

JUDITH JOSEPHSON: *The Pahlavi translation technique as illustrated by Hōm Yašt* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Iranica Upsaliensia. 2.) 214 pp. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1997.

Despite the long historical controversies about the value of the Pahlavi translation of the Avesta [PT], at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries scholars reached a consensus in their appreciation of the PT of certain texts, above all with regard to the vocabulary. A good example of this is Chr. Bartholomae's *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. But thereafter, due to certain unfortunate circumstances, the PT was almost completely forgotten. Only a few editions of bilingual texts and some articles by G. Klingenschmitt had been published before the appearance of Judith Josephson's book. No systematic study of the PT was thus available to her, so that her pioneer enterprise deserves to be regarded with the greatest sympathy and enthusiasm.

Josephson has taken the Hōm Yašt as the basis for her study. One could ask whether this was the best choice: Unvala's edition of this text is better than all other available editions of PT texts, and Iranian studies would have profited from a good edition of a new one. Her declared aims are firstly to analyse the syntax of the PT and its degree of dependence on the Avestan original, comparing its syntax with that of Book Pahlavi; and secondly, to study the translators' technique, especially the strategies used in translating the different grammatical categories of Avestan.

The study begins with an overview of the transmission of the Avesta and the role the PT played in it; Josephson limits herself to a rather schematic exposition of the facts, without giving her own views on the disputed points concerning the dating of the PT. Her brief review of the role of the PT in the history of Avestan studies does not provide any really new information. However, one can hardly make this a reproach against the author because such questions would have led her too far away from her central aim.

The second and third parts of the book are devoted to the editing and translation of the Avestan and Pahlavi versions. Her main attention is directed towards the Pahlavi text, of which a critical edition is provided (in transliteration and transcription). The author does not tell us which manuscripts she has used herself, and what part of her data comes from B. N. Dhabhar's edition (*Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad*, Bombay, 1949). For the Avestan original she gives only a standardized version following the transliteration criteria of K. Hoffmann (but not systematically: vid. Y.9.28 *aēnaghā* instead of the correct form *aēnaŋ'hā* or Geldner's *aēnaghā*). Unfortunately Josephson does not apply the usual editing conventions with regard to emendations to Geldner's text by marking emendations based on the manuscripts with * and those without direct textual support with †. With regard to the latter she merely indicates the origin of the conjecture in a footnote. It

would also have been desirable to supply the manuscript variants where the author differs from Geldner.

The translation of the Avestan texts includes almost all the improvements to Wolff's translation which have appeared in the literature during the present century. The author has largely succeeded in recording and evaluating the abundant and scattered bibliography on the different passages of the Hōm Yašt. Nevertheless, she does not provide any new interpretation of the Avestan text, probably because she was mainly concerned with the Pahlavi version. Unfortunately, while adopting various viewpoints she has not always tested their congruency, and sometimes we find mutually exclusive elements side by side.

On Y.10.20 the author follows Geldner (GrIrPhil. II, 48) only in part, and her translation is therefore incongruous: 'Praise for the cow! Praise for the cow! The protective formula for the cow, defence for the cow! The cow [is asked for] food, the cow [is asked for] clothing!'. Geldner's translation was: 'Die Kuh (bittet um) freundliche Rede und Schutz; an die Kuh (ist die Bitte um) Nahrung und Kleidung.' Geldner based his interpretation on an incorrect understanding of *nəmō* as 'Bitte'; Josephson does not accept his view and translates twice 'Praise for the cow!' (instead of Geldner's distinction between 'the cow has a request; there is a request to the cow'). A correct translation of the whole passage could be: 'Praise to the cow! Praise to the cow! The cow has the word, the cow has the defence. The cow has food, the cow has clothing', i.e., praise should be offered to the cow because she has word, defence, food and clothing and bestows them on mankind.

Despite the author's careful work, her interpretation of the Avestan text is sometimes wrong:

In Y.9.25 the well-known formula *ušta te yō* ..., actually 'Happiness to you who ...', is wrongly translated as 'Excellent are you who ...', which is grammatically impossible.

In Y.10.15 she edits *dasti* (despite J. Kellens's correction to *daste* with J.3. 7, Pt4, Mf2, C1, L1), a linguistically unacceptable form; the correct form would have been *dadāiti*. Only a middle form could show the zero grade in the root (av. *daste* = véd. *dattē*).

In Y.10.16 the author translates the following passage: *pancanam ahmi pancanqm noit ahmi/ humatahe ahmi dužmatahe noit ahmi huxtahe ahmi dužuxiahe noit ahmi huuarštahe ahmi dužuarštahe noit ahmi sraoŋsahē ahmi asruštōiš noit ahmi* 'I am [a partisan] of the five; I am no [partisan] of the five./ I am [a partisan] of him of good thought; I am no [partisan] of evil thought./ I am [a partisan] of him whose speech is good: I am no [partisan] of him whose speech is evil./ I am [a partisan] of him whose deeds are good; I am no [partisan] of him whose deeds are evil./ I am [a partisan] of the obedient one; I am no [partisan] of the disobedient one'. Josephson thus translates *humatahe*, etc. as exocentric compounds and not as the abstracts they actually are. And the enigmatic 'I am [a partisan] of the five; I am no [partisan] of the five' is left without any commentary because nobody has treated the

question recently. As a matter of fact there is a play on words here. In the first part the speaker declares himself to be a partisan of the five thoughts contained in the Ahuna Vairiō, as can be seen in Y.19.14 (a commentary on the Ahuna Vairiō), where we find *panca tkāēša* 'Five are the doctrines (contained in the Ahuna Vairiō)'. This is probably why in the cabalistic strophe Y.11.9 the number 'five' is represented by the word *mandāidiāi* 'to note in one's mind'. In contrast, in the second part the speaker declares himself not to be a partisan of the five deeds punished by the death penalty. For these five deeds, which are enumerated in V.15.1-8, no possible redemption exists. Asked how many of the kind there are, Ahura Mazda answers: 'five': (1) to criticize a Zoroastrian in front of a member of another religion (V.15.2); (2) to give a dog to eat bones that have not been previously cut, or food that is too warm (V.15.3-4); (3) to beat or choke a female dog which has recently given birth (V.15.5-6); (4) to copulate with a menstruating woman (V.15.7); (5) to copulate with a new-born child (V.15.8). Josephson pays much greater attention to the Pahlavi version, where her labours also produce their best results. Earlier work is very scanty and she has to carry the heaviest load of interpretation herself. The Pahlavi text is correctly interpreted and translated. Future studies will surely correct one or other detail, but as a whole, the author's work will be the basis for all future approaches to the PT of the Hōm Yašt. We miss only a translation of the Pahlavi commentaries.

Josephson has failed to notice that there are two different forms of the pronoun of the first person: the casus rectus *ANE*, whose reading is controversial, and the casus obliquus *mn/manj*. This leads her to an incorrect interpretation of the PT of Y.9.2: *azəm ahmi zarađuštra haomō ašauua dūraošō* 'I am, O Zarathuštra, righteous, death-destroying Haoma', PT *hōm hom zardušt hōm ī ahlaw ī dūrōš* 'I am Hōm, O Zardušt, righteous, death-destroying Hōm'. The correct reading of the translation of *azəm* is not *hōm* <hwm> but *ANE*, the ideogram of the casus rectus of the first person—a slightly different graphic combination—, so that the translation should read: 'I am, O Zardušt) righteous, death-destroying Hōm'.

In Y.9.7 Av. *āθβiiō*, the name of the father of Ōraētaona, is translated into Pahlavi as *āspiyan* (so J.J.); the author seems to believe both persons to be one and the same. But Phl. <spy'n> is a loanword from Av. *āθβiiānt-*, a patronymic of *āθβiia-* which is a usual epithet of Ōraētaona (vid. Air. Wb. 323). The translators seem to have confused *āθβiia* with his descendant *Ōraētaona*; Josephson translates as if *āspiyan* were identical with *āθβiia* (vid. p. 169). The reading is dubious as well: the variant <twbyw'n>. (vid. H. S. Nyberg, *Manual of Pahlavi*, II, 36) suggests rather the reading *jāhwiyān*.

One cannot always agree with Josephson's proposals concerning the correspondence between Avestan and Pahlavi words. For instance in Y.10.12a *āhuua pauuruatāhuua* → *andar ān gyāg* <ī> *purr-tāg* she indicates that the translator has misunderstood *pauuruatāhuua* and that he explains it by

means of *andar ān gyāg* <ī> *purr-tāg*. But the process seems to have been quite different. Phl. *ān* translates *āhuua*, which in its turn is specified by the gloss *gyāg*, and then follows the PT of *pauuruatāhuua*, where the translators have erroneously understood *pauuruua-* as a form of *pauru-*, whence the PT *purr* as well as the translation of *tāhuua* as *tāg*.

Especially noteworthy are the observations included in the commentaries following the translation and explaining the different ways in which the translators have been led to their erroneous interpretations. The knowledge of such mechanisms is crucial for a use of the PT in Avestan studies.

The book also marks a step forward in the field of Pahlavi lexicography. For a correct understanding of this text Josephson has been obliged to interpret a great number of words not registered in the well-known glossaries of H. S. Nyberg and D. N. MacKenzie. Given the desperate need for a Pahlavi dictionary, her glossary of Pahlavi words (p. 166-91) is a tool of inestimable value. We only miss, with regard to the words not previously registered, some information about their etymology, which is always necessary for a good reading, as well as some references to other occurrences in order to justify the author's interpretations. If she had simply trusted the meaning of the Avestan terms translated, she could often have been misled.

In Y.9.19. Phl. <zb'l> translates av. *zbaraθaēibiia* 'with your feet'. Basing herself on the Av. text the author translates Phl. <zb'l> by 'feet'. In MacKenzie's *Dictionary* we only find **zibāl* <zb'l> 'swift (horse, etc.)'. The situation is made even more complicated by the fact that Phl. <zb'l> also translates Av. *zbarah-* 'hill' (V.19.4, 11), which could suggest that it also means 'hill'. Most probably, however, an error has occurred in the translation of one or other of these cases. The author should have commented on the problem. It is, however, possible that Phl. *zβāl* corresponds to Av. *zbaraθa-*, and that in this word the second *a* is purely graphic: **zbarθa-* (Av. *zbaraθa-*) > **zbaθl* > *zβāl*.

A similar case is that of *gurdīh* in Y.9.24, translation of Av. *vərəδi-* 'growth, increase'. Josephson translates Phl. *gurdīh* by 'growth, increase' without any commentary. However Phl. *gurdīh* cannot be the equivalent of Av. *vərəδi-*, because the latter should regularly have yielded Phl. **gūl*. In Phl. we only know *gurdīh* 'heroism', an abstract formation on *gurd* 'hero' (<vr̥tV, cf. Sanskrit *vṛt-* 'army'). Here a translation error remains possible. However in Y.31.4 and V.20.8 Av. *vərəδ-* 'growth' is also translated by *gurdīh*. If we therefore consider the PT *gurdīh* as correct, this should be interpreted as a North-Western dialect form.

In Y.9.32 and Y.11.6 the Phl. form *mūdag* is translated by Josephson as 'destruction' because *mūdag zamestān* in V.2.22 (PT of *mrūra zītā*), which 'suggests an active meaning'. However, if we derive *mūdag* from **mūtaka-*, from the root *mū-* 'to have a dull mind' (cf. Av. *mūra-* and *mūraka-* 'stupid' [PT *mūdag*], Skr. *mūrā-* 'stupid', *mūkā-* 'mute'), we arrive at a better understanding of the exact sense of this form: *mūdag* means 'stupid, having a dull

mind', vid. DkM. 340.19 *ma hawēd mūdāg ud tabāh cīyōn mūdāg būd jān: ...-š dōšid rāmišn ī az sazišnig xwadāyih abar az ān ī asazišn kirbag* 'don't be stupid and useless as was Yima when preferring the bliss provided by kingdom to everlasting virtue'. Vr. 7.1 *amūiama* → *amūdāgih /ciš ī *ōšyārīh* 'the non-stupidity / (i.e.) a certain amount of consciousness'. Expressions such as DkM. 117.10 *mūdāg waran* 'blind desire', *mūdāg xēsm* 'blind wrath' are comparable to Spanish 'ira ciega'.

The most innovative part of this work is its study of the ways in which the different grammatical categories of Avestan are reflected in the PT. Such an analysis has never been undertaken before, despite its crucial importance evaluating the degree of grammatical correctness of the PT and making a sound use of it in Avestan studies. And the many attempts yet to be made to reconstruct lost Avestan texts on the basis of the preserved PTs have as a precondition for their success an exhaustive study of the ways in which the PT reflects Avestan grammatical categories. The data supplied by Josephson represent a first step in the right direction and an essential instrument for the study of the translation techniques applied. Given the limited length of the hymn analysed, the author's conclusions cannot be more than

partial; however this does not diminish their importance. Future studies will remain dependent on these results.

If, for instance, Josephson had worked with a greater quantity of materials, she would have seen that the distribution in the translation of the dual forms is not as she assumes it to be. The dual is usually translated by the plural, as expected, and the presence or absence of the ending *-ān* is only due to the difference between direct and oblique case.

The part devoted to the grammatical categories is followed by the most exhaustive study of the translator's technique so far. Josephson analyses syntactical as well as lexical facts, and she stresses the efforts made by the translators to achieve Pahlavi sentences that made good sense without much alteration to the Avestan word order. Concerning the lexicon one would have appreciated greater attention to the use of the Avestan loanwords, less frequent in this text than in later ones but nevertheless an important feature of the translation.

The Pahlavi and Avestan glossaries round off a work which, despite some gaps, must be considered as a pioneer effort that will be essential for every future study of the PT of Avestan texts.

N. ALBERTO CANTERA GLERA

SOUTH ASIA

KLAUS KARTTUNEN: *India and the Hellenistic world*. (Studia Orientalia, 83.) x, 439 pp. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 1997.

This is a very substantial study, a sequel to the author's doctoral dissertation, *India in early Greek literature* (1989). It provides a massive bibliography of relevant scholarship, and what I take to be an unequalled survey of ancient sources bearing on its theme. Though the author defines his standpoint as that of the Indologist, his coverage of obscurer Classical authorities is so thorough as to have turned up unnoticed details even in well-worked areas. He has searched through Pliny's *Natural History*, a gold mine of surprising information; and again Aelian's *Natura Animalium*, where he has discovered (p. 205: 15, 8; 16.3) an unnoticed reference to Eucratides, an echo of a lost source for the Bactrian kingdom: *πόλις ἐστὶν ἢν ἤρχε Σώρας ὄνομα, ἀνὴρ γένους βασιλικοῦ, ὅτε καὶ Βάκτρων ἤρχεν Εὐκρατίδης. ὄνομα δὲ τῆ πόλει Περιμίουλα, κατοικοῦσι δ' αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Ἰχθυοφάγοι.*

Especially fascinating is ch. v, 'Bird-watchers and story-tellers', with its descriptions of Indian plants, beasts and birds. The standard descriptions of Indian fruits make an interesting comparison with those of the Arab traveller Ibn Battūta (ed. Gibb, III, 1971, 609) who is fuller than the Classical authors, describing—besides the jack-fruit, banana, mango and jujube—the orange and several others. Many exotic spices, medicaments and dyestuffs, such

as bdellium, malabathrum, myrobalan, spike-nard and indigo, are also reported. Among the birds, particularly intriguing was, in Aelian, *Natura Animalium*, 17, 33 'A gay-coloured bird flying upside down and barking like a dog'. This has been identified by one commentator with the *monāl* pheasant (a bird the size of a capercaillie, with blue-black plumage, and a stubby yellow tail). However, it better fits the *hubāra* bustard. The incredible *caireus* (p. 207) 'the size of a peacock and multi-coloured, with emerald wing-tips, a vermilion face and blue-grey head with saffron speckles. Its legs are orange in colour ...' is again likened to the *monāl*, but the description better fits the more exotic tragopan.

Chapter vi provides an unusually accomplished survey of knowledge on the Greek East, including the Indo-Bactrian kingdoms and their coinage. The author disclaims expertise on numismatic questions (p. 272), and sometimes seems puzzled that in this field authorities are often at variance. Yet this situation does not imply numismatic evidence, so far as it goes, is unreliable. It is rather that on many questions the coin evidence is indecisive, and conclusions optional. When, however, decisive arguments emerge, as for the differentiation of Antimachus Theus and Antimachus Nicephorus, settled by the Sangcharak parchment (pp. 290, 308), matters are quickly clarified.

One may notice a few details inviting query or discussion. On p. 44, about the Gedrosian Ichthyophagi ('Fish-Eaters'), it could be noted, though the name was no doubt justified by local consumption of fish, that there was also