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Abstract

This article discusses some manuscripts copied and described by E. W. West in his Notebooks held at the Royal Asiatic Society, with special reference to the texts contained in the Pahlavi codex MK.

Keywords: Pahlavi literature; Codex MK; West’s notebooks

In the field of Iranian Studies Edward William West (1824–1905) is well known for his contributions to the study of Zoroastrian literature in Middle Persian (Pahlavi). These include his still valuable survey of Pahlavi literature in the Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie (West 1896–1904), his translation of the Pahlavi Texts in five volumes in the series The Sacred Books of the East (West 1880–1897), and his work on the Arda Wiraf Nāmag in collaboration with Martin Haug (Haug and West 1872). What is less known, however, is that he described, copied and collated Zoroastrian manuscripts many of which are no longer accessible. This part of West’s—to date unpublished—work is available for consultation in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society (RAS) in London. In 1950 Jean de Menasce published a handlist of West’s papers at the RAS, grouping them into 70 items, of which the first nineteen had been numbered by West himself as Notebooks 1–19. Little, if any, further work was done on West’s papers until the summer of 2018, when Aadityakrishna Satish, an undergraduate from the College of the Atlantic in Bar Harbor, Maine, USA, worked as an intern with the Society and provided a more detailed description of the contents of the notebooks1. In 2019, the RAS’s archivist Nancy Charley completed the catalogue and, as a result, a full inventory of West’s paper is now available online on the RAS’s Archives Hub (https://archiveshub.jisc.ac.uk/data/gb891-eww). At the time when Aadityakrishna Satish was working at the RAS in the summer of 2018, members of the Multimedia Yasna (MUYA) team at SOAS,2 in

1A short summary by Aaditya of his work-experience at the Royal Asiatic Society can be found here: https://royalasiaticociety.org/a-short-reflection-archive-e-w-west-knowledge/.

2The Multimedia Yasna (MUYA) is a project funded by the European Research Council (ERC) with an Advanced Investigator Grant (Principal Investigator: Almut Hintze) 2016–2021. The research of the present paper was carried out as part of this project. My thanks are due to the ERC for the financial support granted, and to the collaborators named above and other MUYA team members for their help in photographing the Notebooks. I would also like to thank Dan Sheffield for having shared the pdfs of various rare nineteenth-century
particular Leon Goldman, Céline Redard and Mehrbod Khanizadeh, undertook to photograph notebooks 1–36, and in December 2019 Carlo Marchetti and Massimiliano Vassalli (both of the University La Sapienza, Rome) digitised notebooks 37–55 in collaboration with SOAS students, including Ruzbeh Hodiwala and members of the MUYA team. The images have been made available to the Royal Asiatic Society for eventual online publication. In what follows I propose to discuss manuscripts copied and described by West in his notebooks, with special reference to the texts contained in the Pahlavi codex MK.

I am delighted to dedicate this article to François de Blois, who has spent a good part of his career at the Royal Asiatic Society as a Research Fellow working on his invaluable Bio-Bibliographical Survey of Persian Literature. I have always valued and admired his work as that of a great, and rare, scholar whose expertise spans both Iranian and Semitic language sources.

Born as the eldest of twelve children into a family of architects and engineers on the paternal side, E.W. West studied Engineering at King’s College, London (1839–1842). His father owned several cotton presses in India, and West spent the years 1844–1851, 1852–1866 and 1874–1876 in India, firstsuperintending the family-owned cotton presses in Bombay and, from 1852, as Chief Engineer on the Great Indian Peninsular Railway Project. In preparation for his first trip he studied Hindustani for a few weeks under Professor Duncan Forbes of King’s College, London and learned the Perso-Arabic and Nagari scripts. Otherwise his knowledge of foreign languages was self-taught. In Bombay, West made the acquaintance of many Parsis. It was a Parsi who managed the family cotton presses, and occasional conversations with him drew West’s attention to the Zoroastrian religion. West read Martin Haug’s Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees, first published in 1862, and their personal encounter in Poona in 1866 led to a life-long friendship not only with Haug but also with leading Zoroastrian priests and scholars, in particular with Dastur Hoşang Jāmāspījī Āṣā in Poona, with Dastur Peshotan Behram Sanjana and his son Dārāb Dastur Peshotan Sanjana in Bombay, and, especially, with Dastur Jāmāspījī JāmāspĀsāna in Bombay.

I. West’s copy of MK (1875)

During his third visit to India in 1874–1876 West spent a good amount of his time studying Zoroastrian ancient texts and manuscripts. It was in that period that he copied a considerable number of Pahlavi manuscripts. Among them was the Pahlavi codex MK of the collection of Dastur Jāmāspījī JamaspĀsāna, who greatly treasured this particular manuscript. West made his copy in 1875, and it is preserved on pp. 1–99 of his Notebook (NB) 13 at the RAS. In his notebooks, West used the siglum DJ (for Dastur Jāmāspījī) for this manuscript, while JamaspĀsāna 1913 refers to it as MK after the initials of the scribe Mehrbān.
Kayhusraw, who copied it in 1322 CE. The manuscript contains 38 texts which belong to different literary genres, including Wisdom (Handarz) and Court literature.

The significance of MK lies not only in the fact that it is the oldest extant Pahlavi manuscript, and thus the oldest extant witness for any of the texts it contains, but also that seven of them are only known from this manuscript and its transcripts. These are Ayāḏgār ṭ Zaērān ‘Memorial of Zaēr’ (MK Text 1), Šahrestānānā ṭ Ėrān ‘The cities of Ėrān’ (MK Text 2), Abdīh ud salīǧīn ṭ Sīstān ‘The marvel and worthiness of Sīstān’ (Text 3), Ḥusraw ṭ Kawādān ud nēdak-ē ‘Ḥusraw, son of Kawād, and a page’ (MK Text 4), Handarz ṭ dānaḡān ḏ mazdēsnān ‘Advice of the Wise to the Mazdayasnians’ (MK Text 6), Handarz ṭ Ḥusraw ṭ Kawādān ‘Advice of Ḥusraw, son of Kawād’ (MK Text 7) and Wūzāḡūḏa ṭ Baktāfīrūd ud Ādurbād ṭ Zardušt ‘Sayings of Baktāfīrūd and of Ādurbād, son of Zardušt’ (MK Text 18).

On a loose sheet enclosed in Notebook 13 after p. 144, West describes the manuscript MK and provides insights into its state of preservation in his time, as follows:

Pahlavi Shahnamah Ms. (D.J.) in the library of Dastur Jamaspji Minochiraj Jamaspasana, 142 folios of old brownish Indian paper, 9" × 5½" written 14 lines to the page, on the first 110 folios and 14 to 22 lines on the rest, clear and distinct where not eaten away by the white ants; has been bound but the folios are now loose and easily displaced, the sewing being eaten away. The folios have no catch words and are only numbered with a lighter ink (and probably at a later date) at the bottom right hand corner on the b page in Gujarati figures; these figures indicate the loss of some folios, the missing 18 folios being N. 63, 66, 68, 112–125, and 140; the last fol. being N. 160.

West’s number 18 of the missing folios diverges from the number 21 given by Anklesaria 1913, p. 1 only because West omits from his count folio 0 at the beginning of the manuscript and fol. 161–162 at the end. The number of folios missing then was actually the same as it is today. What West refers to as fol. 140 is wrongly marked and is in fact fol. 137, as noted by Anklesaria. On the same loose sheet, West goes on to explain his method of marking lacunae or restorations in his transcription of MK:

In the copy, all letters more or less eaten away are underlined with pencil; when they are absolutely certain they are written in ink, if more or less uncertain in pencil (but these include all letters certain but of which no traces remain, or which are not absolutely indispensable). When the letters are very uncertain the space above the pencil line is left blank. — Every page is collated, after writing, with the original. Glosses in different ink, and therefore presumably by a later hand, are written here in pencil. Words struck out (by overpoints, or otherwise) in the original MS. are omitted in this copy, but blunders unaltered in the original MS. are copied as they stand, and often indicated by sic to show that they are in the original.

The rigorous precision with which West executed the copying of MK and of other manuscripts is characteristic of his work preserved in the Notebooks. His diligence is particularly valuable, well suited to documenting the lacunose state of preservation of MK. In fact, the poor physical condition of MK even in West’s time led Anklesaria 1913, 2 to comment that the copies of MK and of any other witnesses of the texts MK contains, are essential to fill the many gaps in MK.

6Haug 1878, pp. 109–110.
7It is in fact from MK’s fol. 128v that the lines per page are more than 14.
8West’s note enclosed in Notebook 13 after p. 144.
2. The manuscript JJ (1767) and its copy T (ca. 1850?)

The most important copy of MK, the manuscript JJ, was transcribed by Dastur Jamshed JamaspAinsula, whose initials provide the siglum of this ms. Anklesaria 1913, 8 notes that at the time JJ was copied the 14 folios 112–125, which included an entire quire, and the two folios 161–162 of MK were still present, because the texts they contain are transcribed in JJ. However, MK’s four folios 63, 66, 68 and 137 (wrongly marked 140) were already missing. In JJ the gaps of text due to the absence of these four folios are not indicated, the preceding and following folios being copied continuously.9

In various places both in his Notebooks and in print, West states that JJ was copied in the year 1721 of the Christian era.10 This date is based on the assumption that JJ was completed in 1090 of the Yazdegird era (AY). The year 1090 is written above the line in West’s description of Dastur Jamasp’s copy (T) of JJ in Notebook 3, p. 227, where the colophon in Persian of JJ is copied. West also gives this date in the draft of a note, which would have accompanied the copy he made for Dastur Jamasp of some of the texts in Notebook 13 (Fig. 1):

Figure 1. Note by West giving the date of the ms. JJ as AY 1090 (1721 CE) on a loose piece of paper inserted in NB 13 after p. 20.

The following Pahl. texts are copied from my transcription of a very old MS. (DJ) in the library of Dastur Jamasp Minochiharji Jamaspasana in Bombay. They occur on fols. 19–2811 of DJ which is dated AY 691, but seems to be in the handwriting of the copyist of K20, who must have lived somewhat later, though fully 500 years ago. The letters in red ink have been eaten away in DJ; but are supplied from a transcript of a copy (T) made in Nawsâri in A.Y. 1090 and now in Teherân. DJ contains 25 distinct texts, varying from 45 to 3038 words in length and after the 14th text occurs a colophon copied by the writer in A.Y. 691 stating that ‘these memoranda’ were written in A.Y. 324 by Dên-panâh Aêtarpâî Dên-panâh in Brôgac (Bhrôc).

At the time West wrote this note, the original ms. JJ was in Tehran. JJ had been taken there by its then owner Manekji Limji Hataria, who was a keen collector of Zoroastrian manuscripts. According to West’s 1887, 264 and fn. 3 account of the history of JJ, Manekji Limji Hataria acquired the manuscript JJ in Mumbai “il y a à peu près 35 ans”. This would have been around 1852. In 1854, Manekji was sent to Iran as the first emissary of the Society for the Amelioration of the Condition of Zoroastrians in Persia, and it was

9JamaspAinsula 1913, 68 n.60, 72 n.1, 74 n.1, 127, n.8.
10E.g. West 1887, 264 and 1896–1904, p. 111.
11The texts West refers to are Šahrestânîhā i Erân (MK fols. 19v–26r6, West NB 13, 20.11–25.20) and Ahâdîh ud salîhîh i Sîstân (MK fols. 26v–28r4, West NB 13, 26.1–27.13).
presumably at that time that he took JJ to Tehran. After Manekji’s death on 15 February 1890, his library was bequeathed to the Parsi Community, and with it JJ came back to India. In a note on the bottom margin of p. 8 of Notebook 13, West records the presence of JJ in Bombay in July 1891 (Fig. 2):

Figure 2. West, Notebook 13, p.8 bottom margin

Red collation here is from a copy of this passage from the Tehran copy now (July 1891) in Bombay and said to be dated A.Y. 1136 (see Jivanji Jamshedji Modi’s letter of 4th June 1891).

The note indicates that West now dates the ms. JJ to AY 1136 on the basis of a letter of 4 June 1891 by J.J. Modi. This correction was presumably possible because the original manuscript had by then returned to Mumbai and was again available for consultation. While working on his Introduction to JamaspĀsīna’s Pahlavi Texts, Anklesaria 1913, 8–10 must have been able to consult the original manuscript JJ as he reproduces its colophons, which state that JJ was completed on day Hormazd, month Shahrewar AY 1136 (= 16th March 1767 CE).

The manuscript JJ then came into the possession of the Trustees of the “New Atash Behram” in Bombay. The “New Atash Behram” was established under the leadership of Dastur Jāmāspji on 17 October 1897 and named Anjuman Ateš Bahram. Around 1930 the Hataria collection was transferred from there to the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay, as recorded in the Annual Report for the year 1930 of the Cama Oriental Institute:

Manekji Limji Hateria Library. —As stated in the report for the year 1929, arrangements were made, by securing the order of the High Court, to transfer the above Library from the Anjuman Atash-behram to this Institute. The books and Ms. were selected by Prof. N. D. Minocherhomji and brought to this Institute, numbered as under:

- Avesta, Pahlavi and other books relating to Zoroastrianism……..38
- Ms. on the same subjects ……………………………………...28
- Books on miscellaneous subjects………………………………………..…………131
- Persian books and Ms. ……………………………………...923
  Total ……………..1,120

12Anklesaria 1913, 8. Similarly, Geldner 1896, xi fn.1 notes that the Avestan ms. Ml–4 of the collection of Manekji Limji Hateria have been “in the hands of a committee in Bombay” since Manekji’s death. Of these, the manuscript 4615_Ml3, a Pahlavi Videvād dated 1595 CE, is now kept in the Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, USA, where it is catalogued with the shelfmark X892.5 Av3 S2. Digital images of Ml3 were published by Miguel Ángel Andrés-Toledo on the website of the Avestan Digital Archive.

13Anklesaria 1913, p. 62.


15According to the report of 1929 (Journal of the Cama Oriental Institute 17, 1930, 98), an approach was made by Dr N. N. Katrak on behalf of the Bhagarsath Anjuman Atashbehram to hand over to the Cama Oriental Institute the Manekji Limji Hateria Library along with the fund of Rs. 5,000 belonging to the Hateria Library and six cupboards.
The ms. JJ could well have been among the ms. transferred to the COI, but unfortunately to date it has not been possible to locate it either there or anywhere else.

By the time JJ was returned to Bombay in 1891, West was living in England, and he never saw the original manuscript. What he used for his collations was a copy of JJ made by Dastur Jāmāspji, who must have copied JJ before it was taken to Tehran. In his Notebooks, West refers to this copy as T (for Tehran). West 1887, 264 mentions that Dastur Jāmāspji lent him his copy of JJ (i.e. T) in 1877 in order to fill the gaps in his own transcription of MK of 1875. 16 Since West returned to Europe in 1876, Dastur Jāmāspji must have sent his copy of JJ to West by mail or in some other way. It seems that upon completion of his work West sent the ms. T back to Bombay because Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana 1896, pp. xxx–xxxii seems to describe this manuscript, referring to it as “J”, although he did not collate it in his edition of the Kāmānak. That Sanjana’s “J” is not MK itself but a copy of it emerges clearly from the fact that Sanjana describes MK’s second colophon, which is of Mihrābān Kayhusraw, as that “of the original codex from which J. is derived”. Moreover, he provides the text of the Sanskrit colophon, which is lost in MK but present in JJ. Since JJ was available again in Bombay from 1891, Sanjana’s “J” could be that ms. However, Anklesaria 1913, 8 informs us that JJ is written 16–18 lines per page and has 172 folios while Sanjana’s description differs slightly from JJ in that his “J” has 347 pages (= 174 folios) written 12 lines to a page. These details perfectly agree with those provided by West, Notebook 3, p. 227 for Dastur Jāmāspji’s copy of JJ, for which West uses the siglum T: “T is a manuscript of 347 pages, 7¾” high × 6” wide, written 12 lines to a page.”

The present location of Dastur Jāmāspji’s copy (T) being unknown, all we currently have are the readings of T given by West in his Notebooks, alongside those of JJ provided by Jamaspâsūna 1913. For when Dastur Jāmāspji began his work on the edition of his Pahlavi texts in 1896 (Anklesaria 1913, p. 1), he would have had access to the original ms. JJ.

3. West’s copy (W) of texts copied in Notebook 13 (1890)

In 1890, while living in Munich, Germany, West copied his own 1875 copy of MK, preserved in Notebook 13, for Dastur Jāmāspji in order to aid the latter in his editorial work. The draft of a cover note by West has survived on a loose sheet following p. 20 of his Notebook 13. It is dated Munich, March 1890 and was meant to accompany the copy West made for Dastur Jāmāspji. The note states (Fig. 3)

(Heading of a copy made for Dastur Jāmāspji)

The following Pahlavi text is transcribed from a copy of Dastur Jāmāspji’s old MS (called Vishtâsp-shâh-nâmâk) made in 1875. The letters written in blue ink are eaten away in the old MS., and were supplied by guess in the copy of 1875, but have since been confirmed by comparison with a copy of a transcript made by Jamshêd JâmâspÂsū, in 1721, and belonging to Mânekji Limji of Teherân. The letters interlined in red ink are given from the copy of the transcript of 1721, where they could not be guessed in 1875, on where that copy differs from the guess

16West 1887, pp. 264–265 writes: “Il y a onze ans Dastûr Jâmâspji a bien voulu me permettre de copier son ancien manuscrit de 1322, et deux ans plus tard il me prêté une copie qu’il avait faite sur celle de Téhéran pour remplir les lacunes qui existent dans son ancien codex.”
then made. All variations of the copy of the transcript of MK of 1875 are neglected, as being manifestly errors, or emendations, of the copyists.

München, March 1890. EWW

Although West explicitly made the transcript of his copy for Dastur Jamaspji, Anklesaria 1913, p. 10, informs us that West sent the copy to his father, Ervad Tehmur Dinshaji Anklesaria “for facilitating Dastûr Jamaspji’s work.” In his edition of the Pahlavi texts, JamaspAsâna 1913 uses the siglum W to refer to West’s copy of 1890. The latter is now kept in the library of the Cama Oriental Institute, Mumbai under the signature Khata 4. According to Sheffield’s description, the volume has 68 pages and includes “various texts” of MK, starting with Text 1, the Ayâdgar i Zardâstân.17

Anklesaria 1913, p. 11, reports that West did not send copies of MK’s Text 5 Ėçdâg handarz i paryôkhsân (= Pand īmâg i Zardûst, PT pp. 41–50), Text 6 Handarz i dânâğân o mazdîsân (PT pp. 51–54), Text 7 Handarz i Husrav i Kawâdân (PT pp. 55–57), Text 24 Ayâdgar i Wuzîngimir (PT pp. 85–101), Text 27 Wîzañsî i cîtang ad nîhîsin i nêw-ardaxzîr (PT pp. 115–120), because editions of these five texts had been published by Peshotan Behram Sanjana in 1885. Nor did West provide a transcription of the Kârmânâg, a text which is also absent from West’s copy of MK of 1875. Notebook 13, p. 60 only provides a note stating that the Kârmânâg covers fol. 75r to fol. 108r of the codex MK. Accordingly, JamaspAsâna 1913 provides no readings reported by West for any of these six texts. The fact that the first five of them are present in West’s notebooks further confirms that JamaspAsâna was working with West’s copy of 1890, which West copied from his own transcription of MK of 1875, preserved in his Notebook 13. JamaspAsâna’s edition of 1913 omits the Kârmânâg on the grounds that Ervad Edalji Kersapji Antia used MK for his edition of the text,

17Sheffield 2009, 20.
published in 1900. Moreover, at the time Dastur Peshotan’s son Darab Peshotan Sanjana was also working on an edition the *Kārnāmag*, published it in 1896.\(^{18}\) However, Sanjana collated neither MK nor its copies JJ or T, although he describes the latter, referring to it as “J” (see above section 2).

4. The ms. DP (ca. 1350–1390?)

Like Dastur Jāmāspji, Dastur Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana (1828–1898), too, owned a remarkable collection of manuscripts, which he passed on to his son Darab Peshotan Sanjana (1857–1931). After the death of the latter, the manuscripts together with the printed books of the Sanjana collection were presented to the Cama Oriental Institute in 1933.\(^{19}\) Among the manuscripts of the Sanjana collection was the codex DP containing texts also found in MK, but in the absence of a catalogue it is difficult to verify whether the codex DP was among the six manuscripts recorded to have been donated to the Cama Oriental Institute in 1933.

Referring to DP with the siglum Pt, West 1896–1904, pp. 110–111, surveys the contents, and in Notebook 13, p. 101 he provides the following physical description of the manuscript, which was bound in an unusual way:

MS. D.P. belonging to the library of Dastur Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana. *Pahlavi Jāmāsp nāmak*, etc., 75 folios remaining out of 163 numbered, of old brownish Indian paper, 7½” × 4½”, written 14 to 17 lines to a page; folios generally uninjured, excepting some of the earlier ones. It has been written not to bind up as a book, but for each folio to be reversed separately whilst reading, so that the writing on one page is upside down to that on the other, and the folios appear to have been connected at the top in pairs, at least fols. 100 + 101 are so connected, so that after reading 100a you turn it up from the bottom and then have 100b and 101a before you ready for reading one below the other, and then turning up 101a from the bottom you have 101b similarly before you. — The folios are numbered in the centre of the top margin on the b side in Gujarati figures; this numbering extends up to 163, but the following 88 folios are missing: 1 to 16, 20 to 26, 32 to 73, 79 to 99, and 162; it seems likely also that some folios were missing before these numbers were written, as between fols. 132 + 133.

West 1887, 264 describes DP as “un manuscrit vraiment ancien” and as one with no date.\(^ {20}\) According to Sanjana 1885, English preface p. iv, DP was copied by Ervad Kāmdīn Shiehryār Nēryosangh Samand from a manuscript which was completed by “a chief Peshwa of our religion” at Bharuch on day Gōš, month Ardibehest in the Samvat year 1067 (= 1011 CE.) for the use of a pupil named Šāhzād, son of Šād. West 1887, 264 notes that Kāmdīn’s son Rām copied a manuscript dated 1410 CE, and Peshotan, the son of Rām and grandson of Kāmdīn, copied a further manuscript in 1397 CE. The latter is the miscellaneous codex M6 (Cod.Zend 51) obtained by Martin Haug in Surat in 1864 and now kept in the State Library

---

\(^{18}\) Anklesaria 1913, 32.

\(^{19}\) The Annual Report for 1933 (journal of the Cama Oriental Institute 27, 1934, 167) records a donation of six mss. and 59 books from the library of Dastur Darab S. Sanjana by his daughter, Mrs Ratanbai C. Badshah.

\(^{20}\) Haug 1872, p. 108, too, refers to DP as a “very old manuscript in Dastur Peshotanji’s library in Bombay.”
of München. On the basis of this data, West estimates that DP was copied between 1350 and 1390 CE.

The details of the place and beneficiary given by Sanjana for Kāmdīn’s original agree with those in col. 2 of MK fol. 74r4–5. The latter colophon belongs to the 10th-century manuscript of Dēn Panāh, the source manuscript from which the Texts 2–19 (and probably also Text 1, the Ayādgār ī Zaṛētuṇa) of MK were transcribed. However, the date AY 324 (956 CE) of MK’s colophon 2 is different from the year Samvat 1067 (1011 CE), which Sanjana gives for the completion of Kāmdīn’s original. Regardless of this discrepancy, it appears that DP derives not from MK, as almost all other copies do, but is an independent transcript of the source manuscript from which Texts 1–19 of MK ultimately also descend. François de Blois 2000, p. 88 already noted this when commenting that neither MK nor DP is copied from the other but they both descend from a common source.

During his third stay in India, in 1876, West fully transcribed those parts of DP which are either not included in MK (Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg or which were lost in MK at his time (MK Text 25 Māh ī Frawardīn Rāz ī Hordād, and MK Text 29 Mādayān ī sīn rōzāg). West’s transcription of these three texts of DP are preserved in Notebook 13, pp. 101–112, where West also surveys the other texts of DP which he did not transcribe but only collate with his transcriptions of other manuscripts, including MK.

The ms. DP has been noted as being a very rare witness of the Pahlavi version of the Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg (or, Jāmāsp Nāma). The typeset text of DP’s folios 17–19 (AJ 10.1–12.9) and folios 27–31 (AJ 16.4–43) of the Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg is reproduced in West 1904 and then again in Agostini 2013, pp. 367–375. West’s edition provides the text in the Pahlavi script “so far as it was extant in 1876 in a very old Manuscript belonging to the late Shams-ul-Ulama Dastur Dr. Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana” (West 1904, p. 97). That the typeset Pahlavi text he reproduced in the publication of 1904 is based on the transcription he made in 1876, and which is preserved in Notebook 13, pp. 102–109, is confirmed by the fact that the typeset text of DP published in 1904 includes words restored by West in his Notebook from the Pāzand version to fill gaps in the manuscript DP (Fig. 4).

West also collated the remaining texts of DP with those which are preserved in MK, providing the readings of the former in his transcription of the latter. That JamaspĀsāna 1913 worked with West’s copy of the manuscript DP rather than with the original emerges from Anklesaria 1913, 11, who informs us that the variants of DP and of five other manuscripts “were all kindly supplied by Dr West, but for which the texts would have been very imperfect”. A case in point are §§117–132 of the Handarz ī anōṣag-ruwān Ādurbād ī Māraspandān (Hand.Ādur. Mār., MK Text 12), which are lost in MK due to the loss of its folio 63. In his edition of the Pahlavi Texts, JamaspĀsāna, who on this occasion refers to DP as W, states that he has taken the text of these paragraphs “solely from W”, that is

---

23 JamaspĀsāna 1913, p. 83.
24 De Menasce 1950, p. 56.
25 On the manuscripts of the Pahlavi version of this text, see Agostini 2013, pp. 6–9.
26 JamaspĀsāna 1913, p. 69 fn.67.
from West’s transcript of 1890, discussed above in section 3, of his copy of MK of 1875. While JamaspĀśāna 1913, p. 69 edits the text of §§117–132 of this Handarz, West, Notebook 13, p. 50 (see Fig. 5) omits §§117–118 and only provides the text of §§119–132 from DP. It is unknown where JamaspĀśāna took the text of §§117–118 from.

Much of the text of MK’s lost folio 63 has thus been retrieved from DP through West’s copy of this manuscript. In his transcription of MK, the text of MK’s folio 64–65, covering Hand.Ādur.Mār. §§133–154, is collated with DP, whose readings are provided in red above
the words of MK written in blue ink (West, Notebook 13, pp. 50–52). The Handarz ī anšag-nuwan Ādurbaḏ ī Māraspandān ends at the bottom of MK’s folio 65, but folio 66, on which a new text should have started, is lost. In his transcription in Notebook 13, West leaves the remainder of page 52 and the first six lines of p. 53 blank. He might have been hoping to be able to supply the text lost with MK’s folio 66 from another manuscript, but unfortunately these lines in his Notebook 13 have remained blank. JamaspĀsānā 1913,
p. 77 supplies some of the text of MK’s lost folio 66 from other manuscripts. The text lost in MK on fol. 66 was possibly all of Mādayān t šīh yazdān, and §§1–3 of an unspecified fragment, retrieved by JamaspĀṣāna 1913, p. 72 from the ms. TDa. In August 1871 West copied the Mādayān t šīh yazdān in Notebook 3, 124–126 from M6 (Cod.Zend 51) of Martin Haug’s collection, the manuscript which was written by the grandson of the scribe of DP mentioned above, and collated the end of this text with DP fol. 74r10–77v, supplying text missing in M6 from DP.

5. Concluding Remarks

A close investigation of West’s transcription of texts preserved in the Pahlavi codex MK shows the extent to which his work informed the editorial work of Dastur Jāmāspji. On numerous occasions, readings edited by JamaspĀṣāna 1913 are in fact not those of the ms. MK but result from emendations made by West in his transcription of 1875, where he usually supplied, in pencil and by conjecture, words which are missing in MK due to damage to the manuscript. Usually West was later able to confirm or correct his restorations by collating other manuscripts, in particular the ms. T (Dastur Jāmāspji’s copy of the manuscript J]). In the case of the Handarz t amūšag-nuwān Ādurbadār Māraspandān in Notebook 13, pp. 43–51, where at the top of the folios of MK four lines are lost due to physical damage to the codex, he filled most of the gaps with readings, marked in pencil, “from a copy of H16 and H17” (Notebook 13, p. 43 bottom) except for the end, which he collated with DP. Almost all of West’s restorations have entered JamaspĀṣāna’s edition of 1913, many of them unmarked. Shortly before his death West is reported to have said with characteristic understatement that “although his studies and researches had always been undertaken for the sake of amusement and curiosity, they could hardly be considered as mere waste of time”.

In fact, they have long come to be regarded as a milestone, and his Notebooks reveal that his contributions to Pahlavi studies are even greater than hitherto thought.
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