloss, ān “that” should be associated with ābādīh: “to him that prosperity came”. However, apart from Y 9.7, in the mentioned manuscripts, ān is absent in their texts of Y 9.3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 in which the same formulaic structure ō āy mad ābādīh occurs. In the present edition, in agreement with YIndP J2, K5, M1 and YIrP G14 F2 T6, āy is only employed.

2) Line 9 Y 9.7cP hād abzārwisīh ēd būd kū “That is: Being of powerful clan was this that”

In Y 9.7, Frēdōn carries the epithet abzārwis which is the translation of the Avestan word vīsō.sūraiiā̊. According to the commentary, he was given this epithet because of his victory over Dahāg and returning the inheritance which Dahāg had taken with force. In addition to abzārwis, Frēdōn bears the epithets purr:pērōzgar “very victorious”, tagīg “valiant” and zōrig “powerful” in the Pahlavi literature because of his triumph over Dahāg (Tafazzoli 1999: 531).

Regarding the reading ēd (HN’) “this”, it is replaced by ‘w’ in YIrP Pt4, T55b. Otherwise, in YIrP Mf4, both variants are attested as ‘w’ HN’. As discussed in section 2.1 and 3.1, the larger degree of variation in the YIrP manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line is one of the features suggesting scribal correction. As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, the evidence favours ēd because it is attested in both old YIrP J2, K5 and YIrP Mf4, G14, T6 of the Hōšang ī Syāwaxš-line. Furthermore, the reading of YIndPs and YIrP manuscripts G14, F2, T6 agrees with ēd kū formula which is often used to introduce short explanatory commentaries. Moreover, abzārwisīh ēd forms the ēd ... ēd repetition style with the following xwadāyīh ēd:

\[
\text{hād abzārwisīh ēd būd kū} \\
\text{xānag-ē az abarmānd ī pidarān was būd} \\
\text{ān-īz ī dahāg pad stahmakīh abāz grift} \\
\text{u-š xwadāyīh ēd xwēšāwandīh paydāg nē būd āy dāšt}
\]

Preceding the verb būd “was”, the likeliest reading of the spelling ‘w’ is ūh “in the usual way”.

Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.

For ēd kū formula see Cantera (2015a).
For *kū*, it appears as *kū-š* in YIrP F2, YIndP J2. However, as far as the editorial judgement is concerned, in agreement with the reading of the base text, the variant *kū* is employed in the present edition.

3) **Line 10 Y 9.7cP** xānag-ē az abarmānd ī pidarān was būd “there was a house (full of) many (instruments) from the inheritance of ancestors”

With the exception of YIrP F2 and YIndP J2, Phl. *xānag* is followed by *ē* according to whose position in the sentence, it can only be interpreted as the indefinite article *ē*. Moreover, Phl. *was* is omitted in YIrP G14 and T6.\(^{379}\) By contrast, it is attested in its related Iranian manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line\(^{380}\) and the old YIndP J2 and K5. Therefore, in agreement with the reading of the majority of manuscripts, *was* is employed in the present edition. As far as the noun of *was* adj. is concerned, the adjective occurs in *hād abzārwisīh ēd būd kū xānag-ē az abarmānd ī pidarān was būd ān-iz ī dahāg pad stahmakīh abāz grift*. The Pahlavi sentences after *ēd* explain why Frēdōn is called *abzārwis*. It seems that *xānag* is the gloss to *wis*, the first element of *abzārwisīh*. As regards *abzār*, in Pahlavi, it can mean either “power, skill, powerful” or “instrument, means”.\(^{381}\) According to the context of the passage, the Pahlavi commentator probably considered the second meaning of *abzār* and associated it with *was* “many”. Therefore, the commentary explains that there were many instruments (*abzār*) in the *wis* i. e. *xānag* “house” but they were usurped by Dahāg. Later, Frēdōn took them after his victory over Dahāg.

---

\(^{379}\) According to the Gujarati colophon of T6, it was copied from G14. See section 2.2.

\(^{380}\) Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōshng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.

4.8 Y 9.8

1 (Y 9.8aA) yō janaṭ aẓīm dahākəm
2 ẓrī.ẓafanəm ẓritāməɾədəm
3 ẓsīuaś aẓīm hazaynara ẏoxštīm
4 (Y 9.8bA) aṣ.əojanəm daēuūm drujam
5 aym gaēṯāuviū druaṃtəm
6 (Y 9.8cA) yam aṣ.oajastməm drujam
7 fraça kəɾənətə aṣ.əmjən məniiuṣ
8 aoi yam astuuañüm gaēṯəm
9 mahrkāi aṣ.əhə gaēṯənəm

1 (Y 9.8aA) Who slew the dragon Dahāka,
2 the three-muzzled, three headed,
3 six-eyed, having a thousand skills,
4 (Y 9.8bA) the very powerful, the Demoness Deceit,
5 wicked for the living creatures, deceitful,
6 (Y 9.8cA) whom as the most powerful Deceit
7 the Evil Spirit mis-created
8 against the material world
9 for the destruction of the creature of the Truth.

1 (Y 9.8aP) kē-š zad az ī dahāg
2 ī sē zafar ī sē kamāl
3 ī ṣaṣ aṣ ī hazaóżəštər [ī adādag pad gōhrag]
4 (Y 9.8bP) was ōz dēw druz
5 ī wattar ō gēhān [zyān kār] ī druand
6 (Y 9.8cP) kē-š was ōztom druz
7 frāz kirrēnūd gannāg mēnōy
8 abar ō astōmandān gēhān
9 pad margīh ī ān ahlāyiīh ī gēhān
10 [kū-š az druz ī gētī ī stahmagtar dād
11 kō ʃəqim yim ahuɾmən mazdaq
12 ān ēd āmir kū
13 har ān zyān ī-š pad dāmān ī āhrmazd tuwān būd
14 ā-š be kard
15 ud im būd tis ī-š tuwān būd kardan
16 u-š nē kard]

1 (Y 9.8aP) Who slew¹ the dragon Dahāg²,
2 the three-muzzled, three-headed,
3 six-eyed, (having the skills of) a thousand investigators³ [who is unjust by essence],
4 (Y 9.8bP) of many powers⁴ Demon(ess) Deceit,⁵
5 worse for the material world⁶ [doer of harm], deceitful
6 (Y 9.8cP) whom as the most powerful Deceit,
7 the Evil Spirit mis-created⁷
8 against the material world,
9 for the destruction of the righteousness of the world
[which he, among the deceit of the world, created that one the more oppressive
Who (grieves) you, who are Ahura Mazdā?
that the reckoning of this⁸ is that
each harm which could be done by her against the creatures of Ohrmazd
then, she did⁹
and this meant the thing that she could do,¹⁰
he did not do].

1) Line 1 Y 9.8aP kē-š zad “Who slew”

In the Pahlavi version of YIrP Pt4 (superscript, fol. 56v line 1), G14 (fol. 55r line 8) and T6 (fol. 46v line 2-3), the commentary kū band kard “that means: He fettered” is inserted between kē-š zad “who slew” and az ī dahāg “the dragon Dahāg”. It is omitted in the present edition because as discussed in section 2.1 and 3.1, the manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line³⁸² have the features of Jāmāsp’s post arrival corrected manuscripts. One of these features, is the presence of commentaries which are absent in the older copies. The suggested correction is corroborated by the fact that the commentary is absent in Mf4 and T55b. The former contains the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš and T55b is closely related to Pt4. Furthermore, in Pt4, the New Persian object postposition rāy follows dahāg in kē-š zad kū band kard az ī dahāg rāy. It shows that under the influence of New Persian, the scribe of Pt4 corrected the construction of the text from the ergative to its accusative counterpart.

The inserted commentary in Pt4, G14 and T6 shows the influence of a story which is absent in the Avesta. According to the Pahlavi literature, Ohrmazd warned Frēdōn not to kill the dragon Dahāg lest creatures be born from his dead body:

Dk. Book VI. …frēdōn az ī dahāg āzadan kāmist ohrmazd guft kū-š nūn ma ōzan čē purs ī³⁸³ ēn zamīg xrafstar bawēd.

Frēdōn wanted to kill Az ī Dahāg. Ohrmazd said that do not kill him now, because this earth may become full of noxious animals.³⁸⁴

Therefore, Frēdōn fettered Dahāg who will be slain by Kirsāsp in the final battle at the end of the world:

³⁸² Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
³⁸³ As pointed out by Shaked (1979: 284), the syntax of purs ī ēn zamīg xrafstar bawēd is unusual which could be explained by suggesting that the text is based on a lost Avestan original. The expected syntax would be purs ī xrafstar ēn zamīg bawēd.
Then, near into the end of Uşēdarmāh’s millennium, Dahāg will be free from fetters, Bēwarasp will injure many creatures and creation with the dēwic desire, and at that time Sōšyāns, son of Zardušt, will appear, and for thirty days and nights, the sun will stand at the zenith of the sky. Of earthly beings, they will first raise the dead body of Kirsāsp, son of Sām, who will smite and kill Bēwarasp with the mace… 385

By contrast, in the Avesta, Ōraētaona is never described as a hero captor. For example, according to Vd. 1.17, Ōraētaona was born in Varəna to slay the dragon Dahāka:

Vd. 1. 17 caθru.dasm asan̄qamca šōiθran̄mca vahištəm fraθβərsəm aəm yō ahurō mazdā
varən̄m yim caθru.gaošəm
yahmāi zaiiata θraētaonō
jaŋta ažōiš dahākai ... 386

and the fourteenth of the best places and lands that I, who am Ahura Mazdā, created (was) the four-cornered Vara
for which, Ōraētaona was born
as the killer of the dragon Dahāka… .

Therefore, two contradictory conclusions can be drawn: 1) Similar to the account of Alexander, two stories about Ōraētaona existed in parallel from the beginning namely the dragon captor vs. dragon slayer hero;387 2) The story of the fettered dragon is a late introduction to the Zoroastrian system of belief.388

As far as the story of Ōraētaona in the Avesta is concerned, its cognate, or Traitana, only occurs once in the Rig-veda:

RV 1.158.5. nā mā garan nadio māṭriamā dāsā yād īm sūsamudbhams avādhuḥ
širo yād asya traitanō vitāksat svayām dāsā úro ōmsāv āpi gdha389

385 The text is after Anklesaria (1956: 280-283).
387 For Alexander see Nöldeke (1890).
388 Boyce (1975a: Vol. I, 283) suggests that the myth of the fettered az ī dahāg ‘evolved a pattern whereby all representatives of the powers of evil will be gathered again for their final defeat at the end of the world.’
(A man who is bound and tossed into rivers by Dāsas says) ‘The rivers, best of mothers, will not swallow me!’ (he cried) when the Dāsas sank him, tightly bound, when Traitana hewed away the head, the Dāsa himself ate his own chest and shoulders.390

It is evident that in contrast to the Avesta, the Vedic Traitana is described as a demonic creature, or Dāsa. However, in the Vedic mythology, there is another hero called Trita whose name is also another cognate of Θraētaona derived from IE *trito- “third” (Lincoln 1981: 104). By comparing the similarities between the Vedic myth of Trita and that of Θraētaona, Spiegel (1887: 262-267) and Benveniste (1934: 195-196) mention that Trita is the hero counterpart of Θraētaona. Moreover, as pointed out by Watkins (1995: 321-322), the Avestan and Vedic stories of Θraētaona and Trita follow the following mythological IE formula:

| Hero slays (*gʷhwen-) serpent. |

As far as the the dragon captor heroes in IE mythology are concerned, Zeus brings down Mount Etna on the body of Typhon (Penglase 1994: 195). Furthermore, in the Norse mythology, the wolf monster Fenrir is bound by the gods. At the end of the world, Fenrir slays the god Odin, but the son of Odin namely Vidar smashes the wolf and thus prevents him from destroying the cosmos (Lindow 2002: 111-113, 312-314). There are also parallels in the Mesopotamian mythology. For example, in the Akkadian myth of creation (Enuma-Elish) the god Sirsir ‘heaped up a mountain over Tiʾāmat and who with his weapon dragged off the body of Tiʾāmat’ (Heidel 1951: 57).

It can be concluded that even if the captor hero is an IE-Mesopotamian concept, it is absent in the early IIr. accounts of Ved. Trita and Av. Θraētaona. By contrast, as far as the dragon captor hero in the Avesta is concerned, Taxma Urupi Azinauuanṭ is a hero who rules over the demons and subdued the Evil Spirit:

Yt 19. 29. yaṭ bauuṭ aifī. vāniā
vīspe daēuu maśiūça
vīspe yātauuō pairikāšca
yaṭ barata aŋṟom mainiūm
framitom aspha kōhrpa
ðrisatam aifī. gāmanañm

\textit{uua pairi zəmō karana}

So that he (Taxma Urupi Azinauaṇt) overcame all demons and mortals all wizards and witches.
(It accompanied him) when he rode the Evil Spirit, transformed into the shape of a horse, for thirty steps, around both edges of the earth.\textsuperscript{391}

Moreover, in the Šāhnāma (ed. Bertels, vol. I, 36-38, vv 1-46), the New Persian variant of Taxma Urupi, or Tahmuras, carries the epithet \textit{dēv band} (نیو بند) “demon fetterer” as he binds Ahriman and other demons.\textsuperscript{392}

Therefore, as far as the original story of Av. \textit{ϑraētaona-} is concerned, the evidence suggests that he was a dragon slayer by whom Dahāka was smashed. However, as stated above, although according to the Avestan literature, \textit{Θraētaona} is a dragon slayer, in the Pahlavi literature, Kīrsāsp takes over his role by killing Dahāg at the end of the world. It should be noted that the two slayers of the dragon Dahāg in Pahlavi and Avesta could originally have been a single figure because Av. \textit{ϑraētaona-} is the son of Av. Āḏβiiia- and Av. kərəsəspa- is the son of Av. \textit{ϑrita-}. Both Ṣrita and Āḏβiiia were probably one figure, or Ir.*\textit{trita- ātya-}, corresponding to Ved. \textit{trita- ātya-} “third Āptya”.\textsuperscript{393} However, the Avestan and Pahlavi traditions also show an important discrepancy according to which Av. \textit{dahāka-} was slain before Zaraϑuśtra’s birth (see Y 9.3-14) whereas according to the Pahlavi literature, he will be killed at the end of the cosmic battle. The reason for the Pahlavi innovation may lie in the fact that his status was changed from the immortal into mortal by Ahriman:

MX. 8. 27-28. \textit{čē paydāg kū ohrmazd jam ud frēdōn ud kāwōs ahōš dād hēnd ud ahriman ēdōn wardēnīd čiyōn āšnāg}\textsuperscript{394}

It is clear that Ohrmaz created Jam, Frēdōn and Kāwōs immortal and Ahriman altered (their status) as it is known.\textsuperscript{395}

Therefore, Frēdōn could be considered no longer as the dragon slayer of the dragon

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{391} Edition and translation by Hintze (1994b: 20).
\item \textsuperscript{392} For Taxma Urupi in the Mazdean and Islamic sources see Christensen (1917: 137ff.).
\item \textsuperscript{393} See Geiger (1916: 59); Boyce (1975: Vol I, 98); Sarkarati (1999 (1378): 244-245).
\item \textsuperscript{394} For the Pahlavi text see \url{http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcx/iran/miran/mpers/mx/mx.htm}: Data entry by MacKenzie (1993); corrections by Jügel (2007-2008); TITUS version by Gippert (1998-2008).
\item \textsuperscript{395} My translation.
\end{itemize}
Dahāg in the final battle.

2) Line 1 Y 9.8aP az ī dahāg “the dragon Dahāg”

In the Iranian manuscripts G14 (fol. 55r line 8) and T6 (fol. 46v line 3), az ī dahāg appears as the univerbed azdahāg, corresponding to New Persian Aždahā. However, in the Avestan original, Av. aži- and Av. dahāka- are treated as two separate words. In the other collated manuscripts, they are correctly rendered as Phl. az ī dahāg in which the ezāfa ī relates az and dahāg.

3) Line 3 Y 9.8aP hazārwizōstār “(having the skills of) a thousand investigators”

The Pahlavi agent noun hazārwizōstār renders the Avestan adjective hazaŋrā.yaoxšti- which is a compound consisted of hazaŋra- “thousand” and the abstract noun yaoxšti- whose etymology and meaning have been the subject of extensive debates among scholars. Bartholomae (AirWb. 1797) translated Av. hazaŋrā.yaoxšti- as “having one thousand skills”. He interpreted Av. yaoxšti- as the ti- abstract noun derived from the s-aorist stem of the root yaog “to yoke” (AirWb.1229-1230). It should also be noted that although the verbal roots in ti- abstract are usually in zero grade, they also occur in full grade, for example, the well-known epithet of Miϑra, or vouru.gaoiiaoiti- “providing wide cattle pastures” in which iiaoiti- is of the root yauu “to move” (Bailey 1954: 138). Bartholomae’s view was accepted in the last etymological studies of the word by Narten (1986: 198) and Hintze (1994a: 100) with whom it is translated as “having a thousand skills” in the present edition.

396 For the ti-abstract words with verbal roots in full grated see (AiGr, II 2, 630-631, §467b).

397 Deriving the root from Av. yaoz “to be in commotion”, Geldner (1882: 61) argues that the etymological study of the root is insufficient for a conclusive semantic interpretation of the word yaoxšti- and it should be analysed in its context. Therefore, he interprets yaoxšti- in Yi 10.35 as “sense, perception” (Geldner 1882: 61-64). With Geldner, Darmesteter (1898: II, 139-140, 147) translates hazaŋrā.yaoxšti- as “thousand senses”.

Hübschmann (1897: 199) compares the Armenian verbal root yuiz “to search” with Av. yaoz “to be in commotion”. Considering the Armenian verbal root, Gershevitch (1967: 187) mentions that there should be a second root beside yaoz “to be in commotion” according to which the abstract yaoxšti- meant originally as “faculty of investigation” which from the semantic point of view, can be compared with Ved. dṛṣṭi- “eyesight”. Therefore, Gershevitch (1967: 187) translates yaoxšti- in Yi 10 as “perception”. By contrast, Narten (1986: 198, fn 21) casts doubt on Gershevitch’s comparison with Vd. dṛṣṭi- as the two different verbal roots are not comparable. Hintze (1994: 99) also states that relating Av. yaoxšti- to the root yaoz is unconvincing for semantic grounds. Bailey (1936: 99) associates Av. yaoxšti- with the Sogdian verb ywe “to teach”. To explain y, he suggests an IE *euk beside *euk “to accustom”. However, as pointed out by Hintze (1994: 100), it is also possible to derive the Sogdian verb from either IE *yi-aucja- or IE *ni-aucja- both of which from the well-attested IE *euk. Additionally, she states that the corresponding Avestan root yauk “to teach” is absent in the Avesta.
The Pahlavi corresponding word *hazārwizōstār* is translated by Davar (1904: 305) as “with thousand observer powers, or senses”. By contrast, Josephson (1997: 49) translates it as “with a thousand skills”.\(^{398}\) It seems that in their editions, the Pahlavi word is treated similar to its Avestan counterpart. However, the meaning of the agent noun *hazārwizōstār* should be different from its Avestan abstract counterpart. From the etymological point of view, the Pahlavi *wizōstār* is derived from the Ir. root *caud* “to impel” to which the preverb *wi-* is attached (Cheung 2007: 57). In Pahlavi, the verb *wizōstan* denotes “to search, to investigate”:

\[
\text{MHD. A13,13-15} \quad \text{tan kē dārišn ī pad zēndān paydāg}
\]
\[
dādwar pad wizōyišn mad ēstēd be wizōst wināhkārīh-ē nē paydāg pad kardag
\]
\[
az zēndān be nē hilēnd
\]

A body (or man) who is clear to be held in prison (and) for the investigation, a judge has come (and) searched. An offence is not obvious for the deed (to the judge), he is not released from the prison because of a (certain) section (of the judicial law).\(^{399}\)

Moreover, in a Judeo-Persian text, the corresponding word occurs as *bzw-št* meaning “investigation” which develops to NP. *pažuhiš* (MacKenzie 1968: 252).

As far as the suffix of the agent noun *wizōstār* is concerned, it has been interpreted as either *-tār* or *-ār*. Salemann (*GIrPh*. 282), Rastorgueva (1966: 34) and Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 179-180, §357) take the suffix as *-tār*. Moreover, as stated by Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 179-180, §357), the suffix *-tār* appears together with its variants *-dār* and *-dār* in Pahlavi. However, to accept such an interpretation, it is needed to assume either irregular stems or suffixes. For example, the form *brēhēnīdār* “creator” is to be derived from the present stem *brēhēn-* + *ī* + *-dār* in which *ī* is left unexplained, or regarding the word *burdār* “career”, the present stem would be from the irregular zero grade *brā* “to carry” while its present stem *bar-* is well attested in Pahlavi.

By contrast, Rastorgueva and Molcanova (1981a: 71-72) consider the suffix *-ār* < *-tar* attached to the past stem. Moreover, deriving *-ār* from *-tar*, Abolghassemi (1375 (1996): 316) rejects the suffix *-tār* due to the necessity of considering non-existing stems as mentioned above. Therefore, the evidence shows that the Pahlavi agent noun consists of the past stem *wizōst* + *-ār* and it is translated in the present edition as “(having the skills of) a

---

\(^{398}\) Mills (1903c: 319 and 319, fn. 6) translates *hazārwizōstār* by conjecture as “thousand jointed” which is obviously a wrong translation of the Pahlavi word.

thousand investigators”.

In addition, the Pahlavi commentary ī adādag pad gōhrag “who is unjust by essence” follows hazārwizōstār. In the Avesta, the two opposing beings namely the dragon Dahāka and Miōra bear the epithet hazārang.yaōxšti-. Therefore, the Pahlavi commentary could be inserted to distinguish between the unjust essence of Dahāka and the essence of Miōra which is just.

Finally, in YIrP Pt4 and its closely related T55b, hazār mard rāy zōr dāst “he had the power of thousand men” appears in their margins. According to its meaning, the Pahlavi sentence should be a gloss to hazārwizōstār.

Figure 30. Left: YIrP Pt4 (fol. 57v); right: YIrP T55b (fol. 72r).

The interlinear New Persian version of the Pahlavi gloss hazār mard rāy zōr dāst also appears in YIrP F2 and YIrP T6:

\[
\text{F2 fol 54r line 13} \\
\text{hazār mardōm barābar kōšiš-\text{-u quvvat dāranda būd} \\
as many as thousand people, he (the dragon Dahāg) had strife and power.} \\
\text{T6 fol 46v line 2} \\
\text{barābar-\text{-i hazār mard zōr-\text{-u tūvān mē-\text{-dāst}}} \\
as many as thousand men, he (the dragon Dahāg) had strength and power.}
\]

As regards the editorial judgment, the Pahlavi gloss in Pt4, T55b is omitted in the present edition because it is absent in other Iranian manuscripts, especially those of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line. Furthermore, as discussed in section 3.1, the gloss in Pt4, T55b

---

400 See Y 9.8, Yt 10.35, 82, 107 and Yt 19.35.
401 My translation.
402 My translation.
403 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
has a feature of the corrected Jāmāsp’s post-arrival manuscripts in which are added commentaries which are absent in the older copies.

4) Line 4 Y 9.8bP was ōz “of many powers”

The Pahlavi translation of Av. aš.aojahând varies among manuscripts. While Av. aš” is consistently rendered by was “many”, the second element is translated in YIndPs and YIrP Mf4, F2 and T6 as ōz (’wc’) in contrast to YIrP Pt4 and G14 writing ōzōmand (’wc wmnd’). Moreover, in YIrP T55b (fol. 72v line 3), it appears as ōzman? which is probably the misspelling of the form ōzōmand. It should be noted that in YIrP T6, čiyōn az (cygwn MN) “as from” is also added after ōz. Therefore, to draw an editorial judgement, it is necessary to examine how the Pahlavi translators rendered Av. aš.aojah- and its cognates elsewhere in the Avesta. In Y57.15, the Avestan gen. sg. aš.aojahhō occurs in the following context:

Y 57.15 sraošəm ašîm huraoðəm vərədrājanəm
fradət,gaēdəm ... yazamaide
yō vananô kaiïdαhə
yō vananô kāiïðiehe
yō janta daēwaiiă drujô
aš.aojahhô ahîm mərəcô
yō harəta aïfiiâxštaca
vîspaiiâ frauîois gaēðaiiă

We worship Sraoša, accompanied by rewards, fair of form, victorious, furthering the world … ,
The vanquisher of the kaiïada-offender,
The vanquisher of the follower of the kaiïada-offender,
The smiter of the very strong demoness Deceit,
who is the destroyer of existence,
(Sraoša), the guardian and supervisor
of the promotion of all worldly creatures.

The Pahlavi translation is as follows:

404 J2 (fol. 84r line 12), K5 (fol. 62v line 17), M1 (162r line 13).
405 In YIrP T6, F2, ōz is spelled without the final stroke. For the spellings of YIrPs see Pt4 (fol. 56v line 5), Mf4 (p. 152 line 6), G14 (fol. 44r line 11), F2 (fol. 54v line 2), T6 (fol. 46v line 5).
406 In YIrP Pt4, ‘wmnd is written above the line. In YIrP G14, d is written above the line, probably by a second hand.
407 The text is after Kreyenbroek (1985: 44-45).
We (worship) the righteous Srōš, the well-grown, the victorious, …
the vanquisher of iniquitous men,
the vanquisher of iniquitous women,
who smites the demon Deceit
of great strength, the destroyer of existence,
(Srōš) who is the leader and supervisor
of all the creatures of the material world.\textsuperscript{409}

Like Y 9.8, in the Pahlavi version of Y 57.15, the translation of \textit{aš.aojah-} varies among the manuscripts as shown in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 220r line 19)</td>
<td>\textit{ws ōz āwand} (\textit{KBD we wnd}: above the line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP Mf4 (p. 551, line 16)</td>
<td>\textit{ws w wnd} (\textit{KBD w āwnd}: above the line)\textsuperscript{411}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP G14</td>
<td>Y 57 is absent from G14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP F2</td>
<td>Y 57 is absent from F2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP T6 (fol. 241v line 3)</td>
<td>\textit{KBD w ce}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP T55b</td>
<td>Y 57 is absent from T55b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIndP J2 (fol. 311r line 5)</td>
<td>\textit{ws w ce’}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIndP K5 (fol. 259r line 7)</td>
<td>\textit{ws w ce’}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIndP M1 (fol. 613r line 3)</td>
<td>\textit{ws w ce’}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table, while in YIndPs and YIrP T6, \textit{aš.aojah-} is rendered by \textit{ws ōz “of many powers”}, in YIrP Pt4 and Mf4, it is translated by \textit{ws ōz āwand “very powerful”}. By contrast, the superlative form of \textit{aš.aojah-}, or Av. \textit{aš.aojastāma-}, is translated in the Avesta by \textit{ws (wēš? “more”: F2) ōz to which the superlative suffix \textit{tom} is attached (Table 409)

\textsuperscript{409} The text is after Kreyenbroek (1985: 44-45).

\textsuperscript{410} : The Pahlavi letter \textit{n} is missing after \textit{ws we’ w} and before \textit{d}.

\textsuperscript{411} : In \textit{ws w wnd} (\textit{was ōz āwand}), the Pahlavi letter \textit{c} is missing after \textit{ws w} and before \textit{wnd}. As regards the superscript word, the reading \textit{z} is hypothetical and the long \textit{ā} is missing.
 Likewise, the comparative Av. aš.aogiastara- is rendered by Phl. was ṥez to which the Pahlavi comparative suffix tar is attached (Table 3).

As regards Av. aogjah- adj. “powerful”, it occurs in Y 34.8 and Y 57.10. In all of the collated manuscripts, it is translated by Phl. ṥezōmand (lit.) “possessing power”, “powerful” (Table 4). The adjective OAv. aogjhuuetàñ/YAv. aogjhañ- “possessing power, powerful” is formed with the suffix -uñht-, attached to aojah- in Y 28.6, Y 31.4, Y 34.4, Y 43.8, Y 43.16, Y 57.11 and Vd 20.8. It is translated as Phl. ṭezōmand with the exception of Vd 20.8 in which the Avestan adjective is rendered by the Pahlavi noun ṭez “power, strength” (Table 5). Furthermore, in Y 9.15, Y 29.3, Y 57.13, Vd 3.20 and Vd 17.1 occurs the superlative aojištå- adj. “the most powerful” which is rendered by ṭezōmand, the comparative ṭezōmandtar and the superlative ṭezōmandtòm/虿zōmandīhātom in Pahlavi (Table 6). As a comparative adjective, Av. aojištå “stronger” is attested in Y 34.8 which is translated as ṭezōmand in Pahlavi (Table 7). By contrast, the neuter noun Av. aogjah- is consistently translated by ṭez (Table 8).

In conclusion, the Avestan adj. aogjah- and its comparative, superlative and possessive counterparts, with one exception in Vd 20.8, are rendered in the manuscripts by Phl. ṭezōmand, to which the comparative or superlative suffixes can attach. By contrast, the neuter noun aogjah- is always translated in Pahlavi by ṭez. It shows that Pahlavi translators distinguished between Av. aogjah- adj. and its neuter counterpart.

Regarding aš.aogiastora- adj., its superlative and comparative adjectives are consistently translated by was ṭeztom and was ṭeztar in the manuscripts. By contrast, YIrPs show confusion by giving different translations of aš.aogiastora- as mentioned above. Considering the fact that these different translations appear in the Iranian manuscripts, written down after the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp in India, they can be associated with corrections introduced by their scribes. It is corroborated by the fact that while T6 writes was ṭez, the copyists of Pt4 and Mf4 emphasised on the correctness of their Pahlavi translation of aš.aogiastora-, or was ṭezōwandañ, in Y 57.15 by re-writing it above the line with different spellings (see Table 1). Moreover, as shown above, in Y 9.8, ’wmnd in ws ‘we’’wmnd is written above the line in

---

412 In addition to aš.aogiastora-, Av. aš.aogištå- is present in FrW 8.2 which has no Pahlavi translation.
413 Av. aogištå- adj. also occurs in Yt 8.55; 10.98, 141; 13.75; 19.38 which have no Pahlavi translation.
414 Av. aogištå- adj. also occurs in Yt 13.17, 64 which have no Pahlavi translation.
415 Av. aogiastara- ntr. also occurs in Yt 2.12, 14; 10.23, 62; 8.24; 13.1, 134; 19.68 which have no Pahlavi translation. It also takes place in Yt 1.22 whose Pahlavi manuscript is not at my disposal.
416 See section 3.1.
417 In T6, the repetition of ṭ in was ṭez (KBD ṭw’wc) is probably a scribal unintentional mistake. Y 57.15 is absent from G14 and F2.
YIrP Pt4. Mf4, F2 and T6 also attest was ōz like the old YIndP J2 and K5 in which aš.aojah- is consistently translated by was ōz in Y 9.8 and Y 57.15. The originality of the reading was ōz is also corroborated by the similar form, associated with Dahāg, occurring in the Dēnkard:

DkM. 803.3-6. ka dahāg az band harzag bawēd ud pad munjēnīdan ī gēhān abar dwārēd ... ōy hangēzhēd ud pad wāntīdan ī ōy ān ī was ōz druz gēhān frayāđīdan

When Dahāg is released from the fetters and runs to destroy the world...he (Kirsāsp) is awakened and (his awakening is) for destroying him (Dahāg), the demon with many powers (and) for helping the creation of the world.\footnote{My translation.}

Likewise, in PRDd 48.7, the form was ōz is attested:

PRDd 48.7 pas hušēdar gōwēd kū pad ān ī tēztom ud pahntom tēx ud druz ī was ōz čārag xwāhēd ud pas mardōmān ān druz ud āṣtar ud kārd ud warz ud ṣāfṣēr ud nēzag ud tigr ud abārīg snēhīhā ān druz bē ōzanēnd\footnote{Edition by Williams (1990: Vol I, 175).}

Then, Hushēdar will say: ‘With the sharpest and broadest blades find a means (to destroy) that demon of great strength’. And then men will slay that demon, with whip and dagger and mace and sword and lance and arrow and other weapons.\footnote{Translation by Williams (1990: Vol II, 80).}

In conclusion, according to the evidence, was ōz is employed in the present edition. Phl. was ōz also shows that Av. aš.aojah- adj. was interpreted as a noun in Pahlavi.\footnote{For ōz see MacKenzie (1971: 62) and Nyberg (1974: 147).} Therefore, in contrast to Mills (1903c: 319), Davar (1904: 18, 36) and Josephson (1997: 19) translating was ōz as “very powerful”, it is translated as “of many powers” in the present edition.\footnote{All scholars read the Pahlavi word as was ōz. Putting “ful” in the brackets, Davar (1904: 36) translates ōz as the adjective “power(ful)” cautiously.}

**Table 2. The manuscript readings of the Pahlavi translation of the Avestan superlative adj. aš.aojastāma-.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza/Avestan word</th>
<th>Siglum of manuscript /Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Y 9.8 acc. sg. aš.aojastāmām | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 56v line 9): KBD ḡwctwm  
YIrP Mf4 (page 152 line 10): KBD ḡwctwm  
YIrP G14 (fol. 55r-55v line 114): KBD ḡwctwm  
YIrP F2 (fol. 54v line 5): wš ḡwctwm  
YIrP T6 (fol. 46v line 9): KBD ḡwctwm  
YIrP T55b (fol. 72v line 9): KBD ḡwctwm  
YIndP J2 (fol. 84v line 2): KBD ḡwctwm |
Table 3. The manuscript readings of the Pahlavi translation of the Avestan comparative adj. aojastara.-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avestan word</th>
<th>Siglum of manuscript /Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vd 9.48 nom. sg. aš.aojastara | VdP L4 (fol. 1.74r line 3): KBD ʾwctl  
VdP K1 (fol. 124v line 15): KBD ʾwctl  
VdP M13 (fol. 204r line 3-4): KBD ʾwctl  
Vd 9 is absent from VdP G25.  
VdP F10 (fol. 188v line 4): KBD ʾwctl  
VdP G28 (fol. 170v line 14): KBD ʾwctl  
VdP T44 (fol. 212r line 6): KBD ʾwctl  
VdP G34 (fol. 190r line 6): KBD ʾwctl  
Vd B1 (fol. 273v line 11): KBD ʾwctl  
Vd 9 is absent from VdP Bh11.  
VdP E10 (fol. 100v line 18): KBD ʾwctl  
VdP M3 (fol. 190v line 18): KBD ʾwctl |

Table 4. The manuscript readings of the Pahlavi translation of the Avestan adj. aojah.-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avestan word</th>
<th>Siglum of manuscript/Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Y 34.8: nom. sg. aojā | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 156v line 6): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIrP Mf4 (page 402 line 2): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIrP G14 does not have Y 34.  
YIrP F2 (fol. 149v line 11): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIrP T6 (fol. 153v line 8): 'weʾwmnnd  
Y 34.8 is absent from YIrP T55b.  
YIndP J2: Illegible because fol. 216r is damaged.  
YIndP K5 (fol. 172v line 13): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIndP M1 (fol. 420r line 10): 'weʾwmnnd |
| Y 57.10: nom. sg. aojā | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 219r line 14): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIrP Mf4 (page 549 line 8): 'weʾwmnnd  
Y 57 is absent from YIrP G14.  
Y 57 is absent from YIrP F2.  
YIrP T6 (fol. 240r line 8): 'wcmnnd  
Y 57 is absent from YIrP T55b.  
YIndP J2 (fol. 309r line 14): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIndP K5 (fol. 257r line 14): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIndP M1 (fol. 609r line 13): 'weʾwmnnd |

Table 5. The manuscript readings of the Pahlavi translation of the adj. OAv. aojōŋhwaŋt-/YAv. aojan’haŋt-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza/Avestan word</th>
<th>Siglum of manuscript/Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Y 28.6 acc. sg. aojōŋhwaŋt | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 131r line 10): 'weʾwmnnd  
YIrP Mf4 (page 340 line 1): 'weʾwmnnd |
| Y 28 is absent from YIrP G14. | YIrP F2 (fol. 120r line 10): ‘wcmnd  
YIrP T6 (fol. 117r line 8): ‘we’wmnd  
YIrP T55b does not have Y 28.  
YIndP J2 (fol. 175r line 15): ‘we’wmnd  
YIndP K5 (fol. 173r line 5): ‘we’wmnd  
YIndP M1 (fol. 342v line 2): ‘we’wmnd |
|---|---|
| Y 31.4 acc. sg. aojōŋhuuat | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 140v line 20): ‘we’wmnd  
YIrP Mf4 (page 363 line 9): ‘we’wmnd  
Y 31 is absent from YIrP G14.  
YIrP F2 (fol. 132r line 3): ‘wcmnd  
YIrP T6 (fol. 137v line 2): ‘we’wmnd  
Y 31 is absent from YIrP T55b.  
YInd J2: Illegible because fol. is damaged.  
YInd K5 (fol. 150v line 3): ‘we’wmnd  
YInd M1 (fol. 371v line 2): ‘we’wmnd |
| Y 34.4 acc. sg. aojōŋhuuantōm | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 155r line 17): ‘we’wmnd  
YIrP Mf4 (page 398 line 14): ‘we’wmnd  
Y 34 is absent from YIrP G14.  
YIrP F2 abbreviates the stanza.  
YIrP T6 (fol. 151v line 10): ‘we’wmnd  
Y 34 is absent from YIrP T55b.  
YInd J2 (fol. 214r line 1): ‘we’wmnd  
YInd K5 (fol. 171r line 2): ‘we’wmnd  
YInd M1 (fol. 416r line 10): ‘we’wmnd |
| Y 43.8 nom. sg. aojōŋhuuat | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 170v line 16): ‘we’wmnd  
YIrP Mf4 (page 436 line 10): ‘we’wmnd  
Y 43 is absent from YIrP G14.  
YIrP F2 (fol. 165v line 6): ‘we’wmnd  
YIrP T6 (fol. 173r line 7): ‘w’wmnd  
Y 43 is absent from YIrP T55b.  
YInd J2 (fol. 238r line 6): ‘we’wmnd  
YInd K5 (fol. 193r line 5): ‘we’wmnd  
YInd M1 (fol. 463v line 13): ‘we’wmnd |
| Y 43.16 nom. sg. aojōŋhuuat | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 173r line 15): ‘we’wmndy’hl  
YIrP Mf4 (page 442 line 13): ‘we’wmndy’hl  
Y 43.16 is absent from YIrP G14.  
YIrP F2 (fol. 168v line 4): ‘we’wmndy’hl  
YIrP T6: (fol. 176v line 11) ‘w’wmndy’hl  
Y 43 is absent from YIrP T55b.  
YInd J2 (fol. 241v line 14): ‘we’wmndy’hl  
YInd K5 (fol. 196r line 15): ‘we’wmndy’hl  
YInd M1 (fol. 471v line 8): ‘we’wmndy’hl |
| Y 57.11 acc. sg. aojay’hanantom | YIrP Pt4 (fol. 219v line 2): ‘we’wmnd  
YIrP Mf4 (page 549 line 14): ‘we’wmnd  
Y 57 is absent from YIrP G14. |

\[\text{423}423 \text{ is written between ‘we and ‘wmndy’hl. However, while ‘we and ‘wmndy’hl are translated in the interlinear New Persian version, } \text{is left untranslated.}\]
Table 6. The manuscript readings of the Pahlavi translation of the Avestan superlative adj. aojišta-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza/Avestan word</th>
<th>Siglum of manuscript/Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.15 nom. sg. aojištō</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 59r line 7): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIrP Mf4 (page 158 line 12): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIrP G14 (fol. 58r line 9): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIrP T6 (fol. 57v line 5): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIrP T6 (fol. 50r line 2): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIrP T55b (fol. 77r line 3): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIndP J2 (fol. 88r line 3): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIndP K5 (fol. 65v line 6): 'wc’wmnnd&lt;br&gt;YIndP M1 (fol. 169r line 12): 'wc’wmnnd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 29.3 nom. sg. aojištō</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 133v line 20): 'wc’wmnndtl&lt;br&gt;YIrP Mf4 (page 346 line 15): 'wc’wmnndtl&lt;br&gt;YIrP G14 does not have Y 29.&lt;br&gt;YIrP F2 (fol. 123v line 7): 'wcmndtl&lt;br&gt;YIrP T6 (fol. 121r line 2): 'wc’wmnndtl&lt;br&gt;YIrP T55b does not have Y 29.&lt;br&gt;YIndP J2 (fol. 179v line 11): 'wc’wmnndtl&lt;br&gt;YIndP K5 (fol. 141r line 1): 'wc’wmndtl&lt;br&gt;YIndP M1 (fol. 350v line 13): 'wc’wmndtl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 57.13 acc. sg. aojištəm</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 219v line 15): 'wc’wmndtwm&lt;br&gt;YIrP Mf4 (page 550 line 9): 'wc’wmndtwm&lt;br&gt;YIrP G14 does not have Y 57.&lt;br&gt;YIrP F2 does not have Y 57.&lt;br&gt;YIrP T6 (fol. 240v line 9): 'wc’wmndtl&lt;br&gt;YIrP T55b does not have Y 57.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{424}\) The second ‘w is written above the line.

\(^{425}\) The final stroke can also be read as r, forming with the preceding t, the comparative suffix tar. However, the suffix, tar is usually spelled as tl in manuscripts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza/Avestan word</th>
<th>Siglum of manuscript/Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 34.8 nom. sg aojiiā</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 156v line 6): 'wcmnnd  YIrP Mf4 (page 402 line 2): 'wcmnd  Y 34 is absent from YIrP G14. YIrP F2 (fol. 149v line 11): 'wcmnnd  YIrP T6 (fol. 153v line 8): 'wcmnd  YIrP T55b does not have Y 34. YIndP J2: Illegible because fol. is damaged. YInd K5 (fol. 172v line 13): 'wcmnd  YInd M1 (fol. 420r line 10): 'wcmnd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

426 Another 'w is written above the line with pale letters after c.
Table 8. The manuscript readings of the Pahlavi translation of the Avestan aojah- ntr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza/Avestan word</th>
<th>Siglum of manuscript/Pahlavi transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 9.25 inst. sg. aojāgḥa</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 61v line 18): 'wc' YIrP G14 (fol. 61v line 1): 'wc' YIrP F2 (fol. 60v line 12): 'wc' YIrP T6 (fol. 53v line 12): 'wc' YIrP T55b (fol. 82r line 1): 'wc' YIndP J2 (fol. 92r line 9): 'wc' YIndP K5 (fol. 68v line 6): 'wc' YIndP M1 (fol. 177v) omits the word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 10.2 inst. sg. aojāgḥa</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 64v line 21): 'wc' YIrP G14 does not have Y 10) YIrP F2 (fol. 64r line 12): 'wc' YIrP T6 (fol. 58r line 7): 'wc' YIrP T55b (fol. 87r line 15): 'wc' YIndP J2 (fol. 96v line 5): 'wc' YIndP K5: illegible because fol. is damaged. YIndP M1: (fol. 186v line 1): 'wc'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 50.3 inst. sg. aojāghā</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 198v line 18): 'wc' YIrP Mf4 (page 501 line 9): 'wc' YIrP G14 does not have Y 50. YIrP F2 (fol. 197r line 8): 'wc' YIrP T6 (fol. 211r line 3): 'wc' YIrP T55b does not have Y 50. YIndP J2 (fol. 280r line 10): 'wc' YIndP K5 (fol. 230v line 9): 'wc' YIndP M1 (fol. 550v line 9): 'wc'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 60.3 nom. sg. aojō</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 236c line 1): 'wc'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP Mf4 (page 589)</td>
<td>\textit{ʾwc} YIrP Mf4 does not have Y 60. YIrP G14 does not have Y 60. YIrP F2 (fol. 225r): Abbreviating Y 60.3, \textit{aojō} is not attested. YIrP T6 (fol. 254v line 10): \textit{ʾwc} YIrP T55b does not have Y 60. YIndP J2 (fol. 328r line 9): \textit{ʾwc} YIndP K5 (fol. 275v line 2): \textit{ʾwc} YIndP M1 (fol. 646r line 9): \textit{ʾwc}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 71.8 acc. sg. \textit{aojasca}</td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 275v line 18): \textit{ʾwc} YIrP Mf4 (page 697 line 17): \textit{ʾwc} YIrP G14 does not have Y 71. YIrP F2 (fol. 256v line 2): \textit{ʾwc} YIrP T6 (fol. 288r line 10): \textit{ʾwc} YIrP T55b does not have Y 71. YIndP J2 (fol. 371v line 15): \textit{ʾwc} YIrP K5 (fol. 316r line 6): \textit{ʾwc} YIrP M1 (fol. 739r line 7): \textit{ʾwc}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 72.6 acc. sg. \textit{aojasca}</td>
<td>Y 726.6 is omitted in the YP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5) Line 4 Y 9.8bP** \textit{dēw druž} “Demon(ess) Deceit”

In Y 9.8, Av. \textit{ažīm dahiḵom} is followed by a series of adjectives modifying the dragon:

\[\text{ϑri.zafanəm} \vspace{1pt} \text{ϑri.kaməzəm} \vspace{1pt} \text{xšuuaš.ažīm hazəx̃rəm, yaoxš̃t̃m} \vspace{1pt} \text{aš.aojaŋ̃həm daēũm drũm} \vspace{1pt} \text{agəm ... drũuət̃m} \vspace{1pt} \]

the three-muzzled, three-headed, six-eyed, having a thousand skills, the very powerful, the Demoness Deceit, wicked … deceitful

However, the occurrence of the feminine \textit{daēũm drũm} between the adjectives in the accusative case, describing the features of the male dragon Dahāka, is problematic. It is also debated whether \textit{daēũ} should be interpreted as a noun or an adjective. Bartholomae (\textit{AirWb.} 670) suggests that \textit{daēũ} is the feminine counterpart of the adj. \textit{daēũa-} “demonic”. However, Hoffmann (1975: 201), refutes Bartholomae’s suggestion of the existence of the masculine and feminine adjectival forms, arguing that \textit{daēũ} - is the feminine counterpart of the masculine noun \textit{daēũa-} “demon”.

In scholarly translations, \textit{daēũm drũm} is usually translated literally as for example “devilish Falsehood” (Hintze 1994: 22) and “evil Lie” (Josephson 1997: 49). Kellens (1999: 459, fn. 4) deals with the difficulties mentioned above by leaving the problematic expression
untranslated. To make the stanza comprehensible, Pirart (2004: 66-67) adds “ϑraētaona qui frappa”\(^{427}\) in brackets, before daēuuīm drujoṃ and aγəm ... druuaṇṭom.

As regards the Pahlavi version, the Avestan commentary kō ϑbəṃ yim ahuroṃ mazdəṃ is incorporated to explain the demon(ess)\(^{428}\) Deceit:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{i was ōz dēw dru} \\
i\text{wattar ō gēhān [zyān kār] i druwan} \\
kē-š was ōztom dru \\
frāz kirrēnīd gannāg mēnōy \\
abar ō astōmandān gēhān \\
pad margīh i ān ahlāyiḥ ī gēhān \\
[kū-ś az dru] i gētī ēk ān stahmagtar dād \\
kō ϑbəṃ yim ahuroṃ mazdəṃ ...
\end{align*}\]

(Who slew the dragon Dahāg) of many powers Demon(ess) Deceit, worse for the material world [doer of harm], deceitful whom as the most powerful Deceit, the Evil Spirit mis-created against the material world, for the destruction of the righteousness of the world [which he, among the deceit of the world, created that one the more oppressive Who (grieves) you, who are Ahura Mazdā? ...

The corrupt commentary which lacks the verb is borrowed from Vd 18.61:

\[\text{Vd 18.61 kō ϑbəṃ yim ahuroṃ mazdəṃ mazištaiianti inaoiti}\]

Who grieves you, Ahurā Mazdā, with the biggest insult?\(^{429}\)

The answer to the question of Vd 18.61 appears in Vd 18.62 according to which Jahī grieves Ahura Mazdā:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Vd. 18.62 aŋt mraot ahuro mazdə} \\
jahī bā ašāum zaraḏuṣṭra \\
yō xšudrā hqṃ.račbīieti \\
dahmanqəm adahmanqəmcə \\
daēuuīiasnqəm adēuuīiasnqəmcə \\
tanupraṇəntəm atanupraṇəntəmcə
\end{align*}\]

Thereupon, answered Ahura Mazdā:

Jahī indeed O righteous Zaraḏuṣṭra,

\(^{427}\) “ϑraētaona who slew”. Pirart in his French translation of the Hōm Yašt gives the reconstructed proto-Iranian forms of the corresponding Avestan proper nouns.

\(^{428}\) Since the Pahlavi language does not distinguish the feminine, masculine and neuter genders, dēw, rendering Av. daēuuī- “demoness” is translated as “demon” in the present edition.

who mixes, the seeds
of the faithful and unfaithful,
(the seeds) of the demon-worshippers and non-demon-worshippers,
(the seeds) of Tanupərəθa offenders and non-Tanupərəθa offenders.  

It should be noted that in the Avesta, Jahī is used to denote woman as a neutral term or woman in pejorative sense. In the Pahlavi literature, its corresponding Jeh can also mean woman. However, in some Pahlavi texts such as the Bundahiṣṇ, Jeh is the name of a demoness. In Vd. 18.61-63, Jahī means “adulterous woman”. However, it seems that in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.8, Jahī refers to the female demon. The reason is that Av. aš. aojanhəm daęuım druʃəm is rendered by Phl. was őz dēw druž rather than the expected was őzōmand/őzāwand dēw druž. In contrast to the adjective őzōmand meaning “powerful”, the Pahlavi noun őz means “power”. Therefore, it suggests that őz and its following dēw druž have been interpreted as nouns rather that adjectives describing the dragon Dahāg. Furthermore, in the margin of YIrP T6 (fol. 46v), there is a New Persian commentary according to which Jeh is described as an evil being alongside Zahhāk (= Phl. Az Dahāg):

Figure 31. YIrP T6 (fol. 46v).

T6 fol. 64v line 1) čināṅča dar pargard-ī hijdahom ašō zartušt pursīda ast ka kadām

---

431 For Jeh see de Jong (2008: 618-619).
432 For dēw druž see Y 9.8 commentary 4 dēw druž.
kas ast
2) ay hormazd ka tō-rā bisyār āzār rasānanda-u kēnavar ast pas hormazd
3) pāşō dād ka ān bār jeh bāšad ka az ān man kē hormazd-am bisyār āzurda-'am
4) hamčinīn az bahr-ī zahhāk ...

1) As in chapter eighteen, the righteous Zartušt has asked that who is he,
2) O Hormazd (= Phl. Ohrmazd), who grieves you so much and is malevolent. Then, Hormazd
3-4) answered that, she is the evil-doer Jeh that from her, I, who am Hormazd, have suffered so much, likewise from Zahhāk ….

Therefore, in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.8, three evil beings can be identified, namely Az ī Dahāg “the dragon Dahāg, the female demon(ess) Deceit who is identified with Jeh and Gannāg Mēnōy, a term which is the designation of Ahriman. In what follows, based on the dualistic nature of Zoroastrianism, their features are compared with those of Auramazdā, Mitra and Anāhitā, attested in the three Old Persian inscriptions of Artaxerxes II (404-358 BC). For example:

ASd. AM436 anahita utā mitra mām pātuv hacā gastā utamayt kartam
May Auramazdā, Anāhitā and Mitra protect me from all evil, and my Building.

As far as the opposition between Ahura Mazdā and Aŋra Maňiuu is concerned, according to the Old Avestan text of Y 45.2, while Ahura Mazdā does not have an evil counterpart, Aŋra Maňiuu “Evil Spirit” stands against the Spaniaah Maňiuu “More Life-giving Spirit”, as their deeds, minds, words and choices oppose each other. These two entities are also regarded as twins, or Av. yōma-, in Y 30.3. This idea is retained in the Young Avestan texts according to which, the two spirits stand against each other, for example:

Y 57.17 yō nōįg pascaēta huśx afa
yat maňiū ū dāmaŋ daiʼitom
yasca spoŋtō maňiuš yasca aŋrō
hišārō ašahe gaēdā
yō višpāį atiānca xšaft̥asca yūiĎiieiti māzaniamēbiiō haĎa daēuuaēbiiō

433 My translation.
434 Av. ahura- mazdā- appears as the univerbated auramazdā- in Old Persian.
435 Av. arəduuī- sūrā- anāhitā- appears as anāhitā- in Old Persian. For declensions see Kent (1953: 167).
436 AM stands for Auramazdā when written in Old Persian with an ideogram. For Old Persian characters and ideograms see Kent (1953: 11-12).
437 Kent (1953: 154-155).
438 For English translations of Y 45.2 see Insler (1975: 74-75); Humbach (1991: I, 164).
439 For English translations of Y 30.3 see Insler (1975: 32-33); Humbach (1991: I, 123).
Who has not slept, then,
(since) the two spirits created the creations,
Life-giving Spirit and the Evil one.
Watching over the creature of the Truth
who, days and nights, battles with all monstrous demons.\textsuperscript{440}

However, in the Young Avesta, there are examples according to which Aŋra Mańiu stands against Ahura Mazdā:

\begin{verbatim}
Yt. 1.0. xšnaoŋra ahurahe mazdā tarōiditi aŋrahe mańiiuš
With the (hope) of gratification for Ahura Mazdā, with the (wish) of overcoming Angra Mańiu.\textsuperscript{441}
\end{verbatim}

In the first chapter of the Vīdēvdād, the first sixteen lands created by Ahura Mazdā are also inflicted by the counter creation of Aŋra Mańiu (Moazami 2014: 9-10). Furthermore, according to Aristotle’s testimony, appearing in Diogenes Laertius, 1.2.6, Oromazdes stands against Ariemanios (Duchesne-Guillemin: 1984: 672). Finally, in the Pahlavi literature, the antagonism between Ohrmazd and Ahriman is well attested. For example

\begin{verbatim}
IrBd 5.0-1 abar hamēstārīh ī dōwān mēnōyān kū ēwēn mad hēnd pad hamēstārīh kamāligān dēwān ō mēnōyān yazdān čiyōn ahriman ō ohrmazd ...
On the opposition of the two spirits, that is in what manner, the chief Dēws came for antagonism against the spiritual Yazds. Just as: Ahriman against Ohrmazd … .\textsuperscript{442}
\end{verbatim}

Therefore, Zoroastrian literature, especially the Pahlavi and some Young Avestan texts, shows a dualism according to which Ahura Mazdā (Phl. Ohrmazd) is the antagonist of Aŋra Mańiu (Phl. Ahriman).

The antagonism of the Av. Miṱra (= Phl. Mihr) and the dragon Dahāka becomes clear on the one hand by examining the relationship between Ōraētaona (= Phl. Frēdōn) and Miṱra and on the other hand by considering Ōraētaona as the slayer of the dragon Dahāka. It has been shown by Spiegel (1887: 262-267) and Benveniste (1934: 195-196) that Trita is Ōraētaona’s counterpart in the Vedic literature, the oldest collection of the Sanskrit texts. Similar to the story of Ōraētaona-dragon Dahāka, in the Rig-veda, the three-headed, seven-

\textsuperscript{440} The text is after Kreyenbroek (1985: 44, 45).
\textsuperscript{442} The text is after Anklesaria (1956: 54-55).
bridled Viśvarūpa is submitted to Trita by Indra to be slain:

RV 2. 11. 19. sānema yē ta ūṭhibhis tāranto viśvā spyṛda āryena dāsyūn asmābhyaṃ tāt tvāṣṭrāṃ viśvarūpam ārandhayah sākhīyasya tritāya

We would win! We who by your help are overcoming all rivals, the Dasyus along with the Arya.
That was for us that you made Viśvarūpa, son of Tvaṣṭa, submit to Trita, one of your cycle companions.

RV 10. 8. 8. sā pūriyāṇy āyuḍhāṇi vidvān índreṣita āptiyō abhy āyuḍhat triṣiṛśāṇaṃ saptāraśmiṃ jāghanvān tvāṭrāsya cin niḥ sasṛje tritō gāḥ

That one, Aptya, knowing his ancestral weapons, urged on by Indra, attacked. Having smashed the three headed, seven reined (monster), Trita let loose the cows, even those of Tvaṣṭar’s son.

Although Indra is demonised in the Avesta, some of his warrior characteristics are similar to those of Miθra in the Iranian tradition (Malandra 2006a: 104). As mentioned, Indra accompanies Trita, therefore, it is plausible to suggest that Ōraētaona is also associated with Miθra in the Avesta. It emerges from the Yt 19.34-37 where Miθra and Ōraētaona successively seize the Glory each time it left Yima. A further feature which both Ōraētaona (= Phl. Frēdōn) and Miθra (= Phl. Mihr) share is their close association with cattle. Thus, according to the Pahlavi texts, cattle was the totem of Frēdōn’s clan (IrBd 35.8) or in the Šāhnāma (ed. Bertels, vol. I, 57, vv 112), Frēdōn is nourished by the milk of the cow Barmāya. Moreover, according to the Arabic text of Āṣār al-Bāqiya ‘n al-Qorun al-Xāliya, Frēdōn decided to punish the dragon Ḿāḥāk (the Arabic form of Az ī Dahāg) for an ox, kept in his father’s house:

AB 209, line 11-17. “On the 21st or Rām Rōz, is the Great Mihrājān in commemoration of Frēdōn’s subduing and binding Žāḥḥāk. People say that when he was brought before Frēdōn he spoke: ‘Do not kill me in retaliation for thy ancestor’. Upon which Frēdōn answered, refusing his entreaty, ‘Do you want to be considered as equal as to Jam son of Wijahān in the way of retaliation? By no means. I shall punish you for an ox that was in the house of my ancestor’.

---

447 For the Avestan text and its English translation see Hintze (1994b: 21-22).
448 The Arabicised Mihrājān (= NP. Mihragān) is the name of a celebration to honour Miθra.
449 It corresponds to Pahlavi Wiwanghan.
450 Translation by Sachau (1879: 209).
In the Mihr Yašt, Miθra carries the epithet vouru.gaoiiaoiti- “having, or providing, wide cattle-pastures”.451 He is also described as a protector of cattle. For example, he destroys the houses of those who abuse them:

Yt 10.38 xrūmā šaitiitō fraziitnē
anašitā mačšanitā
yāhuu miθrō.druiō šiiete
haišīm.aṣauua.janascar druviitō
xrūmīm gāuš yā caŋraŋhāxš
varaiššīm pantiqm azaitē
yā darōnāhu miθrō.druiqm mašiīnqm
frajarsta aēšām raišiiua
asrū azānū hīštonte
anu.zaʃanō takahe

He (Miθra) sweeps away the crumbling dwellings, the no longer inhabitable abodes in which (used to) live the owners of Falsehood who are false to the treaty and strike at what virtually owns Truth: The cow, accustomed to pastures, is driven along the dusty road of captivity, dragged forward in the clutches of treaty infringing men as their draught animal, choking with tears they (cows) stand slobbering at the mouth (lit. a flow (being) along the mouth).452

Furthermore, according to Yt 10.84, pleads with Miθra a cow who desires to be milked.453 Like Miθra, Indra is a protector of cattle by releasing them from the cave Vala:

RV 2.12.3 yō hatvāhim ārināt sapťa sindhūn yō gā udājad apadhā valāsyā
yō āśmanor antār aṃṇīm jajāna samvṛk samātsu sā janāśa īndraḥ454

Who, having smashed the serpent, let flow the seven rivers who drove away the cattle by uncovering Vala. Who produced the fire between two stones, gathering the winnings in contests, he, O peoples, is Indra.455

Furthermore, the direct relationship between Mihr and Frēdōn appears in the Šahnāma (ed. Bertels, vol. I, 79, vv 9-10) according to which the Mihragān celebration and the

452 The text is after Gershevitch (1967: 92-93).
453 For the Avestan text and its English translation see Gershevitch (1967: 133).
establishment of the month Mihr are ascribed to Frēdōn:

\[
\text{parastīdan-ī mihragan dēn-ī ō-st/tan āsanī-yu xvardan ā ūn-ī ō-st agār yādagār ast az ō māh-ī mihr/be kōš-u be ranj ēč manmāy čehr}
\]

Worshiping Mihragan is his religion/relaxing body and eating are his cult.
If the month Mihr is a memento from him/strive and do not face any suffering.

Likewise, as mentioned above, Biruni in the Āṣār al-Bāqiya ‘n al-Qorun al-Xāliya relates the Mihragan celebration to the victory of Frēdōn over Zaḥḥāk. As far as the opposition between Miθra and the dragon Dahāka is concerned, in Mithraism, the corresponding deity Mithras seems to be a dragon-slayer since a Mithraic ritualistic performance of a simulated dragon slaying is reported in a passage attributed to Lampridius (Widengren 1965: 44-45). As discussed in Y 9.8 commentary 3 hazārwizōstār, in the Avesta, the dragon Dahāka and Miθra also bear the epithet hazaŋrā.yaoxštī-. However, adādag pad gōhrag “unjust by essence” appears as the gloss to hazārwizōstār, the epithet of Evil Spirit in Y 9.8 and the Pahlavi translation of Av. hazaŋrā.yaoxštīm. Therefore, the evidence shows that Evil Spirit’s unjust hazārwizōstār is also the antagonist of Mihr’s just epithet.

Av. jahī- (= Phl. jeh) opposes the Zoroastrian goddesses Av. arǝduuī- sūrā- anāhitā- and ārmaiti- “Right Mindnedness (the pious daughter of Ahura Mazdā)” in the Zoroastrian literature (Rose 2015: 276). However, the features of Jahī as described in the Vd 18.61-63 contrast with those of Arǝduuī Sūrā Anāhitā according to Yt 5.2:

---

456 The name of the seventh month of the Zoroastrian calendar.
457 My translation.
458 Hinmells (1975: 205) states that the dragon slaying ritual must be absent in Mithraism since the snake is ‘a symbol of a beneficial life-giving force’. However, it should be noted that although there is no text written by the followers of the cult of Mithras, according to the personification of the dragons in the Zoroastrian literature, their appearances are different from those of snakes, for example, the three-muzzled, three-headed six-eyed dragon Dahāka. In addition, in IrBd 4.15, snakes and dragons are listed as two different noxious creatures. Moreover, while dragons are killed by heroes, snakes are recommended not to be killed although they are noxious creatures: IrBd 22.18 gōwēd kū xrafstar hamāg jādūg ud mār jādūgtar bē ū-š zadan nē gōwēd “One says that noxious creatures are all sorcerers and serpent is the most sorcerous but it is said (that snakes) not to be killed.” It should be noted that Anklesaria (1956: 186) reads the second verb in the above passage as nē mīrēd “does not die” and interprets bē ū-š zadan nē gōwēd as bē agar-iz zanēnd nē mīrēd “and does not die unless they kill it”. However, in the text of the manuscript TD2, the second verb is obviously written as YMRRN(N)-yt (gōwēd). Furthermore agar-iz is absent in TD2 (Anklesaria 1908: 145, line 2). The text of IrBd 22.18 agrees with the position of the snake in the still living Zoroastrian traditions according to which snakes should not be killed. For the position of snakes in Zoroastrianism see Mazdapour (2008 (1387): 204-220).
459 For a commentary to Yt 5 see Reichelt (1911: 100-109).
According to Yt 5.2 Arəduui Sūrā Anāhitā viṣpanqm arṣanqm xṣudrā yaoždaāiiti “purifies the seed of men”. By contrast, Jahī mixes the seeds of the righteous and non-righteous ones. Moreover, while Arəduui Sūrā Anāhitā is apparently the goddess of waters, the gaze of the demoness Jahī stops the flowing waters:

Vd 18.63 ṛiśum apqm ṛraotōstāinqm txmanqm pairištaiieiti paiti.dīti zaraduštra  
ṛiśum uruuaranqm uzuxšiientinqm srīraṇanqm zairi.gaonanqm vaxšā  
apaiiasaite paiti.dīti zaraduštra  
She holds one third of the powerful flowing waters  
by (her) gaze O Zaraštra!  
She withers one third of the plants (which are) growing up,  
beautiful, yellow-coloured, growing,  
by (her) gaze O Zaraštra!  

Finally, in Y 9.8, dačuuim drujom is described as Av. aš.aojaŋhōm “the very powerful”, rendered by was őz “of many powers” in Pahlavi. Likewise, the goddess is described in Yt 5.64 as Av. aš.amā- “very powerful”:

Yt 5.64. upatacaŋ arduuum sūra anāhīta  
kainīnō khrpa srīrāiī ā  
aš.amaiiā huraṇaiaiī ...  
Ardvī Sūrā Anāhīta hurried towards (him)  
in the shape of a beautiful lady  
(in the shape) of the very powerful (lady), (in the shape) of a good-looking (lady) …  

In conclusion, in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.8, the triad of two male evil beings and a
demoness can be distinguished. The evidence suggests that their attributes contrast with those of Ahura Mazda, Miōra and the goddess Anāhitā. In what follows, the dichotomy of the two Ahuric and Daevic triads is drawn:

6) Line 5 Y 9.8bP wattar ŏ gēhān “worse for the material world”

Av. dat. pl. gaēdāuuiō is translated by ŏ gēhānān in YInP J2, K5 and M1. By contrast, in the Iranian manuscripts the dative expressing ŏ is deleted. As discussed in section 3.1, one of the features of the corrected manuscripts, written down in the eighteenth century, is the deletion of prepositions and adverbs. Therefore, in agreement with YIndPs, ŏ is employed in the present edition. Omitting ŏ, the Iranian manuscripts also write the pl. wattarān probably by analogy with gēhān.

As stated above, gaēdāuuiō appears as the double plural gēhānān in the Indian manuscript in contrast to pl. gēhān in YIrP. The erroneous form gēhānān is probably by analogy with NP. ērānyān (ايرانيان) which is the double plural of ērān (ايران) “Iranians”. As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, in agreement with the Iranian manuscripts, the correct form gēhān is employed in the present edition

7) Line 7 Y 9.8cP frāz kirrēnīd “mis-created”

The Pahlavi verb frāz kirrēnīd translates Av. fraca kərəntət lit. “to cut forth”. The verb describes the demonic creation in contrast to dādan “to create” which is used for the creation of the beneficent camp. Therefore, it is translated as “mis-created” in the present edition.464

464 For a discussion on kirrēnīdan see Lincoln (1997: 681-685).
8) Line 12 Y 9.8cP ēd “this”

While in YIndP J2, K5, M1 together with YIrP F2, ēd in ān ēd āmār kū “that the reckoning of this is that” appears, it is replaced by ān in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b. Regarding the editorial judgement, although both variants are correct, in agreement with the reading of the base text K5, ēd is employed in the present edition.

9) Line 14 Y 9.8cP ā-š be kard “then, she did”

In YIrP G14, ā-š “then she” is replaced by u-š “and she”. However, it appears as ā-š in the other manuscripts in agreement with which, ā-š is employed in the present edition.

10) Line 15 Y 9.8cP ud im būd tis ī-š tuwān būd kardan “and this meant the thing that she could do”

In YIrP F2, tis (MND M) is replaced by abar (QDM) “up, on, over” in the following context:

\[
\text{ud im būd āš/abar (F2) ī-š tuwān būd kardan}
\]
\[
\text{u-š nē kard}
\]

and this meant the thing/over (F2) that she could do, he did not do.

It is obvious that the reading of F2 is semantically meaningless. The same problem also exists with considering QDM as the corrupt heterogram of abar (ʾp̄l) “higher, superior”. It seems that atypes in F2 is a misspelling of ʾpsē.

As regards kardan, with the exception of F2, writing kard, in the other Iranian manuscripts kardan “to do” in tis ī-š tuwān būd kardan “the thing that she could do” is omitted. However, it is obvious that without the infinitive kardan “to do”, the sentence is incomplete. As far as the reading of F2 is concerned, kard can also be interpreted as the short infinitive. Nonetheless, with the base text, kardan is selected in the present edition. Moreover, in YIrP Pt4 abāyēd ā-š kard is added in the following context:

\[
\text{tis ī-š tuwān būd kardan}
\]
\[
\text{u-š nē kard Pt4 abāyēd ā-š kard}
\]

the thing that she could do, he did not do, Pt4 It is necessary, then, (s)he did].
As regards the editorial judgement, it is absent in the other manuscripts especially the copies of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line\textsuperscript{465} and T55b, closely related to Pt4. As discussed in section 3.1, one of the features of the Pahlavi corrected texts is the insertion of commentaries which are absent in the older copies. Therefore, \textit{abāyēd ā-š kard} is not employed in the present edition.

\textsuperscript{465} Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
4.9  Y 9.9

1 (Y 9.9aA) κασά งฟำม
2 งริतีโอ ဟōμα มหาีโอ
3 าสุว้าลีลี หุนūต้า แก่ดีลี
4 กā อำฮมāิ อำสิǎ งรรนāุวī
5 งิ่ง อำฮมāิ งสำำ้ก อุิ่มāปฏ์

1-3 (Y 9.9aA) Who, O Haōma, was the third mortal to press you for the material creature?
4 What reward was granted to him?
5 What boon came to him?

1 (Y 9.9aP) ถī ตō
2 ๗ิ่ดิกร ฮōม ๗ิ่ม ๗าทั้งมāณ
3 ๗ิ่ง อั๊ด ะทั้งมāณดāก งีหāน หุนīหē
4 ถī อัน ต้าสางāีหīห ๗ารด
5 ๗ิ่ง อุ๊ข ๗ือ ๗าด ๗าบāดīห

1-3 (Y 9.9aP) Who, O Hōm, as the third one among men in the material world pressed you?
4 what respect was shown to him?
5 and what prosperity came to him?

1) Line 5 Y 9.9aP ๗ิ่ง อุ๊ข ๗ือ ๗าด ๗าบāดīห “and what prosperity came to him?”

In YIrP G14 and T6, the dative preposition ถี, expressing the dative case in ๗ำฮี, is replaced by อัน “that”. However, ถี correctly expresses the dative case in the other collated manuscripts in agreement with which it is employed in the present edition.
4.10 Y 9.10

1 (Y 9.10aA) āt mē aēm paitiiaoxta
2 haōmō ašauua dūraošō
3 (Y 9.10bA) ṣrītā sāmanqm souuištō
4 ṣrītiiōmq māšītō
5 astuuaiiāi hunūta gaēdiīāi
6 hā ahmāi ašīṣ ərənāuui
7 taṭ ahmāi jasaṭ āiaptəm
8 (Y 9.10cA) yaṭ hē puḍra us.zaiiīde
9 uruāuśaṭiō karṣāspasca
10 (Y 9.10dA)ṛaēšō ańiiō dātō,ražō
11 (Y 9.10dA)āt ańiiō uparō.kairiiō
12 yaawu gaēsuś gaδauuarō

1 (Y 9.10aA) Thereupon answered me,
2 the righteous Haōma whose destruction is difficult:
3 (Y 9.10bA) Ṣrītā, the strongest of the Sāmas
4 as the third mortal
5 pressed me for the material creature.
6 This reward was granted to him,
7 this boon came to him,
8 (Y 9.10cA) that two sons were born to him,
9 Uruaśaiia and Kāraśaspa,
10 (Y 9.10dA) the one as a judge, a law giver,
11 (Y 9.10dA) then, the other(one) a supreme worker,
12 curly haired youth carrying a mace.

1 (Y 9.10aP) ēg-iš ō man ōy passōx guft
2 hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrāš
3 (Y 9.10bP) srīd ī sāmān ī sūdxwāstār
4 [hād srīdī ēd būd
5 kū pus ī sidīgar būd
6 u-s sūdxwāstārīh ēd būd
7 kū-s sūd ī dāmān nēk dānist xwāst]
8 man sidīgar az maroṃān
9 andar astōmandān gēhān hunīdam
10 ōy ān tarsagāhīh kard
11 ō ōy mad ābādīh
12 (Y 9.10cP) ka az ōy dō pus ul zād hēnd
13 urwāxš ud kirsāsp
14 (Y 9.10dP) dādwar any [būd urwāxš kū wizīr ud dādwarīh kard] ud dādārāstār
15 [kū-s dād ī frārōn be nihād]
16 (Y 9.10eP) ud ān ān any abarkār
17 ud juwān gēśwar ud gadwar
18 [kirsāsp kū-s kār pad gad wēš kard
19 māhwindād guft
20 hād dād ī tāzīg būd u-s az gēśwar be guft
21 māhgušnasp guft
22 hād ēd-iš nē škefīh čē gēs turk-iz dārēd]

1 (Y 9.10aP) Then, he answered me,
2 Hōm who is righteous (and) averts perdition:
3 (Y 9.10bP) Sṛīd son of the Sāṃs who is the seeker of benefit
4 [That is: being Sṛīd was this
5 that he was the third son
6 and being benefit seeker was this]
7 that he knew well (and) sought the benefit of the creatures],
8 as the third one among men,
9 pressed me in the material world.
10 The respect was shown to him,
11 the prosperity came to him,
12 (Y 9.10cP) when two sons were born from him,
13 Urwāxš and Kirsāsp.
14 (Y 9.10dP) The one as a judge [was Urwāxš who (made)
and, (he was also) an adorner of law
15 [who established the righteous law].
16 (Y 9.10eP) And the other one superior worker
17 and young with curly hair and carrier of a mace
18 [Kirsāsp who did many works with the mace]
19 Māhwindād said:
20 ‘Yes, it was an Arabian rule and he said about the curly haired one.’
21 Māhgushnasp said:
22 ‘Yes, this is not strange since he also has the curly Turkic hair.’

1) Line 1 Y 9.10aP ēg-iš “Then, he”

YIrP T6 opens the Pahlavi version with ēdōn “thus, so”. By contrast, in YIndP K5 and M1, ēg-iš occurs. While Phl. ēdōn and ēg-iš correspond to āaṭ in Av. āaṭ mē aēm paitiiaoxta, āaṭ is left untranslated in the other manuscripts. In agreement with the reading of the base text K5, ēg-iš is employed in the present edition.

2) Line 6 Y 9.10bP u-š sūdxwāstārīh ēd būd “and being benefit seeker was this”

In YIndP J2, the verb būd is absent, however, in agreement with its sister manuscript K5 and other collated copies, būd is employed in the present edition. As regards sūdxwāstārīh, Av. sūuuištā- “the strongest” is always rendered by sūdxwāstār. Probably, the Pahlavi translators derived sūuuištā- from the root sū “to benefit” added to išt “to desire” (Josephson 1997: 51).
3) Line 11 Y 9.10bP ő ōy mad ābādīh “the prosperity came to him”

YIndP K5 and M1 write ān after ōy. However, it has no counterpart in the Avestan original. Therefore, in agreement with the reading of the base text sister manuscript, or J2, ān is omitted in the present edition. This would be in keeping with Greg’s (1950: 29) definition of the principles of the copy-text in which substantive readings found in a text of similar substantive authority as the chosen one can be selected.

4) Line 12 Y 9.10cP ka az ōy dō pus ul zād hēnd466 “when two sons were born from him”

In Y 9.10, Phl. az is attested in YInd K5 and M1. In addition to Y 9.10, the formulaic structure occurs in Y 9.4, 7, 13 in all of which az occurs in all of the collated manuscripts. Therefore, az is employed in the edition of Y 9.10.

5) Line 13 Y 9.10cP urwāxš ud kirsāsp “Urwāxš and Kirsāsp”

According to Y 9.10, two sons were born to Θīrīta namely Urwāxš and Kirsāsp. The account agrees with IrBd 35.32 according to which Urwāxš and Kirsāsp were brothers. However, nothing much is found about Av. uruuāxšaiia-/Phl. urwāxš other than Yt 15.28 and Yt 19.41. According to the former passage, Av. korošspa- begs Av. vaiiu- “Wind” to enable him to avenge his brother’s murder by killing his enemy, Hitāspa:

Yt 15.28 aom jaiōiiaat
auuaat āiiaptəm dazdī mē
vaiiuus yō uparō. kairiio
yāt kaēna ni. jasāni
azəm barāqrō uruuxšaiia
yāt janāni hitāspəm
raiše paiti vazaiōiīāi
uiti aštī.gafiiō ähūirīš
uiti aēuuō.gafiiō paitiš
uiti gandarβīō upāpō

He prays to him.
give me that boon,
Wind, who are the supreme worker,
that I may come down as the avenger
of my brother, Uruuāxšaiia,
that I may slay Hitāspa

466 Phl. zād hēnd translates 3rd du. ind us.zaiiōiāe. For a discussion on the ending see Y 9.5 commentary 1 frāz raft hēnd.
to drive him on my chariot,
likewise (may be) the Ahuric Ašti.gāfiia,
likewise (may be) the lord Aēuuō.gāfiia,
likewise (may be) the aquatic Gaṅdarəβa.\textsuperscript{467}

According to Yt 19, Kərəšāspa succeeded in taking revenge against Hitāspa:

\textit{Yt 19.41} yō jana
gāndarəβəm yim zairi.pāšnəm
yō apata vīzafārə
mərzxənō gaēθə astuwaitiś aşahe
yō jana
hunauuō yat paθanaiaia nauua
hunauuasca niuuikahe
hunauuasca dāštaiiānōiś
yō jana
zarāniiō.pusm hitāspəm
vərəšəomca dānaiiənəm
pitaonəmca aš.pairikəm

Who slew
Gaṅdarəβa, who had yellow heel, who
rushed about with wide-open mouth
to destroy the world of Truth;
who slew
the nine sons of Paθana,
the sons of Niuuika,
the sons of Dāštaiiāni;
who slew
Hitāspa of golden diadem
and Varašauua, the son of Dāna,
and Pitaona accompanied by powerful witches.\textsuperscript{468}

As regards Av. kərəšāspa-,\textsuperscript{469} its corresponding variant kərəšāspa- also occurs in manuscripts. The spellings of the Avestan word together with the transliterations of its corresponding Pahlavi word in Y 9.10 as attested in the Pahlavi manuscripts are listed in the

\textsuperscript{467} My translation. Edition by Geldner (1886-1896: II, 223). Av. aštī.gāfiia- is read as astī.gafiia- by Geldner (1886-1896: II, 223) with the manuscript J10 and M12 in which the spelling s is attested. Darmesteter (1898: II, 225-226), translating aštī.gafiia- and aēuuō.gafiia- as “is in the deep” and “only of the deep”, respectively, considers them as the epithets of Av. gāndarəβa-. For aštī.gafiia- and aēuuō.gafiia- as proper nouns see Mayrhofer (1979: I/26 and I2), respectively. Interestingly, kərəšāspa- prays to be the avenger of an Ahuric being and a lord namely aštī.gafiia- and aēuuō.gafiia-, respectively. It may reflect the unique position of the hero Kərəšāspa who in spite of being a very powerful hero, has committed several offences such as insulting fire (DkM 803.6-12; PRDd 18; SdBd 20), idol worshipping (Pahlavi version of Vd 9.1) and walking without the sacred girdle, or Kusti (IrBd 31.17-18).


\textsuperscript{469} Av. kərəšāspa- “having slim (meagre) horses” is composed of two elements; kərəsa- which is derived from IE *kərk “to become thin” and aspa- meaning “horse”. See IEW. 581; Myerhofer (1977: I. 60I); LIV. 355.
following table:

Table 9. Manuscripts readings of Av. kərsəspā- and Phl. kirsāsp in transliteration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Avestan original</th>
<th>Pahlavi translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YIrP Pt4 (fol. 57r)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>kls ’sp⁴⁷⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP Mf4 (fol. 77v)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>kls ’sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP G14 (fol. 56r)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>klšʾsp ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP F2 (fol. 55r)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>klš ’sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP T6 (fol. 47v)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>klšʾsp ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIrP T55b (fol. 73v)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>klyšsp⁴⁷¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIndP J2 (fol. 85r)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>kls ’sp’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIndP K5 (fol. 63v)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>kls ’sp’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIndP M1 (fol. 164r-164v)</td>
<td>kərsəspāscə</td>
<td>kls ’sp’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The replacement of s by š in the Avestan original of some manuscripts could be by analogy with s to š retraction after r, especially with 2nd sg. aor. mid. kəρəšuuā “exercise” of the root kar “to make”.⁴⁷²

As far as the Pahlavi spellings are concerned, in addition to the variants listed in Table 9, the Pahlavi word is spelled as glsʾsp, glyšʾsp and kylšʾsp.⁴⁷³ It has also been transcribed differently by scholars as kirsāsp, kersāsp, karsāsp and karšāsp. In New Persian, the word appears as garšāsb. However, since in the Arabic sources, it is attested with the initial k rather than j, corresponding to the New Persian g, Khaleghi-Motlagh (2001 (1380): Notes I/1, 168) suggests that in Early New Persian the word must have been karšāsb.

Regarding the historical development of k > g and the replacement of s by š, Skjærvø (2011a) mentions that the New Persian garšāsb is probably by analogy with the epithet of

---

⁴⁷⁰ The alternative spelling for kərsəspāscə is klyšsp’, unmarking the long ā. However, it should be noted that klyšsp’ is the misinterpretation of kls ’sp’ (Skjærvø 2011a).

⁴⁷¹ In T55b (fol. 53v line 13), the spelling š is confirmed by three diacritic dots:

⁴⁷² For s to š retraction after r, u, k, i, or RUKI rule and the examples in Avestan see Martinez & de Vaan (2014: 32-33, §11.20.5).

⁴⁷³ See Skjærvø (2011a).
gayōmard, or garšāh “the king of mountains”. However, the evidence casts doubt on Skjærvø’s suggestion because while the replacement of s by š also occurs in Avestan, as shown above, the interchange between k and g is absent. Moreover, the Early New Persian karšāsb does not support the analogy theory. In addition, the interchange between the initial voiced g and unvoiced k has parallels in Middle Persian and New Persian. For example, Phl. gēhān becomes kēhān in New Persian, or Manichaean Middle Persian gavīr “desert” is attested as kavīr “desert” in New Persian.474 The interchange in the opposite direction is also seen in the name of the hero kaśvād in New Persian which becomes gaśvād.475 Another example is the name of the Turanian hero karsivaz (Khaleghi Motlagh 1987 (1366): XXVIII). Therefore, it can be concluded that the changes of the initial k > g and s > š are explainable without relating them to the analogy by garšāh.

In the present edition, the Pahlavi word is transcribed with k and s. The reason is that the development k > g is late and the phoneme /s/ etymologically agrees with the expected spelling of the word.

As far as the transcription of the vocalic Ir. *ṛ, Av. ərə, is concerned, it becomes ur after the labials and ir in other occurrences (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014: 138-139, § 250). However, since Ir. *ṛ can also develop to ar in Pahlavi and New Persian, for example *kṛtā- > kard, MacKenzie (1967: 24, fn. 25) suggests the minimal triplets i ~ e ~ a. MacKenzie’s theory, however, is quite hypothetical because the existence of these types of triplets is uncertain (Skjærvø 2009: 200). Therefore, between the two vowels a and i, the latter is selected in the present edition, because the reading i is confirmed by the spelling, <kly>, <kyl> and <gyl> as shown above. The variant spellings, placing y before and after l could also suggest that the Pahlavi word used to be pronounced close to its Avestan original as kirisāsp.

6) Line 14 Y 9.10dP dādwar any [būd urwaxš kū wizīr ud dādwarīh kard] ud dādārāstār “The one as a judge [was Urwāxš who (made) decision and made judgement] and, (he was also) an adorner of law”

The Pahlavi phrase dādwar any is the translation of the Avestan ṭkaēšō ańiiō. While in

475 It is recorded in Arabic as jasvād and kaśvād by the Muslim historians Ṭabarī (b. 839 CE-d. 923 CE) and Ṣaʿālibī (b. 961 CE-d.1038 CE), respectively (Khaleghi Motlagh 2001 (1380): Notes I/1, 387). Therefore, it seems that the development of k > g had started in the tenth century of CE. Khaleghi Motlagh (1987 (1366): XXVIII) chooses the more archaic variant karsīvaz in his edition of the Šāhnāma.
YIndPs, Av. aṇīiō is rendered correctly by the Phl. any, the Avestan word is translated by ān ēd “that is this or that means” in the late YIrPs. In agreement with the base text K5, any is employed in the present edition. It should be noted that in YIndP J2, K5 and M1, any is spelled by the heterogram ZK-ȳ which sometimes replaces ‘HRN-ȳ in the manuscripts.476

7) Line 15 Y 9.10dP kū-š dād ī frārōn be nihād “who established the righteous law”

In YIndP K5, M1, the verb dānist (YD YTWN-st) “knew” replaces nihād (HNHTWN-t) “established”. It is unclear whether the different readings in the sister manuscripts J2 and K5 are because of scribal correction or misspelling of the Pahlavi verb (J2: 477 vs. K5: 479) in one of the manuscripts. However, semantically, the reading of J2 is preferable. Therefore, unlike the reading of the base text K5, nihād is employed in the present edition. This would be in keeping with Greg’s (1950: 29) definition of the principles of the copy-text in which substantive readings found in a text of similar substantive authority as the chosen one can be selected.

8) Line 16 Y 9.10eP ān ī any abarkār “the other one superior worker”

Like the commentary 6, any in ān any abarkār is spelled by ZK-ȳ in all of the collated manuscripts.

9) Line 17 Y 9.10eP juwān “young”

Av. yauuan- m. is rendered by Phl. juwān in Y 9.10. However, juwān is absent in G14 and T6. It is employed in the present edition because juwān is present in the the old YIndP J2, K5 and YIrP Pt4 and Mf4 which like G14 and T6 belong to the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line.480

10) Line 18 Y 9.10eP kirsāsp kū-š kār pad gad wēš kard “Kirsāsp who did many works with the mace”

The Avesta and Pahlavi texts state that kirsāsp carries a mace. In other Pahlavi texts, his

476 For the different spellings of any see Salemann (GlIRPh I/1, 294); MacKenzie (1971: 10); Nyberg (1974: 16).
477 For minor variant readings see text-critical apparatus.
478 J2 (fol. 85v line 2):
479 K5 (fol. 63v line 13):
480 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
club *gad* is called *arm-zadār* “arm-smashing” (Dēnkard 9.23.6),\(^{481}\) *gāw-sar* “ox headed” (Dādestān ī Dēnīg 36.84)\(^{482}\) and *gad ī pērōzgar* “the victorious mace” (Zand ī Wahman Yasn 9.22).\(^{483}\)

11) **Line 19-20 Y 9.10eP** *mahwindād guft hād* “Māhwindād said: Yes”

Māhwindād’s commentary begins with *kū* “that” in YIrPs, *ay* in YIndP J2 and *hād* in YIndP K5 and M1. While all of the variant readings are correct semantically, in agreement with the base text K5, *hād* is employed in the present edition.

12) **Line 20 Y 9.10e** *gēswar* “curly haired one”

In YIrPs, the Pahlavi word appears as the abstract *gēswarīh* “having curly hair”. By contrast, YIndP K5, M1 write *gēswar* “curly haired one”.\(^{484}\) While both readings are semantically meaningful, following the base text K5, *gēswar* is employed in the present edition.

13) **Line 20, 22 Y 9.10eP** *dād ī tāzīg būd* ... *hād ēd-iš nē škeftīh čē gēs turk-iz dārēd* “it was an Arabian rule ... Yes, this is not strange since he also has the curly Turkic hair].”

In what follows, the manuscript readings of Phl. *dād ī tāzīg* are listed:

---

**Figure 32. The variant readings of *dād ī tāzīg*.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YIrP</th>
<th>YIndP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt4 (fol. 57v line 1)</td>
<td>J2 (fol. 85v line 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mf4 (p. 154 line 9)</td>
<td>K5 (fol. 63v line 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G14 (fol. 56v line 11-12)</td>
<td>M1 (fol. 164v line 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 (fol. 55v line 4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{482}\) For *gāw-sar* and an edition and a translation of Dādestan ī Dēnīg 36.84 see Jaafari-Dehaghi (1998: 140-141).


\(^{484}\) The reading in YIndP J2 is illegible.
According to the table, while YIndPs spell dʾt Y, d is interpreted as g in YIrPs by placing two diacritic marks above  in Pt4, G14, F2 and T6. The manuscript T55b places both ^, showing d, and two dots above 485 However, in its left margin, the corrected form appears as gtyh.486 Furthermore, the interlinear New Persian version of T6 reads the word as gādiš. The Pahlavi word is also translated as NP. gurz “mace” (Pt4), NP. jang “war” (F2) and NP. ā kāvyānī “Kavian ā?” (T6). In addition, the marginal selāh gurz “weapon, mace” translates gtyh in T55b.

It is obvious that the New Persian reading of the Pahlavi word as gādiš in T6 is semantically meaningless and wrong. In addition, dʾt or gʾt is not the correct spelling of gt (gad) “mace” which all manuscripts spell correctly in the preceding ud juwān gēswar ud gadwar kirsāsp kū-š kār pad gad wēš kard. It seems that the scribes of the Iranian manuscripts associated the word with the preceding kirsāsp kū-š kār pad gad wēš kard and accordingly interpreted the Pahlavi word. Therefore, in agreement with the reading of YIndPs, dād ī is employed in the present edition.

As far as the adjective tāzīg is concerned, it is derived from the Arab tribal name ṭayy to which the ethnic suffix čīk > zīg is attached.487 The tribe played an important role in the history of Arabs and its name was generalised to Arabs in Aramaic probably from the fourth century onwards in the form of ṭayyāye (Segal 1984: 100-103). The corresponding Pahlavi term tāzīg was used by Iranians to denote Arabs perhaps after 602 CE when the victorious Husraw (r. 598-628 CE), unexpectedly deposed his ally Noʾmān III of the Arab Lakhmanid after whom Iyas of the ṭayy tribe ruled over al-Ḥira (Bosworth 2000: 62-63).488

As shown above, Phl. tāzīg appears as the plural tāzīgān in YIrP Pt4 (-%ān superscript), G14 and T6. By contrast, in YIrP Mf4, F2, T55b and YIndP J2, K5, M1, the singular form tāzīg occurs. As regards turk-iz, it is written as the plural turkʾn-iz in YIrP G14 and T6. In

485 The diacritical marks in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6, T55b and IndPY J2, K5, M5 are studied in my unpublished MA dissertation (Khanizadeh 2013: 39-55).

486 Quatremère (1845: 154-155) first put forward that tāzīg “Arab” goes back to ṭayy. For etymological studies of the word see Schaedler (1941: 27); Sundermann (1993: 166).

488 For a discussion on the relations between Iranians and Arabs during the pre-Islamic period see Bosworth (1983: 593-612).
Pt4 (fol. 57v line 3) and F2 (fol. 55v line 6) *twlk-c* is attested on the line whereas 'n is written with small (and pale: F2) letters above the line:

Figure 33. Left YIrP Pt4 (fol. 57r line 3); right YIrP F2 (fol. 55v line 6).

The variant readings *tāzīgān* and *turkān* in YIrPs, especially those of Hōšang Syāwaxš-line,\(^489\) show that they are the result of scribal correction. The reason is that YIrP Mf4 and T55b, closely related to Pt4, write *tāzīg* and *turk* with the old YIndP J2 and K5. Furthermore, in Pt4 and F2, -ān is not part of the main text. Therefore, in the present edition *tāzīg* and *turk* are employed.

Regarding the dating of the commentary of Y 9.10, the term *tāzīg* was used by Iranians from the seventh century onwards to denote Arabs as mentioned above. Moreover, the curly hair of Kārasāspa is compared with the hair of Turks in the commentary. The earliest attestation of the word Turk in any Iranian language occurs in the Bugut inscription, discovered in Karabalgasun (North Mongolia), in which the form *trʾwkt* describes the kings of the of the Turkish Ashinas tribe:

B-1, line 1-3. *rty (m) [wn] * jk nwm (sn) k' *wst't ʾrʾnt trʾ wktʾ (jšy-nʾs kwtrʾtt ʾxšy-wnʾk Y-(K) ʾ m...m[wx])ʾn xʾyʾn yʾrwkmʾ HY ῶwʾʾr xʾyʾnʾwr-kwpʾʾr crʾʾcw mʾʾtʾfʾʾp[ʾr] (xʾyʾn)...

Kings of Turkish Ashinas tribe have established [this] stone of law when? Muqan Qaghan’ Yaruka brother (named?) Nivar Qaghan for the sake of Urkupar Crlc Eqha Tatpar Qaghan ... .\(^490\)

Although the inscription is in Sogdian, it is set up by Turks in 580 CE.\(^491\) Chronologically, the second occurrence of the word is also in another Eastern Middle Iranian language, or Bactrian, in which *topko* “Turk” is attested in the document S, written in 693 CE.\(^492\)

---

\(^{489}\) Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšng Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.


\(^{491}\) See SgD, xxvi; Yoshida & Moriyasu (1999: 123-124).

\(^{492}\) According to de Blois (2008: 991-997) the Bactrian era begins in 223 CE.
In the Chinese sources, the term Turk occurs for the first time in 552 CE to describe people who called themselves Kök-Türk. These Turkic peoples established an empire, ruled by Qaghans, spreading from the borders of China to Bactria. Their kingdom lasted until the middle of the eighth century CE (von Gabain 1983: 616). Moreover, the earliest texts, written in Old Turkic, date from the eighth century onwards (von Gabain 1983: 621). Therefore, the evidence shows that the commentary, containing the words *turk* and *tāzīg* cannot go beyond the seventh century CE.

In addition to *tāzīgān* and *turkān*, 3rd sg. ind. pres. *dārēd* is replaced by 3rd pl. subj. *dārānd* (*YHSNN-nd*) in YIrP G14 and T6 according to which *turkān* is interpreted as the subject of the verb in *hād ēd-iš nē škefīh cē gēs turkān-iz dārān* "Yes, this is not strange since Turks should also have the curly hair". However, the subjunctive verb is absent in their related Iranian manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line and old YIndP J2, K5 in agreement with which *dārēd* is employed in the present edition.
4.11  Y 9.11

1 (Y 9.11aA) yō janaṭ aẓīm sruwarṣm
2 yim aspō. garwā narwā garwām
3 yim višauwaṇtōm zairitōm
4 (Y 9.11bA) yim upairi viš aroaḍaṭ
5 ārṣṭiī. barxə zairitōm
6 (Y 9.11cA) yim upairi kərəsəspō
7 aiaŋha pitūm pacata
8 (Y 9.11dA) ā rapiḍbinom zruuāṇom
9 tafṣaṭca hō mairitō x'isatca
10 (Y 9.11eA) fraṣ aiaŋhō frasparaṭ
11 yaešiiañtim āpōm parāijhāṭ
12 (Y 9.11fA) parqā tərsto apatacaṭ
13 naire. manā kərəsəspō

1 (Y 9.11aA) Who slew the horned dragon,
2 the horse-devouring, man-devouring,
3 poisonous, yellow one,
4-5 (Y 9.11bA) upon whom, the yellow one, (poisonous) sting grew as high as a lance.
6 (Y 9.11cA) Upon whom, Kārašāspa
7 cooked food in an iron cauldron.
8 (Y 9.11dA) At noon time,
9 the scoundrel became hot and began to sweat.
10 (Y 9.11eA) He knocked the iron cauldron forward.
11 He intended to throw aside the boiling water.
12 (Y 9.11fA) Terrified, ran aside,
13 the manly-minded Kārašāspa.

1 (Y 9.11aP) kē-š zad az ī sruwar
2 ī ash-ōbār ī mard-ōbār
3 ī wišōmand ī zard
4 (Y 9.11bP) kē-š abar wiš rānēniḍ ēstād
5 ash-bālāy ān ī zard
6 [hād ēd ān ī-š pad kamāl ul šud
7 xšuuaēpaia vaēnaiia barošna
8 ān any ī-š pad zafar be ōbast
9 kū kē ēdōn gōwēd
10 hād har dō ēk
11 ud any and bālāy ul šud
12 ud any and drahnāy be ōbast
13 ast kē ēdōn gōwēd
14 hād kabārīh abar pušt hušk ēstād]
15 (Y 9.11cP) kē pad ōy abar kirsāsp
16 ā-š pad ān āhanēn [dēg] pid poxt
17 (Y 9.11dP) ān tā ṽ rapiḥwin zamān
18 taft mar [kū-š garm būd] xwist
19 [kū dō pū būd]
20 (Y 9.11eP) u-š frāz ān āhanēn [dēg] frāz spurd
21 ān ā ayārdēnidag āb be raft
22 (Y 9.11fP) parrōn pad tars be tazīd
23 mard menišn kirsāsp
24 [hād mard meništnī ēd būd kū-š
25 dīl pad gāh dāšt būd]

1 (Y 9.11aP) Who slew the horned dragon,
2 the horse-devouring, man-devouring
3 poisonous, yellow one,
4 (Y 9.11bP) upon whom, his poison was thrown
5 as high as a horse, the yellow (one).
6 [Know this: That one which went up to its head,
7 over the tail, nose (and) top,
8 that means: The other one fell down through the mouth.
9 There is one who says thus,
10 ‘Yes, both are the same
11 and as high as the one went up
12 and to the same length, the other one fell.’
13 There is one who says thus,
14 ‘Yes and also, anything made of the earthen pot remained dry over the back]9.’
15 (Y 9.11cP) Upon whom, Kirsāsp
16 cooked food in an iron [cauldron].
17 (Y 9.11dP) At the noon watch,
18 the scoundrel became hot [that means: He was warm], sweated,
19 [that he was on two feet].
20 (Y 9.11eP) and he trampled on the iron [cauldron],
21 the boiling water flowed away.
22 (Y 9.11fP) In fear, ran away
23 the manly-minded Kirsāsp.
24 [That is: manly-mindedness was this that his heart had been held in place].

1) Line 1 Y9.11aP zad “slew”

In YIrP Pt4 (fol. 57v line 6), appears the superscript and marginal kū kard ud abāz dāšt ud dūr kard “that (he) made and withheld and banished” whose place is marked by the sign “ʌ” between zad and az in the main text. Between the superscript kū and kard, is also written ɘ₇ which is omitted by three deletion dots:
As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, it only appears in one manuscript in which it is not even part of the main text. Therefore, in the present edition, it is not considered as an original commentary to kē-š zad.

2) Line 2 Y 9.11aP asb-ōbār mard-ōbār “horse-devouring, man-devouring”

The Avestan version of Y 9.11 describes the horned dragon as aspō,garṃ narə,garəm “horse-devouring, man-devouring”. The verb gar “to devour” which constitutes the second element of these compounds, characterises certain demonic creatures and deceitful persons as “swallowing up” the good things of life also elsewhere in Avestan (Hintze 2007b: 124-127). By contrast, in Pahlavi, ōbar in asb-ōbār mard-ōbār corresponding to ˚gar is formed from a different root.495 However, the evidence shows that like the Av. gar-, the Pahlavi word ōbār refers to the action of eating carried out by Daēvic beings or deceitful people:

AWZ 39.2-3 u-m did ruwān ī awēšān druwandān kē-sān be ōbārd ud did-iz ōbārd ud rīd ud did-iz ōbard ud rīd...
And I saw the souls of those wicked ones who swallowed (what they had) defecated and again swallowed and defecated…496

MX. 2. 117. pad anāgīh-kāmagīh ī xešm ī xurdruš ud astwihād, kē hāmōyēn dām ōbārēd ud saagrīh nē dānēd
(On the fourth day after death, the soul goes to the bridge of Divider, accompanied by the Yazds and) by the malevolence of the bloody-clubbed Wrath and Astwihād (Dismemberer demon), who swallows all creation and knows no satiety.497

495 Different suggestion have been put forward regarding the etymology of ōbār. Nyberg (1974: Vol. II. 145) derives it from OIr. *ava-pāraya- for which he does not provide any translation. But he associates *ava-pāraya- with the root par “to cross”, attested in the Avestan causative pāraiia- (Bartholomae’s ⁴par, AirWb. 851) meaning “to make pass down”. Henning (1933: 193), by contrast, considers the verb ōbār from ⁴par “to fill” which in the causative formation means “to make down fill”. Recently, Cheung (2007: 12) associated ōbar with Ir. *barg “to chew, to swallow”.


And of serpents…there is that too, which from a distant place drags onto itself and devours ox, sheep, horse and man.\footnote{My correction. In the Madan edition, \textit{az} is written as \textit{gz}.}

The epithets \textit{asb-ōbār} and \textit{mard-ōbār} are also attested elsewhere in the Pahlavi literature to describe the horned dragon. Examples include:

\begin{quote}
\textit{DkM} 597.14-15. \ldots\textit{u-š pad-iš zad} \textit{az} \textit{i srūwar i asb-ōbār mard-ōbār}…
\end{quote}

\ldots and he (Kirsāsp) killed by that (the glory of Jam), the horned dragon, the horse-devouring, man-devouring,… \footnote{My translation.}

\begin{quote}
\textit{PRDd.} 18f5. \ldots\textit{u-m garōdmān be dah az i srūwar be ōzad i asb-ōbār i mard-ōbār}…\footnote{Edition by Williams (1990: Vol. I, 105).}
\end{quote}

\ldots and grant me Garōdmān. (I) slew the horned dragon, the horse-eater, man-eater, … \footnote{Translation by Williams (1990: Vol.II, 40).}

3) Line 4 \textit{Y} 9.11bP \textit{kē-š} “whom, his”

\textit{YIndPs} write Phl. \textit{kē-š in kē-š abar wiš rānēnīd ēstād} “upon whom, his poison was thrown”. By contrast, deleting \textit{-š} and \textit{wiš} after \textit{abar}, \textit{wiš} follows \textit{kē} in \textit{YIrP} G14 and T6:

\begin{quote}
\textit{YIrP} G14 (fol. 56v line 3-4) T6 (fol. 48r line 2-3) \textit{kē wiš abar rānēnīd ēstād} upon whom, the poison was thrown
\end{quote}

Writing \textit{kē-š} like \textit{YIndPs}, \textit{wiš} is omitted in \textit{YIrP} Pt4, Mf4, F2 and T55b. Moreover, in Pt4, Mf4 and T55b, Phl. \textit{tan ōh}, \textit{tan} and \textit{ō} appear after \textit{abar} above the line, in the margin and on the line, respectively:

\begin{quote}
\textit{YIrP} Pt4 \textit{kē-š abar tan ōh}?\footnote{The spelling ‘\textit{w}’ can be read as either the preposition \textit{ō} “to” or the pronoun \textit{ōy} “he, she” or the particle \textit{ōh} “in the usual way”. However, as it occurs before the verb, it is read as \textit{ōh} in the present edition.} rānēnīd ēstād
\end{quote}

\footnote{The text is after Anklesaria (1956: 186-187).}
who, upon his body it was thrown in the usual way.

Figure 36. YIrP Mf4 (p. 154 line 17).

In Mf4 the place of the marginal *abar tan* is marked between *abar* and *rānēnīd*:

YIrP Mf4 *kē-š abar* (marg. *abar tan*) *rānēnīd ēstād*

who, upon his (body) it was thrown.

Figure 37. YIrP T55b (fol. 74v line 1-2).

YIrP T55b line 1 *kē-š abar ōh?* Line 2 *rānēnīd ēstād*

who, upon him, it was thrown in the usual way.

In F2, while *wiš* occurs after *ēstād*, *tan* is absent. However, it seems that crossing out *yš* in *wyš* (*wiš*) by a horizontal line, the scribe edits the first letter as *W* “and”. It is corroborated by its corresponding New Persian interlinear translation ی “and”:

Figure 38. YIrP F2 (fol. 55v line 11).

YIrP F2 *kē-š abar rānēnīd ēstād w(iš)*

upon whom, it was thrown and

As discussed above, YIrP F2 and the copies of Hōšang Syāwaxš-line show different variant readings. From the superscript and marginal words, it can be assumed that the scribe(s) of Pt4 and Mf4 was uncertain whether or not these words should be incorporated into the text. Therefore, the evidence suggests that the scribes of the Iranian manuscripts

---

Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
corrected the Pahlavi translation of *yim upairi viš araođaftar*. By contrast, Av. *yim upairi viš araođaftar* is rendered in YIndPs by the correct word-for-word Pahlavi translation *kēš abar wiš rānenīd ēstād* which is employed in the present edition.

4) Line 4 Y 9.11bP *wiš* “poison”

The Pahlavi word *wiš* translates the Avestan root noun *viš-* in the sentence *yim upairi viš araođaftar* “upon whom (i.e. the horned dragon) *viš* grew.” Likewise, the Sanskrit thematic noun *viśa-* “poison” (Unvala 1924: 20) and New Persian *zahr* (زهر) “poison” render Av. *viš-/Phl. wiš* in the passage. Following Bartholomae (AirWb. 1472), most scholars have also translated *viš-* as “poison”507. However, the translation of Av *viš-* as “poison” was challenged by Hintze (1994a: 215-216) and Sommer (2014: 384-396) as they argue that the meaning of the root noun should be different from that of the thematic stem, well attested in the IE languages.

Hintze discusses Av *viš-* in the commentary to Yt 19.40 whose text is parallel to that of Y 9.11 with minor discrepancies:508

Yt 19.40 yō janaţ ažīm sruuarəm
*yim aspō.garəm nara.garəm
 yim višuaytəm zairiţəm
yim upairi viš araođaftar
xšuaēpáiia vanaiia.barxšna
yim upairi viš araođaftar
ārštiiō.barxza zairiţəm ...

Who slew the horned dragon, the horse-devouring, man-devouring, poisonous, yellow one.
On whom the poisonous plant grew, at the tail as high as a tree.
On whom the poisonous plant grew as high as a spear, on the yellow one… .

According to Yt 19.40, *vanaiia.barxšna* “as high as a tree” and *ārštiiō.barxšna* “as high as a lance” describe *viš*. Hintze (1994a: 216-217) argues that they are two factors suggesting another meaning for *viš* rather than the conventional “poison” because the meaning “poison”
does not agree with something that appears “as high as a tree” and “as high as a lance” on the dragon’s back (xšuāēpaia). According to her, the meaning of the root noun Av. viš-⁵¹⁰ should be slightly different from that of the thematic stem which is well attested in other IE languages. Therefore, she interprets viš- in the context of Y 19.40, as “poisonous plant” which corresponds to the New Persian bīš⁵¹¹ “a poisonous and lethal plant, similar to ginger, which grows in India”⁵¹² and Balochi gīš⁵¹³ “oleander”.⁵¹⁴ According to Hintze (1994a: 217), it could also illustrate why Kārōsāspa mistakes the dragon’s back for a piece of land upon which he decides to cook food.

By contrast, based on Rau’s (1994: 37) suggestion, Sommer (2014: 384-396), translating viš- as “horn”, maintains that the Sanskrit thematic stem viṣa- originally meant poisonous plant Acointum and that such meaning was later generalised to denote poison. Likewise, he concludes that the Avestan thematic stem is expected to mean poison rather than its root noun counterpart. However, Kellens (1974: 366-368) had questioned the occurrence of the thematic viša- in the Avesta. According to him, the presence of the root noun viš- alone or as the final member of the compound in kasuuiš- “one who has a little bit poison, pustule (name of a disease)”⁵¹⁵ is certain. By contrast, when functioning as the first term of a compound, it is not clear whether višō⁻ represents the thematic stem or the root noun in which -ō is by analogy with the compositional vowel -ō. For example, in the compound višō.vaēpa- “poison spraying”.⁵¹⁶ The thematic stem, however, is present in the hapax legomenon višauuant- “poisonous” corresponding to Skt. viṣavant-.⁵¹⁷ and in the mountain name višauuā⁵¹⁸ “belonging to the poison”. Furthermore, Sommer (2014: 386) considers it unlikely that a plant grows on a dragon. Nonetheless, in the Šāhnāma (ed. Bertels, vol. I, 203, vv 1027-1030), the appearance of the tongue of Aždahā is compared with a black tree

---

⁵¹⁰ Pirart (2004: 69) edits višom (nom. sg. ntr. of viša- ntr. “poison”), but his edition is entirely speculative as the form višom is absent in the manuscripts. For the root noun viš- and thematic viša- see Y 9.11 commentary 6 zard “yellow”.

⁵¹¹ بیش.

⁵¹² “گیاهی است که در ریشه‌های زمین‌نگاشی، گل‌ها و ببرهای سیاه و سبز و سبز هنستون می‌رود” (Ln. Vol. III. 4531).

⁵¹³ گیش.

⁵¹⁴ In addition to Balochi, in New Persian gīš means “oleander (خز دره)” (Ln. Vol. XII. 17186-17187).


⁵¹⁶ The other compounds are višāpa-, viš.gaiñtaia-, viš.ciāra- (Kellens 1974: 366). Sommer, does not discuss višō.vaēna and višāpa-. Furthermore, he proposes a different etymology for viš.gaiñtaia- (Sommer 2014: 388). The stem viš.ciāra- is discussed in this commentary.

⁵¹⁷ Kellens (1974: 366) considers višauuant- as the only exception whose first element is derived from thematic stem viša-.

⁵¹⁸ The etymology of višauuā has not been studied so far, but Sommer (2014: 386) derives it from viša- to which the suffix -uua is attached.
in the account of Zāl and Rudāba where Sām, Zāl’s father, writes a letter to the king 
Manuṣīhr:

ma rā kard padrād har kā šanād/ka bar aždahā gurx vāhām kašīd  
az sar tā be dummaš čō kōh-ī buland/kašān mōy bar zamīn čōn kamand  
zabānāš basān-ī draxt-ī siyāh/zafār bāz karda fikanda be rāh

Bade farewell to me whoever heared/that I would unsheathe the club against the dragon. 
(The height) of the head up to his tail (was) like (that of) a high mountain./(He) was 
drawing his hair on the earth like a lasso (swirling in the air). 
His tongue (was) like a black tree/having opened his mouth, hangs (the tongue) down onto the road.519

Likewise, the tongue of the dragon is compared with a tree in the Garšāsbnāma (ed. 
Yaghmai, 60, v 4) in the account of Garšāsb and the dragon:

yakāyak parākanda bar dašt-ū yār/zabān čōn draxt-ū dahān čōn dāhar  
(because of the dragon’s poison) everybody was dispersed in the plain and cave./(His) 
tongue (was) like a tree and mouth (was) like a cave.520

Moreover, in the Garšāsbnāma (ed. Yaghmai, 53, v 63), hair of the head of the dragon 
is compared with a thicket (bīša):

saraš bīša az mōy-u čōn kōh tan/čō dūdāš dam-u ham-čō duzax dahan  
his head (was like) a thicket of hair and his body (was) like a mountain/his breath (was) 
like smoke and his mouth (was) like hell.521

The evidence of the Šāhīnāma and Garšāsbnāma casts doubt on Sommer’s criticism of 
Hintze’s suggestion as body parts of the dragon can be compared with trees or thickets.

As mentioned above, Sommer (2014: 387) translates Av viš- as “horn” which is based 
on the description of the horned dragon in the Pahlavi Rivāyat:

519 My translation.  
520 My translation.  
521 My translation.
... (I) slew the horned dragon, the horse-eater, the man-eater.

And its tooth was as large as my arms
and its ear was as great as fourteen felts,
and its eye was as great as a chariot,
and its horn was as great as a branch in height...

Sommer (2014: 387) compares čand šāk pad bālāy, describing the height of srū, with the height of viš-, described by ārštīō.barzā “as high as a spear” in yim upairi viš araoāat ārštīō.barzā. However, it can only be concluded that the Avestan and Pahlavi sentences follow the same formulaic structure and there is no evidence that srū...šāk pad bālāy corresponds to viš...ārštīō.barzā in Y 9.11 and Y 19.40 especially by considering the fact that the Pahlavi passage u-š srū and čand šāk pad bālāy explains srūwar (= Av. sruuara-), rather than Av. viš. Moreover, different from čand šāk pad bālāy, the height of Av. viš is described by ārštīō.barzā, asb-bālāy and mušṭyaŋguṣṭhatuṅgaḥ in the Avestan, Pahlavi and Sanskrit versions, respectively, according to which none of them is related to horn or branch. Furthermore, according to Y 19.40, viš grows at the tail (xšuaēpaiia) of the horned dragon, but Sommer, translating viš as “horn”, does not give any evidence of a dragon whose horn grows at its tail. In addition, in the New Persian book of Sad-dar Nasr, a similar passage to that of the Pahlavi Rivāyat exists, in which haštād arš “eighty ells” replaces šāk pad bālāy in Pahlavi Rivāyat:

See Y 9.11 commentary 5 asb-bālāy.
Then, the soul of Garshāsb paid homage to the almighty Venerable and said:

“O the bountiful good creator! Bestow heaven upon me because in the world, I slew the dragon who used to devour each man and quadruped whom he saw and pulled by its tail.

And each tooth which was in his mouth was like my arm, (and) each eye was as like as a chariot, and each horn was like the height of eighty ells” … 

The comparison between Phl. šāk pad bālāy and NP. haštād arš shows that they are only used as units of measurement rather than words qualifying the substance of srū.

Assuming “horn” as the meaning of Av. viš-, Sommer (2014: 388-389) suggests that the Av. viš- derives from the IE root *yejs- “to sprout, to grow”. Sommer also considers Av. viš.ciθra-, attested in Vd. 20.3, as a medicine made of horn in contrast to Bartholomae’s translation (AirWb. 1473) as “medicine (of toxic origin)”: 

Vd. 20.3 viš.ciθrəm dim aiiasta
āiiapta xšaθra vairiia
paitištātē yaskahe
paitištātē mahrkahe...

He asked him the remedy (Sommer: a medicine made from horn), the boons through Xšaθra-Vairiia, to withstand illness to withstand death… 

To corroborate his interpretation, Sommer compares Av. viš.ciθra- with Ved. viṣāṇā- “horn” attested in the Atharvaveda:

AVŚ 3.7.1 harināsya raghusyādō ’dhi sīṛṣāni bheṣajām
sā kṣetriyām viṣāṇayā viṣūcīnām anāṇaṣat

On the head of the swift-running gazelle is a remedy; he by his horn hath made the Kṣetriya (disease) disappear, dispersing.

---

527 Edition by Roth & Whitney (1855: 33).
528 Translation by Whitney (1905: III, 94).
In the commentary to the Vedic verse, Whitney (1905: III, 94) suggests that viṣā́nā- consists of the verb sā “to fasten” which in composition with the prefix vi- means “to unfasten”. Whitney’s analysis is in agreement with the padapāṭha’s segmentation of the word as vi-sā́nā-. Sommer (2014: 392-393) accepts Whitney’s etymology only with regard to the neuter stem viṣā́ṇa- attested in the Rigveda. By contrast, he mentions that the verb vi-sā “unfasten” is unsuitable to describe the horn of hariṇa- “gazelle or antelope” in AVŚ 3.7.1. The reason is that these animals do not shed their horns. As mentioned above, he derives Av. viš- and Ved. viṣā́nā- “horn” from the IE root *u̯eis-. Regarding the latter, he suggests that it is extended by the individualising suffix *u̯ison “horn”, from which both the thematic stem and collective noun *u̯is-on-eh2 “horned” developed (Sommer 2014: 393). However, Sommer (2014: 393, fn. 43) also notes that in both forms the o- ablaut grade of the suffix is unexpected. Although as a solution, he suggests that the o- grade ablaut is by analogy, he does not adduce parallels that might have provided a model for such an analogy. Moreover, according to the Indo-Iranian word formation rules, relating Av. viš- to a verbal root is unlikely because such root nouns are mainly used as nomen agentis (AiGr. II 2 4, §3) or denote the abstract meaning (AiGr. II 2 11, §6). By contrast, root nouns without verbal basis are used as the names of the body parts/organs or animals (AiGr. II 2 58, §16b).

As far as the translation of Av. viš- is concerned, the evidence gives weight to Hintze’s interpretation. However, no dragon is described with a plant above its tail whereas the tongue and hair of Aždahā are compared with plants and thickets as discussed above. Therefore, it seems that linguistic analysis of the word on its own is inadequate for a decisive conclusion. As stated above, according to Yt 19.40, viš grows at the tail (xšuuaēpaiia) of the horned dragon (Hintze 1994a: 23). While the horned dragon has no counterpart in Indian mythology (Skjærvø 1989a: 193),529 in Akkadian art, Tiʾāmat, the creator of Akkadian monsters, also appears as a composite horned dragon with a scale-covered body like a serpent and a wriggling tale ending in the scorpion-like sting (Heidel 1951: 87). Furthermore, the following similarities increase the possibility of the Mesopotamian influence on the stories of Kārāsāspa/Kirsāsp.530 According to the text of the Pahlavi

529 For a study on the similarities between the Iranian myths and their Mesopotamian counterparts see Bahar 1996 (1375).
530 Kārāsāspa’s corresponding name (Skt. krśāśva-) is of no importance in the Indian mythology compared to its Iranian counterpart. For example, it occurs with his family members in ŠB 6 6.20 krśāśvo rćiśi bhāryāyām dhūmaketum aṭījanat (Prabhupāda 1975: 12) “Krśāśva (in his) wife, namely Arcis gave birth to Dhūmaketu” (my translation). Moreover, Skt. krśāśva-, appears in Mahābhārata 2.328, according to which he presides among heroes in the world of Yama after death. In another example, according to Rāmāyaṇa 1.21-27, Rāma
Rivāyat, Kirsāsp, before killing the sea dragon Gandarw, was dragged into the sea by the monster.\(^{531}\) In the Akkadian account of creation (Enuma-Elish), Tiʾāmat, the primeval-water ocean, is slain by Marduk. Moreover, according to the Pahlavi Rivāyat, Kirsāsp subdues Wind who was deceived by Dēws:

\[\text{PRDd. 18f20. kirsāsp guft ṫū ohrmazd wahišt-im} \text{ ud} \text{ garōdmān be dāh} \]
\[\text{ka-m wād rēšīd u-m stō kard} \]
\[\text{dēwān wād be frēfī} \]
\[\text{u-šān be ō wād guft} \]
\[\text{kū az harw dām-dahišn tō pādyāwandtar...} \]

Kirsāsp said:

“O Ohrmazd, grant me Paradise and Garōdmān, for I exhausted and wounded the wind. The demons deceived the wind, and they said to the wind:

Of all creation, you are the most powerful”…\(^{533}\)

In the Akkadian story of creation (Enuma-Elish)\(^{534}\), Tiʾamāt creates the storm demon to fight the gods:

\[\text{Enuma-Elish Tablet 1.} \]
\[\text{140 She set up the viper, the dragon and the lahmānu,} \]
\[\text{141 the great lion, the man dog and the scorpion man,} \]
\[\text{142 driving storm demons, the dragonfly and the bis[on].} \]

In Achaemenian art, a horned griffin with a scorpion tail also fights a hero.\(^{536}\) Therefore, in the both Mesopotamian and Achaemenian belief, the main monsters have a scorpion-like tail ending in a sting. The Pahlavi commentary of Y 9.11 also confirms that the poison excretes from the tail of the horned dragon as the direction of the poison flow is from dragon’s tail to his head:

\[\text{hād ān ī-š pad kamāl ul šud} \]

\(^{531}\) See Williams (1990: Vol II. 40).


\(^{533}\) Translation by Williams (1990: Vol. II. 41).

\(^{534}\) Enuma-Elish “when above” is the opening words of the account of creation (Heidel 1951: 1).

\(^{535}\) Translation by Heidel (1951: 23-24).

\(^{536}\) For the figure see Hinnells (1985: 105).
Know this: That one which went up to its head, over the tail, nose (and) top, that means: The other one fell down through the mouth.

Moreover, according to the Garšāsbnāma (ed. Yaghmai, 58, v 33) the tail of the dragon is bent and segmented which is similar to that of the scorpion and griffin’s tail at Persepolis:

His tail was curve (and) segmented until the back./All his head was like a thick thorn (like) hair.

In addition, the verse is preceded by another one in which دم can be read either as dam “breath” or dum “tail”:

Because of the heat of his mouth, the heart of granite (became soft) like a wax/because of the poison of his mouth (tail) the air of the world was poisoned.

As far as the reading of دم is concerned, the picture of the illustrated manuscript S147, describing the fight of Garšāsb and Aždahā supports the reading dum “tail” as Aždahā’s tail ends in the sting:

537 For the meaning see Y 9.11 commentary 7 xšuuaēpaiia vanaiia barēšna.
538 My translation.
539 My translation.
540 The Šahnāma manuscript is kept at the First Dastur Meherjirana Library. The folios are numerated in Gujarati numerals and the picture appears in fol 29r. It renders an arrangement of stories according to which the stories of Garšāsb (Garšāsb-nāma), Sām (Sām-nāma) and Farāmarz (Farāmarz-nāma) are included in the Šahnāma beside the account of the Šahnāma’s most venerated hero, Rustam. A similar manuscript, Or. 2926, is also kept at the British Library which can show a tradition of the transmission of the Šahnāma according to which together with the story of Rustam, the accounts of other heroes, whose names and actions are shadowed by Rustam, are incorporated in the Šahnāma. For a list of the Šahnāma manuscripts and other epics see van Zutphen (2014: Appendix I).
It should be noted that Aždahā is painted carefully to reflect the description of its appearance in details as attested in the text. For example, according to the Garšāsbnāma (ed. Yaghmai 58, v 29-30), dragon’s mouth was open like a cave. In his mouth and breath, there were fire and smoke. In addition, according to the picture, the dragon twines his tail around the foot of Garšāsb probably to bite him. However, it is known from the Garšāsbnāma (ed. Yaghmai, 58, v 25) that his bite was ineffective because Garšāsb had consumed opium:

Due to the fear of injury, (Garshāsb) a piece of opium/ate and tied (his) lasso on the saddle

In conclusion, according to the evidence, the meaning “poisonous sting” is suggested for viš- which grows at the tail of the dragon. By contrast, in the Pahlavi version, it is possible to accommodate the meaning of wiš as “poison” where the Avestan verb araoḍaṯ is rendered by rānēnūd ēstād “had been ejected” in kē-š abar wiš rānēnūd ēstād ash-bālāy ān ī zard “upon whom, the yellow one, poison had been ejected as high as a horse.” As mentioned above, the translation is followed by the commentary ēd ān ī-š pad kamāl ul šud ... ān any ī-š pad zafar be ōbast according to which wiš is considered as a liquid substance

541 For the transcription of the New Persian words see “Notes on the present edition”.
which is ejected and flows upon the body of the horned dragon and later, falls down from the head.

5) Line 5 Y 9.11bP asb-bālāy “as high as a horse”

The Pahlavi compound asb-bālāy “as high as a horse” renders the Avestan hapax legomenon ārštiiō.barζan- “as high as a lance”. While bālāy is a cognate of Av. barζan- the first element of the compound is an entirely different word. Davar (1904: 38-39, fn. 351) positing that asb is the corrupt form of *arišnīg “arm, arm’s length”, mentions:

‘But being badly written in the original manuscript and part of the word being moth-eaten, a not very intelligent copyist deciphered it to the common word asp.’

However, his entirely speculative suggestion is unlikely because it is very difficult to justify the misreading of aršnīg (َاٍرَشْنِح) as asp (اٍسپ) or ṣp. Translating ārštii- as “thumb”, Justi (1864: 53) takes it as the -ya derivative of aršti- “lance”. As mentioned by Bartholomae (1886: 274), Justi’s translation is based on muṣṭyaṅguṣṭatuṅgam, the Sanskrit translation of the word. By contrast, although -ya derivative with the initial vowel Vṛddhi strengthening usually makes adjectives, Bartholomae (1886: 274) associates ārštiiō” with the neuter stem ārštii- “lance (as a unit of measurement)”. For the Pahlavi translation, he mentions that asb-bālāy has an Indian parallel in which cow is used as a unit of measurement. He adds that people in his time used sticks of any length for measurement and in Old Iranian times, people probably used spears of any size. Therefore, he concludes that there is no difference between the units of measurement attested in the Avestan, Pahlavi and Sanskrit versions. However, the Pahlavi and Sanskrit versions, at least, show that the translators had no problem with translating ad sensum here which is in contrast to the usual Pahlavi ad verbum translation technique of the Avesta. For example, Av. ārštiiō.barζa could have been translated by its Pahlavi semantic equivalent nēzag-bālāy which is attested in Pahlavi:

ŠNŠ. 2.10. ka āb nēzag-bālāy andar ēstēd pas-īz bē nihēd be awarēd

…even if water stands as high as a lance, then (the corpse bearer) should also put (the corpse in the daxmag) and come (back). 542

---

As regards the New Persian translation, āṛṣṭiō and brǝza are translated by the interlinear asp i kiršāsp (اسب کرشاسب) “Kiršāsp’s horse” and buland (بلند) “high”, respectively, in YIrP F2 (fol. 55v line 10). By contrast, in YIrP T6 (fol. 48r line 2), the following interlinear New Persian gloss to arštiiō.barǝza appears:

Figure 40. YIrP T6 (fol. 48r line 2).

u mesl ī asp buland bud-u vaqti ka mē-nišast-u mānand ī mušt ī pēčīda mē-nišast
“and (The poison) was like a horse high and when (the horned dragon) used to sit, he was sitting like a clenched fist”.543

The New Persian version of T6 shows that the scribe combined the Pahlavi and Sanskrit interpretations in his gloss to āṛṣtiō.barǝza. For Phl. asb-bālāy, it is rendered in F2 (fol. 55v line 11) by the interlinear NP asp-buland “as high as a horse”. By contrast, T6 (fol. 48r line 3) writes mānand ī asp buland būd “it was like a horse high”. As regards the Sanskrit version, yatropari viṣaṃ purāvahat muṣṭyaṅguṣhatuṅgaṃ pāṭlaṃ “on whom the pale-red poison flowed as high as a clenched thumb”544 in YSkt KM7 (fol. 53v line 8) is explained by the following interlinear New Persian gloss:

Figure 41. YSkt KM7 (fol. 53v line 8).

...hama-yī tan ī xvad rā mesl ī mušt pēčīda-u zard rang buland šuda nišasta
(The horned dragon) having clenched all his body like a yellow fist, stood (and) sat”.545

Regarding the declension of Av. āṛṣṭiō.barǝza, it is debated among scholars. Pirart (2004: 267) postulates that the compound represents nom. sg. *āṛṣṭiō.barǝzō of ntr.

543 My translation.
544 Edition and translation by Unvala (1924: 20 and 20 fn. 35c).
545 My translation.
ārštiō.barəzah-. However, his interpretation is not supported by the reading of any manuscript. Bartholomae (AirWb. 338) interprets °barəza as the nom. sg. of barəzan- ntr. but he also considers the possibility that it can be the instr. sg. of the root noun barəz- (AirWb. 338 fn. 1). Kellens (1974: 352-354) opts for the instr. sg. interpretation as does Hintze (1994a: 217) who adds that the inst. case is confirmed by the syntactic parallelism with the following instr. vanaiia.barəšna.546

6) **Line 5 Y 9.11b** Zard “yellow”

In the first five lines of Y 9.11, the Avestan adj. zairita- “yellow” and its Pahlavi translation zard occur twice as follows:

Y 9.11Av yō janaq ažīm sruuarəm
yim aspō.garəm narə.garəm
yim višauvantəm zarirəm
yim upairi viš araodaq
ārštiō.barəza zairirəm

Y 9.11Phl kē-š zad az i sruwər
i asb-əbär mard-əbär
i viš-əmand zard
kē-š abar viš rānēnid ēstād
asb-bālāy ān i zard

The first Av. zairirəm obviously refers back to Av. ažīm sruuarəm as it is the last in a series of adjectives describing “the horned dragon”. By contrast, the second zairirəm is ambiguous in so far as it could be interpreted either as the acc. sg. m., referring to the relative pronoun yim which in turn refers back to ažīm sruuarəm or as the nom. sg. ntr., describing the colour of the Av. viš. The latter interpretation is that of Bartholomae (AirWb. 1472) and Kellens (1974: 366). It entails that the gender of the root noun viš- is neuter. However, Hintze (1994a: 215) argues that the gender of the archaic root noun viš-547, which is not found outside Avestan, is more likely to be m. rather than neuter. Hintze’s suggestion agrees with the Indo-Iranian historical grammar rule according to which the gender of nonverbal root nouns548 from which a- stems develop is usually masculine (AiGr. II 2, 59, §16d). Therefore, the second zairirəm is associated with ažīm sruuarəm in the present edition.

---

546 For vanaiia.barəšna see Y 9.11 commentary 7 xšuuaēpaia vaēnaiia barəšna.
547 For the archaisms of Av. viš- see Kellens (1974: 366). Except Av. viš-, in other IE languages the thematic equivalents occur (Kellens 1974: 366); (Hintze 1994a: 215).
548 Wurzelnomina ohne verbale Grundlage “root nouns without verbal basis” are root nouns in which the existence of a verbal root is unproven (AiGr. II 2, 57, §16), like viš- (AiGr. II 2, 59, §16d).
As far as the Pahlavi version is concerned, it remains ambiguous whether *zard* describes the colour of the “poison” or “the horned dragon” as, in Pahlavi, nouns are neither inflected nor do they have the grammatical gender. However, in agreement with the Avestan original, an association of *zard* in the Pahlavi version with *azī srūwar* seems preferable.

7) Line 7 Y 9.11bP *xšuuaēpaiia vaēnaiia barēśna* “over the tail, nose (and) top”

The Avestan text of Y 9.11 is parallel to that of Yt. 19.40 with minor variations as illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yt 19.40</th>
<th>Y 9.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Y 9.11aA)</em> yō janaţ aţīm sruuaṟom</td>
<td>(Y 9.11aA) yō janaţ aţīm sruuaɾom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yim aspō.garom naru.garom</td>
<td>yim aspō.garom naru.garom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yim višauuaŋtōm zairītōm</td>
<td>yim višauuaŋtōm zairītōm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Y 9.11bA) yim upairi viš ararōdāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ärštīiō.barēśa zairītōm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Y 9.11bP)</em> kē-s abar wiš rānēnīd ēstād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>asb-bālāy ān ī zarδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hād ēd ān ī-s pad kamāl ul šud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>xšuuaēpaiia vaēnaiia barēśna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(or xšuuaēpaiia vaēnaiia barēśna)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ān any ī-s pad zafr bē ṭobast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kū kē īdōn gōwēd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hād har dō īk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ud any and bālāy ul šud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ud any and drahnāy bē ṭobast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ī ast kē īdōn gōwēd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hād kabārīh abar pušt huṣk ēstād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Y 9.11cA)</em> yim upairi kōrsāpō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aiaŋha pītum pacata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ē rapiḏbinom zruuānōm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Y 9.11dA)</em> a rapiḏbinom zruuānōm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table, Yt. 19.40 has three cola commencing with *yim upairi* while Y 9.11 has two. In the Avestan text of the Hōm Yašt, the second and the third cola only occur. However, the second line of the first colon of Yt. 19.40 is quoted in the Pahlavi version whereas its first line *yim upairi viš ararōdāt* is absent.

Av. *xšuuaēpaiia* is considered as loc. sg. of *xšuuaēpa*—“tail” (*AirWb.* 560). By contrast, as far as the interpretation of *vainaii/vaēnaiia* and *barēśna* is concerned, their meaning and
case are debated. In the Yašt and Xorda Avesta manuscripts F1, E1, Pt1, L18 and H3, the word appears as vanaiia in contrast to vaini, vanaiti, and vaniai in J18, J10 and D, respectively (Hintze 1994a: 213).\textsuperscript{549} Regarding the Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts, in YIrP Pt4 and T55b, vanaiiata is written whereas in YIrP Mf4, vanaiia is attested. By contrast, in YIrP G14-T6 and F2, vainiti and vainaii occur, respectively. As regards YIndPs, while vaina is only legible in J2, vaēnaiia appears in K5 and M1. Regarding barəšna, Yt manuscripts and YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b write barəšna. Slightly differently, barəšna is attested in K5 and M1. By contrast, F2 and J2 write barəšnu and barənus, respectively.

Editing xšuuaēpaiia (inst.sg.) vanaiti (3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. pres ind.) barəšnuš (nom. sg.), Burnouf (1854: 272-273) translates it as “the angry hits (him) with a strike”. However, although vanaiti and barəšnuš are found in the manuscripts, no copy attests the sequence xšuuaēpaiia vanaiti barəšnuš. Furthermore, his translation does not agree with the readings of the majority of copies preserving a better text i.e. Yt F1, YIrP Mf4 writing vanaiia and Yt F1, YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14 providing barəšna.\textsuperscript{550} Geldner (1886-1896: II, 248) edits vaēnaiia which is accepted by Bartholomae (AirWb. 1325). Interpreting vaēnaiia as the loc. sg. of vaēnā- “nose”, Bartholomae (AirWb. 1325) considers barəšna as the adverbial instrumental of the stem barəzan- meaning “on top”. As a result, xšuuaēpaiia vaēnaiia barəšna was translated as “over the back, nose, top” by him (AirWb. 560). Similarly, Mills (1900: 525), Davar (1904: 19), Unvala (1924: 20), Bailey (1933: 83-84) and Dhabhar (1949: 61) read vaēnaiia. Differently, Hintze (1994: 217), takes it as the first element of the compound vanaiia,barəšna. Reading vanaiia”, Hintze (1994a: 217) interprets it as the jo- derivative of vanā- f. “tree”. Following Bartholomae’s suggestion (AirWb. 950), she considers the second element barəšna as the inst. sg. of barəzan-. As a result, suggesting vanaiia,barəšna, she translates it as “so hoch wie ein Baum”.\textsuperscript{551}

As regards the Pahlavi version, the Avestan phrase is preceded and followed by sentences governed by the verbs ul šud “went up” and be ūbast “fell down” in the following context:

\begin{center}
\texttt{hād ēd ān ē-š pad kamāl ul šud xšuuaēpaiia vaēnaiia barəšna}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{549} For the readings of the Yašt and Xorda Avesta manuscripts see Hintze (1994a: 213). For a description of the Yašt and Xorda Avesta manuscripts see Hintze (1994a: 54-56).

\textsuperscript{550} Unlike the corrected Pahlavi version of the Iranian manuscripts, the quality of their original Avestan surpasses that of their Indian counterparts. The base text YIndP K5 writes vaēnaiia and barəšna.

\textsuperscript{551} “as high as a tree.”
ān any ī-š pad zafar bē ūbast

Know this: That one which went up to its head, xšuuaēpaiia vanaiia/vaēnaiia barašna
that means: The other one fell down through the mouth.

Therefore, although the meaning of the Avestan phrase may be different, it seems that
the Pahlavi translators interpreted xšuuaēpaiia vanaiia/vaēnaiia barašna as “tail, nose, top”
over which the poison went up and fell down. As a result, in agreement with the reading of
the base text K5, vaēnaiia “nose” is employed in the present edition. Furthermore, with
Bartholomae barašna is translated as “on top” in the present edition.

8) Line 6, 8 Y 9.11bP hād ēd ān ī-š pad kamāl ul šud ... ān any ī-š pad zafar be ūbast
“know this: That one which went up to its head ... that means: The other one fell down
through the mouth”

In line 6, Phl. hād ēd ān ī-š pad kamāl ul šud is absent in YIrP T55b while it is present
in the other collated manuscripts especially Pt4, closely related to T55b, and other copies of
the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line.552 Furthermore, as discussed in section 3.1, one of the features of
Jāmāsp’s post-arrival corrected manuscripts is the absence of commentaries which are
attested in older copies. Therefore, the omission of the mentioned commentary in T55b is
associated with scribal correction in the present edition.

As shown in the following table, in YIrPs, ān ī-š ... ān any ī-š is written as ÆZ ¿ ¿
... ÆZ ¿ ¿. In YIndP J2, by contrast, it appears as ÆZ ¿ ¿ ... ÆZ ¿ ¿ while K5 and M1
write ÆZ ¿ ¿ ¿ ¿ ¿ ¿ ... ÆZ ¿ ¿.

Figure 42. The orthography of ān ī-š ... ān any ī-š in the Iranian and Indian manuscripts.

| Siglum of | Æn ī-š | Siglum of | Æn any ī-š |
| manuscript | | manuscript | |
| Pt4 (fol. 57v line 10) | | Pt4 (fol. 57v line 12) |
| Mf4 (p. 155 line 1) | | Mf4 (p. 155 line 2-3) |
| G14 (fol. 56v line 4) | | G14 (fol. 57v line 6) |

552 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated
manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšng Syāwaxš.
For a discussion see section 2.1.
Dhabhar (1949: 61) edits in agreement with J2. Mills (1900: 525) and Davar (1904: 19) also read it as ān ī-š ... ān ī-š. By contrast, Bailey (1933: 83-84) edits any ... any according to the well attested formula in Pahlavi corresponding to Av. aniiō ... aniiō or OP. anyā ... anyā:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hād ēn any pad kamāl ul Šuūd} \\
\text{xšuāēpāia vaēnāia barāšna} \\
\text{ān any pad zafar be ōbast}
\end{align*}
\]

that is, this one ascended at the head over tail and snout and neck the other fell down at the jaw\(^{553}\)

However, unlike Bailey’s reading, the sequence of ŠK any as a combination denoting any, does not occur in manuscripts according to the list of any variant readings provided by Salemann (GlPh I/1, 294).\(^{554}\) While the expected orthographies for any are ŠK (ZK-ʾy) and ŠK (ZK-ʾy), the most possible reading for the Pahlavi ŠK is š according to which ŠK would be ZY-š (ī-š). The preceding ŠK must also be ān. Furthermore, with the exception of J2, two ZKs (ŠK) are juxtaposed in ZK ZK ī-š pad zafar be ōbast. In K5 and M1, the second ZK is also followed by ŠK which in combination with ZK forms ZK-š (any). Therefore, three different readings are attested in the manuscripts as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{YIrPs ān ān ī-š pad zafar be ōbast} \\
\text{YIndP J2 ān ī-š pad zafar be ōbast} \\
\text{YIndP K5, M1 ān any ī-š pad zafar be ōbast}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{553}\) The text is after Bailey (1933: 83-84).

\(^{554}\) Salemann transliterates the variant readings in the Hebrew script. By contrast, the different spellings of any were provided in the original Pahlavi script by Bogdanov (1930: 74-75) in his English translation of Salemann’s *Mittelpersisch*. 
The sentence also shares the same formulaic structure with \( hād \, ān \, i-\dot{s} \, pad \, kamāl \, ul \, šud \). Therefore, it seems that \( ān \) introducing a new commentary, corresponds to \( hād \, ēd \) as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening word</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( hād , ēd )</td>
<td>( ān , i-\dot{s} , pad , kamāl , ul , šud )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ān , ān ) (YIrPs) vs. ( ān ) (YIndPs)</td>
<td>( any ) (K5) ( i-\dot{s} , pad , zafar , be , ōbast )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, in agreement with the base text K5, \( ān \) \( any \) \( i-\dot{s} \, pad \, zafar \, be \, ōbast \) is employed in the present edition. Moreover, the following text occurs after the Pahlavi \( hād \, ēd \, ān \, i-\dot{s} \, pad \, kamāl \, ul \, šud \) ...

\( ān \, any \, i-\dot{s} \, pad \, zafar \, be \, ōbast \):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Opening word} & \quad \text{Verb} \\
\text{hād ēd} & \quad \text{ān i-\dot{s} pad kamāl ul šud} \\
\text{ān ān (YIrPs) vs. ān (YIndPs)} & \quad \text{any (K5) i-\dot{s} pad zafar be ōbast}
\end{align*} \]

As regards \( ud \, ZK/ZK-\, ŋ \) and \( bālāy \, ul \, šud \), while YIrPs write \( ZK \), it appears as \( ZK-\, ŋ \) in their Indian counterparts. By contrast, the distribution of \( ZK/ZK-\, ŋ \) in \( ud \, ZK/ZK-\, ŋ \) and \( drahnāy \, bē \, ōbast \) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( ZK )</th>
<th>( ZK-, ŋ )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T55b; YIndP J2</td>
<td>YIrP T6 (deest. ( ZK-, ŋ ) in marg.)\textsuperscript{555}; YIndP K5, M1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although both readings \( ān \) and \( any \) are semantically possible, in agreement with the base text K5, \( any \) \( ... \) \( any \) is employed in the present edition. As a result, the Pahlavi text is translated as follows:

\[ \text{there is one who says thus,} \]
\[ \text{‘Yes, both are the same} \]
\[ \text{and as high as the one went up} \]
\[ \text{and to the same length, the other one fell.’} \]

\textsuperscript{555} T6 (fol. 48r)
9) Line 14 Y 9.11bP kabārīh abar pušt hušk ēstād “anything made of the earthen pot remained dry over the back”

The Pahlavi translators compared the hotness of dragon’s wīš “poison” with the dried kabārīh. In the Sanskrit version, the translation of kabārīh is missing (Unvala 1924: 20). Reading kpʾlyh as kifr, Mills (1903c: 322 and 322 fn. 2) relates it to kaf “froth”. However, it is evident that his interpretation is erroneous because kaf is spelled as kp in Pahlavi. 556 Davar (1904: 40 and 40, fn. 3511) translates kabārīh “sweat, exudation” which is based on his interpretation of the corresponding Persian word kavār “a thick mist” and kavārūn “scab on the skin”. However, according to the Ln. Vol. XI. 15982, kabāra (کباره) and kavār (کوار), the corresponding forms of the Pahlavi word in New Persian, mean “fruit basket (سبد میوه), earthen pot (کاسه سفالین)”.  

Editing kabārag, Bailey (1933: 83) translates the word as “earthen pot”. The Pahlavi word kabārag is also found in Vd 9.11 which is translated as “earthen pot” by Bailey (1933: 82):

Vd 9.11 kadār-iz-ē ān i saxt zamīg kabārag-ē ud tis-ē  
or anything of hard earth, an earthen pot or like.

However, while the form kabārīh appears in all of the collated manuscripts with the exception of T55b writing kpʾlʾ (کباهرا?), Bailey’s corrected form is absent in the manuscripts. Considering the form kabārīh, it can be interpreted as an abstract form of the word kabār corresponding to the New Persian kavār (کوار). The abstract forms denote several meanings one of which is the collective sense (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014: 177, §348). Therefore, interpreting kabārīh as a collective noun, it can mean “anything made of clay” which also suits the context.

10) Line 16 Y 9.11Pc āhanēn [dēg] “iron cauldron”

Av. aiiiah- is translated by āhanēn [dēg] in the Pahlavi version which adds dēg “cauldron” to āhanēn. The reason is that the Avestan word aiiiah- can mean both “metal”

556 For the spelling see MacKenzie (1971: 48).
and “cauldron” (AirWb. 159) while in the Pahlavi language, āhanēn as an adjective, only means “iron, of iron”.557

11) Line 17-19 Y 9.11dP ān tā ō rapihwin zamān taft mar [kū-š garm būd] xwist [kū dō pā būd] “at the noon watch, the scoundrel became hot [that means: He was warm], sweated, [that he was on two feet]

Av. yim upairi kərsāspō aiaŋha pitūm pacata (Section c of Y 9.11 in the present edition) merges with ā rapi̇ð-binom zruān-om tafasaṭca hō mairiō xʷiṣaṭca (section d) in the manuscripts G14 and T6 whilst in the other collated manuscripts, they are separated by the Pahlavi translation of yim upairi kərsāspō aiaŋha pitūm pacata:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YIrP Pt4, Mf4, F2, T55b; YIndP J2, K5, M1</th>
<th>YIrP G14, T6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.11cAv) yim upairi kərsāspō aiaŋha pitūm pacata</td>
<td>(Y 9.11cAv) yim upairi kərsāspō aiaŋha pitūm pacata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>a rapi̇ð-binom zruān-om tafasaṭca hō mairiō xʷiṣaṭca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.11cPhl) kē pad ōy abar kirsāsp ā-š pad ān āhanēn [dēg] pid poxt</td>
<td>(Y 9.11cPhl) kē pad ōy abar kirsāsp ā-š pad ān iāhanēn [dēg] pid poxt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.11dAv) ā rapi̇ð-binom zruān-om tafasaṭca hō mairiō xʷiṣaṭca</td>
<td>ān tā ō rapihwin zamān taft mar [kū-š garm būd] xwist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y 9.11dPhl) ān tā ō rapihwin zamān taft mar [kū-š garm būd] xwist</td>
<td>[kū dō pā būd]558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unique order in G14 and its descendant T6 should be associated with scribal correction. The reason is that the order of their related copies of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line559 agrees with that of the old YIndP J2, K5. In addition, in the manuscripts Pt4 and T55b appears the marginal az ān gyāg be guřēxt “he fled from that place” which is associated with kū dō pā būd by the sign +:

558 The Avestan text is based on Geldner’s edition. For the minor variant readings in G14 and T6 see the text-critical apparatus and G14 (fol. 56v line 9-11) and T6 (fol. 48r line 8-10).
559 Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxš in AY 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxš. For a discussion see section 2.1.
As for the editorial judgement, the sentence az ān gyāg be gurēxt disagrees with the context of Y 9.11 according to which the scoundrel did not flee but he knocked the iron pad forward. Moreover, the commentary is very late because the verb gurēxt, corresponding to the Pahlavi wirēxt, is a New Persian loanword. Therefore, it is not employed in the present edition.

The verb xwist in ān tā ō rapihwin zamān taft mar [kū-š garm būd] xwist is attested as xwāst in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, T6, T55b. The New Persian interlinear translation bar xāst “(he) stood up” in T6 (fol. 48r line 12) also confirms that by analogy with the New Persian verb, it was interpreted as xāstan (hʾstn) “to rise, to stand up” in the manuscripts of the Hōšang Syāwaxš-line and T55b, closely related to T55b. It should be noted that while the verb xwāstan is spelled by either the heterogram BʿY ḤWN-stan or eteogram hwʾstn, the original meaning of hwʾstn (xwāstan) is “to seek, to want, to desire”. It is obvious that it does not fit the context from the semantic point of view because the passage would mean “until the noon watch, the scoundrel became hot [that means: He was warm], (he) wanted”. Furthermore, x(w)āst does not correspond to the original Avestan xəšaťca “and he sweat”. It seems that based on the following gloss kū dō pā būd, the scribes of YIrPs corrected xwist to xwāst “(he) stood up?”. As a result, in the present edition, xwist is employed.

As far as the Pahlavi translation technique of the Avestan tafasaṭ and xəšať in tafasaťca hō mairiiō xvīsaťca is concerned, they are inchoative verbs which are translated by 3rd sg.

---

560 For the spellings see text-critical apparatus.

561
past *taft* and *xwist*, respectively in Pahlavi. It should be noted that although some inchoative verbs are found in Pahlavi like the present stem *xwafš*—“sleep”, the formation of *s*-inchoative verbs is not productive in the language (Abolghassemi 1996 (1375):165-166). It explains why the Avestan verbs are not translated by their inchoative counterparts in Pahlavi.

12) Line 20 Y 9.11eP *u-š frāz ān āhanēn [dēg] frāz spurd* “and he trampled on the iron [cauldron]”

While YIrPs and YIndP J2 spell *spwlt*, in YIndP K5 and its closely related copy M1, it appears as the causative *spwlʾnmt* (spurānd) “to make someone trample something” which from the semantic point of view, does not fit the context. Therefore, in agreement with K5 sister manuscript, J2, and YIrPs *spurd* is employed in the present edition.

13) Line 22 Y 9.11fP *tazīd* “ran away”

Phl. *tazīd* renders Av. *apataca* “ran”. In YIndP K5 and M1, the 3rd sg. past *tazīd* “ran away” is deleted in *parrōn pad tars be tazīd*. However, it is clear that *parrōn pad tars be* needs a verb. It should be noted that in J2, the sister manuscript of K5, *tazīd* is attested. Therefore, although the base text in the present edition is K5, the deletion of *tazīd* is an obvious mistake. As a result, *tazīd* is employed in the present edition.

14) Line 24 Y 9.11fP *kū-š* “that his”

In YIrP Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b, the enclitic pronoun -š is deleted in *hād mard menišnīh ēd būd kū-š dil pad gāh dāšt būd* “That is: manly-mindedness was this that his heart had been held in place”. With the reading of the old YIndP J2 and K5, -š is given in the present edition.
4.12 Y 9.12

1 (Y 12aA) kasə ʔwam
2 tūrīō haōma mašiio
3 astuuaiʕiāi hunūta gaʔiʕiāi
4 kā ahmāi aʃiʃ ərənənui
5 ciʃ ahmāi jasaʃ ələləpəm

1-3 (Y 12aA) Who, O Haōma, as the fourth mortal pressed you for the material creature?
4 What reward was granted to him?
5 What boon came to him?

1 (Y 12aP) kē tō
2 tasom hōm az mardōmān
3 andar astōmandān gehān hunīd hē
4 kē ān tarsagāhīh kard
5 ud cē ə əy mad ābāḏiŋ

1-3 (Y 12aP) Who, as the fourth one, O Hōm,¹ among men in the material world pressed you,
4 what respect was shown to him,
5 and what prosperity came to him?

1) Line 2 Y 9.12aP hōm “O Hōm”

In YIrP Pt4 and T55b, hād “that is, yes and, yes but” is written instead of hōm. However, it is apparent that Phl. hōm is the correct translation of Av. haōmō. As a result, the reading of YInd J2, K5, M1 and YIr Mf4, G14, T6 and T55b is preferred over that of Pt4 and T55b in the present edition.
4.13 Y 9.13

1 (Y 9.13aA) āat mē aēm paitiiaoxta
2 haōmō ašauua dūraosō
3 (Y 9.13bA) pourušaspō mqm tūriiō mašiiō
4 astuuaidiiāi hunūta gaēšiiāi
5 hā ahmāi ašīš orēnāuui
6 taṭ ahmāi jasat āiiaptom
7 (Y 9.13cA) yaṭ hè tūm us.zaiiaŋha
8 tūm orōzuūō zaraŋuṣṭra
9 nmāhe pourušaspha
10 vidēiuō ahura.ākaēśō

1 (Y 9.13aA) Thereupon, answered me
2 the righteous Haōma whose destruction is difficult:
3-4 (Y 9.13bA) Pourušaspa, as the fourth mortal, pressed me for the material creature.
5 This reward was granted to him,
6 this boon came to him,
7 (Y 9.13cA) that you were born to him,
8 You upright, O Zaraŋuṣṭra,
9 (who belong) to the house of Pourušaspa,
10 who rejects demons, accepts the Ahuric teaching.

1 (Y 9.13aP) u-š ō man ōy passōx guft
2 hōm ī ahlaw dūrōš
3 (Y 9.13bP) porušasp ī man tasom az mardōmān
4 andar astōmāndān gēhān hunīd-am
5 ōy ān ī tarsagāhīh kard
6 ud ān ō ōy mad ābādīh
7 (Y 9.13cP) ka az ōy tō ul zād hē
8 tō abēzag zarduṣṭ
9 andar mān ī porušasp
10 ī jud-dēw ohrmazd-dādestān
11 [ast kē jud-dēvīh abāz ā-mān gōwēd]

1 (Y 9.13aP) and he answered me,
2 the righteous, perdition-averting Hōm:
3-4 (Y 9.13bP) Porušasp as the fourth (man) among men pressed me in the material world.
5 The respect was shown to him,
6 and that prosperity came to him,
7 (Y 9.13cP) when you were born from him
8 you, O holy Zarduṣṭ,
9 in the house of Porušasp,
10 who rejects demons, who accepts the law of Ohrmazd
11 [there is one who says then, rejecting demons away from us]
1) Line 1 Y 9.13aP ōy “he”

Phl. ōy renders nom. sg. aēm “this”. In the stanza 9.13, ōy only appears in YIndP K5 and M1 in agreement with which, it is employed in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.13 of the present edition.

2) Line 3 Y 9.13bP porušasp “Porušasp”

Phl. porušasp corresponds to Av. pourušaspa-. Analysing the Avestan word as a compound of pouruša- “grey” and aspa- “horse”, Bartholomae (AirWb. 903) rightly points out the problem that the expected form would then be *pourušāspa-. To explain the short -a-, Bartholomae (1883: 28) regards it as a spelling mistake. Since the short -a- is found in all manuscripts, he suggests that the mistake goes back to a single copy from which all extant manuscripts are supposed to derive.563 The nom. sg., acc. sg. and gen. sg. of pourušaspa- occurs in manuscripts. The variant readings in 66 manuscripts of the Yasna (Sāde, Pahlavi, Sanskrit), Visperad (Sāde), Vīdēvdād (Pahlavi, Sāde) and Yt 5 are listed in the following table:564

Table 10. Variant readings of Av. pourušaspa-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declension</th>
<th>Variant readings of pourušaspa-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom. sg.</td>
<td>pourušaspō, pōurušaspō, pouru.šaspō, pōuru.šaspō, paourušaspō, paōurušaspō, paōurušaspō, paourušaspō, pōurušaspa, pōurušaspā, pōuru.šaspām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. sg.</td>
<td>paourušaspōm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. sg.</td>
<td>pourušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pouru.šaspahe, pōuru.šaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōurušaspahe, pōuru.šaspahe, pōuru.šaspahpe?, pōuru.šspa?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The great variety of different readings point to the influence of the oral tradition on its written counterpart.565 It makes it difficult to reconcile with the theory of a single variant pourušaspa- resulting from the corruption of a postulated *pourušāspa-. Later, Bartholomae

---

563 Bartholomae’s suggestion agrees with the the Stammhandschriften theory, developed by Hoffmann in 1970s, according to which the extant Yasna, Visperad and Vīdēvdād manuscripts go back to one Yasna, Visperad and Vīdēvdād copy, repectively, existed around ninth to tenth century CE. However, it has been recently proved to be false by Cantera (2012a: 279-315) and Tremblay (2012: 98-135).

564 For manuscripts readings see Table 11.

565 For the tradition of transmission of the Avesta see section 3.1.
(1885: 312) suggests that the form *pourušaspa- “having grey horses” is a wrong etymological analysis derived from *pouruš “many” + aspa- “horse”. The analysis of the first element of the word in the Avesta as *pouruš “many” is corroborated by the readings of manuscripts which as shown in Table 10, place the separating dot between *pouruš- and šaspa-. Moreover, YIndS G26b,\(^{566}\) writes *paōuruš.aspō in which š is considered as the nom. sg. inflection of *pouruš in the Bahuvrīhi compound. Furthermore, the interpretation of *pouruš as “many” is present in the following Avestan text of the Vištāsp Yašt:

\[ \text{Vyt 1.2 } \ldots \text{pourō aspō yaḏa pourušaspaha } \ldots \]

(you, Vištāspa may have) many horses like (those) of Pourušaspa.\(^ {567}\)

It should be noted that Bartholomae (AirWb. 903) also considers the Vištāsp Yašt interpretation of *pourušaspa- as a failed attempt at etymologizing the name.\(^ {568}\)

Bartholomae’s explanation of *pourušaspa- as “having grey horses” has been widely accepted by scholars according to the stated graphic theory or the phonetic suggestion, as discussed below. For example, Justi (1895: 254-255) mentions two different interpretations, or that of Vištāsp Yašt and Bartholomae’s suggestion, while taking side neither for nor against any of them. Mayrhofer (1979: I/72) also accepts Bartholomae’s interpretation and Skjærvø (2011b: 27, 131) even goes so far as to transcribe the name as Pourušāspa.

To accept Bartholomae’s interpretation, as mentioned above, one should assume that the exegetes of the Avestan texts, misunderstood the meaning of the word *pouruša- “grey” as pouru- “many” and they considered š as the nominal ending of the first element of the word and simultaneously, they edited the long ā in *pourušāspa to a. The assumption is put into question by the evidence from the Avesta in which the simplex *pouruša- “grey” occurs in Vd 7.57, translated as pīr “old” in the corresponding Pahlavi version. It shows that although in the Pahlavi version, *pouruša- is mistakenly interpreted as pīr “old”, the Avestan interpreters could at least differentiate between pouru- “many” and pouruša- “grey, old (according to Pahlavi interpretation)”.\(^ {569}\) Therefore, it is unlikely that *pourušāspa- was wrongly analysed by them in the same Vidēvdād text; Vd. 19. 4, 19, 46.

\(^{566}\) See Table 11.


\(^{568}\) Darmesteter (1892: 663) suggests that Vištāsp Yašt is a late collection of the Vidēvdād. However, this idea has been challenged by Molé (1963: 350) mentioning that the text of the Vištāsp Yašt is not as incoherent as Darmesteter suggested. Furthermore, Cantera (2013: 95) states that there are texts in the Vištāsp Yašt which are absent in the Vidēvdād.

\(^{569}\) For an edition of the Pahlavi Vidēvdād see Moazami (2014) and also Anklesaria (1949). While in Geldner’s
Kellens (2006: 269) also accepts Bartholomae’s analysis of the name as consisting of *pourušāspa- “grey” and *aspa- “horse” but unlike Bartholomae, he explains the alleged shortening of ā > a as being due to syllabification of the word. According to him, there was a vowel reduction of the hexasyllabic *pourušāspa- to the pentasyllabic *pourušaspah, occurring in Y 9.13, to maintain the octosyllabic metre of nmānahe pourušaspah “in the house of Pourušaspa”. He compares the vowel reduction with dat. sg. *gaēthiai > gaēthiāi in astuiāthīāi hunūta gaēthiāi through whose vowel deletion the octosyllabic metre of the phrase is preserved. However, apart from the dat. case, in other cases, ā is present in gaēthāi. Moreover, it is unclear whether the form gaēthiā is to maintain the metre or according to Reichelt (1909: 197, fn. 1), it is developed by analogy with astuiāthīāi. Furthermore, it should be noted that the fluctuation of -aiia- and -iia- is quite common in the Avesta. As far as other texts giving pourušaspa- are concerned, it is difficult to conclude according to the prose text of the Vīdēvdād because although *pourušāspa- is absent in it, the phrases in which pourušaspa- occur, correspond to that in the metric texts of Y 9.13 and Yt 5.18. However, against Kellen’s phonetic explanation, the phrase Y 9.13 pourušaspō mām tūriiō maṣ̌iiō in which nom. sg. pourušaspō appears, has nine rather than eight syllables. Furthermore, without vowel shortening, the long ā in pourušāspa- can be considered both as a hiatus and a contraction like kərsāspa- in Y 9.11 naire.manā kərsāspō (hiatus) and Yt 19.39 yā upāŋhacat kərsāspem (contraction). Therefore, like the graphic theory, the phonetic suggestion of the shortening of ā > a is unconvincing.

As far as other possible explanations for the short vowel a in the suggested pouruša- “grey” + aspa- “horse” are concerned, Kellens (1974: 202) states that *ā becomes a in the antepenultimate syllables of compounds with mazdā- as the first member like mazdaoxta-, mazdātā- and mazdaitasna-. However, Kellens counts the antepenultimate syllables in the unattested stems rather than the actual inflected forms which occur in the text. For instance, unlike Kellens’s suggestion, ā > a in the gen. sg. mazdaitasnahe in Yt 13.121 should have taken place in the second syllable of the pentasyllabic word rather than its antepenultimate syllable. Kellens’s suggestion is also questioned by de Vaan (2003: 182), stating that ā > a in the mentioned examples of mazdā- is comparable to that in the feminine

---

570 See AirWb. 477-479; Reichelt (1909: 197).
ā- stems occurring as the first member of the compound. It should be noted that with Kellens’s suggestion, it is still impossible to explain the form pourušaspa- because ā in the stem and the attested nom. sg. pourušaspō and acc. sg. pourušaspəm occurs in the penultimate syllable. Moreover, ā in mazdā- takes place in an open syllable, by contrast, as discussed above, according to the octosyllabic metre of Y 9.13, ā in the pentasyllabic gen. sg. *pourušāspahe occurs in the closed syllable -šās- whose shortening, according to de Vaan (2003: 610) is unexpected.

The shortening of the vowel ā > a is studied in detail by de Vaan (2003: 108-160) according to whom the shortening of *pourušāspa- > pourušaspa- in the both penultimate and antepenultimate syllables is unjustifiable. It was probably the reason that de Vaan leaves *pourušāspa- > pourušaspa- undiscussed in his study of the Avestan vowels. The shortening in the penultimate syllable only occurs in a small number of words whose original length is often perceived in some manuscripts (de Vaan 2003: 128). Such shortenings usually take place either by analogy, for example Y 13.1 bipaištatanam with gen. pl. ending -anām or in instances in which the original length of ā is unknown because of the uncertain etymology, for example uštāna- (de Vaan 2003: 128-132). Furthermore, the antepenultimate shortening of *ā > a in gen. sg. pourušaspahe is unlikely because such shortenings occur either in the antepenultimate open syllables of ar-/n- stems or in the sequence of nom. *-āras/ acc. *-āram, or in front of -na- or in a few other examples to all of which the enclitic -ca/-ciŋ is usually attached (de Vaan 2003: 109-122, 127-128).

Av. *pourušāspa- could also be compared with spitāma-, because spitāma- < spita- + ama- in voc. singular, voc. pl. and dat. pl. cases appears as spitāma, spitamāḥhō and spitamāi, respectively. However, in contrast to *pourušāspa- which is absent in the entire Avesta, spitāma- is attested with ā in other cases and the shortening of the vowel in the mentioned examples is associated with the retraction of accent in the vocative case and the dissimilation of ā in the dative case because of the following ā in the next syllable.572 Finally, the shortening of the vowel ā could be explained by analogy (de Vaan 2003: 108) which is also unsupported by evidence because the closest contrasting compound to *pourušāspa-, or Yt 10.102 aurušāspa- “having white horses”, derived from auruša- “white” and aspa- “horse” (AirWb. 191), appears with the long vowel ā in the Avesta. Furthermore, other similar proper names such as (dōjāmāspa-, (dō)jāma- + aspa- (data not

572 Hoffmann (1975: 266); deVaan (2003: 134).
shown), *kəɾəsāspa-*, *kəɾəsa- + aspa- (data not shown) and vištāspa-, viṣṭa- + aspa-,\(^{573}\) consistently occur with the long vowels.

Pakhalina (1987: 157), by contrast, derives *pourušaspa- from OIr. *paru-šašva-* “muchseer, foreteller, prophet” whose second element is derived from the suggested IE *ksekʰos of the root *sekʰ- “to see, to feel, to notice, to speak”. First, it should be noted that the reconstruction of Pakhalina is problematic because šv is absent in Indo-Iranian. Therefore, it should have been reconstructed as *paru-šacwa- according to which its second element šacwa- develops to Av. šaspa-.\(^{574}\) As mentioned by Pakhalina (1987: 157), the etymological cognate of the root occurs in Gr. θέσπιος “who says the divine (words), prophet”. However, the root is absent in Vr. languages. Furthermore, the derivative *ksekʰos has no counterpart neither in Greek nor in any IE language and in the case of θέσπιος, while the expected IE *ks > Gr. ζ is absent in the word, θέσπιος is the contracted forms of *θεό-σπέ-πιος in which the first element of the word is from θέο- “divine”.\(^{575}\)

By analogy with *pouruš.x’āḍra-“who has many pleasure” and the proper name *pourušti-it is possible to associate *pouruš- with the stem *pouru- “many” to which -š is attached. With this interpretation, -š represents the nom. sg. inflection of *pouru- as the first member of the compound.\(^{576}\) As stated above, the interpretation also agrees with the Avestan understanding of the word. Apart from Avestan, in Bactrian, two forms of a proper name appear as πορ[...]πο and its corresponding hypocritic form ποροκο. The former is hypothetically reconstructed as *πορασπο deriving from Ir. *paru-aspa- “having many horses”, cf. Av. pouru.aspa-. (Sims-Williams 2010: 117-118).

In conclusion, while the evidence casts doubt on the graphic and phonetic suggestions of the development *pourušāspa- > pourušaspa-, it seems that on the one hand, the development *pouru – “many” > pouruš- , at least, has analogical models in the Avesta and on the other hand, the proper name meaning “having many horses” occurs in another Iranian language.

Regarding the transcription of *pourušaspa-, Pirart (2004: 71) corrects the word to paourušaspa-. Although, as shown in the table, paourušaspa- with u epenthesis, occurs in the collated manuscripts, Pirart’s correction seems to be unnecessary. Therefore, in the

---

573 The manuscript readings of vištāspa- are not collated. However, in all editions, it has consistently been given by the long ā. The corresponding word in Old Persian, spelled as viš-ta-s-pa, also appears with long vowel (Mayrhofer 1979: II/29).
574 See Windfuhr (2009: 19).
575 For IE k, Av. š, Gr. ζ see Kent (1953: 36, §102). For *sekʰ- see IEW. 896-897; LIV. 526-527. For *θεο-σπέ-πιος see IEW. 268-269, 896-897.
present edition with \( \text{paru}^* \rightarrow \text{pouru}^* \) showing the regular labialisation of \( a \) because of \( u \), \( \text{pourušaspa} \) - is employed.\(^{577}\)

In the Pahlavi version, \( \text{pwlšsp} \) appears in \( \text{YIndPs} \) whereas in \( \text{YIrPs} \), \( \text{pwlwš} \hspace{1pt} sp \) is attested. Beside \( \text{pwlwš} \hspace{1pt} sp \), in the second occurrence of the word in \( \text{andar mān ī porušasp} \), it is spelled as \( \text{pwlwšsp} \) in T6. Likewise, \( \text{porušasp} \) has been transcribed differently by scholars, for example \( \text{purušāsp} \) (Davar 1904: 20), \( \text{pōrūšasp} \) (Justi 1895: 254), \( \text{pourušāsp} \) (Nyberg 1974: 162) and \( \text{porušasp} \) (Josephson 1997: 53). Considering the Pahlavi script, it is impossible to evaluate the value of \( ʾ \) and \( w \). The reason is that although the matres lectionis \( ʾ \), \( w \) and \( y \) often represent long vowels in Pahlavi, they can also stand for short vowels, for example Phl. \( \text{zltwšt} \) vs. Av. \( \text{zara} \hspace{1pt} ϑuštrā- \) and Phl. \( \text{slyt} \) vs. Av. \( \text{ϑrita} \) -.

Regarding the first \( w \) after \( p \) in \( \text{pwl(w)š(ʾ)sp} \), the corresponding word in Avestan is \( \text{pouruš}^* \) with the short vowel \( o \). However, as listed in the table, some manuscripts spell \( \text{pouruš}^* \) as \( \text{pōurūš}^* \) or \( \text{paōuruš}^* \) which could indicate the dialectical lengthening of the vowel \( o > ō \). The evidence from the Arabic sources shows that the corresponding word occurs as both \( \text{bršsf} \) and \( \text{bwršʾsf} \) (Justi 1895: 254-255). The reading \( \text{br} \) in \( \text{bršsf} \) (transcr. \( \text{buršasf} \)) agrees with the expected phonemic and possibly phonetic short \( o \). In conclusion, at least from the phonemic point of view, the value of the first \( w \) in \( \text{pwl(w)š(ʾ)sp} \) is short and therefore, it is transcribed with \( o \) in the present edition. It is evident that the second letter \( w \) appearing in Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b, corresponding to \( u \) in Av. \( \text{pourušaspa} \), is also short. As far as the last vowel is concerned, it is represented by \( \text{alif} \), or \( ʾ \), in Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6 and T55b. In the New Persian version of \( \text{YIrP F2} \) (fol. 56v line 4, 7, 10, 13) and \( \text{YIrP T6} \) (fol. 49r line 6, 8), \( \text{Porušasp} \) is given as \( \text{pwrwšsp} \) (پوروشسپ). Likewise, in the New Persian version of the trilingual \( \text{Vīdēvdād} \) Pahlavi manuscripts (data not shown) and Zoroastrian New Persian text \( \text{Zarātuštrāma} \), \( \text{Porušasp} \) is written with the short \( a \).\(^{578}\) Therefore, it seems that \( \text{alif} \), or \( ʾ \), in Phl. \( \text{pwlwš} \hspace{1pt} sp \) represents the stylistic writing feature of the manuscripts rather than the dialectical lengthening as the long \( ā \) is absent in their corresponding Avestan and New Persian (F2, T6) versions. As a loanword from Avestan, the short vowel \( a \) also agrees with the phonetic value of its corresponding vowel in Av. \( \text{pourušaspa} \) - as discussed above.


\(^{578}\) For the \( \text{Vīdēvdād Pahlavi manuscripts see http://avesta-archive.com/} \).

For the reading of \( \text{pwršsp} \) (پوروشسپ) in Zarātuštrāma see (Dabir-Siyaghi 1959 (1338): 5, 12, 14, 23, 25).
Table 11. Manuscripts readings of Av. *pourušaspa*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>pourušaspa</em></td>
<td>VdIrS TU1 fol. 24r line 6; VdIrS RSPA230 fol. 24v line 20; VdIrS ML15283 fol. 26r line 9; YIrS Nik2 fol. 42v line 7-8; VrIrS KM4 fol. 24r line 10; VrIrS MZK1 fol. 29r line 17; VrIrS MZK2a fol. 36r line 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōurušaspa</em></td>
<td>VdIrS RR1 fol. 25v line 14; YIrS ML15284 fol. 24r line 1-2; VdIndS L1 fol. 19r line 3-4; VdIndS B2 fol. 15r line 13; VdIndS T46 fol. 29v line 8; VdIndS Q2 fol. 28v line 11; VdIndS G12 fol. 21v line 1; VdIndS K10 fol. 22r line 5; YSkt K6 fol. 78r line 2; YSkt KM7 fol. 54v line 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōurušaspō</em></td>
<td>VdIrS 977/978 fol. 21v line 14-15; VdIrS Ave991 fol. 21v line 11; VdIrS Ave1001 fol. 20v line 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōurušaspō</em></td>
<td>VdIndS Malik6459 fol. 22r line 3-4; YSkt S1 fol. 38v line 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōurušaspō</em></td>
<td>VdIndS B4 fol. 22r line 19-20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>purō.šaspō</em></td>
<td>VdIndS G106 fol. 19v line 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>paourušaspō</em></td>
<td>VdIndS Bh3 fol. 19v line 10; YIrS ML15285 fol. 25v line 8; YIndS K11A fol. 48v line 7-8; YIndS Lb2 fol. 29r line 7-8; YIrP G14 fol. 57r line 11; YIrP T6 fol. 48v line 13; YIndP K5 fol. 64v line 13; YIndP M1 fol. 167r line 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>paōurušaspō</em></td>
<td>YIrS S1 fol. 38v line 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>paōurušaspō</em></td>
<td>YIrP Pt4 fol. 58r line 17; YIrP F2 fol. 56v line 4; YIrP T55b fol. 75v line 6-7; YIndP J2 fol. 86v line 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>paōurušaspō</em></td>
<td>YIndS B4 fol. 22r line 19-20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōurušaspō?</em></td>
<td>YIndS L17 fol. 49r line 12-13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōurušaspō?</em></td>
<td>YIndS ML630 fol. 21v line 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōurušaspō?</em></td>
<td>YIndS Bh5 fol. 38v line 7-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pōuru.šaspąm</em></td>
<td>VdIndS FIRE1 fol. 19v line 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variant of pourušaspa- m. in acc. sg. declension**

| *paorušaspō* | YtS B9 fol. 15v line 6-7. |

**Variants pourušaspa- m. in gen. sg. declension**

<p>| <em>pourušaspha</em> | VdIrS TU1 fol. 24r line 11; fol. 243v line 11, fol. 244r line 1-2, fol. 250v line 5-6; VdIrS 977/978 fol. 21v line 18, fol. 244v line 3, fol. 251r line 14; VdIrS 991 fol. 21v line 14, fol. 223v line 11-12, fol. 230r line 19-20; VdIrS Ave1001 fol. 20v line 16, fol. 243v line 10, 20; VdIrS ML16226 fol. 250r line 8; VdIrS RSPA230 fol. 227v line 18, fol. 228r line 8-9, fol. 234v line 21; VdIrS ML15283 fol. 26r line 14-15, fol. 236r line 18-19, fol. 236v line 9; fol. 242v line 13-14; VdIndS B2 fol. 301r line 15; VdIndS T46 fol. 362r line 3-4; VdP E10 fol. 159r line 13; YIrS ML15285 fol. 25v line 13-14; YIrP Mf4 fol. 79r line 2; VrIrS G18b fol. 83r line 12; VrIrS KM4 fol. 24r line 14; VrIrS MZK2a fol. 36r line 8-9. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pōurušspahe</td>
<td>VdIrS 977/978 fol. 244r line 12; VdIrS Ave991 fol. 223r line 21; VdIrS ML16226 fol. 24r line 10, VdIrS RR1 fol. 234v line 20, fol. 235r line 10; VdIndS L1 fol. 19r line 8, line fol. 207r line 3-4; VdIndS B2 fol. 15v line 3, fol. 301v line 10-11, fol. 310v line 12-13; VdIndS T46 fol. 29v line 12-13, fol. 362v line 1, fol. 372r line 8-9; VdIndS O2 fol. 28v line 15; VdIndS Malik6459 fol. 22r line 8-9; VdIndS B4 fol. 22r-22v line 24-1; VdIndS G112 fol. 21v line 5, fol. 246v line 4, line 14-15; VdIndS K10 fol. 247v line 9-10, fol. 248r line 1-2, fol. 255r line 18-19; VdIndS ML630 fol. 21v line 8; fol. 254r, line 16-17, fol 254v line 10-11; fol. 262v line 2; VdIndS FIRE1 fol. 251r line 5, line 15-16, fol. 259r line 11-12; VdP K1 fol. 233r line 7; VdP G25 fol. 128v line 1-2; VdP G28 fol. 264v line 10-11; VdP B1 fol. 388v line 2-3; 410v line 3; VdP M3 fol. 265r line 12, fol. 278r line 13-14; YIrS MZK3 fol. 28r line 14; YIrP G14 fol. 57v line 3; YSk K6 fol. 78r line11; YSk KM7 fol. 55r line 3; VrIrS MZK1 fol. 29v line 5; VrIrS DZVr2 fol 40r line 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pouru.šaspahe</td>
<td>VdIrS Ave1001 fol. 250r line 16; VdIrS ML16226  fol. 256r line 12-13; VdIndS M2 fol. 236v line 8; YIrS ML15284 fol. 24r line 5; YIrS Nik2 fol. 42v line 12-13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōurusasphe</td>
<td>VdIndS K10 fol. 22r line 10-11; YSk S1 fol. 38v line 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōuru.šspahe</td>
<td>VdIndS B4 fol. 202v line 3-4, line 14, fol. 208r line 4; YIndS Lb2 fol. 29r line 14-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pourušspahe</td>
<td>VdP L4 fol. 264r line 10-11, fol. 265r line 12; VdP G28 fol. 251r-252v, line 15-1, fol. 252r line 9-10; VdP T44 303v line 13, fol. 304v line 13; VdP Bh11 259v line 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōurušspahe</td>
<td>VdP L4 fol. 280v line 9-10; VdP T44 fol. 321r line 4; YIndS B3 fol. 34r line 11; YIndS L17 fol. 49v line 3-4; YIndP K5 fol. 65r line 2; YIndP M1 fol. 167v line 5-6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōuruōšspahe</td>
<td>VdP F10 fol. 294r line 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōuruśspahe</td>
<td>VdP G25 fol. 111r line 6; VdP F10 fol. 278r line 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōuru.śspahe</td>
<td>VdP G34 fol. 274r, line 3-4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pouruśtāhe</td>
<td>VdIndS L1 fol. 206v line 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōruśaspu</td>
<td>YIndS Bh5 fol. 38v line 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paourušspahe</td>
<td>VdIndS L1 fol. 213r line 7; VdIndS M2 fol. 227v line 15-16; VdIndS G112 fol. 254r line 13-14; VdP K1fol. 218r line 1; VdP F10 fol. 279r line 9-10; VdP B1 fol. 389v line 11-12; VdP E10 fol. 151v line 4; VdP M3 fol. 266r line 2; YIrP F2 fol. 56v line 10-11; YIrP T6 fol. 49r line 6; YIrP T55b fol. 75v-76r line 15-1; VytP F12A fol 5r; VytP G120 fol. 9r line 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paouru.śspahe</td>
<td>VdIndS G106 fol. 205v line 15; VdP G25fol. 109v-110r line 13-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paourusasphe</td>
<td>YIndP J2 fol. 87r line 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paouruśspahe</td>
<td>VdP Bh11 fol. 237v line 7-8, fol. 239r line 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paoušspahe</td>
<td>VdIrS ML16226 fol. 249v line 18; VdIndS M2 fol. 228r line 11; VdIndS G106 fol. 206r line 5-6; YIrS MZK4 fol. 33v line 1; YIndS G26b fol. 46r line 10-11; YIrP Pt4 fol. 58v line 3; VrIrS DZVr1 fol. 34v line 10-11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paaurusasphe</td>
<td>VrIrS G27 fol. 42r line 8; VdIrS RSPA230 fol. 25r line 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paoušspahe</td>
<td>VdIndS G106 fol. 212r line 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
paourōšaspahe | VdIndS G106 fol. 19v line 11.
paouru.şspahe | VdP G34 fol. 274v line 12.
paourušaspahe | VdP E10 151r line 4.
paōru.šaspahpe? | VytS G18a fol. 13v line 11 (corrupt).
pōuru.šaspa? | VdIndS Bh3 fol. 19v line 13-14; VdIndS FIRES1 fol. 19v line 12.

3) Line 7 Y 9.13cP ka az ōy ul zād hē “when were you born from him”

The Pahlavi verb *ul zād “was born”* translates the Avestan verb *us.zaiianŋha* which could be either interpreted as inj. of the passive stem *zaiia-* of the root *zan “to bear”* or through a small emendation, could be read *us.zaiianŋ* ha of the same root and stem. However, the inj. verb fits the context of the stanza, describing an event in the past. Likewise, with the inj. interpretation, Josephson (1997: 54) and Pirart (2004 :274) translate the Avestan original *yaŋ hē tūm us.zaiianŋha* as “that you were born to him” and “que tu lui naquis”, respectively.

In the Pahlavi version, *us.zaiianŋha* is rendered by the ergative construction *ul zād hē* in which Phl. *ul* stands for Av. *us* and Av. *zaiianŋha* corresponds to Phl. *zād hē*. Moreover, 3rd sg. dat. pronoun *hē* appears in Pahlavi by the ablative expressing preposition *az “from” + ōy “he”.

4) Line 9 Y 9.13cP andar mān ī porušasp “in the house of Porušasp”

The Phl. *andar mān ī porušasp “in the house of Pourušasp”* translates Av. *nmānahe pourušaspahe*. In Pahlavi, the Avestan gen. sg. *nmānahe* is expressed by *andar “in”*. As far as the reading of manuscripts is concerned, they show the following variants of *nmānahe*, occurring in Y 9.13, Vd. 19.4, 46:579

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variants of <em>nmāna- ntr. in loc. sg. declension</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nmānahe, nımānahe, namānahe, nımānih, namānahu, nmāna, namāne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 12, in all manuscripts, *nmāna-* appears in the genitive case with the exception of VdP G25 in which *nmāna-* is expressed by the loc. sg. *nmāne*. However, it is a late manuscript which belongs to the Nawsari school, written down under the correction movement started after the arrival of Dastur Jāmāsp Velāyati in India sometime in the 1720s. It should also be noted that other manuscripts of this class, best represented by E10, T44

579 For manuscripts readings see Table 12.
and Bh11, show the genitive case.\textsuperscript{580} Therefore, while the loc. sg. \textit{nmāne} is to be regarded as a correction introduced to an insignificant manuscript, the gen. sg. \textit{nmānahe} is the original form of the Avestan word. In editions, it is also given unanimously as gen. sg. \textit{nmānahe} by scholars.\textsuperscript{581}

The gen. sg. \textit{nmānahe} in Y 9.13 \textit{nmānahe} \textit{pourušasphahe} can be compared with the Indo-European languages in which two formulaic structures exist regarding asking one’s (paternal) ancestors. They are reconstructed as 1) *\textit{k"osjo h₁essi} “who are you?” and 2) *\textit{k"is h₁essi} “of whom you are?”. Likewise, in the Avesta, two corresponding identifying formulas are used: 1) \textit{ciš ahī} (Y 43.7) / \textit{kō narə ahī} “who are you” (Y 9.1) and \textit{kahiiā ahī} “of whom are you” (Y 43.7). Av. \textit{kō narə ahī} occurs in the following context: Y 9.1 \textit{ā dim} \textit{pərəsatā zaraθuštra kō narə ahī} “Zaraθuštra asked him, who are you?”. It is answered in Y 9.2 by \textit{azəm ahmi zaraθuštra haōm ašauua dūraošō} “I am, O zaraθuštra, Haōm whose destruction is difficult”. Moreover, \textit{ciš ahī} and \textit{kahiiā ahī} take place in the following text:

\begin{verbatim}
Y 43.7 spəntəm aŋ əβə mazdə məŋhī ahurə
hiiat mə vohə pariŋ jasət mananjə
pərəsat cə mə ciš ahī kahiiə ahī
kaβə aiurə daxšərə fərasaiiiə dəšə
ahī əβəhə gədəhəhu tanišicə
I realised that you are life giving, O Ahura Mazdā,
when he, through Good Thought, attended me
and asked me: who are you? Of whom are you?
How would you, O zealous one, set a date for questioning
about your creatures and yourself?\textsuperscript{582}
\end{verbatim}

The question \textit{ciš ahī} is answered in Y 43.8:

\begin{verbatim}
Y 43.8 aŋ aŋi zaraθuštra paouruum
hiiat dəuəčə hiiat isōiə drəguiiiiə
aŋ ašənə rəfənə xiiiiə aŋiŋhhuuat
hiiat a bəštəvasə xəzərahiiə diii
yuukaŋ a əβə mazdə stəumii ufiiiiə
Then, I said: “Zaraθuštra, as the first (one)
would be) a real enemy to the deceitful one. If I were able,
I would be a strong support to the righteous one,
if I acquired the faculties of one who rules at wish
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{580} See Pirart (2002: 24, fn. 11\textsuperscript{3}); Cantera (2015b).
\textsuperscript{581} See Geldner (1886-1896: I, 42; III, 123, 132); Darmesteter (1960: 89); Josephson (1997: 53); Pirart (2004: 71).
\textsuperscript{582} My translation builds on Humbach (1959: I, 112) and Insler (1975: 63), also see Humbach (1991: I, 63).
while I praise and eulogise you, O Wise one”.583

As shown in the above examples (Y 9.1 and Y 43.7), the nom. sg. interrogative pronoun kō and ciš, are answered with the nom. sg. haōm dūraošō and zaraḍuštrō, respectively. However, although the answer to the question kahiīā ahī “of whom are you” is absent in Y 43.8, in the Sanskrit Mahābhārata, the corresponding question and answer in genitive appears as follows:584

Q. MB 1.122.19 ko’si kasyāsi ...
who are you, of whom are you?
A. MB 1.122.28 … aham priyatamaḥ putrah piturdroṇa mahātmanah
I am the most beloved son of my father who has the great spirit, O Droṇa!
Q. MB 1.142.2 … kasya tvam…kā cāsi.
of whom are you … and who are you?
A. MB 1.142.6 tasya mām rāksasendraḥ bhaginīm …
me, sister of that lord Rāksasana...
Q. MB 1.160.34 kāsi kasyāsi ...
who are you, of whom are you?
A. MB. 1.161.20 aham hi tapatī nāma sāvitravarajā sutā
I, namely Tapatī, the younger sister of Śāvitrī, the daughter of the torch of the world Savitar O king of the flock.
Q. MB 3.123.3 kasya tvam asi ...
of whom are you?
A. MB. 3.123.4 … śaryātitanyāṃ vittam bhāryāṃ ca cyavanasya mama
known as the daughter of Śaryāti and the wife of my Cyavana

584 Translations are mine. For MB 1.22.19, 28; 1.142.2, 6; 1.160.34; 1.161.20 see MBP I, 544, 545, 611, 612, 675, 678, respectively.
For MB III 123.3; 123.4 see MBP III. 406-407.
585 As noted by Schmitt (1967: 137), kasyāsi “of whom are you” is only given in the text-critical apparatus of the Poona edition in whose main edited version the phrase appears as ko’i kam tvāmijānīmo vyam kim karavāmahe “who are you? How should we know you? What can we do?” (See MBP. I, 544).
In addition, the Old Persian phrase *mana AM AM-ha adam* “Auramazdā is mine, I belong to Auramazdā”, engraved in the Susa inscription of Darius I (ruled 522-482 BCE), is also related to the IE formulaic structure:

\[\text{DSk. adam dārayavaux XŠ}^{587} \text{ vazarka}^{h} XŠ XŠ-yānām XŠ DH-nām}^{588} \text{ vištāspahyā puça}^{h} \text{ haxāmanişya}^{h} \text{ ōtīy dārayavaux XŠ}
\]

\[\text{manā AM AM-ha adam AM-m ayadaţi AM-maiy upastām baratuv}
\]

I am Darius, the great King, King of the Kings.

king of the lands, the son of Viśāspa, the Achaemenid.

Darius the king says:

Auramazdā is mine, I belong to Auramazdā.

I worshipped Auramazdā.

Auramazdā may bring help to me.\(^{589}\)

Therefore, it seems that from the semantic point of view, the genitive *nmānahe pourušaspahe* is to be understood as a formula, identifying the ancestry of Zarāuštra, corresponding to the question *kahiiā ahī*, or YAv *kahe ahi* and the genitive case in the context of Y 9.13 has the sense of consanguineous belonging to the house of Zarāuštra’s father.

Apart from Y 9.13, *nmānahe pourušaspahe* also takes place in the Vīdēvdād. As given below, while with Y 9.13, *nmānahe pourušaspahe* in Vd. 19.46 should also be translated as “who belongs to the house of Pourušaspa”, according to the context of Vd 19.4, the phrase is to be treated like a simple genitive case associated with the preceding *dr̥jiia paiti zbarahi* “on (the bank of) the high Dr̥jā (river)”:

\[\text{Vd 19.4 us̥hiśtaṭ zaraďuštrō frauşuṣat zaraďuštrō asarōtō aka mahan̄ha xruždiia ūaśēšo, parštanam asānō zasta dražimnō katō masan̄hō kohti aʃauua zaraďuštrō viṇḍōmnō dausuō ahurāi mazdāi kuua hē dražahe aiihā zomō yət paʃanaiiṭ skarṇanaiiṭ duraẹpāraiiṭ dr̥jiia paiti zbarahi}
\]

\(^{586}\) AM stands for *auramazdā-* (= Av. *ahura- mazdā-*) when written in Old Persian with an ideogram. For Old Persian characters and ideograms see Kent (1953: 11-12).

\(^{587}\) XŠ stands for *sāyaḥiya*- when written in Old Persian with an ideogram.

\(^{588}\) DH stands for *dahyu-* when written in Old Persian with an ideogram.

\(^{589}\) The text is after Kent (1953: 145), also see Schmitt (1967: 137).
nnānahe pourušaspahe

Zaraϑuśtra woke up, Zaraϑuśtra began to go forth, unharmed by Evil Spirit, by the hardness of the injuring questions. The running stones of the length of a house size are in (his) hand, the righteous Zaraϑuśtra, finding for the sake of the creator Ahura Mazdā. Where do you direct (the stones) to him (the Evil Spirit), on this earth which is wide, round, whose borders lie afar? On (the bank of) the high Drajā (river) of the house of Pourušaspa.⁵⁹⁰

Vd. 19.46. zātō bē yō ašauua zaraϑuśtrō nnānahe pourušaspahe
kuua hē aosō vīndāma
hā daēuuanqm snādō
hā daēuuanqm paṭitīārō
hā druṅś vī.druṅś
niṅṅinō daēuuaiiazō
nasūs daēwuō.daō draogō miṭāoxtō

The born one is indeed the righteous Zaraϑuśtra, who belongs to the house of Pourušaspa. How shall we find his destruction? He is the weapon against demons. He is the antagonist of demons. He is the counter-deceit of the deceit. Vanished are the Daēuuā (demon)-worshippers, the demon-created decay, the false speaking deceit.⁵⁹¹

From the semantic point of view, Av. nnāna- has been referred to both “house as a physical construction” and “family, household” (Benveniste 1969: 240). Therefore, Y 9.13 could be translated as follows:

(Y 9.13cA) yat̰ hē tūm us.zaiiaŋha
tūm ərzuuō zaraϑuśtra
nnānahe pourušaspahe
vīdaēuūō ahūra,tkāēsō

(Y 9.13cA) that you were born to him,
You upright, O Zaraϑuśtra,
(you who belong) to the house(hold)? of Pourušaspa, who rejects demons, accepts the Ahuric teaching.

⁵⁹¹ The text is after Hintze (2013: 34).
It should be noted that YAv. *nmāna-* develops from OAv. *dəmāna-* from the root *dam* “to build”. As far as the meaning of OAv. *dəmāna-* is concerned, it seems that although in some stanzas, it can be associated with both “house” and “household”, according to the context of some other examples, it is to be interpreted as “house”, for example:

Y 49.11 ḏušxšaṛṛong duš.šiiaothanōng dužuuacangō duždaēnōng dužmananōhō drēguatō
akāiš xvarəddāiš paitī uruupnō [pait]iiienti
drūō dəmānē haiiithā aŋhēn astaiiō

Then, the bad-rules, bad-deeds, bad-words, bad-visions (and) bad-thoughts of the deceitful persons, (their) souls face evil-food.

They shall be the real guests of the house of deceit.593

Y 50.4 ḏv vā yazāi stauuas mazdā ahurā
hadā ašā vaiištācā manaŋhā
xšaṛṛācā yā išō stāŋhaat ā paitī
akā arərdṛong dəmānē garō sraošāne

Then, praising, I may worship you all, O Ahura Mazdā, with Truth and Best Thought
and Rule through which I shall stand on the path of power.
I shall hear the truly sincere beings in the house of song.594

Y 51.14. nōi uruǔāϑā dātōibiiascā karapanō vāstrā ţarōm
gauuōi ţroōi ā.xondā x’aiš šiaothanīscā sōŋhāiścā
yō iš sōŋhō apōmōm druō dəmānē ādāi

The Karpans are not allies, being far from the laws and pasture,
through their action and preaching, there is a joy from injury to the cow,
the preach which place them in the house of deceit in the end.595

Likewise, in Young Avestan, *nmāna-* is to be associated with house rather than household according to some stanzas, for example:

Y 57.21 sraošōm aṣīm huraōōm vərəṛājanōm frādāt gaēōm ... yazamaide
yεjhe nmānōm vərədrayni
hazaṃtō.stūnōm vīdātem
barziište paitī barzazhi
haraiiiō paitī barzazaiā
x’āraošōm aŋtara.naēmāt

592 For *dm* > *nm* see de Vaan (2003: 394-395). For the root see IEW. 198-199; LIV. 114-115.
We ... worship Sraoša, accompanied by rewards, beautiful, victorious, furthering the world, whose victorious house set separately with a thousand pillars on the highest height on the high Harā (mountain), endowed with its own light from the inner half, adorned with stars, from the outer half.  

The text is after Kreyenbroek (1985: 48, 49).


The text is after Gershevitch (1967: 86-87).

As far as the translation of the Avestan root noun dam- is concerned, the Pahlavi interpretors were unaware...
differentiate between the meaning of the athematic *domh₂- and thematic o- grade, or *dómH₂os. However, the results are contradictory and unconvincing. The reason is that the two meanings are easily interchangeable in the texts. Likewise, it is very difficult to argue whether or not the meanings of gen. sg. OAv. də̄ng in də̄ng paṭi- “master of the house(hold)” and loc. sg. OAv./YAv. daṃldaqmi “in the house(hold)?”, all of which derived from the root noun dam-, are different from the corresponding genitive Tatpuruṣa compound nmānō.paiṭi- m./nmānō.paṅī- f. “master/lady of the house” and loc. sg. YAv. nmāne “in the house”, respectively.

Therefore, with some stanzas confirming the meaning of nmāna- as “house”, the Avestan nmānahe pourušaspahe is translated as “(you who) belong to the house of Pourušaspa” in the Avestan original of the present edition.

As far as the relation between the corresponding phrases in the Avestan original and the Pahlavi version is concerned, the Pahlavi translators understood correctly the meaning of kahiiā ahī, indentifying ancestry, in Y 43.7, although the gen. sg. kahiiā is rendered by pl. kēān “whom(s)” following az “from”:

Y 43.7P abzōnīg-im ēdōn tō menīd hē ohrmazd
ka ō man wahman bē mad
pursīd-īz-īṣ az man kū kē hē ud az kēān hē
čiyōn ān ī rōz daxšag [rōz] ī frāžhampursagīh nimūd estēd
[kū daxšag čiyōn kuṇam]
ī abar tō gēhān tan rāy [nimūd estēd]
Thus, I thought you are bountiful to me, O Ohrmazd, when Good Thought came to me.
He also asked me that who are you, and from whom(s) are you?
How that day, Daxšag [day], of consulting is shown?
[that means how should I make the Daxšag?],
which is about your world and body [(as) it appears].

From the semantic point of view, the genitive Y 9.13 (=Vd 19.46) nmānahe pourušaspahe is also correctly translated by andar mān ī porušasp rather than *ī/az mān ī

of its original meaning because the loc. sg. daṃ is translated wrongly by Phl. dahēd “sets, creates” in Y 45.10 (Dhabhar 1949: 198; Malandra & Ichaporia 2010: 67) and Phl. dām “creation” in Y 48.7 (Dhabhar 1949: 211; Malandra & Ichaporia 2010: 77). The Avestan gen. sg. də̄ng paṭoīš is also misinterpreted as Phl. dastwar “authority, priest” which is glossed by xwadāy “lord” in Y 45.11 (Dhabhar 1949: 198; Malandra & Ichaporia 2010: 67).

porušasp “of/from the house of Porušasp” because the latter interpretations are meaningless.\(^{602}\)

Y 9.13cP kē az āy tō ul zād hē
tō abēzag zardušt
ī man ī porušasp
*ū/az mān ī porušasp

which from him, you were born
you, O holy Zarathushtra,
of/from the house(hold?) of Pourušasp.

Regarding the meaning of Phl. mān “house(hold)?”, it translates Av. nmāna- with the exception of the Pahlavi version of Old Avestan texts Y 31.16, 18; Y 32.13 in which OAv. dōmāna- is rendered by Phl. damān. In the Hērbedestān, Av. nmānahe, is also rendered by mēhan “home” in the Pahlavi version:

HN 1.1 Av. kō nmānahe aḏaurunem pāraiāt
Phl. kē ō mēhan ī pad āsrōgīh bē rawēd [kū az mēhan ī wehān ō hērbedestān kardan kē  šawēd

Av. Who of the house should go forth (to pursue) religious studies?
Phl. Who (is there belonging) to the house who shall go for the priestly work? [That means: Who should go from the house of good ones to the residence of priests].\(^{603}\)

Furthermore, Phl. mān is also glossed by xānag “house” and mēhan “home” in the Pahlavi version of the Vīdēvdād and Hērbedestān, respectively, for example:

Vd. 3.2 dādār ī gēhān ī astōmand ī ahlaw
kū duṭīgar ēn zamīg āsāntom
[kū mēnōy ī ēn zamīg āsānīh az ē ē wēš]
ū-š guft ohrmazd
pad ān abar mard ī ahlaw mān ul dād
[kū xānag be kard]
āsrōmand gōspandōmand
nārīgōmand pusōmand ud huramagōmand

O the righteous creator of the material world,
what is the second most comfortable land,
[where does the spirit of this earth have more comfort?],

\(^{602}\) In the Pahlavi version of both Vd 19.4 and 19.46, andar mān ī porušasp translates nmānahe porušaspahe. See Anklesaria (1949: 372, 389) and also Moazami (2014: 430, 448). However, as discussed above, it seems that in Vd 19.4, nmānahe porušaspahe is in the genitive relationship with the preceding word.

\(^{603}\) The text is after Kotwal & Kreyenbroek (1992: Vol. 1, 26-27).
and Ohrmazd said:
On that (land) above which the righteous man sets house forth,
[that means: (He) made house],
Having fire, having beneficent animal,
Having wife, having son and having good flock.604

Vd 5.10 u-š guft ohrmazd kū mān mān wis wis [xānag xānag daṣṭgīrd daṣṭgīrd] sē kadag ul ē dahēnd ūy rist

and Ohrmazd said to him that (in) every house, (in) every village [(in) every house, (in) every building] they should set up three houses for the dead.605

HN 8.3 ēw yujast az mān-ē [mēhan] ēdōn wis-ē ēw hāsar az zand ēdōn deh
One Yujast from a house [home], likewise from a village, one Hāsar from the district, likewise, from the country.606

Therefore, the evidence confirms the meaning of Phl. mān as “house as a physical construction” whereas texts are silent about its possible second meaning or “house as a social entity”. As far as the meaning of nmāna- in compounds is concerned, the Pahlavi translators also interpreted it as “house as a physical construction”. The reason is that the feminine Av. nmānō.pa(snī) is equated with kadag bānūg “the lady of the house” in the FiŌ 77 (Klingenschmitt 1968). Furthermore, while nmānō.paiti- is translated by Phl. mānbed “master of house(hold)?” in the Yasna,607 Vīdēvdād608, Viserad,609 and Hērbedestān610, it is glossed by kadag xwadāy “the lord of the house” in the Hērbedestān:

HN 5.1 kadār pad āsrōgīh mānbed [ī kadag wxadāy]
Which one (should go to pursue) religious studies, the master of the house [who is the lord of the house]?611

---

604 The text is after Moazami (2014: 69, 70).
605 The text is after Moazami (2014: 132-133).
607 See the Pahlavi version of Y 9.27, 13.1, 17.11, 52.2 (Dhabhar 1949: 67, 85, 94, 229).
609 See the Pahlavi version of VīP 3.2 (Dhabhar 1949: 300).
610 See the Pahlavi version of HN 5.1, 3, 4 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992: 36, 38).
611 See Kotwal & Kreyenbroek (1992: Vol. I, 38-39). In their editions, Kotwal & Kreyenbroek (1992: Vol. 1, 39), correct the sentence to kadār pad āsrāgi ḍī [št be rawēd narīg ayāh] mānbed [i kadag wxadāy] probably to correspond to the Avestan original. However, interestingly, in the Pahlavi version, Av. nairika ... vā in nairika vā nmānō.paitik vā “woman or the master of the house” is left untranslated. It may show the change of the tradition according to which women could not pursue religious studies anymore.
In conclusion, according to the evidence, *andar mān ī porušasp* is translated as “in the house of Porušasp” rather than “in the household of Pourušasp” in the Pahlavi version of the present edition.

Table 12. Manuscripts readings of *nmāna*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>nmānahe</em></td>
<td>VdIrS TU1 fol. 24r line 11, fol. 243v line 10, fol. 250v line 5; VdIrS 977/978 fol. 21v line 18, fol. 244r line 11-12, fol. 251r line 14; VdIrS Ave991 fol. 21v line 14, fol. 223r line 21, fol. 230r line 19; VdIrS Ave1001 fol. 20v line 16, fol. 243v line 10, fol. 250r line 16; VdIrS ML16226 fol. 24r line 10, fol. 249v line 18, fol. 256r line 12; VdIrS RR1 fol. 234v line 20; VdIrS RSPA230 fol. 25r line 4, fol. 227v line 18, fol. 234r line 21; VdIrS ML15283 fol. 26r line 14, fol. 236v line 18, fol. 242v line 13; VdIndS L1 fol. 19r line 7-8, fol. 206v line 13, fol. 213r line 7; VdIndS B2 fol. 15v line 3, fol. 301r line 15; VdIndS M2 fol. 227v line 15, fol. 236v line 8; VdIndS T46 fol. 29v line 12, fol. 362r line 3; VdIndS O2 fol. 28v line 15; VdIndS G112 fol. 254r line 13, fol. 246v line 4; VdIndS K10 fol. 22r line 10, fol. 247v line 9, fol. 255r line 18; VdP Bh11 259v line 2; VdP E10 fol. 159r line 13; YIrS MZK4 fol. 33v line 1; YIrS ML15284 fol. 24r line 5, fol. 25v line 13; YIrS MZK3 fol. 28r line 13; YIrS Nik2 fol. 42v line 12; YIndS K11A fol. 48v line 13; YIndS Lb2 fol. 29r line 14; VrIrS G18b fol. 83r line 12; VrIrS KM4 fol. 24r line 13-14; VrIrS MZK1 fol. 29v line 5; VrIrS DZVr2 fol. 40r line 8; VrIrS MZK2a fol. 36r line 8; YIndS B3 fol. 310v fol. 310v line 12; VrIrS T46 fol. 372r line 8-9; VdP L4 fol. 264r line 10; fol. 280v line 9; VdP K1 fol. 233r line 6; VdP F10 fol. 278r line 12, fol. 294r line 11; VdP G28 fol. 251r line 15, fol. 264v line 10; VdP T44 fol. 303v line 13, fol. 321r line 4; VdP G34 fol. 274r, line 3; VdP B1 fol. 388v line 2, fol. 410v line 3; VdP Bh11 fol. 237v line 7; VdP M3 fol. 265r line 12, fol. 278r line 13; YIndS B3 fol. 34r line 11; YIndS L17 fol. 49v line 3; VrIrS DZVr1 fol. 34v line 10; VrIrS G27 fol. 42r line 7-8; YIndP K5 fol. 65r line 2-3; YIndP M1 fol. 167v line 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nəmānahe</em></td>
<td>VdIndS B2 fol. 310v fol. 310v line 12; VdIndS T46 fol. 372r line 8-9; VdP L4 fol. 264r line 10; fol. 280v line 9; VdP K1 fol. 233r line 6; VdP F10 fol. 278r line 12, fol. 294r line 11; VdP G28 fol. 251r line 15, fol. 264v line 10; VdP T44 fol. 303v line 13, fol. 321r line 4; VdP G34 fol. 274r, line 3; VdP B1 fol. 388v line 2, fol. 410v line 3; VdP Bh11 fol. 237v line 7; VdP M3 fol. 265r line 12, fol. 278r line 13; YIndS B3 fol. 34r line 11; YIndS L17 fol. 49v line 3; VrIrS DZVr1 fol. 34v line 10; VrIrS G27 fol. 42r line 7-8; YIndP K5 fol. 65r line 2-3; YIndP M1 fol. 167v line 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nəmānahu</em></td>
<td>VdIndS Malik6459 fol. 22r line 8; VdIndS G106 fol. 19v line 11, fol. 212r line 8-9; VdIndS B4 fol. 22r line 24, fol. 202v line 3, fol. 208r line 3-4; VdIndS G112 fol. 21v line 5; VdIndS ML630 fol. 21v line 8; fol. 254r, line 16, fol. 262v line 2; VdIndS FIRES1 fol. 19v line 12, fol. 251r line 4-5, fol. 259r line 11, fol. 280v line 9; VdP E10 151v line 4; YIndS G26 fol. 46r line 10; YIrP F2 fol. 56v line 10; YIrP T6 fol. 49r line 5-6; YSkt K6 fol. 78r line 10-11; YSkt S1 fol. 38v line 7 YSkt KM7 fol. 55r line 2-3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nəmāni</em></td>
<td>VdIndS G106 fol. 205v line 14-15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nəmānahu</em></td>
<td>VdIndS Bh5 fol. 38v line 15-16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nmāna</em></td>
<td>VdIndS Bh3 fol. 19v line 13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>namāne</em></td>
<td>VdP G25 fol. 109v line 13, fol. 128v line 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) **Line 11 Y 9.13cP** ast kē jud-dēwīh ī abāz ā-mān gowēd “there is one who says then, rejecting demons away from us”

Phl. *ast kē jud-dēwīh ī abāz ā mān gowēd* is a commentary occurring at the end of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.13, which has no counterpart in the Sanskrit Yasna.\(^6\) Mills (1903c: 323) translates it as “some (texts) tell us ‘the demon free’ again for him (that is ‘they repeat the word,’)”. While he obviously offers a free translation, his interpretation of mān as “him” is erroneous. By contrast, Davar (1904: 42) translates it as “There is (someone) who says, ‘being opposed to the demons’ (means keeping them) away from us”. Davar’s reading is based on the Indian manuscripts because ā- appears as \(\mathfrak{f}\) in their YIrP counterparts:

---

**Figure 45. The variant readings of \(\mathfrak{f} \rightarrow \text{mān}\) in the Iranian and Indian manuscripts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\text{YIrP})</th>
<th>(\text{YInd P})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt4 (fol. 58v line 6)</td>
<td>J2 (fol. 87r line 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mf4 (p. 157 line 6)</td>
<td>K5 (65r line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G14 (fol. 57v line 6)</td>
<td>M1 (fol. 167v line 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 (fol. 56v line 14)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6 (fol. 49r line 9)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T55b (fol. 76r line 5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The interlinear New Persian version in F2 shows that \(\mathfrak{f}-\text{mān}\) was interpreted as ēn xāna (کنّه /\(\text{xانة}\)) “this house” by its scribe. In T6, the corresponding New Persian interlinear sentence describes ast kē jud-dēwīh ī abāz \(\mathfrak{f}-\text{mān}\) gowēd as:

---

\(^6\) For the Sanskrit version see Unvala (1924: 23).
NP. zāher hast ka ya 'ni juda kardan-i dēwān-rā bāz ēn az xāna-yī porušasp u dunyā niz dēwān-rā judā karda

It seems that it means separating demons again. This one has also separated demons from the house of Porušasp and the world.

Like F2, NP. ēn appears beneath Y, however, xāna-yī porušasp u dunyā “the house of Porušasp and the world” suggests that Y was also interpreted as two. Moreover, the translation of mān as NP. xāna shows that the scribes of F2 and T6 (and possibly the copyists of other YIrPs) associated mān with the preceding mān ī porušasp “house of Porušasp”:

\[
\text{andar mān ī porušasp} \\
\text{i jud-dēw ohrmazd-dādestān} \\
[\text{ast kē jud-dēwīh abāz Y- mān gōwēd}]
\]

(When you were born Zardušt) in the house of Porušasp who rejects demons, who accepts the law of Ohrmazd [there is one who says rejecting demons (from) this (these two) house(s)]

However, the interpretation of YIrPs is problematic because while Y cannot be read as ēn, its second interpretation as two does not agree with the context of Y 9.13 which is only about the house of Porušasp in which Zardušt was born. By contrast, interpreting Y as the conjunction ā-, the following (l) would be the enclitic pronoun -mān “us”. The reading mān also fits the context of ast kē jud-dēwīh abāz ā-mān gōwēd which is translated as “there is one who says then, rejecting demons away of us” in the present edition.
4.14 Y 9.14

1 (Y 9.14aA) srūtō airiiene vaējahe
2 tūm paoirītō zaraišuṣtra
3 ahunəm vairīm frasrāuuaio
4 vihoaʃfantsəm äxtuiriṃ
5 (Y 9.14bA) aparəm xraoždiehiia frasrūti

1 (Y 9.14aA) Famous in Airiiana Vaējah,
2 you as the first, O Zarausuṣtra!,
3 recited Ahuna Vaiiria
4 separating (it) by four pauses
5 (Y 9.14bA) the following (verse) with louder chant

1 (Y 9.14aP) andar ān ī nāmīg ērānwēz
2 [kū weh dāitī]
3 ud tō fradom zarduşt
4 ahunawar frāz srūd
5 [kū-t yāst ī nāwar kard]?
6 be barišnīh [pad be göwišnīh] ćahār
7 [tā ē ān ī pas]
8 (Y 9.14bP) pad harwisp wāz srāyišnīh [tuxšāgīhā]

1 (Y 9.14aP) In the famous Ērānwēz1,
2 [by the good2 Dāitī]
3 and you as the first, O Zarduşt!,
4 recited the Ahunawar3,
5 [That means: You performed the Nāwar ceremony]4,
6 carrying out (the pauses) [in the recitation] four times
7 [until the following (verse)]5
8 (Y 9.14bP) (carrying out) the recitation for all words6 [energetically]

1) Line 1 Y 9.14aP andar ān nāmīg ērānwēz “in the famous Ērānwēz”

The Phl. nāmīg provides the standing translation of the Av. srūta-. The Avestan original gives nom. sg. srūtō from the stem srūta- adj., followed by the loc. case airiiene vaējahe. By contrast, the Pahlavi translation places the preposition andar, expressing location, before ān ī nāmīg ērānwēz. As stated by Josephson (1997: 55), the Pahlavi translation also changes the meaning according to which the adj. nāmīg describes ērānwēz instead of tō corresponding to Av. tūm in the Avestan original.
2) **Line 2 Y 9.14aP** *weh* “good”

In YIndP J2, *weh* is omitted. However, it is attested in J2 sister manuscript, or K5, and the other collated copies. Therefore, in agreement with the base text, *weh* is employed in the present edition.

3) **Line 3-4 Y 9.14aP** *ud tō fradom zardušt frāz srūd* “and you as the first, O Zardušt!, recited the Ahunawar”

In YIrPs Pt4, G14 and T55b, under the influence of New Persian, the construction of the sentence *ud tō fradom zardušt ahunawar frāz srūd* was changed from the ergative to accusative by the addition of *hē* after *srūd*: *ud tō fradom zardušt ahunawar frāz srūd hē*.

In Vd. 19.2, *zardušt ahunawar frāz srūd* is glossed by *ān ī dō yatāhōwairyō kē hušiti ō pēš kē ēstēd* “the two *yaθā ahū vairiiō* which precedes *hušiti* (= Y 68.14)”. It agrees with the contemporary performance of the Yasna ritual as described by Kotwal & Boyd (1991: 123):

‘The zōt continues the sliding gesture of the cup on the mortar’s rim during this recitation which is followed by *y.a.v.* 2, said by both priests in a normal voice. While saying actions (*šyaọθanām*) in each *y.a.v.*, the zōt pours some of the mixture over the date-palm cord into the mortar, and then continues the sliding gesture. Y 68.14-18 are recited by the zōt alone, the rāspī joining him in sts.*

Therefore, alongside Y 9.1, in the Pahlavi version of Y 9.14 and Vd 19.2, Zardušt is described as a Zōt, reciting the Yasna. Furthermore, the agreement between the Pahlavi text and the description of the contemporary performance of the Yasna ritual show the continuity and antiquity of the ritual.

---

614 *Y.a.v.* stands for *yaθā ahū vairiiō*.
615 Sts. stands for stanzas.
616 See Y 9.1 commentary 2 *ka-š ātaxš gāh kāmīst sūtan gāhān srāyīštīnīh* and commentary 3 *ka-š ān ašom vohū sē guft kē fravarānē ō pēš.*
4) Line 5 Y 9.14aP *kū-t yašt ī nāwar kard* “That means: You performed the Nāwar ceremony”

The ergative construction is corrected to its accusative counterpart *kū-t yašt ī nāwar kard hē* under the influence of New Persian in Pt4, G14, T6 and T55b. It is another piece of evidence showing that the Iranian manuscripts are corrected.617

As regards Nāwar, in the Zoroastrian tradition, it is the initiation ceremony into the priesthood, lasting four days for which the collective noun *nōg nāwar* “new Nāwar” is used. Prior to the Nāwar ceremony, two priests perform the Yasna ceremony called Gewrā for six consecutive days followed by a four day Nāwar ceremony during which the candidate performs the Yasna as Zōt, while the initiating priest acts as Rāspīg. During the first three days of the Nāwar, the Yasna together with the Bāj and Afringān ceremonies are performed. The first Yasna is dedicated to *minu nāwar* “the spirit Nāwar”. The ceremonies of the second and third days are in honour of Sraoša and Sīrōza, respectively. On the fourth day, the Yasna is replaced by the Visperad ceremony.618

As far as the orthography of *nāwar* in Pahlavi is concerned, it is written differently in texts. For example: *lxkn* in YIrP Pt4, Mf4, G14, F2, T6 and T55b; *lyjEAn* in the YIndP J2, K5, M1619 and VrS K7b.620 In the Dādestān ī Dēnīg, manuscript TD, it appears as *lxkn*621 whereas in the Hērbadestān and Nērangestān, both forms *lxkn* and *lxkn* are attested.622 The word is usually transcribed as *nāwar, nābar or naēwar*. In addition, Unvala (1932: Vol. II, 649) gives the reading *nawar*, beside *nābar* and *nāwar* in the Index of his translation of the Persian Rivayat. West (1882: 234) also writes *nābar* in the main text of his translation of the Dādestān ī Dēnīg but he suggests the alternative readings *naēbar* and *nāgbar* in the footnote. While the correct spelling of the Pahlavi word is unclear, in the Zoroastrian New Persian and Sanskrit texts *nāwar* and *nābar* are attested:

Bharuca p. 55. prathamaṃ ijsnī kṣṇumanī nonāvarāyāh karaṇam [karanīyā]nonāvarāyāī gviāgraḥaṇaṃ ca saptatāyaiḥ

---

617 For correction see section 3.1.
618 For the Nāwar ceremony see Modi (1922: 201-207); Kotwal (1988: 299-307); Kotwal & Boyd (1991: 139-140).
619 In addition to Y 9.14, *nāwar* occurs in Y 19.6. The distribution of different readings of *nāwar* in Y 19.6 is similar to that in Y 9.14 among the YIrP and YIndP manuscripts, with the exception of YIndP M1 (fol. 268r line 13), which writes *lxkn*.
620 The text on *nāwar* appears after VrIndS (fol. 101v line 14-fol. 104r line15).
621 For *lxkn* see Modi (1922: 199 fn. 2).
622 Sanjana (1894: 106, 137).
First, in the dedication ceremony to the new Nāwar, performance [through performing] of the new Nāwar taking the Bāj and with (the Barsom of ) seven twigs, in the watches (of the day) and also the recitation. It is the dedication to Nōnāvar. The word xvarata.naro (is to be said) by the Atravakhsh (priest) and the Afringān … 623

DHR II. 26

Whoever has kept the Nābar and unknowingly eats unscared bread, another Yašt ceremony should be performed for him to be the Nābar correct.624

Furthermore, in the oral tradition of Iranian Zoroastrians, the corresponding word occurs as nābar. For example, in the following folkloric poem, composed in the Zoroastrian Dari dialect:625

nuzād-e mā nunābar-on
yašt-o yezīšn-oš az bar-on
dunāy-e amr-e dāvaron
az hovz-e kowsar rahbar-on
guyid yā numoxodā

Our new priest is a new Nāwar,
He has memorised the Yašt and Yazišn.
He is aware of the command of judges.
He is a leader from the Kowsar pool.626
Say: O in the name of God [i.e. God may protect him].627

To analyse the word, Modi (1922: 199-200), reading nāwar, derives it from nava “new” attached to the root bar “to carry” having the sense of “a new carrier of presents and offerings”. However, the problem with Modi’s suggestion is that the development of *naqua > nā is unusual because the expected form would be *nawbar > *nōbar.628 Likewise, it is

---

623 My translation.
624 My translation.
625 For the poem see Mazdapour ŠNŠ (1990 (1369): 195).
626 According to the Islamic Hadith, Kowsar is the name of a pool in the heaven (Bihār al-Anwār, vol. VIII, p. 286).
627 My translation.
628 Modi’s etymology may agree with NP. nawbar > nobar “first-fruits, young”. However, an etymological
impossible to explain the other suggested readings of the Pahlavi word, or naēwar and nāgwar, with Modi’s suggestion. Furthermore, as stated above, Phl. nōg “new”, NP/Skt no “new”, occurs with nāwar, making the collective term nōg nāwar, describing the four day ceremony. It makes it less likely to expect that two concurrent cognates, or nā/naē/nāg “new?” < *naə “new” vs. nōg “new” < *naŋa-ka “new”, in a term show different developments. Modi (1922: 200) also compares nāwar with nawjōt “the initiation of a child into the Zoroastrian religion”. However, in contrast to nāwar, both nawjōt and its New Persian variant nozūd, show the regular word development, *naŋa- > naw > nō > no. As another possibility, nāwar and its other variant readings can be compared with ahunawar which is also called the yaḏā ahū vairiiō prayer in the Zoroastrian tradition. In Y 9.14, yašt i nāwar “Nāwar ceremony” is the gloss to ahunawar. The relationship between nāwar and ahunawar is also corroborated by the Pahlavi version of Y 19.6 whose YAv original is a commentary to the Ahunawar prayer composed in Old Avestan:

Y 19.6 kē andar ān ī man axw ī astōmand spīūmān zardušt
baxtārīh ī ahunawar ošmārēd
[kū ōh sparānēd]
frāz ān ī ošmurēd dranjēnēd
[kū ōy be kunēd]
ud frāz ān dranjēnēd srāyēd
[kū nērang be dānēd]
ud frāz ān srōd yazēd
[kū yašt be kunēd] sē bār
tarist cēhwидarag ān ī ōy ruwān
ō ān ī pahlom axwān frāz widārām man ī ohrmazd-am
[3 andar ān rōz kē yašt nāwar kunēd
ā-ś 3 bār ruwān be ā anōh nayam
ud nēkīh pad-iš kunam]

Whoever in my material word, O Spitāmān Zardušt,
reckons the apportioning parts of the Ahunawar
[That means: He breaks (its apportioning four parts) in the usual way]
He enumerates it, recites it loud
[That means: He performs it]
and recites it loud forth, sings it,
[That means: He knows the incantation]

study on the New Persian words is wanting. Asatrian has published his book entitled Etymological Dictionary of Persian very recently which is unavailable in the UK at the moment. 
629 Av. yaḏā ahū vairiiō are the opening words of the Ahunawar prayer whose Avestan text is: yaḏā ahū vairiiō aḏā raṭuš aṣačjī çac vahūš dazdā managūh Šuaaxanām aŋhūš mazdāi xšāəromcā ahūrāi ā vīm dragūbūd dadaŋ vāstārum. The precise meaning of the hymn is debated. A translation can be: “as temporal lord (is) chosen, so (is) a spiritual lord, according to Truth, (as) an establisher of the works of Good Mind in the world, and the sovereignty is the Ahura Mazdā’s, whom they have bestowed on the humble as a shepherd” (Brunner 1985: 683).
and worships that hymn forth.
[That means: He performs the Yasna] three times.
Across the Činwad Bridge, I, who am Ohrmazd, pass his soul forth to the best existences.
[Whoever performs the Nāwar ceremony three times on that day, then, I lead (his) soul three times to there, and I do goodness to him].

Considering the close relationship between the Ahunawar prayer and the Nāwar ceremony, it could be suggested that nāwar/naēwar/nāgwar is derived from ahunawar. The development ahunawar > nāwar/naēwar/nāgwar is also explainable by the historical grammar of the Iranian languages. The first change is the well attested omission of the initial a. For example in: Phl. amurdād > NP. murdād “immortality”; MP. anōsagruwān “having the imperishable soul” > NP. nōširawān “having the imperishable soul”; Phl. abāg > NP. bā “with”. The second development, although less frequent than the former one, is the deletion of the initial h, having parallels in MP. hān “that” > MP./NP. ān “that”; Ir. *hacā “from” > MP./NP. az “from”; MP. hambōyīdan “to smell” > NP. anbōyīdan “to smell”; MP hambār “store” > NP. anbār “store”. The final development is the omission of u which is attested in MP uskārdan “to consult” > NP. sigālidan “to consult”; MP. uspurrīgīstan “to complete” vs. MP. spurrīghistan “to complete”. Finally, the different suggested vowels ā, a, aē, agree with the different Pahlavi spellings of the word which suggest that while the exact history and meaning of the word are unknown to the Zoroastrian community, the pronunciations are the result of either the local dialects or misreading of the Pahlavi word. Moreover, the reading nāgwar can be ruled out because it is only one of West’s suggestions in the footnote based on the obscure Pahlavi orthography and it has no parallel in the primary written non-Pahlavi and oral Zoroastrian literature. In conclusion, the development of ahunawar to nāwar can be abbreviated as follows:

\[
\text{ahunawar} > *\text{hunawar} > *\text{unawar} > \text{nāwar/naēwar}
\]

With the above developments, the form nāwar should be dated very late, being under the influence of New Persian. However, apart from the Yasna, it appears in the classic Pahlavi texts Dādestān ī Dēnīg, Hērbadestān and Nīrangestān. Therefore, the second

---

possibility is to take nāwar as the abbreviated form of ahunawar, or Av. ahuna- vairiīa-.\(^{631}\)

It should be noted that abbreviating words/phrases have parallels in the Zoroastrian literature, for example in the Avesta manuscripts Phl. 3 guftan “to say three” often stands for 3 bār guftan “to say three times”. Moreover, Phl. sar (or wars) ud tan šustan “to wash head (hair) and body”, corresponding to Av. frasainānte varvarāsca tanūmca “they shall wash hair and body” in Vd 8.11, is often given in the abbreviated form sar šustan “to wash head” in the Pahlavi texts.\(^{632}\) The term pādyāb “the prelude to the sacred cord (Kusti) ritual” also possibly goes back to *pad pādyāb kustī kardan “doing the sacred cord rite with barrier (purity)” (Boyce 1991: 281).

In conclusion, because of the consensus of the Zoroastrian oral and non-Pahlavi written literature on the reading nāwar/nābar, the Pahlavi word is transcribed as nāwar in the present edition. However, it should be noted that while the evidence shows that Phl. nāwar is closely related to Phl. ahunawar, the abbreviation theory, suggested in the present edition, is hypothetical.

As stated before, Nāwar ceremony is the initiation into the priesthood which seems to lie in the fact that the Ahunawar, or Yathā Ahū Vairiō prayer, is associated with different aspects of the priesthood in the Pahlavi translations of the Ahunawar prayer:

PRDd 60.1 zand ī yatāhōwairyō
čiyōn axw kāmag [čiyōn ohrmazd kāmag]
ēdōn radēhā [ud ēdōn dastwarēhā]
az ahlēyih čegäm-iz-ē
[kār ud kirbag kardan ēdōn dastwarēhā kardan
čiyōn ohrmazd abāyēd abzāyēd]̄
ān-iz wahman dāshn andar kušišn ī ohrmazd
[kū ān mizd ud pādāšn ī o wahman dahēnd
ō ōy-iz ōh dahēnd
ast kē ēdōn gōwēd
ēw xwad-īš wahman dahēd]
xwadāyih ē ohrmazd dād bawēd
[u-š ohrmazd abar tan ī xwēš xwadāy ud pādišāy kard bawēd]
šē ē dīyōsān dahēd wehīgān
[ud parwarišn kū-šān ayāromandīh ud jādag-gōwīh kunēnd
ast kē ēdōn gōwēd
kū xwadāyih ē ohrmazd kū-š ān pādishāyih ē ohrmazd

---

\(^{631}\) The development of AV. ahuna- vairiīa- > Phl. ahunawar is irregular because it is expected that Av. vairiīa- develops to Phl. wēr rather than war/bar. Therefore, ahunawar is to be considered as an Avestan loan word in Pahlavi. Moreover, the Pahlavi form ahunawar shows that Av. ahuna- vairiīa- becomes fused into *ahunavariīa- cf. Av. ahura- mazda- vs. OP. auramazdā- and Phl. ohrmazd; Av. agra- mainīiu- vs. Phl. ahriman. However, it should be noted that the etymology of the word is unknown.

\(^{632}\) For sar ud tan šustan See Boyce (1992: 695).
The Interpretation of the Yaϑā Ahū Vairīō prayer:

As the will of the lord [as the will of Ohrmazd]
is so masterly [and is so priestly]
from whatever righteousness
[good deeds are to be done, so in priestly fashion to be done, as Ohrmazd (wills), one should increase (them)],
which is also the gift of Good Thought within the action of Ohrmazd.
[That means: That payment and reward which they give to Good Thought, they give to him in the usual way.
There is one who says:
Good Thought gives it to himself].
Lordship is given to Ohrmazd,
[and Ohrmazd is made lord and king over his body]
who gives goodneses to the poor ones
[and the nourishment. That means: They perform assistance and intercession.]
There is one who says:
That means: The lordship is from Ohrmazd and his kingship is from Ohrmazd.
There is one who says:
That means: The lordship of Ohrmazd is made current].

Likewise, in the Pahlavi commentaries to the Ahunawar prayer, it is connected with priesthood:

Y 19.12 čiyōn frāz anōh guft
[kū xwadāy ud dastwar dārīšn čiyōn ēn tis
ēdōn guft čiyōn ēn dādestān ēdōn]  
ka-z ō ūy axw ud rad dāhēd
[kū tan bē ū ērbadēstān dāhēd]  
ēdōn-īs ū ūy cāšīd bawēd
ohrmazd menišn menīdārīh ī fradōm dām
[kū-s gāḥānīk rawāg kard bawēd]  
kē ēn [tan ū ūy ī šāhān šāh]
ī az harwisp [mardōm] mahist cāšēd
[kū tan pad šāhan šāh dārēd]  
ēdōn ū ūy dahm cāšīt bawēd
[kū-s gāḥānīghīk rawāg kard bawēd]  
Čiyōn “as”635 he (Zardušt) said (Ahunawar) forth there
[That means: Having the lord and priest is like this thing.
He said Ėdōn “so”, 636 “as” this law (is) “so”],
when he also sets him (Zardušt) as a lord and spiritual judge.

635 The Pahlavi translation of Av. yaϑā “as” in the Ahunawar, or Yaϑā Ahū Vairīō prayer.
636 The Pahlavi translation of Av. aϑā “so” in the Ahunawar, or Yaϑā Ahū Vairīō prayer.
[That means: he gives (his) body to the priestly school].
So it is taught to him that Ohrmazd’s thought is thinking of the first creature,
That means: he will make current the Gāhīc (hymns)]
which this (prayer) [the body to the king of kings]
teaches that he is the greatest of all [mortals].
[It means that he gives his body to the king of kings]
(The Ahunawar) is taught to him, the pious one, so.
That means that the Gāhānīg Avesta is made current by him].

DkM 822.9-823.2 dudīgar fragard yatāhōwairyō
abar arzānīg ī pad gētāyīg ud mēnōyīg
nēkīh pad xwadāy
ud hāst warīh dād pad sālārīh ud dastwarīh awēsān šāyēd
kē abāg astīh ī ī abārīg hunar
kē xwādāyīh ud dastwarīh pad-īš xwēsīhēd
xwad-īz xwādāy ud dastwar dārēd
dōš man zardūst tō pad axwiū ud rādiū
čiyūn hē zardūst axwōmand radōmand
kū tō-īz pad dastwarīh dārēnd
čiyūn tō ēg frāz rasiśnīh
hād kū be bōxtē
ka-t abāg dēwān hamrasiśnīh kū-t abāg ahlamōgān paykār
hād ud xwādāy ud dastwar nē dārīh
ay nē dārīh xem dād ī dēwān būd
ud dāstān ī ohrmazd amahraspandān pad xwādāy ud dastwar
ud ohrmazd xwādāy abāg dādārīh hambūd
ēn-īz kū ī pad ahlāyīh rad pad kāmag
ud xwādāy dānāg ud dādār ud prawardār ud āsnīdār ī dīryōšān
ud drōdmānīgīh ī hamāg awēsān
kē dēn kē az zardūst padirēd
ahlāyīh ābdāh ast pahlom

The second chapter is Yaϑā Ahū Vairiiō
(It is) about the worth which is in the spiritual and material (worlds).
(It is about) goodness to the lord,
and (the lord) created priesthood for authority and priesthood is suitable to them who are with the existence of his other virtues,
who, by them, lordship and authority are owned.
(who) also has a lord and priest himself.

My dear Zardušt! You are in the lordship and spiritual judgement (position),
because you, Zardušt, are provided with authority, are provided with spiritual judgement.
That means: they also have you for the authority when, you, then, arriving forth.
That means you would save (them),
when you arrive against demons and fight heretics.
That means: (those) having no lord and priest.
That is: non-having was the law and character of the demons,

and having Ohrmazd and Amahraspandāns as the lord and priest, and Ohrmazd is the lord together with creatorship (as his feature). This is also that he is the spiritual judge righteously (and) willingly and (he is) the lord, wise and creator and nourisher and purifier of the needy people, and (the reason for) the maintenance of the health of all of them, who accept the religion from the Zardušt. Righteousness is the best prosperity.\footnote{638}

To sum up, according to the Pahlavi literature, the Ahunawar prayer is about priesthood whose related ceremony is called \textit{yašt ī nāwar} “Nāwar ceremony”. It describes why the Nāwar ceremony is the name of the initiation ceremony in Zoroastrianism.

The close relationship between Nāwar and the Ahunawar prayer can also cast light on the concept of the obscure Minu Nāwar which is described as a spirit being called Nāwar.

In the Pahlavi literature, the Ahunawar is the spirit of the Yaḵā Ahū Vairiīō:

\begin{verbatim}
IrBd 1.50 ohrmazd az stī rōsnīh rāst gōwiśnīg
ud az rāst gōwiśnīh abzōnīgīh ī dādār paydāg būd
dām dahišnīh
čē-š asar kirb az asar rōsnīh frāz brēhēnūd
dām ī hamāg andar asar kirb be dād
asar kirb zaman sazišnīg jud būd
az asar kirb ahunawar frāz būd mēnōy ī yatāhōwairyō
\end{verbatim}

Ohrmazd (created) from the existence of light the true-speech, and from the true speech the bountifulness of the creator was revealed which is the creation of creature, because he set forth the endless body (form) from the endless light.

He created all creatures in the endless body (form).

The endless body was separated from the passing time.

From the endless body arose the Ahunawar which is the Spirit of Yaḵā Ahū Vairiīō.\footnote{639}

Moreover, in the Avesta, The power of the Ahunawar prayer, recited by Zaraḵuštra, is compared with house-sized stones:

\begin{verbatim}
Yt 17.20 jaṅṭī māṃ ahuna vairiīa auuauuata snāṅgīśa
yaḵā asma katō,masā
tāpaieiti māṃ aša vahiśta
māṅataw ahe yaḵā auixoङšustom
raekō mē haca anjāhā zomō vaihō kørnāoiti
yō māṃ aēuūō jāmatiiti
yō spitāmō zaraḵuštrō
\end{verbatim}

He smashes me (the Evil Spirit) with Ahuna Vairiīa as the weapon\footnote{638\textsuperscript{My translation.}}\footnote{639 The text is after Anklesaria (1956: 16-17).}
as the stone of a length of a house.
He makes me hot with Best Truth
like the molten brass.
He made it better for me to withdraw from the world,
who causes me to retreat,
who is Zarabuṣṭra Spitāma. 640

These stones are also regarded as the spirit of Yaϑā Ahū Vairīiō in the Pahlavi literature:

Vd 19.4P ul ēstād zardušt frāz raft zardušt
az afsarišnīh ī akōman
[ka-š akōman pad tan afsard estēd]
pad ān ī xrośd bēš pursīṣn
[pad ān pursīṣn ōwōn sαxt į ōy rāy kard estēd
ast kē ēdōn gōwēd
yū u-š afsard ka ān ī xrośd bēš pursīd]
u-š sag pad dast dāṣt ī kadag masāy būd ahlaw zardušt
[sag ī sagēn ast kē mēnō yatāhōwairyō gōwēd]
kē-š windīd az dādār ohrmazd
kā ān dāṣt pad ān zamīg ī pahn ud gird ī dūrwidarag
pad dārāja zibāl andar mān ī porušasp
[ast kē ēdōn gōwēd
ōy dāṣt pad ān zamīg and pahn ī gird ī dūrwidarag
u-š ān ī gyāg dāṣt pad dārāja zibāl andar mān ī porušasp]

Up stood Zardušt, Zardušt approached
because of the frigidness of Akōman
[when Akōman is frozen in body]
because of the hard, hostile questions
[because of the so hard question which he asked him,
there is one who says:
Note: He froze Akōman when he asked the hard, hostile (questions),]
and he, the righteous Zardušt, had a stone in hand which was the size of a stone.
[The stony stone. There is one (who says), it was the spirit of Yaϑā Ahū Vairīiō, which he acquired from the creator Ohrmazd, that he had it on the wide, round earth whose borders lie apart
on (the bank of) the swift Drəjā (river), in the house of Porušasp.
[There is one who says:
He held (stone) on the wide, round earth whose borders lie apart,
and he had a place on (the bank of) the swift Drəjā (river), in the house of Porušasp.] 641

DkM 632.15-633.8 zardušt ahunawar frāz srūd
druz ī ōy stard
abāz dwārīd hēnd but dēw ud sēz ī nihān rawišnīh ī frēftār
ud druž ū (ōy) 642 dawist 643 hēnd

640 My translation.
642 ū is absent in Madan’s edition.
643 Both of the verbs dwārīd and dawist, spelt as dwb lyt’ (DkM 632.16) and dwst’ (DkM 632.17), respectively,
kū tarnigerišn hē gannāg mēnōy
kū tis pad čim bē nē nigerē
ud ān frāmāyn kardan nē šāyēd
nē mān ān ī āy ās abar did kē spitāmān zardušt
az purr xwarrahīh ahlaw zardušt pad menišn abar did
kā dēw ī druwand duśdānāg pad ān ī man ās hampursēnd
ud ul avistād zardušt frāz raft zardušt
anōh paydāḡīhist wuzurg abdīh ū wasān
pad ān ī gōwēd kū
u-š sang frāz dād
dast dāšt ī kadag masāy būd ahlaw zardušt
kē-š windīd ēstād az dādār ohrmazd mēnōy yatāhōwairyō
ud ēw ēd ī nē ēwāz andar ērān šahr ū ērān be andar wisp būm
ud ū har srāyag paydāḡīhist
škastānī dēwēn kālbod
frāz abesrāyishīn ī zardušt ahunawar

Zardušt chanted the Ahunawar prayer,
The deceit was stunned because of it,
the deceiving demons But and Sēz, who proceed in concealment, ran back,
and the deceits ran to him.
That means: You are observing with arrogance O Evil Spirit!
That means: You do not look at the affair(s) with reason.
It is not worth doing what you order.
We did not see the death of him who is Zardušt.
Because of full-Grace, the righteous Zardušt saw in (his) thought
that the deceitful, foolish evil demon consulted about my death
and Zardušt stood upward, Zardušt approached.
There, a miracle was revealed to many
about which it is said that
and he was given forth a stone.
The righteous Zardušt had (the stone) in hand which was house-sized,
he acquired from the creator Ohrmazd, the spirit of Yaϑā Ahū Vairiīō.
And one (other miracle) is that the break of the form of demons because of the recitation
of Ahunawar by Zardušt was revealed not only in the land of Iran, to Iranians but
also in all lands.⁶⁴⁴

Therefore, it seems that Minu Nāwar should be identified with the mēnōy ahunawar “the
spirit Ahunawar” and the Yasna in honour of the Minu Nāwar is actually a dedication to
the spirit of Yaϑā Ahū Vairiīō.

As far as the time of the performance of the Nāwar ceremony by Zardušt is concerned,
as mentioned above, according to the Dēnkard VII, the stories of the recitation of the
Ahunawar prayer by Zardušt and the stone-like Yaϑā Ahū Vairiīō-s, thrown against the
demons by him, took place consecutively. According to the tradition, these two events

⁶⁴⁴ My translation.
occurred during the ten years when Zardušt, between the age of 30-40 years old, consulted seven times with Ohrmazd.\(^{645}\)

In the Avesta, Zarāϑuštṛa (Y 19.12; Y 27.13; Yt 13.91-92, 152; Vd 2.43; Vr. 2.4) and Ahura Mazdā (Y 27.1; Vr 2.4; 11.21) are regarded as Av. ahu- “lord” and Av. ratu- “(spiritual) judge”, corresponding to the same words in the Ahunawar prayer; yāϑā ahu vairiiū aϑā ratuϑ aϑāciĉ hacā ... . While Zarāϑuštṛa is the lord and judge of the material world according to Yt 13.91, 152 and Vd 2.43, Ahura Mazdā is described as the greatest, lord and judge in Y 27.1 and Vr 11.21. However, in Vr 2.4, Zarāϑuštṛa and Ahura Mazdā are compared together as the lord and judge of the material and spiritual world, respectively:

Vr 2.4 ahmiia zahoϑre barosmanaεca
δβμ̄ ρατύ̄m αἱ <<-ιε yeϑti yim ahurωm mazd̄m
mainiaom mainiaiauuanqm dāmanqm mainiaoiiiā stōiś
ahūmca raτūmcα
ahmiia zaoϑre barosmanaεca
δβμ̄ ρατύ̄m α跱e yeϑti yim zarαϑustrɔm spitāmɔm
gaeϑ̄m gaεhiaaŋqm dāmanqm gaεhiaiiā stōiś
ahūmca raτūmcα

At this libation and by the sacrificial straws,
I wish to come in this worship to you, the lord Ahura Mazdā,
the lord and the spiritual judge of the spiritual creatures of the spiritual existence.
At this libation and by the sacrificial straws,
I wish to come in this worship to you, Zarāϑuštṛa Spitāma,
the material lord and the spiritual judge of the material creatures of the material existence.\(^{646}\)

Therefore, in Zoroastrianism, Ahura Mazdā as the greatest lord and judge is also the lord and judge of the spiritual creation. By contrast, Zarāϑuštṛa is the lord and judge of the material creation.

5) Line 7 Y 9.14aP tā ò an ī pas [until the following (verse)]

In YIrP Pt4, Mf4, F2 and T55b, is attested tā ān which like tā means “until”.\(^{647}\) By contrast, ān is absent in the old YIndP J2, K5 and YIrP G14, T6 of the Hōšang Syāwaxšt-line.\(^{648}\) In the present edition in agreement with the old YIndP J2 and K5, tā is employed.

\(^{645}\) For the mythical life of Zarāϑuštṛa see Amouzgar & Tafazzoli (1991 (1371): 47-49).


\(^{647}\) For tā see Nyberg (1974: 189-190).

\(^{648}\) Manuscripts which descend from a copy completed by Hōšang Syāwaxšt in 864. The collated manuscripts Pt4, Mf4, G14 and T6, studied in the present edition, contain the colophon of Hōšang Syāwaxšt. For a discussion see section 2.1.
As regards ē, it is omitted in YIrP G14 and T6 but it is present in the other YIrPs and YIndPs in agreement with which ē is employed in the present edition.

6) Line 8 Y 9.14b pad harwisp wāz srāyišnīh “(carrying out) the recitation for all words”

The Pahlavi translation of Av. aprəm xraoždiiehiia frasrūti “(you recited) the following (verse) with louder chant” is edited as pad harwisp wāz srāyišnīh in the present edition. Mills (1900: 527) edits pavan⁶⁴⁹ khrōzdyek? frāz srāyišnīh. He also translates it as “with a firm intonation” (Mills: 1903c: 323). Reading pavan khrujdis? frāz srāyišnīh, Davar (1904: 20) translates it as “with a deep chant”. Josephson (1994: 54-55) edits frāz xrozād srāyišnīh “chanted with loudness”. As for the readings of the collated manuscripts, while harwisp wāz is replaced by xrośd frāz (hlwscsp pl’c) in YIrPs, YIndPs show the following variations:

Figure 47. The variant readings of harwisp wāz in YIndPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>pad harwisp wāz srāyišnīh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td>pad xrośd frāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>pad xrośd frāz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In J2, Mihrābān Kayhusraw apparently reads the first word as harwisp. By contrast, it seems that he corrected harwisp in K5 by adding c after hlw to correspond to Av. xraoždiiehiia. The second word should be wāz “word” although in K5, probably due to scribal correction, w is either omitted or interpreted as the final stroke in hlwcsp’. The erroneous correction in K5 suggests that Mihrābān Kayhusraw understood that xraoždiiehiia is left untranslated and as a result, he tried to edit harwisp to correspond to the original Avestan word. Regarding the Iranian manuscripts, harwisp is replaced by xrośd. Although in Vd 19.4 xrośd, translating xroždiia- “difficulty, trouble” means “difficult, hard”,⁶⁵⁰ it seems that in the Iranian Pahlavi manuscripts it is interpreted as “loud” to correspond to xraoždiiehiia. As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, the spellings of

---

⁶⁴⁹ It corresponds to pad in MacKenzie’s system of transcription.
⁶⁵⁰ See Moazami (2014: 430, fn2 and 553).
YIndP K5, M1 are obviously wrong. Between the readings of J2 and YIrPs, the performance of the Yasna ritual, as described by Kotwal & Boyd (1991: 123), agrees with the reading of J2 because as mentioned in the commentary 3 on ud tō fradom zardušt frāz srūd, Zardušt is described in Vd 19.2, corresponding to Y 9.1, 14, 15, as a Zōt, reciting the Ahunawar prayer which precedes hušiti (= Y 68.14). During this recitation in the Yasna ritual, Zōt and Rāspī should chant the Ahunawar prayer in normal voice. Therefore, editing pad harwisp wāz srāyištīnīh, the sentence is translated as “(carrying out) the recitation for all words” in the present edition.

651 Vd 19.2P zardušt ahunawar frāz srūd [ān ī dō yatāhōwairēkē hušiti ō peš kē ēstēd] u-š āb ī weh frāz yazīd kē weh dāitī u-š dēn ī mazdēsnān franāft [kū s frauwarānē kard] druz az ŏy stard abāz dwārēd hēnd būt dēw ud sēj ī nihān-rawištī ī frēftār “Zardušt recited Ahunawar [the two yatē ahē vairītō which precedes hušiti]; he sacrificed to the good waters of the good Dāitī and he professed the Mazdayasian religion [That means: He recited Frauwarānē]. Stunned Deceit, ran away from him, the demon Būītī and Sēj, moving stealthily, (and) deceitful.” (The text is after Moazami 2014: 428-429).
4.15 Y 9.15

1 (Y 9.15aA) tūm ẓamōrgūzō ākōraunūō
2 vīspe daēuua zarāguštra
3 yūī para ahmāj vīrō. raōda
4 apataiēn paitī āīia zomā
5 (Y 9.15bA) yō aojištō yō taŋcištō
6 yō ḥālaxštō yō āsištō
7 yō as vaŋhrajaŋstomō
8 abauuāg mańiuuā dāmān

1-2 (Y 9.15aA) You, O Zarāguštra, made all the demons hide in the earth,
3 who previously, in human shape,
4 appeared on this earth.
5 (Y 9.15bA) (Zarāguštra) who was the strongest, the mightiest,
6 the most vigorous, the swiftest,
7 the most victorious
8 of the creation of the two spirits.

1 (Y 9.15aP) tō andar zamīg nigān kard hēnd
2 harwisē dēw zardūšt
3 kē pēš az ān wīr-ārōyišn
4 padīd hēnd abar pad ēn zamīg
5 [pad dēw kirbih
6 hād har ān kē tan mēnōy tuwān būd kardan
7 ā-s kālbod be škast
8 ān kē nē tuwān būd kardan
9 xwad be škast
10 kālbod be škast ēd kā
11 az frāz pad dēw kirbih wināh nē tuwān būd kardan
12 tā pad stōr kirbih ud mardōm kirbih nūn-iz ōh kunēd]
13 (Y 9.15bP) kē ẓōmmand hē kē tagīg hē
14 kē tuxšāg hē kē tēz hē
15 ast kū pērōzgartar
16 dād estē az ān ī mēnōyān dām
17 [az dām ī mēnōyān xwēš]

1-2 (Y 9.15aP) You made all the demons buried in the earth, O Zardūšt!
3 who previously, having the shape of humans,
4 appeared on this earth,
5 [in the form of demons,1
6 that is: Every spiritual one who was able to assume a body,
7 then, he (Zardūšt) broke his shape.
8 That one who was not able to do this [i.e. demons who were incapable of assuming a spiritual body]
9 he (Zardūšt) broke (it) [i.e. demon] itself.2
10 Breaking the shape means this that3
11 thenceforth, it was not possible (for them) to perform offence in the form of demons,
12 so that in the form of cattle and in the form of human, even now, someone could perform (evil) in the usual way.]

13 (Y 9.15bP) You (O Zardušt) who are strong, who are brave,
14 who are diligent, who are swift.
15-16 It is that⁴ you have been created as the more victorious among the creation of the spirits⁵
17 [among his creations⁶ of the spirits.]

1) Line 5 Y9.15aP pad dēw kirbīh “in the form of demons”

Regarding the word formation of kirbīh, it is an abstract noun from kirb “form” whose abstract form seems to denote the collective sense, or all forms (of demons).⁶⁵² In Y 9.14, Zaraϑuštra is described as the first mortal who recited the Ahunawar prayer and according to Y 9.15, he made all the demons hide in the earth. Yt 19.81 which corresponds to Y 9.14-15, mentions that Zaraϑuštra’s feat of driving the demons underground was achieved through the recitation of the Ahunawar prayer:

Yt 19.81 āaṭ tē aēuuo ahunō vairiīō
yım aṣauua zaraϑuštrō frasrāuuaiat
vī.baraϑβantom äxtūrum
aparom xraożdiiheia frasrūtit
 roamgūzō auuaza višpe daēuua
aiiesniia auuahniia

But a single Ahuna Vairia (Prayer) which truthful Zarathushtra recited divided four times into sections, the last (section) with louder recitation, drove all demons, which are unworthy of veneration, unworthy of praise, under the earth.⁶⁵³

In the Pahlavi commentary of Y 9.15, Zardušt is said to break the form of demons. Other sections of the Pahlavi literature confirm that breaking the form of demons was achieved through the recitation of the Ahunawar prayer. For example:

DkM 633. 7-8 škastan ī dēwān kālbod
frāz abesrāyišnih ī zardušt ahunawar

The break of the form of demons because of the recitation of Ahunawar by Zardušt (was revealed not only in the land

⁶⁵² For the usage of the -īh abstract suffix in forming nouns with the collective sense see Durkin-Meisterernst (2014: 177, §348).

of Iran, to Iranians but also in all lands). 654

The commentary of Y 9.15 distinguishes two types of demons:

1) Demons who could transform their material body into the spiritual form: Y 9.15aP6 har ān kē tan mēnōy tuwān būd kardan “every spiritual one who was able to assume a body”;

2) Demons who were incapable of changing their material form into the spiritual shape: Y 9.15aP8 ān kē nē tuwān būd kardan “That one who was not able to do this”.

The difference between the two types of demons, attested in Y 9.15, is that those of the first group could not commit offence in their demonic bodies after the recitation of the Ahunawar prayer by Zardušt: az frāz pad dēw kirbīh wināh nē tuwān būd kardan “thenceforth, it was not possible (for them) to perform offence in the form of demons”. However, they are still able to do evil in the body of humans and animals: tā pad stōr kirbīh ud mardōm kirbīh nūn-iz ōh kunēd “so that in the form of cattle and in the form of human, even now, someone could perform (evil) in the usual way”. By contrast, the demons of the second group were destroyed through the recitation of Ahunawar by Zardušt: xwad bē škast “(Zardušt) broke the self (of the demons)”. These two types of demonic bodies and their respective fate are shown in the below table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of demonic bodies</th>
<th>Fate after the recitation of the Ahunawar prayer by Zarauštra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Transformable from the material form into the spiritual shape.</td>
<td>Continued their offences through hiding in the body of animals and humans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Non-transformable from the material form into the spiritual shape.</td>
<td>Destroyed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar, but a shorter text, takes place in Sad dar Nasr Bundahišn as follows:

SdBd 3.5-6

و جوئن زرتشت استفتنمان دین بجهان اورد و آشکاره کرد قالب دیوان بیکاره بشکست و در زیر زمین شندند

اکنون که گناهی خواهند کرد برکدار و مانند ادمیان تووانند شند مگر بر صورت خر و گا و مانند این

5) va čon zartušt isfāntamān dēn ba jahān āvardu āskāra kard qālib-i dēvān ba yakbāra be šikastu dar zir-i zamīn šūdand

6) aknūn ka gunāh-e xvāhand kard bar kardār-u mānand-i ādamiyān natuvānand šudan magar bar surat-i xar-u gāv-u mānand-i ēn

5) and since Zartušt Spitāman brought the Religion to the world and revealed it,

654 My translation.
suddenly the shape of the demons was broken and they went beneath the earth.

6) If they want to commit an offence now they cannot act as humans and become like them but (they can commit an offence) in the shape of donkey and cow and suchlike.655

The text of SdBd 3.5-6 slightly differs with the corresponding Pahlavi commentary in Y 9.15 as in SdBd 3.5-6 it is stated that the demons can only do evil in the body of animals while in Y 9.8 it is attested that the demons can penetrate the bodies of both humans and animals.

While the passages just quoted indicate that demons exist in material form, other Zoroastrian texts are more ambiguous about this question. According to IrBd 1.46, Ohrmazd created the material world from his Material Light, or gētī rōšnīh. Furthermore, according to the Pahlavi literature the beneficent material creation is described as compounded, visible and tangible, developed from the uncompounded, invisible and intangible spiritual creation. By contrast, as far as Ahriman is concerned, some Pahlavi texts clearly state that he has no material creation. This is so because of the cold and dry power of his spiritual creation, incapable of becoming compound which is the prerequisite of the material world.656 However, elsewhere the mis-creation of the material antagonist of the material creation of Ohrmazd is attributed to Ahriman. For example, in opposition to gētī rōšnīh, Ahriman created his creatures from the Material Darkness, or gētī tārkīh:

IrBd 1.47. gannāg mēnōy az gētī tārkīh ān ī xwēštan dām frāz kirrēnid pad wazag kirb ī siyāh ī adurestarēn ī tom arzānīg ī druwand čiyōn bazag axwтар xaftstar

The Evil Spirit mis-created from the Material Darkness his own creation in the form of a frog, black, ashy, worthy of darkness, (and) evil like the most offence-natured noxious animal.657

In addition, there is an opposition between the material Deceit and the material Yazds (IrBd 5.3).658 The problem of the existence of a material creation of Ahriman becomes even clearer when one considers the fact that the Avesta, too, mentions material negative antagonists of the good material creations. Examples include the corn-bearing ants that were produced by Aŋra Mainiu as the evil counter-creation to the fourth land created by Ahura.

655 My translation.
657 The text is after Cereti & Mackenzie (2003: 39).
658 See Anklesaria (1956: 56-57).
Mazdā, or Bactria (Av. bāxōr-) (Vd 3.19). Other evil material creations include the man devouring, horse devouring horned dragon (Y 9.8, Yt 19.40), the mis-creation of the dragon Gāndaraṣṭa against the world of Truth (Yt 19.41), that of the dragon Dahāka against the Fire (Yt 19.46-50). However, according to Shaked (1967: 233) the evil material creation is ‘a purely negative concept, lacking substance, and thus not evidence of material creation, unlike light’.

The accounts of creation in the Pahlavi literature provides further insights into the nature of the body of demons. A feature of Ahriman’s evil creation that it is secondary to Ohrmazd’s beneficent creation. Thus, in IrBd 1.33, the creation is viewed as:

IrBd 1.33 dām dahišnīh mēnōyīhā gōwam ud pas gēṯīyīhā

I shall speak of the creation spiritually and then materially.

The above passage shows that the creation is divided into two categories; spiritual and material. A short description of the spiritual and material creations is given in IrBd 1.53:

IrBd 1.53 … u-š dām ī mēnōy mēnōyīhā dārēd
u-š dām ī gēṯīy mēnōyīhā dād
u-š did bē ŏ gēṯūg dād ...

… and he (Ohrmazd) maintains the spiritual creation, spiritually. And the material creation, he (Ohrmazd) created spiritually, and then again he (Ohrmazd) produced it for the material world … .

The text of Bd 1.53 states that the spiritual creation was created in the spiritual stage while the material creation was produced in two distinct stages; first, the spiritual stage and second, the material state. It seems that the creation of amahraspandān “Life-giving Immortals” demarcates the spiritual creation and the spiritual stage of the material creations:

IrBd 1.53 ... az dām ī gēṯīy
ī pad mēnōy dād
nazdist šaš
ān ī haftom xwad būd čē ohrmazd ...

---

661 The opposition is my interpretation according to the context of Yt 19.41.
663 The text is after Cereti & MacKenzie (2003: 36).
664 The text is after Cereti & MacKenzie (2003: 40).
from the creations of the material world, he (Ohrmazd) created in the spirit, next, the six (Amahraspands), the seventh was himself ... .

These Amahraspands are Wahman, Ardawahišt, Šahrewar, Spandarmad, Hordād and Amurdād (IrBd 1.53a). Moreover, Ohrmazd is regarded as the seventh Amahraspand (IrBd 1.53, 53a). They oppose kamālīgān dēwān “Chief Demons” whose names are listed in IrBd 1.55 as Akōman, Indar, Sawar, Nānghē (or Tarōmad), Tarwiz, Zēriz and Ahriman as the seventh. Likewise, in the Zoroastrian New Persian literature, Amahraspān and Kamālīgān Dēwān are categorised as the opposing beings of the material creation:

... u haft dēw andar gētī be dād ...
and he (the Evil Spirit) created seven demons in the material world ... and each one is for the antagonism and opposition against the Life-giving Immortals.

In the first chapter of the Bundahišn, the spiritual creations of Ohrmazd and Ahriman are not symmetrically opposed to one another at the time before Ohrmazd’s creation of gētī rōsnīh “Material Light (IrBd 1.44)” and Ahriman’s gētī tārīkhī “Material Darknes” (IrBd 1.47). Before gētī rōsnīh, Ohrmazd fashioned forth nēk rawišnīh “Goodness” (IrBd. 1.35), zamān “Time” (IrBd 1.36), zamān ī dagrand-xwadāy “Time of long dominion” (IrBd 1.39), asazīshnīh “Imperishability” (IrBd 1.39), axwārīh rawišnīh “unblissfulness (of demons)” (IrBd 1.39) and mēnōy ī abewardišnīh “Spirit of Immutability” (IrBd 1.39). By contrast, the texts are not only silent about Ahriman’s counter-creation before gētī tārīkhī but also display further asymmetry between the opposing beneficent nēk rawišnīh “Goodness” and evil duš rawišnīh “Evilness” in so far as Ohrmazd’s creation of nēk rawišnīh “Goodness” (IrBd. 1.35) occurs before the creation of gētī rōsnīh (IrBd. 1.44):
IrBd. 1.35 u-š nazdist yazdān xwadîh dād nēk rawišnîh ān î mēnôy î-š tan î xwêš pad-iş weh be kard ...  
and next he created the essence of Yazds, Goodness, that spirit by which he made himself better ...  

By contrast, in the opposing camp, the creation of the antagonistic duš rawišnîh “Evilness” (IrBd 1.49) takes place after the creation of gētî y târîkîh “Material Darkness” (IrBd 1.47):

IrBd 1.49. u-š nazdist dēwān xwadîh dād duš rawišnîh ān mēnôy î-š gannâgîh î dâm î ohrmazd az-iş bûd ...  
and next he created the essence of the demons, Evilness, that spirit from which the corruption came to the creations of Ohrmazd ...  

The following table illustrates the different chronology of the creations of the opposing forces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of creation</th>
<th>Ohrmazd’s camp</th>
<th>Ahriman’s camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nēk rawišnîh</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>gētî y rôsnîh</td>
<td>gētî y târîkîh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>duš rawišnîh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it can be suggested that the creation of Ahriman starts from gētî y târîkîh. Regarding the creation after gētî y rôsnîh and gētî y târîkîh, each of Ohrmazd’s creation has an antagonist in Ahriman’s camp until the creation of Ahunawar. The counter-creations of the two forces appear in formulaic constructions in the Bundahishn as follows:

1) gētî y rôsnîh vs. gētî y târîkîh:

Ohrmazd’s Creation: IrBd 1.44 ohrmazd az ān î xwêš î xwadîh az gētî y rôsnîh kirb î dâmân î xwêš frâz brêhênîd pad ātaxš kirb î rôsn ...  

Ahriman’s Creation: IrBd 1.47 gannâg mēnôy az gētî y târîkîh ān î xwêš tan dâm frâz kîrrêniy

---

672 The text is after Cereti & MacKenzie (2003: 37).
674 To highlight the formulaic structures, the translations which are after Cereti & MacKenzie (2003: 38-39), appear in the footnote.
675 Ohrmazd fashioned forth from his own essence, from Material Light / the form of his own creation / in the form of fire ... .
pad wazag kirb ī siyā ...

2) wāy vs. waran:

Ohrmazd’s Creation: IrBd 1.45 ā-š kirb ī wāy ī weh frāz brēhēnīd ċiyōn wāy abāyis677

Ahriman’s Creation: IrBd 1.48 u-š az gētiy xwad-dōšagīh waran pāygirb frāz kirrēnīd ċiyōn waran abāyis678

3) rāst gōwišnīh “Truthful Speech” vs. drō gōwišnīh “Lying Speech”:

Ohrmazd’s Creation: IrBd 1.50 az rāst gōwišnīh abzōnīgīh ī dādār paydāg būd679

Ahriman’s Creation: IrBd 1.49 az drō gōwišnīh anāgīh ī ōy gannāg mēnōy paydāg būd680

4) aϑrō kerpa681 “Form of Fire” vs. kirb “Form”:

Ohrmazd’s Creation: IrBd 1.50 ė-š aϑrō kerpa az asar rōšnīh frāz brēhēnīd ud dām-iz hamāg andar aϑrō kerpa be dād682

Ahriman’s Creation: IrBd 1.49 ė-š az asar tārīkīh ān kirb frāz kirrēnīd u-š xwēš dām andar ān kirb be dād683

5) ahunawar vs. –:

Ohrmazd’s Creation: IrBd. 1.50: ud az aϑrō kerpa ahunawar frāz būd684

Ahriman’s Creation: -

6) mēnōy ī sāl “Spirit of Year” vs. –

---

676 For the translation see above.
677 He then fashioned forth the form of the good Wāy / for Wāy was needed.
678 And from the material self-will, he mis-created the form of Waran “Lust” / for he needed Waran.
679 From Truthful Speech the bounteouness of the creator became manifest.
680 From Lying Speech the Evilness of the Evil Spirit was manifested.
682 For he fashioned forth the Form of Fire from Endless light / and all creation also was created in the Form of Fire.
683 For from Endless Darkness he mis-created that form / and he created his own creatures in that form.
684 And from the Form of Fire the Ahunawar came forth.
Ohrmazd’s Creation: IrBd 1.50 az ahunawar mēnōy ī sāl frāz būd

Ahriman’s Creation: -

The benevolent and evil antagonists are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohrmazd’s camp</th>
<th>Ahriman’s camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) gēty rōsūnīh (IrBd 1.44)</td>
<td>1) gēty tārīkīh (IrBd 1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) kirb ī dāmān ī xwēṣ (ātaxš kirb) rōsūnīh (IrBd 1.44)</td>
<td>2) xwēštan dām (wazag kirb) (IrBd 1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) wāy (IrBd 1.45)</td>
<td>3) waran (IrBd 1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ăϑro kerpa (created from the Endless Light)” (IrBd 1.50)</td>
<td>4) dēwān xwādīh (duš ravišnīh) (IrBd 1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) rāst gōwišnīh (IrBd 1.50)</td>
<td>5) drō gōwišnīh (IrBd 1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) aϑro kerpa (created from the Endless Light)” (IrBd 1.50)</td>
<td>6) kirb (created from the Endless Darkness) (IrBd 1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) ahunawar (created from aϑro kerpa) (IrBd. 1.50)</td>
<td>7) –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) mēnōy ī sāl (IrBd 1.50)</td>
<td>8) –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison between the Bundahišn, and Y 9.15 seems to provide an answer to the dilemma of Ahriman’s material creation. As mentioned above, the recitation of Ahunawar by Zardušt breaks the form of demons. Therefore, on the one hand, it is conceivable to suggest an opposition between Ahunawar and kirb “form”. On the other hand, no evil force can withstand Ahunawar. The victory of Ahunawar over the demonic kirb “form” can explain why in the Bundahišn, the material form, or body, of demons does not stand against ahunawar as opposing forces. However, Ahriman created the spiritual prototype of the material form but because of the Ahunawar prayer, it cannot develop further from its spiritual stage, opposing aϑro kerpa. The opposition between the kirb “form” of demons and aϑro kerpa “Form of Fire” agrees with the Zoroastrian cosmogony according to which Ohrmazd’s creatures and men are created from the Form of Fire. (Duchesne-Guillemin: 1964: 14-17). The passages discussed here can also cast light on the meaning of the expression tan mēnōy kardan “making (the demon) bodies spiritual” in Y 9.15, indicating transforming the evil body, contrasting Ahunawar, to Kirb (form), opposing Āϑro Kerpa.

685 From the Ahunawar, the Spirit of the Year came forth.
The spiritual nature of the demonic bodies is corroborated by the other sections of the Pahlavi literature according to which the evil material bodies in the world of mixture are found in Ohrmazd’s good creation:

_irbd_ 22. 3 …. _ud kirb az ēn cahār zahagān ī hast āb ud zamīg ud wād ud ātaxš ..._

and the body (of noxious creatures) is from these four elements which are water and earth and wind and fire.

Regarding the demons whose body was not transformable into the spiritual shape, the texts do not mention their names or features directly. However, in the Avesta, while the Venerables (Av. _yazata-_ ) are characterised as either _mainiauua-_ “spiritual” or _gaēhia-_ “material”, demons (Av. _daēuuua-_ ) are only described as spiritual (Gnoli 1995: 221-224). In _irbd_. 5.3, the material Yazds are also opposed to the material Druz, corresponding to Av. _druj_ “deceit”, rather than the expected Dēw (= Av. _daēuuua-_ ). By contrast, _druj_ - and _daēuuua_- usually stand against _aša_- and _yazata_- , respectively in Zoroastrianism (Pirart 2007: 72, 138). Furthermore, the stories on the struggles between the Iranian heroes and the material dragons and demons (Y 9.1-15, _Šāhnāma_) occur before the story of Zardušt. Therefore, _ān kē nē tuwān būd karden xwad be škast “That one who was not able to do this (i.e. demons who were incapable of assuming a spiritual body), he (Zardušt) broke (it) [i.e. the demon] itself” probably refers to the *_gētīy dēwān_ “material demons”.

2) _Line 9 Y 9.15aP xwad be škast “he (Zardušt) broke (it) [i.e. demon] itself.”_

_In YIrP F2, _ān kē nē tuwān būd_ is repeated after _xwad be škast:_

_hād har ān kē tan mēnōy tuwān būd kardan_
_ā-š kālbod be škast_
_ān kē nē tuwān būd kardan_
_xwad be škast_
_(F2 fol. 57r line 14) _ān kē nē tuwān būd_

The repetition of the the sentence was either a scribal mistake or correction. In the present edition, with the base text and other collated copies the repeated sentence is not employed.

686 _The text is after Anklesaria (1956: 182-183)._
3) Line 10 Y9.15aP kālbod be škast ēd kū “Breaking the shape means this that”

In F2, kālbod is preceded by tan “body” according to which tan ud kālbod means “body and shape”. Moreover, in YIndP K5, M1, kālbod be škast ēd kū “Breaking the shape means this that” is replaced by kālbod be škast ēd čē in which škast can be interpreted as either the short infinitive or past participle. However, since in J2, the sister manuscript of K5, škastan is attested, škast in K5 is interpreted as the short infinitive in the present edition. Moreover, the phrase introduces a new short commentary to the preceding kālbod be škast:

hād har ān kē tan mēnōy tuwān būd kardan
ā-š kālbod be škast
ān kē nē tuwān būd kardan
xwand bē škast
kālbod be škastan ēd kū (K5, M1 kālbod be škast ēd čē)
az frāz pad dēw kirbīh wināh nē tuwān būd kardan
tā pad stōr kirbīh ud mardōm kirbīh nūn-īz ōh kunēd]

As far as the selection between ēd kū and ēd čē is concerned, the former usually introduces new short commentaries, meaning “(the fact) is that”. Therefore, in the present edition, ēd kū, the reading of YIrPs and YIndP J2, is preferred to that of YIndP K5, M1.

4) Line 15 Y 9.15b ast kū “it is that”

With the exception of K5, M1, ast is preceded by kē in the manuscripts. However, with the base text K5, kē is not employed in the present edition.

5) Line 16 Y9.15bP mēnōyān dām “the creation of the spirits”

The Phl. mēnōy in kē ast kū pērōzgar dād ēstē az ān ī mēnōyān dām can be translated as either the adjective “spiritual” or its corresponding substantivized form “spirit”. However, since it translates the Avestan dual mańiuuā “of two spirits”, therefore, it is translated as the substantive “spirit” in the present edition in which -ān is regarded as the plural sign, expressing the Avestan dual number.

687 See Cantera (2015a).
6) Line 17 Y9.15bP dāmān “creations”

In YIrP Pt4 and YIndP K5, M1, dāmān “creations” is written, while in YIrP Mf4, G14, F2, T6, T55b; YIndP J2, the singular form dām “creation” is attested in the context az dām(ān) ī mēnōyān xwēš “among his creation(s) of the spirits”. As far as the editorial judgement is concerned, the commentary explains the preceding ast kū pērōzgar az ān ī mēnōyān dām as follows:

\[\text{ast kū pērōzgar} \]
\[\text{dād ēstē az ān ī mēnōyān dām} \]
\[\text{[az dām(ān) ī mēnōyān xwēš]} \]

It is that you have been created as the victorious among the creation of the spirits [among his creation(s) of the spirits.]

It is unclear whether the gloss is intended to describe a different view which interpreted dām as dāmān or to emphasise on xwēš. Therefore, while both readings are possible, with the base text K5, pl. dāmān “creations”, is edited in the present edition.
5 Appendix:
(Transliteration and Text-critical Apparatus)
5.1 Y 9.1

(a) PWN h’wn’ Itłyh

(b) PWN ‘thon’ [g’s] pyl’mwn ywś’d’slynşnyh

(c) P-s MN ‘w’ pwrsyt’ zltwšt’

(d) MNW L MN hlwpś’ ‘hw’

1 h’wn’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2 K5 M1
  h’wn W F2
  h’wn T6

2 h’wn’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b
  h’wn T6; J2
  h’wn Y K5 M1

3 L’YN’ Pt4
  QDM Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b;
  J2 K5 M1
  Ipt Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
  Ipt F2 T55b

SGYNTWN-t’ J2

SGYNTWN-t K5 M1

3 zltwšt’ Pt4 Mf4; J2 K5 M1
  zltwšt’ G14 T6
  zltwšt’ F2
  zltwšt T55b

4 g’s Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1

1 g’s MN G14 (MN above the line) F2 T6
  deest J2
  4 pyl’mwn’ W Pt4
  pyl’mwn’ W Mf4 T55b
  pyl’mwn’ G14
  pyl’mwn F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
  5 deest Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b

’MT-s ‘thon’ g’s k’myst’
  HLLWN-tn’ G14

’MT-s ‘thon’ g’s k’myst’
  HLLWN-str’ F2

’MT-s ‘thon’ g’s k’myst’
  HLLWN-str’ J2

’MT-s ‘thon’ g’s k’myst’ zswt’n’ K5
  ‘thon’ g’s k’myst W zswt’n’ g’s’n’ M1

6 deest Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b

W g’s’n’ sl’dşnyh G14
  g’s’n’ sl’dşnyh F2; J2 K5 M1

7 ’MT-s Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
  T55b; K5 M1

’MT J2

7 ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b;
  J2 K5 M1
  ZK Y T6

7 ’smwhwk’ Pt4 Mf4 T55b
  ’smwhwk Y G14 T6
  ’smwhwk Y J2
  ’smwhwk K5 M1

’MT-s Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
  gwpt F2; J2 K5 M1

7 MNW Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
  T55b; K5 M1
  deest J2

283
21 śnʾsyʿ Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
śnʾht G14 T6
śnʾht F2
Pt4 writes zltw š after šnʾsyʿ. It is not clear to which section it belongs.

22hlwspʿ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 hlwsp F2 hlwsp" K5 M1
22 ʿhwʾ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 ʿhwʾ F2 ʿhwʾ K5 M1
23 ʾstʾwmnd Pt4 Mf4 T55b ʾstʾwmnd G14 F2 T6; J2 ʾstʾwmnd K5 (ʾwmnd is written above the line) M1
23HZYTWN-t Pt4 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1 HZYTW-t Mf4 HZYTWN-t G14; J2
23HZW-yʾy Pt4 Mf4 T55b HZW-yʾy G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
24Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1 deest G14 T6; J2
24HYʾ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b yʾnʾ J2 K5 M1
24nywkʾ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b nywk F2; K5 M1 J2 illegible
24krtʾ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 krt F2; K5 M1
24YK YMWN-yt Pt4 Mf4 T55b YMWN-yt G14 T6; K5 M1 YMWN-ʾt F2
24W mlg Pt4 T55b mlg Mf4 G14 F2 T6; K5 (In K5, although Ṭʾ ywtwnʿ cygpṭ Ṭʾ nʾ MNW
BLSLʾ Y ywt occurs before Ṭʾ mlg, they are omitted by the deletion dots) M1
BSLʾ Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1

25 ḤẔ YTWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 ḤẔ YTWN-t F2 ḤẔ YTWN-t K5 (ʾwmnd is written above the line) M1
25HZYTWN-t Pt4 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1 HZYTW-t Mf4 HZYTWN-t G14; J2
25HZW-yʾy Pt4 Mf4 T55b HZW-yʾy G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
deest F2
25 pl lwnyh Pt4 Mf4 (in marg.) G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1 deest F2
25 ʾmlg Pt4 Mf4 (in marg.) G14 T6 T55b ʾmlg J2 K5 M1 deest F2
25 krtʾ Pt4 Mf4 (in marg.) G14 T6 T55b; J2 krt G14 T6; K5 M1 deest F2
25YK YMWN-yt Pt4 F2 T55b YMWN-yt G14 T6; J2 K5 M1 YMWN-ʾt F2
25 YK YMWN-yt G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
26Lʾ Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 LĀ Mf4
26ytwnʾ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 ytwn F2
26 Ṭʾ nʾ G14 F2 T6; J2 Ṭʾ nʾ MNW
26 YK YMWN-ʾt F2
26 BSLSʾ Pt4 T55b BSLSʾ Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
26 ywtʾ Pt4 T55b; J2 K5 M1 ywtʾ W Mf4 ywtʾ G14 ywtʾ Y K YMWN-yt F2 ywt G14
27 Pʾnʾ Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1 Pʾnʾ K5 M1
27Y MN Pt4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 deest F2 T6
28krtʾ Pt4 T55b krt Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1 27YK YMWN-ʾt Pt4 F2 T55b; K5 K5 M1
deest F2 T6
28 MN Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; MNW J2 K5 M1 MNW J2 K5 illegible
29gaiiehe Pt4 G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
gaiiehe Mf4 F2 gaiie T55b
---
mīrō Pt4 (in marg.) G14 T6 at the end of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1c deest Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1 F2 at the end of the Avestan section of Y9.1.c.
ziāäh Pt4 (in marg.) F2 at the end of the Avestan section of Y9.1.c.
deest Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1 zaiāäh G14 T6 zarəšūtrəm Pt4 (in marg.) G14 T6 at the end of the Pahlavi version of Y 9.1c deest Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1 F2 at the end of the Avestan section of Y9.1.c.
5.2 Y 9.2

1 (a) 'w' L 'LH pshw' YMMLWN-t
2 hwn Y¹ 'hlwb' Y² dwl 'wš
3 [H]WH-t 'dwl 'wšy HN' 'YK 'wš MN lwb'n Y mlₜₜwn'n dwl YΗSNYN-yt
4 lwšn' gwpt
5 ḤΗΗΤ- 'wšy PWN hwn YΗΗWNW-yt]
6 (b) +NH HWH-m zltwš't
7 hwn Y 'hlwb' Y dwl 'wš
8 (c) ZK +Y ZK Y L hwn 'L hwšn' ['hwšn' l'd BRH hwn]
9 (d) QDM L PWN st'dšn' st'd [BYΝ ycšn']
10 cygwn L 'HL-c
11 swt'ϊmnd st'dyn ['-s ZK Y LK LK l'd]

1 G14 and T6 insert 'mlg krt'
2 ḤY' NPŠH l'd PWN st'dšn
3 Y whrmd before 'w'.
4 F2 inserts 'mlg k[...]' HY'
5 NP[...]' l'd PWN st'dšn
6 whrmd in marg.
7 L 'LH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
8 T55b; J2
9 L deest K5 M1
10 pshw' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
11 T55b; J2 K5 M1
12 pshw F2
13 gwpt' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
14 gwpt F2
15 YMMLWN J2
16 YMMLWN-t K5 M1
17 2-1 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b;
18 J2 K5 M1 T55
19 'F2
20 2-2 deest Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
21 Y Mf4; J2 K5 M1
22 3 ḤΗΗΤ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
23 T55b; J2 K5 M1
24 ḤΗΗW-d F2
25 3 dwl 'wšy' Pt4 T55b;
26 K5 M1
27 dwl 'wšy' Mf4 G14 F2 T6;
28 J2 K5 M1
29 'YK Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b;
30 J2 K5 M1
31 'YK-s Mf4
32 lwš'n' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b;
33 K5 M1
34 lwš'n F2 T6; J2
35 mlₜₜwn'n Pt4 Mf4 T55b
36 mlₜₜwn'n' G14 F2 T6; K5 M1
37 NŠWT'-'n' J2
38 YΗΗSNYN-yt Pt4 Mf4 F2
39 T55b; K5 M1
40 YΗΗSNYN-yt' G14 T6; J2
41 lwš'n' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
42 T55b; J2 K5 M1
43 hwšn F2
44 gwpt' Pt4 G14 T6 T55b
45 gwpt Mf4 F2; J2 K5 M1
46 ḤΗΗW- Hτ4 Mf4 G14 T55b;
47 K5 M1
48 ḤΗΗW-d F2
49 ḤΗΗW-t T6
50 ḤΗΗΤ 5
51 5 YΗΗWNW-yt Pt4 Mf4 F2
52 T55b; K5 M1
53 YΗΗWNW-yt' G14 T6; J2
54 'NH Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
55 'NH Mf4
56 hwšn J2 K5 M1
57 Pt4 and T55b write W after
58 'NH
59 ḤΗΗW-m Pt4 Mf4 T55b
60 ḤΗΗW-m G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
61 zltws't Pt4 Mf4 T55b;
62 J2 K5 M1
63 zltwššt' G14 T6
64 zltwššt F2
65 G14 F2 T6 do not write Y
66 after 'hlwb'
67 8 ZK Y ZK Y L Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; J2
68 ZK ZK Y L T6
69 ZK W ZK Y K5 M1
70 'w' Pt4 (crossed out) Mf4
71 T55b
72 'w' K5 F2
73 deest J2 K5 M1
74 8 hwn, hun (hun in the
75 Avestan letters above the line) Pt4 Mf4
76 hwn'. hun (hun in the Avestan
77 letters above the line) G14
78 hun 'w' (hun in the Avestan
79 letters), 'w' F2
80 hwn' hun (hun in the Avestan
81 letters inmar.) T6
82 hn, hun (hun in the Avestan
83 letters above the line) T55b
84 hwn KN J2
85 hwn 'L K5 M1
86 8 [MND'M-1 B YΗΗWNW-yt']
87 y spty m' Mn' W p'r c L l'd]
88 deest Pt4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
89 Mf4 writes above the line and
90 in marg.: B YΗΗWnt
91 spty m' Š Mf4 (in
92 marg.)
93 G14 writes in marg.: MNW
94 MND'M-1 B YΗΗWNW-yt' y
95 spty m' Mn' W p'r c L l'd G14
96 (in marg.)
97 T6 writes in marg.: MNW
98 MND'M-1 B YΗΗWNW-yt' y
99 spty m' Mn' W p'r c L l'd
100 MNW MND'M-1
101 B YΗΗWnt' y spty m' Mn' W
102 p'r c L l'd [... F2 (in marg.)
103 8 hwšn' hwšn' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2
104 T6 T55b; J2
105 hwšn' K5 M1
106 8-2 hwn' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6;
107 T55b
108 [...\wn J2
109 hwn K5 M1
110 8 Pt4 (with small letters) and
111 T55b write hwšn' hwšt
112 after hwn'.
113 9 st'dšn Pt4 T55b
114 st'dšn' Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
115 9 st'd Pt4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
5.3 Y 9.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>(a) 'פ-š gwpt zltwšť</th>
<th>( \text{tlškāṣy J2} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'YK nm'c 'w' hwm</td>
<td>( \text{tlškāṣy} \ K5 \text{ M1 (} \text{in marg.)} \text{ M1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(b) MNW 'LK</td>
<td>( \text{Krt} \ F2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>pltwm hwm MN 'NŠWT'-'n'</td>
<td>( \text{Krt} \ 'YK \ J2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BYN 'st'wmnd'n' gyh'n' hwn'yt' ḤWH-yyū</td>
<td>( \text{YḤWWN}-'t' \text{ G14 (} \text{YḤMTWN}-'t \text{ above the line with pale script)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MN ZK 'tlsk'syh krt'</td>
<td>( \text{YḤWWN}-'t' \text{ (} \text{YḤMTWN}-'t \text{ in marg. with pale script)} \text{ F2 YḤMT-'} \text{ WN-d} \ (\text{WN-d above the line}) \text{ T6} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[ZK nywkyh 'YK 'D-m YḤWWN-'t]</td>
<td>( \text{MH 'w' 'LH mt' 'p' tyh} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MH 'w' 'LH mt' 'p' tyh</td>
<td>( \text{MH 'F2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & \text{gwpt' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6; J2 T6 T55b} \\
 & \text{gwpt F2; K5 M1} \\
 & \text{1 zltwšť Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1} \\
 & \text{zltwšṭ G14 T6} \\
 & \text{zltwšṭ F2} \\
2 & \text{nm'c' Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 nm'c' G14 F2; K5 M1} \\
 & \text{2 deest Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b 'w' F2; J2 K5 M1} \\
3 & \text{LK Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 t55b; J2 LK hwm K5 M1} \\
 & \text{hwm Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1} \\
 & \text{hwm T55b} \\
4 & \text{‘NŠWT’-'n' Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 ‘NŠWT’-'n' G14 F2 T6; K5 M1} \\
5 & \text{‘st’wmnd’n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b} \\
 & \text{‘st’wmnd’n G14 T6; K5 M1} \\
5 & \text{‘st’wmnd’n Y J2} \\
 & \text{5 gyh'n Pt4 Mf4 T55b; M1 gyh'n' G14 T6; J2 K5 gyyh'n' F2} \\
 & \text{5 hwn'yt Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1 hwn'yt' G14 T6 hwnyt F2} \\
 & \text{5 ḤWH-yyū Pt4 Mf4 T55b ḤWH-yyū G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1} \\
 & \text{6 W MNW Pt4 G14 Mf4 T6 T55b MNW F2} \\
 & \text{MN J2 K5 M1} \\
 & \text{6 ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1 ZK Y T6} \\
 & \text{6 tšl'syh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; K5 tšl[...]'syh F2} \\
 & \text{6 ḤḤ WWN-ʾt T6 (k’ above the line) tlškāṣy J2} \\
\end{array}\]
5.4 Y 9.4

(a) 'w' L 'LH pshw' gwpt
2 hwm Y 'hlwb' dwl wš
3 (b) *wywngh' n L ptlwm MN 'NŠWT'-n'
4 BYN *st' wmn'd n 'ghy' n hwnytm
5 'LH 'ZK 'tslk' syh kr't
6 'w' 'LH mt 'p̥̄ tyh
7 (c) 'MT MN 'LH pws L' L YLYDWN-t
8 MNW 'ym Y šyt' Y hwlnk
9 (d) MNW GDH' wmn'dtwm MN YLYDWN-t n YḤWWN-t [hyašk'ltwm]
10 'hwšlšy' nkylšntwm MN 'NŠWT'-n YḤWWN-t [hwcsmtwm
11 ḤḤḤ+t GDH 'YT Y hwšk'lyh
12 W 'YT' Y PWN tn' Y GBR'
13 ZK Y¹ PWN tn' Y² ym
14 hm-DYN' YḤWWN-t ḤḤḤ-d ŶΚ 'hyašk'lyh
15 ḤḤḤ+t lwšn' gwpt'
16 ḤḤḤ+t GDH ḤḤN 'YT' Y¹ PWN tn' Y² GBR'
17 GDH' wmn'd YHSNN-yyt' hwyšk'lyh ZK lw'k ḤYDN-yyt]
18 (e) MNW-š kr't PWN ZK Y 'LH' hwt'yh
19 'mlg p'h W wyl
20 'hwššn' W MY' W 'wlwl
21 [ŶΚ ZK Y L 'p̥̄ d-st' hwšk³ L' hwšk²]
22 (f) hwšln' 'ŠTHN- n' +n 'psysyšn'
23 [ŶΚ 'MT 'ywkw1 ŠTHN-t YḤWWN-t 'ywkw² mt YḤWWN-t]

T6 inserts 'ytwn at the beginning of the section (a)

1 pshw Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
2 pshw G14 F2
1 gwpt' Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; M1
2 gwpt G14 F2; K5
3 YMLLNW J2
2 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
deest F2; J2
2 'hlwb' Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
3 'hlwb' Y Mf4
3 'hlwb Y J2
4 wywngh' n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b
wywngh' n G14 T6
wywngh' J2
wywngh n K5 M1
3 ptlwm Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1

[...]ltwm J2
3 mltwm' n Pt4 T55b
3 'NSWT'-n Mf4 F2
3 mltwm n G14 T6
3 'NŠWT'-n J2 M1
3 'NST'-n K5
4 'st' wmn'd n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2
4 'st' wmn'd G14 T6
4 'st' wmn'd n Y K5 M1
4 gyh n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; M1
gyh n G14 T6; J2
3 sty gyh n K5
4 hwnyt-m Pt4 Mf4 T55b
hwnyt-m G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
hwnyt-m F2
5 ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2
5 ZK Y K5 M1
tslk syh Pt4 G14 T6 T55b
tslk syh Mf4
tslg syh F2
tslkššy J2 K5 M1
6 'w' Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
W 'w' G14 T6
6 'LH Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b;
J2 K5 M1
LH F2
6 mt Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2
mt F2 T6; K5 M1
7 'MT Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2
K5 M1
MNW G14 F2
7 'LH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
T55b; K5 M1
w' J2
7 BRH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
T55b; J2
pws K5 M1
7 YLYDWN-t Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6
T55b; K5 M1
YLYDWN-t G14; J2
8 ین ی یشیر پت4 مف4 ت55ب; ج2 یمنشیر گ14 ف2 ت6
یمنشیر ک5 م1
8 ی پت4 مف4 ف2 ت55ب; ج2 ک5 م1
deest ج2 ک5 ت6
8 hwlmk پت4 گ14 مف4 مف4 ت6 ت55ب
hwlmk ف2; ج2 ک5 م1
9 ین منندتوم پت4 مف4 ت55ب
منندتوم گ14 ف2 ت6; ج2 ک5 م1
9 ین یلیوان-تین پت4 مف4 ت55ب; ک5 م1
یلیوان-تین گ14 ت6
یلیوان-مندن' ف2
یلیوان-تین' ج2
10 پت4 مف4 ف2 ت55ب
deest ج2 ت6; ج2 ک5 م1
10 hwlشیر پت4 مف4 ت55ب; ج2
deest ج2 ت6
hwlشیر ف2; م1
hwlشیر ک5
10 ینکیشتنم پت4 مف4 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
deest ج2 ت6
ینگیشتنم ف2
10 مین پت4 مف4 گ14 ف2 ت6;
ک5 م1 ت55ب
[...] ج2
10 ین نسیت-تین پت4 ف2 ت55ب;
ج2
deest ج2 ت6
ین نسیت م4; ک5 م1
10 ین یهوان-تین پت4 مف4 ف2 ت55ب;
ک5 م1 ت55ب
deest ج2 ت6
یهوان-تین ت2
یهوانشتنم پت4 مف4 ف2 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
deest ج2 ت6
یهوانش[...] ج2
10 ین هوشتت-تین پت4 مف4 گ14 ت6
ت55ب; ج2 ک5 م1
هوشت-تین ت2
11 ین تپ4 مف4 گ14 ت6 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
هوشت-د ف2
11 ین تپ4 مف4 گ14 ت6 ت55ب;
ج2 ک5 م1
11 ین تپ4 مف4 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
deest ج2 ت6
تپ4 مف4 گ14 ت6 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
deest ف2
12 ین تپ4 مف4 گ14 ت6 ت55ب;
ج2 ک5 م1
12 ین تپ4 ک5 م1
12 ین تپ4 ک5 م1
deest گ14 ت6
13 ین تپ4 مف4 گ14 ت55ب;
ج2 ت55
دئست ف2 ت6; ک5 م1
13-1 ین تپ4 مف4 ت55 ک5 م1
deest ج2 ت6 ت6;
ج2 ک5 م1
deest ج2 ت6
13-2 ین تپ4 مف4 ف2 ت55ب;
ج2 ک5 م1
deest ج2 ت6
14 ین همد تستن پت4 مف4 ت55ب
همد تستن گ14 ت6
hmd تستن' گ14 ت6
dem-DYN' ج2 ک5 م1
14 ین یهوان-تین پت4 مف4 گ14 ف2 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
یهوان-تین ت6
14 ین یهوان-د پت4 مف4
yehvای پت4 گ14 ف2 ت6 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
14 ین یهوان-د ف2
15 ین هوشک لیه پت4 مف4 گ14 ف2 ت6 ت55ب;
ک5 م1 ت55ب
یهوان-د ف2
16 ین یپ4 مف4 گ14 ت6 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
یهوان-د ف2
16-1 ین پت4 مف4 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
deest ج2 ف2
16-2 ین پت4 ت55ب
W مف4
ای گ14 ف2 ت6;
ک5 م1
ای گ14 ت6;
ک5 م1
17 ین منندپت4 مف4 ت55ب
منندپت4 گ14 ت55ب;
‘منندپت4 گ14 ت6;
ک5 م1
‘منند[...] ج2
17 ین هسین-یت پت4 مف4 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
هسین-یت گ14 ت6
17 ین وکلک یک لوبک پت4 مف4 گ14 ت6 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
deest ج2 ت6
18 ین تپ4 مف4 گ14 ت55ب;
ک5 م1
deest ف2 ت6
18 ین دل پت4 گ14 ت6 ت55ب;
م1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23-1 ʾyw'k Pt4 F2 T55b; K5 M1</th>
<th>23 ŶHWWN-t Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1</th>
<th>23 mt' Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 mt G14 F2 T6; K5 M1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʾyw'k Mf4 G14 T6</td>
<td>ŶHWWN-t' G14</td>
<td>23 ŶHWWN-t' Pt4 T55b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾyw'k 1 J2</td>
<td>bwt J2</td>
<td>ŶHWWN-t Mf4 G14 T6; J2 K5 M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 ŠTHN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6</td>
<td>23-2 ʾyw'k Pt4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1</td>
<td>ŶHWWN-yt F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠTN-d F2</td>
<td>'yw'k Mf4 T6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 Y 9.5

1 (a) PWN ZK Y¹ ym hwt'y Y² 'lwnd
2 L' slm'k YHWWN-t' L' glm'k
3 (b) L' zlm'n' YHWWN-t W L' mgyh
4 W L' +'lsk' Y ŠDY' 'n d't
5 [HWH-t hm'k YHWWN-t BR' MN wn's L' WHL d' st YK' YMWN-'t HWH-d]
6 (c) 15 ŠNT-k 'lwdšn' pr'c SGYTWN-t HWH-d 'B'
7 W pws 'kt'1-c 'y
8 [HWH-t bwlcwk PWN st'dšn' Y pwsl gwpt
9 'YK pws 'ytwn' nywk YHWWN-t 'B'
10 'B' 'ytwn' nywk YHWWN-t cygwn Y pw]
11 (d) hm'y 'D 'MT ŚLYT' YHWWN-t
12 hwlmk ym Y [ṣyt] 'wywngh' n' BRH
13 [ZNH MND M 'ytwn' YHWWN-t]

1-1 Y Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1
deest G14 F2 T6; J2
1 ym Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
ym Y J2
1 hwt'yh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
hwlt'y F2; J2 K5 M1
1-2 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5
deest F2
2 slm'k Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
F2 does not write the first stroke of the letter s, therefore, its spelling is like the following glm k, but the reading sarmāg is confirmed by the subscript New Persian translation as:

2 YHWWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
deest J2
YHWWN-t K5 M1
2 L' W Pt4 T55b
L' G14 Mf4 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
2 glm k Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
glm' y J2
3 zlm'n Pt4 Mf4 T55b
zlm'n' G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
3 YHWWN-t W Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; K5 M1
YHWWN-t G14
YHWWN-t F2; J2
4 W Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest F2
4 L' Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
G14 combines L' with the following word and writes l'sk'
4 L'sk' Pt4 Mf4 T55b
l'sk' G14
1 l'sk F2; J2
l'sk'T6
l'syk' K5 M1
4 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
deest J2
4 ŠDY' '-n Pt4 T55b
šdy'-n Mf4 F2; J2 K5 M1
šdy'-n' G14 T6
4 d't Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
5 HWH-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
HWH-t J2
5 hm'k Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
hm'y J2
5 YHWWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; K5 M1
YHWWN-t G14
YHWWN-t' F2
5 YHWWN-t HWH-d F2; J2 YHWWN-t' T6
5 d'st Pt4 M4 G14 T6 T55b
d'st F2; J2 K5 M1
5 YK YMWN-'t Pt4 T55b
YK YMWN-'t Mf4 G14 F2; K5 M1
YK YMWN-'t' T6; J2
5 HWH-d Pt4 Mf4 T55b
HWH-d G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 HWH-t M1
6 s'ilk' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
s'ilk F2
sālk'T55b
s[...]ilk' J2
ŠNT-k K5 M1
6 'lwdšn Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2 K5 M1
'lwdšn F2
'lwdšn' T6 separates 'lw and dšn' by a "8" like shape and gives the new Persian translation below the line as:

6 pr'c Pt4 G14
pr'c Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
SGYTWN-t Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
SGYTWN-t G14 T6
6 HWH-d Pt4 M4 G14 T55b
HWH-d G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
6 'B' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
'B' F2
7 BRH Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 F2
pws K5 M1
7 ktāl-c Pt4 T55b
ktāl-c Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 W k'tl-c K5 M1
8 HWH-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6; K5 HWH-d F2
8 [bwlcwk'] bwlc' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
bwlck F2
W bwlckw J2. It writes 'ytwn'
nywk YḤWWT-cywyn pws
after W bwlckw .bwlckw
K5 M1
8 Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5
M1
deest G14 T6
8 gwpt' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
T55b
gwpt J2 K5 M1
9 BRH Pt4 Mf4Mf4 G14 F2
T6 T55b; J2
pws K5 M1
9 'ytwn' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
T55b; J2
'ytwn F2 K5 M1
9 nywk' Pt4 Mf4 T55b
nywk G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
9 YḤWWnt Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2
T55b; J2 K5 M1
Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2
deest G14 T6; K5 M1
9-10 'B'Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
'B' W 'B' F2
'B' W 'AB' Y J2
'B' 'B' K5 M1
10 'ytwn'Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b;
J2 K5 M1
'ytwn Mf4
10nywk' Pt4 Mf4 T55b
nywk G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
10cywyn Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
T55b; J2
cywyn Y K5 M1
10BRH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
T55b; J2
pws K5 M1
11hmy' Pt4 G14 Mf4 T6
T55b; K5 M1
hm'k 'w' F2
hm'y 'w J2
11 MT Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
T55b; K5 M1
'MT' J2
11 SYLYT-y Pt4 T55b; J2
SYLYT' Mf4 G14 F2 T6; K5
M1
11 YḤWWNT Pt4 Mf4 G14
T55b; J2 K5 M1
YḤWWNT-Tt6
YḤWWNT-d F2
12hwlnk' Pt4 F2 T55b
hwlnk Y Mf4
hwlnk G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
12ym Y šyt Y Pt4 T55b
ym Y šyt Mf4 F2; K5 M1
ymšyt' G14 T6
ym Y šyt' J2
12wywgh' n Pt4 T55b
wywgh n Mf4 F2
wywgh 'n' G14 T6
wywgh n J2
wywgh n' K5 M1
13 'ytwn' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
T55b; J2 K5 M1
'ytwn F2
13 YḤWWNT Pt4 Mf4 F2
T55b; K5 M1
YḤWWNT-t G14 T6; J2
5.6 Y 9.6

1 (a) MNW LK
2 ḌYḤN 'st' wmnd n ġyh n' ħwn'yt ḤḤḤ-yū
3 MNW ZK 'tlsk 'suh krt'
4 [‘ZK nywkyh 'YḴ' D-m YḪWWN-'t]
5 W MH 'w' 'LH mt+ 'p' tyh

2 dtykl Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 M1
dtykl K5
2 'NŠWT'-'n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b
'NŠWT'-'n' G14 T6 'N[...]T'-'n' J2
mltwm n' K5 M1
3 'st' wmnd n Pt4 T55b
'st' wmnd n Mf4
'st' wmnd n' G14 F2 T6; J2
'st' wmnd n' Y K5 M1
3 ġyh n Pt4 Mf4 T55b
ţyh n' G14 T6; J2 K5 M1

3 ħwn't Pt4

hwn'yt Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
hwnyt F2
3 ḤḤḤ-yū Pt4 Mf4 T55b
ḤḤḤ-yū G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
4 ZK Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
LK G14
4 tlsk 'syh Pt4 G14 T6 T55b
tlsk 'yh Mf4

F2
tlsk 'yh J2 K5 M1
5 ZK Pt4 G14 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2
ZK Y K5 M1

5 YḪWWN-'t Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2
YḪWWN-'t F2 K5 M1
6 MH Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b
W MH G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
6 'w' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6; K5 M1
W T55b
W 'w' J2
6 mt' Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2
mt G14 F2 T6
mt' Y K5 M1
6 nywkyh Pt4 Mf4 (p' tyh: in marg.) F2 T55b; K5 M1
nywkyh W 'p' tyh G14 T6 'p' tyh J2
5.7 Y 9.7

1. 'w' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   'ywn' 'w' T6: 'ywn' is written in marg.
   1 'LH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   'w' J2
   1 pshw' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   pshw F2
   1 gwpt' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   gwpt F2
   2-1 Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b K5 M1
deast G14 J2
   2 'hlwb' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   ählwb' J2
   2-2 Y Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1
deast G14 F2 T6; J2
   3 'dyty n Pt4 Mf4
   'spyk n' G14 T6
   'dpyy n (writes ägšišiš below the line) T55b
   'dpyy n' F2
   'spyy n' J2
   'spyy n' Y K5 M1
   3 'NSWT'-'n' Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2
   'NSWT'-'n Mf4
   mltwm n' K5 M1
   4 'st' wʊmnnd' n Pt4 T55b
   'st wʊmnnd' n Mf4 F2 T6; J2
   'YT' wʊmnnd' G14
   'st wʊmnnd' n Y K5 M1
   4 gyh n Pt4 Mf4 T55b
   gyh n' G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
   hwn F2
   4 hwn'yt Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   hwn'yt G14 T6
   hwn'yt F2
   4 HWH-m Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6; T55 (In T55 the stroke is written above the line)
   HWH-m F2 (HWH is written with the pale letters above the line) J2 K5 M1
   5 'w' Pt4 G14 T6 T55b (the order is ZK 'w')
   'LH Mf4 F2; J2 K5 M1
   5 tlsk' syh Pt4 G14 T6 T55b
   tls' sh Mf4
tls' sy F2
tlsk' sy J2 K5 M1
   5 krt' Pt4 G14 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 krt W K5 M1
   6 W 'w' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   MH ZK 'w' F2
   6 'LH ZK Pt4 Mf4 T55b
   'LH G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
   6 mt' Pt4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   m Mf4
   mt F2
   7 MNW Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   'MT' Mf4; J2
   7 MN 'LH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   J2 Illegible
   7 BRH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   pws J2
   7 YLYDWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; K5 M1
   YLYDWN-t' T6
deast J2
   8 MNW Pt4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deast Mf4
   MN F2
   8 'pz' lwys' Pt4 G14 T6 T55b; J2
   'pz' Y lwys F2
   8 plyn' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   plyn' J2 M1
   9 HWH-t Pt4 G14 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   HWH-d F2
   9 'pz' lwys' lwys F2
   9 plyn F2
   plyn J2 M1
   9 HWH-t Pt4 G14 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
   HWH-d F2
   9 'pz' lwys' lwys F2
   9 'w' Pt4 T55b
   'w' HN' Mf4
   HN' G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
   9 'YK Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b ('YK PWN: PWN is written above the line with the small letters); K5 M1
   'YK-s F2; J2
   10 h'nk' 1 Pt4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   h'nk Mf4
   h'nk F2
   h'nk J2
   10 J2 Iylk'1 Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
   QDM-ni J2
   10 BY-t'l' Pt4 Mf4 F2 (l' is written above the line with
the small letters) T55b; K5

1. shambɁ G14 Mf4 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1

10. kbd Pt4 Mf4 E T55b; J2 K5 M1

1. dh Ɂk G14 Mf4 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1

2. sthmb' G14 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1

6. ḤWWN - t Pt4 G14 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1

8. ḤWWN - t' Mf4; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t' F2; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t' T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t' F2; J6 T55b; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t' F2; J6 T55b; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t' F2; J6 T55b; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t' F2; J6 T55b; J2 K5 M1

12. ḤDW - t' F2; J6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
5.8 Y 9.8

1 (a) MNW-š zt +'c' Y dh’k
2 Y₁ 3 zpl Y² 3 km’l
3 Y₁ 6 'š Y² hc 'lwcwst’l [Y³ +’d tk’ PWN gwhlk’]
4 (b) KBD 'wc' ŠDY’' dlwc
5 Y₁ SLY-tl 'w' gyh’n [zyd’n k’l] Y² +dlwnd
6 (c) MNW-š KBD 'wetwm dlwc
7 pr’c klñnyt’ gn’k mynw’d
8 QDM 'w' st’wmdn’ n' 'gyh’n'
9 PWN mlgyh Y ZK 'hl’dyh gyh’n'
[’YK-š MN dlwc Y gytyy 'ywkJ ZK sthmktl YḤBWNT-t
10 kō ḧbjam yim ahuram mzdqam
11 ZK ḤN' 'm’l 'YK
12 KR’ ZK zyd’n' ZY-š PWN d’m’n Y 'whrmzd twb’n YḤWWN-t
13 '-š BR’ krt
14 W LZNH YḤWWN-t MN'D'M ZY-š twb’n YḤWWN-t krt’n'
15 [’P-š L’ krt’]

1 MIHYTWN-t' Pt4 T55b
MIHYTWN-t Mf4 G14; J2
MIHYTWN-yt F2 T6
zt K5 M1
1 'YK bnd Pt4 G14 T6
deest Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
1 krt Pt4
dest Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
1 'c' Y dh’k' Y Pt4 Mf4 T55b
'cdh’k' Y G14 T6
'c' Y dh’k F2
'c' Y dh’k Y J2
'c'k Y dh’k Y J2 M1
1 Pt4 writes 'l’d after 'c' Y dh’k' in the marg.
2 zpl Pt4 G14 Mf4 T6 (zpl is crossed out) T55b
zpl F2; J2 K5 M1
2-2 Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
deest G14 T6
W Y J2
3-1 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest F2 T6
3-2 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest F2
3 Pt4 and T55b describe hc 'lwcwst’l in the marg., as hc’l GBR’ l’d zwl d’stk YḤWWN-t.
3-3 deest Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 W F2 Y K5 M1
3 'd’tk’ Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
d’tk’ Y F2
'd’tk’ J2
'd'tk’ Y K5 M1
3 gwhlk’ Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
gwhlk G14 T6
c’dw F2
4 Y KBD Pt4 Mf4 T55b
KBD G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
dt lw’ Mf4
d’t lw’ t lw’ Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dlw F2
4 ŠDY’ Pt4 Mf4 T55b
ŠDY’ W G14 T6
ŠDY’ W F2
ŠDY’ J2 K5 M1
dlw Pt4 F14 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dlw F2
5-1 Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
Y MN G14 (MN is written above the line with a different colour) T6 (MN is written above the line)
deest J2
5 SLY-tl’n’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
SLY-tl J2
SLY-tl Mf4 K5 M1
5 deest Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
w J2 K5 M1
gyh’n Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
gyh’n’ J2 K5 (two letters are crossed out on the line and ‘n’ is written twice above and below the line) M1
5 zyd’n k’l Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
zyd’n k’l F2
5-2 W Pt4 Mf4 T55b
deest G14 F2 T6; J2 Y K5 M1
dln Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dln Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
6 KBD Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dlw Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dlw Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
7  klynyt Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1 klynyt' J2
7  gnʾk Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 W gnnʾk T55b gnn k J2 K5 M1
8  'st' wmnnd n' Pt4 F2 'st' wmnnd n' G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
8  gnʾk Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
9  mlgyh Y Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1 mlgyh G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
9  ZK Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
9  ZK Y Mf4; J2
9  'hl' dyh Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1 'hl' dyh Y J2
9  gyh n Pt4 Mf4 T55b gyh n' G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
9  mlwyw F2 mlwyw G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
10  YK-š Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
10  YK G14 T6
dlwec' Pt4 G14 Mf4; T55b (It was written as dlwec', but the second /w/ is crossed out)
dlwec F2 (it was written as dwbc, but /b/ is crossed out) T6; K5 M1
dlwec 1 J2
10Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1 deest T6
10  'yw'k Pt4 G14 T6 T55b 'yw'k W Mf4 'yw'k F2; J2 K5 M1
10YHBWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1 YHBWN-t' J2
11  ʾḥqm Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b ʾḥqm J2 K5 M1
11  mazdām Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b mazdām J2 K5 M1
12  n' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b HN ' F2; J2 K5 M1
13  zyd n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1 zyd n' G14 T6 13d 'm n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1 d 'm n' G14 T6
13Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1 deest G14 T6 13twb n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
twb n' G14 T6 [... ]b n' J2
13YHBWN-t Pt4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1 YHBWN-t' G14
14  's Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 's G14
14  krt' Pt4 Mf4 T6 krt G14 F2 T55b; K5 M1
krtn' J2
15W Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 deest G14 F2
15  LZNH Pt4 (writes /m/ above <H>) Mf4 F2 T55b (writes /m/ above <H>); J2 K5 ZNH G14 T6
E P M1
15MND M Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 QDM F2
15ZY-š It is not clear whether Indian manuscripts write ZY-š or ZK-š.
15twb/n Pt4 MF4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
twb/n G14 T6
twb/n G14 T6
twb/n G14 T6
15YHBWN-t Pt4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1 YHBWN-t' Mf4 T6
15deest Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b krt'n J2 K5 M1 krt F2
16L krtPt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; K5 L krt G14
E P F2
16YHBWN-t Pt4 G14 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 YHBWN-t' G14
16G14 writes ZNH YHBWN-t ZY-š twb'n' YHBWN-t 'P-š L' krt in marg.
16Pt4 writes 'p'dt 'š krt (superscr.) at the end of the Pahlavi section.
5.9  Y 9.9

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(a) MNW LK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>stykl hwm MN 'NŠWT'-n'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ḶYN 'st'wmnd' n gyh'n' hwn'yty ḤWH-yūy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'MNW ZK 'tlsk'syh krt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W MH 'w' 'ŁH mt' 'p'tyh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 'NŠWT'-n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b</td>
<td>hwnyt F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'NŠWT'-n' G14 T6; J2 K5 M1</td>
<td>3 ḤWH-yūy Pt4 T55b HWH-yūy Mf4 G14 T6; J2 K5 M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 'st'wmnd'n Pt4 T55b</td>
<td>Ḷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'st'wmnd'n' G14 F2; J2</td>
<td>MNW Mf4 F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'st'wmnd'n Mf4</td>
<td>K5 illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'st'wmnd'n' T6</td>
<td>4 tlsk'syh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'st'wmnd'n' Y K5 M1</td>
<td>Ḷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 gyh'n' Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2</td>
<td>krt G14 F2 T6; K5 M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyh'n' G14 F2 T6; K5 M1</td>
<td>5 W MH Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hwn'yty Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1</td>
<td>T55b; J2 K5 M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 krt Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b</td>
<td>MH F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T55b</td>
<td>5 'w' Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZK G14 T6</td>
<td>5 mt Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 tlsk'syh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b</td>
<td>5 mt Mf4; J2 K5 M1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.10 Y 9.10

1 (a) 'DYN'-š 'w' L 'LH pshw' gwpt
2 hwm Y 'hlwb' Y dwl wš
3 (b) slyt Y 's'm' n Y swthw'st' l
4 [ḤWH-t 'slytyh ḤN' YḤWWN-t
5 'YK BRH Y stykl YḤWWN-t
6 'P'-š swthw'st lhyth ḤN' YḤWWN-t
7 'YK'-š swt Y d'm n' nywk YD YTWN-st' B YḤWN-st]
8 L stygl MN ʾNŠWT'-n
9 BYN 'st' wmm'd n gyh' n' hwn'y't'-m
10 'LH ZK 'tsk' syh krt'
11 'w' 'LH ZK mt' ṭṭ'yh
12 (c) 'MT MN 'LH 2 BRH L'L' YLYDWN-t ḤWH-d
13 'wlwhš W kls'sp'
14 (d) d'tywbl ZK-ỹ [YḤWWN-t ʿwlwhš 'YK wcy R W l dwblyh krt'] W² d't'ṣl' l
15 ['YK'-š d't Y pl' lwn BR YD YTWN-st']
16 (e) W ZK Y ZK-ỹ ṭp̥lk'l
17 W ywbn' gyswl W gtwl
18 [kls'sp ʾYK-š k'l PWN gt' wys krt'
19 m hwnd't gwpt
20 ḤWH-t d't Y t cyk YḤWWN-t 'P'-š MN gyswl BR' gwpt
21 m 'hwshnsp' YMLLN-t
22 ḤWH-t ḤN'-š L' ṣkwtyph MH gys twlk'-c YḤSNN-d

T6 wites ʿytywn and K5, M1 attest 'DYN'-š at the beginning of the Pahlavi version.
1 L Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dest F2
1 pshw' Pt4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
pshw Mf4 G14 F2
1 gwp R Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b
2 gwp G14 F2; K5 M1
YMLLW[...] G14
2 hwm Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; K5 hwm G14; M1
hwm [...] J2
2 ʿhlwb' Y Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
ʿhlwb' Pt4 G14 F2 T6
2 slyt Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
slyt Y J2

2 s'm' n Y Pt4 T55b; J2
s'm' n G14 T6
s'm' n Y MF4
s'm' n Y F2; K5 M1
3 swthw'st l Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
swt Y hw'st l J2
4 ḤWH-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
ḤWH-d F2
4 slytyh] ʿslytyh] [slytyh] Pt4
slytyh Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
slytyh F2
4 ḤN' Pt4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
'n' Mf4 T6
4 YḤWWN-t Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
YḤWWN-t' G14
5 BRH Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
BRH F2

styk' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dkl F2
5 YḤWWN-t Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
YḤWWN-t' G14; J2
6 swtyyh Pt4 (swth'sty l yh is written above the line with pale letters) G14 T6
swthw'st l Mf4
swthw'st l yh F2; K5 M1
swt g'h (/g/ is shown by two diacritic dots above) T55b
swthw'st l yh Y J2 (It seems that it was written swthw'st l Y at the beginning and then, it was emended and yh was added to swthw'st l).
6 ḤN' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
'n' T6
6 YḤWWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
deest J2
7 'YK Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b 'YK-s F2; J2 K5 M1
7 swt Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
swt Y J2 K5 M1
'd-m'n' G14 (writes d-m'n' above their line)
s-m'n' T6
7 nywk Pt4 Mf4 T55b
nywk G14 F2 T6; K5 M1
nywk Y J2
7 YD YTWN-st' Pt4 F2 T55b; J2 K5
YD YTWN-st Mf4 G14 T6; M1
7 B YHWN-st Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1
B YHWN-st' G14 T6
B YHWN-st J2
8 NSWT- n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
'NSWT- n' G14 T6; J2
9 st wmnnd' n Pt4 Mf4 (d-n is written above the line) T55b
'st wmnnd' n' G14 T6; J2
'st wmnnd' n F2
'st wmnnd' n Y K5 M1
9 gyh' n Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
gh F2
gyh' n J2
9 hwnt-m Pt4 Mf4 (/w/ after /h/ is crossed out by two diagonal lines) T55b; J2 K5
hwnt-m F2
G14 T6
K5 illegible
10ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2
ZK Y K5 M1
10 tlsk syh G14
Mf4
G14 T6
K5 illegible
10ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2
ZK Y K5 M1
10 tlsk syh G14

MNW F2
'MT MN K5 M1
12 LH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
'w' J2 ('MT is re-written on an illegible Avestan erased word)
12HWH-ad Pt4 T55b
HWH-d Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
13 wwhs Pt4 G14 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
'lwh's F2 (F2 condisers the first - after /h/ as /hw/ by writing a diacritic mark above it).
13kl's'Pt4 Mf4 T55b (due to the vulgate, T55b writes three dots as the diacritic mark for /s/ above // and reads klyšsp'); J2 K5 M1
14ZK HN' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
ZK-y J2 K5 M1
14YHWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; K5 M1
YHWN-t' T6; J2
14 wwhs Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
'lwh's F2 (F2 condisers the first - after /h/ as /hw/ by writing a diacritic mark above it).
14 'YK Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
'YK-s F2; J2 K5 M1
14-1 W Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
deest G14 T6
J2 illegible
14krt' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
(According to the New Persian translation, T6 reads krt); K5 M1
krt F2
W krt J2
14-2 W Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
deest F2; J2
14d tál st'1 Pt4 T55b
d' t'sl'M4 G14 T6; K5 M1
d' t'sl F2 (writes /s/ with the pale letter above /p/).
d't Y 'l'sl J2
15 'YK-s Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2
'YK K5 M1
15 d't Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
d't Y F2; J2 K5 M1
15pl lwnt Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
p' lwnt J2
15 HNHTWN-J (the ending is crossed out) Pt4; J2
HNHTWN-t' Mf4 G14 T6
HNHTWN-t J2
16ZK Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
ZK Y Mf4
ZK W J2
ZK Y K5 M1
16 ZK y Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
ZK y W J2
17W Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
deest G14 T6; J2
17yw' n Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest G14 T6
yw'n F2
17gywl Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
gywl F2
G14 T6
K5 illegible
17W gtwl Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
gtwl G14 T6
18kl's' Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b (T55b reads klyšsp' shown by three dots as the); J2 K5 M1
kl's' G14 T6
18gt Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
gt F2
18krt Pt4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
kr[... ] Mf4
krt F2
19m hwnt Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
m hwnt' G14 T6
19gwp' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 F2 T55b
gwp t J2 K5 M1
19 'YK Pt4 Mf4 T55b
'YK-s G14 F2 (writes /s/ with a small letter above the line) T6
J2
J2
HWH-t K5 M1
20-ānd p4 (according to the New Persian translation, Pt4 reads it g'ty h. Pt4 also renders two diacritic dots above ś to show /gf/ F2
(writes gtyh below the line with small letters) T6
(according to the new Persian translation, T6 reads it g’tyh. T6 also renders two diacritic dots above ʃ to show /g/)

gt’yh G14
d’t Y J2
d’t Y K5 M1
20t’cyk’n’ Pt4 G14 T6
t’cyk Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
20YHSWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
YHSWN-t J2
20’P-s Pt4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
’YK’P[...] Mf4

20MN Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest T6
20gswlhyh Pt4
gyswlyh Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
gys[...] J2
gyswl K5 M1
20gwpt’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
gwpt F2; K5 M1
deest J2
21m’hgwšnsp’ Pt4 Mf4 T55b;
K5 M1
m’hgwšsp G14
m’hgwšsp F2
m’hgwšsp’ T6
deest J2
21gwpt’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
gwpt F2
YMLLWN-t J2 K5 M1

22kptyh Pt4 G14
škwptyh Mf4 F2 T6 T55b
šykwptyh J2
škwptyh K5 M1
22gs Pt4 Mf4
gs gys F2
gys G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5
deest M1
22twlk’n-’c Pt4 (writes ‘n above the line with small letters) G14 T6
twlk’-c Mf4 T55b
twlk’n-c F2 (writes ‘n above the line with small letters)
twlk’-c J2
twlk’-c Y K5 M1
22YHSNN-d Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
YHSNN’-nd G14 T6
5.11 Y 9.11

(a) MNW- $ zt' 'c' Y slwbl
Y 'sp' wp'1 Y GBR' 'wp'1
Y wš' wmnd Y zlt'

(b) MNW-$ QDM wš l'nynyt YK'YMWN-''t
'sp b'1' ZK Y zlt'

[HWH-t' ẒNH ZK ZY- $ PWN km'1 L' L' 'ZLWN-t
xšuaēpiaia vaēnaiia 'barašna

ZK ZY-ŷ ZY-$ PWN zpl BR' NPLWN-st

'YT' MNW 'ytwn' YMLLN-ýt

[HWH-t KR' 2 'ywk

W ZK-ŷ 'nd b'1'd L' L' 'ZLWN-t'

W ZK-ŷ 'nd dlhn'd BR' NPLWN-st

'YT' MNW 'ytwn' YMLLNW'-ýt

[HWH-t kp' lyh QDM *pwšt hwšk YK'YMWN-'t]

(e) MNW PWN 'LH QDM kls 'sp'

'-$ PWN ZK 'synyn' dyk' pyt' pwht

(d) ) ZK 'D 'w' lpyspn' zm'n

tpt mr [ YK-ŷ glm YḤWWN-t] hwdst

[ YK 2 LGLH' YḤWWN-t]

(e) 'P-$ pr'c ZK Y 'synyn' [*dyk] pr'c *spwlt'

ZK 'y'ltynyt MY' BRH SGYTWN-t

(f) plwn' PWN tls BRH 'tcyt'

mltmynšn' kls 'sp'

[HWH-t 'mltmynšnýh HN' YḤWWN-t 'YP-$

LBBMH PWN g'h d'št]

1 MḤYTWN-t Pt4 (writes
YK klt W L' WKL d'št W
L(H)YK klt after
MḤYTWN-t) Mf4 T55b;
J2
MḤYTWN-t G14 T6
MḤYTWN-ýt F2
t' K5 M1
1 'c' Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
T55b; K5 M1
deest J2
2 Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5
M1
deest G14 T6
2 'sp wp'1 Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
T55b
'sp' wp'1 F2
'sp' wp'1 Y J2 K5 M1
2 mlt'wp'1 Pt4 Mf4 T55b
mlt'wp'1 G14 F2 T6
GBR' 'wp'1 J2 K5 M1

3 Y Pt4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest Mf4 G14 F2 T6
3 wš' wmnd G14 T6
wš' wmnd Pt4 T55b
wš' wmnd Mf4 T55b
wš' wmnd Y F2; J2 K5 M1
3 zlt' Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5
M1
zlt G14 F2 T6
4 MNW-$ Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b;
J2 K5 M1
MNW wš G14 T6
4 tn' 'w'Pt4 (tn' 'w' is written
above the line)
deest G14 F2 T6
tn' (writes in marg.) Mf4
'w' T55b
wš J2 K5 M1
4 l'nynyt Pt4 G14 T6 T55b
l'nynyt Mf4 F2; J2 K5 M1
4 YK'YMWN-'t' J2

YK'YMWN- 't Pt4 Mf4 T55b;
K5 M1
YK'YMWN-ýt' G14 T6
YK YWM- 't F2
5 SWSY' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
T55b; J2
5 L' L' Pt4 T55b
b'1' Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
5 ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2
K5 M1
deest T55b
5 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14; J2 K5 M1

LBBMH F2
deest T55b
5 zlt'4; J2 K5 M1
zlt Mf4 G14 T6
zylt F2
deest T55b
21 ʾyʾlytnyt' Pt4 G14 T6 T55b
ʾyʾlytnyt' Mf4
ʾyʾlytnyt K5 M1
SGYTWN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
SGYTWN-t' J2
22 plwn' Pt4 G14 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
Pt4 and T55B write ʾc' Y slwbl in marg.
plwn F2
22 tcyt' MN Pt4 T55b tcyt' Mf4 G14; J2
tcyn F2
tcyn F2 T6
deest K5 M1
23 mltnynšn' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
mltnynšh F2
GBRʾ-mynšn J2
23 klsʾsp' Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
klsʾsp' G14
klysʾsp T6
klsʾsp F2
24 HWH-t Pt4 G14 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
HWH-d F2
24 mltnynšnyh Pt4 F2 T6 T55b; J2
mltnynšnyh Mf4
mltnynšn' G14; M1
mltnynšyh K5
24 ʾYK-š F2; J2 K5 M1
ʾYK Pt4 G14 Mf4 T55b
25 LBBMH Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
LBBMH F2
LBBMH T6
25 ʾšt' YHWWN-t Pt4 T55b ʾšt' G14 Mf4 T6; J2 ʾšt' F2; K5 M1
5.12  Y 9.12

(a) MNW LK

tswm hwm MN ‘NŠWT’-’n’

BYN* ‘st’wmnd’ n gyh’ n’ hwn’-yt’ ḫWH-yy

MNW ZK ‘tlsk’ syh krt

W MH ‘w’ ‘LH mt’ ṕ’tyh

2 HWH-t Pt4 T55b
hwm Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1

2 ‘NŠWT’-’n’ Pt4 Mf4 T55b
‘NŠWT’-’n’ G14 T6; J2 K5 M1

‘NŠWT’-’n’ Y F2

3 ‘st’wmnd’ n Pt4 T55b
‘st’wmnd’ n Mf4 F2
‘st’wmnd’ n G14 T6; J2
‘st’wmnd’ n Y K5 M1

3 gyh’ n Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2
gyh’ n’ G14 T6; K5 M1
gyyh’ n F2

l hs'yt Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2

hwn’-yt’ T6; J2 K5 M1
3 ḫWH-yy Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2
   T6 T55b
HWH-yy J2 K5 M1
4 W MNW Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
   T55b
MNW F2; J2 K5 M1
4 ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6
   T55b; K5 M1
ZK Y J2
4 tsls syh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
   T55b

F2
tlsk yh J2 K5 M1

krt’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2
krt F2; K5 M1
5 W MH Pt4 Mf4 G14 Mf4
   T6 T55b; K5 M1
MH F2; J2
5 ‘w’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 Mf4 T6
   T55b; J2 K5 M1
ZK F2
5 mt’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2
   K5 M1
mt F2 T6 (written with small script below the line)
5 ṕ’tyh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6
   T55b; J2 K5 M1

iping F2
5.13 Y 9.13

1 (a) 'P-š 'w' L 'LH pshw' gwpt
2 hwm Y 'hlwb' dwl wš
3 (b) pwlšsp' Y L tswm MN 'NŠWT'-n
4 BYN 'st'wmnd n' gyh'n hwn'-yt'-m
5 'LH ZK Y 'tlsk'syh krt'
6 W ZK 'w' 'LH mt 'p'tyh
7 (c) 'MT MN 'LH LK L' ŶLYDN-t ḨWH-yŷ
8 LK 'ḥyck zltwšt'
9 BYN m'n Y pwlwšsp'
10 Y1 ywtd- ŠDY' 'whrmžd-DYN'
11 [ ŶT' MNW ywtd- ŠDY'-yh L'WHL '-m'n' YMLLN-yt]

1 deest Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2
'LH K5 M1
1 pshw' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
pshw F2
1 gwpt Pt4 Mf4 G14T6 T55b YMLLN-t' J2
gwpt F2; J2 K5
2 Y Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest G14 T6
2 'hlwb' Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
'hlwb' Y G14 Mf4
deest J2
2 dwl wš Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
<sup>pt</sup> F2
3 pwlwš'sp' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b
pwlwš'sp F2 T6
pwlšsp' Y J2 K5 M1
3 'NŠWT'-n Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1
3 'NŠWT'-n' G14 F2 T6; J2
4 'st'wmnd'n Pt4 T55b
'st'wmnd Mf4
'st'wmnd n' G14 F2 T6; J2
'st'wmnd n' Y K5 M1
4 gyh'n Pt4 Mf4 T55b; M1
gyh'n G14 T6; J2 K5
<sup>pt</sup> F2
4 hwn'yt-m Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2
hwnt-m F2
hwn'yt'-m K5 M1
5 ZK Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; J2
ZK Y T6; K5 M1
5 tlsk' syh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
<sup>pt</sup> F2
tlsk'šy Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2 K5 M1
5 krt Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
krt F2
6 W ZK Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
ZK G14 F2 T6
6 'w' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest F2
6 mt Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2 T55b;
mt F2 T6; K5 M1
7 'MT Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
MNW G14 T6
MN MNW F2
7 MN Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest F2
7 'LH Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2 K5 M1
LH F2
't' W T6
7 ŶLYDN-t Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
ŶLYDN-t' J2
7 ḨWH'-yŷ Pt4 T6 T55b ḨWH-yŷ Mf4 G14 F2; J2 K5 M1
8 'pyck' Pt4 F2 T55b; J2
'pyck' Mf4; K5 M1
'pyck' Y G14 T6
8 zltwšt Pt4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
zltwšt Mf4 G14 T6
zltwšt F2
9 BYN Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
BYN Y J2
9 m'n Pt4 Mf4 T55b
m'n' G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
9Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; K5 M1
deest T6
9 pwlwš'sp' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b
pwlwš'sp F2
pwlšsp' T6
pwlšsp' J2 K5 M1
10-1 Y Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1
deest G14 F2 T6; J2
10ywtd- ŠDY' Y Pt4 Mf4 T55b
ywtd- ŠDY' G14
ywtd- ŠDY' 'F2 T6; K5 M1
ywtd'- ŠDY'' J2
10-2Y Pt4 Mf4 T55b
deest G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
10 'whrmžd'tst'n Pt4 Mf4 T55b
'whrmžd'tst'n' G14 F2 T6
'whrmžd-DYN' J2 K5 M1
11 'YT' Pt4 G14 T55b; J2 K5 M1
'st' Mf4
11 'YT' F2 T6
11ywtd- ŠDY' Pt4 Mf4 T55b; J2
ywtd'- ŠDY' G14
ywtd'- ŠDY' F2 T6
ywtd- ŠDY'-yh K5 M1
11 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b
deest T6; J2 K5 M1
11L'WHL Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
11L'WHL F2
112 Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
F2 writes 2 below the line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J2 K5 M1</th>
<th>YMRRN-yt Pt4 T6</th>
<th>YMLLN-yt J2 K5 M1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 mʾn Pt4 Mf4 T55b</td>
<td>YMRRWN-yt Mf4</td>
<td>YMRRN-yt G14 F2 T55b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mʾnʾ G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.14 Y 9.14

1 (a) BYN ZK +Y n’myk +yl’nwyc‘
2 [‘YK ŠPYL +d’ytyē]
3 ’hnwl pr’c slwt
5 [‘YK-t yšt Y ’n’ pl krt]
6 BR’ YBLWN-ŠNYH [PWN BR’ gwbšnyh] 4
7 [‘’D ’w’ ZK Y ’HL]
8 (b) PWN “hlws”’ w’e sl’ dšnyh [twhš’ykh’]

1 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2 M1
deest F2 T6
Y W K5
1 ’yl’nwyc’ Pt4 Mf4 T55b
’yl’n’wyc‘ G14
’yl’n’wyc F2
’yl nwyc T6
’yl nyc’ J2 K5 M1
2 wyh Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55
deest J2
ŠPYL Y K5 M1
3 d’ytyk Pt4 G14 T55b
d’ytyē Mf4 T6; J2
d’ytyh F2

d’ytyē Y K5
d’yē M1 (there is a space after
/t/ which shows the scribe
intended to fill it later)
3 W Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6; J2 K5
F2
deest M1 (there is a space after
/t/ in d’yē which shows the
scribe intended to fill it later)
3 LK P4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6; K5 M1
LK W J2
3 zltwšt’ Pt4 Mf4 T6 T55b; J2
(in marg.)
zltwšṭ’ G14 F2

gwbšnyh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
gwbšn’ F2
7 ’D ZK Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b
’D G14 T6; J2
’D W K5 M1
7 ’w’ Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
deest G14 T6
7 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
deest F2; J2
8 PWN Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2
K5 M1
’HL PWN F2 (in marg.) T6
(above the line)
8 hlws’d Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
hlws’d J2
hlws’d K5 M1
8 pr’c Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
w’c J2
’c K5 M1
8 sl’dshn’ Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
sl’dshn G14 T6
8 twhš’ksy’h Pt4 T55b
twhš’ksy’h Mf4 G14 T6; K5 M1
twhš’ yh’ J2
1 (Y 9.15aP) LK BYN zmyk nk’n’ krt ḤḤW-d
2 hlwsp’ ŠDY’’’ zltwšt’
3 MNW L ‘YN’ MN ZK wyl- ‘lwdšn’
4 pyt ḤḤW-d QDM PWN ZNH zmyk
5 [PWN ŠDY’’’] klpyh
6 ḤḤW-t KR’ ZK MNW tn’ mynwzd twb’n YḤWWN-t krt’n’
7 ‘-š k’lpt BR’ TBLWN-st
8 ZK MNW L’ twb’n YḤWWN-t krt’n’
9 hwt’ BR’ TBLWN-st’
10 k’lpt BR’ TBLWN-st ḤN’ ‘+ YK
11 MN ZK pr’ c PWN ‘ŠDY’ klpyh wn’s L’ twb’n YḤWWN-t krt’n’
12 ‘D PWN stwl klpyh W ‘NSWT’ klpyh K’N-’c ’w’ ḪBDWN-tył
13 (Y 9.15bP) MNW ‘wc’ wmnnd ḤḤW- yy¹ MNW tkyk ḤḤW- yy²
14 MNW twḥś’ k ḤḤW- yy¹ MNW tyc ḤḤW- yy²
15 ‘YT’ YK pylwcktl
16 d’t’ YK YMWN- yy MN ZK Y mynw’d n’ d’m
17 [MN ‘d’m Y mynw’d n NPŠH]

1 nk’n Pt4 Mf4 T55b
nk’n G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
1 krt’ ‘BYDWN- d Pt4 (‘BYDWN-d is written above the line)
krt Mf4 F2; J2 K5 M1
krt G14 T6
1 ḤḤW-t Pt4 T55b
ḤḤW-d Mf4
ḤḤW-t G14 T6
ḤḤW-d F2; J2 K5 M1
2 hlwsp’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
hlwsp F2
2 ŠDY’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b

3 zltwšt’ Pt4 T55b; J2 K5 M1
zltwšt’ Mf4
zltwšt’ G14 T6
zltwšt’ F2
3 psỳ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b
L’ ‘YN’ J2 K5 M1
4 ḤḤW-d Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
ḤḤW-d F2; J2 K5 M1
5 PWN Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
dest F2
5 ŠDY’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b

6 ḤḤW-d F2
6 twb’n Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1
twb’n G14 F2 T6; J2
6 YḤWWN-t’ Pt4 T55b
YḤWWN-t Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
7 k’lpt Pt4 Mf4 T55b
k’lpw’ G14 T6
k’bcw’ F2 (bcw’ is written in the next line above which the deletion line appears.
The word is corrected by the pale wt’ after k’lb).
kłp J2
k’lp’ K5 M1
7 śkst’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2
śkst F2
TBLWN-st K5 M1
8 twb’n Pt4 Mf4 T55b; K5 M1
twb’n G14 F2 T6; J2
8 YḤWWN-t’ Pt4 F2 T55b (in marg.)
YḤWWN-t Mf4 G14 T6; J2 K5 M1
8 krt’n’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1
klt’n’ (k’l is written with the pale and second handwriting above the line)
9 BNPŠH Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b

hwt J2
hwt’ K5 M1
9 śkst’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b
śkst F2
TBLWN-st J2 K5 M1
10 k’lpw’ G14 T6
t’k’lpw’ G14 T6
10 śkstn’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b
BR’ śkstn’ F2
śkstn T6
BR’ TBLWN-stn J2
BR’ TBLWN-st K5 M1
10 YK Pr4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 MΗ K5 M1
11 ŠDY’ Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b
ŠDY’ J2
11 ŠDY’ K5 M1
11 twb’n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1
twb’n G14 T6; J2
11 YḤWWN-t’ Pt4 T55b
YḤWWN-t Mf4 G14 F2 T6; J2 K5 M1
12 stwl klpyh Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b; K5 M1
stwl klpyh F2
st klpyh J2
12 ‘NSWT’ klpyh Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; J2 K5 M1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'NŚWT</th>
<th>klpyh G14 T6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KN Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 'w</td>
<td>J2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'w'</td>
<td>K5 M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 BDWN-ty Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b K5 M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'BDWN-ят-ד F2 kword J2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 MNW Pt4 Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 MNW-כ G14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'w' wnmmd Pt4 T55b 'w' wnmmd Mf4 G14; K5 'w' wnmmd F2; J2 M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-1 HWH-yęḥ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55 HWH-yęḥ F2 K5 M1 HWH-yęḥ W J2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-2 HWH-yęḥ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b HWH-yęḥ-yęḥ G14 HWH-yęḥ F2; J2 K5 M1 14twhš' k'[ twhs' k Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b J2 K5 M1 14-1 HWH-yęḥ Pt4 G14 T6 T55b HWH-yęḥ Mf4 F2; J2 K5 M1 14tyc' Pt4 G14 T55b tyc Mf4 F2 T6; K5 M1 J2 Illegible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-2 HWH-yęḥ Pt4 Mf4 G14 T6 T55b HWH-yęḥ F2; J2 K5 M1 15 MNW 'YT' Pt4 Mf4 G14 T55b; J2 MNW 'YT' F2 T6 'YT' K5 M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 YHBWN-t Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b YHBWN-t' G14 T6; J2 d't K5 M1 16 Y Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; K5 M1 deest T6; J2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16mnw'd n Pt4 Mf4 G14 F2 T55b; K5 M1 mynwd 'n T6; J2 17'd m n Pt4; K5 M1 d m Mf4 G14 F2 T6 T55b; J2 17 deest Pt4 G14 Y Mf4 F2 T6 T55b; J2 K5 M1 17 mynwd 'n Pt4 Mf4 F2 T55b; K5 M1 mynwd 'n' G14 T6; J2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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