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Suddenly I knew that you’d have to go
My world was not yours, your eyes told me so
Yet it was there I felt the crossroads of time
And I wondered why.

(...) 

The thundering waves are calling me home to you
the pounding sea is calling me home to you.

A mi familia, por todo.
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## Abbreviations

**Texts and editions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aog</td>
<td>Aogomadaēca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP</td>
<td>Atharvaveda Saṁhitā (Paippalāda recension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVŚ</td>
<td>Atharvaveda Saṁhitā (Śaunakīya recension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>Ayādgar ī Wuzurgmīhr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āny</td>
<td>Ātakṣ Nyāyiṉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>Dādestān ī Dēnīg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dk</td>
<td>Dēnkard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FiŌ</td>
<td>Frahang ī Ōīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrW</td>
<td>Fragment Westergaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>Geldner, K. F. (1896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GrBd</td>
<td>Great Bundahišn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Herbedestān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>Hošbām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdt.</td>
<td>Herodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>Hādōxt Nask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndVS</td>
<td>Indian Vīdēvdād Sāde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IrVS</td>
<td>Iranian Vīdēvdād Sāde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jmp)</td>
<td>Jāmāsp, H. (1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Madan, D. M. (1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>Unvala, E. M. R. (1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Nērangestān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Nāmagīhā ī Manuščihr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ny</td>
<td>Nyāyiṉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRDd</td>
<td>Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Pahlavi translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Pahlavi Vīdēvdād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Ṛgveda Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sīh rōzag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SdB</td>
<td>Saddar Bundahišn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrB</td>
<td>Śrōš Bāj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šnš</td>
<td>Šāvist nē šāyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vīdēvdād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViD</td>
<td>Wīzargard ī Dēnīg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>Vaēḏā Nask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vr</td>
<td>Vīsparad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Vīdēvdād Sāde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyt</td>
<td>Viṣṭāsp Yašt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZ</td>
<td>Wīzīdagīhā ī Zādspram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yasna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YH</td>
<td>Yasna Haptañhāiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt</td>
<td>Yašt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**General abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act.</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aor.</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>Avestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>confert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir.</td>
<td>direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du.</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff.</td>
<td>following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id.</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>id est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE.</td>
<td>Indoeuropean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIr.</td>
<td>Indoiranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imper.</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khot.</td>
<td>Khotanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwar.</td>
<td>Khwaremsian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masc.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP.</td>
<td>Middle Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMP.</td>
<td>Manichaean Middle Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neut.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP.</td>
<td>New Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv.</td>
<td>Old Avestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OInd.</td>
<td>Old Indian</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>
<tr>
<td>Orm.</td>
<td>Ormuṟī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par.</td>
<td>Parāṟī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parth.</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāz.</td>
<td>Pāzand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phl.</td>
<td>Pahlavi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE.</td>
<td>Proto-Indoeuropean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIr.</td>
<td>Proto-Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP.</td>
<td>past passive participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skr.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogd.</td>
<td>Sogdian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAv.</td>
<td>Young Avestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ved.</td>
<td>Vedic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vid.</td>
<td>vide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax.</td>
<td>Waxī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signs**

- | | subdivision of sentences in each paragraph according to the break of the Avestan text by its Pahlavi translation
- | | omits
\( / \) | \( / \) insertion of one or some words in a different language
[ | ] Pahlavi word, gloss or explanation added to the Pahlavi translation and finding no direct correspondence with the Avestan text
+ | emendation of an edition according to the variant of another manuscript
\( x \) | reconstructed word
\( * \) | impossible reconstruction
\( \# \) | derives from
\( \# \) | results in
\( < \) | in transliteration, Pahlavi word;
\( > \) | in transcription, word(s) supplied
\( # \) | word or syllable ending
\( \circ \) | abbreviation of part of a word or compound
\( \rightarrow \) is rendered into
Introduction

As a result of his own research in the field of Avestan philology my director, Prof. Dr. Alberto Cantera, highlighted some years ago the urgent need to once again edit the Avestan text of Vīdēvdād together with its Pahlavi translation. He started this overwhelming project some 15 years ago. He edited V 1–4 as part of his doctoral thesis, and following this he worked on the edition of the following five chapters, V 5–9.

As a result of many years’ extensive study of the Avestan text of Vīdēvdād and its Pahlavi translation he also became fully aware of the importance of reviewing its oral and written transmission before editing this text once more. Thus, first within the scope of his own Vīdēvdād Project and more recently in his next initiative, the Avestan Digital Archive (ADA) Project, he started and guided our team’s search for all the Avestan manuscripts of Vīdēvdād and of other Avestan texts all over the world. As a result of this search, many new manuscripts of Vīdēvdād have recently been brought to light; this has changed our view about the transmission of Vīdēvdād and other texts. Together with the mistakes found in the critical edition of K. F. Geldner (1896), the need of a new critical edition of the Avesta is all the more necessary.

In the scope of this project, my doctoral thesis, comprising a critical edition, translation and commentary of the Avestan and Pahlavi texts of the fragard or chapters 10–12 of Vīdēvdād, tries to be a contribution to a new complete edition of Vīdēvdād.
A) CONTENTS, STRUCTURE AND RITUAL IN V 10-12

1. THE TEXT OF VĪDĒVDĀD AND THE VĪDĒVDĀD CEREMONY

Vīdēvdād (< Av. *vīdaēuua- dāta- “prescriptions to keep the demons away”) was the Nask or book 19th of the 21 Nasks of the Sasanian Avesta. It is also the only one completely preserved, if we must trust the Dēnkard’s description of the contents of the Nasks. This is almost certainly due to its importance in the Vīdēvdād ceremony.

The text of Vīdēvdād has been preserved in two types of manuscripts: those with Pahlavi translation and those without. The first manuscripts, which may continue the Sasanian Great Avesta (Cantera 2004 24, 29), divided the Avestan text into 22 fragard or chapters. The manuscripts of Vīdēvdād without Pahlavi translation, known as Vīdēvdād Sāde, continue the ritual Avesta, and their texts are distributed according to their recitation in the Vīdēvdād ceremony. The Avestan text of Vīdēvdād is intertwined in this ceremony with the Avestan texts of Yasna and Vīsparad, according to the following simplified scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avestan Text</th>
<th>Ritual Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1.1-8</td>
<td>Vr 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 1.10-2.8</td>
<td>Vr 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 2.10-11.8</td>
<td>Vr 3.2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 11.9-15</td>
<td>Vr 3.6-Vr 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 11.16-Y 14</td>
<td>Vr 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 15</td>
<td>Vr 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 16-17</td>
<td>Vr 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 18-21</td>
<td>Vr 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 22</td>
<td>Vr 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 23-27</td>
<td>Vr 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 vid. (Cantera 2006b 61-62), where Av. daēuua- refers especially to evil beings causing impurity, against Benveniste’s (1970 42) interpretation of “vīdaēuua- dāta- as “Loi d’abjuration des Dieux”.

2 vid. (Geldner 1896 11), (Modi 1922 351-354), (Hintze 2004 302).
With regards to the position of the text of Vīdēvdād in the Vīdēvdād ceremony, Skjærvø (2007a 129) says that the chapters of Vīdēvdād are distributed before, between, and after the Old Avestan texts, in order to join forces with them to annihilate the forces of evil. He even remarks that no correlation between the text of Vīdēvdād and the Gāϑās can really be seen, with only two exceptions: a) V 1-2, which corresponds to the mythical texts of Y 29-30; b) V 19-22, which fits with Y 53-54.1.

Furthermore, according to Skjærvø (2007a 122), the mythical significance of Vīdēvdād “is about removing evil from the world of the living and about healing both it and the world of thought”. He (2007a 129) also states that, in the mythical division of the time in 9000 years (3000 for the Primordial Creation; 3000 for the Mixture; 3000 for the Future Body), the time frame of Vīdēvdād is the second 3000 years, that is, the period of Mixture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y 28-30</th>
<th>Vr 13</th>
<th>V 5-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y 31-34</td>
<td>Vr 14</td>
<td>V 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 35-42</td>
<td>Vr 16-17</td>
<td>V 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 18</td>
<td>V 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 43-46</td>
<td>Vr 19</td>
<td>V 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 20</td>
<td>V 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 21-22</td>
<td>V 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 52-53</td>
<td>Vr 23</td>
<td>V 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 24</td>
<td>V 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 55-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The role and disposition of the Avestan text of Vīdēvdād in the Vīdēvdād ceremony, as well as its ritual and mythical significance, have been recently dealt with by Cantera in his conference "Videvdad: pensée, acte et parole" at the École des Hautes Études in 2008. According to him, the distribution of the texts in the Vīdēvdād ceremony, and subsequently in the Vīdēvdād Sāde manuscripts, depends on the division of the staota yesniia (the Old Avestan texts recited between the yaϑā. abū. vairiō and a. airiiōmah. išiō prayers) in the Vīsparad ceremony. Within a ceremony based on the Vīsparad type, that is, in the Vīsparad, Vīdēvdād or Vīštāsp Yašt ceremonies, the staota yesniia could be divided into different parts. They are mostly divided into 9 or 21 parts, to which another one representing the yaϑā. abū. vairiō prayer can be added. Thus, they are arranged either in 1+9 or in 1+21 parts.

In the Vīdēvdād ceremony the texts were distributed on the basis of the division of the staota yesniia of the Vīsparad ceremony in 9 parts or *karta-. The Avestan texts of Vīsparad and Vīdēvdād were added to it as *pari-karta-, that is, as fragard, according to the following sequence extracted from Cantera’s paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*karta-</th>
<th>*pari-karta-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vr 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y27.6</td>
<td>V 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y27.7-27.final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vr 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 28-30</td>
<td>V 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vr 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 32-34.13</td>
<td>V 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vr 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 35-42</td>
<td>V 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 43-46</td>
<td>V 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vr 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 47-50</td>
<td>V 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vr 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 51 (repetition of Y 35-42)</td>
<td>V 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vr 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 52-53</td>
<td>V 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vr 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 54</td>
<td>V 21-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Cantera, the ninefold division of the text of Vīdēvdād in the Vīdēvdād ceremony corresponds, from a ritual point of view, to the nine holes of the Barōsnūm ceremony and, from that of its mythical significance, with the

---

3 Its name derives from the fact that it begins with the purification of the top of the head (Av. barōsnūm. vaykāan, cf. V 8.40) and it is the most important purification’s ceremony in Zoroastrianism. It has been described extensively by some scholars: (Anquetil-Duperron 1771 2.546), (Spiegel 1852-1863 1.295), (Darmesteter 1892-1893 2.162), (West 1882 435), (Modi 1922 97-
Zoroastrian division of the time in 9000 years. Since the nine holes of this ceremony are distributed according to three sets of three holes, Cantera proposes that the same distribution could be applied thematically to the chapters of Vīdēvdād, which would also fit the mythical division of the time in Zoroastrianism in three periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of time</th>
<th>Chapters of Vīdēvdād</th>
<th>Holes in the Barōsnūm-gāh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primordial Creation</td>
<td>V 1-3</td>
<td>First set of three holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phl. bundahīšn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>V 4-18</td>
<td>Second set of three holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phl. gumēzišn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Body (Phl. tan i pasēn or frašegird)</td>
<td>V 19-22</td>
<td>Third set of three holes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, the division of Vīdēvdād into 22 fragard, also found in other exegetical Nasks (Sūdgar, Waršmānsar, Bay), would be the result of the numerological speculation about the yaštā. abū. vairiō and would correspond to the distribution of the staota yesniia in 22 chapters in complex rituals. According to Cantera this can be seen in the following correspondence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y 27.13 yaštā. abū. vairiō (4x)</td>
<td>V 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y 27.14 ašom. vohū (3x)</td>
<td>V 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y 27.15 yeṣṣē. hātam</td>
<td>V 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y 28.0 yēnīm. manō</td>
<td>V 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y 29 xōmēbiū. gōṣī. uruā</td>
<td>V 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y 30 at. tā. vaxšītā. išēntō</td>
<td>V 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y 31 tā. vō. uruātā</td>
<td>V 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y 32 aṇīūcā. saētuš</td>
<td>V 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y 33.1 yaštāiš. ēdā</td>
<td>V 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y 34.1 yē. ūrāōdānā</td>
<td>V 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>YH</td>
<td>V 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y 43.1 uštā. abmāi</td>
<td>V 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y 44.1 taē. ḍē. pōrēsā</td>
<td>V 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y 45.1 āt. frauūxšiū</td>
<td>V 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y 46.1 kēm. nā. mōi. zām</td>
<td>V 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y 47.1 spēntā. mainīū</td>
<td>V 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y 48.1 yezī. adāiš</td>
<td>V 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Y 49.1 at. mā. yānuā</td>
<td>V 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Y 50.1 kaē. mōi. uruā</td>
<td>V 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Y 51.1 vohū. ḥxādram</td>
<td>V 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Y 53.1 vahēštā. īštīṣ</td>
<td>V 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Y 54.1 a. auriōmā. īštīō</td>
<td>V 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his opinion, both divisions merged into the preserved text of the Vīdēvdād Sāde manuscripts, where the 22 chapters of the Sasanian Great Avesta were still numbered, but they were distributed according to the nine parts of Vīdēvdād in the Ritual Avesta. This shows the ritual disposition of the chapters in the Vīdēvdād ceremony according to the staota yesnia and their correspondence with the holes of the Barašnūm ceremony. I believe that Cantera’s explanation is very likely to be true.

My edition of V 10-12 follows Cantera’s conclusions. Indeed, the choice of editing together the fragard 10-12 of Vīdēvdād is motivated not only by the fact that he has already edited V 1-9, but also by his new approach to a comprehensive understanding of the structure, as well as the ritual and mythical significance of Vīdēvdād.

On one hand, V 9 forms a unity with V 8 because both deal with the Barašnūm ceremony. On the other hand, V 10 was understood as the continuation of V 9 and is closely related to V 11.

In V 10 a combination of Old Avestan texts followed by spells is recited to expel the demons in the context of a purification ceremony, perhaps the Barašnūm. V 11 contains formulas and spells for minor purification rituals. So their structure is parallel: Old Avestan texts followed by spells in purification ceremonies.

V 12 seems to be a complement to V 11; in the list of things to be purified in V 11, the first is the house. V 12 deals with the ceremonies to be performed in order to purify the house and other items as a result of the death of relatives. Thus, both are thematically linked on account of the ceremonies to purify the house.

The following fragard, V 13 and 14, dealing with the dog and dog-like animals, have no direct relation with V 10-12. Furthermore, because of thematic reasons, V 10-12 must be edited separately from V 13-14.
2. CONTENTS, STRUCTURE AND RITUAL IN V 10

V 10 deals with the texts to be recited twice, thrice or four times in order to expel the Nasu. It is structured according to the following scheme:

- V 10.1: Zaraϑuštra’s question about how to fight Nasu (= V 9.45).
- V 10.2: 1st part of Ahura Mazdā’s answer: to recite some texts twice, thrice or four times (= V 9.46).
- V 10.3-4: texts to be recited twice (Y 28.1, 35.2, 35.8, 39.4, 41.3, 41.5, 43.1, 47.1, 51.1, 53.1).
- V 10.5-6: spells.
- V 10.7-8: texts to be recited thrice (Y 27.14, 33.11, 35.5, 53.9).
- V 10.9-10: spells.
- V 10.11-12: texts to be recited four times (Y 27.13, 34.15, 54.1).
- V 10.13-14: spells.
- V 10.15-17: resume of the effects of the spells.
- V 10.18: 2nd part of Ahura Mazdā’s answer: to dig the nine holes (in the Barəšnūm-gāh).
- V 10.19-20: other texts to be recited (Y 27.13, 46.7, 44.16; SrB 3).

V 10 has been put in relation with the Barəšnūm ceremony described in V 9 because of two principal reasons:

1. Zaraϑuštra asks Ahura Mazdā which are the formulas to be recited twice, thrice and four times in V 9.46, that is, in the context of the Barəšnūm ceremony, and the same is asked in V 10.1.
2. In V 10.18 it is prescribed to dig nine holes, which fits the digging of nine holes in the Barəšnūm ceremony.

De Harlez (1875-1877 1.191) was the first who noticed the affinity between V 9 and V 10 and stated that V 10 is the continuation of V 9 or even a loosen fragment from it or from another text dealing with the same subject: the Barəšnūm ceremony. According to him, the presence of V 10.18 in this fragard cannot be explained otherwise.

Moreover, Darmesteter (1887 134) believed that V 10 refers to the Barəšnūm ceremony of V 9. He also stated that we cannot know whether the spells in V 10 must accompany those of V 9 when the impure one is being cleansed or whether they must be recited at the end of the ceremony, as this is not explicitly stated. In his French translation, however, Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.173) changed his opinion and thought that V 10 was to be connected with the recitation of the five Gāϑās and the Yasna Haptaϑhāṭī in a funerary context.

---

4 “Le Xe fargard n’est que la continuation du précédent, ou plutôt ce n’est qu’un fragment détaché soit de ce chapitre, soit d’un autre traitant le même sujet” (de Harlez 1875-1877 1.191).
Pirart (1995 18-19) suggested that the number of times the texts have to be recited, namely two, three and four, were equivalent to the number of holes where the impure liquids are collected in the purificatory ceremonies.

In his recent book, Pirart (2007a 57-59) says that the times the formulas must be repeated matches the number of demons expelled. He states that the Evil Spirit and Nasu are expelled by means of the formulas to be recited twice; Indra, Sauru and Nāŋhaiðiia by means of those to be recited thrice; and Aēšma, Akataśa, Varəniiia and Vāta by means of those to be recited four times. In order to avoid the apparent isolation of Tauruui and Zairicī, Pirart (2007a 57-59) considers that Nāŋhaiðiia was originally a dual and that Tauruui and Zairicī were the explanation of this dual. Thus, after the formulas to be said thrice, three demons would be expelled instead of five, and there would be a perfect correspondence between the times the formulas must be recited and the number of demons they expel.

Pirart’s (2007 57-59) interpretation is suggestive. However, I disagree with it for a number of reasons. Firstly, after the formulas to be said twice, four demons are expelled: the Evil Spirit, Nasu, Direct defilement and Indirect defilement. Pirart did not pay attention to the Direct and Indirect defilement, but they cannot simply be obviated. Secondly, Nāŋhaiðiia was not a dual in Avestan; even if this was true and Tauruui and Zairicī glossed Nāŋhaiðiia, it would be hardly explainable that they were not just mentioned immediately after the word they supposedly glossed. On the contrary, they have their own sequence of paiti.pərəne and even a complete list of elements (haca + noun) from which they are exorcised. Because of this, we cannot assume three groups of two, three and four demons respectively without manipulating the text, in which actually not 9 but 13 demons are mentioned.

In his conference “Videvdād: pensée, acte et parole" at the École des Hautes Études (2008), as well as in his recent communication "Daēuas vertreibende Worte" at the conference Démens irannienes in Liège (2009), Cantera partially follows de Harlez’s interpretation. Like de Harlez, he considers that V 10 is a development of V 9.45-46 dealing with the Barəšnūm ceremony, as the mention of the nine holes of this ceremony in a purification’s context in V 10.18-19 indicates. Cantera states that each of the three groups of texts mentioned in V 10 are recited during the ablutions in each set of holes. Moreover, he adds that these groups of texts of V 10 represent a variation with regards to those prescribed in V 8 and 9, but the scheme is the same in each of them: Old Avestan text + spell.

Furthermore, according to Cantera, V 10 is the summarised version of the Videvdād ceremony. In this ceremony the recitation of the Old Avestan texts is combined with that of the Avestan text of Videvdād. The whole of the Avestan text of Videvdād acts here as a spell against the demons. Now in V 10 sequences of Old Avestan texts followed by spells are recited in order to expel the demons. Hence Cantera concludes that the structure of V 10 and that of the Videvdād ceremony are symbolically connected: the Old Avestan texts of the Videvdād ceremony would be summarised in the Old Avestan texts of V 10, while the recitation of the Avestan text of Videvdād in this ceremony would be substituted by the spells of V 10. In this context, V 10 would be not only the continuation of V 9, but also a

---

5 Pirart (2007a 79) admits that, in the list of demons of GrBd 27.5-17, Tāriz and Zāriz are not the explanation of a dual Nanhais.
The purification's ceremony is like a summary of the whole of the purification's ceremony of Vidēvdād. In his opinion, the texts to be recited twice, thrice and four times are abridged symbolic recitations of the whole Old Avesta.

Cantera’s interpretation is evocative, but I also want to call attention upon a problem concerning the structure of V 10 and its relation with the Barašnūm ceremony.

The structure of V 10 and its correspondence with V 9 indicate that both texts could have been part of one single oral composition dealing with the Barašnūm ceremony, and that they probably became separated as independent fragard when the canon of 22 fragard came into being. Perhaps part of V 8, V 9 and V 10, where we find descriptions of parts of this ceremony, were included in this oral composition, and only afterwards they were scattered into different fragard. This conjecture gains plausibility if we take into account the parallel of V 13-14, where it is evident that the end of V 13 belongs to V 14 and that they were wrongly divided.

From the point of view of the composition, V 10 is the result of the combination of different texts. V 9.45-46 is repeated in V 10.1-2 with the only difference of the beginning of V 9.45 (Av. paiti. dim. parəsata. zarədustrō) and the end of V 9.46 (Av. magniion. ba. ... raštīia. varəna), which lacks in V 10.1 and 10.2 respectively. From V 10.3 to V 10.17 the continuation of V 9.46 is given. But V 10.18-20 appears in an unexpected position with regard to the Barašnūm ceremony: the sequence of texts to be recited twice, thrice and four times (V 10.3-17) surely should not appear before the holes were dug (V 10.18). As a matter of fact, there is no parallel in the known variants of the Barašnūm ceremony where these formulas were prescribed before digging of the holes. The reason is clear: before the enclosure for the impurity has been built, it makes no sense to pronounce such spells. Accordingly, from the point of view of the ritual, V 10.18-20 seems to have been misplaced.

With regards to its connection with the Barašnūm ceremony, V 10.18-20 does not only seem a misplaced part. It is composed using abridged texts from different sources not fully understandable by themselves, which however make sense only in the context of the Barašnūm ceremony:

- V 10.18a: in this passage the digging of the nine holes is prescribed. Some indications about where they must be dug follow in V 10.18b-c, which seem to be glosses to V 10.18a.
- V 10.18b specifies where the holes must be dug. It reproduces V 3.15b, but does not include the words yaoždātō.zəmōtəməmca. huškō.zəmō.təməmca of V 3.15c.
- V 10.18c: the text xanaibši.xūragā. pasu.vīra “not drinkable by both flock and men” seems to be a gloss to V 10.18b. It is related to V 6.32c ajiš.xūragā. pasubīia. vīragībīia “drinkable by both flock and men”, referred to the water made pure after removing the impurity caused by Nasu (s. the commentary to V 10.18).

V 10.18a-c summarises some indications about the preparation of the Barašnūm-gāh.

From V 10.18d on, some formulas are recited. V 10.18d-f repeats V 5.21c-e. The insertion of this text in V 10 could be explained by the word yaoždā of V
5.21c-d, interpreted as “purification”, which fits the context of the Barəšnūm ceremony. Whether or not this text of V 10.18d-f was a formula correctly used in some part of the ceremony, I cannot decide. However, the parallel of the modern practice can give us the key to solve this problem.

Indeed, the final words humatāišca. hūxtāišca. huuarštāišca of V 10.18f resemble the words humata, hūxta, huuarṣṭa which the candidate pronounces in modern practice when he enters into the pāvi B at the beginning of the Barəšnūm ceremony (Modi 1922 124). Here the person to be purified pronounces his name together with these words. Provided that V 10.18f is to be interpreted in the same way, the meaning of this passage would be clearer: yō. bhuqm. daēqm. yaożdāite “he who purifies his own religious conscience” should be substituted with the name of the person to be purified in each case. After pronouncing his name, he would say the words humatāišca. hūxtāišca. huuarštāišca when he is going to enter into the Barəšnūm-gāh. If my interpretation is right, V 10.18d-f could be formulas to be recited at the beginning of the Barəšnūm ceremony.

According to this, the formula of V 10.19a (daēqm. ... daēnaii) could have been pronounced by the priest, and afterwards the person to be purified would also repeat V 10.18f (= 10.19b), possibly at the beginning of the ceremony. Finally, the formulas of V 10.20 (Y 27.13, 46.7, 44.16; SrB 3) would be used as a closing bāǰ, as Cantera (in his unpublished communication "Daēuuas vertreibende Worte", 2009) observes.

In such case, prescriptions and formulas of the Barəšnūm ceremony lacking in V 9 could have been mentioned in these apparently unconnected texts of V 10.
3. CONTENTS, STRUCTURE AND RITUAL IN V 11

V 11 deals with texts to be recited in order to purify each item mentioned. The text-types of the PV and the VS differ in the structure of V 11. The PV manuscripts attest the following sequence:
- Zarathuštra’s question about how to purify the house and several other items (V 11.1).
- Ahura Mazda’s answer: to recite some purification’s formulas (V 11.2).
- To recite five Ahuna Vairiia (V 11.3).
- To purify the house and the fire (V 11.4).
- To purify the water and the earth (V 11.5).
- To purify the cattle and the plants (V 11.6).
- To purify the righteous man and the righteous woman (V 11.7).
- To recite eight Ahuna Vairiia (V 11.8).
- To recite the apotropaic formula *paršta* + evil being (V 11.9-10).
- To recite four Ahuna Vairiia (V 11.11).
- To recite the apotropaic formula *paršta* + evil being (V 11.12-13).
- To recite four mazdā. at. mōi (V 11.14).
- To recite the apotropaic formula *paršta* + evil being (V 11.15-16).
- To recite five Ahuna Vairiia (V 11.17).

According to the PV, the sequence of *paršta* + evil being of V 11.15-16 would not be closed by the corresponding *paršta* + evil being. Since the previous sequence with *paršta* + evil being of 11.9-10 is closed by the sequence with *paršta* + evil being of 11.12-13 in the PV as well as in the VS manuscripts, we expect that the sequence with *paršta* + evil being in 11.16 would also be closed by a parallel *paršta* + evil being. The latter lacks in the PV, but it is found in the VS manuscripts.

Actually, the VS manuscripts attest a more coherent structure. The sequence is the same until V 11.16, but these manuscripts attest four ā. airiṣṭmā. iṣiō before the five Ahuna Vairiia prescribed in 11.17, then the apotropaic formula “*paršta* + evil being” and finally five Ahuna Vairiia:
1 sequence with *paršta* + evil being (V 11.9-10).
4 Ahuna Vairiia (V 11.11).
1 sequence with *paršta* + evil being (V 11.12-13).
4 mazdā. at. mōi (V 11.14).
1 sequence with *paršta* + evil being (V 11.15-16).
4 ā. airiṣṭmā. iṣiō (V 11.17).
1 sequence with *paršta* + evil being (V 11.18-19).
5 final Ahuna Vairiia (V 11.20).

According to this, the recitation of the four ā. airiṣṭmā. iṣiō and the last *paršta* + evil being were omitted in the common source of our extant PV manuscripts, surely because of a *saut du même au même*. Cantera (under preparation D) comes to the same conclusion. On the contrary, the VS manuscripts
preserve the right text. Indeed, in the VS both spells with ārənə + evil being are closed by their correspondent ərənə + evil being and the sequences (ārənə + evil being) + (ərənə + evil being) are closed by purification’s formulas. So the sequence in the VS tradition is more coherent. This is why I have preferred to edit the Avestan text according to it and unlike the PV tradition, which Geldner followed in his edition.

Geldner omitted three passages at the end of V 11 and they are long enough to continue Geldner’s numbering as V 11.17. As these passages appear at the end of V 11, the change of Geldner’s numbering does not cause too much confusion. So I have preferred not to follow Geldner’s numbering in this case and I have added these passages as V 11.17-19. My V 11.20 would correspond with Geldner’s V 11.17.

To summarise, after the correction by means of the VS, the structure of V 11 is the following:
- V 11.1: Zarāϑuštra’s question about how to purify the house and several other items.
- V 11.2: Ahura Mazda’s answer: to recite some purification’s formulas.
- V 11.3: (SrB 2; Y 27.13) x 5 + (Y 46.7, 44.16; SrB 3).
- V 11.4: to purify the house (Y 49.1); to purify the fire (Y 36.1).
- V 11.5: to purify the water (Y 38.3, 67.6); to purify the earth (Y 38.1).
- V 11.6: to purify the cattle (Y 35.4); to purify the plants (Y 48.6).
- V 11.7: to purify the righteous man and the righteous woman (Y 54.1).
- V 11.8: (SrB 2; Y 27.13) x 8 + (Y 46.7, 44.16; SrB 3).
- V 11.9-10: spells by ārənə.
- V 11.11: (SrB 2; Y 27.13) x 4 + (Y 46.7, 44.16; SrB 3).
- V 11.14: (Y 34.15) x 4.
- V 11.15-16: spells by ārənə.
- V 11.17: (Y 54.1) x 4.
- V 11.18-19: spells by ərənə.
- V 11.20: (SrB 2; Y 27.13) x 5 + (Y 46.7, 44.16; SrB 3).

With regards to the meaning of V 11, de Harlez (1875-1877 1.195) separated it thematically from the preceding fragard and interpreted it as a compendium of Gāthic texts, each one recited for the purification of a particular item which is mentioned in each Gāthic text. According to him, the inclusion of the moon, the sun and the stars in the list of things to be purified and even the spells against the demons are interpolations.

On the contrary, Darmesteter (1887 139) and (1892-1893 2.179) did not dissociate the Gāthic texts of V 11.4-7 from the spells of V 11.9-20, but he stated that each exorcism consisted on two parts: a line from the Gāϑās alluding to the item defiled by a corpse (V 11.4-7) and a spell (V 11.8-20), which is the same for each item to be purified.

In his recent communication “Daēuas vertreibende Worte” in Liège (2009), Cantera agrees with Darmesteter. Moreover, he observes that the prayers of V 11.3 and 11.17 (in Geldner’s edition), which are not followed by the spells ārənə or ərənə + demon, are used as the introductory bāj and the closing bāj of the
purification’s ritual respectively. In his opinion, V 11 describes the same purification’s ritual with only slight variants after the introductory bāj, depending on the item to be purified (V 11.4-7). I believe Cantera to be correct.
4. CONTENTS, STRUCTURE AND RITUAL IN V 12

4.1. Contents and structure of V 12

V 12 deals with the time the relatives must wait before entering and purifying the house on account of somebody’s death, depending on the degree of kinship and therefore on the defilement produced by this death. The closer the kinship, the longer must the relative wait. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the relative must wait twice as long when the dead is a tanu.țərəϑə-sinner, which Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.186) interpreted as such relative who died without expiating his sin by means of the confession. As usual in Zoroastrianism, an infidel person does not produce defilement. However, the member of the community who has committed a sin produces more defilement that he who has not.

Each part of V 12 is divided by the formulaic repetition of the ceremonies to be performed to purify the house, according to the following decreasing sequence:

- The son with regard to his father, the daughter with regard to her mother: 30 days for the pious, 60 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.1).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.2).
- The father with regard to his son, the mother with regard to her daughter: 30 days for the pious, 60 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.3).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.4).
- The brother with regard to his sister, the sister with regard to her brother: 30 days for the pious, 60 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.5).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.6).
- The master of the house and the mistress of the house: 6 months for the pious, 12 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (12.7).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.8).
- The grandson with regard to his grandfather, the granddaughter with regard to her grandmother: 25 days for the pious, 50 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.9).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.10).
- The granddaughter with regard to his grandson, the grandmother with regard to her granddaughter: 25 days for the pious, 50 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.11).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.12).
- The nephew and the niece: 20 for the pious, 40 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.13).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.14).
- The uncle and the aunt: 15 days for the pious, 30 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.15).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.16).
- The male cousin dies and the female cousin: 10 days for the pious, 20 for the tanu.țərəϑə-sinners (V 12.17).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.18).
- The male cousin’s son dies and the female cousin’s daughter: 5 days for the pious, 10 for the tanu.pərəϑə sinners (V 12.19).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.20).
- Defilement when an infidel relative dies: none (V 12.21-22).

As we observe, the composition of V 12 is based on a decreasing sequence from the closest degree of kinship to the farthest. Only V 12.7 breaks not only the decreasing sequence of days, as Schmidt (1994 267, n.55) also notices, because it prescribes 6 months for the pious and 12 for the tanu.pərəϑə sinners, but also the list of relatives, because it adds the master of the house (Av. nmānō.paiτi-) and the mistress of the house (Av. nmānō.padni-). According to Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.186-187), Av. nmānō.paiτi- is to be interpreted as the chief of the family or common ancestor. As these persons would be more important than any other person, their relatives should wait a greater length of time. In my opinion, however, Av. nmānō.paiτi- does not necessarily designate a relative, as his mention in other lists together with several kinds of rulers (e.g. in V 10.5 ff.) demonstrates.

If it did, V 12.7 would be either misplaced or just an addition to the list, as it also breaks the sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Days of Impurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father and mother (V 12.1)</td>
<td>30 / 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son and daughter (V 12.3)</td>
<td>30 / 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother and sister (V 12.5)</td>
<td>30 / 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Master of the house and mistress of the house] (V 12.7)</td>
<td>[6 / 12 months]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather and grandmother (V 12.9)</td>
<td>25 / 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandson and granddaughter (V 12.11)</td>
<td>25 / 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew and niece (V 12.13)</td>
<td>20 / 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle and aunt (V 12.15)</td>
<td>15 / 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male cousin and female cousin (V 12.17)</td>
<td>10 / 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male cousin’s son and female cousin’s daughter (V 12.19)</td>
<td>5 / 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infidel relative (V 12.21-22)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my opinion, V 12.7 was inserted in the sequence after V 12.5-6 because of the connection between the last ʾxšuvaštim “sixty” of V 12.5 and the numeral ʾxšuvaš “six” of V 12.7. From the point of view of oral composition, this seems the most likely place for the addition, in the midst of a list of relatives, without distorting too much the sequence.

Apart from the addition of V 12.7 and the exclusion of the infidel relatives, whose degree of kinship is not mentioned, this list follows a ninefold compositional pattern, although the degree of kinship is divided into six groups: 1. father, mother, son, daughter (30 / 60 days); 2. grandfather, grandmother, grandson, granddaughter (25 / 50 days); 3. nephew, niece (20 / 40 days); 4. uncle, aunt (15 / 30 days); 5. male cousin, female cousin (10 / 20 days); 6. male cousin’s son, female cousin’s daughter (5 / 10 days).

---

6 Regarding the additions of texts which break the expected sequence in Vīdēvdād and their relation with oral compositional patterns, vid. (Cantera 2004b).
4.2. What does V 12 mean?

The meaning of V 12 in the context of the purification’s rituals depends on how we interpret the Avestan verb +upa.mānaiian of V 12.1 ff. There are two main interpretations, depending on the meaning of two homonymous roots: Av. man- “to think” and Av. man- “to wait”.

According to Burnouf (1833 488), followed by Spiegel (1864 1.292), Av. +upa.mānaiian belonged to the first root Av. man- “to think”, so he understood it as “qu’ils pensent intérieurement”.

On the contrary, de Harlez (1875-1877 1.198-199), followed by Darmesteter (1887 145-146) and (1892-1893 2.183-186), thought that the second root Av. man- “to wait” was implied in this verb. Also Bartholomae (1904 1124-1125) followed them and interpreted it as “warten, ab-, zuwarten ... bes. vom Aushalten der Trauerzeit nach dem Tod eines Angehörigen, während deren das Sterbehaus für verunreinigt galt”.

Apart from V 12, the Avestan verb upa.mānaiia- appears in V 5.42, 5.53-56, 6.27, 7.68-69, 8.38 and 9.30. In V 5.42 it refers to the time one must wait before bringing fire to a house where a person has died; in 5.53-56, to the time a woman must wait eating only meat, meal and wine without water, because of having suffered miscarriage, and being separated from the community; in 6.27 it is apparently included in an Avestan gloss in a context where a corpse is in a stream of water; 7.68-69 repeats 5.53-54; in 8.38 and 9.30 it refers to the time one must wait in the Baršnām ceremony until the impure person’s body is dried from the bull’s urine. As a substantive, the agent noun Av. upa.maiti- in V 5.53-56 and 7.68-69 is used in Av. upa.maitīm. āste as a periphrastic equivalent of Av. upa.mānaiia-.

Therefore, we can take for granted that Av. upa.mānaiia- implies a preventive wait because of temporal impurity and is referred either to a house becoming impure, because someone has died in it, or to people defiled by dead matter or by a corpse. But what must the relatives wait for?

In V 12 it is not evident if the relatives must wait so much time before purifying the house, before entering into the house again or simply before bringing to it fire, water, plants or any other pure item which could thereby be defiled. According to Cantera (in his communication “Daēuuaa vertreibende Worte” in 2009), they must wait before performing the purification’s ritual after which they will be able to enter into the house. Darmesteter (1887 145-146) and (1892-1893 2.184) observed that the fact that in older times the son temporarily abandoned the house where his father died could point to a meaning “to wait (before entering into the house again)”. However, he prefers to interpret it as the period of mourning, during which the relatives interrupted their daily tasks.

In my opinion, Av. upa.mānaiia- designates the period the relatives must wait before entering into the house again. According to the parallels with V 5.42 and 5.53-56, during the period of wait it is prohibited to bring fire into the impure house and to become in contact with water. Regarding V 5.42, nine nights in winter and one month in summer are prescribed (nauua.xšaparam. upa.mānaiian. æte. yöi. mazdaiasna. aïši.gâme. aaṭ hama. māzdrâjahîm “nine nights these Mazdean must wait in winter and one month in summer”) before bringing fire to the house.
The same period of time is prescribed in PRDd 2.1 ff. (Williams 1990 1.40-43, 2.6) and MU 1.138.1-15 ff. (Dhabhar 1932 154-155), but the prohibition concerns not only fire, but also uncooked food, water and people.

The parallels of PRDd 2.1 ff. and MU 1.138.1-15 ff. point to the connection of Av. upa.manaiai with the period of time the relatives must wait before entering into the house, according to the degree of kinship. Because of this, and unlike Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.186), I think that this verb does not imply a period of mourning, but probably the time someone must wait before entering into the house where a relative has died. In any case, the time prescribed in V 5.42, PRDd 2.1 ff. and MU 1.138.1-15 ff. obviously differs from the one prescribed in V 12.

4.3. Ceremonies to be performed when a relative dies

According to V 12, when a relative dies some ritual prescriptions must be realised, regardless of the degree of kinship. They are described in V 12.2 and in their repetitions in 12.4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20.

To begin with, the living relatives must wash their bodies and clothes thrice and also recite the Gādās thrice (ḍriś.frasnāiti. tanunām. ḍriś.frasnāiti. vastranām. ḍriś.frasruiti. gādānām).

Then they must worship the fire, spread the barasman- and offer libations to the good Waters (imā. nō. ātrēm. yazaēta. barēsmā. stōrmēta. aišūō. +vaŋhubiiō. zaodērā. baraēta). As soon as this ritual is completed, the house is considered once again pure and the relatives, the pure elements and the Beneficent Immortals can enter.

This sort of cleansing prescriptions finds some parallels in the New Persian Rivāyats (Dhabhar 1932 167-175), which show a more detailed description of the ceremonies to be performed and of the prescriptions required when someone dies. But the most detailed accounts regarding these ceremonies are found in the last testament of Dastur Nōśirwan Marzabān Kermānī (Dhabhar 1932 175-176), as well as in the ceremonies to be performed for one year after the death of a person aged fifteen years and upwards, described in the New Persian Rivāyat of Bahman Punjya (Dhabhar 1932 176-178).

4.4. The impurity produced by the death of a relative according to the Indian normative texts

The old Indian normative literature attest similar prescriptions to those found in V 12 regarding the impurity produced by the death of a relative, but the time of wait does not depend on the degree of kinship, unlike in the Zoroastrian texts. In fact, in the Indian texts the time the impurity last when a relative dies is usually the same for all, ten days, regardless of the degree of kinship (so in Mānavadharmasāstra 4.217 (Dave 1972-1985 vol. II), Gautama’s Dharmasūtra 14.1, Baudhāyana’s Dharmasūtra 1.11.1, Vasiṣṭha’s Dharmasūtra 4.16 (Olivelle 2000

7 According to Āpastamba’s Dharmasūtra 1.16.18 (Olivelle 2000 52-53), when a death has occurred in a house, one should not eat there for ten days.
and Garuḍa Purāṇa 2.5.3 (Shastri 1979 750), 2.39.3 and 2.39.12 (Shastri 1980 912-913). However, according to Mānavadharmaśāstra 5.57 ff. (Dave 1972-1985 vol. III), where the impurity for each dead is described at length, it is specified that it lasts ten, three or one day depending on several circumstances.

Another difference between V 12 and the Indian legal codes is that according to V 12 the period of impurity is longer for members of the community who have committed a tanu.pəraḍa- sin, while according to the Indian legal codes it is longer for the lower castes. Indeed, according to Mānavadharmaśāstra 5.57 ff. (Dave 1972-1985 vol. III) and Garuḍa Purāṇa 2.222.33 (Shastri 1979 657) the brāhmaṇa becomes pure after ten days, the kṣatriya after twelve, the vaśya after fifteen and the śūdra after a month. According to Gautama’s Dharmasūtra 14.2-5 (Olivelle 2000 152-153), the period of impurity for a kṣatriya lasts for eleven days, twelve days for a vaśya and one month for a śūdra, while according to Vasiṣṭha’s Dharmasūtra 4.27-30 (Olivelle 2000 372-373), the brāhmaṇa becomes pure after ten days, the kṣatriya after fifteen, the vaśya after twenty and the śūdra after a month (Schmidt 1994 268).

The third difference between these normative texts is that according to V 12 one of the means of purification is produced by reciting the Gāthās thrice, while the Indian legal codes prohibited to recite the Vedas during the three days when the brāhmaṇa had accepted an invitation to a funerary rite or a king’s relative had died, as it is stated in Mānavadharmaśāstra 4.110 (Dave 1972-1985 vol. II). This prohibition, according to Āpastamba’s Dharmasūtra 1.10.3-4 (Olivelle 2000 40-41), is extended to twelve days after the death of one’s mother, father or teacher.

In spite of these differences, V 12 shares with these Indian legal codes at least the prescription regarding the washing of the body. According to Āpastamba’s Dharmasūtra 2.15.5-10 and Baudhāyana’s Dharmasūtra 1.11.24 (Olivelle 2000 96-97, 220-221), among other prescriptions to be accomplished thrice when a relative dies, the mourners must dive into the water and come out of the water thrice. Also in Garuḍa Purāṇa 2.5.4-5 (Shastri 1979 750) it is stated that when a relative dies, one should take a bath thrice a day. This agrees with the prescription of V 12 dṛīṣ.frasnāitī. tanumāṁ “by the washing of their bodies thrice”.

— vid. Baudhāyana’s Dharmasūtra 1.11.27-30 (Olivelle 2000 222-223) too.

— Mānavadharmaśāstra 5.73 (Dave 1972-1985 vol. III) prescribes the bath during three days as a part of the purificatory rite. On the contrary, according to Āpastamba’s Dharmasūtra 1.10.5 one must take bath daily during twelve days after the death of one’s mother, father or teacher. According to Mānavadharmaśāstra 5.77-78, 5.103 (Dave 1972-1985 vol. III) and Garuḍa Purāṇa 2.39.5 (Shastri 1980 913), one becomes pure by bathing dressed in his clothes.
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B) THE AVESTAN LANGUAGE IN V 10-12

1. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE AVESTAN TEXT

The Avestan language is divided into three variants:

1. Old Avestan: the Gāϑās (Y 28-34, Y 43-46, Y 47-50, Y 51 and Y 53), the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti (Y 35.2-41.6) and the prayers yaϑā. ahū. vairiiō (Y 27.13), aϑm. vohū (Y 27.14) and a. airii. išiiō (Y 54.1).

2. Middle Avestan: Y 11.17-13.3 or 4, Y 56.1 and Y 58.1-7, according to Tremblay (2006 274).

3. Young Avestan: the remaining Avestan texts, including Vīdēvdād.

According to the communis opinio, Old Avestan is phonetically, morphologically and syntactically older than Young Avestan and is also closer to, and even more archaic than, the stage of the Vedic language preserved in the oldest Veda, namely the RV (Skjærvø 2003-2004 15).

Old and Young Avestan were not only considered as different chronological stages, but also as different dialects (Hoffmann & Narten 1989 77), (Skjærvø 2003-2004 27), (Panaino 2007 30-31). Tremblay (2006) regarded Young Avestan as the direct heir of Middle Avestan, which he considers a dialect different to that of Old Avestan. However, he neither proposed an absolute chronology nor a relative one for these stages of the Avestan language.

The implications of Tremblay’s Middle Avestan for the dating of Young Avestan have still not been discussed by scholars, who only took into account the dating of the Old and Young Avestan variants. On one hand, the dating of the Old Avestan language determined that of the Young Avestan; on the other hand, this dating depended on the supposed date Zaraϑuštra composed the Gāϑās. On the basis of this assumption, three main chronologies were proposed (Skjærvø 2003-2004 16):

- “Long” chronology: ca. mid-2nd millennium B.C. or earlier.
- “Short” chronology: 7th-6th centuries B.C. (Median or early Achaemenian periods).
- Intermediate chronology: ca. 1000 B.C.

The short chronology was mostly preferred during more than one century. In recent times, however, some scholars have opted for long or intermediate chronologies, paying attention not on Zaraϑuštra’s authorship of the Gāϑās, but on the linguistic features that distinguish Old and Young Avestan. They have therefore tried to establish an approximate periodisation of the oral composition of the Old and Young Avestan texts, their fixation or crystallisation, their canonisation and their oral and finally written transmission before our extant manuscripts.

_10_ vid. a summary of its main supporters in (Skjærvø 1994 16 ff.).
_11_ Only Panaino (2007 24-25) criticises that the linguistic arguments were the only basis to establish this periodisation.
The first proposal in recent times was made by Skjærvø (1994 201-202), who opted for a long chronology. He observed the oral features of the Avestan texts and tentatively divided the chronological stages of their composition according to the following time table:

2200-1700 B.C. Proto-Avestan (dialect of Proto-Iranian after the break-up of the Indoiranian unity).
1700-1200 B.C. Old Avestan (time of composition of the YH and the Gâñâs, as well as other literature, part of which survives in Young Avestan).
1200-900 B.C. Transition period (canonisation of the Old Avesta; development of a “Zoroastrianised” religious literature in eastern Iran, some of it preserved in the Young Avesta).
900-400 B.C. Young Avestan (composition and canonisation of the Young Avestan corpus in eastern Iran and gradual spread westward).

Some years later, Kellens (1998 490-513) introduced some variations and specifications to Skjærvø’s time table and opted for an intermediate chronology. He identified three stages in the transmission of the Avestan texts, 1. composition and formulaic variations; 2. fixation; 3. canonisation, and distributed it according to the following scheme:

1200-1000 B.C. Composition of texts in Old Avestan.
1000-800 B.C. Transition period. Fixation of certain Old Avestan texts and apparition of the first Zand. Composition of texts, elements of which could have been reused in Young Avestan texts.
800-600 B.C. Canonisation of the Old Avesta. Composition of texts in Young Avestan. First fixations.
Beginning of the 6th century. Canonisation of the Proto-Yasna A in eastern Iran.
End of the 6th century. Importation of the Proto-Yasna A in western Iran.
First half of the 5th century. Elaboration of religious calendar in western Iran.
Second half of the 5th century. Canonisation of the Proto-Yasna B.
Second half of the 4th century. Third stage of the canonisation and end of the composition of Avestan texts.
3rd century. Creation of the canon of the Yašt.

De Vaan (2003 11-15) took Kellens’ intermediate chronology as the basis of his own proposal and divided the history of the Avestan texts and their languages into the following stages:

2. ± 1500 B.C. Proto-Iranian.
3. ± 1200-1000 B.C. Old Avestan.
4. From ± 1200/1000 to ± 800/600 B.C. Early Young Avestan. Some of the features of Young Avestan were imposed on the Old Avestan texts, which were transmitted for several centuries. At a certain period between ± 800 and ± 600 B.C., the Old Avestan texts were canonised by speakers of Young Avestan as sacred texts and added to the Young Avestan liturgy.
5. From ± 800/600 to ± 300 B.C. Late Young Avestan. Canonisation of the Young Avestan texts. From ± 300 B.C. to ± 379 A.D.: the Avesta was finally arranged into two subdivisions: a long liturgy (Yasna, Visparad and Vidēvdād) and a short one (Yašt and other texts of the Xwardag Abastāg).

6. From ± 300 B.C. to ± 950 A.D. Post-Young Avestan. Before the rise of a written archetype, Young Avestan was no more a spoken language. Between 641 A.D. and ± 950 A.D. the archetype of the Avestan texts was written in the Avestan alphabet.

7. After ± 950 A.D. Post-archetype.

More recently, Skjærvø (2003-2004) tried to specify the chronology of the Old Avestan language according to linguistic arguments. As he (2003-2004 26) states, “the linguistic analysis of the Old Avesta remains the most promising means of dating the texts, both relatively (comparing Old and Young Avestan) and absolutely (comparing Vedic and Old Persian)”. Out of this comparison, he concludes that:

1. OAv. preserves archaisms not found in YAv., but also some morphologic “innovations” with regards to the latter, so that they represent not only two chronological stages, but also two dialects.

2. Some phonetic divergences between OAv. and YAv. point to the fact that YAv. does not derive directly from OAv., at least as we know them from the manuscripts. However, this possibility cannot be ruled out.

He also proposes a tentative chronology of the history of the Avesta which traces back certain periods of de Vaan’s (2003) chronology to some centuries before:

2. ca. 1700-1200 B.C. Composition of texts that were to lead to the Old Avestan texts, constantly updated (recomposed) linguistically in performance.
4. ca. 1000-600 B.C. Young Avestan period. Composition of the Young Avestan texts, constantly updated (recomposed) linguistically in performance. Canonisation of the Old Avestan text with introduction of editorial changes.
5. 600-500 B.C. Crystallisation of the Old Avestan texts.
6. 500-400 B.C. Canonisation of select Avestan ritual texts under the Achaemenids. Zoroastrian calendar in western Iran in 500-450 B.C.
7. From 400 B.C. up to ca. 500 A.D. Canonisation of the Avesta and transmission of the entire immutable text with introduction of linguistic novelties and changes made by the oral transmitters.
8. 500-600 A.D. Creation of the phonetic Avestan alphabet in which the entire known corpus was written down from performances from select performers.
9. From 600 A.D. Written transmission and deterioration of the text due to the copying of manuscripts. ca. 1000 A.D. there is only one single manuscript of each part of the extant Avesta, from which all our extant manuscripts are descended.
To summarise, we observe two main tendencies in recent studies regarding the dating of the Old and Young Avestan: 1. long chronology (Skjærvø 1994 and 2003-2004); 2. intermediate chronology (Kellens 1998; de Vaan 2003). According to them, the period of composition of Old Avestan texts would be either 1700-1200 B.C. (Skjærvø) or 1200-1000 B.C. (Kellens; de Vaan), while the Young Avestan texts would have been composed in 1000-600 B.C. (Skjærvø), 800-600 B.C. (Kellens) or 1200/1000-800/600 B.C. (de Vaan).
2. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE YOUNG AVESTAN TEXT OF VĪDĒVDĀD

The dating of Old and Young Avestan texts has occupied many scholars through the history of Iranian studies and it implies problems with which I will not deal in this chapter\(^\text{12}\). Here I will only focus on the proposals regarding the dating of the Young Avestan text of Vīdēvdād.

Scholars disagreed in the chronology of the composition of Vīdēvdād, but they mostly considered it as a late composition, even made when Young Avestan was no longer spoken, on the basis of four main reasons:

1) its many “ungrammatical” passages;
2) its ascription to the Median magi;
3) the existence of Aramaic and Greek loanwords in Vīdēvdād;
4) the existence of Greco-Roman units of measure in Vīdēvdād.

1) The “ungrammatical” passages in Vīdēvdād were differently interpreted by Spiegel (1852-1863) and de Harlez (1875-1877), (1885).

Spiegel (1852-1863 1.14) was the first scholar who noticed that the language of Vīdēvdād shared with the Old Persian inscriptions of Artaxerxes II (405-359 B.C.) the deterioration of the inflexion: apositions disagree with the nouns to which they refer; nominatives are used instead of accusatives and genitives; the Gen. Pl. substitutes other plural cases. According to him, however, this is not enough to state that both languages belong to the same period, because the same process could have previously occurred in one language.

Spiegel (1852-1863 1.14) fixed this deterioration at the time when these texts were put into writing, before Artaxerxes II for some part but after him for the most. Thus, he thought that the deterioration was due to the written transmission, not to the composition\(^\text{13}\). With regards to contents, Spiegel (1852-1863 1.13-14) said that the Gāϑās were the oldest Avestan texts, that Vīdēvdād followed them in antiquity and that the remaining Avestan texts were of a later date.

Haug (1862 223-224) followed Spiegel’s opinion about Vīdēvdād and tried to fix the dates of each Avestan text. According to him, the Gāϑās were composed ca. 1200 B.C., the longer part of Vīdēvdād ca. 1000-900 B.C., the younger Yasna ca. 800-700 B.C. and the Pāzand part of Vīdēvdād ca. 500 B.C. The Yaštst would be the latest texts in Young Avestan, composed after 400 B.C. Haug (1862 222) supposed that the longer part of Vīdēvdād was very old and that is was partially traceable to oral sayings descended from Zaraϑuštra himself. Nevertheless, he thought that it was composed by his successors, the Supreme High Priests, but he neither justify this statement nor the dates he proposed.

Conversely, de Harlez (1875-1877 cxciii ff.), (1885 346 ff.) based his statement about the late composition of Vīdēvdād on these “ungrammatical”

\(^{12}\) Summaries of the main opinions can be found in Kellens (1998 490-513) and (2002 14 ff.), Tremblay (2006 234-237) and Skjærvø (2007a 112-115).

\(^{13}\) Bréal (1877 208) also noticed the lack of concordance between adjective and substantive in these texts, but he said that such mistakes could be due either to the copyists or to the composers. Geiger (1884 322) also said that the “ungrammatical” passages of the Avesta were due to its editors and the influence of the language they spoke.
passages. Indeed, he stated that these passages were more syntactically corrupted than the latest Old Persian inscriptions, especially with regard to the confusion between nominative and accusative. Hence he concluded that the most of the Avesta was composed during the last five centuries B.C. In (1885 349), however, de Harlez limited the period of the composition of the Avesta to the years between 700 and 100 B.C.

Geldner (1896-1904 37) essentially agreed with de Harlez and limited the date of the whole Avesta between 560 B.C. and 379 A.D, partially following the chronology of the native tradition. He (1896-1904 37-38) also accepted the identification of the Avestan Viśtāspa with Darius’ father, called in Greek Hystaspes, which would date Zaraϑuštra’s life and Viśtāspa’s conversion to Zoroastrianism to the 6th century B.C. If the oldest Avestan texts, the Gāϑās, were composed at such a late date, the remaining Avestan texts would have certainly been composed later.

De Harlez and Geldner uncritically accepted the native chronology and did not take into account Spiegel’s critique regarding the use of the “ungrammatical” passages for dating Viśdēvdād. This argument has reached even to de Vaan (2004 540). As Spiegel rightly observed, this “ungrammaticality” could have been due to the transmission. I will deal later with the problem of these “ungrammatical” passages.

2) Moulton (1917 186-187, 225, 228) was the first to attribute the composition of Viśdēvdād to the Median magi. Moulton (1917 6) partially followed Haug’s date for the Old Avestan texts and traced back the existence of Zaraϑuštra four or five centuries earlier than the traditional date of 660-583 B.C. However, he disagreed regarding the dating of Viśdēvdād.

On one hand, he said that the ritualism of Viśdēvdād has nothing to do with Zaraϑuštra’s ethical teaching. On the other hand, he noticed that some practices attested in Viśdēvdād agree with those of the Median magi as described by Herodotus, like killing noxious animals, exposing the corpse and practicing incestuous marriage. Hence, he concluded that the Median magi would have composed Viśdēvdād.

I must add that Moulton’s (1917) separation of Viśdēvdād from Zaraϑuštra’s teachings is as a result of his own preconceptions. However, this assumption was accepted without criticism and pervaded the works of several subsequent scholars, such as Nyberg (1938 336 ff., 378), Christensen (1941 28-29), (1944 35-36)16, Zaehner (1961 162), etc., and has until now remained in place without being

14 According to it, Zaraϑuštra lived 258 years (Great Bundahišn) or 300 (Ardā Wirāz Nāmag) before the Achaemenians.

15 Although Tremblay (2006 235) notices that this identification stems from Kleuker (1781 1.347), he obviates that Spiegel (1852-1863 1.42) observed that it is already found in Ammianus Marcelinus 23.6: cuius scientiae (sc. Magiae) saeculis priscis multa ex Chaldeorum arcanis Bactrianus addidit Zoroastres deinde Hystaspes prudentissimus Darii pater. Spiegel (1852-1863 1.42) criticised this identification because it is only based on the identity of nouns and does not take into account that there could have existed more than one Viśtāspa.

16 Christensen assigned the composition of Viśdēvdād to the Medians in (1944 35-36), but in (1941 28-29) had stated that Viśdēvdād was composed during the last period of the Achaemenian rule, or even during the time between this period and that of the Arsacids.
critically re-examined. It is true that the practices described in Vīdēvdād were seemingly followed by the Median magi, if we trust Herodotus. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily imply that the Median magi composed this text, because they could have simply continued an older tradition.

3) The existence of Aramaic and Greek loanwords in Vīdēvdād was already proposed by Halévy in a communication to the Société Linguistique de Paris. He adduced the adoption of the Zoroastrian calendar in Persia after Darius I and the supposed Aramaic and Greek loanwords in Vīdēvdād to state that the Young Avestan texts were late compositions. Halévy’s arguments were accepted by de Harlez (1875-1877 cxciii ff.), (1885 346 ff.), who proposed a short chronology for all the Avestan texts.

Halévy’s list of supposed Aramaic and Greek loanwords in Vīdēvdād was reproduced and discussed by Geiger (1884 361). The following Avestan words would derive from Aramaic: tanūra-, naska-, guōa-, guṇda-. The following would derive from Greek: gaēsu-, aspəraṇa-, danar-. Nevertheless, as already Geiger (1884 358-366) argued, it is sometimes highly hypothetic and sometimes untrue that these words were Aramaic and Greek loanwords. Most can be easily explained by Indoeuropean etymology and only Av. tanūra- could be a Semitic loanword. Spiegel (1852-1863 1.12) already observed that Av. tanūra- could derive from Semitic, but he was not certain. Provided that it comes from Semitic, it does not necessarily stem from Aramaic, because it is found in other Semitic languages, such as Akkadian tinūru or Hebrew tanūr. Even if a single Avestan word in Vīdēvdād comes from Semitic, this does not mean that the composition of the whole Vīdēvdād ought to be late. Therefore, this argument cannot be used to state that Vīdēvdād was composed at a late date.

4) The last argument for the late dating of Vīdēvdād was proposed by Henning (1943 235-236). He stated that the system of units of measure for short distances attested in Vīdēvdād and Nērangestān, which is based on parts of the body, resembles so closely that of the Greco-Roman that its foreign origin can be taken for granted. According to him, the Macedonian conquerors introduced the system into Persia.

However, as Skjærvø (2007a 114) rightly observes, the measure systems based on parts of the body were very common in antiquity, for instance in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Therefore, this argument cannot support a supposed late date of composition of Vīdēvdād. Nevertheless, this argument maintains a post-Alexandrian or even a Parthian date of composition of Vīdēvdād. See for instance Boyce (1975 95), (1991 68, n.78), who was convinced of this fact.

To summarise, only the “ungrammatical” passages of Vīdēvdād could support, at a first glance, its late date of composition. So I will add some considerations about this problem.
3. "UNGRAMMATICAL" FORMS IN VĪDĒVDĀD

The term ungrammatical referred to Vīdēvdād is mostly applied to divergences with regard to the nominal syntax of other Young Avestan texts. When applying this term, however, scholars did not take into account two important facts concerning Vīdēvdād: a) it is an oral composition; b) it is a normative text.

As Skjærvø (2007a 115) observes, "the notion of grammatical "standards" is that of written languages and cannot be applied directly to unwritten languages". Indeed, we must take into account that we are dealing with old oral compositions which have reached to us as late written texts after a lapse of many centuries. Therefore, the syntactic problems of Vīdēvdād must be explained according to the main stages in which an oral composition reaches to us (1. composition; 2. performances; 3. oral transmission; 4. written transmission) and to the different compositional patterns of normative texts.

3.1. Syntactic divergences in formulas: compositional patterns

Vīdēvdād is a normative text, composed by many lists of prescriptions, where usually the only variation is the new element added to a formulaic sequence. In oral compositions, and especially in normative texts, parallelism and adaptation of the new elements to parallel structures are more important than avoiding morphosyntactic discordance. That is why syntactic divergences in normative texts are probably not as a result of the stage of the language, but of the oral compositional patterns used in these types of texts.

In V 10-12 there are many formulaic and repeated lists of prescriptions and spells. The main feature of the legalistic and apotropaic formulas of V 10-12 is the repetition of the verb of the prescription or spell and the substitution of its subject or object, which is added as a new element to the sequence, regardless of its inflection. These are the examples where, the verb remaining, a subject or object was added to the formula regardless of their inflection:

- 10.5b ff.: paiti.pǝrǝne + Acc. > paiti.pǝrǝne + X. Out of the syntagms paiti.pǝrǝne. aŋrǝm. mainīūm (10.5b), paiti.pǝrǝne. nasūm. paiti.pǝrǝne. hǝm.raēϑam. paiti.pǝrǝne. paiti.raēϑam (10.6a) or paiti.pǝrǝne. indrǝm. paiti.pǝrǝne. saurum. paiti.pǝrǝne. nāŋhāidīm (10.9b), where the objects appear in accusative, as expected, new elements are added to the formula, regardless of their inflection. Thus, we find paiti.pǝrǝne + nominative (zairici in 10.10a; *varṇiīa. daēnūd and *vātō. daēnūd in 10.14a) or vocative (taurunī in 10.10a), instead of the expected accusatives.

- 11.9: pǝrǝne + Acc. > pǝrǝne + X. The same can be said regarding the apotropaic formula pǝrǝne + object “I fight X” in V 11.9. Out of the syntagms pǝrǝne. *aēšm. pǝrǝne. nasūm. pǝrǝne. hǝm.raēϑam. pǝrǝne. paiti.raēϑam, where the objects appears in accusative, as expected, a variation is produced where
the verb *pǝrǝne* is repeated as a formula and objects are added, regardless of their inflection. Thus, we find *pǝrǝne* + nominative (*xruuiyi*, *būiōža*, *kundiža*, *busigiatan* y. *zairina*, *busigiatan* y. *darayg*, *gauua*, *kapastiš*) or vocative (*xru*, *biiyi*, *kunda*, *mušiš*), instead of the expected accusatives.

- 11.2b-c: *yaoždāta*. *bun* + Nom. Pl. Neut. (11.2b) > *yaoždāta* + X (11.2c). It seems that *yaoždāta*. *bun* + X was understood by the performers of Vidēvdād as a formula where “X” did not necessarily agree in gender, number and case with *yaoždāta*.

In 11.2b the participle *yaoždāta* agrees with the subject in the sentence *yaoždāta*. *nmāna* (Nom. Pl. Neut. + copulative verb in plural + Nom. Pl. Neut.) “the houses will be purified”. In 11.2c, however, the same pattern *yaoždāta* + subject appears, but a list of subjects appears in accusative instead of the expected nominative:

11.2b: *yaoždāta*. *bun* + Nom. Pl. Neut. (11.2b) > *yaoždāta* + X (11.2c). It seems that *yaoždāta*. *bun* + X was understood by the performers of Vidēvdād as a formula where “X” did not necessarily agree in gender, number and case with *yaoždāta*. Hence we can conclude that 11.2c was composed by means of a formulaic *yaoždāta*, to which several elements borrowed from the preceding passage of 11.1c were added, regardless of their expected inflection in the new passage. This is a matter of composition, not of incorrect grammar.

- 12.19a: Nom. + *para.iriđiieiti* > X + *para.iriđiieiti*. In V 12.1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17 the same formula is repeated and only the subject of the verb *para.iriđiieiti* varies. All these subjects appear in nominative. In V 12.19a we find the nominal syntags *tūiriia.pudrō*. *puđrō* “the male cousin’s son” (Nom. + Nom.) and *tūiriia.duyođa*. *vā*. duryođa “the female cousin’s daughter” (Nom. + Nom.) as subjects instead of *tūiriia.pudrahe*. *puđrō* (Gen. + Nom.) and *tūiriia.duyođro*. *duryođa* (Gen. + Nom.). Although the first could be interpreted as a compound *tūiriia.pudrō.pudrō*, the presence of the conjunction *vā* between *tūiriia.duryođa* and *duryođa* in the following subject rules out this possibility. Hence we expect the syntagm Gen. + Nom. in both cases. So it seems that the only variation of the formula in 12.19a was made by adding the nominatives *puđrō* and *duryođa* to the nominatives *tūiriia.pudrō* and *tūiriia.duryođa* of 12.17a, regardless of their inflection.

---

17 cf. the variation of the formula in V 19.20 *bunət. vohu. mano*. *yaoždātō* “let the Good Thought be purified”, where the concordance is preserved.
In other apparent “ungrammatical” uses we observe different compositional patterns. We have already seen examples where the verb is repeated and its subject or object is substituted with another element in a sequence, regardless of its inflection. Thus, the discordance is found in the subject or object. On the contrary, in 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c and 7a, the objects appear in accusative, but the verb and the demonstrative accompanying the objects are not as expected. On one hand, the verb of the question of 11.1b, namely *yaoždaðāni* (1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act.), is repeated in the answer instead of the expected **yaoždaðō** (2nd. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act.). On the other hand, the same neuter demonstrative *ima* accompanies all the direct objects, regardless of their gender. cf. the commentary to V 11.4.

The compositional patterns of these passages of V 11.4 ff. can be summarised as follows: 1. the verb of the question is just pasted in the answer, where it is used as a formula; 2. the first direct object of the list, namely *imaṭ. nmānm* in 11.4a, shows no discordance, because both the demonstrative and the substantive are Acc. Sing. Neut.; 3. out of this model, the remaining elements of the list, extracted from 11.1c, are copied by substituting *nmānm*, but both *ima* and *yaoždaðāni* remain the same. The result is a formula *ima* + X + *yaoždaðāni*, where accusatives of all genders are added: *ima* + *nmānm. yaoždaðāni* (11.4a); *ima* + *ātṛm. yaoždaðāni* (11.4c); *ima* + *āpṛm. yaoždaðāni* (11.5a); *ima* + *zam. yaoždaðāni* (11.5c); *ima* + *gzm. yaoždaðāni* (11.6a); *ima* + *nrurām. yaoždaðāni* (11.6c); *ima* + *narm. aśauaṇām. yaoždaðāni. ima* + *nririkām. aśoṇīm. yaoždaðāni* (11.7a).

Bartholomeae (1904 371, n.3), followed by Reichelt (1909 295), explained the discordance between the demonstrative and the substantive in V 11.4c ff. through the incorrect use of *ima* (Acc. Sing. Neut.) instead of *imaṃ* (Acc. Sing. Masc.) or *imaṃ* (Acc. Sing. Fem.). On the contrary, Friš (1950 79) explained it as a correlation *ima* ... *ima*, which would mark two possibilities and would mean “either ... or”. In my opinion, this variance is not to be interpreted as a wrong use, but as a result of the oral compositional patterns of this kind of normative texts, where parallelism is more important than it is to avoid inconsistencies.

### 3.2. Problems of transmission

We have seen that many “ungrammatical” uses are due to the compositional patterns of the normative texts and do not mean that the texts are late. However, there are other syntactic divergences which could be caused not by the composition, but by the transmission. Besides the above mentioned compositional patterns, we must take into account that it is probable that in repetitions and lists new elements were introduced by imitating the same structure during the oral transmission. So some “ungrammatical” forms could be explained as interpolations in texts enlarged by time.

We know from other oral traditions that oral compositions were always changed to some extent by their performers. This is why oral epic poetry, for instance, preserves variations of formulas. If the composition was metrical, the

---

18 Two possibilities are marked by the correlations *aṭ ... aṭ* or *vā ... vā* in Old Avestan (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 2.112-113; 2.180-181).

19 vid. for instance the problem of the interpolations in Yt 1 in Panaino (2002 15 ff.).
performer was limited by the metre and could not vary so much. In prosaic texts, however, the performer could feel free to vary whatever he wanted, because he was also restrained by the contents.

Variation in oral performances in several places and during many centuries could have introduced many deviations from the syntactic uses of the language of the composition. Even if we assume that the performers spoke the same language of the composition, this language surely should have not been exactly the same in each place and during some centuries. So the performers could have introduced in the composition their own diachronic and diatopic differences within the same Avestan language. But if the performers belonged to areas where Avestan was not the main language or simply it was no longer spoken, the possibility of deviation from the language of the composition increases.

Furthermore, as Cantera indicates me, Vīdēvdād was not learned like Yasna and the Yaštś. The latter were probably learned in the priestly schools in a very similar way as the Vedic texts, that is, with a high degree of precision which avoided possible corruptions. We must not forget that the correct recitation of the sacred texts had further cosmic implications and that a mistake in the recitation invalidates the ceremony. Normative texts like Vīdēvdād were surely much more exposed to variations and introduction of reforms in the frame of the legal discussions of the priestly authorities. So we must also pay attention to the different learning of Vīdēvdād with regards to the problems of its transmission.

Therefore, the so called “ungrammatical” passages of Vīdēvdād can be explained either by the compositional patterns of oral normative texts, by the oral transmission of their performers and even by the peculiarities of its learning. But there is a further possibility: “ungrammatical” syntactic forms could have been introduced when Vīdēvdād was put down to writing.

Unlike other Avestan texts such as Yasna and the Yaštś, which must be recited by heart, Vīdēvdād can be read in the ceremonies. It is therefore probable that it was one of the first Avestan texts to be written. We do not know if there was any written version of Vīdēvdād before its reconstructed Sasanian prearchetype. In any case, “ungrammatical” syntactic forms could also have been introduced in the Avestan text when it was put into writing. In fact, some of the “ungrammatical” syntactic forms in Vīdēvdād are shared by the Yaštś and, according to Panaino (2002 98 ff.), must be ascribed to the Sasanian (pre-)archetype.

To summarise, from these divergences regarding the syntactic uses of other Avestan texts we cannot infer that Vīdēvdād was composed at a late stage. On the contrary, some of the inconsistencies can easily be explained because of the compositional patterns of the normative texts, others just as deviations occurred during the oral and eventually written transmission and others even to the peculiarities of the learning of these normative texts.

I now will analyse the main features of the Young Avestan of V 10-12 and their divergences, in order to know whether or not they could be ascribed to the transmission.
4. FEATURES OF THE YOUNG AVESTAN OF V 10-12

On one hand, we must take into account that V 10-12 are very short fragard. Because of the meagre material, the analysis of the features of the Young Avestan in these chapters will provide only partial results. On the other hand, V 10-12 offers plenty of quotations from Old Avestan texts, which must be ruled out from our analysis, because they belong to another variant of the Avestan language.

4.1. Syntax

4.1.1. Nominal syntax

The nominal syntax of Young Avestan in V 10-12 does not differ substantially from that of other Young Avestan texts. However, in V 10-12 some divergences in gender, number and case point to a simplification of the nominal morphology. As far as these divergences are not systematic, they cannot be ascribed to the stage of Young Avestan of V 10-12. They must rather be explained as deviations occurred during the oral and eventually written transmission of Vidēvdād, which could reflect features of the language of the performers or the people who transmitted this text.

Divergences in the nominal syntax are not equally distributed in all the fragard. From a total number of 1533 inflected words included, 368 can be regarded as divergences from the nominal syntax, as we see in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragard</th>
<th>Total of inflected words</th>
<th>Divergences in nominal syntax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V 10</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>118 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 11</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>182 (41.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 12</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>68 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the 24% of inflected words in V 10-12 would be divergences from the nominal syntax. The majority are found in V 11, while V 12 attests the least.

These are the divergences in gender, number and case found in the Avestan text of V 10-12:

A) Gender

Discordance in gender is rarely attested, but there are at least two examples where the neuter and the masculine are used instead of the feminine:
- 10.1b (twice), where aētaṭ (Acc. Sing. Neut.) appears instead of aētqm (Acc. Sing. Fem.)
- 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13a, 14a, where aṣaonō (Gen. Sing. Masc.) is found instead of aṣaoniiā (Gen. Sing. Fem.).
B) Number

A discordance which implies both number and gender is only found in imā. àtrim in 12.2, repeated in 12.4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20. Indeed, Av. imā is Nom. / Acc. Pl. Fem, while Av. àtrim is Acc. Sing. Masc.

In other cases, the discordance affects both case and number, as in the following examples, where one Nom. Sing. appears instead of an Acc. Pl. and three Acc. Sing. are used instead of Nom. Pl.:

- 10.14a: the first daēuuō (Nom. Sing. Masc.) is used instead of daēuuq (Acc. Pl. Masc.).
- 10.16a, b, c, d: snādātm (Acc. Sing. Masc.) instead of snādā (Nom. Pl. Masc.).
- 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a: vārəramiūm. təməmca. baēṣaziūm. təməmca (Acc. Sing. Masc.) instead of vārəramiūm. təməca. baēṣaziūm. təməca (Nom. Pl. Masc.). The same appears in V 9.27.

C) Case

In V 10-12 most syntactic divergences concern the cases. The nominative replaced other cases, especially the accusative, in some examples. The nominative instead of the accusative is used at least in 10 examples:

- 10.2a, b, c, d, 3c, 5a, 7c, 9a, 11c, 13a: ime (Nom. Pl. Masc.) instead of imq (Acc. Pl. Masc.). cf. V 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a imq. vacō and V 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, e, 7a imq. at. vacō.
- 10.2a, b, c, d, 3c, 5a (2), 7c, 9a (2), 11c, 13a (2): Av. vaca (Nom. Pl. Masc.) instead of the expected Acc. Pl. Masc. vacō (< vac-) or even Acc. Pl. Neut. vacā (< vacah-).
- 10.5a, 9a, 13a: baēṣaziūa (Nom. Pl. Masc.) instead of baēṣaziūq (Acc. Pl. Masc.).

Among all these substitutions of the accusative by the nominative, the last five could be due to a corruption in the oral or even written transmission. Actually,
the endings –a and –ą could have been easily confused in the recitation. Nevertheless, the remaining examples cannot be explained in the same way, so that functional substitution of the accusative by the nominative is probable.

Notwithstanding, there are other passages in V 12, repeated in V 5, where the nominative is replaced by the vocative, as Bartholomae (1904 139, 1389) already noticed:


The same replacement is found in the Yašts. Panaino (2002 98) explains it because “some apparent allegro-forms (e.g. –a instead of –ō) were introduced within the texts of the Later Yašts early in the Sasanian Archetype.”

We also see that the genitive replaced the Loc. Sing. in two examples and the Acc. Pl. in one example:

- 10.18b: *ažhā. zōmō (Gen. Sing. Fem.) instead of ažhe. zōmi (Loc. Sing. Fem.)
- 10.19a: ažhōš. astuuatō (Gen. Sing. Masc.) instead of ažhōuō. astuuainti (Loc. Sing. Masc.).

However, these three replacements can be explained as reinterpretations of their endings during the transmission. The ending –ō in zōmō (10.18b) and astuuatō (10.19a) could have been reinterpreted as a Loc. Sing. like ažhōuō. In dāmām (12.21a, 22b) the ending –am could have been reinterpreted as a Gen. Pl., as in Av. kāmcit.

4.1.2. Prepositions and postpositions

Postpositions were still preserved as such in V 10, as the examples of Av. gādāhuua (< *gādāhu + ā) in V 10.2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b and 15a (3) demonstrate.

Prepositions were redundantly used in V 10 to reinforce preverbs, like in upa. juuautum. upa. duuasaiti and upa. juuautum. *upa. raēβaietiit in V 10.1b and 10.17a-b, where the first upa is unnecessary, but it is used to reinforce the direction marked by the preverb (see the commentary to V 10.1b). This is also found in Middle Persian.

With regards to prepositional syntagms, the use of unexpected cases with the Avestan preposition baca must be observed. In Old Avestan the preposition baca usually accompanies the genitive and the ablative, while YAv. baca is usually found with the ablative and the instrumental. In some passages of V 10-12, however, it is followed by nominative, accusative and genitive:
- Nom., Gen., Instr.: in 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13a and 14a the preposition haca is followed in the same sentence either by an Instr. (nmāna, vīsa, zanțu, daŋhu), by a Gen. (hauulaiš. tanuuo, nmāno. patoši, vīspatoši, zanțupatoši, daŋhupatoši, vīspaiš. əšaon. stoiš) or even by a Nom. (nā. paiti. iristō, nāirika. paiti. irista).

- Acc., Abl.: in 11.10a, 13a, 16a and 19a the preposition haca is followed in the same sentence either by an Abl. (nmānt, ādrāt, apat, zōmat, gaot, uruuaraiāt) or by an Acc. (narm. əšaon. nāirika. əšaonim, strōi, māyhom, huurā, anāyra. raoc, vīsp. vohu. mazādašta. əša. cišra). Although the use of the accusative can be explained as a repetition of the accusatives of V 11.1c, Av. haca + Acc. is attested in other Young Avestan texts (Bartholomae 1904 1752).

- Nom., Acc.: the preposition haca is accompanied by Acc. in 12.1c (haca + pitaram, haca + mātarəm), 12.3b (haca + puðram, haca + duŋkarəm) and 12.5b (haca + xəŋharəm, haca + brātarəm). Av. haca is also accompanied by Nom. in 12.9a (haca + niůkō, haca + niůka) and 12.11a (haca + napə).20

To summarise, we observe that the preposition Av. haca is followed by nominative, accusative, genitive, instrumental and ablative. This use demonstrates that the preposition became more important than the case to mark circumstantial complements.

4.1.3. Attraction of cases

Av. kəmcit appears instead of kəscit (Nom. Sing. Masc.) in kəmcit. vā. taoxmanəm. para. iridiiieti (V 12.21a). The use of Av. kəmcit instead of the expected kəscit (Nom. Sing. Masc.) could be due to the anticipation of the Gen. Pl. ending of the following taoxmanəm. So it would be a corruption in the written transmission. However, Av. kəmcit + Gen. Pl. is used regardless of the expected ending of the indefinite in other passages of Vidēvdād, like in V 8.2, 8.79, 9.32, 14.3 and 18.71 kəmcit. vā. hubaiodinəm. uruuaranəm “or of any one of the most aromatic plants” or in V 9.13 āat. hā. druš. auaustriiiet. kəmcit. vā. vacayhəm “And this Lie becomes weaker at every one of the words”. Because of this, it cannot be interpreted as a textual corruption.

The most likely explanation of this use has been proposed by de Vaan (2004). The ending –əm in Av. aeshəm was reinterpreted as a Gen. Pl. ending and affected other pronominal stems. Hence in late Young Avestan Av. kəmcit and Av. auiəm (V 2.29, 2.37) were also understood as Gen. Pl. After this reinterpretation, the ending of Av. ka- in the syntagm Av. ka- ciq. vā + Gen. Pl. was attracted by this Gen. Pl., so that it became a fossilised syntagm Av. kəmcit. vā + Gen. Pl. Subsequently kəmcit finally agreed with the Gen. Pl. and therefore was no more understood as a pronoun, but as an adjective.

---

20 It seems that also in this passage haca + napə was attested, as the variant napə in K2, F10, T44 in the right margin, L1, T46, P1, L2 and L5 confirm. However, R3, E4, Mf2 and K9 show the correct napə, so I agree with Geldner’s napə in this case.
4.1.4. Verbal syntax

With regards to verbs, there is no syntactic difference between their use in V 10-12 and the rest of Young Avestan texts. The only verb worth-mentioning is Av. upa.manaiian in V 12.1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19. Although Geldner (1896) interpreted it as a corrupted variant of the optative Av. upa.manaiian, due to the perseveration of "ąn" at the end of the word, this lectio difficilior finds no support in the manuscripts’ evidence of V 12, with the exception of some cases in the IndVS manuscript R278. Because of this, we cannot accept that all the variants upa.manaiian in V 12 are textual corruptions. They probably represent a correct subjunctive upa.manaiian.

As Kellens (1984 269-271) observed, subjunctives are used in questions whenever a prescription is requested. They are frequent in direct questions in Vīdvādād when they are introduced by Av. ka-, katāra- or cuuānt-. Consequently, as Av. upa.manaiian appears in a direct question introduced by cuuāt, Geldner’s (1896) emendation upa.manaiian has to be ruled out.

4.2. Morphology

There is no difference between the nominal and verbal morphology of Young Avestan of V 10-12 and that of other Young Avestan texts. Regardless of the Old Avestan quotations present in these three fragar, each of the three genders, three numbers and eight cases are still preserved in the nominal morphology, although not all the cases in their three genders and numbers are attested in V 10-12. The dual number is surely attested only in V 10.18 pasu.vīra (Nom. / Acc. Du. Masc.), where we would expect the Dat. Du. Masc. pasu.vīraēibia or pasubia.vīraēibia.

Regarding verbal morphology, the three persons, two numbers (Sing., Pl.), only two tenses (Pres., Aor.), the five modes (Ind., Inj., Subj., Opt., Imper.) and two diathesis (Act., Mid.) are attested in V 10-12. Therefore, the dual and other tenses than the present and the aorist either lack in the verbal morphology of this stage of Young Avestan or they are simply unrepresented in these three fragar.

The morphology of this Young Avestan is still rich enough to suppose that it was being simplified when V 10-12 was composed. Accordingly, the above mentioned syntactic divergences surely reflect the influence of Middle Iranian languages during the oral and eventually written transmission:

a) Gender: the neuter and the masculine replaced the feminine in some examples of V 10. This agrees with the indistinctness of gender in Middle Persian.

b) Number: singular and plural were not distinguished functionally in their nominative and accusative cases. This agrees with the morphosyntactic indistinctness of direct singular and direct plural cases in Middle Persian.

These two isoglosses with Middle Persian and the fact that the preposition became more important than the case to mark circumstantial complements, which also agrees with Middle Persian, points to a possible influence of this language on the Young Avestan text of V 10-12. Thus, the apparent late uses of the Young
Avestan of V 10-12 would not be due to the composition, but to the influence of a later language during its transmission.

4.2.1. Thematisation

Thematisation is the main feature common to the nominal and the verbal morphology of the Young Avestan of V 10-12. The progressive generalisation of the thematic inflection is reflected in two facts. On one hand, while in Old Avestan the genitive and ablative singular are not distinguished except in the thematic –a stems, in both Young Avestan and Old Persian the Abl. Sing. marker –t of the thematic –a stems is extended to Abl. Sing. of the rest of nominal inflection (Skjærvø 2007b 854). On the other hand, old athematic declensions became progressively assimilated to a universal thematic paradigm. This process influenced even the pronominal declension. Moreover, some athematic verbs were progressively substituted by thematic paradigms.

Concerning thematisations of nominal and pronominal stems in V 10-12, they affect the noun vac- and the interrogative pronoun Av. kaiia-:
- 10.3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b: Av. vaca (Nom. Pl. Masc.), instead of the expected Nom. Pl. Masc. vacō (< vac-).
- 10.3a, 7a, 11a: kaiia (Nom. Pl. Masc.) instead of the expected kaiie. This word is followed by the correct form aëte in all these passages, which excludes any influence of a following ending –a. cf. V 10.3b ime. aëte, where ime preserves the correct ending –e of its pronominal declension.

There are two cases of apparent thematisation:
- V 12.1a: as Benveniste (1935 35) already observed, pitō (Nom. Sing. Masc.) is written instead of the expected pita, which however is attested in 12.3b.
- V 12.9a, 11a: napō (Nom. Sing. Masc.) appears instead of the expected napā.

However, the fact that they were only found in the nominative points to another explanation. Concerning pitō, Panaino (2002 98) notices that in the Yašt the Nom. Sing. with –a of –tar- stems were confused with the thematic stems with –a already in the Sasanian (pre-)archetype. So they appear sometimes as Nom. Sing. with –ö. Therefore, the confusion is shared by Vidēvdād and the Yašt and it can seemingly be ascribed to the transmission.

With regards to verbs, all the athematic verbs appear as such in V 10-1221, with only a single exception:
- 10.2a, b, c, d, 3c, 5a, 7c, 9a, 11c, 13a, 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a: framrauua (2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. Act.) instead of the expected athematic framruiddi22.

21 vid. pərmāne, mrao, hənti, pətī, pərūne, aŋhāt, yaoždāite, yaoždādāsā, asti, yaoždādāni, būn, aŋhən, pərūne, aiti, stərənaēta, jaiṇtī.
Therefore, there are few examples of thematisation of nominal, pronominal and verbal paradigms in this stage of Young Avestan, in which athematic paradigms were still preserved as such.

4.3. Phonetic adaptations of Old Avestan texts to Young Avestan

Phonetics in V 10-12 show no difference with regard to other Young Avestan texts, so that I will not deal with them in this chapter. The only feature of phonetics worth-mentioning in these fragard is the phonetic adaptations of Old Avestan texts to Young Avestan.

The recitation of some Old Avestan texts is prescribed in V 10 and 11. For the most part, they are transmitted correctly in Old Avestan in the manuscripts. Sometimes, however, they do not appear in their original shape, but are adapted to Young Avestan phonetics in some manner. The existence of these Young Avestan adaptations could reveal either an old phenomenon in the oral performance and transmission or just a problem of written transmission in some Vīdēvdād manuscripts.

As we will see, sometimes these adaptations are found together in the oldest PV, IndVS and IrVS manuscripts, so that they must go back to the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād. In other cases, however, they are only found in later manuscripts, so that they must be regarded as a subsequent evolution in the written transmission.

The adaptations going back to the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād imply a number of problems. Provided that they are to be ascribed to the period of oral performance, they could imply that a Young Avestan version of the Old Avestan texts existed when Vīdēvdād was composed or even that these texts were no more recited in their Old Avestan shape. Thus, these adaptations would reflect the Young Avestan variant of that period. But then the question is why these texts are mostly transmitted correctly in Old Avestan, and why not all the whole Old Avestan quotations, but only to some isolated words, were adapted.

In order to try to solve these problems, I will analyse the main Young Avestan adaptations I have identified in the Old Avestan quotations of V 10 and 11.

Old Avestan words in V 10 and 11 dressed in a Young Avestan garment can be grouped according to their consonantal or vocalic adaptations:

a) Consonantal adaptations:
   They consist on the fricativisation of the intervocalic voiced stop –d– > –ð–, as we observe in the following cases:
   - 10.4: B2, T46 aniünstacā instead of aniünstacā; B2, T46 daðomabhī instead of daðomabhī; B2, T46 iṣūiṣūmahā instead of iṣūiṣīmahā; B2, T46 daðomade instead of daðomade; L1 huṇāstimā, B2 huṇāstomā and T46 huṇāstomā instead of huṇāstomā; B2, T46 fradaṇāðā instead of fradaṇāðā.
   - 10.8: B2, T46 daðimabiačā instead of daðimabiačā.

vid. other Young Avestan examples of thematisation of athematic verbs in (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 209, 217, 219).
- 11.6b: L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9 adāiš instead of adāiš.

Another example of Old Avestan consonantal adaptation to Young Avestan phonetics occurs seemingly with intervocalic *-h-. In such case, YAv. –ųh- appear instead of OAv. –ųŋh-:
- 10.4: B2, T46 mōnhācā instead of mōngbācā.

The fricativisation of OAv. –d- > YAv. –ð- does not allow us to draw further conclusions about the period of composition, since fricativisation of voiced stops (intervocalic or not) occurs frequently through the written transmission. This is because the scribes surely could not differentiate fricatives and voiced stops in the pronunciation. Therefore, this fricativisation can be due to the transmission.

The same can be said regarding the writing of YAv. –ųh- instead of OAv. –ŋh- in B2, T46 mōnhācā instead of mōngbācā. On one hand, B2 and T46 are the only IndVS manuscripts that attest the full quotation and include this word. On the other hand, the confusion between ŵ and ņg can be easily explained by the influence of the recitation, because actually they were not distinguished phonetically. Because of this, only one graphem, namely ŵ, was generalised and progressively substituted the old graphic distinction. As a matter of fact, the same generalisation of ŵ in medial and final position is also found in manuscripts of Yasna where no adaptation to Young Avestan is made, like those of the Sanskrit Yasna of Neryosangh (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena xxxi). So this adaptation can be explained as a mere graphic standardisation of ŵ during the written transmission.

b) Vocalic and semivocalic adaptations:
In V 10 and 11 they mostly concern the shortening of the Old Avestan long vowels and diphthongs in final syllable:
- 10.4: B2, T46 vorazōne instead of vorazōnē; B2, R278, P1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 abura instead of aburā; B2 gaiasca instead of gaiāscā; L4 staotarasca instead of staotarascā; B2 abura instead of aburā.
- 10.8: B2 yo instead of yō.
- 11.4b: L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 pafre instead of pafrē.
- 11.4d: L4, P2, G34. Br1, L2, E4 abe instead of abīā.
- 11.4d: D62, P2, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 paoirüie; L1, P1 paoirüie; B2, T46 paoirüie; R278, Br1, L2 paoirüie; G42 paoirüie; E4 paoirüie instead of OAv. xpaourüiē.
- 11.4d: L4 mazda instead of mazdā.
- 11.5b, d: yazamaide instead of yazamaidē.
- 11.6b: D62, P5, F10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 gauue instead of gauuōi. Only the variant gaōu in Mf2 and K9 points to the Old Avestan original form.
- 11.7b: K2. B2, T46 jantu; E10 jantu instead of jantū.
- 11.7b: L4 nāiribiasca instead of nāiribitascā.
- 11.7d: Mf2 masata instead of masatā.

In other cases the shortening is found in medial position, like in the following example:
- 11.4b: bōndunō instead of bōndunō. The long vowel –ō- is only attested in L2 and FK1.

Another frequent adaptation takes place in the simplification of the Old Avestan group *-(i)u VN# / *-(i)u VN#. We find it in the ending of the Gen. Sing. YAv. –abe instead of the expected OAv. –abiā and in YAv. –im instead of the expected OAv. –iiām:
- 10.4, 12: B2, T46 zaraϑuštrahe instead of OAv. zaraϑuštrābiā or even Middle Av. zaraϑuštrāhē.
- 11.7b: zaraϑuštrahe instead of OAv. zaraϑuštrābiā or even Middle Av. zaraϑuštrāhē.
- 10.12: L1, B2, T46 haidēm instead of hādīīm.

Concerning the Old Avestan long vowels and diphthongs in final syllable (and sometimes in medial position), they are usually well distinguished from the equivalent short vowels and diphthongs. Nevertheless, among all the cases found in V 10 and 11, the only shortenings shared by the oldest manuscripts of the three groups are those of V 11.4d (pairi.jasāmaide instead of pairi.jasāmaidē) and 11.5b, d (yazamaide instead of yazamaide). Therefore, these isolated shortenings are also to be ascribed to the written transmission.

With regards to the simplification of the Old Avestan group *-(i)u VN# / *-(i)u VN#, only zaraϑuštrahe, instead of OAv. zaraϑuštrābiā or Middle Av. zaraϑuštrāhē, in V 11.7b is shared by the oldest manuscripts of the three groups.

This latter adaptation would be the only one that can be traced back to the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād. In spite of the variant zaraϑuštrahe also being usual in the manuscripts in other Old Avestan texts, it cannot form the basis of the hypothesis of a Young Avestan version of the Old Avestan texts at the time when Vīdēvdād was composed. Therefore, all the phonetic adaptations of Old Avestan to Young Avestan in isolated words in V 10 and 11 must be regarded as later developments in the written transmission.

To summarise, the Young Avestan language of V 10-12 does not differ substantially from that of other Young Avestan texts, neither in phonetics nor in morphology. Nevertheless, it attests some syntactic divergences:

- Gender: feminines are substituted by masculines and neuters in two examples.
- Number: singular and plural were not distinguished functionally in their nominative and accusative cases. This agrees with the morphosyntactic indistinctness of direct singular cases and direct plurals in Middle Persian.
- Case: the nominative replaced other cases, especially the accusative. The vocative replaced the nominative in two examples, repeated in V 5.
As far as verbal morphology is concerned, it is the same as in other Young Avestan texts. The fact that the dual and other tenses instead of the present and the aorist are not attested in these three fragard does not necessarily mean that they did not exist in the stage of Young Avestan of V 10-12.

Concerning syntax, these are the main features of the Young Avestan of V 10-12:

- Syntactic divergences in formulas are due to the compositional patterns of normative texts, not to the supposedly late or “corrupted” stage of the Young Avestan of V 10-12.
- Postpositions were as such still preserved. Sometimes prepositions were redundantly used in V 10 to reinforce preverbs.
- Use of unexpected cases with the Avestan preposition haca. Prepositions became more important than cases to mark circumstantial complements.

These partial results must be checked with the remaining fragard of Vīdēvdād and compared with other Young Avestan texts before drawing further conclusions. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the morphologic and syntactic data extracted from the analysis of V 10-12 can be laid as a provisional basis for further studies.

Concerning the relative chronology of V 10-12, I do not believe that it was composed when Parthian and Middle Persian were spoken. Conversely, I think that these uses are due to the western oral and eventually written transmission of the Avestan text of Vīdēvdād. In fact, if Parthian or Middle Persian would have been spoken when Vīdēvdād was composed, we would not expect so many correct uses in its Avestan text, which agrees with other Young Avestan texts.
C) THE PAHLAVI TRANSLATION OF V 12

1. THE MANUSCRIPTS WITH PT OF V 12

V 12 lacks in the old PV manuscripts. So no old PT of this *fragard* is preserved. Nevertheless, as far as I know, there are at least nine late PV manuscripts which attest a PT of V 12, namely K2, G25, R1, R3, F10, T44, T42, D66 and MU1. With the exception of T42, which is now under preservation at The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarī and cannot be used, and Jāmāsp’s (1907 xxii) MU1, which seems to be lost, I have collated the PT of V 12 in each of these manuscripts.

Theoretically, there are at least two different explanations for the presence of this PT in these manuscripts: either they preserve an old PT lost in the rest of manuscripts or it has been created in recent times. The first hypothesis seems very unlikely, because these manuscripts should continue a tradition different from the rest of all known PV manuscripts. However, as Cantera (2007b) and Cantera and I (2008) have recently demonstrated, at least two of them, namely K2 and T44, do stem from the oldest known PV manuscripts. K2 stems from K1, while T44 stems from L4, so that they clearly belong to the same tradition of the remaining preserved PV manuscripts.

Thus, the second hypothesis, according to which these PTs were created in recent times, seems more likely. The making of new PTs must be explained in the frame of Dastur Jāmāsp Īrānī’s teaching and of the reformist schools stemming from it (Anquetil-Duperron 1771 1.326 ff.), (Cantera 2007b), (Cantera & Andrés-Toledo 83–85).

Because of a dispute between traditionalists and reformists concerning the use of the *padām*, the Dastur Jāmāsp Īrānī came from Kermān to Surat forty years before Anquetil wrote his travel report, that is, sometime in the 1720s. After resolving the dispute, he decided to check the current version of the PV used in Gujarat. He concluded that it was too long and not very accurate in several passages. In order to repair this situation he taught Avestan and Pahlavi to three Parsi Dasturs: Dārāb from Surat, Jāmāsp from Navsarī and a third one from Baruch, and also left in Surat a corrected PV manuscript. After he went back to Iran, his students continued teaching and correcting their PV manuscripts. The transmitted text of the PV manuscripts was thus corrected and not only under the influence of the Indian *vulgata*, as has often been stated, but also by collating other PV manuscripts.

At least three different schools of copyists arose in Gujarat in the 18th and 19th centuries, of which two were reformists: one started in Surat by Dastur Dārāb, the copyist of K2, and another started by Jāmāsp in Navsarī. The copyists of G25, G25a, F10 and T44 are to be ascribed to the reformist school of Navsarī. Both schools created a new exegetical and editorial movement which tried to stop the corruption of the Avestan written transmission and to correct the texts by means of additions, deletions, rearrangements, etc.

23 Regarding D66, I have been able to collate only the PT of V 12.1-2.
In their attempt to fill the gaps in the old manuscripts, these reformist copyists seem to have created *ex professo*, together with other texts which will be analysed in this chapter, a new PT for V 12 by copying its Avestan text from a VS manuscript and adding its PT.
2. THE CREATION OF OTHER PTs IN THE PV MANUSCRIPTS

V 12 is not an isolated case. In the old PV manuscripts there are some passages whose PT was lost during the written transmission or never existed. Hence, their PTs also lack in the remaining manuscripts stemming from them. However, some PV manuscripts preserve a PTs of these lost passages.

As we will see, the PT of V 12, like other texts lacking in the old PV manuscripts, was created and inserted in the tradition of the PV in the frame of the reformist movement just mentioned, which probably stems from Dastur Jāmāsp Irānī’s teaching. Therefore, we must analyse these new PTs of other passages and compare them with that of V 12.

Among the manuscripts which attest the PT of V 12, R1 and R3 do not preserve the rest of the PV, and T42, D66 and MU1 cannot currently be studied. So only the manuscripts K2, G25 (only in its second volume, which includes V 12-22), F10 and T44 can be used for this comparison.

I will analyse those passages whose PT was lost in the old PV manuscripts in order to elucidate the procedures that the new translators used when creating their own PTs. For this purpose, I will take into consideration Cantera’s (2007b) division of the types of omissions in the PV manuscripts and check how the scribes of these new manuscripts proceeded.

As Cantera (2007b 135 ff.) states, the PV manuscripts attest three kinds of omissions of PTs:

1. The Avestan text present in the VS manuscripts is omitted in the PV manuscripts together with its PT.
2. The Avestan text is included in the PV manuscripts, but it remains untranslated.
3. The Avestan text of the VS manuscripts is included in the PV manuscripts and also its PT, but the PT of the foregoing clause is lacking.

1. The Avestan text present in the VS manuscripts is omitted in the PV manuscripts and also its PT.

In such case the copyists of K2, G25, F10 and T44 copied the Avestan text from a VS manuscript and rendered it into Pahlavi ex professo, as we observe in the following texts:

-V 3.41: after spaiiēiti. draōšm the oldest VS manuscripts attest spaiiēiti. yātuγnəm (L1, T46, Mf2, K9), while others add (spaiiēiti.) auuaγnəm (P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, B4)\(^{24}\). Neither the first text nor the second are included by Geldner (1896) in his edition, because the Avestan text as well as its PT lack in the PV manuscripts.

\(^{24}\) L1 spai.ēiti. yātuγnəm; T46 spaiāéiti. yātuγnəm; P1 auuaγnəm. spaiēiti. yātuγnəm; L2 spaiēiti. auuaγnəm. spaiēiti. yātuγnəm; E4 spaiatae. auua.ganəm. spiaēiti. yātuγnəm; E4 spaiatae. auua.ganəm. spiaēiti. yātuγnəm; L5 auuaγnəm. spaiatae. yātu.ganəm; B4 spaiatae. auua.ganəm. spaiatae. yātu.ganəm; G42 spaiēiti. auuaγnəm. spaiēiti. yātuγnəm; Mf2 spaiēiti. auuaγnəm. spaiēiti. yātuγnəm; K9 spaiēiti. yā. τυγνəm. vid. (Cantera under preparation D).
The second hand of K2a followed the first group of VS manuscripts, which only attests after *spaiieiti. draošm* the Avestan text *spaiieiti. ūātuγnəm*, copied this Avestan text and created a new PT for it:

The copyist of F10, however, followed the second group of VS manuscripts, namely those which attest the longer text (*spaiieiti. auuaγnəm. spaiieiti. ūātuγnəm*). He copied this Avestan text and left a blank, which was completed by the second hand of F10a with its PT:

The copyist of T44 added in the left margin the same Avestan text and a PT very similar to that of F10 and F10a:

With regards to their technique for the PT, all three could check the correspondence between Av. *spaiieiti* → Phl. <LMYTWN-yt> *abganēd*, because it is repeated in the foregoing passages, so that they only had to create a PT for Av. *auuaγnəm* and Av. *ūātuγnəm*. Their PTs, however, are completely different.

The second hand of K2a created a pseudo-Pahlavi <yʾtwgnnk>, which seems to be an attempt to adapt Avestan phonetics into those of Pahlavi. The copyists of F10a and T44 in turn translated separately *auua* and *γnəm*, on one hand, and *ūātu* and *γnəm*, on the other hand. Hence they rendered Av. *auua* into Phl. <ʾytwn> and added to it Phl. <MHYTWN-tyh>. The result was pseudo-Phl. *ēdōn zadih*, which obviously cannot be an old PT and makes no sense. Apparently

25 <dʾnd AYK-š hdylbʿlyh YHBWN-m krpk> in the left margin.
because of this, an explanatory gloss, modelled on the basis of the rest of glosses of V 3.41, was added.

The most important conclusions one may draw from the comparison between these PTs are that

a) they do not stem from a common source;

b) they have been created independently from different Avestan texts of VS manuscripts;

c) they show a different technique: K2a made a word adaptation, while F10a and T44 tried to interpret each word, misunderstood the dots and even added an explanatory gloss.

- V 11.9e: after pərhəne. *būṣi₂ ASTA. yā. darayī.ɡauuɑ, all the VS manuscripts attest pərhəne. mūi₂i. pərhəne. kapastis, but this text and its PT lack in the old PV manuscripts. In this occasion the copyist of K2 proceeded like in V 3.41, but he did not know how to render the Avestan words mūi₂i and kapastis into Pahlavi. He therefore left a blank for them in the PT and translated only Av. pərhəne → Phl. <pwltynm> purdēnɑm:

Conversely, the copyist of F10 omitted these Avestan words as well as their PT, but the second hand of F10a added all of them in the right margin:

The copyist of T44 added the same PT of this Avestan passage, so that once again K2 differs from the group of F10 and T44:

Furthermore, K2 attests a different division of paragraphs. The Avestan text pərhəne. mūi₂i. pərhəne. kapastis. pərhəne. pairikām ... is copied consecutively in K2 and its corresponding PT follows it, while in F10 and T44 we find the sequence Av. pərhəne. mūi₂i. pərhəne. kapastis + its PT + pərhəne. pairikām ... + its PT.

26 Regarding the PTs <mwtk kl’l> and <’kwstk>, see the commentary to V 11.9.
- V 18.52-57: this passage is omitted in the old PV manuscripts, probably because of a loss of one folio in the copy from which L4 and K1 stem (Cantera under preparation D). Indeed, V 18 is completely disordered in L4 and K1.

Among the innovative manuscripts, only F10 did not complete this passage. However, K2 and G25 attest in its right position the whole Avestan text together with its PT. In K2 we find:

18.52. āa. hē. nāma. fr

adātibīāi. āataṛu. dātum. vā. āata. cīrūm. vā. āata. zaṇtūm. vā. āata. dāxiūm. vā. kūm. cīt. vā. āata. dātanīm. <AP-s ZK ŠM ʾt prʾc dhšnʾk ʾtš dʾ tʾ ywp ʾtš pyʾkʾ ywp znd ʾywp dhšnʾ kʾlʾcʾ yʾ wp ʾtš dʾ tʾ nʾ/blank/> ʾywp

18.53. sraošō. ašiū. drujiū. aproṣat. apūništā. patti. vazariū. druṣī. aṣābre. auniwarzāke. <slwš ʾhlwbʾ y dlwc pwsyt BRA MN cygwnk AYK QDM wzl ʾniḥāʾ> dlwc ʾhwʾlyʾ w′ wlcšnk> kūta. aṣābāšī. arṣānīm. tūriū. <kʾl OLE-sʾn gwšnk tswm>

18.54-55. āa. hē. ḫa. patti.dauuata. yā. daēnu. druṣī. sruša. aṣiū. hurāoṣa. <AP-s ZK>
In G25 it is attested the following text:

18.52. āaṭ. bē. nām. fradaišīā. ātarā. dātām. vā. ātarā. cīdēm. vā. ātarā. zāntiūm. vā. ātarā. daxīūm. vā. kām. čī. vā. ātarā. dātāb. nām. <yṭwn> ZNE ŠM y prʾc bωltʾ l tewm dʾtʾ ywpʾ twrʾ ctlʾ ywpʾ twrʾ zndʾ ywpʾ twrʾ MTAʾ ywpʾ cyšʾm-cʾ yʾ twrʾ dʾtʾ ŠM y [AYK ZNE cygwn plznd BRA plšklt krtʾlyh LNE lʾd BRAʾ psplmtʾ bwnyk mynšnʾ]>  

18.53. sraošī. aṣšīō. dṛujm. apārṣat. <slwš AHL 'hlwbʾ dlwc pwrsyt [MN hrwtk AYT MNW

---

27 The first hand of K2 separated Av. māraṃcātīī from Av. gaēdā. astaunatiš. aṣābe, left a blank for the first part and translated the second one. However, the second hand of K2a did not notice that Av. gaēdā. astaunatiš. aṣābe had been already translated and filled the blank after māraṃcātīī with a PT from an Avestan text where Av. māraṃcātīī was not separated from Av. gaēdā. astaunatiš. aṣābe by the PT. Because of this, the PT of Av. gaēdā. astaunatiš. aṣābe was copied twice. This is important to notice that the second hand of K2a compared the PT of K2 with another PT from a different manuscript which also completed the missing parts. Since none of our extant manuscripts attests exactly this PT here, it must stem from an unpreserved source.
ʾytwn’ YMRWN-yr’ AYT MN hygiene AYT MNW MN gnm’gmnwg
apatiuxtāt, paiti, yavzīrāt, <BRA MN ’ywešn’ wzl [AYK wzl HNHTWN-t’n ’y pyt’kynyt’ AYK hwstwykhy y PWN bym LA PWN hwstwykhy YHSNN-š’n’>
druṣi, asādīre, anuaarzike. <AYK dlwc y ’hw’lyh [AYK nwykyh c’nc ’eš LOYT’) ’wlcsn’ [AYK MNDOM y pl’lwn LA wlcyd]> kō, tē, aṁtāčām, aršām, tūriiō. <kt’l LK MN OLE-š’n’ gwšn’n’ tswm>

18.54. āat, bē, bā, paiti daunata, yā, dačūni, druṣi, sraoša, aştia, huraoša. <AP-š OL pshwynyt’ MNW ŠDYA ’dlwc [AYK slwš ‘hulb’ hwulwst’>

bō, bā, mē, ačām, aršām, tūriiō. <ZK pl MN OLE-š’n’ gwšn’n’ tswm>
yat, nā, jahika, pasca, pąncda,sam, saradām, frapatata. <MNW GBRA yyy AHL MN 15 ŠNT pr’e ’wptyt’ [AYK OBYDWN-yr’]
anaijāstā. vā, ana badāsta, vā. <BRA MN ’n’ ypy’d’t ’ywptyt BRA MN ’YDOYWTWN-tn’>

18.55. pasca, tūriiō, gāmō, baraitām, isara, pascaita, vaim, yō, daeuuae, batax, vaim, auna, miuunāmbhe, bizzuac, paimuac, xšiamaana, pascaita. <AHL MN sh’l OD g’mk tswm YBLW<DN’>šnyh [AYK tswm b’l>
Surprisingly, T44 only attests V 18.52-54 and only 18.52 is rendered into Pahlavi:
The comparison between these three texts brings some interesting results. T44 did not preserve the same Avestan text as K2 and G25. Since its Avestan text is not the same, obviously it was copied from a different VS manuscript.

It is also noteworthy that K2 and G25 did not show the same division of paragraphs as that of T44. K2 and G25 agree in V 18.52 and 18.57, while only T44 deviates from their common division in 18.52. Nevertheless, the former manuscripts disagree in the rest of completed passages. For instance, in 18.53 K2 attests the sequence Av. sraošō. ... aiauarrzike + its PT + Av. kuta. ... tūriiō + its PT, while in G25 we find Av. sraošō. ... aporastat + its PT + Av. apaiuitst. paiti. vazrāt + its PT + Av. druxš. ašādhe. aiauarrzike + its PT + Av. kō. tē. ... tūriiō + its PT. Also a different division is found in 18.54-56. However, we must take into account that K2 usually divided the paragraphs differently in the rest of Avestan and Pahlavi texts of Vīdēvdād, so that this fact by itself does not demonstrate that it stems from a different source.

Concerning the PT, there are also two groups of manuscripts. The PTs of K2 and G25 are very similar and differ from that of T44.

Despite their similarity, the PTs of K2 and G25 are slightly different. On one hand, the scribe of G25 went one step farther than that of K2, because he completed the blanks of K2 and even added glosses to the PT. In this regard, it is closer to the PT of T44, which also adds glosses. On the other hand, their particular mistakes in the PT of some Avestan words can hardly be traced back to a common source. Instead they rather indicate that their scribes were making a different version of a common PT. Accordingly, innovative but mistaken PTs are found independently in K2 and G25. Let’s see some examples:

a) Wrong PTs because of the dots: in 18.55 in K2, the Avestan numeral panca.dasim was rendered not by Phl. <15>, but by <5 10>. The same is found in 18.52 in G25, where Av. ətara.dātahe.nām was rendered into Phl. <ʿtwr dʿ ŠM> ādur-dād-nām instead of Phl. <ʿʾtwr dʿ tʾn> ādur-dādān, or in 18.55 in G25, where Av. yātu.manta was rendered into Phl. <ʾtwk mynšn> and ʾmanta was wrongly connected with Av. man- “to think”.

b) Wrong interpretation of an Avestan word deviating from their usual PT:
- Av. ātarə.daxiium → Phl. <dhšn'> in 18.52 in K2 (besides the omission of the PT of the first element of the compound ātarə, Av. daẖhu- "country" has been confused with Phl. dahšān "creation").
- Av. zanda → Phl. <zywndyḥ> zindih in K2 in 18.55, but → Phl. <MHYTWN-d> zanēd in G25.
- Av. kām.cit → pseudo-Phl. <cyš-m-c-HD> in G25 in 18.52, where the Avestan word has been dismembered as kā-m-c-iṭ and readapted as pseudo-Phl. čiš-am-iz-ē.
- Av. naicīš → pseudo-Phl. <LA ME’-š> nē čē ā-s in 18.57 in G25, which is an attempt of morphologic analysis, but a syntactic aberration.

Therefore, it is clear that the PTs of K2 and G25 belong to a different group than that of T44 and where made from the Avestan text of different VS manuscripts. Nevertheless, G25 went one step farther and completed the blanks of K2 and even added glosses lacking in K2. Moreover, it innovated and made mistaken PTs which cannot be traced back to a PT common to K2.

- V 19.41-44: the PV manuscripts omit the Avestan text from 19.41 after the words mərəzujitīm mašiuān to 19.44 aŋrō. ʰmaniuš, and its corresponding PT. In G25 this passage lacks too. However, K2, F10 and T44 attest the complete Avestan and Pahlavi texts placed in their right position.

In K2 there are many blanks in the PT which have been completed by the second hand of K2a:

---

19.41. ... nazdištā. daẖhāuu. yaoḏdāriuḏh. haca. frakarai. frakara.ṇiṅ. vāstri. vəɾaziuṅ. pasuš. xarıdōm. gauua. xarıdōm. <nzštn MTA’n ywš’l slynt MN pr’c kltn yw’l kltnyy w’stl wlcynš p’h’ hwlšnk gwspn<\> hwlšnk /blank/>

19.42. nizba’mi. karō. mاشe. ʰpapache. bun. jafrān. vmaxiuān. vairiian. <BRA KRTWN-m gl ms’y w’ p’n bwn zpl’n’ k’mk hnd /blank/>
K2a was copying from a PT similar to those of F10 and T44, because it includes a gloss. As we have already observed, K2 usually omits the glosses, while the manuscripts from Navsarī included many of them.
In F10 there are three blank pages, but the second hand of F10a completed this large omission with the whole Avestan and Pahlavi texts placed in their correct position:

19.41. ... nizdištāt. daišbā-num. yaoźdaštāt. bāca. frakari. frakaromašt. vāstaria. vorzūašt. pasuš. xārādūm. gaume. xārādum. <nyzlyš ŠDYA MN nzdyk y kyšwl y ywš’dslgl BRA YATWN-yt pr’c kwnš’n’qh pr’c kwnt [AYK pyhw OBYDWN-d ‘nzdst OZLWN- yt] W w’slywš [AYK bwlcygl ’ywlt’kyšwc’] OBYDWN-yt p’h hwlšn’ l’d W TWRA [gwspnd] hwlšn’ l’d>

19.42. nizbaiemi. karō. masiū. upa’po. bun. jafranq. vaquirq. <BRA KRYTWN-m knl’y ms MYA bwnd zwp pl y w’n’ nizbaiemi. mawz. ʾpouwū. ʿalūtū. ʿyuʾštū. mainiu, ḍāmūn. <BRA KRYTWN<N>-m ḡwlc’ytl pwl ht’ yh MNW hw–hw’dšn’ mynw’ng’n’ d’m’n’ [ʾtw<h>št’ ‘mhrspnd]> b’nyzbaiemi. hapta. sruu. bāmiia. <BRA KRYTWN<N>-m hpt srd’l

b’myk l’d> bnʾqybo. puʾdrʾqybo. pusnuʾqybo. frabqynti. (19.43.) frabqynti. ʿvidāwata. frambqnti. ʿvīmāniqnti. abyā. mātius. pooru. mābhq. <‘hw’ ʾwmand W pwšʾlʾn’ ʾwmand W pwṣʾwmand YHWWN-d pr’c hw–hw’dšn’ W ywdt hw’dšn’ W pr’c myšnʾn’ W ywdt mynnšnʾ OBYDWN-m gnʾkmynwg pwmlg l’d> daʾwunq. bāqybo. <ŠDYA-ʾn’ ŠDYA> aindarq. daeunuq. <ndl ŠDYA [MNW dwsʾmn y ʾrtwhʾl AYT’]> saunu. daeunuq. <ʾswl ŠDYA [MNW dwsʾmn y ʾtrwywr AYT’]> nʾhybqndm. daenūq. <ʾnʾghʾlt’ ŠDYA [MWN dwsʾmn y spndrm AYT’]> taunuq. zatirq. <ʾtlyc W zʾlyc ŠDYA lʾd [MNW dwsʾmn y hwrdt W ʾmwrtd AYT’]> ašm. ʿxṣcim. draom. <ḥyšm y hlwyk dwsʾlm lʾd> aṭyʾšm. daenūq. <ʾktʾš ŠDYA [MNW dwsʾmn y tyl AYT’]> lʾd> zuʾqm. daenūq.dāṭm. <ʾzmstʾn’

29 Written <ywšt’>.
ŠDYA-'n dt l’d> 
ast’læjö. maræjonst. <syc nyh’n lwbsnyh l’d [AYK ‘stwyd’t’]> 
zawruni. dwdíyjædo. korænaoití. <zwly’n’ 
SLYA OBYDWN-’yk l’d> 
büti. deænuţ. <bwt ŠDYA l’d> 
darijìș. deæwuţ. <splk ŠDYA l’d> 
daijìș. deænuţ. <plyptl ŠDYA l’d> 
kaænuț. deænuţ. <kweš ŠDYA [AYK Kyna] 
l’d> 
paitiș. ndænuţ. <bws’sp ŠDYA l’d> 
daænuəńt. deænuţ.tmoț. <ŠDYA-’n’ ŠDYA 
gwhlykyh l’d>

19.44. 
daænuț. nît. daænuńata. <’n’ ŠDYA SLYA 
hw’dns’ gwpt> 
bó. yó. duždă. <OLE AYT’ dwš d’n’k> 
aybrò. mainiiuș. paouru. mahrkô. <gn’k 
mynwg pwmlng [gwpt hm’y ŠDYA-’n’ l’d]>

T44 attest the same text as F10a also in its correct position: 

19.41. ... niædiștți, daæjîhnûș. waoædăvrîș. 
hac. fraæră. fraækînorîț. văstră. wæxțiîqț. 
pasû. xwaæt’m. gunău. xwaæt’m. <nylzyl 
ŠDYA MN BYN nîdqk y kyșwl y wws’d’sgl 
BRA YATWN-yt pr’c kwnșnyh pr’c kwnty 
[AYK pyhw’ OBYDWN-d ’nzdst OZLWN- 
yt] W w’stlywș [AYK bwlygyl ywl’k kyșwcl] 
OBYDWN-yt p’h hwls’n’ l’d W TWRA 
gwspnd] hwls’n’ l’d>
In this passage, all these manuscripts preserve the same Avestan text with only some textual variants. Once again, the division of paragraphs of K2 differs from that of F10a and T44. While K2 attests the sequence Av. nizba"mi. karō. ... vairianām + PT + Av. nizba"i"mi. mərəzu. ... bau"anti + PT in V 19.42, in F10a and T44 we find Av. nizba"i"mi. karō. ... vairianām + PT + Av. nizba"i"mi. mərəzu. ... dəmən + PT + Av. nizba"i"mi. haptə. sənu. bəmii+a + PT + Av. hukāyəhə. ... frābāu"anti + PT. Also in 19.43 and 44 the division of paragraphs in K2 differs from that of F10a and T44, but, as mentioned before, this is usual in K2. It therefore does not by itself demonstrate that its text stems from a different source.

With regards to the PT, K2 disagrees from the common PT of F10a and T44. While the latter ones share some innovations, K2 attests other ones which clearly demonstrate that it does not stem from their common source:

a) Wrong PTs because of the dots: the scribe of K2 wrongly analysed Av. frakaranəəət as Av. frakara.nət in V 19.41, surely influenced by the preceding word frakarai, and misunderstood it as Av. frakara + the negative adverb nət. Hence he rendered Av. frakara into Phl. <pr'c krt'> and made a literal equivalence in Av. frakara.nət → pseudo-Phl. <pr'c klt
ny>, where <klt
ny> represents <kltn> + the PT <ny> nə, that is, the Pahlavi negative adverb. The same is found in Av. yūi.əštö instead of Av. yūi.əštö in 19.42. He divided it by a dot and interpreted that yōiº was the relative pronoun, so that he rendered this Avestan word into pseudo-Phl. <MNW dšt>.

b) Deviations from the usual PT:
- Av. upāpō: in K2 it is not rendered into Phl. ābīg in V 19.42, as usual, but into Phl. <w' p'n'> ə əbən. Obviously the Pahlavi translator of K2 segmented the word as Av. upa + āpō → Phl. ə əbən. Although his interpretation is morphologically correct, it disagrees with the rest of PTs, so that it must be considered as an innovation and therefore not as an old PT.
- Av. vīº in 19.43 the Avestan preverb vīº was wrongly equated with the New Persian verbal prefix bi-, so that it was translated as Phl. <BRA> bē in Av. vidauuata → Phl. <BRA gwwyt> bē gōwēd and Av. vī.mainiiata → Phl. <BRA mynynyt> bē menēnēd.

- Av. daunuata: in 19.44 he misunderstood this Avestan verb and rendered it into Phl. <dywʾn’n> dēwān “demons”.

On the other side, F10a and T44 share a PT which clearly stems from a common source, as we can observe in their interpretation of some Avestan words. For instance, in V 19.42 both of them translated the Avestan thematic ending of Nom. Pl. -āyāb of Av. hūāyābō. pusūāyābō by means of Pahlavi suffix –ōmand. This is surely due to the confusion with the Avestan suffix –uuah-, which is usually translated as Phl. –ōmand, in Av. hūāyābō and pusūāyābō. Moreover, they agree in some mistaken or innovative PTs:

- Av. upāpō: the Pahlavi translators of F10a and T44 only understood āpō, so that they translated it as Phl. <MYA> āb.
- Av. karō: in 19.42 it was interpreted as Phl. <knʾ> kanār.
- Av. bun: in the same passage was misunderstood as Phl. <bwnd> bawand.
- Av. smuō “horns”: in 19.43 it was wrongly rendered into Phl. <srdʾ> sālār “authority”.
- Av. uiti “so, thus”: in 19.44 they confused this Avestan adverb with the Pahlavi adjective <SLYA> wad “bad”.

Therefore, it is evident that the PT of K2 does not belong to the same common tradition of those of F10a and T44.

2. The Avestan text is included in the PV manuscripts, but it remains untranslated.

Sometimes an Avestan text extant in the old PV manuscripts just lost its PT through its written transmission. These omissions were usually supplied by a newly made PT in K2, F10 and T44, as we can see in the following passages:

- V 11.9c: in the sequence pārōne. hām.raēdžom. pārōne. pawtī.raēdžom. pārōne. wī. pārōne. xru. pārōne. xruumīni. pārōne. būīdī. pārōne. būīdūža. pārōne. kūnda. pārōne. kundīža all the PV manuscripts omit the PT of pārōne. xru. ... pārōne. kundīža. Only in K2 we find an attempt of PT. The copyist of K2 wrote the Avestan text, translated twice Av. pārōne → Phl. <pwltynm> purdēnam and left a blank to translate the Avestan words he did not understand. Afterwards he copied the PT of the following Avestan text, which is attested in all the PV manuscripts with its PT. This can be deduced by the fact that he copied the gloss in this PT, while he usually omitted all the glosses and commentaries embedded in the PT.

| pārōne. hām.raēdžom. pārōne. pawtī.raēdžom. pārōne. wī. pārōne. xru. pārōne. xruumīni. pārōne. būīdī. pārōne. būīdūža. pārōne. kūnda. pārōne. kundīža | pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ ... > |
On the contrary, the copyists of F10 and T44 simply omitted the PT, like the rest of PV manuscripts.

3. The Avestan text of the VS manuscripts is included in the PV manuscripts together with its PT, but the PT of the foregoing clause is lacking. In this case, the copyists of K2, F10 and T44 only needed to create *ex professo* the PT of an extant Avestan text:

- 15.8: the PT of *agāt.baca. irišuāt* and the following Avestan text *yezi. tat. paiti. irišiēiti* is lacking in all the PV manuscripts. They are also missing in T44, but in K2 the Avestan text *agāt.baca. irišuāt* together with its PT and the following Avestan text were added by the second hand of K2a:

![Image of Avestan text]

The same is found in G25:

![Image of Avestan text]

In G25 the following Avestan text is lacking. Moreover, Phl. *<lyšt>* has been misunderstood as Phl. *rasēd*, as the gloss with the Pahlavi verb *<YATWN-\* yt>* *rasēd* demonstrates.

In F10 the same PT and gloss and the omission of the same Avestan text as in G25 are found. However, a second hand has added the Avestan text in the left margin:

![Image of Avestan text]
- 15.21-22: the PT of višpom. ā. māt. trād. kārṇaunu, yaṭ. aēte. yōi. spāna. uz. jasnu in 15.21 and the Avestan text yaṭ. nōiṭ. haraērom. baraiti of the beginning of 15.22 lack in all the PV manuscripts, including T44. In K2, however, the PT is written in its right place, while the following Avestan text is supplied by the second hand of K2a around the text in this folio:

In G25 the PT is present and the following Avestan text is omitted, but the second hand of G25a added it in the right margin:

In F10 a PT similar to that of G25 is present, but the following Avestan text is lacking and was not supplied by a second hand:
- 18.5-6: the PT of 18.5 mā. dim. mruiiā. ādrauauważ. uiti. mraoṭ. aburō. 
mazdā. āi. așāum. zaraduṣṭra and the Avestan text of 18.6 tām. dim. mruiiā. 
ādrau ontvang. uiti. mraoṭ. aburō. mazdā. āi. așāum. zaraduṣṭra are not preserved 
in the old PV manuscripts. In this case, G25 and T44 do not attest the PT of the 
Avestan text of 18.5, but they do preserve the Avestan text of 18.6. On the 
contrary, K2 attests the PT of this Avestan text of 18.5, but omits the Avestan text 
of 18.6:

Only F10 attests the PT of 18.5 and the following Avestan text of 18.6:

To summarise, this is the scheme of the completed passages in each 
manuscript:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>G25</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>F10a</th>
<th>T44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9c</td>
<td>PT with blanks</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9e</td>
<td>PT with blanks</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.21-22</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.52-57</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td>partally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.41-44</td>
<td>PT with blanks</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td>lacking (3 blank pages)</td>
<td>PT + comm.</td>
<td>PT + comm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The copyists of K2, G25, F10 and T44 were aware of the gaps in the old PV manuscripts and tried to supply them in order to correct the transmitted text. The most evident example of it is found in the creation of the PT of V 12, but, as we have observed, this is not an isolated case. In my opinion, this attempt to correct the old tradition of the PV stems from Jāmāsp Īrānī’s teaching and is to be inserted in the frame of a reformist movement.

With regards to the new manuscripts studied in this chapter, it is represented by at least two different schools: that of Surat and that of Navsarī. K2 is to be placed in the first one. It is also the only manuscript which tries to fill every gap in the written transmission. Furthermore, when its scribe was not sure about how to render some specific Avestan words, he left a blank. Moreover, his translation was more inaccurate, did not add glosses and it is completely different from those of the manuscripts of Navsarī.

On the contrary, the manuscripts written in Navsarī, namely G25, F10(a) and T44 did not fill so many gaps. Furthermore, they even added some glosses and brief explanations not found in K2 (with the only exception of the second hand of K2a, which surely copied them from a manuscript similar to those of Navsarī). Moreover, the PTs of F10 and T44 are very similar and differ from that of K2, so that it is obvious that they do not stem from a common source. Since they are not old and do not stem from the same source, obviously they were created ex professo separately.

Among the manuscripts written in Navsarī, G25 must be placed in an intermediate position. Indeed, it usually agrees with K2, but also completes the blanks of K2 and even added glosses lacking in K2. In this regard, it is closer to the tradition of Navsarī. Moreover, G25 innovated and made mistaken PTs which cannot be traced back to the PT of K2. Because of this, G25 could have been influenced by both traditions, namely that of Surat and that of Navsarī.

As we will observe, these data also fit the PT of V 12. Indeed, each reformist school chose its own way, expressed by two main kinds of PTs, which I have edited as A and B respectively. The former was made by the reformist school of Surat, represented by K2 and the manuscripts which stem from it or were more influenced by its PT, while the latter one is to be ascribed to the reformist school of Navsarī (F10 and T44).

This division is confirmed by the stemmatics of V 12, so that I will analyse it in order to show how the manuscripts with a PT of V 12 can be grouped.
3. **STEMMA CODICUM OF V 12 IN THE PV MANUSCRIPTS**

As mentioned above, at least nine manuscripts (K2, G25, R1, R3, F10, T44, T42, D66 and MU1) include a PT of V 12. In order to establish the relations between them in a *stemma codicum*, firstly we must extract the main data about them from their colophons and afterwards compare them with their shared *errores significavi*.

K2 has no colophon. However, according to Rask’s information (Westergaard 1852 6), K2 was copied by Dastur Dārāb from an exemplar brought from Persia by Dastur Jāmāsp Īrānī, so that it would be close to Anquetil’s visit to India in the 18th century.

G25 was copied by Mobed Tehmur Nawruz Mobed Rustam Sanjana in Navsari in 1163 A.Y. (1794 A.D.). However, we have no information about the copyist of G25a, the second hand which wrote V 12.

F10 was completed by Dastur Sorabji Kavasji Sorabji Meherji-rana in Narsārī in 1.2.1872 Samvat (1st volume) and 14.10.1872 Saṁvat (2nd volume), that is, 1815 A.D. However, V 12 with its PT has been added by a more recent second hand at the end of the second volume.

T44 was completed by Mobed Sohrāb Dastur Frāmroz Sohrāb Rustom (Meherji-rana) in 1210 (in letters) or 1208 (in numbers) A.Y. (1841 or 1839 A.D.). In T44 the 12th *fragard* was written by the same hand, but was added at the end of the manuscript.

According to Dhabhar (1925 125), T42 was written by Sorab Framji Sorab Rustom Maneck Meherosh Kaekobad Meherji-rana from a manuscript of Mobed Rustam Mobed Behram Sanjana, and completed on the day Ohrmazd of the month Day 1224 A.Y. (1855 A.D.). Like in T44, the 12th *fragard* is added at the end of the manuscript by the same hand.

The rest of manuscripts, namely D66, MU1, R1 and R3, attest no colophon. D66, now preserved at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai, is the fourth volume of Dhabhar’s (1923a 49-50) manuscript 70 in the Mulla Feroz Library. According to Dhabhar’s information, the volumes of 70 were written by Dastur Edalji Darabji Sanjana.

According to Jāmāsp (1907 xxii), the 267 folios of MU1 were written by Dastur Sōhrābī Frāmjī Mehrjī-Rānā of Narsārī about 75 years before the publication of his book, that is, about 1832 A.D. According to Jāmāsp’s (1907) critical notes to V 12, it includes the same glosses and variants such as F10, so that it is very close to this manuscript.

According to a note in New Persian at the beginning of V 12 in R1, we know that it was copied from a manuscript of Mobed Rustam Sanjana (Dhabhar 1923b 135). Moreover, the water mark of its paper indicates the year 1867. Regarding R3 (Dhabhar 1923b 135), we have no further information.

The analysis of these data brings some previous results. On one hand, if Rask’s information about K2 were true, K2 would be the oldest PV manuscript.
which attests a PT of V 12, but it does not imply that it would be the common source of the remaining as we still do not know its filiation and relation with other manuscripts with a PT of V 12. Also D66 and R3 would be isolated for the moment.

On the other hand, the second oldest manuscript, supposedly G25a, would also be isolated for the moment. T42 was copied from a manuscript of Mobed Rustam Mobed Behram Sanjana, while R1 was copied from a manuscript of Mobed Rustam Sanjana. Finally, the scribes of F10 and T44 belonged to the Meherji-rana family, so that it is possible that their PTs would be connected. Moreover, T44 was presented by Dastur Söhrabjí Frāmī Meherji-rana, the scribe of MU1, so that it is also very likely that MU1 was related with T44. Therefore, we can consider the possibility of including in the same group the 12 fragard in F10, T44 and MU1.

To these hypothetical and previous relations, we must add the data of other added PTs. Actually, we have observed that K2 belongs to a tradition different from the manuscripts of Navsarī G25, F10 and T44. Furthermore, these three manuscripts agree in the addition of glosses and explanations with MU1, according to Jāmāsp (1907 403 ff.), and D66 (at least in V 12.1-2). On the contrary, K2, R1 and R3 are usually free from glosses. Therefore, at a first glance it seems that there was a tradition of Surat (K2, R1 and R3) and a different one of Navsarī (G25a, F10, T44, MU1, D66 and maybe T42). However, in order to know exactly the inner relations of all these manuscripts, we must try to reconstruct a stemma codicum by means of their errores coniunctivi and errores separativi in their Pahlavi as well as in their Avestan texts.

3.1. Errores coniunctivi of all the manuscripts

Although these manuscripts can be ascribed to two different groups, they could stem from a common source, provided that we take into account the following errores coniunctivi:

a) Rare variants:
- V 12.5a: <AH-dl> instead of <hwʾ(h-l)> or <AHTE(-l)> for Phl. xwah(ar) “sister” in the second and third PTs in all the manuscripts. Regarding the first PT of Av. xʾanhar-, the common mistaken variant <AHT'E> in K2, R3 and T44, written as in G25a could also indicate a common source.

b) Glosses:
- V 12.1e: F10 and MU1, according to Jāmāsp (1907 404), include in V 12.1e the gloss <HNA AYK ZK gywʾk mʾšnyh BRA HNA gywʾk wtlyšnʾ AYT> at the end of the passage, namely after <tnʾpwlgnʾ>. D66 adds the gloss <AYK wnʾskʾlʾnʾ SLYYA myndʾnʾlʾd> to <tnʾpwlkʾnʾ lʾd> in the same passage. Although this gloss is not found in the manuscripts of the tradition of Surat, the existence of a blank of one and a half line in K2 could indicate that the copyist of K2 knew that there was a gloss after this word <tnʾpwlgnʾ>. In their turn, G25a, R3 and R1 wrote <AYK> after
<tn’pwlɡ’n’>. Furthermore, R3 added <AYK> and a blank of one and a half line.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that T44 did not add neither gloss nor blank nor <AYK>. Furthermore, the gloss of D66, whose PT is the same as that of F10, MU1 and T44, attest a different gloss. Since all four manuscripts stem from a common source, it is unlikely that they did not include the same gloss.

On this account, the blank in K2 can be explained otherwise: K2 left a blank to be filled with the PT, but this was not finally filled completely, as usual in many passages in K2. Accordingly, other manuscripts compared their texts with that of K2 and understood that a gloss was omitted by K2, as usual in other passages too. Hence they added a Pahlavi gloss which never existed. If my assumption is correct, the blank in K2 cannot be used to demonstrate that a gloss existed in an alleged archetype of the PT of V 12.

Therefore, only these three minor errores coniunctivi are not enough to state that all the PTs of V 12 stem from a common source. As a matter of fact, they could be due to the influence of Jāmāsp Īrānī’s teaching. It is possible that he made a model of PT of V 12, on which the rest of PTs were based, but this does not imply that they all were copied from a common written source. Moreover, the rest of newly made PTs in other passages which lack in the old PV manuscripts, as we will see, demonstrate that at least two different schools of PTs existed.

3.2. The groups α and β

There are some errores separativi which clearly reveal the existence of two different groups of manuscripts, namely that of K2, G25a, R1 and R3 and that of F10, T44, D66 and MU1:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
     - 12.7c: K2, G25a, R1, R3 → AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd →
     - 12.11a: K2, G25a, R1, R3 /blank/ → npk →
     - 12.11a: K2, R1 /blank/ → npyh →; G25a, R3 → npyh →
     - 12.17a: K2, G25a /blank/ → 4-wm →; R1, R3 → 4-wm →
   - Long omissions.
     - 12.9a: K2, G25a, R1, R3 → npk ... ny’kyh →

b) Rare variants:
   - 12.2c: K2, G25a, R1, R3 tn’g’n (instead of tn’).
   - 12.4c: K2, R1, R3 tn’hl; G25a tn’hl (instead of tn’).
   - 12.6c, 8c: K2, G25a, R1, R3 tn’hl (instead of tn’).

Therefore, the common errores separativi in K2, G25a, R1 and R3 in comparison with the other manuscripts reveal the existence of a separate common ancestor. I will call it “α” and this first group of manuscripts “group α”.
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Another group is formed by F10, T44, D66 and MU1. With the exception of D66, of which we do not know place of copy, the rest were written in Navsarī. Since I could check only V 12.1-2 in D66, I can only draw partial conclusions. Equally, for MU1 we must trust Jāmāsp’s (1907) information. According to all these data and the many glosses and explanations lacking in the group α, the manuscripts F10, T44, D66 and MU1 share some errores separativi, which are not present in the group α:

a) Abbreviations:
- 12.4c: F10, T44 ŋōriš. ... spēntanam
- 12.8b, 10a, 12a, 14b, 20a: F10, T44 kuḍa. ... spēntanam

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
  - 12.2b: F10 Ŧ y, MU1, T44 Ŧ y, D66 Ŧ y syš (added before the first AYḴ).
  - 12.2d: F10, T44 Ŧ y (before spyt’n’); D66 Ŧ y (before zltwhšt).

c) Rare variants.
- 12.22c: F10, MU1, T44 Ŧ Ŧ

Therefore, we can conclude that there was another separate ancestor, from which a second group of manuscripts (F10, T44, D66 and MU1) stem. I will call this second ancestor “β” and this second group of manuscripts “group β”.

This division into two groups agrees with the results of the analysis of other newly made PTs. Accordingly, there were two different schools, that of Surat and that of Navsarī, from which two different kinds of PTs stem.

3.3. Inner relations in the group α

A) K2-R1-R3

After considering the existence of these two groups of manuscripts, we must analyse their inner relations in each group. Regarding errores conjunctivi in the group α, K2 shares with each manuscript of its group the highest number of omissions, additions and rare variants, but it is R1 to which it is most closely related. Actually, K2 shares eight omissions, four additions, eight rare variants with R1:

a) Omissions:
- Omissions of one or a few words.
  - 12.6c: K2, R1, R3 Ŧ p y ŠPYL
  - 12.11b: K2, R1 viśautica (G25a in the right margin).
  - 12.19a: K2, R1, R3 Ŧ ywp BRA YMYTWN-yt
  - 12.21a: K2, R1 blank k’mk
  - 12.21a: K2, R1 blank DYNA
- 12.21a: K2, R1 ├ ptylyt ├
- 12.22f: K2, R1 ├ hʾnk ├
  - Long omissions.
- 12.11a: K2, R1 ├ niākō. ... napti ├

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
- 12.5a: K2 ꜱ yʾywp; R1 ꜱ yʾywp
- 12.13a: K2, R1 AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd ADYN’
- 12.17a: K2 ’ywĕ BRA; R1, R3 ’ywĕ BRA (ʾywĕ added).
  - Long additions due to perseveration.
- 12.9a: K2 ṣuvat, ṣešam. ṣupa.māniān. ṣuvat; G25a ṣuvat, ṣešam. ṣupa.māniān. (2nd -a- scratched) ṣuvat

c) Rare variants:
- 12.11b: K2, G25a, R1 panca.dasa
- 12.11b: K2, G25a, R1 ḍristom
- 12.11a: K2, G25a, R1 15
- 12.11a: K2, G25a, R1 30
- 12.15b: K2, R1 visaiti
- 12.15b: K2 ciḥʾrāstom; R1 caḥʾrāstom
- 12.15b: K2, R1 20
- 12.15b: K2, R1, R3 40

K2 shares only with R1 six omissions, two additions and three rare variants as errores coniunctivi. It is also much more closely related to K2 than to any other manuscript of the group a. R1 is the only manuscript of this group which often attests a PT where the rest just left a blank. We could suppose that scribe of K2 could have consciously left blanks, but in V 12 they are mostly found in K2 when its scribe did not know how to render into Pahlavi a certain Avestan word. See for instance V 12.2d, where K2 attests blanks where the PT of Av. upāiti is expected, or V 12.9b, where a blank is left in K2 where the PT of Av. pancaštom is expected.

On the contrary, the scribe of R1 really understood the Avestan text and rendered each Avestan word into Pahlavi. Therefore, obviously it cannot be the source of the other three. If this were true, K2 would have incorporated the PT of these words, for which he left a blank because he did not understand them.

Accordingly, in my opinion, the scribe of R1 innovated and filled the blanks of K2 by means of newly made PTs. Furthermore, R1 usually abbreviated the repeated passages and attests errores separativi not found in K2 which seem not to be the result of a tradition, but simply of the scribe of R1:

a) Abbreviations:
- 12.10a: R1 ꜱ tā ꜱ upāiti. ... spitama ꜱ
- 12.10a: R1 lʾpštʾ ꜱ mʾnʾ ... mʾnʾ ꜱ
- 12.12b: R1 ꜱ tā ꜱ āq. ... pascaēta ꜱ
- 12.12b: R1 npšt mʾn' ... zltwšt
- 12.14b: R1 tā | yaoždađānī ... bun
- 12.14b: R1 frasnāiī | spāntanām
- 12.14b: R1 NPŠE mʾn' ... zltwšt
- 12.16b, 20a: R1 tā yaoždađānī ... spitama

b) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
- 12.17a: R1 tūrīio | pudrō
   - Long omissions.
- 12.22f: R1 W ... YBLWN-t

c) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
- 12.2e: R1 ZK mʾn' (ZK added).
- 12.22c: R1 HYA HYA (HYA added).
   - Glosses.
- 12.2d: R1 AY K wʾc BYN hʾnk YDBHWN-yt

d) Transpositions:
   - Transpositions of words.
- 12.22f: R1 hwlšnk W hʾnk (instead of hʾnk W hwlšnk).

e) Rare variants:
- 12.22e: R1 ʾnyʾšw

On the contrary, K2 attests the following errores separativi, which are found mostly in repeated passages:

a) Abbreviations:
- 12.8d: K2 kʾmk ... zltwšt

b) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
- 12.2d: K2 /blank/ KON
- 12.2e: K2 /blank/ lpd (thrice).
- 12.4e: K2 /blank/ lpd (thrice).
- 12.6c: K2 KON
- 12.7c: K2 knyk NPŠE pws
- 12.9b: K2 /blank/ 50
- 12.10a: K2 aišiūo. vaŋhubiūo
- 12.12b: K2 ḍriśfrasrūiī. gāḍanām
- 12.12b: K2 upāiī
data gaṃ
data gaṃ
- 12.14b: K2 upāiī
- 12.16b: K2 – aiβiiō. vaŋhubiiō –
- 12.18d: K2 – spytʾmʾn’ –
- 12.20a: K2 – starmaēta. aiβiiō. vaŋhubiiō –
- 12.22c: K2 /blank/ – wltkyh BRA SGYTWN-ynyt –
  - Long omissions.
- 12.22f: K2 /blank/ – W ... nmt –

c) Additions (deleted afterwards):
  - Additions of one or a few words.
- 12.5c: K2 aēša. dahnmanaṃ
- 12.9b: K2 ADYNʾ gwʾp AP-š
  - Long additions due to perseveration.
- 12.5a: K2 ʾaat. yat. brāt. para.iriḏaiiata. xāŋha. va. para.iriḏaiiata. ADYNʾ MNW āaat

Since the errores separativi in K2 could have been easily supplied by the scribe of R1, because they occur mostly in repeated passages, it seems possible that R1 stems from K2.

The second manuscript which is much more closely related to K2 is R3. Actually, K2 shares 12 omissions, two additions, three rare variants with R3:

a) Omissions:
  - Omissions of one or a few words.
- 12.6c: K2, R1, R3 – ḫʾy ŠPYL –
- 12.7c: K2, G25a, R3 – BYRH –
- 12.11a: K2 /blank/ – nyyʾk –; G25a, R3 – nyyʾk –
- 12.14d: K2, R3 – lwd –
- 12.16c: K2, R3 – slʾyt –
- 12.19a: K2, R1, R3 – ḫʾyw BRA YMYTWN-yt –
- 12.20d: K2, R3 – blsm ASLWN-x₁ –
- 12.22c: K2 prʾc /blank/ – plwyt |-; R3 prʾc – plwyt –
- 12.22h: K2, R3 – pʾhlwm –
  - Long additions due to perseveration.
- 12.12b: K2, G25a, R3 – 3 ... gʾsʾn’ –

b) Additions:
  - Additions of one or a few words.
- 12.14b: K2, R3 cy cygwn (cy added and deleted in both of them).
- 12.17a: K2 ḫʾywʾp BRA; R1, R3 ḫʾywʾp BRA (ʾywʾp added).

c) Rare variants:
- 12.10a, 14c: K2, G25a, R3 tnʾhl
12.16c: K2, R3 tn'hl

K2 shares only with R3 five omissions, one addition and one rare variant. Apart from these, there is another fact which indicates to a closer relation between these manuscripts. Actually, after the last <YM YTWN-yt> in 12.22g there is a blank in K2. After that word, only K2 left a blank. Conversely, R3 copied in Pāzand the commentary to the parallel PT of V 5.38: (Pāz. mordb under the line)


We could suppose that the scribe of R3 has filled the blank when copying K2. However, the existence of this blank indicates that the scribe of K2 knew that there was a commentary after this word, surely when comparing his PT of V 12.22 with that of the parallel passage of V 5.38. He did not copy the commentary, but left a blank in order to mark its existence. Otherwise, we can suppose that K2 has copied from R3. However, R3 includes the following errores separativi not found in K2, so that K2 cannot be a copy of R3:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
     - 12.1a: R3 ─ pyt ─
     - 12.1d: R3 ─ dhm’n’ cnd ─
     - 12.3a: R3 ─ BRE ─
     - 12.15a: R3 ─ tūriia. va. para.iriθieiθi ─
     - 12.19a: R3 ─ MNW ─
       - Long omissions.
     - 12.8a: R3 ─ d’t’l ... ’hlwμ’ ─
     - 12.21a: R3 ─ ’ywp ... spn’mynwq ─

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
     - 12.1d: R3 MN t’p”lk’n’ (MN added).

c) Rare variants:
   - 12.3d: R3 80
   - 12.9b: R3 70
   - 12.11a: R3 5 21
   - 12.11a: R3 70
   - 12.15b: R3 payca.dasa
   - 12.15b: R3 ḏristom (like F10, T44)

The errores separativi in K2 could have been easily supplied by the scribes of R3 and R1. Actually, only some omissions present in K2 are not found in repeated passages, while the additions deleted in K2 could have already been
deleted by the scribe of K2. Therefore, we can suppose that R3 simply completed
the omissions present in K2, as they are sometimes marked by a blank in K2. Thus,
the only gloss included in R3 in 12.22g, where K2 attests a blank, could simply
have been added by the scribe of R3. It is therefore unnecessary to reconstruct a
common ancestor of K2 and R3.

Furthermore, although R1 stems from K2, it cannot be a direct copy of K2,
because it shares only with R3 some omissions and additions which lack in the
remaining manuscripts:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
     - 12.3d: R1, R3 ʾwhrmzd ʾ
     - 12.8d: R1, R3 ʾspytʾmʾnʾ zltvšt ʾ

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
     - 12.1d: R1 ʾhaca. tanu.ƿr̄dḥanamʾ; R3 ʾhaca. tanu.ƿr̄dḥanmʾ (ʾhaca added).

On one hand, the significant errores separativi of R3, especially those
relating to numerals, demonstrate that neither R1 can have been copied from R3,
nor R3 from R1. On the other hand, the errores coniunctivi shared only by R1 and
R3 imply to reconstruct a common ancestor of R1 and R3, which stems directly
from K2. I will call it “α1”.

Apart from supposing a common ancestor α1 for R1 and R3, we must take
into account an interesting fact: R3 often agrees in the numerals of V 12 with the
manuscripts from Nāvarī F10, T44 and MU1. Since R3 clearly stems from K2,
though not directly, and K2 clearly differs in the numerals, there is only a possible
explanations for this fact: to suppose contaminatio in α1. Actually, it is possible that
α1 copied the same numerals like K2, but a second hand could have compared K2
with another manuscript from the group β. If the scribe of α1 corrected in the
margin or above the line the variants of K2, we can explain why R1 agrees in the
numerals with K2, while R3 agrees with the group β. Otherwise, we must suppose
that an unpreserved and contaminated copy of α1 is the source of both R1 and R3,
an option which is much more hypothetic, or even that such contaminatio only
affected directly R3.

B) G25a

G25a is less closely related to K2 than any of the other manuscripts of the
group α. Actually, K2 shares with G25a five omissions, two additions and five rare
variants:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
     - 12.7c: K2, G25a, R3 ʾBYRH ʾ
     - 12.11a: K2 /blank/ ʾnyyʾk ʾ; G25a, R3 ʾnyyʾk ʾ
     - 12.13a: K2, G25a, R3 /blank/ ʾBLWL-YLYDWN-k ʾ
b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
- 12.1a: K2, G25a BRA ʾywp (BRA added).
- 12.9a: K2 cuuat. aēšam. upa.ṃṇiian. cuuat; G25a cuuat. aēšam. upa.ṃṇiian. (2nd -a- scratched)
cuat
- 12.11a: K2, G25a (but corrected above the line as 50), R1 30

Nevertheless, G25a does not share only with K2 neither omission nor rare variant, but only a single addition, namely 12.1a <BRA ʾywp>. This is not significant enough to state that G25a copied from K2. On the other hand, G25a exclusively shares with R1 or R3 neither omission nor addition nor rare variant. Moreover, the presence of some errores separativi in G25a, especially in the numerals, demonstrates that it cannot have been copied directly from R1 or R3:

a) Rare variants:
- 12.3a: G25a dwhtl
- 12.15b: G25a dasa
- 12.17b: G25a (but corrected prima manu in the left margin as dasa) panca (instead of the expected dasa)
- 12.17b: G25a (but corrected prima manu in the left margin as vīsata) dasa
- 12.17b: G25a (but corrected above the line as 10) pnc
- 12.17b: G25a (but corrected above the line as 20) 10
- 12.22b, e: G25a ʾnʾhlwb'
- 12.22b: G25a hmlyt

G25a was also influenced by a contaminatio. His scribe usually follows the rare variants in the numerals only present in the group α, but sometimes prima manu and sometimes secunda manu corrects them according to those of the group β, as we observe in 12.17. Moreover, it innovates in the numerals in 12.15.

Conversely, the second hand of G25b has filled in the gaps of the PT of G25a which were common to the group α when comparing G25a with a manuscript of the group β. Indeed, the variants supplied by G25b agree with those present in the manuscripts of the group β.
To summarise, apart from the branch of the group $\beta$, this is the stemma codicum we can reconstruct for the moment:

3.4. Inner relations in the group $\beta$

The introduction of many common glosses and explanations in F10, T44, MU1 and D66 and the errores coniunctivi mentioned above reveal that they must be included in a separate branch of the written transmission of V 12.

F10 can be the source of the rest, because it only has a very insignificant error separativus, namely the omission $\mid$ MNW $\mid$ in 12.7a. According to Jāmāsp’s (1907) footnotes, MU1 would be identical to F10. Since he stated that MU1 had no colophon, while F10 preserve two colophons, they cannot be considered the same manuscript. However, as far as we cannot check completely MU1, we cannot state that it is a copy of F10, that F10 copies from MU1 or even that they are two copies of the same manuscript. Nevertheless, it seems very likely that either MU1 or F10 was the common source of T44 and D66.

On the other hand, T44 show many errores separativi which demonstrate that it cannot be the common source of the remaining manuscripts:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
     - 12.2d: T44 $\mid$ QDM $\mid$
     - 12.17a: T44 $\mid$ l’d BRE $\mid$
     - 12.17a: T44 $\mid$ l’d BRTE $\mid$
     - 12.21a: T44 $\mid$ vā $\mid$
       - Long omissions.
     - 12.1e: T44 $\mid$ HNA ... AYT $\mid$

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
     - 12.2d: T44 OBYDWN-$x_t$
     - 12.2d: T44 OBYDWN-$x_t$
     - 12.7a: T44 OD 6 (OD before the numeral).
- 12.9a, 11a, 15a: T44 OD cnd (OD added).
- 12.13a: T44 tanu.pərəhənənən. āa tä (āa tä added).
- 12.13a: T44 AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd ADYN’ (AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd added).

c) Rare variants:
- 12.2b: T44 wstlg hm
- 12.22b: T44 ’n’šw

Neither can D66 be the common source of the other three manuscripts, since it attests the following errores separatívi:

a) Omissions:
- Long omissions.
  - 12.2d: D66 ├ PWN k’mk ’mhrspnd’n’ l’d BRA YDBHWN-d W ’byd’tyn’nd BYN ZK m’n’ │

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
  - 12.2a: D66 gyh’n’ ’st ’wmnd’n’ ’hlwb’
    - Long additions.
  - 12.1e: D66 AYḲ ŠPYL-’n’ W ’lc’nnyk’n’ l’d (after d’hm’n’)
  - 12.1e: D66 AYḲ wn’sk’l’n’ SLYYA mynd’n’l’d (after tn’phlk’n’ l’d).

c) Rare variants:
- 12.1e: D66 AP-š (instead of ’ytwn’)

d) Transpositions:
- Long transpositions.
  - 12.2c: <ʾy zwhl ycšn’ PWN k’l YHSNN-yt slwš dlwn BRA YDBHWN- yt> is placed after <MN MYA y ŠPYL zwhl bld>, instead of after <stwš YDBHWN- yt>.

To summarise, the stemma codicum of the PT of V 12 which can be reconstructed is the following one:
According to this fundamental division into two groups, I will analyse how these new PTs fit the old tradition and which innovative procedures their Pahlavi translators used in the PT of V 12.
4. PHONETICS

As in many other PTs of Avestan texts, the Pahlavi translators of V 12 focused themselves on rendering the original Avestan words into their closest semantic Pahlavi cognates. Afterwards they tried to preserve the exact order of the original text, though adapted sometimes because of semantic reasons (Josephson 1997 153 ff.), (Cantera 1999b), (Cantera 2004a 240 ff.). Hence vocabulary and syntax were the most important for the Pahlavi translators, Avestan morphology was rendered somehow into that of Pahlavi, phonetics were laid aside and metrics were simply obviated. We find the same procedure through the history of the PT of Avestan texts, from the earliest PTs to the most recent ones, like that of V 12.

The new PTs of V 12 share many procedures with the old PTs. Nevertheless, through their deviations with regards to the latter ones, we can notice that they were made in a more recent period. Indeed, when the PTs of V 12 were made, Pahlavi was no longer spoken, but only written, and the New Persian language influenced these new PTs. Such influence in these new PTs is highlighted through the writing of some Pahlavi words, which reveal some phonological features demonstrating that these PTs are modern.

Pahlavi used an archaic writing system which did not reproduce exactly the phonetic of this language. These new PTs, however, innovated and sometimes did not take into account the writing’s conventions of Pahlavi. As a matter of fact, they wrote some Pahlavi words according to the New Persian phonetics and even to the New Persian graphic conventions. So we can state that they are actually New Persian words with a “pseudo-Pahlavi” garment.

With regards to those phonetic features which bring these PTs closer to New Persian, we find the following:

a) Simplification of the Pahlavi group h + consonant.

When these PTs were made, the Pahlavi group h + consonant had been simplified and h had already disappeared. Because of this, some Pahlavi words where this h is expected were written without it, as we see in the following cases:

- Pseudo-Phl. <tnʾpwlhknʾ> tanāfurgān instead of Phl. <tnʾpwhlkʾnʾ> tanāpulbagān (only attested as such in 12.1d in G25a and in 12.7b in F10, and as <tnʾpwhlgʾnʾ> tanāpulbagān in 12.3d in F10 and 12.5c in G25a and F10).
- Pseudo-Phl. <ʾtš> ātaš instead of Phl. <ʾthš> ātaxš (K2 and R3 in 12.14, 16, 18, 20 and 22).
- Pseudo-Phl. <zwšl> zōr > zur (K2 and R3 in 12.10, 16, 18 and 20) instead of Phl. <zwhl> zōhr. This is also found in old PTs.
- Phl. <zltwhštʾ> zardušt (K2, R3) instead of Phl. <zltweštʾ> zarduxšt (B, G25a and R1). This is also found in old PTs.
b) Lack of some short vowels written in Pahlavi. Although short vowels were not usually written in Pahlavi, there are some cases where they were preserved by convention. However, these new Pahlavi translators seem not to have been aware of this convention, as the following examples indicate:

- Pseudo-Phl. <dhmʾn'> dāhmān (in both A and B in all the cases) instead of Phl. <dʾhmʾn'> dāhmān (only in 12.5d in T44). I think that a simplification of the group h + consonant did not occur in this word, but rather the omission of the short a in the writing, as found in New Persian.
- Phl. <blsm> barsom instead of Phl. <blswm> barsom′, which reproduces the variant of NP. بَلْسَم barsom, where no <w> is written.

On the other hand, these late PTs reproduced the Avestan phonetics and sometimes deviated themselves from the old PTs. This is the case of pseudo-Phl. <spytmʾn'> spitamān in A instead of Phl. <spytʾmʾn'> spitāmān. While only B, R1 and sometimes G25a translated it correctly as Phl. <spytʾmʾn'> spitāmān, the rest of manuscripts of A, namely K2 and R3, systematically attest the incorrect writing of <spytmʾn'> spitamān, which surely tried to reproduce the first short –a- of Av. spitama- instead of the expected first long vowel –ā- of Phl. spitāmān.

Concerning the adaptations of the writing’s conventions of Pahlavi to those of New Persian that reveal that these PTs are not old, we find the following example:

- <ʾyw(y)dʾsl> instead of Phl. <ywšdʾsl> yōǰdāsr. The latter is attested many times in R1, sometimes in G25a and only in 12.2a, d and 4b in B. A attests the wrong <ʾyw(y)dʾsl> with initial <ʾ> in 12.2a, 2d, 4e, 6b, 6c and 12c, which actually reproduces the New Persian writing یوزداتر, found usually in the New Persian Rivāyats.

---

31 vid. (Cantera 1998 369, n.42) and the commentary to V 4.26a in (Cantera under preparation A 4.26) for the writing convention of <ʾh> for Phl. ab.
32 Nevertheless, this writing also appears in older PTs, like in V 13.35, where we find "daŋšī.ći → <dhmʾn c> (K1), <dhmʾn-yc> (P2), <dhmʾn-c> (G25a, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3).
33 Only G25a attests <blswm> in 12.6, 10, 12, 14, 16 and <blšm> in 12.2, 4.
5. MORPHOLOGY

Regarding morphology, the Pahlavi translators needed to render Avestan synthetic morphology into the analytic structures of a Middle Iranian language like Pahlavi. So they used special procedures for each morphological category. As far as Josephson (1997 124 ff.) and Cantera (2004a 270 ff.) have already systematised them, I will apply their systematisation to the PTs A and B of V 12 in order to clarify their method.

5.1. Nominal morphology

5.1.1. Case

Avestan does not need prepositions to compose oblique cases. However, this is the case in Pahlavi. Hence the Pahlavi translators used prepositional syntagms to form dative (ō, pad), ablative (az), instrumental (pad) and locative (andar, pad), and other syntactic procedures to form the remaining cases.

- Nominative: there is no special morphologic mark for this case in Pahlavi, with the only exception of the concordance with the verb in present tenses. A difference for the old PT might only exist in the case of past tenses (Cantera, 1999a 198 ff.), because an oblique case morphologically marked (e.g. pidar instead of pid) can be used. In the PT of V 12 the procedure is as expected, e.g. in V 12.1 [A] pid bē mīrēd.

- Vocative: there is no special morphologic mark for this case in Pahlavi.

- Acusative: there is no morphologic mark for it, but there is the concordance with the verb in past tenses and the absence of concordance in present tenses. However, sometimes the absence of a morphological distinction between singular and plural in the PT makes this criterium useless, for example, in V 12.2 zaوذ ظ. baraēta → zōhr barēd [A, B], where Av. zaوذ ظ is an Acc. Pl., but Phl. zōhr is a direct object which could be the subject if barēd were not a transitive verb, because Phl. zōhr can be either a direct singular or a direct plural.

On the contrary, with kinship nouns there is sometimes a difference between the oblique case and the direct case. As Sims-Williams (1981) for the Manichaean Middle Persian, Skjærvø (1983) for the Epigraphical Middle Persian and the Middle Persian of the Psalms and Cantera (1999a) for the Pahlavi already stated, the –r forms are used for the oblique singular and those without –r for the direct case. In V 12, however, this distribution is sometimes confusing, as we see in the following examples:

34 In kinship nouns the direct singular case goes back to the old nominative singular, while the origin of the indirect singular probably stems from the old accusative singular (Cantera under preparation E 25).

- Phl. *mádar*: Av. *máta* (Nom. Sing.) and *máтарm* (Acc. Sing.) are rendered systematically by the oblique Phl. *mádar* in V 12. This can be due to the New Persian influence, but it is already found in other Pahlavi texts.

- Phl. *pus / pusar*: the oblique <pwsl> *pusar* is used only in V 12.7 [B]. In the remaining passages, only the direct Phl. *pus* appears. Although the most usual PT is <BRE> or <pwsl>, we find the PT *putrzymał* → <pwsl’n> *pusaran*, that is, an oblique plural, in other late PTs like that of Vīštāsp Yašt, concretely in Vyt 52.

- Phl. *duxt / duxtar*: all the manuscripts agree in all the passages in the variant Phl. *duxt* for direct as well as indirect case, but only G25a in V 12.3b attests the expect oblique *duxtar* for Av. *duyārām*.

- Phl. *brād / brādar*: in all the manuscripts Av. *brāta* (Nom. Sing.) in V 12.5a and b is translated by the rare form <BLWL>, used as the oblique Phl. *brādar*36. On the contrary, the oblique Av. *brāтарm* in V 12.5b is rendered unexpectedly by the direct <bl’t> *brād*.

- Phl. *xwah / xwahar*: while in V 12.5a all the manuscripts agree in the direct case Phl. <AHTE> *xwah*, in V 12.5b the direct and the indirect cases are both expressed by Phl. <AH-dl>, which is not the oblique case *xwahar*, but actually the oblique *brādar*.

As Cantera (under preparation E 29) states, the oblique case is expected for the direct object in imparisyllabic nouns, as it continues the old accusative. However, the fact that the direct case was used for the direct object in isosyllabic nouns could have motivated that the direct was also used in older stages of Pahlavi than that of the PTs of V 12 for the direct object in imparisyllabic nouns. Because of this, the confusing distribution found in these PTs of V 12 does not necessarily demonstrate that they are late.

- Genitive: there are several possibilities in Pahlavi, although there is no morphological difference between this case and the rest in singular. It can therefore only be identified as a genitive because of its position. With regards to the plural, in V 12 the only difference is the more frequent use of the plurals with –ān for the Pl. Gen., e.g. V 12.1 *aēšān* → *awešān* or *tanuparadānām* → *tanāpūblagān*, like for instance in V 12.2 *vāstranām* → *wastarag*, although this is not systematic.

- Dative: the only attested dative in V 12 is *aijiiō. _MANYUBIIō*, which is an indirect object mostly translated by āb <i>web. We expect the use of the preposition ō and therefore the syntagm ō āb<ān> ī web, like, for instance, in Y 62.10 *yō. aŋái. aēšməm. baraiti* → *kē ō āy barēd ēzm*. Nevertheless, it is usual through the tradition of the PT to place the

---

35 In K2 the PT of Av. *kainīnō. x’atō. pūbrəm* is omitted, but R1, R3 and G25a attest Phl. *pus*.

36 Regarding this word, see the commentary to V 12.5 <BLWL>. 
dative as an indirect object at the beginning of the sentence without preposition ō. This is just what the PT of A did, so it cannot be regarded as a mistake. On the contrary, it is incorrect when translating the Avestan plural Av. aištīə, *vanhubiō* by the Pahlavi singular here. Neither the Pahlavi translators of B translated rightly this Avestan syntagm and did not understood that it was a dative, because in the sole passage where it is attested they translated it by *az āb web*, that is, by the ablative.

- Ablative: not attested in V 12.
- Instrumental: the only attested instrumental forms in the Avestan text are *frasnātī* and *frasrūtī*. Instead of being translated as nouns by means of the preposition *pad* + noun, the usual translation of the instrumental case, both are translated as verbs:
  - *frasnātī* → *(pr’c) HLLWN-yt’* (frāz) šōyēd. Only in V 12.2 [B] firstly we find the PT *(pr’c HLLWN-yt’)* frāz šōyēd, while the preverb is omitted secondly. This PT indicates that it was misunderstood as a 3rd. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act. verb. The other cases are abbreviated in B.

    Regarding A, only *(HLLWN-yt)* šōyēd without preverb is attested in all the passages, with the exception of V 12.8c and 14 (K2, R3) *(HLLWN-šnk)* šōyišnag in both cases.

    In the only parallels for this noun, namely V 5.57 and 58, Av. *frasnātī* → Phl. *(pr’c šwst’)* frāz šust, that is, the noun was understood as a verb too.

- *frasrūtī* → *(pr’c sl’yt’)* frāz srāyēd in V 12.2 [B]. As far as the PT of A is concerned, there are three PTs for the same word:
  a) *(pr’c sl’yt’)* frāz srāyēd: V 12.2, 4, 6.
  b) *(pr’c sl’dšnk)* frāz srāyišnag: V 12.8, 10, 14 (K2, R3), 18, 20.
  c) *(pr’c sl’dšn’)* frāz srāyišn: V 12.14 (G25a), 16 (G25a).

    However, A omits *(pr’c sl’yt’)* in 12.12 and *(sl’yt’)* in 12.16 (K2, R3), where only *(pr’c)* is written.

    The only parallel for this noun, namely Y 9.14, translates it by *(PWN ... pr’c sl’dšnyh)* pad ... frāz srāyišnīh. Though not translating it as a noun, the Pahlavi verb used in A and B renders correctly Av. *frā-sravuata*—“to recite”, but in A it seems that the Pahlavi translators found more difficulties and made several mistakes.

- Locative: not attested in V 12.

5.1.2. Number

The Pahlavi translators of A and B usually preserved the nominal and verbal Avestan plurals, but these were sometimes translated incorrectly.
As Cantera (2004a 272) notices, unlike Josephson (1997 122), the plural in the PT is not usually expressed by the oblique plural mark –ān, but by plural forms of the direct case, morphologically identical with the singular ones:

- Pl. zaoḍrā → Sing. / Pl. zōbr
- Pl. yaoḍdāta → Sing. / Pl. yōjdār
- Pl. nmāna → Sing. / Pl. mān
- Pl. aiṣtiō. vayhubiō → Sing. āb (i) web

Therefore, in Phl. zōbr, yōjdār and mān there is no mistake, but that use of the plural direct case, not distinguished by the plural mark –ān of the oblique case.

However, whenever the Avestan words are Gen. Pl., the PT usually translated them by means of the ending –ān. Nevertheless, there are some examples in the PT of V 12 where those Gen. Pl. are translated by the plural direct case instead of the oblique with –ān:

- Pl. tanunąm → Sing. tan
- Pl. vastranąm → Sing. wastarag
- Pl. apám → Sing. āb
- Pl. uruuanąm → Sing. urwar
- Pl. dáman- (dámanąm) → Sing. dām (only in A in 12.22b)

In such case, we can state that the Pahlavi translators of V 12 made a mistake.

5.1.3. Gender

In Pahlavi no suffix distinguishes masculine, feminine and neuter. Nevertheless, gender distinction is very important in the enumeration of kinship nouns of V 12. Hence the Pahlavi translators were impelled to denote it using two main methods, namely heteronymy and suffixation.

The first one, where the distinction between masculine and feminine is marked by different nominal roots, is represented in the PT of V 12 by the following couples:

<pyt> pid / <mʾtl> mādar in V 12.1, 3.
<BRE> pus / <dwht / BRTE> duxt in V 12.1, 3.
<blʾt / BLWL> brād / brādar / <AHTE>37 xwah in V 12.5.

As far as the second type is concerned, three kind of suffixes are found:
- -<k> –ag (< lir. *-a-kā-).
- -<y>, -<yk>, -<yh>.
- -<yn'> –ēn.

The first one, namely –ag, is attested only in V 12.7 <mʾnʾptk>40 mānbedag, used as feminine of Phl. <mʾnʾpt> mānbed in all the manuscripts with the

---

37 Written <AH-dl> in 12.5b.
38 In G25b, F10 and T44. cf. NP pesar barādar “nephew”.
39 In G25b, F10 and T44. cf. NP doxtar barādar “niece”.

90
exception of R1. According to Salemann (1895-1901 277-278), Phl. –ag (< Iir. ʰ–a-ka-) forms only diminutives⁴¹, adjectives and *nomina instrumenti. However, Horn (1898-1901 174) noticed the use of this suffix –ag in Phl. <’c’k> tāzag “Tāzag”, the feminine of Phl. <’t’c’> tāz “Tāz” in Gr Bd 14.36 [TD1 43v.4; TD2 106.9-10], and in Phl. <ymk> jamag “Jamag”, the feminine of Phl. <ym> jam “Jam” in Gr Bd 35.4 [TD1 97v.11; TD2 228.9] (Pakzad 2005 390). Notwithstanding, he interpreted this suffix –ag as a diminutive, instead of as a feminine.

In my opinion, the suffix –ag is used to form feminines in these examples and would be corroborated by the feminine with –ag in Phl. <m’n’ptk> mānbedag, which therefore would be not an isolated case. Thus, I think that a suffix –ag for feminines may have existed in Pahlavi.

The second suffix and the most usual one in V 12, written –<y> and –<yh>⁴², is present in the following couples, all of them hāpax legōmena:
- <ny’k / ny’k> niyāg (Masc.) / <ny’yk> niyāye (Fem.) in V 12.9 firstly and V 12.11 [A] secondly.
  / <ny’kyh> niyāye (Fem.) in V 12.9 [A] secondly and in V 12.9 in F10 secondly.
  / <ny’y ky> niyāye (Fem.) in V 12.9 in T44 secondly.
  / <ny’y kyk> niyāgge (Fem.) in 12.11 [B].
- <npk> nabag (Masc.) / <npky> nābage (Fem.) in V 12.9⁴³ and 11 [B].
  - <npylk> nabērag (Masc.) / <npylkyk> (Fem.) nabērage in V 12.9 [B].
- <BLWL-ÝLYDWN-k> brādar-zādag (Fem.) / <BLWL-z’tkyh> brādar-zādag (Fem.) in V 12.13a (R1).
  - <4-wm BRE> čahārom pus (Masc.) / <4-wmh BRTE> čahārome duxt (Fem.) in V 12.15 [B]⁴⁴.

The most likely readings of this suffix are –ž or –č:

1. –ž: Phl. –<yk> –iğ usually formed adjectives from nominal roots and Phl. –<yh> –iḥ formed abstract nouns, but this morphological distinction disappeared early on as they merged phonetically in the Pahlavi texts as [iː]⁴⁵. Thus, the writing

⁴¹ R1 <m’n’ ptk yn’>. cf. the PT of Vr 3.3 nmnān.opadnīm → <m’nptyn’ ... [ktk-b’nwk]> mānbedēn ... [kadag-bānāg], G 4.8 nmnān.opadnim → <m’nptyn’> mānbedēn and Vyt 17 nmnān.opadnīā → <m’nptynh> mānbede (Dhabhar 1963 363), but V 7.42 nmnān.pātim → <mnp> mānbed and FrÖ 77 nmnān.padnī → <ktk b’nwk> kadag-bānāg (Klingenschmitt 1968).
⁴³ This ending is used as feminine in Vyt 17 nmnān.pātīm → <m’nptynh>.
⁴⁴ Both are omitted in A, but G25b in the right margin completed it by <npk> and <npylk>.
⁴⁵ However, in 12.17 [B] the same čahārome is used for both <4-wmh BRE> čahārome pus and <4-wmh BRTE> čahārome duxt, while in and 12.19 [B] čahāromi is used for both <4-wm BRE> čahārom pus and <4-wm BRTE> čahārom duxt.
⁴⁶ In modern Iranian languages the suffix –ž forms either abstract nouns or adjectives of relation in New Persian (Lazard 1989 284), in the Lori dialects and in the dialects of Fārs (Lecoq 1989 343,
variants with -ī, -īg or -īh respectively when the PTs of V 12 were made, but it surely implied a common reading, maybe -ī. Since a suffix -ī was never used in Pahlavi to form feminine, we must try to explain from where it is derived.

The first possibility is that it was copied from Phl. nārīg “woman”. If so, the Pahlavi translators of V 12 could have made an attempt to establish a correspondence with the couple Phl. nar “man” / nārīg “woman”.

Secondly, they may have borrowed the suffix -ī from modern Iranian languages where it is used for feminine. Indeed, to my knowledge, feminine with the ending -ī is found in Semnanī (Lecoq 1989 307) and Paštō (Skjærvø 1989 391).

Thirdly, they may have created feminines with -ī on the basis of the Gujarati feminines with -ī.

2. -ī: the reading -ī can be justified because of: a) the Avestan words these Pahlavi forms translated; b) the development of Phl. -ag to New Persian -ē; c) the existence of feminines with -ē in modern Iranian languages.

Firstly, if we interpret <-y>, <-yk> and <-yh> as -e, this suffix could reflect an attempt to adapt the Avestan variants with -e to the feminines translated. Actually, Av. niūka appears as niūke in V 12.9 in K2, R1 and R3 and in V 12.11 in K2a in the right margin and R3. Av. napti is written as napte in V 12.9 in R1 and R3 and in V 12.11 in R3, while instead of Av. brātruiia in V 12.13 we find brātruiie in K2 and R1, barātruiie in G25a, F10 and T44, and brātruiie in R3. Thus, Phl. <-y>, <-yk> and <-yh> could reflect a literal translation of Av. -e. Though possible, this interpretation finds two problems. On one hand, some manuscripts which do not attest the Avestan variants with -e, but with -a or -i, also show <-y>, <-yk> and <-yh> in their PTs. On the other hand, while Av. napti only appears as napte in R1 and R3, the rest of manuscripts which do not show this Avestan ending -e also attest Phl. <-y> or <-yk>. Therefore, it is evident that Phl. <-y>, <-yk> and <-yh> renders the Avestan feminines regardless of the Avestan endings, so that a reading -e in this Pahlavi words cannot be supported using only the Avestan variants they translated.

Secondly, provided that we accept that the suffix -ag was used to form feminines in Pahlavi, as I do, an ending -e could reflect the normal evolution of Phl. -ag > NP. -e. In such case, the variants with <-y>, <-yk> and <-yh> are to be read as NP. -e < MP. -ag < OIr. *a-k(a)-.

Thirdly, a reading -ē can be supported on the basis of the parallel feminine endings with -e in other modern Iranian languages, such as Semnanī (Lecoq 1989 307), Kurdish (Blau 1989 330), Gurānī (Blau 1989 337), Sivandī (Lecoq 1989 346) or Paštō (Skjærvø 1989 391), the feminine with -ē in Zāzā (Blau 1989 339) or the feminine oblique -ē in Yidya and Munjī (Skjærvø 1989 413).

I must admit that there is not a single possibility and that both readings -ī and -ē can be justified. I have chosen the reading -e for <-y>, <-yk> and <-yh> simply because it fits the expected New Persian evolution of Phl. -ag, which in my opinion is used to form the feminine in Pahlavi.

345), and abstract nouns in Sivandī (Lecoq 1989 347) and Kurdish (Blau 1989 333). The suffixes -ī / -īg form adjectives in Balōčī (Elfenbein 1989 356).
With regards to the third suffix for the feminine, namely –ēn, it is attested in V 12 in the following couple of hápax legómena:

- <pyt BLWL> *pid brādar* (Masc.) / *pid brādarēn* (Fem.) in V 12.15 (R1).

Phl. <-yn'> can be interpreted as a suffix –ēn. In Pahlavi a suffix –ēn is present in old plurals from –ā- stems as a rest of OIr. *–ēnām* (Gen. Pl.), as found in Phl. *frāwardīn* (Nyberg 1974 278).

Nevertheless, as Klingenschmitt (1968 31) already noticed, a suffix <-’yn'> or <-yn'> was sometimes used in Pahlavi to form feminines, like in the couples Pāz. *fravāk* and *fravākayn* in Bd 15.25 (Justi 1868 37.12) or in the terminus technicus Phl. *hlwsp’yn’* of FiØ 38 (Klingenschmitt 1968 20-38). According to Klingenschmitt (1968 31; 37-38, n.20), this suffix is semantically parallel to Ved. and Av. –ānī- (e.g. Av. *ahurānī-*) and morphologically identical to Av. –ēnī- in Av. *tišttriiaēnī-* “Frauen des Tišttria” and Av. *paoiriiiaēnī-* “Name der Plejaden”, and to Sogd. <-yn'> in Sogd. <-yw’t yn> “queen” < OIr. *hya-tāyγīnī-* (cf. Sogd. <-yw’t w> “king” < OIr. *hya-tāyγa-*) (Benveniste 1966 29 ff.), which he interpreted as Old Iranian and Middle Iranian suffixes respectively to form feminines.

I agree with Klingenschmitt (1968 31) and I interpret Phl. <-yn'> as –ēn. I add that Phl. <-yn'> was used as a feminine suffix too in old and recent PTs when translating the following Avestan feminines:

- Av. *nmānō.pādnī- → Phl. <m’nptyn'> *mānbedēn* (Fem.) in Vr 3.3 and G 4.8; Phl. <m’ n’ ptk yn'> *mānbedagīn* in V 12.7 in R1.
- Av. *vispā- → Phl. *hlwspyn’* *harwispēn* (Fem.) in V 10.5b in L4, G34, T44 and E10.

Therefore, it seems that the Pahlavi translators of V 12 were aware of the use of this suffix –ēn to form the feminine and they applied it accordingly.

Suffexation in order to form feminines is a very interesting procedure in these PTs. On one hand, the Pahlavi translators of V 12 knew the rare and old Pahlavi suffixes of some feminines, namely –ag and –ēn, although they did not use them in the same PTs. As a matter of fact, the suffix –ēn appears in the PT of Av. *nmānō.pādnī-* in other Pahlavi texts, but not in V 12, where a suffix –ag is preferred in the translation of this Avestan word. On the contrary, the suffix –ēn is only used in V 12 to render the hápax legómenon Av. *tūriia*.

Conversely, these Pahlavi translators innovated. Actually, when translating feminine kinship nouns which were unattested, such as Av. *niūka* (V 12.9 and 11), *napīti* (V 12.9 and 11), *tūriia* (V 12.13) and *tūriia.dūyōa* (V 12.15), they mostly used the suffixes <-y>, <-yk> and <-yh>, which I interpret as NP. –e. As far as they could not check any other PT for these hápax legómena, they were forced to create a new feminine form by means of the suffix –e. If my interpretation is right, this suffix NP. –e would derive from the Pahlavi suffix –ag, scarcely used for feminines. In such case, these PTs by means of NP. –e would be innovations only

---

46 In GrBd 14.34 [TD1 43r.15; TD2 106.3-4] it is written <plw’kyy>. 
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to a certain degree. Indeed, they would be the result of an older tradition which equated the Pahlavi suffix –ag with that New Persian one –e. Thus, the Pahlavi translators were writing pseudo-Pahlavi words, closer to New Persian.

5.2. Verbal morphology

5.2.1. Persons and numbers

The only persons attested in V 12 are the 1st. Sing. and the 3rd. Sing. and Pl.:

- 1st. Sing.
  - +yaoždaðāni \rightarrow \textless wyšd’slynyt\textgreater yōǰdāsrēnēd in A in all the passages, \textless wyšd’slym\textgreater yōǰdāsrē\textlesssna\textgreater m in 12.2 (F10) and \textless wyšd’slynym\textgreater yōǰdāsrēnam in 12.4 (F10). T44 writes \textless ym\textgreater in both 12.2 and 4 \textless wyšd’slynym\textgreater, where the Avestan 1st. Sing. has been translated by a Pahlavi 1st. Pl. Hence only F10 would attest the right variant in 12.4. Although the expected ending of the 1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act. is \textless n\textgreater -ān, there was a tendency to substitute the subjunctive by the indicative in the PT (Cantera 1999a 182-184). So the ending \textless m\textgreater in 12.4 cannot by interpreted as a mistake because of the person, but because of the mode.
  
  In the remaining parallels the manuscripts show variants with \textless m\textgreater, \textless yḏ\textgreater and \textless yt\textgreater:
  - yaoždaðāni \rightarrow \textless wyšd’slynm\textgreater yōǰdāsrēnam in V 11.1.
  - yaoždaðāni \rightarrow \textless wyšd’slynyḏ\textgreater yōǰdāsrēnē in V 11.4a in D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 and (Jmp), but \textless wyšd’slynyt\textgreater yōǰdāsrēnēd in L4, G34 and E10, and \textless wyšd’slyhynyt\textgreater yōǰdāsrēhēnēd in T44. In V 11.4c all the manuscripts attest \textless wyšd’slynyḏ\textgreater yōǰdāsrēnē. In V 11.5a, c, 11.6a, c and 11.7a we find mostly yaoždaðāni \rightarrow \textless wyšd’slynyḏ\textgreater yōǰdāsrēnē too.
  - yaoždaðāni \rightarrow \textless wyšd’slym\textgreater yōǰdāsrē\textlesssna\textgreater m in V 19.12, 21.6, 10 and 14, and only in the manuscripts D62, F10 and P10 in V 11.1.

- 3rd. Sing.
  
  When translated by means of a personal verbal ending, all the Avestan 3rd. Sing. Pres. attest the Pahlavi ending \textless yt\textgreater -ēd in V 12, regardless of the Avestan mode:
  - para.iriḏiieiti \rightarrow <BRA YMYTWN-yt"> bē mīrēd in all the passages in both A and B.
  - yazaēta \rightarrow <ycyt / YDBHWN-yt> yazēd in all the passages in both A and B.

47 However, as Ferrer (unpublished 57-58) observes, the ending \textless ym\textgreater was used for the 1st. Sing. as well as for the 1st. Pl. in the PT.

48 This form is identical to the variant of F10 in V 12.2 and surely represents Phl. yōǰdāsrēnam. It is attested in V 11.1 in the manuscripts D62, F10 and P10 as well.

49 As a past, the injunctive Av. mraoį is translated by Phl. <gwpt> guft, as usual.
- **ham.raēβaiieiti** → <hm gwmyhtyt> ham gumēxtēd in 12.21 and 22 in both A and B.
- **paits.raēβaiieiti** → <QDM gwmyhtyt> abar gumēxtēd in 12.21 and 22 in both A and B.
- **jainti** → <MHYTWN-yt'> zanēd in 12.22 secondly in both A and B.
- **frāuuaieiti** → <prʾc znyt> frāz zanēd in 12.22 only in T44. G25b adapted it as Phl. <plwyt> frawēd.
- **azaiti** → <BRA SGYTWN-ynyt> bē rawēnēd in 12.22 [A]. In K2 it is omitted, while in B we find the rare forms -<F10> and -<T44>.

The exceptions to this PT with -<yt'> -ēd are two optatives with -<x1> and -<d> and two indicatives with -<d>:
- **stornaēta** → <ASLWN-x1> bandēd in each passage in both A and B, with the exception of 12.4 [A] and 12.20 [A]. In 12.4 [A] we find the incorrect -<st'>, where -<st'> could be either a past or a confusion because of the very similar ending -<yt'>. In 12.20 [A] -<ASLWN-x1> is omitted.
- **baraēta** → -<bld> bard in each passage in both A and B, with the exception of 12.12 [A], where the ending -<x1> is used in the heterogram -<YBLWN-x1>. Only G25a attests -<YBLWN-t> in 12.14, 16 and 18.
- **jainti** → -<nd> zand in 12.22 firstly in both A and B.
- **apa.baraiti** → <BRA bld> bē bard only in 12.22 [A]. While in B it is omitted, only in G25a we find <BRA YBLWN-t> bē bard.

When interpreting -<d> in the PT of V 12, we could suppose that this ending reflects the verbal ending of the 3rd. Sing. NP. -ad. However, it is noteworthy that this ending -<d> in V 12 is only found in the verbs which also attest it in older PTs (Ferrer unpublished 115-116). Therefore, I have preferred to interpret -<d> as the old ending of this Pahlavi verbs, not as an influence of New Persian.

- 3rd. Pl.
- **upa.manağiän** → <QDM KTLWN-d> abar mânēnd only in 12.3 [A], 5 [A], 17 (G25a), 19 [A]. It seems that the Pahlavi translators of A and B did not understand the ending of this Avestan verb because of the multiplicity of translations:
  - <QDM KTLWN-t> abar mānd in 12.3 (R1), 5 [B], 19 (R1).
  - <QDM KTLWN-yt> abar mānēd in 12.5 (T44).
  - <QDM NTLWN-yt> abar pāyēd in 12.3 [B].
  - <QDM KTLWN-šn'> abar mānišn in 12.7 [B], 9 (F10), 11 [B], 13 [B], 15 [B], 17 (T44), 19 [B].
  - <QDM NTLWN-šn'> abar pāyišn in 12.9 (T44).
  - <QDM KTLWN-šnk> abar mānišnag in 12.13 [A], 15 [A].
  - <QDM NTLWN-šnk> abar pāyišnag in 12.7 [A], 9 [A], 11 [A], 15 (G25a), 17 [A].
  - <QDM KTLWN-šnyh> abar mānišnīh in 12.1 in both A and B, 17 (F10).

F10 attests <prʾc ynt>, while K2 and R3 only <prʾc> and R1 the rare <prʾc OD gwpt>.
- *bun* → <YHWWN-t> būd in V 12.2 (but in T44 <YHWWN-yt'> bawēd secondly), 4 in both A and B, and only in A in 12.6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 (G25a). In K2 and R3 in 12.18 secondly and in both cases of 12.20 the group of A attests <bwd>, which represents either Phl. būd or NP. bawēd.

Both translations būd and bawēd are incorrect, but the second translation Av. *bun* → Phl. *bawēd* is confirmed by the parallels with V 11.2, 17.10 and 19.23.

5.2.2. Tenses

5.2.2.1. Present

The Old Iranian verbal stems, composed by present (present, imperfect), aorist and perfect (perfect, plusquamperfect), were reduced morphologically in Pahlavi to present and preterite stems. From the preterite, etymologically a perfect passive participle, the perfect, plusquamperfect and future perfect developed by means of analytic structures, formed by PPP. + copulative (*b- / būdan, baw-*) or estative verb (*ēstādan, ēst-*).

This difference regarding the Avestan and Pahlavi verbs seems to have been noticed by the Pahlavi translators, because they usually translate the Avestan present with the Pahlavi present stem. Thus, we find in V 12: *para.iriβiiiti* → <BRA YMYTWN-yt'> bē mīrēd; *ham.raisβαiiiti* → <hm gwmyhtyt> ham gumēxtēd; *paiti.raēβαiiiti* → <QDM gwmyhtyt> abar gumēxtēd; *jainti* → <QDM / MHYTWN-yt'> zanēd; *frānuaiiti* → <pr'c znyt'> frāz zanēd; *azaiti* → <BRA SGYTWN-ynytt> bē rawēnēd in 12.22 [A]; *yaωzdavani* → <ywšd'slynnm> yōjētrēnam in V 12.2 [B] and 4 [B] and <ywšd'slynt> yōjētrēned in the rest of forms in A; *yazaēta* → <ycyt / YĐBHWN-yt> yazēd.

On the other hand, while in *stārmaēta* → <ASLWN-x1> and *baraēta* → <YBLWN-x1> the Pahlavi ending *-x1* can be interpreted in many ways, in *baraēta* → <bld> bard and *apa.baraiti* → <BRA bld> bē bard we find the ending *-d* (Ferrer unpublished 115-116).

The main exception to the PT of an Avestan present as a Pahlavi present is the use of a preterite to translate the Avestan injunctive present (Cantera 2004a 286-287), because it was understood as a past verb.

Regarding V 12, apart from the Pres. Inj. Av. *mraōt*, systematically translated by the preterite Phl. <gwpt> guft as usual, we find the Pres. Subj. *upa.mnatiqan*, whose verbal ending seems not to have been fully understood by the new translators, as we have already observed. Because of this, it was translated not only by different nominal forms and even different roots, but also by different persons and tenses. As a matter of fact, this 3rd. Pl. Pres. Subj. is translated by the present <QDM KTLWN-yt> abar mānēd (3rd. Sing. Pres.), <QDM KTLWN-d> abar mānēnd (3rd. Pl. Pres.) and <QDM NTLWN-d> abar pāyēnd (3rd. Pl. Pres.), while only in 12.3 (R1), 5 [B] and 19 (R1) it is attested by a preterite <QDM KTLWN-t> abar mānd.
5.2.2.2. Aorist

As Cantera (2004a 289-290) points out, even the old Pahlavi translators did not any more recognise the meaning of the aorist. Therefore, it is very unlikely that the later translators of A and B recognised this tense. Indeed, the only aorist attested in V 12, namely bun, 3rd. Pl. Aor. Subj. Act. of baun-, was translated in A and B by <YHWWN-t> būd, <YHWWN-yt> bawēd (T44) and <bwd> bawēd, that is, the same Avestan verbal form does not attest the same PT.

Other Avestan Aor. Subj. are translated by Pres. Ind. verbs in Pahlavi (Cantera 2004a 289-290). This is confirmed by the parallels in V 11.2, 17.10 and 19.23, which agree in the translation <YHWWN-yt> bawēd. Consequently, we can state in this case that the Pahlavi translators gave more importance to the mode than to the tense. Thus, <YHWWN-yt / bwd> bawēd would be the right PT instead of <YHWWN-t> būd. However, both A and B prefer <YHWWN-t> būd, so that they would be wrong in their PTs of Av. bun.

5.2.3. Modes

With the exception of the injunctive, Pahlavi preserved the rest of the Old Iranian modes, namely indicative, subjunctive, optative and imperative, and created a new one, the hortative, by means of the particle ō + Pres. Ind. Act.

Avestan modes other than indicative were also usually translated by the indicative in the PT. Nevertheless, in the old stage of the Pahlavi language represented by the old PTs, the subjunctive and the optative attest more persons than in any other further Pahlavi texts (Cantera 1999a) (Cantera 2004a 291-292).

With the exception of the imperative, in V 12 all the rest of Avestan modes are attested, but in their PT all of them are rendered by means of the indicative in both A and B. Nevertheless, this fact is very frequent in other PTs, so that this fact does not by itself prove that the PTs of A and B are recent.

5.2.3.1. Indicative

As usual, the Avestan indicative is translated by the same mode in the PT of V 12: para.iriššieiti → <BRA YMYTWN-yt'> bē mīrēd; hām.raēššaiššieiti → <hm gwmyhtyt> ham gumēxtēd; paiti.raēššaiššieiti → <QDM gwmyhtyt> abar gumēxtēd; jaišši → <znd / MHYTWN-nt'> zand/zanēd; frāššaiššieiti → <pr'c znyt'> frāz zanēd; apa.baraiti → <BRA bld> bē bard.

5.2.3.2. Injunctive

The only injunctive in V 12 is mraot, which should be translated by a preterite indicative guft in Pahlavi, as usually found in the old PTs.
5.2.3.3. Subjunctive

In V 12 A and B agree in the use of the indicative when translating the Avestan subjunctive:
- Av. $^+\text{yaoždašäni} \rightarrow$ Phl. $\langle\text{ywšd’slynm}\rangle\text{ yōjdaśrēnam}$ or $\langle\text{ywšd’slynyt}\rangle\text{ yōjdaśrēnēd};$ Av. $\text{bun} \rightarrow$ Phl. $\langle\text{YHWWN-t}\rangle\text{ būd, }\langle\text{YHWWN-yt}\rangle\text{ bawēd}$ or $\langle\text{bwd}\rangle\text{ bawēd.}$
- Av. $\text{upa.mānaiign.}$ When translated as a verb, the indicative appears too: $\langle\text{QDM KTLWN-yt}\rangle\text{ abar mānēd, }\langle\text{QDM KTLWN-d}\rangle\text{ abar mānēnd, }\langle\text{QDM NTLWN-d}\rangle\text{ abar pāyēnd, }\langle\text{QDM KTLWN-t}\rangle\text{ abar mānd.}$

5.2.3.4. Optative

Apart from the optatives Av. $\text{stərənaēta} \rightarrow \langle\text{ASLWN-x1}\rangle$ and Av. $\text{baraēta} \rightarrow \langle\text{YBLWN-x1}\rangle$, where the Pahlavi ending $\langle-x1\rangle$ can be interpreted in many ways, other Pahlavi endings are used when translating Avestan optatives:
- Av. $\text{stərənaēta} \rightarrow \langle\text{ASLWN-st'}\rangle\text{ bast}$ in V 12.4[A], where surely $\langle-st'\rangle$ is wrongly written instead of $\langle-yt'\rangle$. In any case, the indicative is implied.
- Av. $\text{baraēta} \rightarrow \langle\text{bld}\rangle\text{ bard,}$ where the indicative is used too.
- Av. $\text{yazaēta} \rightarrow \langle\text{ycyt / YDBHWN-yt}\rangle\text{ yazēd,}$ where the indicative is used.

5.2.4. Diathesis

All the Avestan verbs in V 12 attest the active diathesis, so that no particularity can be noticed in their PTs, because of the absence of middle and passive Avestan verbs in this text.
6. SYNTAX AND TRANSLATION’S TECHNIQUE

The Pahlavi translators of Avestan texts reproduced the Avestan word order, so that the syntax in the PT rarely shows the word order usually found in other Pahlavi texts (Cantera 2004a 241-242).

This being a normal procedure in the technique of the old PTs, the word-by-word reproduction of the Avestan text went one step further in A and B. Actually, these late PTs, especially that of A, differ from the older ones because they omitted every word which did not find a direct correspondence in the Avestan, though necessary in Pahlavi, such as prepositions, the ezāfe and Phl. kū after the verb guft.

In their attempt to render exactly the Avestan text regardless of the Pahlavi syntax, they sometimes did not take into account the enclitics. Indeed, the Avestan adversative conjunction vā preserved its enclitic position in the less accurate PT of A, whose translators systematically misplaced Phl. ayāb in its attempt to reproduce the Avestan word order exactly. Thus, in A we find māta. vā → mādar ayāb (12.1), duōda. vā → duxt ayāb (12.3), xōyha. vā → xwah ayāb (12.5), mnānō. padni. vā → mānbadag ayāb (12.7), niūka. vā → niyāyī ayāb (12.9), napti. vā → nīyāg ayāb (12.11 only in R1), ṣbrāturiia. vā → brādar-zādage ayāb (12.13 only in R1), tūriia. vā → pid brādarēn ayāb (12.15 only in R1), ०tūriia. duōda. vā → <...> duxt ayāb (12.17). Moreover, the Pahlavi translators of both A and B mistook the Avestan emphatic particle vā for the adversative conjunction vā in 12.21, translated it by Phl. ayāb and even placed it in the Avestan enclitic position.

Nevertheless, sometimes both A and B contradicted this usual tendency of word-by-word reproduction and reflected the expected Pahlavi syntax. Thus, in 12.6 [A] we find ०frasnāiti. tanunām → tan šōyēd, instead of the syntagm šōyēd tan in the rest of passages. In 12.2 [B] it is attested Phl. gāhān frāz srāyēd, instead of the expected reproduction of the Avestan in frāz srāyēd gāhān, found in A in all the passages of the PT of V 12, which would fit Av. ०frasrūiti. gāthānām and therefore the old type of PTs.

In spite of these shared techniques, sometimes the Pahlavi translators of B deviated themselves from such a word-by-word reproduction of the Avestan text. Indeed, in all the cases where the Avestan adversative conjunction vā and the

51 In this case the Pahlavi translators of K2, G25a and R3 did not know how to translate Av. napti, so that they left a blank where the Pahlavi word was expected and placed Phl. ayāb after this blank.
52 As in 12.11, the Pahlavi translators of K2, G25a and R3 did not know how to translate Av. brāturiia in 12.13, so that they left a blank where the Pahlavi word was expected and placed Phl. ayāb after it.
53 The same as in 12.11 and 13 regarding K2. However, G25a and R3 tried to translate Av. tūriia by Phl. <BRTE / dwht> duxt.
54 The same as in 12.11, 13 and 15, but in this case the translators left a blank in order to translate the first element of the compound. On the contrary, they understood and translated rightly the second one, namely Av. duōda-, by Phl. duxt “daughter”.
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Avestan enclitic *zī* in 12.22b are attested, they placed their corresponding PT *ayāb* and *čē* in the correct position. The PT of Av. *zī* was simply omitted in A.

Another difference between A and B is that the latter added glosses to the PT, thus contradicting the technique of a direct correspondence with the Avestan text and imitating the style of the old PTs. Apart from this fact, the glosses of B reveal two peculiarities. Firstly, in the gloss of V 12.2b *ay gāhān xwānēd tā sē rōz* there is a strange hyperbaton, because we expect *ay tā sē rōz gāhān xwānēd* (cf. the gloss in V 12.2c *kū tā sē rōz stōs yazēd*). Secondly, the first gloss is misplaced in V 12.7 *ēg kē mānbed bē mīrēd* [*ay kadag-xwadāy*] *ayāb mānbedag* [*ay kadag-bānūg*] *bē mīrēd* and in 12.9 *nabag az niyāg* [*kū nabērag*] *ud nabagī* [*kū nabēragī*] *az niyāgī*. Actually, while the second glosses are placed in its correct position, namely immediately after the word which explains (*mānbedag* [*ay kadag-bānūg*]; *nabagī* [*kū nabēragī*]), the first ones do not immediately follow the glossed word (*mānbed* ... [*ay kadag-xwadāy*]; *nabag* ... [*kū nabērag*]). Although there are some misplaced glosses in the old PTs, one-word explanations by means of a synonym are always placed immediately after the word they explain, so that this procedure is innovative in the PTs of B.

Syntax in these PTs can also be used to demonstrate that they are not old. Actually, this can be inferred from the use of some New Persian structures, like Phl. <lʾd> *rāy* to mark the direct object in B, as in New Persian and late Pahlavi, or Phl. <MNW> *kē* instead of the expected Phl. <AMT> *ka* in both A and B.

To summarise, we observe that the translation’s technique of A and B disagreed with the old PTs in their extreme attempt to reproduce the Avestan text. Both A and B omitted the Pahlavi prepositions, the ezāfe and Phl. *kū* after the verb *guft* because these Pahlavi words did not find a direct correspondence in the Avestan text. The use of Phl. <MNW> *kē* instead of Phl. <AMT> *ka*, and that of Phl. <lʾd> *rāy* to mark the direct object in B, also reveals that these PTs are not old. However, the PT of B tried to correct some mistakes, like the enclitic position of Pahlavi conjunctions just because they were enclitic in Avestan, and even imitated the style of the old PTs by adding glosses and explanations.
7. VOCABULARY

As we have seen, the Pahlavi translators of B were mainly correct concerning syntax, while those of A were more careless. Considering that syntax and vocabulary were the most important issues for the Pahlavi translators, we must analyse their knowledge not only about Avestan and Pahlavi vocabulary, but also about the traditional rendering of Avestan words into Pahlavi.

In order to check the Pahlavi translators’ knowledge of this tradition and their degree of innovation, I have compared the PT of each Avestan word in V 12 with the rest of preserved PTs of the same word. From this analysis, I can conclude that the vocabulary used in these new PTs agrees mostly with that of the old PTs with only some exceptions. I have grouped these according to the following scheme:

1. PTs of Avestan *hápx legómena*
2. Innovative PTs of Avestan words attested in other passages:
   2.1. Variations out of the same root as that of old PTs
      2.1.1. With a different suffix
      2.1.2. Without a suffix attested in old PTs
      2.1.3. Without preverb
   2.2. Use of different Pahlavi words
      2.2.1. Synonymic variation
      2.2.2. Wrong PTs

1. PTs of Avestan *hápx legómena*

Some Avestan kinship nouns of V 12 are *hápx legómena*, so that their PT cannot be compared with old PTs. It is in those nouns where we can observe with more detail the different procedures used by the Pahlavi translators of A and B. Both adapted at least one of these words from their Avestan phonetics, Av. *niīaka-* → Phl. *<nyʾk>* *niyāg* in 12.9a and 11a, and created its feminine equivalent Av. *niīkā-* by Phl. *<nyyʾky / nyʾkyh / nyʾyk / nyʾyk> niyāge / niyāye*. On the contrary, they disagreed regarding the rest of *hápx legómena* of kinship nouns.

While the Pahlavi translators of A usually left a blank because they did not understand those Avestan words, and they could not check them in any other PT, those of B reinterpreted them, as we can observe in the following examples:

- *napat-* → *<npk>* *nabag* in B in 12.9a and in both cases in 11a, which seems a “re-Pahlavisation” from Phl. *nab* “grandson” (MacKenzie 1971 57). The Pahlavi translators of A left a blank in the three cases and only that of R1 translated the first one in 12.11, but he mistook Av. *napat-* for Av. *niīka-* and wrote Phl. *<nyyʾk>*., that is, the PT of Av. *niīka-*.
- *naptī-* → *<npky>* *nabage* in B in 12.9a and 11a firstly. Surprisingly in 12.11a secondly the Pahlavi translator of T44 translated *<npk>* *nabag*, that is, the masculine noun. The Pahlavi translators of A did not translate it in

---

55 In 12.9a secondly we find only the variant *<nyyʾk>* in B, which is however omitted in A.
these three cases, with the exception of that of R1, who translated the first one in 12.11, but he mistook Av. naptī- for Av. niāka- and wrote once again Phl. <nyny’k>, that is, the PT of Av. niāka-. This confirms what we have observed regarding the PT of Av. napat-: they did not understand the meaning of this Avestan word.

- brātūriia- → <BRE BLWL> pus brādar only in 12.13a [B]. The Pahlavi translators of B correctly interpreted this Avestan word, translating it by pus brādar, which is the “re-Pahlavised” form of NP. which is the “brother’s son, nephew”. The Pahlavi translators of A left a blank in the PT and only the translator of R1 translated it as <BLWL-YLYDWN-k> brādar-zādag, which is also correct.

- brātūria- → <BRTE BLWL> duxt brādar only in 12.13a [B]. Like in the word mentioned before, the Pahlavi translators of B interpreted correctly this Avestan word and translated it with duxt brādar, which is the “re-Pahlavised” form of NP. دخترياراد “brother’s daughter, niece”. Here the Pahlavi translators of A also left a blank, with the only exception of R1, which created by suffixation the feminine <BLWL-z’tkyh> brādar-zādag from the masculine Phl. <BLWL-YLYDWN-k> brādar-zādag.

- tūriia- → <4-wmyh BRE> čahārom pus only in 12.15a [B]. On one hand, the Pahlavi translators of B tried to translate an Avestan word which they did not fully understand. They mistook Av. tūriia- “uncle” (<*tārya- < *taryja- < IE. *prtyuio-; cf. Ved. pitrya- “uncle” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.130), (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52, 94)) for the homonymous numeral Av. tūriia- “fourth” (<IIr. *(k)turyja-; cf. Ved. turṣya- “fourth” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.657)). Hence they translated Av. tūriia- “uncle” by Phl. čahārom “fourth”. The addition of Phl. pus “fourth son” is to be explained because these Pahlavi translators slipped into the PT of Av. +tūriia.pūdra- of 12.17a and 12.19a. Indeed, considering the misunderstanding of Av. tūriia- “uncle” → Phl. čahārom, Phl. čahārom pus would be the exact Pahlavi equivalent of Av. +tūriia.pūdra-, but not of Av. tūriia-. On the other hand, the Pahlavi translator of A did not understand the Avestan word and again left a blank, with the exception of that of R1, who correctly translated Av. tūriia- by Phl. pid brādar “brother of the father > uncle”.

- tūriia- → <4-wmyh BRTE> čahārome duxt only in 12.15a [B]. Once again the Pahlavi translators of B translated an Avestan word they did not understand and created by suffixation a feminine from the word already mentioned. Accordingly, they created the feminine čahārome from čahārom. The addition of the feminine equivalent to Phl. pus, namely Phl. duxt, is due to the same mistake as that of tūriia-: the Pahlavi translators of B slipped into the following Av. +tūriia.duṣṭar- of 12.17a and 12.19a, whose exact PT would be Phl. čahārome duxt. On the other side, the Pahlavi translators of A also left a blank, with the exception of that of R1, who created a feminine Phl. pid brādarēn “sister of the father > aunt” from the preceding Pahlavi masculine pid brādar “brother of the father > uncle”.

- tūriia.pūdra- → <4-wmyh BRE> čahārom pus only in G25b in 12.17a and in 12.19a [B]. In 12.17a, however, B attests the feminine Phl. <4-wmyh BRE>
čahārome pus. This could make us think that their Pahlavi translators interpreted the first element of the compound tūiriia as a feminine because of the ending –a. Nevertheless, as far as B attests tūiriō. pudrō, this interpretation makes no sense. Hence we must consider that it is simply an incorrect translation. In any case, the Pahlavi translators of B obviously made a word-by-word translation and simply equated the wrong PT of Av. tūiriia- → Phl. čahārom and added to it that of Av. pudrō → Phl. pus. On the other hand, the Pahlavi translators of A did not understand the Avestan compound and only translated the second element pudrō → <BRE> pus in 12.17a. Nevertheless, in 12.19a they neither translated the first nor the second element of the compound.

- tūiriia.duyār- → <4-wmyh BRTE> čahārome duxt only in 12.17a [B], but <4-wm dwht> in 12.17a in G25b and in 12.19a [B]. Like in the preceding compound, the Pahlavi translators of A did not understand it and only translated its second element duyā → <BRTE> duxt in 12.17a, but omitted it in 12.19a without translating neither its first nor its second element.

Therefore, we notice that the Pahlavi translators of A were more conservative and just left a blank whenever they did not know how to render an Avestan word into Pahlavi. On the contrary, those of R1 and B interpreted the hāpax legōmena and translated them, although sometimes this was incorrect.

2. Innovative PTs of Avestan words attested in other passages

2.1. Variations from the same root as that of old PTs

Although the PTs of V 12 usually agree with the old PTs in their common use of the same Pahlavi root to translate the same Avestan word, the PTs of V 12 sometimes vary their suffixes, prepositions or preverbs, omit them or even add further Pahlavi words to the PT.

2.1.1. With a different suffix

There are some examples where the same Pahlavi root as that of old PTs is used, but another suffix is added:

- “frasrūti- → <pr’c sl’yt> frāz srayēd (in A in 12.2, 4, 6, 12 and in B in 12.2), <pr’c sl’dyt> frāz srayēd (in R1 in 12.2), <pr’c sl’dšnk> frāz srayišnag (in A in 12.8, 10, 14, 18 and 20) and <pr’c sl’dšn’> frāz srayišn (in G25a in 12.14 and 16) instead of Phl. frāz srayišnih (PT of Y 9.14).

- xvarāda- → <hwlsnk> xwarisnag in both A and B in 12.22f instead of Phl. xwarisn of other parallels, like for instance V 5.20, 38, 55, 14.17 or HN 2.36.

- varata- → <PWN wltynšn> pad wardēnišn (only in T44 in 12.22c) instead of Phl. pad wardagīh. While K2 omitted this PT, the rest of manuscripts of A agree in the PT <wltkyh> wardagīh, confirmed by the parallels of V 5.37, 18.12 and Y 8.6, which attest <PWN wltkyh> pad wardagīh, with the only difference of the absence of preposition in A. Because of these parallels, I do not interpret <wltkyh> in the PT of A as a *wardage (feminine with –e), which would agree with Av. gauu-, but
probably as an abstract with <yh>. Nevertheless, the interpretation as a feminine cannot be ruled out.

- *marota-* → <YMYTWN-ytk> *murda* (in B in 12.22a and only in F10 in 12.22d) and <YMYTWN-y*t'> *mirēd* (in A in 12.22d and g, and in T44 in 12.22d) instead of Phl. *murda* (cf. the PT of V 5.36–38).

2.1.2. Without a suffix attested in old PTs

We also find at least one example where a expected suffix of the Pahlavi word is omitted:

- *juwu-* → <zynd / zwyn / zynd *nd*> (in both A and B in the five cases of 12.22c) instead of Phl. <zy(w)ndk> *zindag*. K2 and R3 attest mostly <zynd>, but G25a and R1 wrote <zywnd>. Both A and B agree in the rare writing <zynd *nd*> in 12.22b and d, which surely represents an adaptation of NP. *zend-e-and* “they have lived”. On the contrary, in all the passages of V 5.36–38 and 5.61 we find unanimously the writing <zywndk> *zindag*. In the plural in Y 45,7 it is attested <zyndk *n*'> *zindagan*. In 13.3d L4, T44 and E10 show <zyndk> and K1 <zywndk>. Although the variants without the suffix <k> are rare, they are confirmed by the variant <zywnd> of P2, K2 and M3 in V 13.3d.

2.1.3. Without preverb

Sometimes the Pahlavi translators of A and B omitted the PT of preverbs, which was almost certainly due to the fact that they did not identify them as such. Here we find some examples:

- "frasnāiī* → <HLLWN-yt> *söyēd* instead of Phl. *frāz* *söyišn*, where the Pahlavi translators interpreted this noun as a verb. Although we expect an abstract noun deriving from the Pahlavi verb *sustan*, *söy-* “to wash”, this verb is the right one in this PT. With regards to the Avestan preverb *fra*, it is only translated in 12.2 [B] firstly as expected, that is, by Phl. *frāz*. The PT of A systematically omitted the preverb.

- "upāiti* → <lpd / lwd> [A] *rawd* instead of Phl. *abar rawšin*, which obviously implies that the Pahlavi translators of A understood this Avestan noun as a verb. PT’s without preverb are also found in <SGYTWN-ynyt> *rawēnd* (in T44 in 12.2 firstly), <KRYTWN-š*n* OBYDWN-<x1> *xwāhišn kunēd* (in T44 in 12.2 thirdly) and <KRYTWN-š*n*> *xwāhišn* (in F10 in 12.2 thirdly). On the other hand, the Pahlavi translators of A preferred <lpd> and its variant <lwd> *rawd* (Ferrer unpublished 115–116), but we also find the variants <lt> *raft / rawd* (especially in R1), <SGYTWN-<t> (12.16, 12.18 in G25a) and <SGYTWN-d> *rawēnd* (12.15 in G25a). In spite of the

---

56 *vid. frasnāā* → <pr*c HNA šwδyd> in V 7.13 and 74; frasnāā → <pr*c HNA šwδnd* in V 7.14; frasnāā → <pr*c HD šwδyd> in V 7.14 and 15; frasnāā → <pr*c HD šwδnd> in V 7.15; frasnāā → <pr*c y šwδyd> in V 7.74 and 75; frasnāā → <pr*c HNA HLLWN-d> in V 7.75; frasnāā → <pr*c HLLWN-yt> in V 7.75; frasnāą → <pr*c y šwδnd> in V 8.11, 12 and 13; frasnāā → <pr*c y HLLWN-yt> in V 8.40, 9.15; frasnā → <pr*c svst* in V 8.40, 9.15, 18.19, 21, 22 and 26; frasnāā → <pr*c šδšn> in V 8.98 and 99; frasnā → <pr*c y HLLWN-x> in V 16.7; frasnā → <pr*c y HLLWN-d> in V 16.12; frasnāć → <pr*c šδsystym> in Vyt 49.
absence of the preverb in the PT of A, it chose the same verb as the old PTs.\(^{57}\)

When the Avestan verb has only a preverb, and the old PTs usually translated it by means of two preverbs, only one preverb is attested in these new PTs of A and B. This procedure depends on the translation’s technique of the Pahlavi translators of A and B, who omitted in their PTs every word that did not find a direct correspondence in the Avestan text, as in the following examples:

- \(ḥam. raēdβαιειτι \rightarrow <hm gwmyhtyt> ham gumēxtēd\) (in both A and B in 12.21 and 22) instead of Phl. \(ō ḥam gumēxt\). The PT \(ham gumēxtēd\) is the same as the one found in V 5.33 and it seems that it was copied out of it, because the rest of passages where this verb is attested, Av. \(ḥam\) is translated by the two preverbs \(ō ḥam\):
  \[
  ḥam. raēdβαιειτι \rightarrow <OL hm gwmyhtyt> ḥam gumēxtēd in V 5.34, 35, 36
  
  ḥam. raēdβαιειτι \rightarrow <OL hm gwmyhty> ḥam gumēxt in V 19.20
  
  ḥam. raēdβαιειτι \rightarrow <OL hm gwmycyd> ḥam gumēzdēd in V 18.62
  
  ḥam. raēdβαιειτι \rightarrow <OL hm gwmycynd> ḥam gumēzdēnd in V 19.20
  
  ḥam. raēdβωντι \rightarrow <OL hm gwmycynd> ḥam gumēzdēnd in N 61
  
  ḥam. raēdβαιειτι \rightarrow <OL hm gwmycynd> ḥam gumēzdēnd in N 62

- \(frazābaōah\) \(→ <prʾc bwd> frāz bōy\) (in both A and B in 12.22c) instead of Phl. \(frāz az bōy\). Although the preposition <MN> \(az\) lacks in A and B, all the Pahlavi PV manuscripts attest \(<prʾc bwd>\) also in the parallel of V 13.12a. Therefore, the variant found in V 12 is not as a result of the modernity of the PTs of A and B.

2.2. Use of different Pahlavi words

We can notice that the PTs of A and B are not old, because they used Pahlavi words different from those found in old PTs to translate the same Avestan words. In spite of this difference, they usually chose a mere synonymic variation, so that their PT was also correct. Nevertheless, sometimes they clearly did not understand several words and made a wrong PT.

2.2.1. Synonymic variation

Both A and B attest some examples of synonymic variation with regard to old PTs:

- \(para.iri\) \(→ <BRA YMYTWN-ytʾ> bē mīrēd\) in all the passages in both A and B instead of the verb Phl. \(widardan, wider-\), the only one used in the PT to translate this Avestan verb\(^{58}\).

---

\(^{57}\) vid. \(upāiti \rightarrow <QDM lpd> abar rawd\) in V 15.9, 15.18; \(upāit \rightarrow <QDM SGYTWN-t> abar raft\) in Y 9.1; \(upāīt \rightarrow <QDM SGYTWN-t YKOYMWN-yt> abar raft ēxtēd\) in V 7.12, 13. On the contrary, in two passages the verb is different: \(upāiti \rightarrow <BRA ʾyʾyt> bē ayābēd\) in V 8.100, 101, 102; \(upāiti \rightarrow <QDM YHMTWN-ytʾ> abar raied\) in V 13.28.

\(^{58}\) vid. \(para.iri\) \(→ <BRA wtylyt> bē widerēd\) in V 5.1, HN 2.1; \(para.iri\) \(→ <BRA wtl> bē widard\) in HN 2.16 firstly and \(<BRA wtl HWE-yḥ> bē widard\) bē secondly; \(para.iri\) \(→ <BRA wtl> bē widerēd\) in V 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4; \(para.iri\) \(→ <BRA wtl> bē widard\) in V 5.41, 5.42,
- upa.маңаиин → <QDM NTLWN-> abar пây- instead of <QDM KTLWN-> abar mân-. Although the latter is also attested in many passages in the PT of A and B59 and is confirmed by the old PT, where only Phl. abar mădan, măn- appears60, in both A and B Phl. <QDM NTLWN-> abar пây- is found as well61.
- yaoژdāta- → <DKYA> pâk in A instead of <ywšdl> yōjôsr. It is noteworthy that Phl. pâk usually glosses the adjective yōjôsr in old PTs.
- șurmâeta → <ASLWN-x(t)> бандêд in almost all the passages in both A and B instead of the Pahlavi verb wistardan, wistar- “to spread”, the only one used in the old PTs62.
- xʷatō → <NPŠE> xwēš in 12.7 [A] and <hwt> xwad in 12.7 [B]. In K2 it is omitted. In the rest of passages of this adverb we find <NPŠE> xwēš (V 15.11 and 12), <hwt> xwad (V 18.11) and <BNPŠE> xwad (V 19.13 and 34).
- aniiō.варна- → <ywdt hw’dns’> jud-xwāyišn (in B in 12.21a) and <ZK k’mk> ān kâmag (in G25a in 12.21a) instead of Phl. any-kâmag. The Pahlavi translators of A did not know what this adjective means and they simply left a blank, while those of B innovated with Phl. jud-xwāyišn, which is correct. Although Phl. ān kâmag is a wrong PT, because it confuses Av. aniiia- “another” with Phl. <ZK> ān “that, the”, it is however very close to the PT <ZK-’y k’mk> any-kâmag in the only parallel of this Avestan word: V 15.2.
- aniiō.ткәеша- → <ywdt kyš> jud-kēš (in B in 12.21a) and <ZK DYNA> ān đēn (in G25a in 12.21a). The Pahlavi translators of A, like in Av. aniiō.варна-, did not know how to translate it and left a blank, while those of B innovated again with a correct PT, where Phl. kēš is etymologically the same as Av. ткәеша-. The attempt of PT in G25a by <ZK DYNA> ān đēn stems too from the wrong assimilation of Av. aniiia- “another” with Phl.
ān “that, the”. However, it is close to the only parallel for it, V 15.2, where we find the PT <ZK- y DYNA> any-dēn.

- vikorāt uštāna- → <ywtd k BRA OBYDWN-yt HYA> judag bē kunēd gyān (in B in 12.22c) and <BRA OBYDWN-d HYA> bē kunēnd gyān (in A) instead of Phl. jud kīrēnīd gyān. We might suppose that the PT of A simply omitted <ywtd k>. However, in my opinion, the PT of A reinterpreted the compound as Av. vii → Phl. bē, Av. korāt → Phl. kunēnd and Av. uštāna- → Phl. gyān. In both cases it varies regarding the parallels of V 5.37, 13.12a, 13a, 14a and 15a, where this Avestan compound is unanimously translated as <ywtd klynyt HYA> jud kīrēnīd gyān.

- frāuuaiieiti → <pr’c znyt frāz zanēd (in T44 in 12.22, written <pr’c znt> in F10). The PT of B does not agree with the only parallel of this verb: V 5.37 frāuuaiiōi → <plwynyt> frawēnēd, edited thus by Jamasp against the variant <plkʾt> of the manuscripts. Although the PT frāz zanēd of B in 12.22 does not agree with the this old PT, we have to compare it with the parallel of N 65 noīt. adro frauuatimca → <LA ZK y ʾthš plwynšn [twcʾk AYK BRA LA YKTLWN-yt] nē ʾān ī ātaxš] frawēnišn [tōzāg kū bē nē ʾōzanēd]. In this passage Av. frauuaiti- is translated by Phl. frauwēnišn and this Pahlavi word is explained by ʾōzanēd. Thus, the Pahlavi explanation to Av. frauuaiti- in N 65 uses the same verb as the PT of Av. frāuuaiieiti in V 12.22, namely Phl. zadan, zan-. The only difference is that the former chose the preverb ʾō, while the latter preferred the preverb frāz.

Sometimes the variation simply reflects a different interpretation, as we see in the following example:
- ṑris → <OD 3 YWM> tā sē rōz (in B in 12.2b) instead of <3 bʾl> sē bār (in all the passages in A). All the Avestan parallels of multiplicative + Av. frasnā- confirm that the PT of A is the right one. In this case, the Pahlavi translators of B just understood that Av. ṑris did not mean “thrice”, but “during three days”, so that they added Phl. rōz “day”.

Other cases of variation may be due to the fact that these Pahlavi translators could have had at their disposal Avestan-Pahlavi lexica where the Pahlavi word differed from the usual one in old PTs. This is at least what can be inferred from the following PT:
- Av. brātar- → Phl. <BLWL> brādar instead of <AH> or <blʾt> brād (only in 12.5b secondly). Phl. <blwl> /bror/ represented the Gabrī variant of Phl. brādar and slipped into some Pahlavi texts from the Frahangī Pahlawī g. vid. the commentary to this word in V 12.5.

2.2.2. Wrong PTs:
- āat. yat → <ADYN’ MNW> (in all the passages of V 12, with the exception of 12.7a, where A and F10 only attest <ADYN’) and omit <MNW>. The expected PT in Vidēvdād would be <ADYN’ AMT> ēg ka

vid. ṑris. frasnāašiyān → <3 bʾl prʾc ’y šwdynd> sē bār frāz ē sōyēnd in V 7.14; biš. frasnāašiym → <2 bʾl prʾc ’y šwdyn> dō bār frāz ē sōyēnd in V 7.75; brisatadʾonym. frasnāţe → <30 bʾl ... prʾc šwdšn> sīh bār ... frāz sōyišn in V 8.98, panca.dasa. frasnāţe → <15 bʾl ... prʾc šwdšn> pānzdah bār ... frāz sōyišn in V 8.99.
or simply <AMT> ka, as confirmed by most parallels⁶⁴. However, in other instances Av. āāt. yaṭ is translated by Phl. <cygwn'> čīyōn (V 7.3), <MNW> kē (Yt 3.1) and <ytwn’ MNW> ēdōn kē (Yt 14.63). Only the late Vyt 43 and Ny 3.6 (only in the manuscript U1) confirm the PT <ADYN’ MNW> ēg kē of V 12 for Av. āāt. yaṭ.

This wrong PT is due to the late confusion between <MNW> kē and <AMT> ka (sometimes <AYḴ> kū too) because of the influence of NP. ke, where in some cases the functions of these three words merged. Thus, when Pahlavi was no more a spoken language, the scribes “re-Pahlavised” New Persian uses and they confused the heterograms <MNW>, <AMT> and sometimes <AYḴ>.

- tanu- (tanunām) → <tn’g’n> (12.2), <tn’hl> (12.4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 18 in G25a and 20) or even <tn’phl> (12.12) in the PT of A instead of <tn’ tan, only attested in 12.2 [B] and in 12.18 in K2 above the line and R3. The variants <tn’hl> and <tn’p’h> seem to be corruptions of Phl. <tn’phl’> tanāpūhlagān, which appears in preceding passages. This means that the Pahlavi translators of V 12 wrongly took Av. tanu- for a synonym of Av. tanu.pārda-.  
- Av. x’ayhab- → Phl. <AH-dl> (in 12.5b) instead of <AHTE> xwah, surely due to a confusion with the heterogram of Phl. brādar, namely <AH>. 
- ʾupāiti- → <KRYTWN-šn’ OBYDWN-x’> xwāhiṣn kunēd (in T44 in 12.2 thirdly) and <KRYTWN-šn’> xwāhiṣn in F10 instead of <QDM SGYTWN-šn’> abar rawiṣn. 
- na- (nō) → <KON> nūn (in A in all the passages) instead of <LNE> amā (only in B in 12.2c). The Pahlavi translators of A surely confused the pronoun Av. nō with the temporal adverb Av. nū(n) because of their phonetic proximity.  
- pančāca. x’visaitica → <S 29> (only in R3) instead of <S 32> wīst ud panj (in 12.9b in both A and B and in 12.11b [B]). 
- pančasatam → <70> (only in R3 in 12.9b and 11b) instead of <50> panjāb (only in B and the manuscripts G25a and R1 in 12.9b and 11b).  
- vá (emphatic) → <ʾyw> ayāb (in both A and B in 12.21). Surprisingly, in 12.21 T44 omitted this vá, but translated it by <ʾyw> ayāb as well.  
- viš.huška- + tarō → <Wyś hwšktl> wiś hušktar (in K2 and B in 12.22a). The Pahlavi translators in K2 and B made the same mistake, because they confused the adverb tarō following viš.huškō with the Avestan suffix for comparatives. They must have assumed that the dot separating the adverb from the compound actually divided the latter from its comparative suffix. On the contrary, the remaining manuscripts of A divided <t> from <wyś hwšk>, so that they translated correctly. These manuscripts agree with the only parallel of this text, V 5.36, where we find <wyś hwšk> wiś-hušk and <LCD-r’> tar separately.

⁶⁴ āāt. yaṭ → <AMT> ka in V 3.20, 5.13, 8.10; āāt. yaṭ → <ADYN’ AMT> ēg ka in Yt 6.1, 6.2, 7.4, V 8.1, 8.40 (twice), 17.4, Ny 1.12, 3.6 (but U1 writes <ADYN’ MNW> ēg kē); āāt. yaṭ → <W AMT> ud ka in V 9.15.
- zi → <ʾnd> and (in both A and B in 12.22b, and only in A in 12.22d) instead of <ME> čē.
- frāzwāieiti → <prʾc> frāz (in K2 and R3 in 12.22) or <prʾc OD gwpt> frāz tā guft (in R1). Only G25b attests Phl. <plwyt> frawēd, the same PT as that of V 5.37, which however must be corrected by the causative <ʾplwynty> frawēnēd.
- azaiti → (in F10 in 12.22) and (in T44), which I have not been able to interpret, instead of Phl. raw(ēn)ēd. They were translated under the line by NP. mizanad “smites”. Obviously the New Persian translators confused the Avestan verb az- with Phl. and NP. zadan, zan- “to smite, to kill”, maybe as a result of their phonetic similarity. Nevertheless, we must also notice that Av. azaiti is also rendered into Phl. <znšn'> zanišn in P 8, where it seems to have occurred the same confusion.

---

vid. azaita → <BRA SGYTWN-ynyt> bē rawēnēd in V 5.37; azaēta → <SGYWON-yt> rawēd in V 18.68; azaiτe → <SGYWON-ynyt> rawēnēd in V 18.76; *azōide → <SGYWON-ynd> rawēnēnd in V 3.11.
8. Pahlavi Glosses and Explanations

The Pahlavi translators of A consciously omitted all the glosses and commentaries to the PT in the entire Pahlavi text of Vīdēvdād, not only in V 12, because they did not find a direct correspondence in the Avestan text. Only B and rarely R1 included glosses and explanations to the PT, which suppose not only a deviation from the strictly word-by-word reproduction of A, but also that their Pahlavi translators imitated the style of the old Pahlavi translators.

Some of them are quite unnecessary, because the Pahlavi text is clear enough, but some others try to shed some light on obscure words or to explain an aspect of the purification process. Moreover, they are especially interesting because we can thereby catch a glimpse of the procedures and language of the translators better than through the mere PT alone. They can be divided in the following basic types:

8.1. One-word synonymic explanations

Among the first glosses, which only give a synonym of a word, we find urwar [kū ḫōrdā] “the plants [namely grain]” (12.2d); mānbed ... [ay kadag-xwadāy] ayāb mānbedag [ay kadag-bānūg] “the master of the house ... [namely the householder] or the mistress of the house [namely the lady of the house]” (12.7a); and nabag ... [kū nabērag] ud nabāgī [kū nabēragī] “the grandson ... [namely the grandson], the granddaughter [namely the grandaughter]” (12.9a). Some of these synonymic explanations in V 12, typical through the history of the PT, are also attested in other PTs. Actually, mānbed ... [ay kadag-xwadāy] in 12.7 is parallely reflected in the PT of N 5.1, where nmānō.pātī → mānbed [‘ay kadag-xwadāy], and mānbedag [‘ay kadag-bānūg] in 12.7 is found, as we have already observed, in Vr 3.3 nmānō.pātīnī → mānbedēn ... [kadag-bānūg].

8.2. Short explanatory glosses and brief explanations

Sometimes the Pahlavi translators of R1 and B added short explatantory glosses and brief explanations, which usually tried to explain a sentence, but sometimes included a different interpretation. In these kinds of glosses and explanations we find the following examples:

- 12.1f (only in F10) ēd kū ān gyāg mānīnīh bē ēd gyāg widerišn ast by “this (means) that that passage (refers) to the wait, but this passage refers to the death”.

66 The explanation nabērag to Phl. nabag “grandson” in 12.9a seems a “re-Pahlavisation” from the equivalent NP. نیر “grandson”. The feminine counterpart nabēragē is derived from the masculine one, like in other examples already seen.
- 12.2 (only in R1): ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb ī web zōbr barēd [kū nāf andar xānag yazēd] “He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters [that is, the family will worship it (i.e. the fire) in the house]”. Here its Pahlavi translator specified that the worship of the fire must be performed by one’s own family in the house.

- 12.2b: sē rōz frāz šōyēd tan [ān kū tā sē rōz tan pāk dārēd ud abāg apākhī nē gumēxtēd] “during three days he will wash his body [that (means) that during three days he will keep his body pure and will not mix it with impurity]”; tā sē rōz šust wastarag [dārēd kū wastarag ham pāk x nibēd] “during three days he will wash his clothes [he will have (them so), that is, he will clothe his clothes clean too]”; and tā sē rōz [abāg yōǰdāsrīh] gāhān frāz svāyēd [ay gāhān xwānēd tā sē rōz] “during three days [with the purification] he will recite the Gāϑās [that is, he will recite the Gāϑās during three days]”.

- 12.2c: ēn amā ātaxš yazēd [kū ātaxš andar ān mān rōšn dārēd ud wuzurg x nibēd] “he will worship this our fire [that is, he will keep the fire kindled in that house and he will build a high one]”.

- 12.2d: yōǰdāsr pas bawēd mān [kū pas az sē rōz ān mān yōǰdāsr x nibēd] “then the house will be purified [that is, after three days he will purify the house]”.

- 12.3: čand awēšān abar mānēnd [kū andar ān mān mānišn kunēd ud abastāg xwānēd] “how long must they wait (because of) them (before entering into the house) [that is, he waits in that house and recites the Abastāg]”. Here the Pahlavi translators only added some new information about the recitation of the Abastāg.

- 12.21: jud-kēš [kū dēn jud dārēd] “another faith [that is, he has another religion]”. We must notice that a verbal sentence instead of a synonym explains here the compound of the PT.

- 12.21 and 12.22: ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēd] and abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēd] respectively. In both cases the Pahlavi translators of B continued the tradition of the PT, because these glosses are attested in other parallels. Actually, we find həm.ṛaēϑβaiieiti → <OL hm gwmyhty [PWN hmlyt]> ō ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēd] in V 5.34, 35 and 36 and həm.ṛaēϑβaiieiti → <OL hm gwmyht [PWN hmlyt]> ō ham gumēxt [pad hamrēd] in V 19.20, and paītī.ṛaēϑβaiieiti → abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēd] in V 5.33, 34, 35 and 36; paītī.ṛaēϑβaiieiti → <OL hm gwmyht [PWN ptlyt]> ō ham gumēxt [pad payrēd] in V 19.20. It is noteworthy that the same gloss is also attested in V 19.20, where the Avestan verb paītī.ṛaēϑβaiieiti is wrongly translated as Phl. ō ham gumēxt instead of abar gumēxt.

- 12.22: mar druwand dō zang ēdon asemōg anāšō x spēnāg-mēnōg dāmān ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēd] [kē abāg ōy har ka rasēd pad xēm wattar bawēd] [ōy rāy ṣ sustan abāyēd] “the vile, the liar biped, so an impious heretic defiles directly [with direct defilement] the creatures of the Beneficent Spirit [everyone who comes in touch with him, he becomes worse in his nature] [it is necessary to wash him]”. It is noteworthy that kē ... bawēd is extracted from V 5.36, but the Pahlavi translators of B added ōy rāy ṣ sustan abāyēd, just where we find the New Persian structure for the direct object by object + postposition rāy, which reveals the modernity of this PT of V 12.
- 12.22d: *nē ēdōn mīrēd [nē rēman] “not so when dead [he is not impure]”. The same is found in the parallel passage of V 5.37.

8.3. Short commentaries

Through the history of the PT anonymous commentaries and doctrines of some known commentarists were included in the transmitted Pahlavi text. These commentaries, more or less extensive, added information which cannot be extracted from the mere PT.

In this way the Pahlavi translators of B added ritual information in two short commentaries in V 12.2c and d:
- 12.2c: *barsom bandēd [kū tā sē rōz stōš yazēd ud zōhr yaşiñ pad kār dārēd ud drōn srōš yazēd] “he will bind the barsom [that is, he will perform the stōš ceremony during three days, he will perform the ceremony of the libation(s) and he will consecrate the sacrificial bread to Srōš]”.
- 12.2d: *pad kāmag amahraspandān xwānišn kunēnd [kū drōn ud mizd ud āfrīnagān kunēnd ud amahraspandān rāy yazēnd ud pad kāmag xwēš tan āb ud urwar xwarēnd ud pad kāmag amahraspandān rāy bē yazēnd ud xayādēnēnd andar ān mān] “they will invoke the Beneficient Immortals at will [that is, they will consecrate the sacrificial bread, give the reward and recite the Āfrīnagān prayers, they will worship the Beneficient Immortals, they will consume for themselves water and plants at will, they will worship the Beneficient Immortals at will and remind them in that house]”.

In the first commentary it is interesting to notice the New Persian use of *tā sē rōz instead of the expected Phl. *sē rōz, while in the second one we find the New Persian structure object + postposition *rāy for the direct object in *amahraspandān rāy *yazēnd and *amahraspandān rāy bē yazēnd, which indicates that this PT of V 12 is not old.67

8.4. Misplaced glosses

Sometimes the glosses were misplaced from its correct position. There are two other glosses which have been misplaced only two positions: *ēg kē mānbed bē mirēd [ay kadag-xwadāy] “When the master of the house dies [namely the householder]” in 12.7a and *tā čand awēšān abar mānišn nabag az niyāg [kū nabērag] “how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house), the grandson with regard to his grandfather [namely the grandson]” in

---

67 The same is valid for the PT of the Nyāyišn, where we find many times the structure object + postposition *rāy + verb yaštan, yaz-, for instance in Ny 1.6a xwarēd amarg rāyōmand arwand-asp rāy yazēm; 1.8a, b tištar drust-čašm rāy yazēm; 1.8c warišnīg tištar stārag rāy yazēm; 1.8n zarrēnōmand abzār rāy yazēm; 1.9c ruwān ī xwēš rāy yazēm; 1.9d frawahr ī xwēš rāy yazēm; 2.12a mihr xwadāy buland kē amarg ud ahlaw ast ōy rāy yazēm, etc.
12.9a. Actually, we expect that these synonymic glosses were placed immediately after the word they explain, namely Phl. mānbed and Phl. nabag respectively.

Another possible example of misplaced gloss, though much more than those of 12.7a, could be found in 12.3d. Indeed, the gloss gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd of this passage should be placed either in 12.2d or in 12.3b. In such case, these would be the two possibilities:

- 12.2d: gāhān frāz srāyēd [ay gāhān wēş xwānēd tā sē rōz] *(gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd)* “he will recite the Gāϑās [that is, he will recite the Gāϑās during three more days] [they will recite the Gāϑās, namely the Abastāg].”

- 12.3b: tā čānd awēšān abar mānēd [kū andar ān mān mānišn kunēd ud abastāg xwānēd] *(gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd)* “how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house) [that is, he remains in that house and recites the Abastāg] [they will recite the Gāϑās, namely the Abastāg].”
9. THE USE OF BLANKS

While B shows almost no conscious omission, but only abbreviations of the text repeated in 12.4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20, there are many omissions in A which demonstrate that the Avestan knowledge of their Pahlavi translators was minimal. Indeed, when they did not know the meaning of an Avestan word, they usually left a blank in the PT. These are the most noteworthy instances:

12.11a, b: └ npk └ npky ┓
12.13a: └ BRE blʾt └ BRTE blʾt ┓
12.15a: └ 4-wm BRE └ 4-wmyh BRTE ┓
12.17a: └ 4-wmyh BRE └ 4-wmyh BRTE ┗
12.19a: └ 4-wm BRE BRE └ 4-wm dwht dwht ┗
12.21a: └ ywdt hwʾdšnʾ └ ywdt kyš ┗
12.22c: └ znytʾ └ PWN ... SGYTWN-yt ┗

Furthermore, in the Avestan sentence haŋhuš. *xʾarəθaheca. vastraheca. draošca. nəmataheca. aiiaŋheca. apa.baraiti of 12.22f, only the PT of Av. *xʾarəθaheca is included in both, while the rest of the PT is simply omitted. Only A (except R1) left a blank, so that their Pahlavi translators were aware that something lacked, although they felt theirselves not able to translate these Avestan words.
10. SUMMARY OF THE MAIN MISTAKES AND INNOVATIONS IN BOTH PTs

As we have already observed, both manuscripts reveal the modernity of their PT in some mistakes and innovations in the tradition, which I summarise as follows:

1. Phonetics
   - Some Pahlavi words are written according to New Persian (e.g. ʾtš ātaš in A instead of Phl. ʾthš ātaxš; ʾyw(y)dʾsl instead of Phl. yōǰdāsr).

2. Morphology
   2.1. Nominal morphology
   2.1.1. Number
   - Use of the direct plural instead of the oblique plural.
   2.1.2. Gender
   - Use of three endings for feminines:
     - <k>–ag (Iir. *–a-kā-). Used in older Pahlavi texts.
     - <y>, <yk>, <yh>–e. Late, probably from Phl. –ag.
     - <yn’>–ēn. Used in older Pahlavi texts.

   2.2. Verbal morphology
   2.2.1. Persons and numbers
   - The Avestan 1st. Sing. is sometimes translated by a Pahlavi 3rd. Sing.

3. Syntax and translation’s technique
   - Extreme word-by-word reproduction without taking into account:
     - Enclitics: when Phl. ayāb translates the Avestan enclitic vā, it is placed in the same enclitic position in A. On the contrary, B is more accurate.
     - Prepositions needed in Pahlavi, which are sometimes omitted.
     - Ezāfe connection, generally omitted in these PTs.
     - Phl. kū after the verb guft, in spite of being required in Pahlavi.
   - The PT of B misplaced some synonymic glosses.
   - New Persian structures:
     a) rāy to mark the direct object.
     b) Confusion between <MNW> kē and <AMT> ka in Av. āaṭ. yaṭ → <ADYN’ MNW> ēg kē instead of <ADYN’ AMT> ēk ka.

4. Vocabulary
   4.1. PTs of Avestan hápax legómena
   - A usually left a blank, while R1 and B interpreted and translated them, though sometimes incorrectly.
   4.2. Innovative PTs of Avestan words attested in other passages
     4.2.1. Variations out of the same root as that of old PTs
4.2.1.1. With a different suffix (e.g. Av. xʷarəθa- → Phl. <hwšnk> xварəишаг instead of Phl. xварəишн).
4.2.1.2. Without a suffix attested in old PTs (e.g. Av. juua- → Phl. <zynd / zywnd> instead of Phl. <zy(w)ndk> zındag).
4.2.1.3. Without preverb (e.g. Av. ʰfrasnāiiti- → Phl. <HLI WN-yt> šoyēd instead of Phl. frāz šoyišn).
4.2.2. Use of different Pahlavi roots
4.2.2.1. Synonymic variation (e.g. Av. para.iriϑiieiti → Phl. <BRA YMYTNW-yt> bē mīrēd instead of the verb Phl. widardan, wider-).
4.2.2.2. Wrong PTs (e.g. Av. na- (nō) → Phl. <KON> nūn instead of Phl. <LNE> amā).

Conclusions

We observe that the PTs of V 12 did not proceed exactly like other Pahlavi translations of the Islamic period. Indeed, the usual procedure in the latter ones was to gather together old Pahlavi translations and compare them with the Avestan text to be translated in order to create a new PT. The translators of many Avestan texts of the Xwardag Abastāg based their PTs on the older PTs of Yasna and Vīdēvdād, as the quotations from those texts in the Xwardag Abastāg point out (Cantera 2004a 166 ff.). For example, the translators of the Wištāsp Yašt composed their Pahlavi translation from extracts from the Āfrīn ī Zardušt, Hādōxt Nask, Vīdēvdād and Yasna (Cantera 2004a 176 ff.).

On the contrary, the Pahlavi translators of V 12 created new PTs ex professo without considering the parallels in older PTs by means of some shared procedures but also by means of different techniques. Both wrote some Pahlavi words according to the New Persian phonetics and writing system; confused and simplificated the Pahlavi morphology and created Pahlavi feminines; made a word-by-word reproduction of the Avestan syntax without taking into account Avestan enclitics and the Pahlavi ezāfe connection, prepositions and kū after guft; and made innovative PTs of Avestan words attested in other passages, sometimes wrong. In my opinion, these common procedures stem from Jāmāsp Īrānī’s teaching.

Although they share these procedures, A and B show a different division of paragraphs and did not make the same PT of some Avestan words. Moreover, the PT of A is more inaccurate than that of B, which also incorporated glosses and short commentaries. Hence we can conclude that they did not copy from the same source.

To summarise, the new PTs of V 12, like those of the lost passages of V 18, 19, etc., were made under the editorial teaching of Jāmāsp Īrānī, which gave at least two exegetical schools: one in Surat (A) and another one in Navsarī (B). Their PTs are not old and were made ex professo in order to fill the gaps of the written transmission. Although they attest some mistakes and reveal their modernity, they tried however to continue the transmission of the Pahlavi Vīdēvdād by means of a newly improved tradition.
D) TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Do we really need a new edition of the Avesta?

The huge task of editing the Avesta by collating more than a hundred manuscripts placed Geldner’s (1896) work at the pinnacle of research into the Iranian studies. Since then, no other complete edition of the Avesta has been undertaken, mainly because of the authority of Geldner’s work and the difficulties of collecting such a vast number of manuscripts. While Westergaard (1852) only collated manuscripts available in Europe, Geldner broadened his spectrum to include many manuscripts from India. In fact, it is a significant merit of Geldner to have noticed “that in India there was hidden an unopened store of manuscripts” (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena i).

As far as the Iranian manuscripts are concerned, Geldner did not take a similar interest in them. In fact, the sole Iranian manuscripts he collated were brought to India before his time. Therefore, despite Geldner’s edition being the first to incorporate Avestan manuscripts from Iran, it is important to note that this inclusion occurred by chance.

The remaining manuscripts he used already belonged to European libraries at that time. Thus, Geldner increased so significantly the number of manuscripts that his edition almost consigned previous editions to oblivion.

Geldner’s edition however must still be considered as one of the most comprehensive works of the Iranian studies. Nevertheless, it must be deeply revised, not only because the Avestan studies have improved our knowledge of the Avestan language and of its written transmission, but also because of some problems our working team in Salamanca have found in it. Firstly, new manuscripts have been brought to light. Secondly, through our work with the manuscripts for our critical edition of Vīdēvdād by the autopsy of these manuscripts, we have observed that Geldner made some methodological mistakes. I will try to show why a new edition of the whole Avesta has to be carried out by analyzing Geldner’s procedures in his critical edition of Vīdēvdād.

WF Westergaard’s edition has been reedited in 1993 on the initiative of R. Schmitt.
1. **RECENSIO**

1.1. Geldner’s *recensio*

Geldner’s main contribution to the critical edition of the Avesta was his exploration of that “hidden an unopened store of manuscripts” of India; until then only manuscripts located in European libraries had been used. In the Prolegomena of his critical edition of the Avesta, Geldner described 134 manuscripts belonging at that time to the following libraries:

1. Bombay University (B1, B2, B3)
2. Mulla Firoze Library in Bombay (Mf1, Mf2, Mf3, Mf4)
3. Some private collections in Bombay:
   a. Behmanji Rustamji Mullan Firoz (Br1, Br2)
   b. Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana (Pt1, Pt2, Pt3, Pt4)
   c. Dhanjibhai Framji Patel (Dh1)
   d. Edalji Darabji Rustomji Sanjana (E1, E2)
   e. Framji Fardunji Madan (F1, F2)
   f. Jamaspji Minocheherji Jamasp Asana (J1, J2, J3, J4, J5, J6, J7, J8, J9, J10, J11, J15, J16, J17)
   g. Jamsetji Bomanjee Wadia (Jb)
   h. Jamshedji Mânekji Unwalla (Jm1, Jm2, Jm3, Jm4)
   i. Khorshedji Bejanji (Kh1, Kh2)
   j. Mancherji Barzoji Powri (Mb1, Mb2)
4. Jamshedji Peshotanji Sanjana’s private collection in Bulsar (Jp1)
5. Hoshangji Jamaspji’s private collection in Poona (H1, H2, H3, H4, H5)
6. Two manuscripts from Surat (S1, S2)

For Vīdēvdād, Geldner used a total amount of 21 manuscripts, 9 of which are Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts (L4 and Pt2, which belong to the same group; K1 and the manuscripts which stem from it, that is, Ml3, K3b, B1, K3a, P2 and M3), 9 Indian Vīdēvdād Sāde (B2, Br1, L2, K10, L1, M2, O2, P1, Dh1) and 3 Iranian Vīdēvdād Sāde (Mf2, Jp1, K9⁴⁹). B1, B2, Br1, Dh1, Jp1, Mf2 and Pt2 were handed out to him from India. Ml3 came from Iran, but when its owner died it came into the hands of a committee in Bombay (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena xi). The rest were placed in different libraries in Europe.

However, Geldner never travelled to India. So the manuscripts he used were not chosen according to his scientific criteria, but to those of the Indian Parsees who kindly sent them to him. Therefore, we cannot exclude that important manuscripts remained inaccessible to him.

This becomes obvious when we compare the Indian manuscripts he used for the edition of Vīdēvdād with those included in Jāmāsp’s (1907) edition of the Pahlavi Vīdēvdād. On one hand, the group of L4 is scarcely represented in

---

⁴⁹ K9 was written in India, but it is a careful copy of the IrVS Mf2 (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena vii).
Geldner’s edition, because he only collated L4 and Pt2, in comparison to the 7 manuscripts of the group of K1. Jâmāsp, on the contrary, collated more manuscripts of the group of L4. On the other side, Geldner’s did not know a very important manuscript used by Jâmāsp: IM. I will deal later with the importance of this manuscript for the written transmission of the Pahlavi Vīdēvdād.

1.2. Mistakes in Geldner’s collatio

Despite the huge merit of Geldner’s use of the Indian manuscripts, his procedures regarding his treatment of those preserved in Europe deserve a severe criticism. He admired Westergaard’s previous work with the manuscripts in Europe too much as to undertake their exhaustive examination. As Geldner (1896 Prolegomena i) stated: “So admirably did Westergaard work through the manuscripts that were known to him, and so model the text he provided (sic), that without entirely new manuscript material, there would have remained little or nothing for me to do. A re-reading of the texts extant in Europe, I found, promised but little fruit.”

His weak interest in “re-reading” the manuscripts in Europe reflected the fact that, during the preparation of his edition, he never travelled to some libraries where they were preserved. Instead of the original manuscripts in Paris, he used: a) Olshausen’s collations for P6, P10 and P12; b) copies by Olshausen for P2, P11, P13 and P14; c) and Brockhaus’ (1850) reprinted edition of Burnouf’s (1829-1843) lithographed copy for P1. The situation is similar regarding the manuscripts of the British Museum in London, where he used: a) the M. A. Stein’s collation for Lb1 and Lb16; b) that of E. V. Arnold for Lb2; c) and that of A. V. Williams Jackson for Lb5. The only European library with Avestan manuscripts he visited was that of Copenhagen.

When adopting Westergaard’s readings of most manuscripts in existence in Europe and those of the copies and collations of his European colleagues, Geldner made a methodological mistake. Its main consequences have proved to be, firstly, the confusion of some manuscripts due to the erroneous information contained in the collations. Secondly, we cannot be sure that the readings Geldner took from these copies and collations really correspond to those of the extant manuscripts, and a narrow revision actually shows some deviances.

As far as the possible confusion of manuscripts is concerned, our analysis of the Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts from the Bibliotèque Nationale of Paris has showed that Geldner confused at least two of them (Cantera & Andrés-Toledo 2008). In fact, our own autopsy of the Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts from the Bibliotèque Nationale of Paris has revealed a surprising fact: although Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xii) described and identified correctly the manuscripts P2 (= Suppl. Pers. 26) and P10 (= Suppl. Pers. 25), he confused them in the explanation of their relations with other Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts in his Prolegomena and in his critical notes to the text. This could be due to a mistake by Olshausen or by Geldner himself, but it alerts us about the validity of the variants of P2 quoted in the critical notes of Geldner’s edition. A few examples will suffice to demonstrate it:
- Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xv) stated that P2 pr. *manu* omits V 4.51 and inserts it sec. *manu* in the margin. However, P2 attests it pr. *manu*, but not in the margin, while it is P10 pr. *manu* which omits it and writes it sec. *manu* in the margin.

- According to Geldner (1896 Prolegomena x), in V 13.17 P2 pr. *manu* attests *sraošino*, which is corrected sec. *manu* as *sraēšomnō*. This is, however, what we find in P10, as we can observe:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* sraošino & * sraēšomnō
\end{array}
\]

Thus Geldner apparently confused both manuscripts.

- The same happens, for instance, in V 13.50. Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xiv) stated that P2 pr. *manu* attests *nasuš*, but the readings in P2 and P10 are:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* nasuš & * suniš
\end{array}
\]

Obviously, Geldner has confused once again both manuscripts, because it is P10 pr. *manu* which attests *nasuš* and corrects it sec. *manu* as *suniš*.

According to this, the data he ascribed to P10 correspond to P2. This is also the case in V 14.1, where the omission of Av. *hazayraš. süniš. nairiūo.nāmanō* in L4 and K1 is not completed in P10, despite Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xvi), but it is in P2. Therefore, it is obvious that Geldner’s data regarding P2 refer to P10, and vice-versa.

Surprisingly these data are not extracted from the critical notes to the text, but from the Prolegomena, where he presents the fundamental criteria for establishing the *stemma codicum* of *Vidēvdād*. Therefore, after our observations, Geldner’s data regarding P2 and P10 must be reconsidered before studying their relation with the remaining PV manuscripts in order to build the *stemma codicum*.

Geldner’s confusion of both manuscripts seems however to be older than himself; indeed already Westergaard had confused them:

- According to Westergaard (1852 5, n.1; 6, n.2), in V 13.36 P2 attests by a first hand *ipimno* and by a second hand *isimano*, but this is found actually in P10:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* ipimno & * isimano
\end{array}
\]

- Westergaard (1852 5, n.1) stated that in V 13.42 P2 attests the correction *draokhto*, but this is what we find in P10:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* draokhto & *
\end{array}
\]

- According to Westergaard’s (1852) edition, in V 1.10, which corresponds to Geldner’s V 1.9, P2 shows the variant *upayhacit*, but this is the variant of P10:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* upayhacit & *
\end{array}
\]

According to the Prolegomena, where he presents the fundamental criteria for establishing the *stemma codicum* of *Vidēvdād*. Therefore, after our observations, Geldner’s data regarding P2 and P10 must be reconsidered before studying their relation with the remaining PV manuscripts in order to build the *stemma codicum*. Geldner’s confusion of both manuscripts seems however to be older than himself; indeed already Westergaard had confused them: 

- According to Westergaard (1852 5, n.1; 6, n.2), in V 13.36 P2 attests by a first hand *ipimno* and by a second hand *isimano*, but this is found actually in P10:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* ipimno & * isimano
\end{array}
\]

- Westergaard (1852 5, n.1) stated that in V 13.42 P2 attests the correction *draokhto*, but this is what we find in P10:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* draokhto & *
\end{array}
\]

- According to Westergaard’s (1852) edition, in V 1.10, which corresponds to Geldner’s V 1.9, P2 shows the variant *upayhacit*, but this is the variant of P10:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
P2 & P10 \\
\hline
* upayhacit & *
\end{array}
\]
Obviously Westergaard confused both manuscripts too, and this could be the source of Geldner’s mistake. But Westergaard’s confusion is not so surprising if we consider his statement: “I shall here remark that I am indebted to Dr. Spiegel’s edition for the readings in the two Parisian copies, P2 and P10, which my limited stay there did not allow me to examine, any more than a third Parisian copy, P5, belonging to the same class” (Westergaard 1852, 6, n.1). Therefore, we must search in Spiegel’s edition for the source of this mistake.

As a matter of fact, Spiegel (1853-1858, 1.8) already confused P2 (= Suppl. Pers. 26; C in his edition) and P10 (= Suppl. Pers. 25; F in his edition). According to him, C (= P2) was written in 1127 A.Y., has 488 pages and corresponds to Fonds d’Anquetil Nr. 1. Furthermore, he identified F (= P10) as Nr. II of Anquetil’s Supplementum. P2 is written in 1127 A.Y. and has 488 pages, but it is really Nr. II of Anquetil’s Supplementum, while P10 is Fonds d’Anquetil Nr. 1.

Spiegel’s mistake could imply either that he simply confused the data of the catalogues or possibly that he never even saw the manuscripts preserved in Paris. The latter seems most likely, as he admitted to have used Olshausen’s and Müller’s collations in his edition (Spiegel 1853-1858, 1.8, 27-28). Did Olshausen or Müller already confuse these manuscripts?

Although I have no information about Olshausen’s collation, as I have not had access to it, we can nonetheless suppose that the mistake would be present in his collation. Actually, Geldner admitted to have used Olshausen’s collation, but not that of Müller. Since Westergaard copied the data of P2 and P10 from Spiegel’s edition, and Spiegel used Olshausen’s and Müller’s collations, it is very likely that the source of this confusion was due to a mistake in Olshausen’s collations.

Therefore, Olshausen’s mistake would explain why these manuscripts were confused. Moreover, since Spiegel did not himself see the manuscripts, but instead used Olshausen’s and Müller’s already mistaken collations, he could not check if the data in these collations agreed with those of the original manuscripts. Thus, it is very likely that Spiegel confused Olshausen’s mistaken collations and mixed the names of the manuscripts. Later Westergaard continued the confusion, simply because in his edition he trusted Spiegel’s readings. Eventually the mistake was inherited in turn by Geldner, who did not collate the manuscripts in Paris, but was overly confident in Olshausen’s collation and in Westergaard’s edition.

Geldner’s use of collations and copies made by others was thus not only a methodological mistake leading to confusion, but it is also responsible for some mistakes in the critical notes.

We would expect of course that there would be no mistake in the manuscripts which Geldner saw himself. Unfortunately, there are some; in the

---

70 Even though, it is noteworthy that M. J. Müller made a parallel mistake when collating P10. The manuscript Cod. Zend. 2 of the Bayerische-Staatsbibliothek of Munich is a collation of P10 made by M. J. Müller. According to Bartholomae (1915, 2-3), at the end of Müller’s collation of Suppl. Persan 25 (= P10), he wrote in red ink a colophon with the year 1127 A.Y. Also according to the former, this is the colophon of Suppl. Persan 39 (= P5). This could explain why P2 and P10 were confused. P10 preserves no colophon, while the colophons in P2 and P5 attest that both were copied in 1127 A.Y. Müller also copied this date in his collation of P10, and because of this mistake three manuscripts of the same library were supposed to be written in 1127 A.Y.
variants of Geldner’s critical notes I have noticed some mistakes, of which I will show only some examples taken from V 11:

- V 11.7d: according to Geldner: L4 išiām; but really: ašiām, partially written by the second hand of L4a.
- V 11.12a: according to Geldner: L4 kundiža; but really: knudižda.
- V 11.12f: according to Geldner: L4 uruuarā, K1 uruuarai̯; but really: L4, K1 uruuarai̯. The right reading is, however, in P2, but this variant is not recorded by Geldner.

The most significant of these mistakes is that they are recorded in the two oldest PV manuscripts, namely L4 and K1, just two of the most important ones when choosing the variants in the constitutio textus. Since the data recorded by Geldner sometimes does not correspond to the original manuscripts, a question arises: can we trust Geldner’s critical notes?

In order to know if these mistakes are representative enough, I have analysed the critical notes to V 14 as an example. Among 246 variants of L4 and K1 recorded by Geldner, he was wrong 15 times71. This means that only 6.09% of the variants of L4 and K1 in V14 were mistaken. His inaccuracy is slight, but it is significant enough in a critical edition and demonstrates that it must be deeply revised.

Geldner’s first methodological mistake was already made in the recensio. Actually, as far as he did not himself see some manuscripts, he should not have included their readings in the collatio. Moreover, he trusted Westergaard’s previous edition, which inherited Spiegel’s and Olshausen’s mistakes, and did not check his critical notes with the manuscripts. Thus, the mistakes in the copies, collations and previous editions of his colleagues were continued in his own edition. To these mistakes, he added his own, as we see in the variants recorded in V 14.

Therefore, the autopsy of the manuscripts is necessary to correct the mistakes made by Geldner.

---

71 14.2b (L4 nisrinui̯u, not °srinui̯u), 14.4a (L4 frastra̯an̯am, not frastra̯on̯am), 14.4b (K1 daŋp̣,pairaŋharštaṇ. daŋp̣,yaoždā, not simply pairayb”), 14.4b (L4 haṣ̌.naep̣a, not all the manuscripts haṣ̌naep̣a exc. K1; actually, there is no manuscript which attests Geldner’s haṣ̌naep̣a), 14.5a (L4 udarō,drstaṇ, not drstaṇ), 14.6c (L4 ʃaipi.jauni̯aṭ, not jani̯i̯a), 14.7c (L4 hidaraṇom, but not corrected sec. manu to k, because there is no correction by a sec. manu), 14.7e (L4 tizi̯bāṛom, not tizi̯i̯.bāṛom), 14.9i (L4, K1 ašuandaiso, not ašuaidaiso), 14.11a (L4, K1 vo.rozai̯ianṭom, not vo.rozai̯ianṭom), 14.11c (K1, P2, M3 ərozaṭo, not all Mss. ərozaṭom, exc. K1 ərozaṭo), 14.11d (K1, P2, M3 yaṭ, not all Mss. ya.da, exc. K1 yaṭ), 14.14d (K1 zarzai̯u, not zarzai̯i̯).
1.3. *Descriprio codicum* of this edition of V 10-12

Aside from the methodological mistakes made by Geldner, a new critical edition is justified by the new Vidēvdād manuscripts discovered in India and Iran after Geldner’s edition.

On one hand, in India many Avestan manuscripts, to which Geldner did not have access, were brought to light by other scholars at The First Dastur Meherji-rama Library of Navsari (Dhabhar 1925)\(^{72}\), the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai (Dhabhar 1923a) (Dhabhar 1923b) and the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute of Poona (Cereti 1996). To them, we must add new Vidēvdād manuscripts in the Indian libraries of The First Dastur Meherji-rama Library of Navsari, the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai and the Bombay University Library, many of them already digitised by us and made available in [www.avesta-archive.com](http://www.avesta-archive.com). Furthermore, we have digitised another Vidēvdād Sāde manuscript of the private collection of the Dastur Dr. F. M. Kotwal, which we have called FK1.

On the other hand, in Iran three new Iranian Vidēvdād Sāde manuscripts, unknown to Geldner, have come to light, two of them in Tehran and the third one in Mashhad. Unfortunately, I could not collate them before finishing my edition.

These new manuscripts must be incorporated to Geldner’s *stemma codicum* of Vidēvdād.

Concerning the PV manuscripts, his *stemma* is partially valid, but unavoidably it must be rebuilt because of the new PV manuscripts. In his Prolegomena, Geldner (1896) established a *stemma codicum* of the PV manuscripts he had at his disposal. He collated 9 PV manuscripts, which he divided in two main groups: on one hand, the group of L4 and Pt2 and, on the other hand, the group of K1, M13, K3b, K3a, P2, B1 and M3.

In my edition, I have incorporated to Geldner’s list the manuscripts D62, P5, K2, G25a, F10, T44, E10, P10, R1 and R3. Consequently, in my edition I have collated 15 PV manuscripts, of which R1 and R3 only contain Vidēvdād 12. Now the scope is wider and we can understand better the inner relations of the PV manuscripts. Because of this, not only is a new edition needed, but also a new *stemma codicum* of the PV is required.

Regarding the Vidēvdād Sāde (VS) manuscripts, they are divided in two main groups: the Indian VS (IndVS) and the Iranian VS (IrVS). Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xxi ff.) collated 9 IndVS manuscripts. As far as he considered that the IndVS represented the *vulgata*, and was conscious of having collated only a small part of what existed in India, he did not dare to establish any *stemma codicum* with these manuscripts. Nevertheless, at least, he divided the written transmission of the IndVS into two main groups: on one hand, the more carefully written group of Br1, L2 and K10 and, on the other hand, the group of L1, M2, O2, B2 and P1. The manuscript Dh1 held an intermediate position between both groups, according to Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xxi). According to Cereti (1998), this manuscript, together with the rest of Zoroastrian manuscripts of the Indian Museum, is supposed to be at the Biblioteca della Facoltà di Lettere dell’ Università di Firenze.

---

\(^{72}\) Regarding Vidēvdād, Cantera (2007b) has studied the relation between the new PV manuscripts from Navsari and L4.
But it is now lost, either because it has been misplaced in this library or because it was destroyed by the 1966 flood in Florence. The rest of manuscripts, with the exception of Br1 and B2, were available.

In our recent trip to India, we have collated 15 new IndVS manuscripts, mainly at The First Dastur Meherji-raha Library in Navsari and the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai, which must be analysed and incorporated to Geldner’s list. We have rediscovered B2 at the Bombay University Library, whose colophon surprisingly remained unnoticed to Geldner and, thanks to the Cantera’s observation, has revealed that it is the oldest IndVS, apart from L1. The second oldest IndVS, namely R278, has been also discovered by us at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai. Furthermore, although Geldner’s Br1 was considered lost, I have verified during my stay in Mumbai that it is really the manuscript D61 of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai, where I could collate it. Thus, all the IndVS that Geldner used (with the exception of Dh1) are again available, together with a lot of newly discovered manuscripts. Accordingly, now the reconstruction of a *stemma codicum* of the IndVS is even more complicated.

Until a complete edition of the Avestan text of Yasna, Vîsparad and Vîdêvdâd is carried out, including these new discoveries, it is impossible to reconstruct a trustworthy *stemma codicum* of the IndVS manuscripts. Having edited only Vîdêvdâd 10-12, I cannot dare to such a reconstruction. Furthermore, the fact that it can only be made by means of an Avestan text, which transmits a *vulgata* mostly identical in many manuscripts, this task is made even harder. This *vulgata* implies that collating many manuscripts does not usually provide enough differences between manuscripts. Because of this, they cannot all be incorporated to the edition before a motivated choice is justified. I have therefore incorporated to my edition the only IndVS manuscripts at my disposal which preserve a colophon. They are 11. Apart from the (supposedly) oldest manuscript L1 and the manuscripts P1, Br1 and L2, which Geldner already used, I have added six manuscripts to which Geldner did not have access: R278 (at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai), T46, G42 and E4 (at The First Dastur Meherji-raha Library in Navsari), L5 (at the British Library) and FK1 (from the private collection of the Dastur Dr. F. M. Kotwal). T46 (1033 A.Y.) is the fourth oldest IndVS and sometimes provides new readings, but it usually agrees with the rest of IndVS. On the contrary, G42, E4, L5 and FK1 are late and seem not important to reconstruct a *stemma*. The rest of newly discovered manuscripts must be still analysed in order to draw further conclusions.

Regarding the IrVS manuscripts, during my stay at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai, I could collate the oldest one: Mf2. Moreover, I have compared its variants with those found in its copy K9, which I have also collated.

To summarise, for my critical edition of V 10-12, I have collated 27 manuscripts (15 PV, 11 IndVS and 2 IrVS), whose *descriptio codicum* follows:
Pahlavi Vidēvdād (PV):

- **L4**: the oldest PV manuscript known to us, copied by Mihrābān Kay-husraw Mihrābān in Navsarī on the day Hordād of the month Ābān 692 A.Y. (1323 A.D.), according to the colophon preserved in its copies Pt2 (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena ix) and E10. The old parts are partially lost and were completed by a second hand (L4b, e. g. in V 7) and by a modern one (Geldner’s L4a, e. g. in V 1) at de Guise’s command. A third hand (L4c) is found in V 1073. The 2nd, 3rd and 18th fragard are misplaced in the following passages: 2.18c > 2.11a > 2.15a > 2.19a; 3.25c > 3.29 > 3.32d > 3.26; 18.1-7 > 18.16-44 > 18.12-16 > 18.45-51 > 18.7-11 > 18.58-76. Library: British Library in London. Current signature: Mss. Avestan 4.

- **K1**: PV manuscript copied by Mihrābān Kay-husraw Mihrābān, the same scribe of L4, in Cambay on the day Dēn of the month Tir 693 A.Y. (1324 A.D.) (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena vi). Folios 1-92 (V 1.1-5.26) are lost. Apart from the same misplacements as L4, it shows the following misplacement in the 9th fragard: 9.16 > 9.18c-20c > 9.17a-18d > 9.22e-24c > 9.20d-22e > 9.24 ff. Its colophon was reproduced and translated by Sanjana (1895 xxxiv ff.). See also (Unvala 1940 123). Library: Kongelige Bibliothek in Copenhagen. Current signature: Cod. Iran 1.


- **P5**: PV copied from the group of K1, but partially collated with a manuscript of the group of L4 and with VS manuscripts. It shows additions from the VS, rearrangements, etc. and usually a PT different from the rest of PV manuscripts, which stems, however, from the same source like K2. Copied in 15.10.1127 A.Y. (1758 A.D.), that is, later than P2. Its colophon was reproduced and translated by Unvala (1940 123 13-

---

73 In V 10.11a L4c attests _FE2BFE2

- **K2**: PV copied from the group of K1, but partially collated with a manuscript of the group of L4 and with VS manuscripts. Like P5, it shows additions from the VS, rearrangements, etc. and a PT different from the rest of PV manuscripts, but common to P5. This manuscript attest no colophon, but only a note written in Danish by Rask himself (Westergaard 1852 6), according to which it was copied by Dastur Darâb from an exemplar brought from Persia by Dastur Jâmāsp Irâni 74. Thus, this manuscript would be close to Anquetil’s visit to India in the 18th century. It must be considered as a didactic manuscript belonging to the reformist school of Surat (Cantera & Andrés-Toledo 2008) and it attests a PT for V 12 before V 13. Library: Kongelige Bibliothek in Copenhagen. Current signature: Cod. Iran 2.

- **G25**: PV of the group of L4 with New Persian interlinear translation copied by Mobed Tehmur Nawruz Mobed Rustam Sanjana in Navsarî in 1163 A.Y. (1794 A.D.), according to its colophon. The 12th fragard is added by another hand (G25a) There are some corrections by a second hand (G25b), which stem from other manuscripts of the group of L4. Only the second volume, which contains V 12-22, is available. It attests a PT for V 12 before V 13. Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarî. Current signature: G25.

- **G34**: PV of the group of L4 with New Persian interlinear translation copied in Navsarî. It is the best preserved copy of L4. According to Kotwal’s unpublished catalogue, it was sold to Mancherji Faredunji for Rs. 25 by Faredunji Kawasji Barucha on the day Asman, month Mahafarvadin of 1204 A.Y. Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarî. Current signature: G34.

- **F10**: PV of the group of K1 with New Persian interlinear translation, but partially collated with VS manuscripts. Copied by Dastur Sorabji Kovasji Sorabji Meherji-rana in Navsarî in 12.1872 Saṅvat (1st volume) and 14.10.1872 Saṅvat (2nd volume), that is, 1815 A.D. There are some corrections by a second hand (F10a), which stem from other manuscripts of the group of L4. Like P5 and K2, it shows additions from the VS, rearrangements, etc. and its copyist belongs to the reformist school of Navsarî (Cantera & Andrés-Toledo 2008). 1st volume: V 1-8. 2nd volume: V 9-22. The 12th fragard is added in European paper at the end of the second volume by a recent hand. Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarî. Current signature: F10 of the Dastur Erachji Sorabji Meherji-rana’s collection (Dhabhar 1925 7-8).

74 “Vendidad med pehlevi Oversættelse afskrevet af Destur Darâb efter et gammelt Exemplar bragt fra Persien af Destur Jämsp irâni”.
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- **T44**: PV of the group of L4 with New Persian interlinear translation, but partially collated with VS manuscripts. Copied by Mobed Sohrāb Dastur Frāmroz Sohrāb Rustom (Meherji-rana) on the day Dādār Hormizd, month Ordibehešt in 1210 (in letters) or 1208 (in numbers) A.Y. (1841 or 1839 A.D.), according to its colophon. Like P5 and K2, it shows additions from the VS, rearrangements, etc. and its copyist belongs to the reformist school of Navsarī. The 12th *fragard* is added at the end of the manuscript by the same hand. Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarī. Current signature: T44 of the Original collection (Dhabhar 1925 125).

- **E10**: PV manuscript of the group of L4, but partially collated with VS manuscripts. Like P5, K2 and T44, it shows additions from the VS, rearrangements, etc. Like Pt2, it preserves the lost three colophons of L4, but it does not include the data of the final copyist, place and date of E10. Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarī. Current signature: E10 of the Naib-Dastur Edalji Navroji Meherji-rana’s collection (Dhabhar 1925 66).


- **R1**: PV manuscript without colophon, although the water mark in the paper indicates year 1867. Only V 12 and parts of other texts of Vīdēvdād. At the beginning of the 12th *fragard* it is written in Persian that it was copied from a manuscript of Mobed Rustam Sanjana (Dhabhar 1923b 135). Unknown to Geldner. Library: K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai. Current signature: R. 1.

Indian Vīdēvdād Sāde (IndVS):


- B2: IndVS manuscript. Although Geldner (1896 Prolegomena ii) considered old, he did not noticed that it preserves the colophon. As Cantera has recently noticed, the colophon is written in folio 53v. According to it, this manuscript was written by Dārāb Hērbed Hīrā in Surat on the day Mihr of the month Amurdād 995 A.Y. (1626 A.D.). Library: Bombay University Library. Current signature: № 28.


- T46: IndVS manuscript copied by Ervad Erach Dastur Xoršed Dastur Hošang on the day Ohrmazd of the month Mihr 1033 A.Y. (1664 A.D.), according to its first colophon in folio 77, and completed by Ervad Erach Dastur Xoršed Dastur Hošang Sanjana in Navsarī on the day Māraspand of the month Ābān 1033 A.Y. (1664 A.D.) (Dhabhar 1925 126). Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarī. Current signature: T46 of the Original collection (Dhabhar 1925 126).

- P1: IndVS manuscript copied by Dārāb Hērbed Rōstam Hērbed Xōršēd Hērbed Aspendyār Hērbed Rōstam in Surat on the Zāmyād of the month Mihr 1083 A.Y. (1714 A.D.), according to its Pāzand colophon. Its colophons were reproduced and translated by Unvala (1940 123 4-6). Burnouf (1829-1843) published a lithographed copy of P1, which was reprinted by Brockhaus (1850). Library: Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris. Current signature: Suppl. Persicum 27.


- **E4**: IndVS manuscript copied by Behdin Xurshedji Kausji Edalji on the day Rām of the month Šahrewar 1161 A.Y., Sarvot 1848 (1792 A.D.), according to its Gujarati colophon. Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarī. Current signature: E4 of the Naib-Dastur Edalji Navroji Meherji-rana’s collection (Dhabhar 1925 64).

- **L5**: IndVS manuscript copied by Hērbed Rūštam Hērbed Dārāb Frāmrōzzī Hērbed Mīnōcōhōrzī Hērbed Ḫarašspazī Pāvadī in Mumbai on the day Spandarmad of the month Day 1161 A.Y. (1792 A.D.), that is, later than E4. Its colophons were reproduced and translated by Unvala (1940 123 86-87). Library: British Library in London. Current signature: Mss. Avestan 5.

- **FK1**: IndVS manuscript copied by Rostam bain Dastur Xurshed bān Dastur Mihirṅōš bān Dastur Bhimwn bān Dastur Xurşat on 1172 A.Y. Belonging to the private collection of the Dastur Dr. F. M. Kotwal and recently presented by him to The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarī.

**Iranian Vīdēvdād Sāde (IrVS):**

- **Mf2**: the oldest IrVS manuscript known to us, copied by Husraw Anōšīrwān Rōstām Shahryār Wahrām Dahišnyār Mīhrābān in Turkabad (Yazd) on the day Ādur of the month Ābān 987 A.Y. (1618 A.Y.). It attests two colophons, one after V 9 and another at the end of the manuscript. This important manuscript is described by Dhabhar (1923a 13-14) in the number 15 of his catalogue. Library: K. R. Cama Oriental Institute of Mumbai. Current signature: D. 58.

2. STEMMATICS

In order to establish the *stemmata codicum* of the Avestan texts, Geldner followed partially Lachmann’s (1842-1850) method for the edition of classical texts. By means of this method Geldner reconstructed the *stemma codicum* of the PV and the IrVS, but he did not dare to establish that of the IndVS, because he was conscious of having at his disposal only a part of the extant material. However, and unlike Lachmann, he based the *collatio* not only on the *errores significativi*, further divided by Maas into *errores coniunctivi*, that is, those connecting two or more manuscripts, and *errores separativi*, namely those which separate one manuscript from the rest. Geldner also took into account other minor variants, such as dittographies and haplographies. As we will observe, this choice implied some problems.

2.1. *Stemma codicum* of Vidēvdād

As far as Vidēvdād is concerned, its archetype must be reconstructed on the basis of two main text-types: a) that of the Pahlavi Vidēvdād manuscripts, that is, those which attest a Pahlavi translation of the Avestan text; and b) that of the Vidēvdād Sāde manuscripts, where only the Avestan text is preserved.

The VS manuscripts show the text in full without abbreviation, mainly because they must be recited in a ritual, unlike the Pahlavi ones. Moreover, the arrangement of texts in the VS is completely different from that of the PV. While in the latter ones there is no further text between each *fragard*, in the VS the text of Vidēvdād is added between Visparad and Yasna. Therefore, the Vidēvdād Sāde can be considered a text-type, opposed to the text-type of the Pahlavi manuscripts.

Notwithstanding, the text of the VS is substantially the same as that of the PV manuscripts with only slight differences, as Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xlv) already noticed. Accordingly, both text-types seem to stem from a common pre-archetype. I will deal later with the problem of the reconstruction of this common pre-archetype. I will now analyse Geldner’s considerations, as written in his Prolegomena, about the archetype of Vidēvdād in order to show the fundaments of his critical edition of Vidēvdād.

Geldner based his edition on the PV manuscripts. According to him (1896 Prolegomena xiii ff.) all the known PV manuscripts stem from L4 and K1. According to the colophon in K1 and that of Pt2, which is a copy of L4, Māhyār Māhdād brought from Sistān to India a manuscript written by Ardašīr i Wahman i

---

75 Lachmann’s (1842-1850) method was systematised and improved by Maas (1957). As regards the main principles of stemmatics applied to Greek and Latin, vid. (Pasquali 1952), (West 1973), (Reynolds & Wilson 1974 VI.3), (Timpanaro 1981), (Bernabé 1992 54 ff.).

76 Concerning the application of text-types to the textual criticism of other sacred texts, vid. Westcott & Hort’s (1881) text-types in the Greek New Testament.
Rōzweh Šāhburzēn Šāhmard from a manuscript copied by Hōmāst Wahišt in the 12th century A.D. Hōmāst Wahišt’s manuscript, therefore, is the archetype of our extant Pahlavi Vīdēvdād and represents the written transmission current in Sīstān, according to Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xxiii).

Anquetil-Duperron (1771 1.323, 2.4) reports that Ardašīr’s manuscript was copied twice in India. According to Westergaard (1852 4, n.1), from one of these two copies, made by Rōstām Mihrābān Marzabān, two other copies were made by Mihrābān Kayhusraw: L4 (692 A.Y., 1323 A.D.) and K1 (693 A.Y., 1324 A.D.). The remaining PV manuscripts known to Geldner stem from these two copies, whose *stemma codicum* he (1896 Prolegomena xix) reconstructed thus:

```
Ms. of Hōmāst
     |
Ms. of Ardašīr (1205 A.D.)
     |
Ms. of Rōstām (after 1269)
     |
L4 (1323)    K1 (1324)
 |
ML3 (1594)    B1    K3b
 |
Y corrections by a second hand
 |
P2 (1758)    K3a
 |
M3
```

Geldner’s *stemma* had to be rebuilt because of the discovery of another important PV manuscript at the beginning of the 20th century: Jāmāsp’s (1907) IM (1575 A.D.). Its importance manifested as it is the only known manuscript which does not stem from L4 or K1.

Before IM was discovered, all the known PV manuscripts were supposed to stem from one of these two copies of Rōstām Mihrābān Marzabān’s copy, which is reflected in Geldner’s *stemma codicum*.

IM was brought from Iran to India by an Iranian Zoroastrian named Siyāwaxš Ormazdyār. It was presented to Mānakjī Sōhrābjī Kāwusjī Ashburner in 1853 A.D., according to a Persian colophon on the last folio. In 1907 it was in Jāmāsp’s possession. Unfortunately now it is lost.

IM contains a colophon at the end of V 9 and other colophons at the end of the manuscript, all of them reproduced by Jāmāsp (1907 xxiv ff.). According to the colophon after book 9, it was copied in Kermān by Marzabān Frēdōn Wahrām Rōstām Būnyār in 944 Y.E. (1575 A.D.) from a copy by Šahryār Ardašīr Ėrič Rōstām Ėrič (ς) that goes back to a copy by Wēžan Wahrāmshāh Wēžan (ὅ), who copied it from the manuscript of Ardašīr (硖). Therefore, while IM stems from one copy of the manuscript of Ardašīr, L4 and K1 stem from a second copy of the same manuscript (Cantera & Andrés-Toledo 2008), as we can observe in the following diagram:
Until IM can again be located, L4 and K1 are the oldest PV manuscripts we know and the only source of the rest of PV manuscripts.

According to Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xx, xlv-xlvi), the Vidēvdād Sāde manuscripts are divided into two groups, the Indian and the Iranian one, each stemming from an Indian and an Iranian vulgata respectively. These two vulgatae stem in turn from a common VS tradition, older than the archetype of our extant PV, and only retraceable by comparison of the scanty Iranian material with the great number of Indian manuscripts.

As mentioned above, Geldner did not dare to reconstruct a stemma codicum of the Indian VS, and limited himself to the Iranian one.

Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xxxv) traced back the Iranian VS to a common ancestor of the 15th century approximately:

He denied the possibility of retracing the common ancestor of the Indian vulgata (1896 Prolegomena xxi) because of the great number of Indian VS manuscripts and because he admitted to have collated only “a fragment of what exists”. Kellens (1998 455) agrees with him.
Geldner was very cautious, since he knew he had at his disposal only limited materials. Nevertheless, his decision implies a problem. As a matter of fact, unless we try to reconstruct at least a provisional *stemma codicum* of the Indian VS, it is impossible to reach the archetype of the text-type of the VS, because one of its two branches lacks.

But this problem does not only affect the VS text-type, but also that of the PV. Actually, since both text-types are supposed to go back to a common pre-archetype, that of the whole Vīdēvdād, lacking any reliable archetype of the VS tradition, the latter cannot be established. Nevertheless, Geldner seems not to have noticed the implications of this fact for the reconstruction of the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād.

### 2.2. Geldner’s archetype of Vīdēvdād

Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xlvi) denied the possibility of reaching what Hoffmann & Narten’s (1989) called afterwards a Sasanian archetype, called pre-archetype by modern textual criticism since Pasquali (1952). On this subject, Geldner was closer to Maas’ (1957) concept of the archetype than to that of Lachmann (1842-1850), because he only tried to reconstruct the text which the manuscripts can attest. Moreover, his doubts about the possibility of reaching this pre-archetype were closer to modern critics like Dawe (1964).

Geldner’s concept of a common pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād determined the *constitutio textus* of his edition, so that I will outline some remarks about it.

On one hand, Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xx) supposed that the VS text-type “lies farther back than our oldest Pahlavi Vendîdâds in point of time, or before the Ms. of Rustam”, on account of the readings shared by all the VS, which differ from those of the PV. On the other hand, he (1896 Prolegomena xix) guessed that the VS text-type presupposes a common archetype excerpted and compiled out of the PV manuscripts because of two reasons: a) the VS incorporated glosses from the PV; b) the IndVS manuscripts B2 and P1 included corrections from the oldest PV manuscripts.77

The VS certainly incorporated glosses from the PV (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena xlvii). But these are sometimes difficult to distinguish from the original text, as he himself indicated. In such cases he admitted to have followed the Iranian VS, which according to him (1896 Prolegomena xxiii, xlvii) is almost free from glosses and preserves a better text than the Indian VS. He (1896 Prolegomena xxii) furthermore stated that the IndVS manuscripts B2 and P1 include corrections from the oldest PV manuscripts. Therefore, at a previous stage, our extant VS manuscripts would have copied the text of Vīdēvdād from the PV text-type.

Geldner’s conclusions raise some methodological problems.

The only textual materials now available are the extant manuscripts of both text-types. Provided that we admit that the direction of copy was PV > VS, as

---

77 The only correction noted by Geldner would occur in V 18.70, where P1 agrees with L4 in the variant zaodrō.
Geldner did, we can no more take the text-type of the VS as older at a previous stage. Thus, a methodological contradiction arises.

Furthermore, Geldner’s arguments for a direction of copy PV > VS must be reviewed. It is not true that some IndVS introduced corrections from the oldest PV manuscripts. Indeed, from a single example of a supposed correction from L4 in P1, we cannot infer that even this IndVS manuscript was corrected by means of the oldest PV ones. This is only a coincidence between two manuscripts which demonstrates nothing by itself, because it is nothing unusual. So the only influence of the PV on the VS text-type that could point to the previous existence of the PV text-type and to the direction of copy PV > VS is the incorporation of some Avestan glosses from the PT of the PV into the VS. However, we must admit that there were Avestan glosses to the Avestan texts, so that all the glosses of the VS must not necessarily be ascribed to the PT, that is, not all the glosses incorporated into the VS stem from the PV. They could have already been included in the Avestan text of the VS.

2.3. The archetype of Vīdēvdād after Geldner

After Geldner’s approach, new perspectives were made possible concerning the problem of the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād. The most important contributions after Geldner were those of Humbach, Hoffmann & Narten and Kellens.

Humbach (1973 109-110) stated that the PT was added to a previous VS text because of the comparison between V 15.49 and 15.50:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V 15.49</th>
<th>V 15.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yō. gaδβam. yam. apudräm. ṇraiqam.</td>
<td>dātarə. yō. gaδβam. jainťi. yam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bāuzdri. barọdrica. pudrāca.</td>
<td>apudräm. ṇraiqam. bāuzdri. barọdrica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paēmainica. aiiatāca. taēca. aētađac.</td>
<td>pudrāca. paēmainica. aiiatāca. taēca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pudräm. baraiti. sūnquam. bāuzdri.</td>
<td>pudräm. baraiti. sūnquam. bāuzdri. kā. bē. asti. cīδa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Humbach (1973 109-110), all the manuscripts of the PV and the VS text-type would stem from the same “Stammhandschrift”, namely a VS, because all of them attest the same wrong repetition. Humbach (1973) explains it out of a scribal mistake in a VS, from which the rest of manuscripts stem. The scribe of the archetype of the VS text-type would have copied wrongly the expected Avestan text of V 15.50, namely our V 15.49. He then noticed the mistake of V 15.49, marked it with deletion marks and copied the right one of V 15.50 below. Later copyists of this manuscript did not notice the deletion marks and copied both V 15.49 and 15.50. Afterwards the Pahlavi translators rendered both texts into Pahlavi, also without noticing this repetition.

In Humbach’s (1973) opinion, the PT was added after this mistake in the Avestan text was made. On one hand, if the PT was older than this scribal mistake,
the PV manuscripts would attest only one PT, regardless of the repetition of the Avestan text. On the other hand, this implies that all the extant Vīdēvdād manuscripts, both PV and VS, stem from a common manuscript.

Humbach (1973 109-110), however, did not specify whether a PT was made from this VS “Stammhandschrift” or this PT already existed and was adapted to the VS. If it was made from this VS “Stammhandschrift”, it must necessarily have been made in Sasanian times because of the archaisms of the PT (Cantera 1999a). In such case, the VS “Stammhandschrift” would be at least as old as this archaic Pahlavi. On the contrary, if a PT already existed and was adapted to the VS, Humbach still could not explain where this PT came from.

This idea of a common written archetype was continued by Hoffmann & Narten (1989). Indeed, they stated that both text-types, namely the PV and the VS, stem from a common “Stammhandschrift” written in the 9th or 10th century, which in its turn stems from the Sasanian (pre-)archetype:

```
Sasanian (pre-)archetype
    Stammhandschrift of Vīdēvdād
        PV
        VS
```

According to them, the loss of some “Stammhandschriften”, in times when the Zoroastrian community was in danger and the Pahlavi literature flourished partly at the cost of the interest for Avestan, explains why only a meagre part of the Avesta is preserved.

They state, unlike Geldner, that a critical edition of the Avesta must try to reconstruct this Sasanian (pre-)archetype. Nevertheless, as we have already observed, in the contaminated written transmission of Vīdēvdād this task cannot be easily fulfilled.

The third most important approach to the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād was made by Kellens (1998 472-473). He criticised Hoffmann & Narten’s vision of the written transmission of the Avesta because of its extreme linearity and explained the loss of the most part of the Avesta in a different way.

According to him, apart from the Great Sasanian Avesta, described in Dēnkard 8-9, there was a parallel text of the Avesta for ritual purposes. This ritual Avesta comprised a textual canon for major rituals (Yasna, Visparad and Vīdēvdād) and another for minor rituals (Xwardag Abastāg). Our extant manuscripts would stem from this ritual Avesta. According to Kellens’ hypothesis, since our manuscripts stem from the ritual Avesta, then the text-type of the Sāde manuscripts would be the oldest one. In this regard he agrees with Humbach’s opinion.

As far as Vīdēvdād is concerned, Kellens (1998 473) follows Humbach (1973 109-113) and takes for granted a VS “Stammhandschrift” A previous to a PV
“Stammhandschrift” B. Like Humbach, he observes that there are some common omissions in the VS as well as in the PV manuscripts. This fact is corroborated sometimes by an omission in the PT too. According to Kellens, such omissions can only be explained because they already occurred in a common archetype, namely the VS “Stammhandschrift” A. The hyparchetypes of the VS and the PV stem from it.

On the other side, he also notices that Avestan glosses from the PT of the PV manuscripts slipped even into the oldest VS manuscripts. This fact is explained by Kellens (1998 473) by means of the PV “Stammhandschrift” B.

According to him, although the VS “Stammhandschrift” A would be older and all the manuscripts of Vīdēvdād stem from it, a copy of it with the PT already included, namely the PV “Stammhandschrift” B, was the source of all our extant PV as well as VS manuscripts. Regarding the latter ones, they would have been copied without the PT from this PV “Stammhandschrift” B.

Kellens’ study finally agrees with Geldner’s opinion. Indeed, Kellens’ VS “Stammhandschrift” A would be the manuscript which “lies farther back than our oldest Pahlavi Vendīdāds in point of time, or before the Ms. of Rustam”. Nevertheless, Kellens did not explain where the PT of the PV manuscripts came from and how it was assembled with the Avestan text, since these PV manuscripts stem from a VS. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a new VS text-type could have been extracted from a PV manuscript, unless it was made by means of a copy-paste process of several manuscripts. Actually, this copy-paste process would mean that the new VS manuscripts after the “Stammhandschrift” B were extracted from different manuscripts with the text of Yasna-Vīsparad and Vīdēvdād independently.

The last study about the pre-archetypal vehicle of Vīdēvdād has been recently presented by Cantera in a conference at the École des Hautes Études in 2008.

On one hand, Cantera criticised Humbach’s (1973) argument regarding V 15.49-50. As already mentioned, Humbach stated that the repetition of the PT in the repeated Avestan text demonstrates that this PT was added, but not necessarily made, later. Since V 15.50 attests the complete Avestan text, if Humbach (1973) were right we would expect the PT rendering each Avestan word. As Cantera observes, however, both PTs omitted the PT of Av. jainti. Hence Cantera concludes that a PT where Av. jainti remained untranslated already existed before the Avestan text was copied twice. Thus, the VS was not translated later: a PT already existed and was added latter to the Avestan text. When the scribes noticed that the Avestan text was repeated, they simply copied again the only PT they had at their disposal.

On the other hand, Cantera agrees with Kellens concerning the priority of the VS text-type, but he disagrees with him regarding the reconstruction of a PV “Stammhandschrift” B because of two reasons.

Firstly, and unlike Kellens, he thinks that some Avestan glosses from the PT slipped into the VS text-type when this PT was joined to the Avestan text of the VS, because they show mutual influence. There was a process of mutual contamination when both text-types merged, but this does not imply the need of a “Stammhandschrift” B.
Secondly, Cantera notices that Kellens’ hypothesis of a VS “Stammhandschrift” A and a PV “Stammhandschrift” B does not explain a further problem: none of our extant PV manuscripts attest the 12th *fragard*. If all the VS manuscripts stem from this PV “Stammhandschrift” B, we would expect them not to include this 12th *fragard*. But they do. If Kellens’ hypothesis were right, its presence in the VS could only be explained either a) as an omission in the archetype of all our extant PV manuscripts, older enough to go back to the time when Dēnkard was written, because V 12 is not described in Dēnkard; or b) as an addition of this *fragard* in the VS manuscripts after the PT was embedded in the PV manuscripts.

According to Cantera, V 12 is not preserved in the PV because it never belonged to the Vīdēvdād Nask of the Great Avesta, but only to the ritual Avesta.

Cantera thinks that the scribes from the 10th century onwards were comparing both text-types when both traditions merged78, possibly from a single manuscript of each type. They did not simply copy, but also tried to improve the transmitted text in what can be viewed as an editorial attempt. Thus, whenever they did not find the corresponding *fragard* in the Vīdēvdād Nask of the Great Avesta, as it is the case of the 12th *fragard*, they simply omitted it in the PV manuscripts. According to Cantera (under preparation D), the scribes apparently preferred not to include the Avestan text without PT instead of adding an Avestan text without PT. On the contrary, they added some glosses from the PV into the VS manuscripts, especially when these glosses were accompanied by its corresponding PT. So both traditions contaminated each other.

Like Geldner, Humbach and Kellens, Cantera considers that the Avestan text of Vīdēvdād is basically the heir of a VS text-type. He thinks that this VS was used for ritual purposes and existed as such in Sasanian times: our extant VS are, more or less, the direct heirs of the tradition of this ritual Avesta.

As far as the PV text-type is concerned, he says that our extant PV manuscripts are the result of the addition of the PT of the Vīdēvdād Nask of the Great Avesta to this basic VS text-type. According to him, this Vīdēvdād Nask only preserved the PT together with its glosses and commentaries, although he does not rule out that it may have included an Avestan text very similar to that of the VS text-type. At a certain point of the written transmission, both traditions merged and the PT together with its glosses and commentaries was assembled with the Avestan text of the VS. So the process of adding a PT to an Avestan text would be parallel to that of the creation of the Pahlavi Yasna, as Cantera & de Vaan (2005) noticed on account of the manuscripts Pt4 and Mf4. Therefore, the creation of the PV text-type would be parallel to that of the Pahlavi Yasna text-type: an independent Avestan text, to which a PT was assembled.

I agree with Cantera in refusing a PV “Stammhandschrift” B and I consider very unlikely that a whole VS could have been extracted from the PV text-type.

---

78 Cantera and I have verified that this is a long term process which continued in India in the PV manuscripts from the 18th onwards. As Cantera notices, however, it is older than we had supposed (see for instance the revision of the manuscript mentioned in the colophon of the IrVS manuscript Jp1).
His explanation of the presence of Avestan glosses in the VS manuscripts because of the joint of an independent Pahlavi text to the VS text-type is more likely. Furthermore, this is confirmed by the parallel of the written transmission of the Pahlavi Yasna, composed joining a PT to the Avestan text. This allows us to explain better why sometimes the PT does not fit exactly the Avestan text. Indeed, both do not always fit because the texts were independently transmitted and only merged afterwards. I disagree, however, regarding his explanation of the absence of V 12 in the PV manuscripts. I will deal later with this problem.

Cantera’s main innovation consists on tracing back both text-types to independent, later merging sources. But this has further theoretical and methodological consequences for the edition of Vīdēvdād:

a) One Avestan pre-archetype.

There would be only one Avestan pre-archetype, namely that of the ritual Vīdēvdād. As far as the Avestan text of the VS was copied from it, it must be taken as the basis and looked upon as preeminent. This contradicts Geldner’s method, because he based his edition on the PV manuscripts. Thus, Geldner’s edition must be revised according to the preeminence of the VS text-type.

b) How to reach it.

The stemma codicum of the IndVS is still an unfulfilled task, and so is accordingly that of the whole VS. But Geldner’s list of variants common to the VS text-type is of no use for it. Indeed, it is mostly based on dittographies, shared often by other manuscripts from the PV text-type and different from L4 and K1. As they can be found independently in manuscripts of a different text-type, due to common innovations, these minor mistakes cannot be used to reconstruct a pre-archetype. Therefore, unless the stemma codicum of the whole VS text-type is built, we will never know which variants are supposed to stem from the pre-archetype of the VS. Furthermore, the great amount of VS manuscripts makes this task all the more difficult.

c) The stemma.

If there was an open tradition, horizontal and contaminated in its very beginning, the reconstruction of a classical stemma codicum must be dealt with caution. The errores coniunctivi become more important than the errores separativi, because the scribes could have corrected the mistakes of the older manuscripts from which they copied.

d) How to choose in case of divergence?

Since these two text-types stem from a common VS source, the VS text-type must be the basis of the constitutio textus.

Only when the IrVS, IndVS and PV manuscripts agree, a reading can be taken for sure or at least for reliable. If they disagree, the usual criterion of textual criticism of two versus one implies that a reading must be preferred when it is shared by the IrVS and the IndVS. If the VS disagree, a reading is more reliable when it is shared by the oldest manuscripts of the PV text-type and at least by the oldest manuscripts of any of the two branches of the VS text-type.
2.4. Types of mistakes in V 10-12

After considering the problem of the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād and its implications for the stemmatics of this text, I will deal with another important subject in stemmatics: the types of mistakes in the written transmission.

Geldner based his conclusions about the relations between manuscripts on some types of mistakes, such as dittographies and haplographies, which modern textual criticism rules out for the reconstruction of a *stemma codicum*. But before trying to build the *stemma codicum* of Vīdēvdād, we must search the types of mistakes found in the Avestan manuscripts and understand which ones are significant and which ones are not.

The Avestan manuscripts share with those of other written traditions some types of mistakes, which are usually due to the writing itself, to the pronunciation or to psychological reasons. In V 10-12 I have found examples of the following:

1. Derived from the writing:
   1.1. Confusion of similar graphems.
   
   This mistake is one of the most common in both Avestan and Pahlavi. Example: V 10.2b: K1 <sʾsʾnʾ> instead of <gʾsʾnʾ>. In Avestan it is very usual in the graphems formed by adding a diacritic to another graphem. Example: V 10.2b: V 10.19a: B1 kamāicić and M3 kamāi.citć instead of *kaṇāi.citć. Confusions are obviously more probable among similar graphems. Example: V 12.1a: G25a, R3, B2, L1, T46, P1, Br1, L2 attest māca instead of māṭa.

   1.2. Due to a wrong division of words.
   
   In Avestan the division of the words through dots by the scribes was not always correct, and in Pahlavi sometimes the scribe wrote a stroke in the midst of the word. As Cantera (2004a) notices, it is not properly a mistake, since it is due to the usual tendency of the scribes to separate endings from the lexeme. Example: V 10.4a: L1, B2 vōhū.nam and T46 vōhū.nam instead of *vohunām; V 10.4a: B2, T46 aōge.madahecā instead of *aogamanđecā; V 11.2c: P2 <lwšn’yh> instead of <lwšnyh>. There are cases in Pahlavi where the wrong separation was not marked by a stroke, as in V 11.12g, where P2 attests <ˈhwwk ynsnʾ> instead of <ˈhwkynšnʾ>.

2. Derived from the pronunciation

These very common mistakes are mainly due to the inner recitation of the scribe when copying or to the pronunciation of another person while he was copying.

---

79 Regarding the creation of different graphems in Avestan from the Pahlavi writing, vid. especially (Hoffmann & Narten 1989 23-33). Cereti is now studying the problem of the creation of the Avestan script in comparison with the Pahlavi writing of coins and epigraphy.
In Avestan they affect mainly the final vowels, but also phonetically close vowels and consonants in all positions. These confusions often indicate that some phonemes were not distinguished at the time when the copy was made. Examples:

- V 10.5b: K1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, E4 attest nāirike instead of nāirika (surely because of a pronunciation of –a as [æ]).
- V 11.8a: D62, B1, P10 <slʾdyš> instead of <slʾdyšn> does not mean that the scribes forgot a final stroke for <-n>, but that they were not pronouncing Phl. srāyšn, but possibly NP. sarāyeš.

The same can be said regarding the PV manuscript K2, which systematically attest <ʾtš> instead of <ʾthš>. Of course, this variant implies that its scribe did no more pronounce Phl. ātāxš, but NP. ātāš.

As Geldner (1896 Prolegomena l) noticed, this confusion, due to phonetic reasons, is a problem whenever we must choose between a middle or an active verbal ending. This problem cannot be easily solved, as the fluctuation between –e / –i is very common in the manuscripts. Moreover, in such cases the PT usually does not help in the choice.

3. Derived from the context

The most frequent context-bound mistakes are due to the perseveration of a previous word or the anticipation of a following one. They are found especially in the Avestan nominal endings. However, sometimes it is difficult to distinguish such contextually conditioned mistakes from ungrammatical passages, which can be due not to a scribal mistake, but to a later composition.

Among the most probable context-bound mistakes of perseveration and anticipation, the following ones can be mentioned:

- V 10.5b: K1, P10, M3 paiti.parənm and D62 paiti.parənm instead of paiti.parəne by influence of the following ayrəm.
- V 10.9a: Br1, L5 ima instead of ime because of the preceding and following vaca.
- V 10.19a: L4 yaoždainiša instead of yaoždāitiš because of the preceding yaoždainiša in L4.
- V 11.3c: Mf2, K9 vairiō instead of vairiōm because of the preceding vairiō.
- V 11.4a: P2 vaca instead of vacō because of the preceding aba and the following framruua; etc.

4. Omissions

4.1. Short omissions

4.1.1. Haplographies

Haplographies, that is, omissions of a syllable or a few graphems, are very common. Examples: V 10.1b: L1, B2, P1, L2 nas instead of nasuš; V 10.1b: L4 upa.raēi instead of upa.raēiiaiiti; V 10.3b: P10 gāhuua instead of gādahuua; V 11.9c: L4a <bwšsp’> instead of <bwš’sp’>.

4.1.2. Omissions of one or a few words

With the exception of words with only one graphem, such as Phl. ud <W> or Phl. i <y>, omissions of one or a few words are not
found as frequently as haplographies. Nevertheless, they are usual enough, especially in Pahlavi. Examples: V 10.1a: L4 — mazda —; V 10.2d: L1 — setqam —; V 10.10a: F10 — MN znd —; V 11.9f: — ʾwlwl —; V 12.7a [A]: G25a — ʾywp —.

Sometimes they are due to a saut du même au même. This visual mistake is due to the identity of two elements in the same line or in two paragraphs. The scribe slips then into the following one. So he omits the previous one together with the text written between both. The saut du même au même occurs when these two words have the same beginning (homoeoarcton) or the same ending (homoeoteleuton).

An example of saut du même au même due to a homoeoarcton is found in V 10.5b: B1, M3 — haca. nāirika. paiti.iriste — in this context: ... haca. nā. paiti.iristō. — haca. nāirika. +paiti.irista. — haca. nmanāhe. ... Since the following prepositional syntagms begins with haca. nā-, the scribe was not aware of having omitted it.

4.2. Long omissions

Long omissions, though less common, are very important for establishing the filiation of manuscripts.

4.2.1. Saut du même au même

4.2.1.1. Homoeoarcton

Example:

- V 10.1b: K1, D62, P2, B1, P10 M3 — upa. ... irista — in the following context:

Obviously, the scribe slipped from the first upa into the following one because of irista.

4.2.1.2. Homoeoteleuton

Examples:

- V 10.7b: E4 — ʾaṭ. ... ṭīṣāmrūta — in the following context:
  ... ṭīṣāmrūta. — ʾaṭ. mraot. aburō. mazdā. ime. aēte. vaca. yōi. bō̂nt. gādahu. ṭīṣāmrūta. — ime. vaca. ...

It seems that the scribe omitted this text because of ṭīṣāmrūta. As both V 10.7a and b end with this word, he slipped into V 10.7c because he though he had already copied b.

4.2.2. Longer omissions

Longer omissions may also arise because of the loss of one or more folios. Although in V 10-12 I have found no omission of this type, the one of V 18.52-57 and V 19.42-44 must be explained in this
5. Additions

5.1. Dittographies

Dittographies are found when some graphems are added in a word, or when a syllable is repeated within the same word. This mistake is very usual, especially in late manuscripts. Examples: V 11.9b: P2 <pytlyt’n'> instead of <pytlyt>; V 11.11a: L4, K1 imaqm instead of imaq; V 12.1: K2, L1, P1, L5 paitarəm instead of pitarem; V 12.1: L2 tanu.parədanəm instead of tanu.pərədanəm.

5.2. Additions of one or a few words

This mistake is less common, but it happens too. Example: V 11.9c: L4a <pltwm MNW> (<MNW> added); V 11.9g: L4, T44 <ʾpzʾl y OLE> and E10 <ʾpzʾl OLE> (<OLE> added).

5.3. Glosses

The scribes often added glosses to some words or passages, mainly in the margin or above the line, which did not belong to the original text, unlike older glosses and commentaries like those of the Pahlavi commentators in the PT. As those glosses were sometimes difficult to distinguish from the rest of the text, later copyists eventually incorporated them.

In other cases, a later copyist did not take them as glosses, but as corrections made by the original scribe or by any other person who corrected the text. So he copied them together with the rest of it.

There are not many examples of glosses incorporated to the text, but Av. kaininō. xʾatō. pudrəm in V 12.7 could be one of them, although I think that it was copied from a commentary to the lost PT of V 12.

5.4. Longer additions

Longer additions are very rare, but also important for textual criticism. In V 10-12 I have found only one, but there are good examples of them in V 13. They are mainly due to perseveration, where the scribe slipped into a preceding text already copied and repeated it completely.

A good example of this kind of addition is found after V 12.4, where the IndVS manuscripts L1 and P1 repeat 12.3-4.

Concerning V 13, after yō in V 13.19b, the scribe of F10 went back to the preceding yō in V 13.18b. Thus he added again the Avestan and Pahlavi texts from this yō in V 13.18b till the following one in V 13.19b.

6. Transpositions

6.1. Transpositions of graphems

Transpositions of graphems are very common in the Avestan manuscripts, especially because their scribes no longer spoke the languages they were copying. Examples: V 12.4: R3 vastarnām instead of vastranām; V 12.4: L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5 vayubibiō instead of vyuhubibiō; V 12.9:
G25a dhamanām instead of dahmanām; V 12.13: L5 caḍbaṛastaim instead of caḍbaṛasatam.

6.2. Transpositions of words

Transpositions of words are rarer than the preceding ones. Nevertheless, there are some examples of them in Vidēvdād. In V 10.13b only G34 writes haca. daiḥbu. haca. zantu instead of haca. zantu. haca. *daiḥbu. The same manuscript changes the expected order of one aēte. vaca and writes vaca. aēte in V 10.15a.

In V 11.9f the manuscripts L4, K1, T44, B1, P10, M3 attest <ʾwlwl gwspnd> instead of the expected <gwspnd ʾwlwl>, which was restituted in later PV manuscripts.

In V 12.2 the IndVS manuscript FK1 attests ḍrīṣa.ṇrasrūta. gāḍṇām. ḍrāsanāiti. vastrinām instead of the expected ḍrīṣ.ṇrasnāiti. tanunām. ḍrīṣ.ṇrasrūti. gāḍanām.

In later manuscripts of reformist schools, transpositions of words in the PT are more usual, because of their scribes’ attempt to adapt the Pahlavi text to the Avestan word-order.

6.3. Longer transpositions

These are even less common than the other two, but they are attested in the manuscripts of Vidēvdād too, though not in V 10-12. For instance, in V 13.55b-56a all the PV manuscripts continued with the Avestan text of 13.56 and added the PT of 13.55b after it.

7. Hypercorrections

They are motivated sometimes by a conscious attempt of correcting the transmitted text, and sometimes even by the religious belief of the scribe. In written traditions where the scribes were immersed in a religious practice, sometimes their religious belief slipped into the text they were copying. Although this kind of mistake is scarcely attested in the Avestan manuscripts, we find examples of it in V 10-12.

For instance, in V 11.9f the scribe of E4 wrote hāitīm instead of āhūtīm. Behind this hypercorrection stands the Avestan word for a chapter of Yasna, namely hāitī-. In V 12.2 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 and T46 attest yazata and R1 ʿyazator instead of yazaēta. Obviously, the scribes corrected the optative by the Avestan word for “divinity”, namely yazyata-.

As we have observed, there are many types of mistakes in the written transmission of Vidēvdād. Among them, only some kinds of omissions, additions and transpositions can be regarded as errores significativi:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
   - Omissions of whole sentences or even paragraphs.

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
   - Glosses.
- Longer additions.
c) Transpositions:
   - Transpositions of words.
   - Longer transpositions.

To them we must add the variants completely different from the rest, which are not due to minor mistakes, but to a different source.

Geldner noticed many of these *errores significativi* when collating the manuscripts of Vidēvdād. However, he also took into account other minor mistakes to establish relations between the manuscripts and, more importantly, to make the *stemma codicum* of the PV and to group the IndVS into two branches. Since these minor mistakes can be easily made by scribes of different manuscripts regardless of the model they were transmitting, as happened often, they are but of little use for textual criticism. Since Geldner’s method was deficient in this regard, his *stemma* of the PV and his conclusions about the IndVS need to be reviewed.

### 2.5. Stemmatics of the PV in V 10-11: *errores coniunctivi*

Unlike Geldner, now we know about the existence of reformist schools of copyists which tried to correct and improve the written transmission of Vidēvdād (Cantera & Andrés-Toledo 2008). This affects the analysis of the *errores coniunctivi*, which become thus more important than the *errores separativi*.

The copyist of a manuscript can continue a mistake inherited from the manuscript he copies from, and this is significant enough to relate them. However, if the mistake of an older manuscript is not continued in another manuscript, this does not necessarily mean that the new copy does not stem from this older manuscript, because the scribe of the new one could have corrected it.

As far as my edition of V 10-12 is concerned, I am conscious of the impossibility of drawing any conclusion from the data of only these three *fragard*, of which the 12th is not even preserved in any old PV manuscript. Until a complete edition of Vidēvdād is achieved, a *stemma codicum* cannot be considered definitive, but simply tentative.

As V 12 lacks in the most of PV manuscripts, the *stemma* of the PV manuscripts with V 12 and their inner relations require a separate consideration. Hence I will content myself with just showing the only *errores significativi* in V 10-11, which relate and divide the manuscripts I have used, until a definitive and complete edition of Vidēvdād is achieved.

Apart from the important data from the colophons, the *errores coniunctivi* in V 10-11 which point to a common source for all the PV manuscript (except IM) are the following:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
   - 10.6a: L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ⊃ MN ⊃ (omitted before <wys> and before <znd>). Only P2 and F10a above the line completed it.
- 10.6a: L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ± MN ... dhywpt' |. Only P2 completed it.
- 10.9a: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ± gwbšn' |.
- 10.15a: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ± OLE-šn' | (1st).
- 10.15a: K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, L4a ± OLE-šn' | (3rd).
- 10.17a: L4, D62, P2, G34, B1, P10, M3 ± HWE-d |. Only F10 above the line, T44 and E10 completed it.
- 10.18e: K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, L4a ± MNW |. Only G34a above the line completed it.
- 11.2c: L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 ± ywšdšlyh | (after <m’h>). Only F10 above the line, T44 and E10 completed it.
- 11.2c: L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 ± ywšdšlyh PWN | (before <hwšyt>). Only P2 and E10 completed it.
- Long omissions due to a saut du même au même.
- 11.4b: all the PV ± p’nykh mhst AYK-m OD tn’ y psyn’ |
- 11.9e: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 ± pørnē. múiō. pørnē. kapastis |. It was completed in P5, K2, G34a, F10a, T44 and E10.
- 11.9e: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 ± pwltynm mwtk kl’t PWLTYNM xkystwk |. It was completed in P5, partially in K2 and in G34a, F10a, T44 and E10.
- 11.12a-b: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 ± ptk’lym hšm ... paršta. hām.raēβom. paršta. paiti.raēβom |. These manuscripts omit the PT of paršta. +ašmām. paršta. nasūm, together with its gloss and the following Avestan text paršta. hām.raēβom. paršta. paiti.raēβom. On the contrary, the manuscripts P5, K2, F10a and E10, which belong to reformist schools, try to complete it with a newly created PT, while P5, K2, G34a, F10a, T44 in the left margin and E10 seem to have supplied it by means of a VS manuscript.
- 11.12e: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ± ptk’lym ... xkystwk |. It was completed in P5, partially in K2 and in F10a.

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
- 10.16a: L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK; P2, E10 hnd AYK (<AYK> added).
- 10.16c: L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK (<AYK> added). Only P2 does not attest the addition.
- 10.17a: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) HWE-d MNW (<HWE-d> added).
- 11.12d: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 'hwkynyt' MNW (<MNW> added).
In spite of some corrections, these errores coniunctivi reveal that all the PV (except IM) stem from a common source. Nevertheless, although the oldest manuscripts L4 and K1 where copied by the same scribe, namely Mihrâbân Kayhusraw, he was not that accurate and made several mistakes, as Westergaard (1852) and Geldner (1896) already noticed. Because of this, in both manuscripts there are many errores separativi which divided the written transmission of the PV into two main groups, that of L4 and that of K1.

2.5.1. The group of L4: errores coniunctivi

Apart from L4, Geldner only collated the manuscript Pt2 from the group of L4. Although now Pt2 is lost, I have collated other manuscripts which stem from L4 and share with it many errores coniunctivi not present in the rest of manuscripts. These are the manuscripts G25, G34, T44 and E10, preserved at The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsarî, of which G25 cannot be used for V 10-11, because only its second volume (V 12-22) is available.

The manuscripts L4, G34, T44 and E10 share the following errores coniunctivi:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one of a few words.
     - 10.7a: L4, G34, T44, E10 — MNW —
     - 10.7b: L4, G34, T44, E10 — gwbšn’ —
     - 11.2a: L4, G34, T44, E10 ywdtdyw’d’t — HD — (the rest, <ywdtdyw’d’t-HD>)
     - 11.10a: L4, G34, T44, E10 — MN MTA —

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one of a few words.
     - 11.6c: L4, G34, T44 yws’d’slyny’d. YHBWN-ym; E10 yws’d’slyny’d YHHWN-ym (<YHBWN-ym or YHHWN-ym> added)
     - 11.9g: L4, G34, T44 ’pz’l y OLE; E10 ’pz’l OLE (<OLE> added)

c) Transpositions.
   - 10.2b-c: in L4, G34, T44 and E10 the Avestan text of V 10.2c follows that of V 10.2b and then their respective PTs are written. Thus, the sequence is: Avestan text of V 10.2b > Avestan text of V 10.2c > PT of V 10.2b > PT of V 10.2c. On the contrary, in K1 and the manuscripts of its group the sequence is: Avestan text of V 10.2b > PT of V 10.2b > Avestan text of V 10.2c > PT of V 10.2c.

L4 is the oldest manuscript of this group and was copied in Navsarî as well. Nevertheless, it attests some errores separativi, concretely omissions, which are not found in the rest:
- Omissions of one or a few words.
  - 10.1a: L4 | *mazdąm* |
  - 10.1b: L4 | *BRA* |
  - 10.6a: L4 | *paîtì.parone* | (3rd)
  - 10.15a: L4 | *aête* |
  - 11.7a: L4 | *YMRRWN* |
  - 11.10a: L4 | *"hlwb"* |
    - Long omissions.
  - 10.11c: L4 | *ime...* *framruua* |

Since L4 is the oldest and the source of the rest of its group, which do not attest these omissions, they must essentially have corrected them either by means of another PV manuscript of the group of K1 or (exclusively for the Avestan text) with the help of another VS manuscript. Geldner does not register the variants of Pt2 in the preceding *errores separativi* of L4, so that it is impossible to know whether Pt2 already corrected them or not. At least we know that these corrections took place before G34, the second oldest manuscript preserved within this group, was copied.

The rest of preserved manuscripts of this group share one omission and one addition not present in L4, so that these mistakes go back either to Pt2 or to a copy of this manuscript:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
     - 11.6b: G34, T44, E10 | *p‘hlwm* |

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
     - 11.9e: G34a in the right margin, F10a in the right margin, T44, E10 <pwltyrn mwtk kl’l pwltyrn *kystwk*>

As far as the rest of manuscripts of the group of L4 are concerned, I can only add some *errores coniunctivi* only present in T44 and E10. However, only with the data from V 10-11, I cannot dare to draw further conclusions about them:

a) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
     - 10.5b: T44, E10 | *m’n’* |

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
     - 10.18b: T44 *vi.uruuarō.təmtəmcə. huškō.zəmō.təmtəmcə*; E10 *vi.uruuarō.təmtəmcə. huškō.zəmō.təmtəmcə* (*huškō.zəmō.təmtəmcə added*).
On the other side, there is not enough material to establish the position in the *stemma* of the additions and corrections of L4a, L4b, L4c, G34a, F10a and P10a, which belong to the group of L4 too.

2.5.2. The group of K1: *errores coniunctivi*

As we have already seen, K1 is the second copy of the manuscript of Rōstām Mihrābān Marzabān made by Mihrābān Kayhusraw. Nevertheless, K1 and the manuscripts that stem from it share many *errores coniunctivi* not found in L4, so that they form an independent group.

Apart from K1, Geldner collated the manuscripts M13, K3b, K3a, P2, B1 and M3 of this group. Of these, M13 is lost and K3b and K3a do not preserve V 10-11, so that I cannot analyse their relation with the other manuscripts of this group in these *fragard*. B1 was lost since Geldner used it, but in our recent trip to India we have again found it. To Geldner’s manuscripts I have added in my edition the manuscripts D62, P5, K2, F10 and P10, all of them belonging to the group of K1.

D62 is the third oldest PV manuscript of the group of K1.

Regarding P5 and K2, Cantera and I (2008) have observed that they belong to a reformist school which tries to improve and correct the transmitted text by means of manuscripts of the group of L4 and VS manuscripts. Therefore, although both P5 and K2 can be traced back to K1, they completed several omissions of K1 and the rest of manuscripts of its group. Moreover, as they usually created a new PT, they must be analysed very carefully, because their extreme *contaminatio* affects our considerations about their position in the *stemma codicum*.

I must add that their PTs agree with each other, but it is completely different from that of the rest of PV manuscripts. This fact implies that they must be analysed apart from the more or less faithful copies of K1. Therefore I have preferred not to incorporate the Pahlavi variants of P5 and K2 into the critical notes to my edition of the PT, but to add their PT as an appendix.

On the other side, F10 belongs to another reformist school of copyists as well, although it does not show as many corrections and innovations as P5 and K2.

Regarding P10, we will see later that Geldner confused P2 and P10.

These are the *errores coniunctivi* which K1 shares with D62, P2, B1, P10 and M3 (and sometimes with P5, K2 and F10):

a) Omissions:
- Omissions of one or a few words.
  - 10.5a: K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10 — gwbsn’ —. M3 omits a longer text.
  - 10.7c: K1, B1, M3 — *vaca* —. M3 attests a blank. The rest completed it.
  - 10.9b: K1, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3 — MN —. Only completed in P2.
  - 10.10a: K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 — ŠDYA —
  - 10.17a: D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 — gwbsn’ —. Only completed in F10.
  - 11.1c: K1, B1, P10 (but P10a *uruvarq* *kudi* above the line) — *kudi*.
    *uruvarq* —. The rest completed it.
- 11.9f: D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 \(\rightarrow\) ZK y \(\rightarrow\). K1 cannot be read here.
- 11.12g: K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 \(\rightarrow\) ZK
- 11.12g: K1, D62, B1, P10 \(\rightarrow\) gwspnd \(\rightarrow\). The rest completed it.
- Long omissions due to a saut du même au même.
- 10.1b: K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 \(\rightarrow\) upa. ... irista \(\rightarrow\). P5, K2 and F10 included it.

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
- 10.2d: K1 \(-\) e. aete; D62, M3 ine. aete; P2 ine. aiti; P5 ine. ite; K2 ine. ite; B1, P10 ine. aete (aete added).

K1 is the oldest manuscript of the group and, because of the shared errores coniunctivi, seems to be the source of the rest. Nevertheless, it attests some omissions not found in them:

a) Omissions:
- Omissions of one or a few words.
- 10.11b: K1 \(-\) mazdā \(-\)
- 10.14a: K1 \(-\) pair̷.por̷me. vātō. daēuuō \(-\)
- Long omissions due to a saut du même au même.
- 10.16d: K1 \(-\) ZNE ... sn’h \(-\)

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
- 11.4a: K1 gwbs̷n’ BRA (<BRA> added).

Therefore, it is evident that the rest of manuscripts of this group have supplied these omissions and corrected the addition. The second oldest manuscript of this group, Ml3 (963 A.Y., 1594 A.D.), could have already corrected the mistakes of K1. However, as Geldner did not mention the variants of Ml3 in these passages, we cannot know whether they were already corrected in this manuscript or not.

As far as I know, the only direct copy of Ml3 was the manuscript DJJ, whose colophon was reproduced by Jāmāsp (1907). This manuscript, written by Dastur Jamšīd Jāmāsp in Navsarī in 1767 A.D., is actually the only one preserving the same colophon as Ml3 (Jamas 1907 x ff.). DJJ is lost as well, and we cannot know whether it included the contaminatio or not. In any case, D62 is older than DJJ and the mistakes of K1 are supplied in it. Accordingly, the corrections in the group of K1 must be traced back to Ml3 or to a direct descendent of it.

2.6. Stemmatics of V 12: did it exist in the PV?

The Avestan text of V 12 has been preserved in all the VS manuscripts. Nevertheless, this fragard lacks in all the old PV manuscripts and also in many
other recent manuscripts stemming from them. But after the 11th fragard the PV manuscripts numbered the following one as the 13th fragard. How could we explain its omission?

Three possible explanations may be suggested: a) the 12th fragard was lost in the manuscript of Hōmāst Wahišt, the archetype of the PV, or in one of its copies between the 12th and 13th centuries from which L4 and K1 stem; b) it was lost in a PV manuscript older than that of Hōmāst Wahišt; c) V 12 never belonged to the PV.

Provided that the first hypothesis were correct, this fragard would have been omitted in only one manuscript, from which the extant PV manuscripts stem. This could be Hōmāst Wahišt’s manuscript or a copy from it, from which the rest of the preserved PV manuscripts stem.

In support of the second hypothesis could be the fact that V 12 lacks in the Dēnkard’s description of the contents of the Vidēvdād Nask, where it should be placed between Dk 8.44.51 and 8.44.52. Dēnkard was composed in the 9th century, that is, several centuries before Hōmāst Wahišt’s manuscript. V 12 could thus have been lost very early, before Dēnkard was composed, in an archetype of the PV older than the manuscript of Hōmāst Wahišt.

Cantera (under preparation D) considers nonetheless that the third hypothesis is the right one, and that V 12 never existed in the PV, but only in the VS.

The first hypothesis was already denied by West (1892 161), followed by Geldner (1896-1904 5). He remarked that it is very unlikely that this omission is due to the loss of some folios in a copy older than L4 and K1, because no fragard fills exactly a certain number of folios of each manuscript. Actually, in the oldest PV manuscripts preserved, namely L4 and K1, each fragard is copied immediately after the foregoing one and no blank is left. Therefore, each fragard is not expected to begin at the top of a folio and to end at the bottom of another folio, and an omission of V 12 due to the loss of some folios would have affected either the end of V 11 or the beginning of V 13 or both of them. Moreover, West stated that if this omission was due to a loss of folios, it must have happened before Dēnkard was composed, since V 12 lacks in its description of the Nasks.

Also Cantera (under preparation D) denies that the omission of V 12 could have been due to the loss of some folios, because of the same reasons as West.

As regards to the absence of V 12 in the Dēnkard’s description, Cantera adds that it does not suffice to state that this fragard was already lost (or never existed) when Dēnkard was written. As a matter of fact, V 12 is not the only fragard that lacks in its description: part of V 10 and the whole V 21, whose Avestan text together with its PT is preserved in all the PV manuscripts, also lacks in the Dēnkard’s description. Concerning V 10, after the description of V 9.47-57 in Dk 8.44.50 (“About the strength and aid which are given to the druz nasūš by him who does not understand purifying, and yet would accomplish it; also the sin thereof at the bridge of judgement”), that of V 11 appears in Dk 8.44.51 (“About the victory of the yādāhūwayrō for the destruction of the druz and for the

---

healing”). Only V 10.12 ff. and V 11 could fit this description. In such case, we must suppose that V 10.12-20 and V 11 were considered as a unity and that the description of V 10.1-11 and V 12 lacks.

Nevertheless, since half of V 10 and the whole V 21 are not described in Dēnkard, this text does not represent a fully trustworthy key to reconstruct exactly the Vidēvdād Nask and cannot be adduced to support any conclusion about the absence of V 12.

As the lack of V 12 in the Dēnkard’s description is not conclusive, and the loss of some folios being an unlikely explanation of its absence in the oldest PV manuscripts, another problem arises: how do we explain that these manuscripts omitted V 12 but numbered the following fragard as the thirteenth one, like in the VS manuscripts?

According to Cantera (under preparation D), the PV stems from the Vidēvdād Nask of the Great Avesta, while the VS stems from the ritual Avesta (without PT). The first one did not have V 12. However, as he states, these two traditions merged very early (at least, earlier than our extant manuscripts) in the framework of an editorial attempt to make both fit. The result was a common written recension of the Avestan text with only one main difference: V 12. When both traditions merged, V 12 was consciously excluded from the canonical recension of the PV by the Sasanian exegetes because this fragard never had a PT. When later on both traditions were compared, the numeration of fragard in the VS manuscripts was added to the PV ones, but V 12 was excluded from the PV manuscripts because of not having a PT.

Thus, the only significant difference between the PV and the VS traditions would be the inclusion of V 12 in the latter one and its exclusion from the first one due to the lack of an old PT.

In my opinion, however, there is an argument which points out that a lost PT of V 12 existed: the gloss of V 12.7c. Actually, as Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.185, 189) already noticed, Av. kainīnō. x³ atō. puϑrəm in V 12.7c is to be interpreted as an Avestan gloss from the commentary of a lost PT of V 12 that slipped into the Avestan text of the VS, as usual regarding other Avestan glosses in the VS manuscripts. I will deal with this in the commentary to V 12.7.

2.7. Stemmatics of the IndVS

The analysis of only three fragard along 11 manuscripts does not provide enough support to venture a trustworthy stemma codicum of the written transmission of the IndVS, which becomes even more complicated than that of the PV because of the inclusion of the Avestan texts of Yasna and Visparad. To this I must add the meagre errores significativi I have found in the Avestan text of Vidēvdād 10-12 in the IndVS manuscripts.

Nevertheless, some of these errores can help to sketch at least a provisional panorama of the inner relations of some IndVS, so that I will expound them.

Among the four oldest IndVS manuscripts (L1, B2, R278 and T46), B2 and T46 are the only ones that attest all the Avestan text, even the quotations from Gāthic texts, in full. In this regard they agree with the IrVS, which also usually
attest it in full, as a result I think that they represent the oldest group of IndVS. That they must be grouped together can also be inferred from at least two errores coniunctivi:

a) Omission of a few words:
- 11.9c: B2, T46 - porne. būšīqsta. yā. zairina -

b) Rare variant:
- 11.7d: B2, T46 ašayā (instead of ašabūā)

Regarding the relation with each other, B2 is older than T46, so that T46 could have been either copied from B2 or they could have had a common ancestor.

Concerning the relation of B2 and T46 with the rest of IndVS manuscripts, none of them copied from B2 and T46. This can be assured on the basis of the omission of V 11.9c. Indeed, this text lacks in the rest of IndVS manuscripts but is present in both B2 and T46, as we have seen. Regarding T46, also the following additions lacking in later IndVS manuscript demonstrate that they could have not copied their text from T46:

- 11.7a: T46 yaōždaðāmi. imat. nārirām. ašaonim. yaōždaðāmi
- 11.9c: T46 yāzairine. porne. būšqsta. porne. kuṇḍiža

Another group of IndVS manuscripts is formed by L1 and P1. They are the only ones that repeat V 12.3-4 after 12.4c. Moreover, they share the following errores coniunctivi:

a) Addition of one word:
- 11.4d : L1 abūa abe; P1 abe. abe
b) Rare variants:
- 12.18b: L1, P1 aeviiō
- 12.21a: L1, P1 yadainiiō.varm
- 12.22f: L1, P1 hanuš

L1 is seemingly older than P1. Notwithstanding, P1 cannot be a direct copy of L1, because L1 attests some errores separativi not present in P1:

a) Omissions of one or a few words:
- 12.6a: L1 - dātarō -
- 12.9a: L1 - niūka. vā. para.īriāeiti -
b) Addition of one word:
- 12.6b: L1 zaōdrā. bā
c) Rare variants:
- 11.2c: L1 mazdaā
- 12.9a: L1 nūo,kō
- 12.9a: L1 nūoā
- 12.12b: L1 vō
- 12.22d: L1 nōoē

Nor can be L1 a copy of P1, because the following errores separativi of P1 are not found in L1:

a) Omission of a few words:
- 11.12a-b: P1 - paršta. nasūm. ... paiti. raeðbēm -
b) Additions of one word:
- 11.13a: P1 *strūsca* (-ca added)
- 12.4c: P1 *δρίς, frasnāiti* (δρίς added)

Therefore, L1 and P1 must have been copied from a common ancestor. P1 has no direct heir, as its *errores separativi* are not continued by any manuscript. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that it shares with E4 two *errores coniunctivi*:

a) Addition of one word:
- 11.9d: P1, E4 *porēne. porēne*

b) Rare variant
- 11.11a: P1, E4 *ahunahe*

The shared addition might have occurred by chance, while the rare variant is found in FK1 as *abōnahe*. Thus, these sole common mistakes are not enough to state that E4 copied from P1. Otherwise we ought to suppose that E4 corrected the mistakes of P1.

Another old manuscript which however seems isolated is R278. Indeed, it shares no *error coniunctivos* with the manuscripts mentioned before and even attests some *errores separativi* not present in them:

a) Omissions of one or a few words:
- 10.5b: R278 ∴ *haca. nāirika. paiti. iriste* ∴
- 10.13b: R278 ∴ *xruu. drūm* ∴
- 11.12g: R278 ∴ *paršta. ... urruarā* ∴
- 11.18a: R278 ∴ *paršta. ... urruarā* ∴
- 12.5a: R278 ∴ *xępha. vā. para. iriđieiti* ∴
- 12.11a: R278 ∴ *napti. vā. para. iriđieiti* ∴
- 12.15a: R278 ∴ *tūriia. vā. para. iriđieiti* ∴

b) Additions of one word:
- 11.6d: R278 *vaxša. ahurō*
- 11.10a: R278 *haoma. haca*

None of the other younger IndVS manuscripts continued these *errores*, so that obviously none of them copied from R278.

For the moment, L2 seems to be isolated as well. Actually, it is the only one that attests the following omissions of one or a few words:
- 10.13b: L2 ∴ *haca* ∴
- 11.9f: L2 ∴ *porēne. pairikām* ∴
- 11.19a: L2 ∴ *haca. zōmaṭ* ∴

Finally, the three youngest manuscripts I have collated, namely E4, L5 and FK1, seem closely related. On one hand, E4 and L5 share at least two *errores coniunctivi*:

a) Omission of a few words:
- 12.19a: E4, L5 ∴ *vā. puṇṭrō* ∴
b) Rare variants:
- 12.19b: E4 dasatana.poroθanām; L5 dašatanu.poroθanām
- 12.22b: E4 baizanhrō; L5 bizanharō

On the other hand, L5 and FK1 share some errores coniunctivi not present in E4:

a) Additions of one word:
- 12.21a: L5 iniō.vairiniō. iniō.vairiniō; FK1 ainiiō.vairina. ainiiō.vaṛna
b) Rare variants:
- 11.7d: L5 mašitā; FK1 mašaitā
- 12.11a: L5, FK1 naptō

Among these three manuscripts, E4 is older, but attests some errores separativi not found in the other two, so that it cannot be their common source:

a) Long omissions:
- 10.7b: E4 chair ... driṣmṛta |
- 12.4a-c: E4 chair ... mazdā |
b) Additions of a few words:
- 12.18b: E4 upāita. apām. vasō. upāita
c) Rare variants:
- 11.1c: E4 uuair
- 11.1c, 13a: E4 aśabe.caïdra
- 11.16a: E4 aśabecai̇dra
- 12.7c: E4 pušró
- 12.22f: E4 abraîitī

L5 attests some errores separativi not present in the other two as well:

a) Omissions:
- 12.8b: L5 chair ... uruuaranm. vasō. upāiti |
- 12.13a: L5 chair ... cuuat. aēšam. upa.mnai̇n |
b) Additions of a few words:
- 10.18f: L5 huu̇m. ȧhbu̇ṁ (ahbu̇ṁ added)
- 12.12b: L5 sp̣ntaṇm. sp̣ntaṇm
c) Rare variants:
- 12.9b: L5 pańca.sata
- 12.10a, 14b: L5 auruuaranṁ
- 11.1c: L5 mazdaθ̣ṭabe
- 11.4b: L5 fp̣ara
- 11.6b: L5 taïś
- 12.5b: L5 xai̇haca

Also FK1 attests some errores separativi lacking in the other two:

a) Omissions
- 10.9b: FK1 chair nmānahe |
- 10.14a: FK1 chair païti.p̣ṛme. ... stōiś |
- 10.19a: FK1 chair yaoždaiθ̣śa. ... astī |
Therefore, although they are connected, it is obvious that none of these latter three manuscripts copied from each other.

To summarise, the IndVS manuscripts can be provisionally ascribed to the following groups:

a) B2, T46.
b) L1, P1.
c) E4, L5, FK1

The rest of IndVS manuscripts, namely R278, Br1, L2 and G42 still must be analysed before determining their position in the tradition of this text-type.
3. **CONSTITUTIO TEXTUS IN GELDNER’S EDITION**

As we have remarked, Geldner followed partially Lachmann (1842-1850) for establishing the *stemma codicum*. However, Geldner’s method was not that of classical stemmatics for the *constitutio textus*. On the contrary, he (1896 *Prolegomena* xlvi) admitted that he was basically eclectic, mainly due to the corrupted written transmission of the Avesta and the impossibility of editing an Avestan text only with one class of manuscripts. Nevertheless, he applied many of the principles of classical stemmatics to his edition.

Geldner’s criteria when editing his text must be revised before carrying out the effort of editing any Avestan text, because although he was right often, he also made several mistakes. I will try to examine them according to some principles used in textual criticism of classical texts since van Groningen (1963 113-115), divided into two types: the external evidence, which is related to the features of the manuscript and its written transmission, and the internal evidence, referred to the variants in the text.

### 3.1. External evidence

1. *Lectio antiquior potior*: the chronological principle

Geldner’s edition is based on one of the most important principles of the external evidence since Lachmann (1842-1850), namely that which establishes that the reading is best when supported by the oldest manuscripts (*lectio antiquior potior*). As far as Vīdēvdād is concerned, this implies to give pre-eminence to the PV manuscripts L4 and K1. Furthermore Geldner supposed that the written archetype of Vīdēvdād went back to the PV, although he stated that its pre-archetype corresponds to the VS text-type. Thus, Geldner (1896 *Prolegomena* xiii) concluded that the PV manuscripts L4 and K1, the oldest ones, were to be taken as the basis and that “it is only where both Mss. agree that the reading may be looked upon as well established” (Geldner 1896 *Prolegomena* xix).

Notwithstanding, although L4 and K1 are the oldest manuscripts, they were written by the same inaccurate scribe. Indeed, as a comparison between both manuscripts demonstrates, they were copied very inaccurately and often disagree, so that, although they are the oldest ones, none of them can be considered as a *codex optimus*.

In spite of the inaccuracy of their scribe in some concrete cases, the principle of antiquity might be supported in general terms for the PV if only L4 and K1 were free from *contaminatio*. Unfortunately they are not, as Geldner
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81 Geldner (1896 *Prolegomena* xlvii) shows a good example where he did not follow the reading of the manuscripts L4 and K1: V 13.20-23. Actually, there is a repetition in these passages and these manuscripts often disagree. In such case, Geldner did not follow the variants of L4 and K1, but the sum of the best Indian and Iranian VS manuscripts.
already noticed. Moreover, as Cantera (under preparation D) concludes, the manuscript they copied from already contained mistakes. Thus, even when they agree, their common reading cannot always be traced back to the archetype of the PV. Since L4 and K1 are not reliable enough to support the choices in the edition, the chronological principle is here no more decisive: the VS manuscripts must also be taken into account.

2. Recentiores non deteriores / Recentiores aliquando non deteriores

L4 and K1 are not complete and have been partially completed by a second and even a third hand. Furthermore, their oldest copies were made before the parts later completed by other hands were lost in the manuscripts. Thus the *eliminatio codicum descriptorum*, usually applied in textual criticism, cannot be used for many parts of Viđēvdād, because the copies of L4 and K1 are needed for establishing many parts of the text which these two manuscripts do not preserve.

For the parts lacking in the oldest PV manuscripts, some copies of the latter were the main source used by Geldner, because he thought that they were trustworthy copies of the manuscripts L4 and K1. However, they are not. Indeed, the comparison of the extant parts of L4 and K1 with their “copies” demonstrates in many cases that the *recentiores* belonging to each group do not agree with the oldest manuscript of their group.

The *recentiores* not necessarily agreeing with the oldest manuscripts, a reading in one of these “copies”, or even in all of them, is not enough support for attributing it to the oldest manuscript from which they stem.

Furthermore Geldner already noticed that the “copies” of L4 and K1 were influenced by a *contaminatio*, sometimes from the IndVS manuscripts (e.g. Pt2) and sometimes from other PV manuscripts stemming either from L4 or K1 (e.g. K2). However, he could not find out to what extent they were contaminated. In any case, if the “copies” of L4 and K1 were contaminated, they can no more be assigned to a horizontal written transmission.

As regards the PT, the *recentiores* PV manuscripts are useful by themselves only in the cases where L4 and K1 do not preserve a PT. They cannot be used to reconstruct systematically the original readings of these oldest manuscripts because they are not (more or less) exact copies of the oldest PV of their branch, but rather improved copies of them influenced by editorial work.

Concerning the Avestan text, whenever the copyists could not copy it from L4 or K1, they extracted it from the VS manuscripts. Being mere apographs of a VS manuscript, these texts are obviously useless for textual criticism.

3. Lectio melioris classis potior

The principle of antiquity proves not to be enough to give exclusive pre-eminence to the PV, because the older manuscripts L4 and K1 are not definitely trustworthy. This is why it is even more important to supplement it with a further
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62 This is Bernabé’s (1992 70) modification of Pasquali’s (1952) principle *recentiores non deteriores*. According to the former, younger manuscripts are sometimes worse.
general principle of the external evidence: the reading of the best class of manuscripts is to be preferred \textit{(lectio melioris classis potior)}.

Geldner solved the dilemma between these two principles in favour of the PV, that is, of the principle of antiquity, mainly because of his hypothesis of a Pahlavi archetype. Nevertheless, he also followed partially the principle of the best class. On one hand, he gave pre-eminence to the PV because the oldest manuscripts are preserved in this text-type and because his archetype of \textit{Vidēvdād} stems from the PV. On the other hand, he admitted that the best class of manuscripts is that of the IrVS ones, and so he (1896 Prolegomena xlvi) added that the PV has to be controlled by means of another class of manuscripts, especially the IrVS ones.

However, no statistical criterion confirms that the IrVS manuscripts Geldner used are better than the oldest IndVS, nor viceversa, so that this principle cannot be applied in general terms before determining which group of manuscripts is the best. The same can be said regarding the principle according to which the reading of the best manuscript is to be preferred \textit{(lectio melioris codicis potior)}.

4. The geographical principle and the contrast of two text-types

Geldner did not mention geographical considerations in his Prolegomena for the \textit{constitutio textus}. This suggests that he did not pay attention to the geographical principle of the external evidence, according to which a reading is best when supported by the most diverse groups of local texts (Streeter 1924).

Whenever the oldest manuscripts L4 and K1 of the text-type of the PV shed no light, then the IrVS was the touchstone in his edition. Although L4 and K1 were written in India, they represent the Iranian tradition of Sīstān, while the IrVS continued the written transmission of Yazd (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena xxiii). Since these both have properly an Iranian origin, the geographical principle could not be applied until at least one of them was compared with the IndVS manuscripts.

Now, the PV sometimes agrees only with the IndVS and sometimes only with the IrVS, while the two branches of the VS are often opposed to the Pahlavi one. So this principle must be applied very carefully, if at all.

5. Repetitions and indirect transmission

Many parts of the Avestan text of \textit{Vidēvdād} and its PT show parallels in other parts of the Avesta or were also transmitted by other Zoroastrian sources. The data offered by these alternative sources not only may supply criteria to prefer one reading to another, but they also partially allow us to know how this text looked in a stage previous to that of the extant \textit{Vidēvdād}. The quotations of V 11 in NM are a good example of it.

Geldner’s procedure in these cases was not systematic. Indeed, regarding parallels and repetitions, he (1896 Prolegomena xlvii) admitted that “the selection of this or that reading has for the most part been made only after weighing the particular case individually and with the guidance also of experience and of a certain feeling”, and he recognised that he could have made mistakes. Clearly a more systematic method is required for a critical edition.
When preparing our edition of the text, the requirement of uniformity in repetitions must be also applied to the numerous quotations of Old Avestan texts in V 10-11. As they are sometimes adapted to Young Avestan phonetics and sometimes preserved in their Old Avestan appearance, uniformity is necessary in order to avoid further confusion, as even the same manuscript is not systematic.

6. The aid of the Pahlavi translation

The Avestan text has suffered such a corrupted written transmission that sometimes one cannot take for sure that a reading in the Avestan text is correct. In case of doubt the Pahlavi translation can be of some use.

Geldner (1896 Prolegomena xlviii) considered that the PT of Vīdēvdād is trustworthy enough to choose the right Avestan reading whenever the sense in Pahlavi is the same. So he claimed for a new edition of it in order to make available this important material.

On the other side, Geldner admitted that an Avestan word must not be ruled out whenever its Pahlavi translation lacks. The examples of omissions he gave are clear enough to accept that the lack of the Pahlavi equivalent proves nothing by itself. We must admit that Geldner was very accurate in this regard.

However, the PT is as important as the Avestan text proper in order to establish the relations between manuscripts and to reconstruct the stemma codicum of the PV. Nevertheless, he did not take it into account in his stemma, based only on the Avestan text. But the Avestan text of the PV manuscripts could have been partially completed by scribes collating VS manuscripts, as we know they did. Thus, beyond the mere comparison of the versions of the Avestan text, the PT seems to be a necessary complement to reach a stemma codicum of the PV.

3.2. Internal evidence

1. Lectio difficilior potior

Geldner usually followed the principle according to which the most difficult reading must be preferred, but to which he did not limit himself. In dubious cases he contrasted the Avestan word with its PT in order to choose the right variant, as in the case of haŋhuš instead of aŋhuš in V 5.38 and V 12.22 (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena xlviii).

2. Lectio brevior potior

Geldner followed another principle of classical textual criticism according to which the shorter reading must be preferred, because “there is a tendency in general for words to grow longer as the corruption advances” (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena xlviii). Nevertheless, he also notices the contrary process of haplography, usual in the Avesta too, which happens when identical or similar
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83 Regarding the importance of the Pahlavi translation in this and other cases, vid. (Klingenschmitt 1969), (Klingenschmitt 1978), (Josephson 1997) and especially (Cantera 2004a).
syllables follow each other, as in V 18.68 paitiš instead of the right paititiš. Therefore, we must admit Geldner’s accuracy in this regard.
4. CRITICAL NOTES

The fundamentals of a critical edition are obviously the search for the material, its selection, the study of the inner relations of the manuscripts by means of their most significant mistakes, and eventually the establishment of a reliable text. It is however no less important to understand how the text and its critical notes are presented to the reader.

Geldner’s presentation rests upon his method for editing the Avesta, but it implies some problems which must also be analysed before editing an Avestan text.

4.1. Problems of Geldner’s critical notes

As it is known, Geldner wrote the Prolegomena of his edition after editing the whole text of the Avesta. This is the main source of many contradictions between his criteria, as established in the Prolegomena, and the critical notes to his edition and as such the following problems arise:

1. Only the oldest manuscripts are recorded throughout.

   Geldner’s only interest was to reconstruct the original written text, i.e. Maas’ archetype. For Ćiđēvdād he consequently focussed mainly on L4 and K1 and on their comparison with the oldest VS manuscripts. But according to his own claims (1896 Prolegomena xlvii, lii) as a minimum the variants of the oldest manuscripts of each class should have been recorded. For Ćiđēvdād this would have implied to include not only the PV manuscripts L4 and K1, but also L1 (IndVS) and Mf2 (IrVS).

2. Geldner did not always record all the variants of the manuscripts.

   When Geldner recorded no variant of a word he edited, then we suppose that there is no variant at all. This is not the case however. His choice imply some problems:
   a) Sometimes even the variants of the oldest manuscripts of one class are not recorded. This makes impossible any new attempt to reconstruct the text out of the variants he records. For example in V 14, of 150 mistaken variants in L4 and 155 in K1, he only recorded 116 (77.33%) in L4 and 130 (83.87%) in K1, that is, he omitted 34 (22.67%) variants in L4 and 25 (16.13%) in K1. Thus, of 246 variants recorded in L4 and K1, he omitted 59 (23.98%)\(^4\).

\(^4\) 14.1a (L4 āstuwaินtā), 14.1b (K1 udām), 14.3a (L4 vohū,gaonabe; L4 vohū,kaṟatōī), L4 hařā,naēpataii; L4 bōkoāītānānā; K1 niśrōniųįнтй), 14.4a (L4 karšmaēne), 14.4b (K1 niśrōniųįнтй), 15.5b (L4 spakntā), 14.5c (L4a baenntārā), 14.5e (L4 baenntārā), 14.5f (L4 baenntārā), 14.5f (L4 dāno,kaṟištānā; K1 dāno,kaṟištānā), 14.5g (L4 bywīl), 14.6b (L4 baenntārā), 14.6b (K1 maštām), 14.6d (K1 niśrōniųįнтй), 14.7d (L4, K1 bankusrōm), 14.7e (L4 tīzi,žnūtām), 14.8a (K1 āgiā), 14.8a (K1 niśrōniųįнтй), 14.8d (K1 xraštrānntām), 14.8e (L4 urunāiitā), 14.9a (L4 viśpot), 14.9a (K1 niśrōniųįнтй), 14.10a (L4 ciđiṁ), 14.10a (L4 niśrōniųįнтй), 14.11a (L4, K1 voṛzaiantānt), 14.12a (L4, K1 niśrōniųįнтй),
b) Sometimes significant variants are not recorded. For example, in V 11.1b Geldner edited *mmānam*, but did not record any variant. My own autopsy has shown that Geldner’s *mmānam*, which is the right reading, is attested in K1, D62, P5, K2, F10, E10, P10, M3, L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2. But we find in L4, T44. *Mf2, K9 nmmānam* and in P2, B1, E4, L5 *nmānam* as well. The right variant is attested in manuscripts of different classes and groups, but the variant in the oldest one, L4, has not been recorded by Geldner.

The same can be said, for instance, regarding V 11.5a, where Geldner edited *ima* and recorded no variant, although all the PV manuscripts (and therefore the oldest L4 and K1 as well), with the exception of F10, attest the variant *ima*. Only the VS manuscripts attest *ima*.

Not only is it necessary to record each variant but it is no less important to record the *errores significativi* in each manuscript, in order to establish the relations between them and to ascribe a manuscript to one or to another group within the same class. However, Geldner did not record each omission, addition, transposition, etc.

As far as additions are concerned, after V 12.4 only L1 and P1 repeat V 12.3–4, so that it is clear that L1 and P1 are more closely related. Geldner, however, did not note this.

c) Sometimes the variants of later manuscripts disagree with those of the oldest recorded ones.

Unless all the variants are recorded for each word, the study of the inner relations of the rest of manuscripts, when they are different from the oldest ones recorded, is impossible.

Geldner could have chosen not to register the variants of the later manuscripts because of the *eliminatio codicum*. Since he did not proceed in this manner, he should have recorded all the variants of these later manuscripts. However, apart from the oldest PV manuscripts L4 and K1, the rest of PV manuscripts he had access to are hardly ever recorded.

The first main consequence of this is that from his edition we cannot know whether the manuscripts belonging to the same class (PV, IndVS or IrVS) or even group (group of L4, group of K1, etc.) agree with the edited word, with its only recorded variant or possibly even neither of these.

For instance, in V 13.16 Geldner edited *tižidātahe*, attested in L4, T44 and T46, and recorded only K1 *taži*. We find in K1, B1, M3 taži. *dātahe*, but there are many other variants too: P2, G25, L1, P1, Br1, L2 *tiži. dātaha*; P5 taža. *dātahe*; F10 – *tiži. dātahe* –; E10 – L5 *tiždāiti*; P10 *taždātahe*; E4a in the left margin *tižidāti*; *Mf2, K9 tiža. dātahe*. Geldner’s note does not allow us to see the relations

14.11b (K1 *bakara*), 14.12a (L4 *cōtim*), 14.12a (L4 *niriniuia*; K1 *nśriṃuṇiuia*), 14.13a (L4 *cōtim*), 14.13a (L4 *niriniuia*; K1 *nśriṃuṇiuia*), 14.14a (L4, K1 *nmmānam*), 14.14a (L4, K1 *niriniuia*), 14.14b (K1 *nmmānam*), 14.14c (K1 – *mraot* –), 14.14d (L4 *niriniuia*), 14.15a (L4 askṇedqm; K1 askṇāqm), 14.15a (L4 *niriniuia*), 14.15c (K1 gaośānuara), 14.15c (K1 upa.vālāiaeta), 14.16a (K1 *anumiia*), 14.16a (L4 *cōtim*), 14.16a (L4 *niriniuia*), 14.16b (L4 gaṇṇāqm), 14.17c (L4 vāstrīiaeta), 14.18a (L4, K1 *be*), 14.18b (K1 *nmmāne*).
between the variants of K1 and other manuscripts of the same group, nor between K1 and the group of L4, nor even between the class of the PV manuscripts and that of the VS ones.

Regarding omissions, in V 13.45d Av. aēšō. kasu. draonō. yaḍa. ādrauma is omitted in K1, according to Geldner. However, when we collate the manuscripts, we observe that this text is omitted in D62, B1, P10 and M3 as well, but it is preserved in P2, P5, K2 and F10. These latter four manuscripts belong to the group of K1, so that Geldner’s note can lead us to the wrong conclusion that this omission is present in all the manuscripts stemming from K1. In other cases the omission is found in the oldest manuscript of a group, but it is not recorded by Geldner, as we find in V 13.46b, where only K1 omits Av. nmānahe.

The second main consequence is that Geldner’s edition does not provide the information needed in the variants to revise the stemma codicum. Indeed, we do not have enough information in the critical notes. This proves to be fatal in case of lost of manuscripts after the edition: the important manuscripts Pt2, M13 or Jp1 Geldner used are no longer available, and their information can no more be recovered.

Furthermore, newly discovered manuscripts can hardly be incorporated to Geldner’s stemma, because their variants, omissions, additions, etc. cannot be compared with those of the manuscripts he did not record. This is why the new textual materials appeared since Geldner’s edition can only be evaluated on the basis of a new account of all available manuscripts, and why his stemma codicum must be reconstructed again.

3. Only when he thought that some variants were different enough he recorded those of other later manuscripts too.

This procedure is deficient both because Geldner sometimes assigned a differential value to minor differences, which are now considered irrelevant in textual criticism, and because it rests upon subjective appreciations. Indeed, there is no apparent reason to quote the variant of some manuscripts in some cases and to omit them in others.

4. Emendations and words above the line or in the margin by the same hand are not usually recorded.

Geldner was not systematic in recording the emendations contained in the manuscripts. When only a graphem is crossed out, in general Geldner did not take it into account. However, an old reading with a crossed-out graphem can be copied by the scribe of another manuscript of the same family with or without this crossed-out graphem.

On the other hand, sometimes only one word is written above the line or in the margin by the same hand. The scribe who is copying this manuscript may obviate these additions by an older hand in a fast reading.
Therefore, in order to establish the inner relations between the manuscripts, crossed-out graphems and words or graphems written above the line or in the margin must be systematically recorded.

In the following example of V 11.4 we can observe the importance of taking them into account. In this passage Geldner recorded that L1 attests the reading ahe, like L4 and L2. He not only was wrong, as L1 actually shows abhiia ahe but he also omitted that P1 attests ahe. ahe. In this case it is clear that the scribe of L1 (or maybe a second hand) noticed the mistake of repeating these words and deleted the second one. Moreover, he considered that the right variant should be abhii. This mistake has been reproduced in P1, which obviously has copied either from a common ancestor, from L1 itself or even from a manuscript stemming from L1, because both are the only manuscripts which repeat the demonstrative. Through Geldner’s note, however, we cannot deduce this at all.

5. Second or third hands are sometimes obviated.

The same can be said regarding the emendations by a second and even third hand. Geldner did not always distinguish and record that a second hand was implied, although it is very important for the inner relations between manuscripts. For example, in V 1.17 he edited varanam and recorded no variant. Our autopsy reveals the following variants: T44, L4a. L1, T46, P1, L2, E4. K9; K3b, P10 | variṇam |; K3a, P2 virinam; P5 varinam; K2 vīrīn | variṇam; F10 varanā; E10 varanam; P10a, M3 virinim; L5 varanam. Here not only the omission in K3b and P10, but also the addition by a second hand in P10 is important for the inner relations between these manuscripts.

Taking as an example V 14 in L4 and K1, we notice that Geldner recorded emendations by the same or a second hand or above the line 5 times, but omitted them 4 times, that is, he omitted almost half of emendations.

6. Different scribes in a manuscript are not always distinguished.

Although it is very important for textual criticism, Geldner did not always distinguish between different scribes, like in L4. Actually, he only distinguished the first hand (L4) and a later one (L4a) for the supplements pasted on L4 (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena ix), although he (1896 Prolegomena xvii, n.2) noticed that at least two different hands corrected the manuscript L4. However, he made no difference and called both of them L4a.

It seems clear that we have at least four different scribes in L4: the oldest hand (L4), a later second hand in the supplement of the beginning and other parts of the manuscript (L4a; e. g. in V 1), a third old hand in other supplements in the middle of the manuscript (L4b; e. g. in V 7) and some additions and corrections by a fourth hand (L4c; e. g. in V 10).
7. Order of the manuscripts recorded.

When Geldner recorded variants, he was not systematic in their order in the critical notes. Thus, sometimes an IndVS manuscript is recorded firstly, sometimes an IrVS one and sometimes a PV one. A systematic way of quoting each manuscript is needed in a critical edition, and the order of quotation and its justification have to be explained in it.

As an example, we can observe Geldner’s incoherence in V 20.3 in the critical notes to višcidrəm. He recorded that the right variant is confirmed by L1, K10, M2. Then he quoted Jp1, Mf2 viš. ciðrəm; L4, L2, Br1 višcidrəm; K1 višcidrəm. Therefore, we expect in other critical notes the same sequence “right variant; IrVS; PV”. However, we find in other cases a different order, like for instance in V 9.40, where the variants to fraoirisaite are the following ones: K1; L4, L3 fraoirisaēite; Mf2 fraöirisiiete; Jp1 fraöirisiiite; L1, L2, Br1 fraöirisiiiti. Neither the order in the classes of manuscripts nor the sequence within one class remains the same (e. g. Jp1, Mf2 in V 20.3, but Mf2, Jp1 in V 9.40).

8. The differences in some graphems are not recorded.

Geldner (1896 Prolegomena lii) stated that he consciously did not record the differences between aē/ae, aō/ao, n/n and š/š in the variants. These differences, however, are sometimes important.

The diphthong ao of the PV manuscripts is written aō almost always in the VS. When a PV manuscript has been completed by a VS, the fact that it attests aō can indicate that it was copied from a VS.

Moreover, Geldner did not distinguish other graphems, such as ā / ā, in the critical notes. Until we are able to determine their exact distribution, this difference must be registered at least.

9. The dot is not marked.

Geldner (1896 Prolegomena lii) edited the enclitics and proclitics throughout as part of the word they were attached to, that is, without a dot. He did not register the manuscripts where this dot is written and those which do not attest it.

The same can be said regarding compounds and some words wrongly separated by a dot (e. g. V 10.5b: K1 hāuuaii.ii.əs.tanuuō; P2, F10, E10, M3 hāuuaii.ii.əs.tanuuō instead of hauuaiii.əs.tanuuō).

10. Confusing critical notes.

In other cases, the critical notes are so confusing that we can hardly understand them. This is the case, for instance, of V 11.12. In this passage Geldner’s critical note to kundi is the following one:


Out of this note it is really impossible to know which one is actually the variant attested in L1.

Another example will suffice to state that Geldner’s edition was not accurate enough. In V 13.35 his critical note to dahmāicīq is as follows:
L4 and P. V.; *dahmāci* K1; the rest *kahmāici*.

On one hand, this is very confusing, because K1 is a PV too. On the other hand, if we test the manuscripts the result is very different: K1 *daŋāci*; P2 . L1, T46, Br1, L2 . Mf2, K9 *kahmāici*; P5, K2, G25, M3 *kaṃāci*; F10, T44 *kaṇāci*; E10, (G) *dahmāici*; B1, P10 *kaṃāci*; P1 *kahmāici*; L5 *kahmāici*; E4 *kahamāici*. Actually, of the manuscripts recorded, only K1 and E10 attest the variant with *d*-, but not the rest of PV manuscripts.

13. Abbreviations.

Geldner’s preference for brevity was also applied to the abbreviations in the PV. Actually, when an Avestan text is repeated, the PV manuscripts usually abbreviate it, while the VS reproduce it in full. Since Geldner edited according to the text-type of the PV, he systematically abbreviated the text written in full in the Sāde manuscripts. His choice can be justified because of practical reasons, but it is not always possible to determine how much he abbreviated.

Geldner’s preference for abbreviation also caused further problems. For instance, in V 11 the supposed abbreviation of the PV manuscripts after V 11.15 veils that there is no abbreviation properly, but rather an omission in the PV manuscripts, which can be noticed only by contrast with the VS ones. Therefore I have preferred to include the Avestan text always in full.

All these problems derived from Geldner’s choices regarding the critical notes make urgent not only a deep revision of Geldner’s edition, but also of those partial editions of Avestan texts which are based on it.

To this we must add the fact that the previous editors of the Avesta did not always see themselves all the original manuscripts they refer to, but that they relied sometimes on collations and copies made by other scholars. The mistakes in these copies passed into Geldner’s edition, as we have observed in the confusion of P2 and P10. Geldner’s admiration for the previous editors of the Avesta led him to overlook the deficiencies of their work and of their editing methods.

4.2. A new edition of the Avesta

Geldner’s merit of having gathered and collated so many manuscripts for his edition is thus unfortunately overshadowed by methodological mistakes which need to be corrected. Furthermore, now we know more about the written transmission of the Avesta, and concretely of Vīdēvdād, and new manuscripts have been brought to light in recent times. Therefore, a new edition of the Avesta must be undertaken improving Geldner’s method, incorporating the new manuscripts and making use of the new technologies.
4.2.1. Use of digitised images

The new electronic possibilities are of great use for the task of collating manuscripts, because they provide us with digitised copies of the original manuscripts. Microfilms and facsimiles are no more needed, as the digitised copies in color have a much better quality.

In Salamanca, in the frame of the ADA Project, we have built the web site www.avesta-archive.com, which already contains many digitised manuscripts of Vīdēvdād. Users can not only see each manuscript with an excellent quality of image, but also search concrete passages. Since all this is available for everybody, our own possible mistakes in the critical notes can be contrasted with the images of the manuscripts by the other scholars.

The use of digitisation and internet now makes the task of collating the manuscripts much more efficient and easier than when Geldner undertook his edition. It is especially useful for the PT, because we can simply copy from the electronic digitised page the uncertain readings and paste them into our critical notes. This avoids inaccuracies and this technique is used in my edition when a variant cannot be easily interpreted.

4.2.2. A new method for editing Vīdēvdād

The new manuscripts and the new electronic helps for reading them alone would not justify the need of a new edition of Vīdēvdād. I will try now to present in a systematic shape my own methodological choices for the edition of V 10-12, ordered according to the stages of a critical edition.

A) Collatio
1. Autopsy
   Only the original manuscripts, or at least good and trustworthy reproductions of them, can be used in the edition. This includes good facsimiles, microfilmed copies or digitised copies, but excludes collations and copies made by others. So only the autopsy of the manuscripts allows us not to add previous mistakes to those we might make ourselves.
2. Number of manuscripts
   The more manuscripts of each class we collate, the more reliable our text will be. More manuscripts do not necessary offer better readings, but provide us with a better knowledge of how they were transmitted.

B) Stemmatics
1. Towards a stemma codicum.
   The reconstruction of the stemma codicum of the archetype of the IndVS is necessary before drawing further conclusions about the pre-archetype of Vīdēvdād. Once the stemma codicum of the archetype of the IndVS will be reached, it will have to be compared with that of the IrVS in order to know as exactly as possible how the VS text-type looked.
With regards to the PV, the Pahlavi text is as important for establishing the *stemma codicum* of the PV as the Avestan text.

2. The *errores coniunctivi* are more important.

Since we have to count with a very early *contaminatio*, and since we know that some manuscripts were written by reformist schools, the *errores coniunctivi* get a greater relevance than the *errores separativi* for establishing the *stemma codicum*. As the new copies partially corrected the text they were copying and collated it with other manuscripts, only the *errores coniunctivi* may reveal the source they were copying from.

3. Only *errores significativi*.

The following *errores significativi* are the most important and the first to be taken into account for the *stemma codicum*:

a) Omissions:
- Omissions of one or a few words (excluding Phl. <y> and <W>).
- Omissions of whole sentences or even paragraphs.

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words (excluding Phl. <y> and <W>).
- Glosses.
- Longer additions.

c) Transpositions:
- Transpositions of words.
- Longer transpositions.

d) Variants completely different from the rest.

Therefore, dittographies, haplographies, etc. mostly have to be ruled out.

4. Statistical analysis

Apart from the aforementioned *errores significativi*, the *stemma codicum* must be reconstructed with the help of a statistical analysis including all the variants. This will allow us to know which manuscripts are more faithful copies to its source, to find out which ones copied their variants from a different source, and also to determine which ones introduced innovations. Moreover, the analysis of the variants where a manuscript disagrees with its source, as compared with the rest of variants in other manuscripts, will provide exact data about the real influence of certain manuscripts on the written transmission. On the other hand, a systematisation of scribal mistakes will reveal which ones are the most usual.

Therefore, a method combining the main criteria of traditional textual criticism, especially based on the *errores significativi*, and statistics not only of mistakes but also agreements between manuscripts, will provide us with the most complete panorama available of the written transmission of Vidēvdād.
C) *Constitutio textus*

1. *Eclecticim.*

None of the manuscripts is a *codex optimus* and none of the classes of manuscripts can be taken as the only basis. Hence we are forced to an eclectic method.

2. *VS + PV.*

Only when at least one of the two classes of VS manuscripts agrees in their oldest manuscripts with the oldest PV ones, a reading can be considered, if not the original, at least the most likely. Regarding the PV manuscripts, only when L4 and K1 share a common reading it can be ascribed to the hyparchetype of the PV and thus be compared with the two other classes, in order to verify whether or not it stems from the pre-archetype. Only when a text is not preserved in the PV manuscripts, the agreement of the oldest IndVS and IrVS is enough to choose their common reading, because the contrast with the PV lacks.

3. The apographs still cannot be ruled out.

The apographs of the oldest manuscripts of each class cannot be ruled out completely until the complete *stemma codicum* of the whole Vīdēvdād is achieved. Afterwards the *eliminatio codicum* will be necessary before editing a definitive text.


When the same text is repeated in other passages, uniformity is necessary in order not to add more confusion. The same can be said regarding the quotations of Old Avestan texts in V 10-11. Only when their difference does not depend on a corruption in the written transmission it must be preserved and explained.

5. Restoration of abbreviated passages.

Abbreviated passages must be edited in full, even when they are not attested thus in the VS manuscripts. When part of the text lacks in all the manuscripts because of an abbreviation, I complete the text of this abbreviated passage in a height of font of 10 mm.

6. Division of the text

I divide the paragraphs according to the breaks of their PTs, using the brackets ||, and I number them by means of an alphabetical order (|a|, |b|, etc.).

D) Critical notes

1. A fix order when quoting the manuscripts.

When the manuscripts are quoted in the critical notes, they must follow always the same fix sequence.

2. Manuscripts by classes.

The manuscript must be grouped by classes which can be distinguished at a first glance. I have grouped the three classes of manuscripts in my critical edition of Vīdēvdād according to their antiquity: firstly the Pahlavi Vīdēvdād (PV), secondly the Indian Vīdēvdād Sāde (IndVS) and thirdly the Iranian Vīdēvdād Sāde (IrVS).
This corresponds to the antiquity of the oldest manuscript preserved in each class: \textbf{L4} (1323 A.D.), \textbf{L1} (1435 A.D.\textsuperscript{65}), \textit{Mf2} (1618 A.D.). A dot separates each class. The \textbf{PV} are marked in bold letters, the \textbf{IndVS} in plain (because the most of manuscripts of \textit{Viddēvdād} belong to this class) and the \textit{IrVS} in italics. Within each class I arrange each manuscript according to its antiquity.

When the antiquity of a manuscript is not specified by its colophon, I try to place it in the sequence by means of other external or internal evidences. For instance, \textit{K2} attests no colophon, and only Rask’s information and Anquetil’s notes are written in its beginning, but the analysis of this manuscript reveals that it was written before the following one in the sequence, namely \textit{G25} (1794 A.D.).

3. Each variant must be recorded.

Since we are forced to adopt an eclectic method, all the variants, crossed-out graphems, emendations above or under the line, omissions, additions (in the margin or not), transpositions, etc., in each manuscript (not only in the oldest ones) must be recorded in the critical notes, until the complete \textit{stemma codicum} of the whole \textit{Viddēvdād} is achieved. Afterwards, as already mentioned, only the main sources of each text-type will be recorded in the critical notes and the \textit{eliminatio codicum} will exclude the apographs from them.

Regarding the crossed-out graphems, I mark them by means of a grey background. Graphems or words written above or under the line are written as superscript or subscript respectively. Omissions are marked between the brackets \[ X \]. Corrections by different hands are always distinguished.

Every different graphem as well as the dots inside the words must be marked as variants in the critical notes. After Hoffmann & Narten’s (1989) research about the written transmission of the Avesta and their analysis of the creation of each Avestan graphem, Geldner’s linguistic criteria regarding the variants, especially regarding the sibilants \( s, \breve{s}, \check{s} \), must be corrected.

4. Different hands must be marked.

The different hands in the same manuscript must be distinguishable at a first glance in the critical notes. I have followed Geldner’s choice: \textit{L4a} is the second hand and \textit{L4b} the third one of \textit{L4}, \textit{P10a} is the second hand of \textit{P10}, etc.

To summarise: the methodological problems and mistakes of Geldner’s edition do not allow a mere addition of the newly found manuscripts. As Skjærvø (1994 235-236) says, “it ought to be clear that the \textit{Avesta} is in need of re-editing, which, although it will not change the general shape of the overall phonology and morphology as we know them, is bound to affect numerous details”.

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{L1} is not the oldest \textbf{IndVS} and its date is possibly wrong. Nevertheless, until the \textit{stemma codicum} of the \textbf{IndVS} is achieved, I have for the moment no argument to change its place in the sequence of \textbf{IndVS}. Hence I have preferred to maintain it as the supposedly oldest \textbf{IndVS} manuscript in order not to add more confusion.
Now we have better possibilities than Geldner to improve his overwhelming task and to work towards a new *stemma codicum*. My edition of V 10-12 just tries to be a provisional contribution to it.
E) CRITICAL EDITION, TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY
I. Prayers to be recited in order to purify all that Nasu has polluted


102. K1, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); E4, L5 zarađuštrə
103. L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1.
104. Mf2, K9, (G); K1 aburəm; D62, P2, P5, K2, B1, P10, M3 | L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 īňa ī aburəm. āstuaitiŋəm ī F10. FK1 ī aburəm. āstuaitiŋəm ī
105. astuuaitinəm ī
106. K1 | T46. Mf2, (G); L4 ī mazdəm ī G34, T44, E10 | B2. K9 mazdəm
107. K1, G34, E10. Mf2, K9, (G); T44. B2, T46 ahuramazda
108. L4, K1, T44, E10 mainiū; G34 | B2, T46. K9, (G) mainiū; Mf2 mainiū
109. L4, K1, T44. Mf2, K9, (G); G34 | T46 spəništa; E10 spəništa; B2 spənsta
110. L4, K1. Mf2, (G); G34 gađanəm, T44. B2 gađanəm, E10 gađanəm; T46 gađanəm; K9 īňa ī gađanəm. astuuaitiŋəm ī
111. L4, K1, (G); G34, E10 astuuaitiŋəm; T44. B2 astuuaitiŋəm; T46. Mf2 astuuaitiŋəm
112. L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, B1, P10, M3. Mf2, (G); F10 īňa ī aētaŋ; T44 aētaŋ; E10 ī L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, K9 ātaŋ; E4 ātaŋ; FK1 ātaŋ
113. L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1.
114. Mf2, K9, (G); F14. T46. L5 dru.x, E4 ī dru.x
115. L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); T46. P10 pərənane; Br1 pərənane
116. L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, G42, E4, L5, FK1, Mf2, K9, yə
117. L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, Mf2, K9, (G); P2 həci
118. L4, K1, P5, K2, G34, T44 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1. K9, (G); D62, F10, B1, P10, M3 | E4 irišta; P2, E10 iriš; Mf2 arəsta
119. L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line | R278, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 ī upa. irišta ī
120. P5, K2, T44 | R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, P10a above the line juuntəm; F10, E10 juuntəm; L1, B2, T46 upajuuntəm; FK1 juuntəm
121. L4 | L1, T46, P1. Mf2, K9a above the line, (G); P5, G34, F10, E10. B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 upa. duṇaṣai; K2 upa. raēdəaiet'i. cygwə PWN OLE's i dwl pt lym MNW MN OLE lystk w əzyəndək duṇaṣai; T44 upa. duṇaṣai; P10a above the line upa. duṇaṣa; FK1 upa. duṇaṣaet'i
[a] Zaraḏuštra asked Ahura Mazda: “O Ahura Mazda, most beneficial Spirit, Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how shall I fight this Lie, which from the dead hurls itself into the living, how shall I fight this Nasu, which from the dead contaminates the living?

[a] [zend] cygwn PWN AHRN gywʾk nptš\textsuperscript{115} [b] cygwn\textsuperscript{114} PWN ṬOLE\textsuperscript{115} dlwc ptkʾlym\textsuperscript{117} [AYK-š] cygwn stwb\textsuperscript{119} BRA\textsuperscript{120} OBYDWN-m\textsuperscript{21} MNW MN OLE\textsuperscript{22} lyst\textsuperscript{113} OL\textsuperscript{124} OLE zywndk\textsuperscript{125} QDM dwbʾlyt\textsuperscript{126} [PWN hmlytʾ] cygwn PWN OLE\textsuperscript{27} nswš ptkʾlym\textsuperscript{128} [AYK-š] cygwn stwb\textsuperscript{129} BRA\textsuperscript{130} OBYDWN-m\textsuperscript{31} MNW\textsuperscript{132} MN OLE lyst\textsuperscript{113} OL\textsuperscript{134} OLE zywndk\textsuperscript{135} QDM gwynhty\textsuperscript{136} [PWN ptlyt\textsuperscript{138}]

\textsuperscript{125} L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, P10a above the line . Mф2, K9a above the line, (G); E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 aietat; E4 aietat\textsuperscript{126}
\textsuperscript{126} L4, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line . T46, E4, L5, FK1 . Mф2, K9a above the line, (G); P5 dnasus; K2 . Br1 nasu; L1, B2, R278, P1, L2, G42 nas\textsuperscript{127}
\textsuperscript{127} L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line . Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 . Mф2, K9a in the left margin ṣā\textsuperscript{128}
\textsuperscript{128} L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mф2, (G); F10, E10 ṣirisi; L5 ṣirīša; FK1 ṣrastā; K9a in the left margin hacairisti\textsuperscript{129}
\textsuperscript{129} L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mф2, K9a in the left margin, (G); B2 imp\textsuperscript{130}
\textsuperscript{130} L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, T44, B1, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mф2, K9a in the left margin, (G); P2 ṭafmūnt (P2a above the line -a- before -n-); F10, E10 ṭaftnūnt; P10 ṭafmūnt; FK1 ṭaftnūnt\textsuperscript{131}
\textsuperscript{131} P2, M3; L4, (G) upa-raʾḏjaʾīti; K1 upa-raʾḏjaʾīne; ṫ P5 upa-raʾḏjaʾinae; K2 upa-raʾḏjaʾiati; G34 ṫ upa-raʾḏjaʾiati; F10 upa-raʾḏjaʾiati; T44 upa-raʾḏjaʾiati; E10 upa-raʾḏjaʾiati; B1, P10 ṭafmūnt; FK1 ṭafmūnt; L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 ṭafmūnt; R278, P1 ṭafmūnt; T46 ṭafmūnt; E4 ṭafmūnt; E4 ṭafmūnt; L5 ṭafmūnt; FK1 ṭafmūnt; Mф2, K9 ṭafmūnt\textsuperscript{132}
\textsuperscript{132} L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); P2 pwsryt pww rṣyt zlthwšt’ MN ’wrmzd AYK ’wrmzd mnwng ’pznwng ṭʾl ṣw’ ’stʾwmndʾn’ ṣlwʾb [dʾtʾl PWNY zlwʾb KRYTWN-nyny ’p rʾk PWNY stʾdsnʾn’] – zend cygwn AHRN gywʾk nptš –
\textsuperscript{133} K1, D62, F10, B1, P10; L4, G34, T44, E10, M3, (Imp) nptš. L4 and G34 attest a short blank after this word.
\textsuperscript{134} L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); F10 cygwn stwb bwn’ BRA OBYDW-m MN
\textsuperscript{135} MN cygwn
\textsuperscript{136} L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp) OLE-šʾnʾ
\textsuperscript{137} L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); F10
\textsuperscript{138} L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); T44 ptkʾlym
\textsuperscript{139} L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); E10 AYK
\textsuperscript{140} L4, G34, F10, T44, E10, (Imp); D62 stwb bwn’; P2 ṣt ṣwbʾnʾ; B1, P10, M3 stwbwn
\textsuperscript{141} L4e above the line, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); L4 – BRA –
\textsuperscript{142} L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); P2 OBYDW-m; G34 OBYDW-m (G34a –N–)
\textsuperscript{143} L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); G34 ZK OLE
\textsuperscript{144} K1, D62, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); L4, G34, F10, T44, E10 lyst; P2 lysty
\textsuperscript{145} L4, G34, T44, E10, (Imp); K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 ’wʾ
\textsuperscript{146} K1, D62, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); L4, G34, T44, E10 zyndk; P2 QDM zyndk; F10 zyndk
\textsuperscript{147} D62, P2, T44, B1, P10, M3; L4, G34, E10, (Imp) dwbʾlyt; F10 dwbʾlyt
\textsuperscript{148} L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); E10 OL
\textsuperscript{149} L4, K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); D62, P2 ptktym
\textsuperscript{150} L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); P2; F10 stwb
\textsuperscript{151} L4, K1, D62 above the line, P2, G34, T44, E10, (Imp); B1, M3, P10 (P10a - A) – BRA –
\textsuperscript{152} K1, D62, P2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); L4 OBYDW-m; G34 OBYDW-m; F10

[a] [The Pahlavi translation, as it is written in another passage] |b| How shall I fight this Lie [that is, how shall I defeat it]? which from the dead runs [with direct defilement] through the living, how shall I fight this Nasu [that is, how shall I defeat it], which from the dead contaminates the living [with indirect defilement]?


vid. V 9.45 and 9.47 too, where the same Avestan text and PT from kūḍa uppto *upa.raēβ/aieieiti is repeated.

Av. parənāne (10.1b)

Av. parənāne was attributed to parət– “to fight ” by Bartholomae (1904 868-869). Av. parənāne should then be explained as an assimilation of *t–t + n– > n– (Av. parənāne < *parənāne < *parənāte/). However, the usual evolution of IIr. *tn > Av. Ḯn makes this explanation very unlikely. cf. Av. šiaodna-< IIr. *čaytna- and Ved. cyautnā- (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.555). Indeed, if Av. parənāne belonged to parət– “to fight ”, we would expect *parənādne < *pənāte/.

According to Kellens (1984 178, n.8), a root Av. par- must be proposed. Actually, Av. parənāne it is the 1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Mid. of the Avestan verb par-“to fight” (Klingenschmitt 1968 83-85), (Kellens & Pirart 1995 33), (Cheung 2007 294)]. With a nasal infix in the present stem too, it is also attested in Khot. purr– (< *ppnə-) (Emmerick 1968 84), (Bailey 1979 244), (Emmerick 1989 212).

132 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 MN /blank/
133 K1, D62, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 lystk; P2 lystk; F10 lysts’t
134 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 ’w
135 K1, P2, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4, D62, G34, T44, E10, P10 zyndk; F10 zndk
136 P2; L4 dwbl’yt PWN pt gwmhyht; k1, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, (Jmp) gwmhyt’t; E10 gwmhyht’; M3 gwmhyht’
137 L4, D62, P2, G34a, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 –| PWN |
138 E10, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 pytylyt; k1 pytylyt; D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 pytylyt; F10 pytylyt

A variation of this gloss is added after Phl. wānidan, wān– “you will overcome” in V 19.8: pad-am kadār gōwišn wānē [kū-m stō bē kunom] “With which words will you overcome [that is, will you defeat me]?” and in V 19.9: pad-at ān gōwišn wānēm [kū-i stō kunom] “With that words I will overcome you [that is, I will defeat you]”. On the other side, the same gloss is found in V 19.12: čīyōn az awēsān’az kunom az ōy druz az ōy dujdanāg gannāg mēnōg [kū-š čīyōn stō bē kunom]: “How will I separate it from this Lie, from this ignorant Gannāg Mēnōg [that is, how will I defeat him]?”.

140 Regarding this verb and Av. parsta, see my commentary to V 11.12.
141 Cheung (2007 294), though ascribing correctly this parme to par- “to fight, to struggle”, confuses the adjective parme (< Av. parəna- “full”) in V 2.8, 12, 16 ff. with the the phonetically identical verb parəne (< Av. par- “to fight”).
Av. *upa duuqaṣaiti* (10.1b)

This verb seems an Avestan *-s* (< IE. *-sk*)\(^{142}\) present from a root Av. *duuana*- where the vowel *-q*—entails some morphological and etymological problems.

On one hand, we expect a root in the zero grade in a *-s* (< IE. *-sk*) present. In such case, the vowel *-q* < *-a*- in Av. *duuqa*- would denote a root *ultimae laryngalis*, that is, IE. *dʰ ᵒyʰH*-ske- > OIr. *duansa- > Av. *duuqa*- (Kellens 1984 157, n.12). According to Kellens (1984 157, n.12), Mayrhofer (1992-2001 1.801) and Cheung (2007 83), the existence of this root *ultimae laryngalis* is confirmed by Ved. *dhvān- “qualmen, rauchen” < IE. *dʰ ᵒyʰH-en-bʰ* (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.801). Thus, in Av. *duuqa*- (< IE. *dʰ ᵒyʰHske-), like in Ved. *dhvānta-* “dark, darkness; name of a wind” (< IE. *dʰ ᵒyʰH-tó*-)\(^{143}\), the nasal would have been analogically reintroduced after the vocalisation of the nasal sonants.

However, the reconstruction of a root *ultimae laryngalis* is problematic because of the causatives Ved. *ádhvānayat “darkens” in RV 6.18.10 and Av. *uzduuṇnaiat “causes to float upwards” in Yt 5.61, where the long vowel of Ved. *dhvānaya- and Av. *duuṇnaiia- should stem from IE. *dʰ ᵒyneje-.

Conversely, the vowel *-q* in Av. *duuqa*- could represent an irregular full grade OIr. *duansa-, as Kellens (1984 157, n.12) observes. I have identified a further Avestan parallel of a *-sa- (< IE. *-ske-*) present from a full grade in the root, which could support Kellens’ hypothesis: Av. *ṇḷaṣza- “in Bedrängnis geraten” (Bartholomae 1904 798). According to Hoffmann & Forssman (1996 188), the present Av. *ṇḷaṣza- stems from a full grade of the radical *tyeŋz₇ < *tyeŋ₇*-ske-. Moreover, the syllabic structure is very similar: IE. *tyeŋ₇*-ske- in Av. *ṇḷaṣza- and IE. *dʰ yan-ske- in Av. *duuqa-. Therefore, Av. *duuqa-* would not be an isolated case of an inchoative present from a full grade of the radical and it can be analysed as OIr. *duansa-.

As far as the meaning of Av. *duuqa- is concerned, Kellens (1984 157, n.12) says that it acquired the meaning “to fly” because of “sémantique populaire” from OAv. *duuṇaman- / YAv. *duuṇman- “cloud”. Although Pirart (1995 405) states that Kellens’ explanation is semantically difficult, he admits a verbal root Av. *duuṇan- “to float, to move in the air”.

In my opinion, the meaning of Av. *duuqa-* must be determined according to two facts:

---

\(^{142}\) Regarding the inexistence of PIE. *-sk*- presents, which stem from a palatalised reflex of PIE. *-sk-, vid. (Lubotsky 2001).

\(^{143}\) Mayrhofer (1992-2001 1.801) relates it to the Vedic root *dhvān- and proposes a root *ultimae laryngalis*. So he explains Ved. *dhvānta- as IIr. *CānC- < IE. *CphC-*. On the contrary, Pirart (1995 405) states that this Vedic word can be also interpreted as IE. *dʰ ᵒyʰH-tó- and be related to a non-attested Vedic root *dḥvaṃ-*, according to him in the same way that Ved. *sánta- “tranquilised” is related to Ved. *sám- “to be calm” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.610). However, he finally denies this possibility because of the causative Av. *uzduuṇnaiia- “to cause to float” < Av. *duuṇan- in Yt 5.61.
a) the subject of Av. *duuąsa- is always Av. nasu-, which is embodied as a fly (mxši. košrpa) in V 7.2 and 9.26. This image determines the interpretation of Av. *duuąsa- as “to fly”. But apparently it does not fit the meaning “to fume, to smoke” of Ved. dhvan-. Hence we must search other verbs from this root in Iranian in order to reach the exact meaning of this Avestan verb.

b) the root OIr. *dyan(H)- is also present in other Iranian languages (Cheung 2007 83):
- Khwar. δβ’ny-, mδβ’ny- “to winnow” (Benzing 1983 254, 396).
- New East Iranian “to winnow” (e. g. Pašto lwan-, lust “to scatter, winnow”).

According to these parallels and the image of Nasu as a fly, the most likely meaning for Av. *duuąsa- would be “to twirl”. The image of a circular movement in the air could have been applied either to the smoke, which would explain Ved. dhvan- “to fume, to smoke”, or to a fly. If my interpretation is right, we could suppose that Av. upa.duuąsa- actually meant “to twirl to, to hurl into”.

Av. upa ... upa.duuąsaiti; upa ... +upa.raēδβaiieiti (10.1b)

In both verbs the preverb Av. upa is repeated, as Bartholomae (1904 764, 1483) already noticed. The repetition of Av. upa is problematic and has been interpreted in two ways depending of the consideration of the verbs as transitive or intransitive: a) Av. upa is a preposition in this passage, so that the verbs are intransitive; b) Av. upa is a repetition of the preverb, so that the verbs are transitive.

The first interpretation is proposed by Hale (1993 39). He denies the possibility of considering Av. upa as an example of tmesis with preverb doubling and thinks that Av. upa is a preposition. According to him, Av. haca ... upa means here “from ... to”, so that this implies that these verbs are intransitive.

The second one is followed by Pirart (1995 406), who considers Av. upa a repetition because of the “diascévase scolaire” and therefore interprets the verbs as transitive.

I concur with Hale that Av. upa is repeated as a reinforcement of the direction by means of a preposition. The starting point is marked by the use of the preposition Av. haca and the target by Av. upa. The same kind of redundant marking of the direction is found in other Indoeuropean languages also with transitive verb, for instance in Greek. In Hdt. 6.72 we find ὑπὸ δικαστήριον ὑπαχθείς “being lead under the court of justice”, where Gr. ὑπάκω is transitive and the Greek syntagm “preposition ὑπὸ + Acc. + preverb ὑπὸ + verb” (Liddell & Scott 1996 1874) is identical to that found in the Avestan scheme “preposition upa + Acc. + preverb upa + verb”. Therefore, we cannot rule out that the repetition of Av. upa concealed a transitive verb in Avestan just, and that it combined with haca to express both terms of a movement.
Phl. zand čīyōn pad any gyāg nibišt (10.1a)

In the interpretation of this passage three questions arise:
- Firstly, why the usual PT of the Avestan formula parsāt. zarāďuštrō. ... aṣāum, namely Phl. pursīd zarāuxšīt ... ahlaw, does not appear?
- Secondly, has it been substituted by the gloss Phl. zand čīyōn pad any gyāg nibišt “The Zand, as it is written in another passage”?
- Thirdly, what does Phl. zand mean here?

The first question cannot be easily answered. There are two possible explanations for the absence of Phl. pursīd zarāuxšīt ... ahlaw:

a) it is an omission already in the common source of our extant PV manuscripts. Actually, this PT is omitted in L4 and K1, so that this omission would stem from their common source. Furthermore, in V 11.1a the PT of the same Avestan passage is omitted in all the PV manuscripts with the exception of P2. In L4 and G34 it is noteworthy that a blank, lacking in K1, appears after the gloss Phl. zand čīyōn pad any gyāg nibišt. Blanks are used in later manuscripts to mark that a text must be completed. However, in L4 they are never found, with the only exception of this passage. It is possible that the scribe of L4 was aware of the omission of the PT pursīd zarāuxšīt ... ahlaw in his source, but he could only fill the blank by means of the gloss, since there is not enough space to write this PT together with its gloss. Nevertheless, I know no other passage where the scribe of L4 left a blank and filled it afterwards, so that it remains unexplained why he proceeded in this manner in V 10.1a.

b) a gloss could have substituted the PT, so that the PT pursīd zarāuxšīt ... ahlaw would have never existed in this passage. However, it would be surprising that this PT would have been substituted by a gloss here only.

Cantera (2004a 1-13) has extensively studied the meaning of Phl. zand in this passage and in further Pahlavi texts where this word is attested together with Phl. abastāg. According to him (2004a 13), the syntagm Phl. abastāg ud zand must be interpreted as “das Avesta und seine Auslegung”. Phl. zand comprised both the commentary or exegesis of the Avesta and its PT, although the latter meaning progressively consolidated itself in the Pahlavi literature, as early as the 9th century (Cantera 2004a 10).

Phl. zand in Vīdēvdād is only attested in this passage of V 10.1a. According to Cantera (2004a 10), Phl. zand čīyōn pad any gyāg nibišt “The Zand, as it is written in another passage” undoubtedly refers to V 2.1a, where after the usual PT pursīd zarāuxšīt ... ahlaw the gloss Phl. ay ohrmazd dādār ahlaw pad xwānišn abāriq pad stāyišn “that is, “Ohrmazd, Maker, Righteous” (are used) in the invocation; the rest, in the praise” is added. According to him, V 10.1a attests the same PT as V 2.1a, while only the gloss of V 2.1a lacks in V 10.1a. Hence he states that Phl. zand can only mean here “commentary”. As this word is only attested in V 10.1a, where it would mean “commentary”, the meaning “Pahlavi translation” would not have existed when the PT of Vīdēvdād was composed.

However Cantera overlooks two possibly relevant facts. Firstly, the PT pursīd zarāuxšīt ... ahlaw is explained in a passage closer to V 10.1a than V 2.1, namely in V 9.1, by the same commentary as that of V 2.1, namely Phl. ay ohrmazd
dādar ahlaw pad xwānišn abārig pad stāyišn “that is, “Ohrmazd, Maker, Righteous” (are used) in the invocation; the rest, in the praise”. Provided that Phl. zand in V 10.1a refers exclusively to a “commentary” to the usual PT pursid zarduxšt ... ahlaw, it is difficult to explain why it should refer to V 2.1 instead of the closer V 9.1. Furthermore, V 10 is inserted in the context of the Barāšnum ceremony and it is in V 9 where this ceremony is described.

Secondly, it has been proved untrue that V 10.1a attests the same PT as V 2.1a. On the contrary, no PV manuscript preserves the PT of the Avestan text of V 10.1a, that is, Phl. pursid zarduxšt ... ahlaw lacks in V 10.1a. If this PT was present, Cantera’s explanation of Phl. zand as “commentary” would fit perfectly, because the same explanation added to the PT of V 9.1 would be summarised by Phl. zand čīyōn pad any gyāg nibīšt. In such case, this gloss would mean “The commentary, as it is written in another passage”, that is, as in V 9.1. However, since the PT pursid zarduxšt ... ahlaw is absent in V 10.1a, the interpretation of Phl. zand depends on our explanation as to why this PT is lacking.

If we think that the PT has been omitted consciously, because it was already repeated in V 9.1a, Phl. zand must be understood in this passage not as “commentary”, but rather as “Pahlavi translation” or even “Pahlavi translation together with its commentary”. Thus, Phl. zand čīyōn pad any gyāg nibīšt would summarise the PT of V 9.1a together with its commentary.

Conversely, if we suppose that in V 10.1a there was just an unconscious omission of the PT in the common source of L4 and K1, the gloss of Phl. zand would summarise that of V 9.1a, not the PT together with its gloss. In that case, Phl. zand would mean here “commentary”.

Although both choices are possible, I have preferred the first one in my translation.

Phl. čīyōn pad ōy druz pahikārēm (10.1b)

This PT is repeated in V 9.45 and 9.47 in the same context. In V 9.45 the PT is almost identical to that of V 10.1b\(^4\), but we find an interesting variation in V 9.47b-c:

\(\text{[b]}\) čīyōn ān druz pahikārēd [kū-š stahmagišt čīyōn bē bawād] [ast ke ēdōn gōwēd ay čīyōn pad ān druz pahikārēhād kū-š čīyōn stō bē kunibād] ke az ōy rist ō ōy zīndag abar dwārēd [pad hamrēh] \(\text{[c]}\) <čīyōn pad ōy nasuš pahikārēm [kū-š stahmagišt] \(^4\) čīyōn bē bawād] [ast ke ēdōn gōwēd ay čīyōn pad ōy nasuš pahikārēhād kū-š čīyōn stō bē kunibād] ke az ōy rist ō ōy zīndag abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēh]

\(\text{[b]}\) How will he fight this Lie [that is, how will the violence against it be] [there is (a commentator) who says: “how will this Lie be fought, that is, how will it be defeated”], which from the dead runs [with direct defilement] through the living,

\(\text{[c]}\) (how will I fight this Nasu [that is), how will (the violence against it) be] [there is (a commentator) who says: “how will this Nasu be fought, that is, how will it be

\(^{4}\) The only difference is found in the PT of the second Av. āzarne as Phl. pahikār instead of pahikārēm in the group of K1.

\(^{4}\) Omitted in L4 and K1.
defeated”), which from the dead contaminates the living [with indirect defilement]?”

Apart from the different PTs of Av. aēta, we must notice that the PTs of the verb Phl. pahikārdān, pahikār- imply different Avestan verbs: Phl. pahikārēd implies the activ Av. parōṇāiti, while the passiv Phl. pahikārīhād reproduces Av. parōṇāite. However, this correspondence between the Avestan verb and its PT is not found in V 9.47b-c, as we see:

- Av. (druxš.) parōṇāne → Phl. pahikārēd
- Av. (nasuš.) parōṇāiti/~ → Phl. | ... |

Actually, Phl. pahikārēd does not translate Av. parōṇāne, but correctly Av. parōṇāiti. Moreover, it is noteworthy that there were three different PTs of the same Avestan verb par-: Phl. pahikārēm, Phl. pahikārēd and Phl. pahikārīhād, corresponding to the three Avestan variants of the same verbal root in the same formula:

- Av. parōṇāne → Phl. pahikārēm
- Av. parōṇāiti → Phl. pahikārēd
- Av. parōṇāite → Phl. pahikārīhād

The correspondence between these three Avestan variants and their PTs in V 9 and 10 can allow us to go one step further, as it could point to the existence of several oral or written recensions of the Avesta before the PT was made. Let’s consider two possibilities:

a) Several archetypes of an Avestan text could have existed before the PT was composed.

b) Each school of Pahlavi translators and commentators could have had a different Avestan text and PT of Vīdēvdād. As a matter of fact, in Śnš 2.1 (Tavadia 1930 30) it is mentioned the 3rd frāgard of the Juddēvdād of Médōmah, which corresponds to the 7th frāgard of our extant manuscripts, while in Śnš 2.12 (Tavadia 1930 36) it is mentioned the 5th frāgard of the Juddēvdād of the same commentator, whose contents are found actually in the 6th frāgard of our extant manuscripts.

In such case, the divergences between PTs would reflect not only different PTs of the same Avestan text due to a different exegesis in each school, but even divergences in the Avestan text itself.

The sole examples of V 9 and 10 obviously are not enough to support such a conclusion, which ought to be verified by means of a deep revision of the variants in Avestan and their correspondences with possibly different PTs in other texts.

---

146 L4, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 parōṇāiti; K1 parōṇāite; K2, P5, T44, E10 parōṇāne
147 Only P2 Av. parōṇāiti → Phl. pahikārēnēd; K2 Av. parōṇāne → Phl. pahikārēm.
10.2. |\( \Delta \)| आत. म्रात. ¹⁴ \( ^* \) अहूरो. मादाः. इमे. \( ^* \) वाचा. \( ^* \) स्रावन।\( ^* \) योि।\( ^* \) हूँति। गाध्युना। \( ^* \) बिसामरुत। \( ^* \) इमे. \( ^* \) वाचा। \( ^* \) स्रावन। \( ^* \) योि। \( ^* \) हूँति। गाध्युना। \( ^* \) द्रिशामरुत। |\( \Delta \)| इमे. \( ^* \) वाचा। \( ^* \) स्रावन।

¹⁴ L₄, K₁, D₆₂, P₂, P₅, K₂, F₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . B₂, R₂₇₈, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, L₅, FK₁, (G); G₃₄ म्रात। T₄₄, E₁₀ \| म्रात। अहूरो। मादाः \| \| L₁, T₄₆ . M₉₂ म्रात। P₁ म्रात। K₉ \( ^* \) ताः \| म्रात। अहूरो। मादाः

¹⁵ K₁, D₆₂, P₂, P₅, K₂, F₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . L₁, B₂, T₄₆, P₁, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, L₅, FK₁, (G); L₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे; G₃₄ इमाद; R₂₇₈ इमा

¹⁶ L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, L₂, G₄₂ . M₉₂, K₉ \( ^* \) इमे

¹⁷ L₄, K₁, D₆₂, P₂, K₂, F₁₀, T₄₄, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . Br₁, (G) स्रावन। P₅ स्रावन। G₃₄ स्रावन। E₄, FK₁ स्रावन। L₅ स्रावन।

¹₈ L₄, K₁, D₆₂, K₂, G₃₄, F₁₇, T₄₄, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . Br₁, E₄, L₅, FK₁, (G); E₁₀ योि। L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे L₅ इमे

¹⁹ T₄₄ . L₁, R₂₇₈, P₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄ . M₉₂, K₉; L₄, K₁, D₆₂, P₂, P₅, K₂, F₁₀, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . Br₁, (G) स्रावन। G₃₄ स्रावन। B₁, T₄₆ स्रावन। L₅ स्रावन। FK₁ स्रावन।

²₀ L₄, D₆₂, P₂, K₂, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . E₄, L₅, FK₁, (G); E₁₀ योि। L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे P₂ इमे T₄₄ इमे L₅ इमे

²¹ L₄, D₆₂, K₂, G₃₄, F₁₀, T₄₄, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे P₂ इमे T₄₆ इमे L₅ इमे

²² K₁, D₆₂, K₂, G₃₄, F₁₀, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे P₂ इमे T₄₆ इमे L₅ इमे

²³ L₄, D₆₂, K₂, G₃₄, F₁₀, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे P₂ इमे T₄₆ इमे L₅ इमे

²⁴ L₄, D₆₂, K₂, G₃₄, F₁₀, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे P₂ इमे T₄₆ इमे L₅ इमे

²⁵ L₄, D₆₂, P₂, K₂, G₃₄, F₁₀, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂, K₉ इमे P₂ इमे T₄₆ इमे L₅ इमे

²⁶ L₄, D₆₂, P₂, K₂, G₃₄, F₁₀, E₁₀, B₁, P₁₀, M₃ . L₁, B₂, R₂₇₈, T₄₆, P₁, Br₁, L₂, G₄₂, E₄, FK₁, (G); L₄, G₃₄, T₄₄, E₁₀ . M₉₂ इमे; K₁ \( ^* \) इमे; e. aete; D₆₂, M₃ इमे. aete; P₂ इमे. aite; P₅ इमे. iete; K₂ इमे. iete; B₁, P₁₀ इमे. aete (P₁₀a above the line \( ^* \) instead of \( ^* \) ); L₅ इमा; K₉ इमे. वाचा. स्रावन। योि। बूँति। गाध्युना। द्रिशामरुत। म्रात। अहूरो। मादाः। इमे। वाचा। स्रावन।
And Ahura Mazda said: “Recite these words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gādās, [b] recite these words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gādās, [c] recite these words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gādās, [d] recite these words which are to be said twice, thrice and four times while (reciting) the Gādās.”

|a| AP-s gwpt ’whrmzd AYK ZNE gwbn'176 pr'c177 YMRRNW178 MNW HWE-d179 PWN g's'n180 byš'mlwt181 [ywddtydwt'-HD182 BRA183 YĐBHWN184] |b| ZNE gwbn'185 pr'c YMRRNW182 MNW HWE-d183 PWN g's'n189 cslw's mlwt190 |c| ZNE gwbn'191 pr'c YMRRNW192 MNW HWE-d193 PWN g's'n194 cslw's mlwt195 |d| ZNE
Av. *framrauua*

The prescriptive sense of this passage requires that the verb be either an optative or an imperative. However, Av. *framrauua* does not agree with the expected morphology of these modes. In order to clarify this rare Avestan verbal form, different explanations arose: a) it is a 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. secondarily thematised; b) it is a 1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act.; c) it is a corruption of the optative *framruia*.

Bartholomae (1904 1196, n.4) stated that Av. *framrauua* was a thematised 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. Friš (1950 79), followed by Schindler (1982 201) and Hoffmann & Forssman (1996 201), interpreted it instead as a 1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act. This interpretation, however, implies an incoherence. It is Zarāduštra who asked Ahura Mazda in V 10.1: *kuša. aēta. droux. pormāne* “how shall I fight this Lie”. As expected, V 10.2 begins with Ahura Mazda’s answer: *āta. mraot. ahurō.*
mazdā. *framrauua “And Ahura Mazdā said: “recite these words””. If Av. *framrauua was a 1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act., the latter sentence must be understood as “And Ahura Mazdā said: “I will recite these words””. Obviously it makes no sense that Ahura Mazdā answered Zarathustra’s question saying what he will do instead of prescribing Zarathustra what to do. It is unlikely that the god recites himself the words required in the ceremony. Therefore, a prescriptive 2nd. person is expected in Ahura Mazdā’s answer.


Schindler had also guessed the possibility of taking it as secondarily thematised 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper., and this cannot be totally excluded. In Young Avestan we find secondary thematisations of athematic verbs (e. g. Y 8.43 naēnižaiti; Yt 12.3 and 5, V 20.5 frīṁaṁahi; V 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a stṝonaēta; V 19.2 fraorṇaēta (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 209, 217, 219), etc.) as well as of non-thematic substantives (e. g. V 12.1a pitō instead of pīta; V 12.9a napō instead of napā, etc.). Therefore, this second interpretation as a 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. is also likely. As far as it agrees with the manuscripts’ evidence and with the contexts where Ahura Mazdā prescribes the purifications’ formulas, I prefer it.

On the other side, the Pahlavi translators understood correctly the meaning of Av. *framrauua and translated it accordingly, namely by its Pahlavi equivalent 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. frāz gōw.

Av. bišāmrūtaca. ḍrišāmrūtaca. caḏrušāmrūtaca (10.2d)

Regarding the shortening of –ā + ca > -a-ca in words with more than three syllables, vid. (de Vaan 2003 188-191).

Av. ˈāmrūta. ... framrauua (10.2a-d)

Whenever Av. mrauu- is preceeded by a preverb, this is usually Av. fra. In such case, Av. fra-mrauu- means “to pronounce, to recite”, especially applied to prayers (Bartholomae 1904 1195). Nevertheless, we find the same meaning with the preverb ā in Av. āmrutō in N 6.4 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 50-51).
With both preverbs Av. ā and Av. fra, the only parallel is attested in Yt 3.3: ādim framraomi. aşəm. vahiṣṭom “I invoke thee, Aṣa Vahiṣṭa”.

Phl. ēk ān i pad gāhān ēk ān i pad juddēwdād (10.2d)

This gloss is not easily understandable by itself and depends on the meaning of the correlative ēk ... ēk. As far as this text refers to the Baraṣṇūm ceremony, two main possible interpretations in the context of this ceremony can explain the correlative ēk ... ēk: a) it refers to two different persons; b) it distinguishes two texts.

Regarding the first possibility, we know from Modi (1922 123) that in modern practice the Baraṣṇūm ceremony must be performed by two priests. One being a hērbed, the other must be a purifier (Phl. yōǰdāsragar). But as far as I know, no text prescribes that each priest must recite a certain text. So it seems unlikely that Phl. ēk ān i pad gāhān ēk ān i pad juddēwdād meant “one (priest recites) what is in the Gāϑās; the other (priest recites) what is in the Juddēwdād”.

According to the second possibility, this gloss could be interpreted as “on the one side, what is in the Gāϑās; on the other side, what is in the Juddēwdād”. But what does this mean?

In my opinion, this gloss can only be understood as a continuation of the preceding gloss Phl. juddēwdād-ē bē yaz “celebrate a Juddēwdād” in V 10.2a. As a matter of fact, it seems to have been misplaced from V 10.2a, where it makes more sense.

In the PT of V 10.2a the recitation twice of some Gāthic texts is prescribed. According to the commentator who introduced the first gloss Phl. juddēwdād-ē bē yaz, this implies to celebrate a Vidēvdād ceremony. Therefore, this first commentator mistook the recitation of Gāthic texts in the Baraṣṇūm ceremony for the celebration of a Vidēvdād ceremony. Provided that the second gloss Phl. ēk ān i pad gāhān ēk ān i pad juddēwdād followed immediately this first gloss, as I suppose, a second commentator would have specified that “one thing is what is in the Gāϑās” (Phl. ēk ān i pad gāhān) and “another thing is what is in the Juddēwdād” (Phl. ēk ān i pad juddēwdād). Therefore, the second commentator disagreed with the first, because he thought that the recitation of the Gāthic texts in the Baraṣṇūm ceremony has nothing to do with the celebration of a Vidēvdād ceremony. In my opinion, this interpretation as a misplaced gloss is more likely, so that the PT of V 10.2a would run as follows:

u-š guft ohrmazd kū ēn gōwišn frāz gōw kē hēnd pad gāhān bišāmrūd [juddēwdād-ē bē yaz] <ēk ān i pad gāhān ēk ān i pad juddēwdād>

And Ohrmazd said: “recite these words, which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gāϑās [celebrate a Juddēwdād] <one (thing is) what is in the Gāϑās; another (thing is) what is in the Juddēwdād>.”

\[208\] In V 9.32 (Jāmāsp 1907), (Anklesaria & Kapadia 1949 242), however, Abarag prescribed two purifiers: abarag guft ay yōǰdāsragar dō oḥ abāyēd “Abarag said: “Two purifiers would be necessary””. Also regarding the importance of this yōǰdāsragar in the ritual of purification, cf. MU 1.299.10 ff.

|a| Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, which are these words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gādās? |b| And Ahura Mazdā said: “these are the words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gādās, |c| recite these words twice.”

---

209 Mf2; L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. FK1, (G) | gaēdān. aṣūmat |; P5. Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 ṭā/ | gaēdān. aṣūmat |; K2. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1. K9 ṭā/ aṣūmat; G34 gaēdān
210 G34 | aṣūmat. aṣūmat |; Mf2 aṣūmatāna
211 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, FK1, (G); P2 kaii; G34 kaunia; Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2 kiau; L5 kiaiec; K9 dātara. aṣiu
212 L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. Mf2, (G); D62 aētetc; E10 aet; L1 aeti; B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 aete; G42 aeta; K9 aētə
213 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10. P1. L5, FK1, (G); E10 yō; M3. L1, B2, R78, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2 kīō; K9 yō
214 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 (G);
215 L4, G34 honti; T44 honti; M3 honti; L5 honti; FK1 honti
216 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. B2, R78, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); P5. L1, T46, E4, gādāhu.
217 K1, D62, P5, P10, M3. L1, (G); L4, T44 biṣāmrūta; P2, K2 biṣāmrūta; G34 biṣāmarūta; F10. B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 biṣā.marūta; E10 baesāmrūta; B1 biṣāmrūta; L5 biṣā.marūta; Mf2, K9 biṣāmrūta
218 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3. Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); G34. L5 mrao.; T44, E10 | mrao. aburo. mazdā |; L1, B2, R78, T46, P1. Mf2 maro; K9 ṭā/ mrao. aburo. mazdā
219 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. R78, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L4, G34. Mf2, K9 ime; T44 aēm; L1, B2, T46 imi; G42 aīme
220 L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, B1, P10, M3. Mf2, K9, (G); K1, F10, T44. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 aete; P2 aeti; E10 aeti; E4 ṭaete
221 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L5, FK1, (G); P2. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); P5. gādāhu.; P10 gādāhu.; Mf2 aīma above the line –ah–
222 D62, P5, K2, G34, F10a in the right margin, B1, P10, M3. L2, (G); L4 biṣāmrūta; P2 biṣāmrūta; F10 | biṣāmrūta |; T44 biṣā.marūta; E10 biṣāmarūti; L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, FK1 biṣā.marūta; L5 biṣā.marūta; Mf2, K9 biṣāmarūta
223 K1, D62, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. Mf2, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44. M5 ime; P2 aēme (P2a above the line i- instead ae-); L5 ima
224 L4, (G) aṭibītim; K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2 aṭ.битим, B1, P10. K9 aṭ.битим (P10a above the line –a- after –a-); R278 aṭ.bitim
225 K2. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9; L4 framrīnu; K1, D62, P2, P5, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –a- after –r-), M3. T46, FK1, (G) framrīnu; G34 framrīnu; E4 framrīna; L5 fara.marāua

|a| dādār kadār awēšān gōw išn kē hēnd pad gāhān bišāmrūd |b| u-š guft ohrmazd kū ēn awēšān gōw išn kē hēnd pad gāhān bišāmrūd |c| ēn gōwnd dō bār frāz gōw

[a] Maker, which are these words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gāϑās? [b] And Ohrmazd said: “these are the words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gāϑās, [c] recite these words two times.”

cf. N 16.1-2 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 98-99), where an abridged version of V 10.3-4 is given.

Av. Ṯāḥbitīm (10.3c)

In Av. Ṯāḥbitīm < IIr. Ṯā-duit(ī)jam (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.767-768), the group PIr. Ṯā-ḥt- develops into Av. -ṭb-. But this is not the only development of this group in Avestan. As a matter of fact, PIr. Ṯāḥ (<& Ir. Ṯāḥ, Ṯāḥḥ) yields different results in Old Avestan and Young Avestan according to its initial or medial position, as we observe in the following table:

---

227 L4, K1, G34, F10, T44, E10, (Jmp); D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 gwbšnyh
228 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; E10 hnd; (Jmp) HWE-nd
229 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 Ṭb
230 K1; L4, D62, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp) byšʾmlwt; P2 byšʾmlwt; G34, M3 byšʾmlwt; F10 byšʾmlwt
231 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; E10 whrmzd
232 L4, K1, D2, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, D62, (Jmp) ZNE
233 L4, K1, G34 (G34a above the line -ʾn), T44, E10, (Jmp); D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 gwbšnyh
234 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34a above the line, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 MNW HWE-d
235 PWN
236 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34a above the line, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; E10 hnd; (Jmp) HWE-nd
237 L4, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62 byšʾmwlwt; P2 byšʾmwlwt; F10 byšʾmwlwt
238 L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp); P2 gwbšnyy; F10, M3 gwbšnyh; B1 gwbšnyh
239 (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 OD 2
240 L4, K1, P2, G34, E10, B1, M3; D62, F10, T44, P10, (Jmp) YMRWN
### Plur. *#dy-* in Old Iranian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAv. (duu-, db-)</th>
<th>YAv. (duu-, db-, ṭb-, b)</th>
<th>OP. (duv-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OAv. duu-
duuaēšab- 240, a-duuaēša-, vi-
duuaēša-; duuaṃta-; hōn-duuar- |
| YAv. duu-
duuaēša- 242, duua.dasa(°), duua-cina, duuaērţ, aip.i.duuaōnaia, upa.duuașa-, uz-duuañaia-; duua-ar (verb), a-duuaoroța, apa.duuar-, upa.duuar-, pačićaduuarqnt, pairi.duuar-, fra-duuar-, nižduuar-, ban-duuar-, băn-
duvarna-, băm.duuar-; duuar- (noun), duuaațra-; paiti.duuaēś-, vi-duuaēšiuō |
| duvara- 243, duvaardi- 244, duvita- 245, dūvitiyam' |
| OAv. db-
daibisonti- 248, daibisiante- 249, daibisunant- 250, daibita- 251, daibitia- 252 |
| YAv. ḏb- a-ṭbiṣa- |
| YAv. ḏb-
ṭbaēš-, (°)ṭbaēšab-(°) 253, ṭbaēšaynuant- 254, ṭbiṣuante-, ṭbiṣante-, a-ṭbaēša-, a-ṭbiṣa-, a-ṭbiṣa-, a-
ṭuīm, upa.ṭbiṣa-, upa.ṭbiṣa-, nāṣiūo, tiś-, moṇu, tiś-, varzānō, tiś-, vītaara.ṭbaēšab-, vi-ṭbaēšab-, haśi, tiś- |
| YAv. b-
biitia- 256, bae 257, bi(i) 258, bi⁰, bižuwaṭ; tiśi, frāmaṭa- |

In the medial position, this group is found in Old Avestan and Young Avestan, but not in Old Persian:

---

241 IIr. *dyáman-* cf. Ved. dhīni- “thunder” (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 2.263) and Ved. dhvan-
“thunder” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.801). Regarding the accent of *d'yāman-*, see the Vedic
neutra in –man- with full grade in the root, like for instance Ved. kārman- (MacDonell 1916 69).
242 IIr. *dyā-.*
243 IIr. *dyār-* (Kent 1953 30, 192).
244 < *duvara- “door” + vardī- “cover, protection” (Kent 1953 192).
245 IIr. *dyitā-* (Kent 1953 30, 192).
246 IIr. *dyitā-á* (Kent 1953 30, 192).
248 IIr. *duišānti-.*
249 IIr. *duišānt-.*
250 IIr. *duišānt-.*
examples, OAv. -a- between d- and –b- is an anaptyctic vowel, while -i- is an epenthetic vowel
254 According to Werba (1986 358), YAv. ṭb- must be interpreted as an “Altostiranischen” form.
255 IIr. *duišānt-*.
256 IIr. *dyiši-*á-.
257 IIr. *dyiš-.*
This multiplicity of results has been explained by Hoffmann & Forssman for Old Avestan and by Werba for Young Avestan.

With regards to Old Avestan, Hoffmann & Forssman (1996 87) thought that the difference between the results OAv. duu- and OAv. db- in OAv. duanaβab- and OAv. daibisiiant- respectively is due to the different vowel which follows them in each case. According to them, when the following vowel was -a-, the group IIR. *dγy- was preserved as OAv. duu- (OAv. duanaβab-). On the contrary, when the vowel -i- follows this group, IIR. *dγi- develops into OAv. *dni- (OAv. daibisiiant-).

However, I think that the different results in Old Avestan could not be due to the change of the vowel, but to the shift of the accent. Indeed, when the accent followed immediately the initial group IIR. *dγy-, this group was preserved as such in OAv. duu-. On the contrary, when the accent was not placed in the syllable just after the initial *dγy-, this group turned into OAv. db-. We can observe this evolution in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIR. *dγy V &gt; OAv. duu V</th>
<th>IIR. *dγy V-C V &gt; OAv. dbV-C V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAv. duanaβab- (&lt; IIR. *yidjašas-)</td>
<td>OAv. daibisiiant- (&lt; IIR. *dγišanti &lt; IE. *dγisenti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv. duanaβman- &quot;cloud&quot; (&lt; IIR. *dγyanman-)</td>
<td>OAv. daibitā- (&lt; IIR. *dγitā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv. daibissiint- (&lt; IIR. *dγisijant &lt; IE. *dγisijent-)</td>
<td>OAv. daibitii- (&lt; IIR. *dγitiša-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only exceptions to this rule could be OAv. duanas- and OAv. duanadā, whose etymology is unknown, provided that they are to be really analysed as IIR. *dγfas- and IIR. *dγfjadā- respectively.

---

259 IIR. *yid-yanaï (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 241).
260 According to Werba (1986 343, n.22), IIR. *bändja- “glücklich” is substantivised as IIR. *bändja- and related to Ved. bhand- “sich glücklich fühlen” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.244-245).
261 Unknown etymology. According to Pirart (1985 205, n.5), it is probably related to Av. vazdab-, which he (1985 204-205) interprets as *vānas+DHA and translates as “hommage charmé”.
262 Written –duu- sometimes.
Apart from these two possible exceptions, if my interpretation is right, this evolution affecting only Old Avestan can be enunciated as follows:

- IIR. *dy Y > OAv. duu V
- IIR. *dyV-C Y > OAv. dbV-C V

Apparenty the same explanation could be right in Old Avestan in medial position. However, on one hand, Old Avestan only attests –duu– in this position. On the other hand, OAv. aduiæ₃₆₃₄ (cf. Ved. adves₄₃₅₆ (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.770)), OAv. adu₃₄₅₆ (cf. Ved. adh₃₄₅₆ (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.68)) and OAv. b₃₄₅₆ (if it really stems from PIR. *b₃₄₅₆, as Werba (1986 343, n.22) states, and not from PIR. *b₃₄₅₆) would contradict this rule in medial position. So the rule can be completed by stating that in Old Avestan there would be a difference because of the shift of the accent only when PIR. *dy– appears in the initial position.

For Young Avestan, however, I have found no accentual pattern which explains the divergences. In any case, here the different results cannot be explained because of the change of the vowel. When PIR. *dy is followed by the vowel –a–, the five results duu-, db-, ṭb-, ḍb- and b are found in Young Avestan. Also when the following vowel is –i– there is not a unique result: PIR. *dy + –i– > YAv. ṭb-, ḍb-, b; PIR. *dy- + –i– > YAv. –duu-. Therefore, neither the change of the vowel nor the shift of the accent seem to determine the different results in Young Avestan.

The only explanation of this divergence in Young Avestan has been proposed by Werba (1986 358). According to him, YAv. ṭb– in YAv. ṭb₃₄₅₆ and ṭb₃₄₅₆ vs. OAv. duu– is a dialectal variation, concretely an “Altostiranischen” form. Although Werba does not mention it, he seems to state that a variant YAv. ṭb– must be interpreted as western Iranian because of the development PIR. *dy– > Parth. b–.

Two main objections must be made to Werba’s explanation. On one hand, he obviates that Young Avestan attests four different results in initial position (duu-, db-, ṭb-, ḍb-, b) and two more in medial position (–duu–, –b–). If YAv. ṭb– is to be interpreted as a dialectal variation, concretely as a western Iranian form, he ought to explain to which dialect the rest of variants are supposed to be ascribed.

On the other hand, the interpretation of YAv. ṭb– as a western Iranian form seems to derive from the development PIR. *dy– > Parth. b–, although Werba does not mention it. Indeed, Parthian attests this development, but this is not exclusive of this language. As a matter of fact, among other results, PIR. *dy– yields b– in western Middle Iranian languages like Parthian and Middle Persian, but also in modern eastern Iranian languages like Paštō, Parāĝi, Ormuṟī and Waxī, as we can observe in the following table:

\[\text{Possibly related to Khwar. } \ddag y\text{– “to envy.” vid. (Benzing 1983 28).}\]
Although the variation in Young Avestan could be explained because of dialectal differences, there is no reason why YAv. ţb- ought to be interpreted as a western Iranian development. Moreover, different developments of this Protoiranian group are attested even in the same Middle and New Iranian languages, and sometimes a particular development is shared by two or more geographically distant Iranian languages. Hence it is very problematic to ascribe a particular development to a concrete linguistic subgroup or dialect.

Therefore, in my opinion, Plr. *dγ- > YAv. –b- in YAv. *佯bītim could have represented a variant of a particular Avestan dialect, though not necessarily western Iranian. In any case, if dialectal differences were implied in the different results of this Young Avestan group, we cannot locate them geographically because of the many results of Plr. *dγ in each Iranian language.

Finally, I must add a brief consideration about my choice of –b- vs. Geldner’s –b-. With the exception of L4 aōbītim, all the manuscripts attest either āaț-bitim or aț-bitim. Obviously, this variant is due to a wrong separation of ā- + țbitim stemming from a misunderstanding between ā- + ț and āaț. Indeed, the scribes interpreted Av. *佯bītim as āaț + bitim. This is a normal confusion, since Young Avestan only attest bitiia- (not *duuiia-, *dbitiia- or *tiitiia-).

Although the variant aōbītim of L4 finds a parallel in YAv. a-ōbišta- vs. a-țbišta-, I have preferred to emend it as *佯bītim, because the rest of PV manuscripts and all the IrVS and IndVS agree in the variant –b-.

266 vid. (Skjærvø 1989 377), Skjærvø 1989 402-403).
267 vid. (Kieffer 1989 453).
268 vid. (Kieffer 1989 453).
269 vid. (Skjærvø 1989 377).
10.4. |a| abiuā. yāsā. 270 nmañhā. 271 x'ustānāzasto. 272 rafōrāpiā. 
exmānātiš. 273 mazā. 274 rau‘niūm. 275 spōntābiā. ašā. viśpōng. 
śūpdānahā. 276 vārhāniš. xratām. manañhō. yā. 279 x'siñ̂nišhā. gūŝcā. 
uruuān̂m. ⊓⊔ (= Y 28.1) 278 hūntān̂m. 279 būhxatām. 280 x'hunarāštān̂m. 281 x'udacā. 282 x'aniadacā. 283 vorāziuāntān̂mā. 284 x'vānuuγ̃γ̃ε̂nuāntān̂mā. mabh. aibi̇jarātārō. 285 
'naēnāstārō. 286 'yādōnā. 287 x'vohūnātm. mabh. 289 (= Y 35.2) 288

270 K1, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G); L4 yāsē; D62 yā.sā; P2 abiuā. 2 b'; P5 . L5 yāsā. 2 b'; K2 
yā.sā. /tāj/ 2 b'; G34 yānā; L1 yāsā. 2 /tāj /; B2 yānā; R278, P1, L2, G42, E4 yāsā. 2; T46 yāsā; 
Br1 yā.sā. 2; FK1 ahiuāsā. 2 b'; Mf2 yāsā; K9 yāsā

271 B2, T46 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, P1, Br1, L2, 
G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) nmañhā. ...uruuān̂m |; L1 /tāj / nmañhā. ...uruuān̂m |

272 B2 uštā. nazdastō; T46 uštā. nazdastō; Mf2, K9 uštā.nazastō

273 B2, T46 . K9 māniūtiš. Mf2 māniūtiš

274 B2, T46; Mf2, K9 mazdā

275 B2 pāniūniim; T46 pānūniim; Mf2 pāniūniim; K9 pānūniim

276 B2, T46 śīādānā; Mf2, K9 śīādānā

277 B2, T46; Mf2, K9 xratām

278 B2, T46 . Mf2, K9 māniñhō

279 T46; B2 . K9 yā

280 B2, T46 xšnūniitä; Mf2 yāxšnūniitä; K9 xšnūniitä

281 B2 . Mf2, K9; L1, T46 gūsā

282 L1, T46; B2 uuuān̂m. 2; Mf2 uuuān̂mt. abiuā. yāsā. 2 b'; K9 uuuān̂mt. abiuā. yā. 2 b'

vid. (Insler 1975 25): “With hands outstretched in reverence of him, (our) support, the spirit 
virtuous through truth, I first entreat all (of you), Wise One, through this act, for (that) through 
which Thou mayest satisfy the determination of (my) good thinking and the soul of the cow”;
(Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 1.105): “En hommage à (celui qui offre) le secours, les mains tendues, je 
yous) demande à tous la (formule) fondamentale du bénéfique état d’esprit, ô Mazdā, avec 
l’Harmonie et l’acte (rituel) grâce auquel tu choies l’efficacité de la divine Pensée et l’être de la 
Vache”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.117): “With hands stretched out (and) in 
reverence to Him I first entreat all (those present), O Wise One, for actions of support for the spirit 
prosperous through truth, (for the spirit) with which Thou mightest satisfy the intellect of good 
thought and the soul of the cow”.

283 L4 . T46 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, E4, L5 . 
K9 humarān̂m; R278 humarān̂m. 2 /tāj /; G42, FK1 humarān̂m. 2

284 T46; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, 
FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G) humarān̂m...mabh |; B2 bīhxatām

285 B2 humarān̂m; T46 humarān̂m

286 B2, T46 yat.ća

287 B2, T46 anīaśācā

288 B2 vurajija.manañmācā; T46 vurajija.manañmācā

289 B2 vānuuγ̃γ̃ε̂nuāntān̂mācā; T46 vānuuγ̃γ̃ε̂nuāntān̂mācā

290 T46; B2 aibi̇jarātārō

291 B2 naināstārō; T46 naināstārō

292 B2 yādānā; T46 yādānā

293 L1, B2 voḥūmān̂; T46 voḥūmān̂

294 L1, T46; B2 mabh. humarān̂m. 2

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 1.133): “Nous sommes les glorificateurs de ce qui est et a été 
bien pensé, bien dit, bien accompli, ici et ailleurs; étant donné notre mise en place (rituelle), nous ne 
sommes pas les dénigreurs des bons (acts rituals)”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.143): 
“We are the eulogists of the well-thought (thoughts), of the well-spoken (words), and of the well-
performed (actions) – both (those that are now) performed and (those) that have been performed here and elsewhere – a we are non-abusers [praisers] of the good (things)”.}

L4, K1, P2, P5, G34, T44. FK1, (G); D62, K2, F10, E10, B1, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9 ašahiā; P10 ašahiā (P10a above the line –ā-); Br1 ašahiā 2

L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10. L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); K1, B1, P10, M3 āt (P10a above the line –ā- after ā-); P5 āt abuhūā āt 2 b’l; K2 ʿāq ... abuhūā ʿāq 2 b’l; F10, B2, T46 āt

L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); T44 s’rī; E4 šairī; FK1 šrī

L4, K1, D62, G34, B1, P10, M3, (G) āt ašahiā ... abuhūā āt; P2, G4 āt ašahiā ... abuhūā āt 2 b’l; F10, E10. B2, T46 āt; L1, R278 āt; P1, Br1, L2, E4 āt ašahiā. ... abuhūā āt; FK1 ašahiā āt; Mf2, K9 āt ašahiā ... abuhūā āt

B2, T46 vorzōne; FK1 āt vorzōne ... abuhūā āt

T46; B2 kahmācīṭ

T46; B2 ūtgm

B2 ji.jišgm; T46 ji.jišgm

B2 vahēšgm; T46 vahēšgm

B2; T46 ubōibiā

L1, T46; B2 abuhūā. ašahiā. āt sarī. 2; Mf2, K9 abuhūā. 2 b’l

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.134): “Dans l’union avec l’Harmonie, dans le clan de l’Harmonie, à quiconque je dis que l’effort pour se concilier les Existants est très bon pour les deux existences”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjarvø 1991 1.144): “He has declared the best search for refuge, for anyone among those who exist, (to be) in the shelter of truth (and) in the community of truth, for both existences”.}

L4, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); E10 āt yaḥā. tū.ī.ī | L1 ... Mf2, K9 yaḥā

D62, B1, P10, M3. L1, L2, G42, (G); L4, P2, G34, F10 tū; P5 yaḥātū; K2, T44. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, E4, FK1 tū; L1 tū.ī.ī. aburamazdā. 2 ʿāq ʿām. mazdā. aburā; L5 yaḥātū; Mf2, K9 tū

L4, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (G) āt aburā. ... aburā āt; P2, P5, F10. FK1 aburābe; K2 aburū; B2, R278, P1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 aburā

Mf2, K9; P2, P5, F10 mazdā. 2 b’l; K2 mazdā. ʿāq 2 bār; L1 aburamazdā; B2 mazdā; R278 mazdā. ʿāq; P1 mazdā; 2; T46 aburamazdā; B1 aburamazdā. 2; L2, E4, FK1 mazdā. 2; G42 mazdā. 2 b’l; L5 aburamazdā. 2 b’l

P2, P5, K2, F10. R278, P1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 āt māngbācā. ... aburā āt; B2, T46 māngbācā; Mf2, K9 āt māngbācā. ... išūidiāmābī. ʿāmā āt

B2, T46 vahēšga

B2 vahēšga; T46 vahēšga

B2, T46 ūt

B2, T46 ubōibiā

B2, T46 çiš.mābī
aiš. yazamaide. adā. nemašiāmahī. adā. išiidiāmahī. ḍīā. mazdā. aburā. (= Y 39.4) 


ḥudāstāmā. (= Y 41.3) ḍīō. staotarasca. maḏrānasca. aburā. mazdā. aogomadaēcā. usmahiēcā. visimadaēcā. hiaat. miḏdam. mawāeddām. fradadāvā. daenābū. mazdā. aburā. (= Y 41.5)

T278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 humāim; K1, B1, P10, M3 = humāim. mazdā. aburā |- T44 haamāim

T44 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G); L4, G34, P10a above the line . L1, FK1 ižīm; D62, F10, E10 |- ižīm. ḍīā. hudāstāmā |- ; P2 . R278 |- ižīm. hudāstāmā |- 2; P5, K2 yūžom; P1 yžīm; L5 |- ižīm. hudāstāmā |- 2 b’l; MF2 ʾaŋhuu |= ḍīā. ižīm. ṣātām. apyhuū |- 

K2 . B2; L4, G34, T44, (G) |- yazatām. hudāstāmā |- ; P5 yazatām. 2 b’l; L1 2 yūžom. apyhuū |- ; T46 yazatām; P1, Br1, L2, E4 |- yazatām. hudāstāmā |- 2; G42 |- yazatām. hudāstāmā |- 2 b’l; FK1 yazīm 

B2; K2 yūžom. hudāstāmā |- 2 bār 

B2, T46 dadāmāide 

B2, T46 tūnū 

B2 gaiascā; T46 gaiascā 

B2, T46 astam.īāmā 

L1, T46 ṣātām; B2. K9 ṣātām; MF2 above the line ṣātām 

L1 hudāstāmā; B2 hudāstāmā, humāim. ḍīā. ižīm. 2; T46 hudāstāmā; MF2, K9 hudāstāmā. 2 b’l vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.139): “Rends les hommes, ô Maître Mazdā, partisans de l’Harmonie, désireux de l’Harmonie, bienveillants, pâtres, (fais) qu’ils nous aident pour une communauté durable qui détienn immortelle et soit assez nombreuse”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjarvø 1991 1.150): “We elect Thee, the blessed (and) abundant Yazata, (Thee) who agreeest with truth. Thus mayest Thou be for us both, life and frame in both existences, O most munificent one among those who exist”. 

L1, R278, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . MF2, K9, (G); L4, T44 ḍīō 

L1, L2, G42, L5 . MF2, (G); L4 staotarasca; D62 ḍīōtārasca; P2 ḍīōtostārasca; P5 ḍīōtostā.tarasca; K2 . E4 ḍīōtostā.tarasca; G34 . B2 ḍīōtostā.tarasca; F10 ḍīōtostā.tarasca; T44 sataotarasca; E10 . Br1 ḍīōtostā.tarasca; P10a above the line ḍīōtostā.tarasca; R278 satō.tarasca; T46 ḍīōtostā.tarasca; P1 ḍīōtostā.tarasca; FK1 stō.tarasca; K9 staotarasca
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Through a virtuous spirit and the best thinking, through both the action and the word befitting truth, they shall grant completeness and immortality to Him. The Wise One in rule is Lord through piety; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.167): “Grâce au bénéfice état d'esprit, par la très divine pensée, l'acte et la parole (rituels), (les consécrations) harmonieuses lui confèrent l'immortalité et l'intégrité. Le Maître Mazdâ est avec l'emprise et la Déférence”;

“With prosperous spirit and best thought, with action and word in accordance with truth, (those present) shall offer Him integrity and immortality. The Ahura (will) remember (that) with power and r
t

vid. (Insler 1975 89): “Through a virtuous spirit and the best thinking, through both the action and the word befitting truth, they shall grant completeness and immortality to Him. The Wise One in rule is Lord through piety”;

(G); (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 voûbā; Mf2, K9 voûbā

D62, P2, P5, K2, T44, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1 voûbūxšādārām; G34 voûbūxšādārām; F10, E10 xšādārām; B1 voûbūxšādārām; L5 xšādārām; FK1 xšādārām; (G) xšādārām

P5, K2, F10, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, L2; L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 = vairīm. ... varšānē =; P2 . P1, Br1, E4 = vairīm. ... varšānē = 2; G42, L5 = vairīm. ... varšānē = 2 b’l; FK1 vairīm; Mf2, K9 vairīm

T46; B2 aibihairistām

B2 vidīš.mānaiš; T46 vidīš.mānaiš

B2, T46 antarcaraīti

B2, T46 šiāōnaiš; T46 šiāōnaiš

B2, T46 vahīštām

B2, T46 nū.cīt; Mf2, K9 nū.cīt

T46; L1 varšānē; B2 varšānē. voûbā. xšādārām. vairīm. 2; Mf2 varšānā. 2 b’l; K9 varšānā. 2 b’l

vid. (Insler 1975 61): “That good rule must be chosen which best brings good fortune to the man serving it with milk. In alliance with truth, it shall encompass the best (for us) through its actions, Wise One. This very rule shall I now bring to realization for us”;

(Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.181): “L’invigation ... le très bon (…), par les actes (rituels) et l’Harmonie, ô Mazdâ, à celui qui ...
vid. (Hintze 2002 33-34), who remarks the importance of V 10.4, 10.8 and 10.12 for corroborating that the same sequence of Old Avestan texts surviving today and the times each text must be recited, and probably the same Yasna liturgy itself, too, was already in existence when Vīdēvdād was composed.

la divine emprise de choix très apporteuse de part. Ce (…), je vais à présent l’exercer à notre avantage”; (Humback & Ellenzbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.186): “The desirable good power, (which is) an excellent bringer of wealth to him who is liberal with abundance whatsoever, is exchanged between (God and men), with truth. (The power which is) the best through actions, O Wise One, that I will provide for us right now “.

vid. (Insler 1975 111): “(to the adherents.) The best wish of Zarathustra Spitama has been heard if the Wise Lord shall grant to him those attainments in accord with truth and a good existence for all time, (to him) and to those who have accepted and taught the words and actions stemming from His good conception”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988 1.192): “The best vigour will become famed (for being in possession) of Zara Spitama, if the Wise Ahura in accordance with truth may have granted him (as) boons good existence for all time, (to him) and to (those) who practise and master the statements and actions of his good religion”. 

199
"And after these words to be said twice, recite these words, victorious, healing."

I fight the Evil Spirit, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the defiled man, away from the defiled woman, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the righteous existence.

[1] ZK 436 AHL MN 435 byš’mlwt 434 gwbs’n 435 ZNE 436 gwbs’n 437 pr’e YMRWRN-yhy 438 pylwc1 439 byš’zynyt’l 440 | BRA 441 pwltnm 442 gnn’k 443 mynwg 444 MN m’n 445
“After the words to be said twice, recite these words, victorious, healing:” I fight Gannag Mēnōg, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the man who is defiled, away from the woman who is defiled, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the righteous existence.

The list in V 10.5 ff.


Parts of this list, however, are repeated in other Avestan texts. The most closely related to that of V 10.5 ff. is found in Yt 10.18:

utra. nmānem. uta. visem. uta. zāntūm. uta. dašīuēm. uta. nmānanam. nmānō.paitiōiś. uta. viśam. viśpatiōiś. uta. zāntūnām. zāntupatiōiś. uta. dašīuēnām. *dašīu.patiōiś. uta. dašīuēnām. fratmaātō.

“(Miθra enraged and provoked comes forth to smash) the house, the clan, the tribe, the country, the heads of the houses who preside over the houses, the heads of the clans who preside over the clans, the heads of the tribe who preside over the tribe, the heads of the countries who preside over the countries, and the councils of the premiers of the countries” (Gershevitch 1967 82-83).

In this passage of Yt 10.18, the only variations with regard to V 10.5 ff. are the absence of hauauīzō.tauuō. / nā. paiti.iristō. / nāirika. *paiti.irista and the substitution of viśpatiā. aṣaonaō. stōiś by dašīuēnām. fratmaātō. In Yt 10.87, which is repeated in Y 62.5, 68.5 and Ny 5.11, Av. x dājhusastimca completes the list after dašīu-. nmānoma. visēmca. zāntūmca. dašīuēmca. x dājhusastimca “the house, the clan, the tribe, the country, and the empire (lit. command of countries)” (Gershevitch 1967 114-115, 296-299).

As Gershevitch (1967 298) noticed, this fivefold division is parallel to the fivefold division of religious authorities (Av. ratu-):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nmāniia-</td>
<td>nmānanam. nmānō.paitiś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viśia-</td>
<td>viśam. viśpatiś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zāntūma-</td>
<td>zāntūnām. zāntupatiś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dašīuēma-</td>
<td>dašīuēnām. *dašīu.patiś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaraθuštrō.tōma-</td>
<td>dašīuēnām. fratmaātō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

477 cf. Y 19.18: kaiia. ratanūō. nmāniō. viśiō. zāntūmō. dašīuēmō. zaraθuštrō. puixō “Which are the ratu-? That of the house, that of the clan, that of the tribe, that of the country, Zaraθuštra (is) the fifth” (Gershevitch 1967 265).
In my opinion, the list of V 10.5 ff. has been modelled on the same scheme of a fivefold division in two groups, where the three elements hauuiaišaₜanuuō. / nā. paiti.irstō. / nāirika. *paiti.irsta* in the list A correspond to vispaiiₕ. ašaonō. stōiš in the list B, as we observe in the following scheme:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
A & B \\
\text{nmāna} & \text{nmānahe. nmānō,patōiš} \\
\text{viṣa} & \text{viṣō. vispoṭiš} \\
\text{zāntu} & \text{zāntōš. zāntupatoiš} \\
+\text{dājhu} & +\text{dājhoḥuš. dājhpatoiš} \\
\hline
\text{hauuiaišaₜanuuō} & \text{vispaiiₕ. ašaonō. stōiš} \\
\text{nā. paiti.irstō} & \text{nāirika. *paiti.irsta*} \\
\end{array}
\]

Accordingly, the elements of the list of V 10.5 ff. correspond to a fivefold division, which finds its correspondence in a social and religious equivalence. Some elements can be added and some can be excluded from the list, but it seems that all of them are based on a common fivefold pattern:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
A & B \\
\text{nmāna / nmāniiₕa} & \text{- nmānahe. nmānō,patōiš} \\
\text{viṣa / viṣia-} & \text{- viṣō. vispoṭiš} \\
\text{zāntu / zāntuma-} & \text{- zāntōš. zāntupatoiš} \\
+\text{dājhu / dāxiuₕma-} & +\text{dājhoḥuš. dājhpatoiš} \\
\hline
\text{hauuiaišaₜanuuō} & \text{vispaiiₕ. ašaonō. stōiš} \\
\text{nā. paiti.irstō} & \text{vispaiiₕ. ašaonō. stōiš} \\
\text{nāirika. *paiti.irsta*} & \text{vispaiiₕ. ašaonō. stōiš} \\
\end{array}
\]

However, I do not think that the fivefold social division of V 10.5 ff. was motivated by any division of religious authorities, but properly to that of the Gāϑās themselves. Indeed, each social authority finds its equivalence in the fivefold division of the Gāϑās, whose beginning has been recited in V 10.4 together with five sections of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti. This equivalence was already made in Šnṣ 13.15 (Kotwal 1969 45), where each Gāϑā is associated to a member of the fivefold social division:

frāḥam ī pad ahunauwaiū gāḥ frāz barēd māṇbedān ān ī pad uṣtawad gāḥ frāz barēd wisbeeld ān ī pad spandamēn gāḥ frāz barēd zandbedān ān ī pad vohux̣eah vāhr gāḥ frāz barēd dahibedān ān ī pad wahištoīṣt gāḥ frāz barēd zarduṣṭrōdom

The frāḥam which one raises at the Ahunauwaitī Gāϑā (is) for the masters of the houses, that which one raises at the Uṣtauwaitī Gāϑā (is) for the headmen of the clans, that which one raises at the Spāntémainiūtī Gāϑā (is) for the headmen of the tribes, that which one raises at the Vohux̣eạ̄rī Gāϑā (is) for lords of the countries, that which one raises at the Vahištoīṣtī Gāϑā (is) for the zarduṣṭrōdom.

Therefore, the texts to be recited twice in V 10.4, with the only exception of the texts of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti inserted between Y 28.1 and 43.1, correspond to the authorities of the fivefold social division of V 10.5, according to the following scheme:
V 10.4 (Gāḍās)  
Ahunauaitī (Y 28.1)  -  nmānahe. nmānō. pataiś
Uśtauaitī (Y 43.1)  -  vīsō. vīspatiś
Spaṭāmāniū (Y 47.1)  -  zantōu. zantupatiś
Vohuxādrā (Y 51.1)  -  *dājhpus. dājhpatiś
Vahistōisti (Y 53.1)  -  (zaradustro. tama-)

So each Gāḍā protects each human group and its social authority, with the only discordance of the last elements of the lists, where hauvaiai̯̅̃̃s.tanuuō / nā. paii. iristō / nārika. *paiti.irista and its equivalent vīspatū. ašaonō. stōiś have substituted the zaradustro. tama- in the list.

Av. hauvaiai̯̅̃̃s.tanuuō (10.5b)

Three main phonetic features in this syntagm are remarkable: a) the preservation of a final –ś in external sandhi; b) YAv. h(ajua- vs. OAv. xā-; c) the variant bāuwa- with long vowel in the manuscripts.

In external sandhi the preservation of the final –ś, written here as –so before the following t-, is also found in Y 9.3, 6, 9, 12 kasa. ḯpa, Y 10.13 yasa.tē, Y 10.18, V 17.9 imās. tē, Y 10.19 imās. tūmicī, Y 43.8 +vasa. xādbrāh, Y 58.7 nam. tōi, Y 62.1, Yt 5.90, 10.30, 33, 91, 13.20, 17.61 yasa. ḯp, Hb 2, Any 1, 3, Ny 1.1, 1.19, 2.1, 5.4, 20, V 21.1 nam. tē, V 13.10–11, 22.1, 8 yasa.tā, Yt 1.13 +īsā.xādṛa and +īsā.xādriūtetōm, Yt 5.90, 94 yasa. taua, Yt 8.34 napās. tā, Yt 8.43 vīspās. tā, Yt 10.112 yasa. täm, Yt 15.46 karadawas. nam, Yt 16.2 usā. hiśtā and Yt 19.87 yasa. taxmō.

When followed by ingleton it is attested in Y 9.19 +ajhā. s.tanuuō, V 4.50–52 +ašā. xād. hōi̯̅̃̃s.tanuuō, in the same hauvaiai̯̅̃̃s.tanuuō in V 16.7 and in Yt 10.23 xā. pāi̯̅̃̃s.tanuuō. It is also remarkable that OIr. *-as + t- was written in Avestan as –as. t-, where the “Kompromiśform” –a- (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 112) reflects the expected result of final *-as without sandhi. This is explained by de Vaan (2003 384–385) as an attempt to preserve the same vowel –ā by analogy with the forms without sandhi.

Regarding the degree of the first vowel in Av. hauvaiai̯̅̃̃s, we must explain, on one hand, why YAv. hauua- is found instead of YAv. haua-ōs and whether Av. baō is etymologically right or it contains an anaptyctic vowel; on the other hand, the variant bāo in the manuscripts also deserves an explanation.

According to Pirart (1995 409) and de Vaan (2003 49), this –a- in Av. hauvaiai̯̅̃̃s must be interpreted as an anaptyctic vowel, because this word stems from IIR. *syāas. More recently, however, de Vaan (2005 703) admits another possibility.

He (2005 699, 703) observes that xā- is only attested in Old Avestan, in Young Avestan adaptations of Old Avestan texts and in Young Avestan compounds, while in the rest of cases Young Avestan only knows hauua-.

---

The variant xā- is only present in Old Avestan, according to de Vaan (2005 703).
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OAv. *xa- (and maybe YAv. *huua-) would imply IE. *syó-, while YAv. *huua- could stem from IE. *seyó-. The coexistence of IE. *seyó- “his, her, its own” together with IE. *syó- “id.” would be confirmed by the doublets Gr. ἐός, Lat. suus “id.” < IE. *syóś and Gr. ὦς “id.” < IE. *syós (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 169), (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.788), (de Vaan 2005 703). Only Greek and Young Avetstan attest these doublets, which according to de Vaan developed separately in each language. Indeed, as he (2005 703-704) observes, the rest of Iranian languages confirm that only PIr. *h- existed and that it was replaced analogically by YAv. *huua- in Young Avetstan due to other personal and demonstrative pronouns in initial *h-.

Although I think that de Vaan’s explanation regarding the replacement of an old *hyá- by YAv. *huua- is likely, I disagree with him concerning the existence of Young Avetstan forms *huua-. He states that they are to be emended by *huua-, which in his opinion is more numerous and more frequently attested in the good manuscripts, but he does not demonstrate this statement by means of statistics. On the contrary, he simply quotes some examples extracted from Geldner’s (1896) edition.

Since Geldner omitted many variants and did not consign systematically the oldest ones, we cannot trust de Vaan’s statement unless we verify all the variants of YAv. *huua- in all the available manuscripts. Until this work has been fulfilled, I must just notice that variants of YAv. *huu exist together with those of YAv. *huu even in the oldest manuscripts (e. g. V 10.18 huam in K1; V 13.8b huu in Mf2; V 13.39a huuastr in L4 and huuuuastr in Mf2). Therefore, and unlike de Vaan, I cannot confirm that only *huua- existed in Young Avetstan without forcing the manuscripts’ evidence.

With regards to the third problem concerning how to explain the variant *há in the manuscripts, this variant could be interpreted as a scribal particularity or as a feature of the Avetstan language.

On one hand, each manuscript does not always attest the same variant. As a matter of fact, while Av. hauui in V 10.19a shows no variant with *há in the PV nor in the VS manuscripts, in the rest of passages of V 10 the same manuscripts attest sometimes *ha and sometimes *há. No evident distribution is found in them.

On the other hand, the vowel *a- in initial syllable tends to be lengthened in Avetstan, especially if the vowel of the following syllable is *a- (de Vaan 2003 105). Therefore, the variant *há originates itself from *ha, so that we must suppose an Avetstan stem *haa-, from which *a developed into *a in initial syllable. So the correct variant would be *haa-. According to de Vaan (2003 105), this development is attested in Old as well as in Young Avetstan. But as regards Young Avetstan it occurred in post-Avestan times, when a strong stress in the first syllable was introduced.

479 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34 paiti.pārne; B2, T46 paiti.pārne
480 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); Mf2, K9 nasūm
481 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); B1 paiti.pārne; L1 paiti.pārne
482 L4 . Mf2, (G); D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 hām.raēdīmad; P2, E10 . FK1 hām.raēdīmad; L1 hām.raēdīmad; B2 hām.raēdīmad; R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 hām.raēdīmad; T46 hām.raēdīmad; P1 hām.raēdīmad; K9 hām.raēdīmad
483 L4c above the line, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 = paiti.pārne =
484 L4c above the line, K1, K2, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62 paiti.raēdīmad; P2 paiti.raēdīmad; P5, F10, E10 . P1 paiti.raēdīmad; G34 (G34a above the line paiti.) raēdīmad; L1, B2, R278, T46, L2, G42, L5 paiti.raēdīmad; Br1 paiti.raēdīmad; E4 paiti.raēdīmad; FK1 above the line pitraēdīmad (in red ink)
485 B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K1, G34, B1, P10, M3 nmānāhe; D62, P2, T44 nmānāhe; P5, F10, E10, L1 nmānāhe; K2 nmānāhe; P1, E4 nmānāhe; L5, FK1 nmānāhe
486 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 haca. haca
487 L4, K1, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 viśi; P5 above the line viśi; E10 . L5 viśi; FK1 viśe
488 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34, P10 zanti
489 L4, D62, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . R278, Br1, E4; P2 . L1, L2, G42, L5, FK1, (G) daiṭbi; P5 viśa. haca. daiṭbi; G34, E10 . B2, T46, P1 . Mf2, K9 daiṭbi
490 Mf2, (G); G34 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; K1, D62, T44, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 hāniāsa.se.tanuū (above the line -ə- instead of -e-); P2 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; P5, K2 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; F10, E10 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; L1 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; P1 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; E4 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; L5 . K9 hāniāsa.se.tanuū; FK1 haca.hāniāsa.se.tanuū
491 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 = haca... paiti.irstō |
492 K1, P5, K2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9, (G); D62 paiti.irstō; F10 paiti.irstō; E10 paiti.irstō; L1 nāpaiti.irstō; L5 paiti.ārāsto; FK1 paiti.irstō; Mf2 paiti.ārāsto
493 P5, G34, T44, E10, P10, M3 . Br1, L2, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10 . L1, L2, B2, R278, T46, P1, G42, L5 niṙir; K2 niṙir
494 T44 . L2, E4; L4, K1, K2, G34, B1, P10, M3 paiti.irstō; D62 paiti.irstō; P5 . L1 paiti.irstō; F10 paiti.irstō (F10a deletes -ō and writes -i); E10 paiti.irstābe; B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, FK1 . K9, (G) paiti.irstē; L5 paiti.ārāsto; Mf2 paiti.ārāsto
495 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 hca
496 K1, K2, E10, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, P2, G34, T44 nmānahe; D62 nmānehe; P5 nmānō; F10 nmānē; B1 . R278, P1, E4 nmānahe; L5, FK1 nmāne
497 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, T44 nmānō.patoiśi; Br1 nmānō.patoiśi; E4 nāmanō.patoiśi; L5 nāmanō.patoiśi; FK1 nāmanō.patoiśi
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I fight Nasu, I fight the Direct defilement, I fight the Indirect defilement, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the defiled man, away from the defiled woman, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the righteous existence.

BRA pwltynm nswš BRA pwltynm MNW PWN hmlyt' [lymn' YHWWN-t YKOYMWN-yt] BRA pwltynm MNW PWN ptylyt [lymn' YHWWN-t YKOYMWN-yt] MN m'n'MN wys MN znd MN MTA
MN \(^{524}\) <y> hwyš tn' MN \(^{525}\) GBRA MNW \(^{526}\) QDM lyst \(^{527}\) MN \(^{528}\) n'lyk MNW \(^{529}\) QDM lyst \(^{530}\) MN \(^{531}\) m'n pt MN wys wyspt MN znd \(^{532}\) MN MTA x'dhywpt \(^{33}\) MN \(^{34}\) hlwsp \(^{35}\) ZK \(^{36}\) y \(^{37}\) x'hlwby stem sty |a| bē purdēnam nasuṣ bē purdēnam kē pad hamrē [rēman būd ēstēd] bē purdēnam kē pad payrē [rēman būd ēstēd] az mān az zand az deb az <i> xweš tan az mard kē abar rist az nārig kē abar rist az mān mānbed az wis wisbed az zand zandbed az deb' dahibed az haświsp ān i'ahlaw stī |a| I fight Nasu, I fight him who [has become impure] by direct defilement, I fight him who [has become impure] by indirect defilement, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the man who is defiled, away from the woman is defiled, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the righteous existence.

Av. nasūm, ham.raēθām, paiti.raēθām (V 10.6a)

The Direct defilement (Av. ham.raēθā-) and the Indirect defilement (Av. paiti.raēθā-) appear only in the enumerations of evil entities of Vidēvdād. They are mentioned together with Nasu in this passage of V 10.6, but also in the list of V 11.9a-b (repeated in V 11.12, 11.15 and 11.18) and in V 19.12. While the same sequence nasu-, ham.raēθā-, paiti.raēθā- is repeated in V 10 and 11, in V 19.12 there is a variation ham.raēθā-, paiti.raēθā-, nasu-.

Av. raēθā-

Av. raēθā- stems from a root IIr. *(H)ri-th* “to blend, to mingle” (de Vaan 2003 215-216). As a verb, it is present in Av. irir-, whose present stems are Av. iririiya-, raēθā- and raēθāia-. With Av. nasu- as subject, this verb is also preceded by the preverb upa in V 3.14, 9.45 and 10.1, where it means “to contaminate”.

---

524 P2, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 –| MN ... dhywpt’ |-
525 P2; (Jmp) W MN
526 P2; (Jmp) y
527 P2 lysty; (Jmp) lyst
528 P2; (Jmp) W MN
529 P2; (Jmp) | MN W
530 P2; (Jmp) YMYTWN-yt’
531 P2; (Jmp) OD | MN ... dhywpt’ |-
532 P2 W zndpt
533 P2 W dhywpt
534 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); T44 W MN
535 K1, B1, P10, M3; D62, F10, (Jmp) hlwsp; P2 hlwst’; G34, T44, E10 hlwst’
536 L4, K1, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; D62, P2, (Jmp) | ZK y |-
537 L4, K1, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3; P10 | y |-
538 (Jmp); L4, D62, G34 ‘hlwby n’; K1, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ‘hlwby n’; P2 ‘hlwby n’
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Apart from the verb, this root yielded some nouns:
- Av. paiti.raēϑā - “indirect defilement” (Bartholomae 1904 834).
- Av. raēϑāskara - “he who mingles; name of a priest” (Bartholomae 1904 1483).
- Av. raēϑīsbajina - “mixing vessel” (Bartholomae 1904 1484).
- Av. hām.raēϑā - “direct defilement” (Bartholomae 1904 1811).
- Av. hām.iristi - “blend” (Bartholomae 1904 1811).

With the preverbs hām and paiti it designates in Vīdēvdād the termīni technīci for direct and indirect defilement (Bartholomae 1904 1482-1483), (Cantera under preparation A 5.33).

The evolution of OIr. *-a(CC) > YAv. –a(CC) instead of the expected –ōi(CC) - (de Vaan 2003 355) has been explained in two ways. According to Fortson (1994 44), the result of OIr. *-ař > YAv. –aē- instead of –ōi- before the cluster OIr. *-ōi in YAv. raēϑā- vs. OAv. rōiϑan (Y 31.7) is explained because Av. raēϑā- would stem from OIr. *rajūya-, a Sievers variant of OIr. *rajūya-. Av. rōīϑan would stem from the latter one.

Unlike Fortson, de Vaan (2003 342-343, 355) thinks that in Young Avestan, contrariwise to Old Avestan, the initial r- conditioned the development of OIr. *-ař > YAv. –aē- before the cluster OIr. *-ōi-. Actually, he states that OIr. *-a(CC)-, *-a(CC)# yielded YAv. –a(CC)-, –a(CC)# when the cluster was –st-, –sm-, –šm- or –šr-, or when the the diphthong was proceeded by r- and followed by the clusters –xn-, –xš-, –ϑβ- or –št-. I agree with de Vaan.

539 Mf2; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . FK1, (G) – gaēdhānam. astuauitaɪnām. aśāum –; K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 . K9 ītā/ aśāum; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 ītā/ – gaēdhānam. astuauitaɪnām. aśāum –
540 Mf2 astuauitaɪnām
541 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G); L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 kiia; L5, FK1 kiia
542 L4, K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P10, M3 aetae; P5 itē, K2 ite; E10 . FK1 aeti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 yōi
543 K1, D62, P2, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –n- instead of -n-), M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34 honti; T44 honti; T46 honte; E4 hontai; L5 hinti; FK1 honta
544 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 . B2, T46, E4, L5 gādā. buua
545 L4, K1, D62, K2, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); P2 driśā. murūta; P5 driśāmrūta; G34 driśāmarūta; F10, E10 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 driśā. murūta; T44 driśā. murūta; R278 driśā. murūta; L5 driśā. marūta; FK1 driśā. murūta; Mf2, K9 driśāmrūta
546 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); E4 – āat. … driśāmrūta –
547 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, M3 . Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); G34 mraōt; T44 mraōt; P10 mraōt; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 mraōt; K9 above the line ītā/
548 Mf2 aburō. mazdā –; P10 mraōt; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 mraōt; K9 above the line ītā/
549 Mf2 aburō – mazdā
550 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9 above the line, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 ime; E10 ima
551 L4, K1, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9 above the line, (G); D62, P2, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9 above the line, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 ime; E10 ima
552 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9 above the line, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 ime; E10 ima
553 K1, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –n- instead of -n-), M3 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 in the left margin yōi
554 K1, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –n- instead of -n-), M3 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 in the left margin, (G); L4, G34 honti; D62 honta; T44 honti; B2 yōhonti; L5 honti; FK1 honta
555 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T46, L5 gādā. buua
556 L4, K1, D62, K2, B1, M3 . L1, (G); P2 gādā. buua driśāmrūta; P5, F10, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 driśā. murūta; G34 driśāmarūta; T44 . FK1 driśā. murūta; E10 driśāmrūti; P10 driśāmrūti; R278 driśā. mrūta; L5 driśā. marūta; Mf2, K9 in the left margin driśāmrūta
557 K1, K2, F10, E10, B1, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, T44 ime; D62, P10 ime; iti; P2 ime; ite; P5 ime; āti; L1 imi; L5 ima; FK1 imaе
558 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1, B1, M3 – vaca – (M3 attests a blank)
559 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 ā. drītīm; G34 ādrītām (G34a above the line –ritim); L5 ādharītīm
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a Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, which are these words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gāϑās? b| And Ahura Mazdā said: “these are the words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gāϑās, c| recite these words thrice.”

| a| dʾtʾl ktʾl OLE-šʾn 561 gwbšn 562 MNW 563 HWE-d 564 PWN gʾsʾn 565 slyšʾmlwt 566 | b| AP-š gwpt ʾwhrmzd AYḴ OLE-šʾn 567 gwbšn 568 MNW 569 HWE-d 570 PWN 571 gʾsʾn 572 slyšʾmlwt 573 | c| ZNE 574 gwbšn 575 3 bʾl prʾc YMRRWN 576
| a| dādār kadār awēšān gōwi šn kē hēnd pad gāhān srišāmrūd | b| u-š guft ohrmazd kū awēšān gōwi šn kē hēnd pad gāhān srišāmrūd | c| ēn gōwi šn sē bār frāz gōw

a Maker, which are these words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gāϑās? b| And Ohrmazd said: “these are the words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gāϑās, c| recite these words three times.”


---

560 D62, F10, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; L4 framr’niaa; K1, P2, K2, T44, B1, M3 . FK1, (G) framr’niaa; P5 framr’niaa; G4 framaruua; E10 framaruua; E4 framaruua; L5 frafruua
561 K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34 OLE-šʾny; T44 OLE-šʾnʾy
562 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 gwbšnyy
563 K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 MNW |
564 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; P2 HWE (P2a above the line -d); (Jmp) HWE-nd
565 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 ʾl-ʾšʾnʾ
566 K1, P2, T44, E10, P10, M3, (Jmp); D62 slyšʾmlwt; G34 slyšʾmlwt; F10 slyšʾmlwt; B1 slyšʾmlwt
567 F10; L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 OLE-šʾn; (Jmp) ZNE OLE-šʾnʾ
568 K1, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3 OLE-šʾn; (Jmp) ZNE OLE-šʾnʾ; (Jmp) ZNE OLE-šʾnʾ
569 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; P2 W gwbšnyy
570 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 MNW |
571 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) HWE-nd
572 L4, K1, D62, P2 above the line, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 pa
573 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 ʾl-ʾšʾnʾ
574 K1, M3; L4, P2, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp) slyšʾmlwt; D62 slyšʾmlwt; G34 slyšʾmlwt; F10 slyšʾmlwt
575 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp); M3 MNW
576 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, P10, M3, (Jmp); B1 ʾšʾnʾ
577 L4, K1, F10, E10, B1, M3; D62, F10, T44, P10, (Jmp) YMRRWN

⁵⁷⁷ L4, (G); D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 vohū; P2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 vohū. 3, P5 vohū. 3 3 b’l; K2 vohū. /lā/ 3 b’l; FK1 vohū. 3 bār; Mf2, K9 vohū. 3 gwptn’ vid. (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjarø 1991 1.115): “Truth is the best (part of all that is) good. As desired (all) the desired (things) are available (as) truth for (that) which (is) best truth / or: for (him) who (is) Best Truth / or: for (him) who (represents) best truth”.

⁵⁷⁸ L4, G34, E10. B2, R278, Br1, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); K1, D62, F10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –3); M3 ye; P2 ye; L1, P1: Mf2, K9 yā; T46, L2 yā

⁵⁷⁹ L4, K1, D62, F10, B1, P10. L1. Mf2, K9, (G); P2 suomištō; P5, K2 āyānāštō; G34, E10. B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4 suomištō; T44 āyānāštō; M3 suomištō; R278, FK1 suomištō; P1 suomištō; L5 suomištō

⁵⁸⁰ L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G) | aḥurū. ... pātīi |; P2. R278, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5 | aḥurū. ... pātīi |; P5. G42 | aḥurū. ... pātīi |; 3 b’l; K2 /lā/ | aḥurū. ... pātīi | 3 b’l; L1 3 /lā/ | aḥurū. ... maṛz-dātā. mó. |; FK1 | aḥurū. ... pātīi | 3 bār; Mf2, K9 /lā/ | aḥurū. ...

⁵⁸¹ kahūačīti |

⁵⁸² B2, T46 armaitišcā
⁵⁸³ T46; B2 aḥm.čā
⁵⁸⁴ B2 frādaṭ.gaeṭām; T46 frādaṭ.gaeṭām
⁵⁸⁵ B2 vohū
⁵⁸⁶ B2; T46 vohūxšaṭromcā
⁵⁸⁷ B2; T46 sratāmōi
⁵⁸⁸ B2 maṛz-dātā.mōi; T46 maṛz-dātāmōi
⁵⁸⁹ B2; T46 a.ḍāi
⁵⁹⁰ L1 kahūācīti; B2 kahūā.čīt; T46 kahūā.čīt
⁵⁹¹ L1, T46; B2 pātīi. yā. suomištō; 3; Mf2, K9 pātīi. 3 b’l

vid. (Insler 1975 53): “The Wise One who is the Most Intelligent, and piety, and truth which prospers the creatures, and good thinking, and (good) rule – listen to me, gave mercy on me, when there is any requital”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.124): “Ô Maître Mazda qui es très opulent, Déference, Harmonie qui fais prosperer les troupeaux, divine Pensée et emprise, écoutez-moi et faites-moi grâce chaque fois lors de la présentation!”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjarø 1991 1.138): “(Thou) who (art) the strongest Ahura and the Wise One, and (You who are) Right-Mindedness and Truth promoting the herds, as well as Good Thought and Power, do listen to me! do have mercy on me at any apportionment!”.}

⁵⁹² D62, P5, G34, F10, E10, P10. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; L4, (G) huxšaṭro. tāmāi; K1, P2, B1, M3. L1. Mf2, K9 huxšaṭro. tāmāi; K2 huxšaṭro. tāmāi; T44 huxšaṭro. tāmāi; E4 huxšaṭro. tāmāi

⁵⁹³ L4, K1, D62, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G) | bā. ... vabištāi |; P2. P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | bā. ... vabištāi | 3; P5. Mf2, K9 | bā. ... vabištāi | 3 b’l; K2 /lā/ | bā. ... vabištāi | 3 b’l; L1 3 /lā/ | bā. ... ašāicā |; R278 /lā/ | bā. ... vabištāi |; FK1 | bā. ... vabištāi | 3 bār

⁵⁹⁴ B2, T46 bāt
⁵⁹⁵ B2, T46 abmāt
⁵⁹⁶ B2, T46 aebī
⁵⁹⁷ B2, T46 daśmābicā
⁵⁹⁸ B2, T46 čiš.mahēcā
dužūarənāiš. x vaēšō. rāsti.tōi. narəpiš. rajiš. aēšasā. 607
dōjīj.arətə. pošō.tanuūō. kū. ašauuā. aburom. yō. ī. jūtūš. 608
hōm.māt)iāt. x vās.itoiścā. 609
tā. mazdā. tānuā. kšərət. yā. xražjiūoi. 610
dābī. drigmauē. vabiūō. (= Y 53.9) 611

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.133): “Celui sur qui l'emprise est bonne, pour autant que cela nous concerne, nous exerçons évidemment l'emprise sur lui, la lui appliquons, la lui addressons – lui, c'est le Maître Mazdā et (c'est aussi) la très divine Harmonie”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.144): “As far as we are able, we truly assign [offer], commit and delegate the power which (is) with us to the best ruler who (is) the Wise Ahura, and to Best Truth”.

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T46 dužūarənāiš

vid. (Insler 1975 113): “Poison adheres to those of evil preferences. They are decline and darkness, these furious violators of truth whose persons have been condemned. Where is the truthful Lord who would expel them from life and liberty? (to the Wise Lord). Such is Thy rule, Wise One, through which Thou mayest grant the better (part) to the poor person who lives decently”.
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619. L4, K1, D62, K2, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); P2 drīša.mruna; P5, F10 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 drīša.mruna; G34 drīṣāmarūta; T44 drīṣāmrūta; L5 ṭarīṣा.marūta; Mf2, K9 ṭarīṣāmrūta

621 K2, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, T44 ime; Br1, L5 ima

620 L4, F10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, K1, D62, P2, K2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, (G) framruua; P5 fra.mruna; G34 framruua; E4, L5 framruua; FK1 framrua

621 L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10 . Br1, L2, G42; K1, P2, B1, P10, M3 vāroḍraynī (P10a above the line — instead of —); D62 vāroḍraynī (D62a — after —); L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 vāroḍraynī; E4 vāroḍraynī; L5 vāroḍraynī; G34 vāroḍraynī; FK1 vāroḍraynī; Mf2, K9, (G) vāroḍrayne

619 K1, P5, K2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, L4, G34, (G) baēazāia; D62, P2 baēazāia; F10 baēazāia; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 baēazāia; Br1 bīzhiia

620 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 . T46 in the left margin androm; D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, P10, M3 . R278, E4 indram; G34, E10 indaram; T44 . L5, FK1 indaram; B1 . L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42 indrom

621 L4, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G); K2 paiti; T46 in the left margin paiti.pairīmm; Mf2 paiti.pairom

620 K1, E10, P10 . Br1, G42, (G); L4 saurnm; D62, F10, B1, M3 . R278, L5, FK1 suurnm; P2 suurnm; P5, K2 saornm; G34 suornm; F10 s’urornm; L1 suornm; B2, P1 suornm; T46 in the left margin suornm; L2 su; E4 suornm; Mf2, K9 saornm

621 L4, D62, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 paiti.pairom; K2 paiti; T46 in the left margin paiti.pairom

620 D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 . G42, (G); L4, T44 nāḥpādīmm; K1 nāḥpādīmm; P5, K2 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9 nāḥpādīmm; G34 nāḥpādīmm; F10 nāḥpādīmm; E10 nāḥpādīmm; L1 nājądīmm; L5 nājądīmm

621 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 daēum; F10 daēum

620 L4, K2, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P5, F10, E10, M3 nmānē; P2, G34a above the line namānē; G34 || namānē. haca || T44 . L5 namānē; B1 . P1, E4, FK1 namānē

621 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44 visi; E10 . FK1 visi; G42 visi

620 D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . B2, T46, P1; P2 dājphō; P5 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) dājphē; E10 . Mf2, K9 dājphū

620 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . || || haca. ... stōi ||

621 Mf2; P5 hānuuāiśe.tanuū; K2 hānuuāiśe.tanuū; L1, B2, R278, T46, G42, FK1 hānuuāiśe.tanuū; P1, L5 hānuuāiśe.tanuū; Br1, L2 hānuuāiśe.tanuū; E4 hānuuāiśe.tanuū; K9 hānuuāiśe.tanuū

620 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9; FK1 hurcānā

621 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 paiti.irisō; L5 paiti.iriśū; FK1 paiti.irisō; Mf2, K9 paiti.irisō

620 P5 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, K2 nāirki; B2, T46 nāirēka; L5 nāirīke

620 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1; G42 paiti.iriśū; E4 paiti.iriśū; L5 paiti.iriśū; Mf2, K9 paiti.iriśū

620 L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, K5, K2 nmānē; R278 nmānabhi; P1, E4, L5 namānabe; FK1 nmānabe
"And after these words to be said thrice, recite these words, victorious, healing." [b] I fight Indra, I fight Sauru, I fight Nāgapaiśia, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the defiled man, away from the defiled woman, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the righteous existence.

[a] ZK y' AHL MN slyš'mwlwt' gwbšn' ZNE gwbšn' p'r' YMRRWN pylwcgl byš'zynyt' [b] BRA pwltynm 'pard' [SDYA] BRA pwltynm swl BRA 'nāhyāda/ ŚDYA MN m'n' xMN' wys' xMN' znd MN' MTA'

641 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; P5 nmānō.paitōiš; K2 nmānō.paitōiš; E4, L5 namānō.paitōiš; FK1 namānō.paitōiš
642 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; Br1 vīso; G42 vīso; E4 vīso
643 P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; K2 vīs.paitōiš; L5 vīs.paitōiš; FK1 vīs.paitōiš
644 B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42; P5 . FK1 zantu.paitōiš; K2 zantu.paitōiš; L1, T46, E4, L5 . K9 zantu.paitōiš; Mf2 zantu.paitōiš
645 K2 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, E4; P5 . L1, R278, L2, G42, L5, FK1 daįbhužās Mf2, K9 daįbhužās
646 P5 . FK1 daįbhu.paitōiš; K2 daįbhu.paitōiš; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2 daįbhu.paitōiš; G42, L5 daįbhu.paitōiš; E4 daįbhu.paitōiš; FK1 daįbhu.paitōiš
647 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9; FK1 vīspīņu; Mf2 vīspīņu
648 P5 . R278, G42, L5; L1, P1 ašāōṇō; B2, Br1, L2, E4, FK1 ašāōṇō; Mf2, K9 ašāōṇō
649 L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; P5 sāōṇō; K2 ašāōṇoāstōiš; T46 ašāōnōstōiš

650 L4, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2, G34, T44, E10 ẏ y
651 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 ↓ MN ↓
652 K1, P2, M3; L4, T44, E10, (Jmp) slyš'mwlw; D62, B1 slyš'mwlw; G34 slyš'mwlw; F10 slyš'mwlw (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3 ↓ gwbšn' ↓; P10 YM
653 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 3
654 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) gwbšnhy
655 L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 prp'r
656 L4, P2, G34, E10, B1, M3; D62, F10, T44, P10, (Jmp) YMRRWN
657 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3; D62, P10, (Jmp) pylwcgl; F10
658 L4, T44, (Jmp); K1, D62, P2, G34 byš'zynyt' l; F10 byš'zynyt' l; E10 byš'zynyt' p; B1, P10, M3 wyš'zynyt' l
659 L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 pwlt ynm; E10 pwltynwm
660 L4, D62, F10, T44, B1, P10a above the line, M3, (Jmp); ZK indarx; G34 andar; E10 andra; P10 indar ... pwltynm
661 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10a above the line, M3, (Jmp); E10 PWN
662 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10a above the line, M3, (Jmp); G34 pwlt ynm'; E10 pwltynwm
663 L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 swr; E10 swl ŚDYA
664 D62, P2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, T44 W BRA; G34a above the line B'A; F10 BRA
665 pylty wn BRA
666 D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 PWN
667 D62, P2, F10, P10, (Jmp); L4, E10 nāyhaib; G34 nāyhaib; T44 nāyhaib; B1, M3 nāyhaib
668 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, (Jmp); G34, E10, B1, P10 m n; T44 m m; M3 m n
669 L4, G34, T44, E10 W; K1, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ↓ MN ↓; P2 W MN

216
The list of demons

In Vīdēvdād there are three main lists of demons: a) that of V 10.5-14; b) that of V 11.9-10 ff.; c) that of V 19.43.


The third one also sums 17 demons: āṇrō. *maniūs. pouru.mahrkō, ḫdrō, +sauru, +nāḥχāidīm, tauruui, *zairici, +aēṣmām. xruui.ḍrūm, +akatašām, ziām, iđīeja, +maraαonām, sauruua. dūzqāyā. būiīi, dṛiṣi, dāiβi, kasuui, +paitiī. If we add the demon Kunda, mentioned in V 19.41, all make 18.

The comparison between the lists reveals some shared compositional patterns. On one hand, the three evil beings related to impurity, namely nasu-, ḫam.raudbā- and paiti.raudbā-, were mentioned together and in the same order in both V 10 and 11. On the other hand, the same sequence of 7 demons formed by ḫdr-, sauru-, nāḥχāidīia-, +tauruui-, +zairici-, aēṣma- +xruui.ḍrū- and +akataša- appears in both V 10 and 19. As far as we only find their names in Vīdēvdād, we are unable to know whether they were just part of a formula which could be amplified by the addition of more elements or they formed a closed group of seven demons.

The parallel phenomenon of the creation of a fixed number of Beneficent Immortals might help us to solve the question. We know from Nartén’s (1982) study that the number of Beneficent Immortals was not closed until late times, when a fixed group of seven was consolidated. At the head of this group, Ahura Mazdā was sometimes included. Likewise a parallel list of seven demons, opposed to the Beneficent Immortals, could have become fixed in the Avestan and Pahlavi texts.

Pirart (2007a 42) denies that these demons were opposed to the Beneficent Immortals in post-Gāthic times and thinks that this process is to be ascribed to the

---

670 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 w’s
671 L4, P2 W MN; D62, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) W; T44, P10 | MN |
672 D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 | MN |; E10 W
673 L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; P2 TA; F10 MTA-k; (Jmp) MTA OD gyw’k
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9th century A.D. Although a late date can be assumed for this opposition, it could be traced back some centuries earlier, that is, to Sasanian times, at least in one case: the PT of Y 48.1a, where the demon Indar is considered the opponent of Ardwahišt (Dhabhar 1949:209):

\[
ka\ \text{pad an dahišn [pad tan i pasēn] ablāyih druz wānēd [ašwahišt indar]} (...) 
\]


In any case, some Pahlavi texts clearly reveal the opposition between the Beneficent Immortals and some demons, considered rather as arch-demons\(^{674}\), as we observe in GrBd 34.27 (Pakzad 2005:386), (Anklesaria 1956:34.26 in 290-291):

\[
pas\ \text{ohtmazd}\ \text{gannāg mēnōg ud wahman akōman ud ašwahišt +indar}\^{673}\ \text{ud šahrewar +sawr}\^{676}\ \text{ud spandarmad tarōmad [i ast nanhais] ud hordād ud amurdād +tawriz ud +zāriz}\^{677}\ \text{ud rāst-gōwišnīh ān i drō-gōwišnīh ud srōs ablaw xešm i xurūdruṣ}\^{678}\ \text{gīrēnd} 
\]

Then Ohrmazd will catch Gannāg Mēnōg, Wahman Akōman, Ašwahišt Indar, Šahrewar Sawr, Spandarmad Tarōmad [who is Nanhais], Hordād and Amurdād Tawriz and Zāriz, the True speech the False speech and the righteous Srōš Wrath of the bloodstained stick.

With slight variants, the same is found in WZ 35.37 (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993:134-135):

\[
ud\ \text{rōsnān jud jud +hamēstār i xwēš zanēd čiyōn wahman akōman <ud> ardwahišt indar ud šahrewar sōr <ud> spandarmad nāngbait ud hordād <ud> amurdād tawriz ud zāriz <ud> goşurwan druz i gurg-tōhmag mēnōg i zōr azbōr i az zarmānīh} 
\]

And each of the luminaries will smite his own adversary: Wahman Akōman, Ardwahišt Indar, Šahrewar Sōr, Spandarmad Nānghait, Hordād and Amurdād Tawriz and Zāriz, the Soul of the Cow the Lie of the race of the wolves, the Spirit of the Strength the Lack of strength because of the old age.

It is noteworthy that these Pahlavi texts still do not show a closed list of seven Beneficent Immortals and their evil counterparts. In GrBd 34.27, on the contrary, 9 Beneficent Immortals and the same number of arch-demons appear, while in WZ 35.37 the lists include 8 elements\(^{679}\). The list is even reduced to five

---

\(^{674}\) Regarding the list of arch-demons and the texts where they are mentioned, vid. (Jackson 1895:655 ff.).

\(^{675}\) Pakzad (2005:386) transcribes Andar, but the initial <ʾ-> must be read as i- in this case, according to the Avestan name *in dra-* of this demon.

\(^{676}\) Pakzad (2005:386) transcribes Sawul.

\(^{677}\) Pakzad (2005:386) reads Zariz, but I prefer Zā(y)riz, according to the variants <zʾlyc> (TD2), <zʾlyc> (DH, K20, K20b).

\(^{678}\) Pakzad (2005:386) transcribes xurūdruṣ.

\(^{679}\) cf. Dk 5.7.4 (Amouzgar & Tafazzoli 2000:38-39), where at least 9 demons plus Gannāg Mēnōg are mentioned:

\[
\ldots \ \text{nīkoḥīdag ud zadag dāštān i īdāwān dēw gannāg mēnōg u-š māzan abzārān čiyōn akōman ud indar ud ʾsawr ud nānhaus ud tāriz ud zāriz ud agdaš ud āz ud xešm ud abārig māzan dēw} 
\]
demons in other texts, like in NM 1.10.9 (West 1882 319), (Dhabhar 1912 47), where they are evidently opposed to the Beneficent Immortals:

\[x_0\] cand ka sabišn pas o menog dastwaran õwön ayâbihist ciyöã ëe spitâmân zarduxit guft ësted kü fractom jár ka-s spitâmân amahraspand did hënd ëg-aš mënëd kü hënd indar ud \(\text{\textsuperscript{11}sarw}\) ud \(\text{\textsuperscript{12}nanhais}\) ud \(\text{\textsuperscript{13}târiz}\) \(\text{\textsuperscript{14}<ud>}\) zârîz kë hënd mazantom.

To many, when an opinion regarding the spiritual (world) is obtained afterwards by the priestly authorities, (it transpires) as has been said regarding Spitâmân Zarduxit: “the first time when Spitâmân saw the Beneficent Immortals, then he thought that they were Indar, Sârw, Nanhais, Târiz and Zâriz, which (are) the most gigantic”.

The list of arch-demons was progressively fixed with seven, although traces of an older stage, where it was still open, remained. In this intermediate stage GrBd 1.54 (Pakzad 2005 23-24), (Anklesaria 1956 1.55 in 18-19) is to be placed:

\[\text{gannag mënog pas ãn petyåragomandih az } \text{\textsuperscript{15}kamålishån} \text{ ëdwan nazdist akåman fráx kirvënîd pas } \text{\textsuperscript{16}indar pas } \text{\textsuperscript{17}sável} \text{ pas nanhais pas tarómëd pas } \text{\textsuperscript{18}tawriz ud zariz pas abårigån ëdwan haftom xwad gannag mënog.}\]

Gannâg Mênôg, as contracreation, created Akôman as the first of the chief demons, then Indar, then Sawr, then Nanhais, then Tarômad, then Tawrîz and Zârîz, then the rest of demons. The seventh (was) Gannâg Mênôg itself.

The final stage, when the number of arch-demons became fixed with seven, is reflected in other Pahlavi texts as well as in the New Persian Rivâyats. Thus, in Dk 9.21.4 [M 811.1] the number of seven demons (Phl. \(\text{haʃt dëwân}\)) is mentioned without further explanation, while in SdB 1.5 (Dhabhar 1909 70), (Dhabhar 1932 505) the name of the seven arch-demons is specified:

و أهَرمن گجستان چوَن این سخن به‌شتهٔ درد ع ظُرم برُوی رَسید و هَفته دیو اندّر غیتی بداد اکو١م و اندر و ساو١ل و نانیکه١ت و تاریخ و زابریخ و هَشم و هَر یک

And when the accursed Ahreman heard these words, a great distress befell him and he created seven demons in the material world: Akōman, Andar, Sâwal, Nānikhait, Târix, Zârîx and Hîshm. And every one is opponent and adversary of the Beneficient Immortals.

... (it is necessary) to keep blamed and smitten the demon of demons Gannâg Mênôg and the powerful Mâzan (demons) like Akōman, Indar, Sawr, Nanhais, Târiz, Zârîz, Agdaš, Greed, Wrath and the rest of Mâzan demons.

648 Dhabhar (1912 47) edited <KN>.
649 Dhabhar (1912 47) edited <sʾlw’>.  
650 Dhabhar (1912 47) edited <nʾkyhʾ>.  
651 Dhabhar (1912 47) edited <tʾwylyc’>, which seems a corruption of <tʾylyc’>, which surely represents Phl. \(\text{târiz}\).

According to TD2, DH <kmʾlykʾn’>. Pakzad (2005 23) edits \(\text{kamåmlīgån}\).

Pakzad (2005 24) transcribes \(\text{Sawul}\), but accepts the possible readings Sawar / Sâwal.
Av. indram (10.9b)

Much has been written about the relation of the Avestan Indra with the Vedic Indra\(^{686}\). I will only focus on what can be deduced from the Zoroastrian literature.

In the Avestan texts, Indra is only mentioned in this passage of V 10.9 and in the list of demons of V 19.43. With regards to the Pahlavi texts, since V 19.43 preserves no Pahlavi translation and there is no further explanation about him in that of V 10.9, the oldest note about this demon appears in the PT of Y 48.1a, mentioned above, where Indar is the opponent of Ardwahišt.

In later Pahlavi texts, like in those mentioned above, Indar is just part of a enumeration of evil beings, and no particular feature describes him. Whenever his evilish activity is mentioned, it is in connection with Sawr and Nanhaïs, who prevent believers from wearing the under-shirt and the sacred girdle. Thus, sinners who do not wear the under-shirt and the sacred girdle worship Indar and Sawr, according to Dk 9.9.1 [K43 147.8-10; M 792.18-20] (West 1892 181-182):

\textit{abar pahrēz ī az ēzišn ī gannāg mēnōg rāy anāstawān ī dēn ud ān ī az ēzišn ī indar ud ān <i>sawr</i> rāy an-ēbyāst dād}

About abstaining from non-professing faith in the religion because of the worship of Gannāg Mēnōg and from the custom of being without the sacred girdle because of the worship of Indar and Sawr.

The relation between the sin of being ungirdled and the influence of Indar, Sawr and Nanhaïs is attested in other texts, like GrBd 27.7 (Pakzad 2005 318), (Anklesaria 1956 26.6 in 234-235) and 27.10 (Pakzad 2005 319), (Anklesaria 1956 27.9 in 234-237):

\textit{27.7. *indar dēw kār ēn kū menišn ī dāman az frārōnīh kardan ōwōn afsārēd čīyōn snēxr ī xūb-afsārd ēn ō menišn ī mardōmān abganēd kū šabīg ud kustīg nē abāyēd dāštān}

The function of the demon Indar is this: that he freezes the minds of the creatures from practising righteousness, like much frozen snow. He throws this into the minds of the mortals: “you ought not to wear the under-shirt and the sacred girdle”.

\textit{27.10. čīyōn gōwēd kū kē tis ō ān mardōmān dahēd kē dād ēn kū šabīg ud kustīg nē abāyēd dāštān ēg-ās *indar ud *sawr ud nanhais šnāyēnīd bawēd}

As one says: “He who gives something to those mortals whose law is this, that one ought not to wear the under-shirt and the sacred girdle, then he makes happy Indar, Sawr and Nanhaïs”.

---

\(^{686}\) See the discussion of the problem in Kellens (1994 17-20). On the basis of the proper noun zariasba in the tablets from Persepolis (Mayrhofer 1973 254), whose Vedic cognate is hāryaśva-, epithet “à affectation particulière” of Indra, Swennen (2009 308) has recently stated that an Indoiranian god Indra existed and that poets of a Proto-Avestan language devoted hymns to him. According to Swennen (2009 308), Indra belonged to the old Iranian pantheon, but was “délibrément évacué” from it by the Zoroastrians, who turned him into a demon.

\(^{687}\) The same rare structure 
\textit{az + (...) + rāy} is found in WZ 35.22 az *har mardōm-ē rāy “of each mortal” (Zaehner 1972 218), (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993 132-133), (Panaino 1998 98).

\(^{688}\) Pakzad (2005 318) reads andar.

\(^{689}\) Pakzad (2005 318) reads sawul.
The only Pahlavi text where traces of particular features of the demon Indar could appear is Dk 9.32.3 [M 836.7-13] (Pirart 2007a 63-64, 81):

\textit{passoxi ohrmazd o awēšān kū dujdānāg dwāred ō bun ī ān ār'yanā tom ēdōn aśmā harvist \textit{"kē"} dēw hēd ā-tān az akōman-iz ast tōhmag [ku-tān tōhmag az ānōh kū akōman] ud waran-iz ī abesihēnīdār ūd āz-iz ī an-hambā'īñūs ud indar-iz ī kōšīdār dēw\textit{"mēnōg ī ahlamōi"h ūd frāz frēbēd mardōm stī pad huzīwiñ ūd amarg ruvānih}

The answer of Ohrmazd to them (was): “You, ignorant, rush to the confine of that horrible darkness. All of you who are demons (are) thus, then your origin stems from Akōman [that is, your origin (stems) from there where Akōman (stems)], the destroyer Lust, the insatiable Greed and the fighter Indar too, spiritual demons of heresy, and you deceive the existence of the mortals regarding proper living and immortal spirituality.”

According to West (1892 253), who read Indar, the hypothesis of a warrior god of Indoiranian origin demonised afterwards by Zoroastrianism is confirmed by the epithet Phl. \textit{kōšīdār} “fighter, slayer” of Indra. On the contrary, Pirart (2007a 63-64, 81), who denies this hypothesis, emends Madan’s (1911) \textit{<yndlc>} by \textit{x\textless \textless \textless n’hlc> and interprets it as Anaš / Anārti “malchance / absence de l’envoi des pensées, paroles et gestes bons”. He reads Phl. \textit{anaš-iz ī kōšīdār} \textit{"mēnōg ī ahlamōi"h instead of Phl. indar-iz ī kōšīdār dēw} \textit{"qui, ennemie de Dainā (“la religion mazdéenne”) est la Mānyavī (“la (diablesse) abstraite, l’allégorie”) de l’hérésie” instead of “the fighter Indar too, spiritual demons of heresy”}. Hence he thinks that there is no fighter Indra in Dk 9.32.3, so that this text cannot be used to state that an Indoiranian god Indra was demonised by Zoroastrianism.

I disagree with Pirart’s emendation, which finds no support in the manuscripts’ evidence, and I think that the demon Indra appears here as a fighter, although I must accept that the sole Pahlavi text of Dk 9.32.3 is not enough to support the hypothesis of a demonisation of an Indoiranian god Indra.

In the New Persian Zoroastrian literature, Indar acquired a role in individual eschatology, as we see in SdB 2.13-16 (Dhabhar 1909 71), (Dhabhar 1932 506):

\begin{quote}
\textit{و اندی هو کار آنست که مرمدناریا دل تنگی دهد و غم و انده در دل مرمدنان افتگد و چون مردم گنه ایشان بدور برادر و عقوبت برادران با نمایید مردم گه پیوسته دزم روي باشنند اندی هو کنند و سر چنود پول نخست اندی هو پیش آید و چنود پول بر دروندان اوت تنگ کنند}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{690} I follow Pirart’s (2007 63, 81) emendation.

\textsuperscript{691} I follow Pirart’s (2007 63, 81) emendation as \textit{<MNW> kē}, confirmed by the PT of Y 32.3a, quoted in Dk 9.32.3: \textit{\textit{ēdōn aśmā harvist kē dēw hēd ā-tān az akōman-iz ast tōhmag [ku-tān tōhmag az ānōh kū akōman]} (Dhabhar 1949 148).

\textsuperscript{692} Pirart (2007 63-64, 81) emends it as \textit{x\textless \textless \textless n’pwhl> anāpaž”inexpiable”.

\textsuperscript{693} Pirart (2007 63-64, 81) reads it as \textit{kōšīdār} \textit{"mēnōg ī ahlamōi"h qui, ennemie de Dainā (“la religion mazdéenne”).}
13. And the function of the demon Indar is this, that he gives anguish to the heart of the people and infuses grief and anxiety in the heart of the people.
14. And when people commit a sin, he carries them to hell and inflicts punishment to their souls.
15. When people have a sad aspect, it is the demon Indar who causes it.
16. And the demon Indar comes first at the head of the Pass of Činvad and he straitens the Pass of Činvad for the liars.

Av. saurum (10.9b)

The name of the demon Sauru, generally interpreted as Av. sauruua-, only appears in this passage of V 10.9 and in the list of demons of V 19.43. The interpretation as sauruua- implies two main problems: a) the variants in the manuscripts and the expected morphology of this word; b) its relation with Ved. śarva-.

With regards to the first problem, Geldner (1896) edited saurum in V 10.9, where an Acc. Sing. is expected, and saoru in V 19.43, where it should appear in Nom. Sing. On one hand, provided that we accept Geldner's choice, Av. saoru in V 19.43 should be the Nom. / Acc. Sing. Neut. of Av. saoru- (or rather sauru-) or just an unexpected Instr. Sing. Masc. or Fem. of Av. sauru, in the same way we find in two other –u stems like zantu and *dajbu. Otherwise, as a Nom. Sing. Masc. or Fem., we would expect *sauruš. On the other hand, if sauru were the Nom. / Acc. Sing. Neut. of Av. sauru-, then saurum in V 10.9 could not be its Acc. Sing. Neut., but the Acc. Sing. Masc. or Fem. of either Av. sauru- or Av. sauruua-, as Spiegel (1871-1878 2.128, n.1) already noticed. Although in the second case we would expect *saurum < *sauruuom, the fact that –um and –ūm alternate in the written transmission of the Avesta makes difficult to ascribe saurum to Av. sauru- or Av. sauruua-. In order to try to solve these problems and decide whether this noun is to be interpreted as sauru- or sauruua- and as a Masc./Fem. or a Neut., we must analyse the variants of this word in V 10.9 and 19.43.

In V 10.9 only the oldest PV manuscript L4 (and its copy G34) attest a variant without –m, sauru, which might be interpreted either as the Nom. / Acc. Sing. Neut. of Av. sauru- or as a haplography of sauru<m>. Since the rest of PV as well as VS manuscripts agree in the variant with –m, this latter one is to be preferred from the point of view of textual criticism.

In V 19.43 a Nom. Sing. is expected and the manuscripts’ variants point to an original reading *sauru. While the PV manuscripts do not preserve this passage, the oldest VS ones agree in a variant with –u (R278 suru; L1 saoru; Mf2 šāuru), except B2 and T46, which attest surū, probably a corruption from *suru or *sauru. As far as *sauru seems to be the original reading, it is to be interpreted either as Nom. / Acc. Sing. Neut. or as an unexpected Instr. Sing. Masc. or Fem. in V 19.43.

As we have observed, we must edit saurum in V 10.9, which cannot be the Acc. Sing. Neut. of Av. sauru-. Hence the reading sauru of V 19.43 cannot be interpreted as a Nom. / Acc. Sing. Neut., but as an unexpected Instr. Sing. Masc. / Fem. Let’s see if these readings belong to Av. sauru- or Av. sauruua-.
Regarding the second problem, that of the relation of an Avestan demon Sauruua with the Vedic god Šarvá, it was motivated by the supposed etymological identity between them proposed by Burnouf’s (1833 528-529) and it was continued by all following scholars, with the only exception of Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.175), Spiegel (1871-1878 2.128-129) and Jackson (1895 656), who interpreted it as sauru-. This supposed correspondence was used to support the hypothesis of a demonisation of Indoiranian gods by Zoroastrianism.

Taking this hypothesis for granted, Gray (1929 182) interpreted Av. sauruu- as “Archer, Crusher”, on the basis of the connection of Šarvá with cytenegetics, on one hand, and the supposed etymological relation between Ved. śarvá-, Ved. śáru- “arrow, spear” and Ved. šar- “to break, to crush” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.617-618), on the other hand. According to the same link with cytenegetics and the Vedic Šarvá, Pirart (2007a 43, 119 n.310), who also interprets this Avestan word as sauruu-, has recently broadened to Lat. cervus “deer” the etymological relation between Ved. śarvá- and Av. sauruu-.

Although Šarvá is an epithet of Rudra / Śiva in post-Vedic literature (Böhtlingk & Roth 1855 7.104), (Gray 1929 182), (Christensen 1941 34), (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.621), he is mainly associated to the god Bhavá in Vedic (Pirart 2007a 118). Nevertheless, Šarvá is not only accompanied by Bhavá or Rudra in Vedic literature, but also by many other gods, as Pirart (2007a 117-119) rightly notices. Among them, the mention of Índra together with Šarvá in AVŚ 8.8.18 = AVP 16.30.6 (Whitney & Lanman 1905 2.505 ff.), (Pirart 2007a 112) is noteworthy, as it could support the interpretation of Av. sauru- as sauruu-:

\[\text{índraś cāksamhatam śarávā sénām amūm hatam}\]
And Índra, with both snare and net, Sárva, slay that army.

Although Índra only accompanies Šarvá in this text of the Atharvaveda, it is noteworthy that the former was invoked firstly and the second afterwards. Actually, this order in Vedic fits the Avestan sequence of Índra and Sauruua of V 10.9 and 19.43. But this does not necessarily imply that the Avestan Sauru must be read as Sauruua nor that he was a demonised Indoiranian god Šárva, as many scholars supposed. As a matter of fact, the existence of an Avestan demon homonymous with a Vedic god is difficult to be explained from the Avestan textual evidence and implies a problem in the reconstruction of an Indoiranian religion.

Already Spiegel (1871-1878 2.128-129) noticed that the Avestan Sauru was not related with Šarvá, but rather with a personified śárnu- “arrow, spear” (Böhtlingk & Roth 1855 7.100), (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.618), which is expelled in some Vedic texts. In my opinion, the interpretation of this demon as Sauru, supported by the Avestan manuscripts’ evidence, and its comparison with Ved. śárnu- “arrow, spear” explains better why it appears together with Índra. Actually, Índra’s arrow or spear (Ved. śáru- (Masc. / Fem.)), by which he kills his enemies, is mentioned in several Vedic texts, like for instance RV 1.100.18, 2.12.10, 4.28.3, 6.27.6 and 7.85.2. In other Vedic texts this weapon seems to be personified and is mentioned in curses, like in RV 10.27.6, 10.125.6, 10.182.3, and in apotropaic texts, like in RV 7.71.1, 8.18.11, AVŚ 1.2.3 (where Índra is invoked too), 1.19.2 (in plural, where Índra is invoked as well) and 12.2.47.
The association of Índra with this weapon and its appearance in curses and apotropaic texts finds a worthy parallel in Vídēvdād. Actually, on one hand, Índra is mentioned together with Sauru in V 10.9 and 19.43, and, on the other hand, V 10.9 is an apotropaic formula. That is why, as I suppose, Índra and Sauru are mentioned together in the apotropaic formula of Vídēvdād and in the list of demons of V 19.43. Whether Av. sauru meant “(Índra’s) arrow” or was already a personified evil entity, I cannot be certain, although I think that the second possibility is more likely. However, its personification in Vedic and its appearance in the Vedic curses and apotropaic texts demonstrate that Ved. sāru- was not a god, but something to be feared. This fits its appearance in Vídēvdād as an evil being to be expelled and rules out its interpretation as a demonised Indoiranian god Šárva. Thus, if we accept Av. sauru- instead of sauruua-, the hypothesis of a Zoroastrian reform which demonised some Indoiranian gods cannot be supported by this word, since there is no Avestan Sauruua, but Sauru.

With regards to the Pahlavi literature, Sawr also immediately follows the demon Indar in the lists and is opposed to Šahrewar. Sawr is so closely related to Indar that the Pahlavi texts state that both are worshipped when someone commits the sin of being ungirdled (vid. Dk 9.9.1 and GrBd 27.10).

But Sawr plays another role in other Pahlavi texts. He is the leader of the demons and acts as an oppressive ruler, according to GrBd 27.8 (Pakzad 2005 318-319), (Anklesaria 1956 27.7 in 234-237):

\[ +\text{sw}r \text{dēw} [kū sālār i dēwān] kār ēn kū duš-pādixšāyīh ud stahm ud adādestānih ud mustgarīh \]

The function of the demon Sawr [that is, the leader of the demons] is this: evil rule, oppression, illegality and violence.

As Pirart (2007a 80) has observed, popular etymology (or rather Sasanian exegetes) reinterpreted the name of Sawr according to a wrong connection with Phl. sar “head”. Hence he was considered the “head” or leader (Phl. sālār <srdʾl> < *sar-dār) of the demons and therefore associated with the rulership and the oppression.

This interpretation of Sawr as an oppressor was followed in the New Persian Zoroastrian literature, as we see in SdB 2.22 (Dhabhar 1909 72), (Dhabhar 1932 506-507):

\[ و ساول دیو کار آنست که پادشاهان که ظم لکنند و مصداره دوست دارد شان طراری و دزدی راه داری هر چه بدن ماند ساول دیو راه نماید و در دل مردمان افکند و مردمان گم راه کند تا کار های ناشایست کندن تا بدان سبب هلاک افتد \]

And the function of the demon Sāval is this, that he likes the rulers who practise oppression and fining. He allows pickpocketing and robbery.

---

694 Written either <swl>, <sʾwl> or <sʾlwʾ> in Pahlavi. Although it is commonly transcribed as Sawul, I prefer to read it as Sawr. Nevertheless, taking into account the Pahlavi forms with alef <sʾwʾ> or <sʾlwʾ> and their Pāzand writing sāwār (K20b in GrBd 34.27) and sār (K20, M51 in GrBd 34.27), we must interpret these variants as Phl. sāwār and sā(w)rw respectively. In any case, these later forms were continued in the New Persian name of this demon, namely سول, which is usually read as Sāvul.

695 Pakzad (2005 318) reads sawul.
The demon Sāval gives way to all that is related with it and he infuses it in the heart of the people. And he makes that people take the wrong way, so that they make improper deeds, so that the destructive noose falls upon them
d.

Av. nānyaʰaidiίm (10.9b)
In the Avestan lists of demons Nānyaʰaidiίia is always placed after Sauru in the sequence Indra - Sauru - Nānyaʰaidiίia of V 10.9 and 19.43, the only Avestan passages where this demon appears.

His Vedic etymological cognate nāsatiya-, epithet of the Āsvināu, appears usually in dual and only once in singular: in RV 4.3.6 (Böhtlingk & Roth 1855 4.126), (Spiegel 1871-1878 2.129-130) (Jackson 1895 657-658), (Gray 1929 183), (Thieme 1978 44), Pirart (1995 401-403; 2001 106-107). In the Mahābhārata it is also found in the singular.

As far as the Avestan Nānyaʰaidiίia is attested only in singular, there is a discordance between the Vedic general use in dual and its Avestan cognate in singular. In order to make both fit, Pirart (1995 21-22), on one hand, interprets that Av. nānyaʰaidiίm is a corruption from an old dual *nānyaʰaidiίa > *nānyaʰaidiίde > *nānyaʰaidiί/-i > nānyaʰaidiίm/-im, and, on the other hand, he thinks that the following demons of the list, namely Tauruu and Zairiċī, which according to him also appear in dual, refer to this dual *nānyaʰaidiίde. So they would be the names of the two Indoiranian *nāsatiya- only manifest in Avestan. However, in p. 403 he states that the singular nāsatiya in RV 4.3.6 designates one of the two Āsvināu, while Rudra is the name of the other.

In my opinion, Pirart’s emendation is to be ruled out, because it finds no support from the manuscripts’ evidence. Indeed, all the manuscripts agree in the variants with –m in both V 10.9 and 19.43. Hence it is very unlikely that the same corruption occurred in two passages in different fragard.

Moreover, Pirart’s hypothesis is based on an expected equivalence between the number of formulas to be recited in V 10 and that of demons to be exorcised as a result, which however does not occur. According to Pirart, the formulas to be recited twice expel the Evil Spirit and Nasu, while the three demons Indra, Sauru and Nānyaʰaidiίia are exorcised by the formulas to be recited thrice. Since Tauruu and Zairiċī follow these three demons and therefore would break the sequence, because they are also exorcised by the formulas to be recited thrice, Pirart interprets them as the names of the two Indoiranian *nāsatiya-. Thus, the demons to be exorcised by the formulas to be recited thrice would not be five, but probably three, and the correspondence between the number of formulas and that of demons would be exact. As far as the nāsatiya- are usually two in Vedic, this correspondence would fit, if Tauruu and Zairiċī would be these two nāsatiya-.

This hypothesis is suggestive taking into account the structure of V 10 and its ritual background. However, it must be rejected because of three reasons. Firstly, it is not true that two demons were exorcised by the formulas to be recited

696 That is, the noose of death. Regarding the image of the noose of death in Old Indian as well as Old and Middle Iranian texts, vid. Andrés-Toledo (2009c). Concerning this image in other literatures, see Scheftelowitz (1912) and Eliade (1947-1948).
twice. As a matter of fact, after these formulas, four evil entities are mentioned: the Evil Spirit (Av. aŋrəm. "manīiūm), Nasu (Av. naśūm), the Direct Defilement (Av. hām.raēϑəm) and the Indirect Defilement (Av. paiti.raēϑəm). As far as the first supposed correspondence does not fit, it cannot be justified why the second one should do it.

Secondly, I do not think that Tauruui and Zairicī were written in dual. As a matter of fact, if we compare this list of V 10 with that of V 11.9, we realise that there are other names of demons whose ending is also –ī: būīī and mūīī (V 11.9). Nevertheless, there is no reason to suppose that these demons of V 11.9 were also in dual. Therefore, the interpretation of Tauruui and Zairicī as dual is not the only possible one.

Thirdly, neither in the Avestan nor in the Pahlavi lists of demons Tauruui / Tawriz and Zairicī / Zāriz are assimilated to Nāŋhaiūția / Nanhais. On the contrary, while they are always considered different evil entities, Nanhais is an epithet of Tarōmad in GrBd 34.27.

Finally, I must add that the parallel of Ved. nāṣatya- as a singular in RV 4.3.6, continued in the Mahābhārata, confirms that an unique Indoiranian *nāṣatja- could have existed. I do not believe that this was an Indoiranian god demonised by Zoroastrianism. I think rather that it was simply an epithet applied to divine beings, which probably acquired different meanings in the Indian and the Iranian groups.

As far as concrete features of this demon are concerned, in the Avestan texts no further information about him is given. However, in the Pahlavi literature he is considered the adversary of Spandarmad. As mentioned before, in GrBd 34.27 he is assimilated with Tarōmad, while he is associated with the sin of being ungirdled in GrBd 27.10, together with Indar and Sāwar.

Nevertheless, the demon Nanhais also shows some particular features. Actually, he causes dissatisfaction, according to GrBd 27.9 (Pakzad 2005 319), (Anklesaria 1956 27.8 in 234-237):

\[ \text{nanhais dēw kār ēn kū ahunsandīh ō dāman dahēd} \]

The function of the demon Nanhais is this, that he produces dissatisfaction to the creatures.

In the New Persian Zoroastrian literature more functions are ascribed to this demon, which confirm its assimilation with Tarōmad, as we observe in SdB 2.26-28 (Dhabhar 1909 72-73), (Dhabhar 1932 507):

\[ \text{ناخیکهٔت دیو کار آن باشد که مردمان یککر بکنند و جون رنجی بمرد} \]

\[ \text{ناخیکهٔت اورا نگنارد و بیا شویدند و چیر ازد داردار تا کرفرکها نکن دو در ایزد} \]

\[ \text{تاسیس شود} \]

\[ \text{و جون مردمان اورا پند دهدن او بتر باشد و نصیحت نپریدر} \]

\[ \text{و بی طاعتی پادشاه مادر و پدر و زن در شهو و بنده در خداوند که کند از} \]

\[ \text{ناخیکهٔت دیو باشد} \]

---

697 As Pirart (2007a 80) notices, popular etymology (or Sasanian exegesis) has reinterpreted Phl. nanhais according to Phl. a-hunsandīh “dissatisfaction”.

226
26. The function of the demon Nānikhait is this, that he makes people arrogant and when any lamentation afflicts the mortal, Nānikhait does not leave him. And he makes him confused and deprives him of courage, so that he makes no meritorious deed and is ungrateful to God.

27. And when people give him advice, he turns worse and does not accept the admonition.

28. And the disobedience to the ruler, the mother and the father, of the woman to the husband, of the slave to the master, which he practises, is on account of the demon Nānikhait.

|a| I fight Tauruui, I fight Zairiči, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the defiled man, away from the defiled woman, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away

---

L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5, K2 → paiti.pərẽ. ... stoiš → B2, T46 paiti.pəroni; E4 paiti.pərona

L1, L2, G42; L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (G) tauru; P2 turi (P2a above the line – before –r–); F10 taoruina; E10 . L1 tauruue; B2, T46 taoruina; R278 tauruina; P1 taorūa; E4 taoruina; L5 tauruina; FK1 tauruui; Mf2, K9 tauruui

L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 paiti.pəroni

L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, T44 namānabe; G34, F10, E10 nmaāne; B1, R278, P1 namāna; L5, FK1 namānē

L4, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62 bac+

L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E10 . L5 više

K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 dāhaca

L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L2, E4; P2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G) daijhu; G34, E10 . Mf2, K9 daijhu

P2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9; L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G) → haca. ... stoiš → Mf2 → haca →

P2 → hauauiāša.tanuuō. ... stoiš → L1, B2, P1, L5 . Mf2, K9 hauauaiāse.tanuuō; R278, T46, G42, FK1 hauauiāša.tanuuō; Br1, L2 hauauaiā.se.tanuuō; E4 hauauaiāša.tanuuō

L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 haua

L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); B2, T46 zantuš

L1, B1, L2, G42; B2, P1 zantu.patoiš; R278, L5 . Mf2, K9 zantu.patoiš; T46 zantu.patoiš; E4 zantu.patoiš; FK1 zantu.patoiš

L1, B1, L2, G42; B2, P1 zantu.patoiš; R278, L5 . Mf2, K9 zantu.patoiš; E4 zantu.patoiš; FK1 zantu.patoiš

L1, B1, L2, G42; B2, P1 zantu.patoiš; R278, L5 . Mf2, K9 zantu.patoiš; E4 zantu.patoiš; FK1 zantu.patoiš

L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 haua

L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 višpuš

R278, L5; L1, B2, P1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 ašaonoš; Mf2, K9 ašaonoš

L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; T46 ašaonoš
from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the righteous existence.


[a] bē purdēnam tawriz [dēw] bē purdēnam zāriz [dēw] az mān az wis az zand az deb

[a] I fight [the demon] Tawriz, I fight [the demon] Zāriz, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country.

Av. +taurui (10.10a)

The manuscripts disagree in the name of this demon, which is only attested in V 10.10 and 19.43. As far as V 10.10 is concerned, each group of manuscripts seems to have preserved a different reading: tauru (PV), tauruna (IndVS), taurui (IrVS). Indeed, while the oldest PV manuscripts attest tauru, the oldest IndVS agree in variants with –a (B2, T46 tauruua; R278 tauruuua; with the exception of L1 tauruue) and the IrVS in the variant with –i (Mf2, K9 tauruii). In order to choose one of them, the contrast with V 19.43 is required.

In V 19.43, absent in the PV manuscripts, the oldest IndVS agree in a variant with –i (B2 tauruui; L1, T46 taurui) and the IrVS attest the same variant of V 10.10, namely tauruui. Since final vowels are usually lengthened in the IrVS, the variant tauruii is seemingly the original one in V 19.43. In V 10.10 this agrees with the variants taurui of some IndVS manuscripts (Br1, L2, G42) and tauruui of the IrVS ones, so that those variants with –a are to be interpreted as corruptions of a final –i. Since taurui is seemingly the original variant in V 19.43 and it is also represented in V 10.10, I have chosen it in my edition. On the contrary, de Vaan (2003 261) prefers the variant +tauruii of the IrVS manuscripts, but there is no etymological –i in this Avestan word, if we trust the etymology proposed for Av. tauruii–.

Av. +tauruii was already connected with the Vedic root tiēr- by Darmesteter (1875 33-34). Afterwards it was more precisely related to Ved. tiērvi- “conquerer” by Persson (1912 777), followed by Gray (1929 184), Nyberg (1938 339 ff.), Christensen (1941 34) and Mayrhofer (1992-2001 1.662). This Vedic word

724 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 pwltyynm; E10 pwltyynwm
725 L4, K1, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; D62, P2 twlyk; F10 zʻlyk; (Jmp) tlyc
726 K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34 W BRA; E10 PWN; B1, P10 BRA W
727 K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 pwltyynm; D62 W pwltyynm; E10 pwltyynwm; B1 pwltyynm
728 L4, K1, G34, T44, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62, F10 zʻlyk; P2 zʻlyk; E10 zai̇rci; P10 zʻlyyk
729 L4, G34, T44, E10 a above the line, (Jmp); K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 ʃ SDYA ʃ
730 P2, L4, G34, T44, E10 W; K1, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ʃ MN ʃ
731 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 wʼs
732 P2, L4, G34, E10 W; K1, D62, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ʃ MN ʃ; F10 ʃ MN znd ʃ
733 K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, L4, G34, T44, M3, (Jmp) ʃ MN ʃ; E10 W
734 L4, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; K1 MTyy; D62 MT5; P2 MTA OD; (Jmp) MTA OD gywʼk
is a hapax legomenon only present in RV 9.42.3 (Pirart 2007a 44-45), where it designates one of the Āśvinīa, according to Pirart (1995 22) (2007a 58-59, 149-150).

In the Pahlavi literature the demons Tauruui and Zairīci are usually mentioned together and also belong to the list of the arch-demons. According to Dk 9.9.1 [K43 147.10-11; M 792.20-21] (West 1892 182), they are worshipped when people walk with one boot:

.ud ān ī az ēzišn ī tawriz 736 ud zāriz rāy ēw-mōg dwārišn
And walking with one boot because of the worship of Tawriz and Zāriz.

This idea continued in the New Persian Rivāyat, as it is confirmed by MU 1.95.15-18 = MU 2.468 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 101-102):

و یکه پایی بر هنری رفتین آنها ایمیک دوارشنی گویند اورا گناه چندارپس که تاریخ و
زارخ دیو را یزش کرده ویشته پاشد

And walking bare-footed they call ē-mōk-dwārišn (walking with one boot). Such a sin is as if Tāriix and Zāriix were worshipped.

Av. Goodzāirica (10.10a)

The name of this demon, attested in V 10.10 and 19.43, has usually been read as zairica. Actually, this is the variant common to the oldest PV and IndVS manuscripts in V 10.10, while the IrVS ones attest zārica. In V 19.43, not preserved in the PV manuscripts, the oldest IndVS and the IrVS agree in the variant zairica (L1, B2, T46, Mf2). Therefore, from the point of view of textual criticism, we should edit zairica.

Darmesteter (1880-1887 2.175, n.9) interpreted Av. zairica as zairi-ca, where —ca would be an enclitic. But Spiegel (1871-1878 2.130, n.1), followed by Jackson (1895 657-658), noticed that the existence of the feminine Av. zairici— demonstrates that this —ca is not an enclitic, but belongs to the name. However, he read it as Zairica and did not correct it as Zairici. Furthermore, Jackson (1895 657-658), related Av. zairica with Ved. jařás— “old age”.

Spiegel’s interpretation was developed by Bartholomae (1904 1680), who interpreted Av. zairica as a Nom. Du. of Av. zairik— and compared it with Av. zairiānc— (Masc.) and zairici— (Fem.). However, he related them not to Ved. jařás— “old age”, but to Av. zairi— “yellowish” (cf. Ved. bāri—) + the suffix —anc— (cf. Ved. śvityānc— “whitish”). Gray (1929 184), Christensen (1941 34) and Pirart (2007a 47) followed this etymology and translated zairica as “celui qui est de couleur d’or” and “jaunâtre” respectively. Moreover, Christensen stated that this name referred to a liquor that gives immortality, an interpretation which depends on his view of some Zoroastrian rites in comparison with shamanism, but cannot be supported by the Avestan passages where this demon appears.

Pirart (1995 22, 412) follows partially Bartholomae’s interpretation of Av. zairica as a Nom. / Acc. Du., but adds that *zairiānca would be expected. He

awēsān har sās kamālīgān dēwīn gōwēd abārīg hamkār ud hamayār ī awēsān hēnd
All of them are considered the arch-demons. The rest are their collaborators and assistants.
737 Written <t’wlyc’> in Madan (1911) and in K43 (Dresden 1966).
adopts the variant $^*z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny a}$ of the IrVS manuscripts\textsuperscript{737} and proposes that this dual stems from $^*z\text{\tiny b}h\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny a}$-, thematised and derived by $vr\text{\tiny dd\text{	extperiodcentered i}}$ from $^*z\text{\tiny b}h\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny j\text{	extperiodcentered an}}$- “yellowish”. According to him, $^*z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny a}$ would be a $dv\text{\tiny a}n\text{\tiny d\text{	extperiodcentered v}}$ compound together with $t\text{\tiny a}ru\text{\tiny n\text{	extperiodcentered i}}$.

Unless we accept Pirart’s hypothesis regarding Av. $n\text{\tiny y}h\text{\tiny a}d\text{\tiny i}m$ as a corruption of a dual $^*n\text{\tiny y}h\text{\tiny a}d\text{\tiny i}d$, a hypothesis that I rule out in my commentary to Av. $n\text{\tiny y}h\text{\tiny a}d\text{\tiny i}m$ in V 10.9, there is no need to interpret $t\text{\tiny a}ru\text{\tiny n\text{	extperiodcentered i}}$ and $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny a}$ as $dv\text{\\tiny a}n\text{\\tiny d\text{	extperiodcentered v}}$ compounds in dual.

In my opinion, the misunderstanding of this name is due to a corruption in the written transmission from the Nom. Sing. of Av. $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny i}$- “yellowish” (cf. Av. $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny i}$- “Zairicī, name of a righteous woman” in Yt 13.139 (Bartholomae 1904 1681) and Ved. śvitiś- (Fem.) “whitish”).

Regarding the Pahlavi literature, popular etymology or Sasanian exegesis reinterpreted Av. $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny i}$- according to a supposed relation with Phl. $z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}$ “poison” (Pirart 2007a 80). On one hand, its phonetic is very close to Phl. $z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}$ “poison” and $z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}a\text{\tiny g}$ “bile, gall” (MacKenzie 1971 97). On the other hand, the PT of this demon as $<$z’lyc$>$ or $<$z’lyk$>$ could have been misunderstood by the scribes as $<$zhlyk$>$ $z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}i\text{\centered g}$, so that the confusion with Phl. $z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}$ “poison” and even with Phl. $z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}a\text{\tiny g}$ can also be explained graphically.

According to Dd 36.40 (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 124-125), Zāriz poisons foods:

$$ud \ "z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}z" \ d\text{\tiny e}w \ p\text{\tiny d\text{	extperiodcentered ad}} \ x\text{\tiny w}ar\text{\tiny i\text{	extperiodcentered sn\text{	extperiodcentered a}}} \ z\text{\tiny a}hr\text{\tiny n\text{	extperiodcentered id\text{	extperiodcentered a}}} \ <u\text{\tiny d}> \ m\text{\tiny arg\text{	extperiodcentered i}}h \ w\text{\tiny h\text{	extperiodcentered a\text{	extperiodcentered n\text{	extperiodcentered e\text{	extperiodcentered n\text{	extperiodcentered id}}}}} \ d\text{\tiny a}m\text{\tiny a}n \ g\text{\tiny um\text{	extperiodcentered e\text{	extperiodcentered z\text{	extperiodcentered e\text{	extperiodcentered d}}}}$$

And (he appointed) the demon Zāriz to poison foods (and) to cause death.

The same idea is found in GrBd 27.12 (Pakzad 2005 319), (Anklesaria 1956 27.11 in 236-237): $\text{\tiny c\text{\tiny i\text{	extperiodcentered y\text{	extperiodcentered o\text{	extperiodcentered w\text{	extperiodcentered e\text{	extperiodcentered d}}}}} \ k\text{\tiny n} \ "t\text{\tiny a}w\text{\tiny r\text{	extperiodcentered i\text{	extperiodcentered z}}}" \ i \ t\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny w\text{	extperiodcentered e\text{	extperiodcentered n\text{	extperiodcentered i\text{	extperiodcentered d}}}}} \ ud \ "z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}z \ i \ z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}-k\text{\tiny a}d\text{\tiny d\text{	extperiodcentered a}}$$

As one says: “Tawriz the conquerer and Zāriz the poisoner”.

\textsuperscript{737} Nevertheless, in a recent publication Pirart (2007a 47) prefers the reading with short vowel $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny a}$.

\textsuperscript{738} cf. FrO 192 (Klingenschmitt 1968 69), where Phl. $z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r}a\text{\tiny g}$ is the PT of Av. $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i}c\text{\tiny a}$ “gall”.

\textsuperscript{739} Jaafari-Dehaghi (1998 124) edits $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny z}$, but the manuscripts attest $<t\text{\tiny l\text{	extperiodcentered y\text{	extperiodcentered c\text{	extperiodcentered a}}}>$, which is an adaptation of Av. $z\text{\tiny a}r\text{\tiny i\text{	extperiodcentered c\text{	extperiodcentered i}}}$-.

\textsuperscript{740} Since Tawriz usually appears together with Zariz, the first one is also associated with the use of venom in the previous passage of GrBd 27.11 (Pakzad 2005 319), (Anklesaria 1956 27.10 in 236-237):

$^*t\text{\tiny a}w\text{\tiny r\text{	extperiodcentered i\text{	extperiodcentered z}} \ d\text{\tiny e}w \ a\text{\tiny n} \ k\text{\tiny e} \ z\text{\tiny a}h\text{\tiny r} \ o \ u\text{\tiny r\text{	extperiodcentered w\text{	extperiodcentered a\text{	extperiodcentered r\text{	extperiodcentered a}}}}} \ d\text{\tiny a}m\text{\tiny a}n \ g\text{\tiny um\text{	extperiodcentered e\text{	extperiodcentered z\text{	extperiodcentered e\text{	extperiodcentered d}}}}}$

The demon Tawriz is she who mingles poison into the vegetable creatures. Pakzad (2005 319) reads it as Tariz, but all the manuscripts attest $<t\text{\tiny l\text{	extperiodcentered y\text{	extperiodcentered c\text{	extperiodcentered a}}}>$. In my opinion, this represents a deviation from the reading $<t\text{\tiny w\text{	extperiodcentered l\text{	extperiodcentered y\text{	extperiodcentered c\text{	extperiodcentered a}}}>}$ of the PV manuscripts in V 10.10, which I interpret as Tawriz.

\textsuperscript{741} Pakzad (2005 319) reads it as Tariz, but all the manuscripts attest $<t\text{\tiny l\text{	extperiodcentered y\text{	extperiodcentered c\text{	extperiodcentered a}}}>$ here as well.
The same relation between Zāriz and poison was continued in the New Persian Zoroastrian literature, as we observe in SdB 2.32-33 (Dhabhar 1909 73), (Dhabhar 1932 507):

32. And the function of Tārix and the demon Zārix is this, that they give unpleasantness to those things which have the unpleasantness in them.

33. And in hell they make foul the food for the souls of the liars and they give them foulness and stench and they are their vigilants until they eat the food and they inflict torture to their souls.
10.11. [a] dātar. gādhanām. 742 x astuwaitanām. 743 aśāum. kaiia. 744 aete. 745 vāca. yōi. 746 bonti. gādbhūna. 747 caudrāsmṛta. 748 [b] āat. mraoq. aburō. mazdā. 749 ime. 750 aete. 751 vāca. yōi. 752 bonti. gādbhūna. 753 caudrāsmṛta. 754 [c] ime. 755 vāca. āxtürīm. 756 framraua. 757 |a| Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, which are these words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gādās? [b] And Ahura Mazdā said: “these are the words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gādās, [c] recite these words four times.”

742 Mf2; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . FK1, (G) | gađhanām. astuwaitanām. aśāum |; K2 | gađhanām. astuwaitanām |; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 . K9 | tā | gađhanām. astuwaitanām | aśāum |; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | tā | gađhanām. astuwaitanām. aśāum | |
743 Mf2 astuwaitanām
744 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, L5, FK1, (G); G34 kauua (G34a above the line -ii- instead of -uu-); L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 kiia
745 L4, K1, P5, G34, F10, T44, B1, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2, K2, P10 aētia; E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; Br1 aete
746 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10 . G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); E10, M3 yōi; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2 . Mf2, K9 yōi
747 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34 hantii; F10 honτa; T44 hantii; E4 honτe; L5 hintii
748 K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 . L1, E4, L5 gadā. bhuua; D62 7 gadvbhūna; FK1 gadbhūna
749 L4, D62, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); P2, P5 caudrā. mruuṭa; K2 caudrā. mruuṭa; G34 caudrā. mruuṭa; F10 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 caudrā. mruuṭa; T44 caudrā. mruuṭa; E10 caudrā. mruuṭa; E4 caudrā. mruuṭa; L5, FK1 caudrā. mruuṭa; Mf2 caudrā. mruuṭa; K9 caudrā. mruuṭa
750 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); G34 . L5 mraoq; T44, E10 | mraq. aburō. mazdā |; L1, T46, P1 . Mf2 mraoq; K9 | tā | mraq. aburō |
751 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1 | mazdā |
752 L4, K1, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); D62 7e; K2, G34, T44 . K9 ime
753 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, (G); P5 aite; K2 ite; E10 aiti; L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 aete; B2, L5 aeti; K9 aeti
754 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L2, FK1, (G); P5 . L1, R278, T46, Br1, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 yōi; E10 . L5 yō
755 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line -n- instead of -n-), M3 . L1, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 hantii; B2, P1 yōibhantii; T44 hantii; L5 hintii
756 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4, L5 gadā. bhuua
757 D62, P10 . L1, B2, T46, (G); L4 caudrāsmṛta; P2 caudrāsmṛta; P5, T44 caudrā. mruuṭa; K2 caudrā. mruuṭa; G34 caudrā. mruuṭa; F10 . R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 caudrā. mruuṭa; E10 caudrāsmṛta; B1, M3 caudrāsmṛta; E4 caudrā. mruuṭa; L5 caudrā. mruuṭa; FK1 caudrā. mruuṭa; Mf2 caudrāsmṛta; K9 caudrāsmṛta
758 L4c in the left margin, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); L4 | ime . framraua |; G34, T44 . K9 ime; B2, T46 ime
759 K1, P2, P5, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9; L4c in the left margin, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, (G) framraua; G34 framraua; FK1 framraua

233
|a| dʾtʾl OLE-š’n 761 gwbšn 762 MNW 763 HWE-d 764 PWN gʾšʾn’ cslyšʾmlwt 765 |b| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd AY K ZNE 766 OLE-š’n’ gwbšn 767 MNW HWE-d 768 PWN gʾšʾn’ cslyšʾmlwt 769 |c| ZNE gwbšn 769 4 770 bʾl prʾc YMRWN 771
|a| dādār kadār awēšān gōwīn kē hēnd pad gāhān časrušāmrūd |b| u-š guft ohrmazd kū ēn awēšān gōwīn kē hēnd pad gāhān časrušāmrūd |c| ēn gōwīn čahār bār frāz gōw

[a] Maker, which are these words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gādās? |b| And Ohrmazd said: “these are the words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gādās, |c| recite these words four times.”

cf. N 18.1-2 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 98-99), where an abridged version of V 10.11-12 is quoted together with ritual directions and prescriptions if a text to be recited is omitted. That these texts of Nērangestān are really quotations from V 10 can be deduced by comparison between the Avestan text of N 18.1 and its PT: kaiia. caḥrušāmrūta.

kadār awēšān gōwīn kē hēnd pad gāhān časrušāmrūd

It is evident that the PT of N 18.1 is taken from V 10.11, because it reproduces all the words present in the Avestan text of V 10.11 instead of the two Avestan words of the abridged passage of N 18.1.

vid. (Insler 1975 59): “Wise One, therefore tell me the best words and actions, namely, those allied with good thinking and truth, as the just claim for my praises. By our rule, Lord, Thou shalt truly heal this world in accord with our wish”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.101): “Harmonieux comme un (maître est harmonieusement) digne de choisir par l’existence (rituelle), le modèle des actes de l’existence de la divine Pensée et leur emprise sont attribués au Maître Mazda, dont (cette emprise) fera un père pour les nécessiteux”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Škjarvø 1991 1.115): “Just as (a judgement) is worthy of being chosen by the world, so the judgement, (which) in accordance with truth itself, (is to be passed) on the actions of good thought of the world is, assigned to the Wise One, and the power (is assigned) to (Him), the Ahura, whom (people) appoint as a shepherd to the poor”.771

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L1, R278, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yādā
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 aṭā
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44 aṭmōi
B2, T46 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G) | vahīštā. ... abūm | P2 . R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | vahīštā. ... abūm | 4; P5 | vahīštā. ... abūm | 4 b’l; K2 /ītā | vahīštā. ... abūm | 4 b’l; L1 | vahīštā ... vāsnā |
B2 šiográfānačā; T46 šiográfānačā; Mf2, K9 šiográfānačā
B2; T46 . Mf2, K9 vālāčā
B2, T46 tātū; Mf2, K9 tātī
B2, T46 vōhū; Mf2, K9 vōhi
B2, T46; Mf2, K9 mānaḥbā
Mf2, K9; B2, T46 ašācā
B2, T46 . Mf2, K9 išūndo
B2, T46; Mf2, K9 stūtī
B2, T46; Mf2, K9 xšamākāi
B2, T46; Mf2 fora. abhūra; K9 fora. abhūra
Mf2, K9; B2, T46 frašč
Mf2, K9; L1, B2, T46 haiṭīm
T46; L1 dāhīm; B2 abūm. mazdāt. mōi. vahīštā. 4; Mf2 dāhīm. mazdā. aṭ. mōi. 4 gwptn’; K9 dāhīm. mazdā. aṭ. mōi. 4 b’l
vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.129): “Ô Mazda, dis-moi les hymnes et les actes très bons! Rends donc plantureux, en raison de la divine Pensée et de l’Harmonie, l’apport de vigueur de l’éloge, (rends plantureux) en raison de l’emprise (rituelle) sur vous, ô Maître, l’(acte) cultuel et l’existence par le ... ”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Škjarvø 1991 1.143): “O Wise One, tell me about the best (things), both eulogies and actions, (tell me) about them with good thought, and (tell me) with truth (about) the invigoration (consisting) of praise. Through Your power make real the existence (which is) brilliant in (my) imagination, O Ahura.”
vid. (Wolff 1910 72): “Her komme der liebe Airyaman zur Unterstützung zu den Männern und Frauen des Zaraḫuṣtra, zur Unterstützung des gutes Sinns. Welches Ich den köstlichen Lohn verdient, (dem) erbitte ich den Preis der Gerechtigkeit, den begehrenswerten, welchen Ahura Mazdāh zuteilen wird.”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.195): “Que la tribu vigoureuse aille au secours! / Aux hommes et aux femmes de Zaraḫuṣtra / Pour le secours de la divine Pensée / La conscience qui gagne une récompense de choix / Je demande l’octroi de l’Harmonie / La (…) vigoureuse dont le Maître Mazdā s’est enivré” or “Que la tribu vigoureuse aille au secours! / Aux hommes et aux femmes de Zaraḫuṣtra / Pour le secours de la divine Pensée, je demande à la conscience, qui gagne une récompense de choix, l’octroi de l’Harmonie, (octroi) que le Maître Mazdā pense vigoureuse”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.195): “Let the tribe, provided with invigoration, come to the support of the men and women of Zaraḫuṣtra, to the support of good thought, a religious view which will deserve a desirable prize. I entreat for the invigorating reward of truth which the Wise Ahura has devised”.

794 L4, G34, E10 . L1, L2, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P10 āairiemā; P2 āairie.mā; P5 āiriēmā; K2 āriēmā; T44 . L5 āiriō.mā; B1, M3 āairiemā; B2, P1 āirūmā; R278 āirūmā; T46 ā’ruymā; Br1 āriyāmā
795 E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, E4, L5; L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 īśīō; P2 āšūō; F10 āirie.maiśīō; P1, (G) īśīō; G42 āirūmāiśīō; FK1 āirūmāiśīō; Mf2, K9 īa / īśīō ... aburō |
796 T46, B2, L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 |= rafōrāi. ... mazdā |= P2 . R278, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 |= rafōrāi. ... mazdā |= 4; P2 . G42 |= rafōrāi. ... mazdā |= 4 b’l; K2 |= īa / īśīō |= rafōrāi. ... mazdā |= 4 b’l; L1 rafōrāi
797 T46, B2 jentu
798 B2, T46 narā. biassecā
799 B2, T46 zaraḥuṣṭrahe
800 B2, T46 yā
801 B2 daenumā; T46 daēnā
802 B2 āšūīā; T46 āšūīā
803 B2, T46 yā.sā
804 T46; B2 ygm
805 T46; B2 īśūm
806 B2, T46 . Mf2, K9; L1 masa.tgm
807 L1, T46; B2 mazdā, āriūmā. īśūm. rafōrāi. 4; Mf2 mazdā. 4 gwptn’; K9 mazdā. 4 b’l gwptn’

829 D62, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); L4 cađrušāmrūta; P2 cađrušāmrūta; P5 cađrušāmrūta; K2 cađrušāmrūta; G34 cađrušāmrūta; F10 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 cađrušāmrūta; T44 cađrušāmrūta; E10 cađrušāmrūta; L5 cađrušāmrūta; Mf2, K9 cađrušāmrūta

810 D62, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 imei; L1 ime; L5 ime; Mf2, K9 ime

811 L4 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –a– after –r–), M3, (G) framrua; G34 . L5 framrua; FK1 framrua

812 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, L2, G42, FK1; P5, E10 vāraḍayn; K2 vāraḍayña; B2, T46, P1 vāraḍaynī; Br1 vāraḍaynī; E4 vāraḍaynī; L5 vāraḍiganīś; Mf2, K9, (G) vāraḍayn

813 K1, D62, K2, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, L4, P2, (G) baśezia; P5 baśezia; G34 baśezia; F10, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 baśezia; E4 baśezia

814 Mf2, K9; K4, K2 aēšmom; K1 aēšmom; D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3, (G) aēšmom; T44 . L5 aēšmom; E10 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aēšmom; T46 aēšmom; P1 aēšmom; FK1 aēšmom

815 L1, L2, G42; L4, D62, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3 xruui.draooi; P2 xruuiddruksi; P5 xruuiddridri; K2 xruuiddridri; F10 . B2, P1, E4 xruuiddrūm; T44 xruuiddrūm; R278 + xruuiddrūm; T46 xruuiddrūm; Br1 xruuiddrūm; L5 xaurī.darūm; FK1 xruuiddrūm; Mf2, K9, Kxruuiddridri; (G) xruuiddrūm

816 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); E4 paiti,parone; K9 paiti,parone

817 Mf2, K9; L4, F10 ayataśam; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3, (G) akataśam; P5, K2 ayataśam; G34 ayataśam; T44 ayatam.tasom; E10 ayatam.tasom; L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 ayataśam; P1 ayataśam; E4 ayataśam; L5 ayataśam

818 L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, (G); K1, D62, P2, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –a– before –m–), M3 daem; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 daem; Mf2, K9 daēum

819 L4, K1, D62, G34, P10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2, G42 . K9, (G); P2, T44 namāne; P5, K2, E10 namāne; F10 . L5, FK1 namāne; B1 . R278, E4 namāne; Br1 namāne; Mf2, K9 namāne

820 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 vīś; T44, E10 . L5, FK1 vīśe; L2 vīśa. haca

821 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34 dairbu

822 L4, K1, D62, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L2, E4; P2 dairbho; P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, L5, FK1, (G) dairbhu; G34 zantu; Mf2, K9 dairbu

823 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . (G) haca... stoī; L2 haca... haca

824 P5 hauuiaśe.tanuuō; K2 hauuiaśe.tanuuō; L1, T46, L5 hauuiaśe.tanuuō; B2, P1 hauuiaśe.tanuuō; R278, G42, FK1 hauuiaśe.tanuuō; Br1 hauuiaśe.tanuuō; L2 hauuiaśe.tanuuō; E4 . Mf2, K9 hauuiaśe.tanuuō

825 P5, K2 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1; L5 paiti,iristō; Mf2, K9 paiti,iristō

826 K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, P5 above the line nārũka; E4, L5 nāirīki; K9 nārka

827 G42, FK1; P5 above the line, K2 paiti,iristō; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4 paiti,iristō; L5 paiti,iristō; Mf2, K9 paiti,iristō

828 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; P5, K2 nmāne; E4 nmānā; L5, FK1 nmānā

829 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; P5, K9 nmāne; paiti,iristō; K2 nmānō,ptoiś; E4, L5 nmānō,ptoiś; FK1 nmānō,ptoiś
“And after these words to be said four times, recite these words, victorious, healing:” [b] I fight the Wrath of the bloodstained stick, I fight the demon Akatasha, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the defiled man, away from the defiled woman, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the rightous existence.

[a] ZK y AHL MN CSLWS MLWT gwbšn' ZNE gwbšn' pr' YMRWN PWLTYNM byš'zynyt' [b] BRA PWLTYNM HYŠN Y HWLWDWS BRA PWLTYNM KTS ŠDYA MN m'n' MN wys MN znd MN MTA

[a] an i pas az časrušámrūd gōwiš ēn gōwiš frāz gōw pērōzgar bešāzēnidār [b] bē purdēnam xešī i xuudruš bē purdēnam agdaš dēw az mān az wis az zand az deh

[a] “After the words to be said four times, recite these words, victorious, healing:”
[b] I fight the Wrath of the bloodstained stick, I fight the demon Agdaš, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country.
Av. \textsuperscript{+}xruui.dṛum (10.13b)

I agree with de Vaan’s (2003 260) emendation \textsuperscript{+}xruui.dṛum, because Geldner’s (1896) xruuin.dṛum is due to the influence of the ending \textasciimacron{-m} on the second element of compound.

Regarding its formation, the first element \textit{xruui\textsuperscript{o}} belongs to a Caland’s system. cf. Av. \textit{xrua\textsuperscript{-} “raw, bloody”}, Ved. krū̄ra\textsuperscript{-} “raw” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.414-415); Av. xru- “raw flesh”. As a Caland’s system, we expect a final short vowel \textit{xruui\textsuperscript{o}}. However, all the manuscripts agree in the reading with long vowel \textit{xruui\textsuperscript{o}}. Accordingly, I have edited \textit{xruui\textsuperscript{o}}.

The second element \textit{dru-} of this compound can stem either from Av. dāuru- “wood” or from Av. draŭ- “to run”, according to Hintze (1994 245). She (1994 247) agrees with Hoffmann (1976 419) and states that it is possible that an \textit{āni} verbal root Av. \textit{dru-} existed together with another \textit{set} verbal root Av. \textit{dṛ-} “to run”. From the latter Av. \textit{dṛ-}, the root-noun Av. \textit{dṛu-} “running” would derive. Accordingly, she interprets Av. \textit{xruui.dṛu-} and translates it as “der einen grausamen Lauf hat”.

On the contrary, de Vaan (2003 260) observes that the analysis of this second element of compound as a root noun \textit{dru(H)-} “to run” is contradicted by the infixion of \textit{dru-}. Actually, while the root noun Av. \textit{hū̄- “pig”} attests a Gen. Sing. \textit{huūō} in the PT of V 7.52Q (Cantera under preparation A 7.52), Av. \textit{dru-} attests a Gen. Sing. \textit{druáš}, that is, it is not inflected as a root noun.

Therefore, I agree with de Vaan’s (2003 260) interpretation as “having a bloody wooden weapon”, which I prefer to translate as “of the bloodstained stick”.

Av. \textsuperscript{+}akaṭaśəm (10.13b)

There are two main problems in this compound. On one hand, its first member puts a textual problem. The reading \textit{aγa\textsuperscript{o}} is attested in the PV of the group of L4 and in the IndVS manuscripts, while the variant \textit{aka\textsuperscript{o}} is found in those PV manuscripts of the group of K1 and in the IrVS manuscripts. They can be traced back to IIr. \textit{*ag\textsuperscript{h}a\textsuperscript{o} “evil”} or \textit{*aka\textsuperscript{o} “evil”} respectively, meaning the same. Since both can be supported by the manuscripts’ evidence, my choice is not the only possible one. Moreover, in the only parallel of this passage, namely V 19.43, only the IrVS attest \textit{aka\textsuperscript{o}}, while all the rest agree in the reading \textit{aγa\textsuperscript{o}}. However, although \textit{aγa\textsuperscript{o}} is attested in the oldest manuscript, the PV L4, I agree with Geldner (1896), Kellens (1974 177-178) and Pirart (1995 413-414) in preferring \textit{aka\textsuperscript{o}}.

On the other hand, it cannot be stated whether the second member of this compound, namely \textit{taśəm}, belongs to an athematic stem \textit{taś-} or to a thematic one \textit{taśa-}. The only passages where this compound is found, namely V 10.13 and V 19.43, attest the Acc. Sing. \textit{akataśəm}, which can be interpreted either as an athematic or a thematic substantive. The only parallel of \textit{taś(a)-} as a second element of compound is Av. \textit{vīspataś(a)-} in Yt 1.14, but its variants in the manuscripts do not help to solve the problem, as Kellens (1974 178-179) observed. However, Pirart (2007b 97) prefers to interpret it as Av. \textsuperscript{+}vīspa.taśa- and doubts if \textit{taś-} produced a root-noun. In any case, it seems clear that this second element of compound stems from IIr. \textit{*taś-} “to fell, to cut” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.612).
According to this etymology and for the use of this verb applied to the composition of hymns, Pirart (1995 413) translates it by “qui façonne de funestes (hymnes)” and “fabricant de mauvaises (paroles rituelles)” in (2007b 97, n.422). Although this interpretation is possible, I agree with Kellens’ translation as “qui crée le mal” and I translate Av. akatašm by “who creates evil (things)”.

Concerning the main features of this demon, in the list of Dk 5.7.4 he is only mentioned without any further explanation, but in other Pahlavi texts he is associated with repudiation (Phl. nakkīrā) of that which is righteous, as we observe in Dk 9.9.1 [K43 147.12; M 792.21-22] (West 1892 182):

\[ ud ān <i> az ēzišn ʾagdašr ī rāy duš nakkīrā-gar \]

And repudiating harmfuly because of the worship of Agdaš.

This is also the case in GrBd 27.25-26 (Pakzad 2005 322-323), (Anklesaria 1956 27.24-25 in 238-239):

25. ʾagdašr ī dēw druz ī nakkīrāyih kē dāmān az tis ī frārōn nakkīrā kunēd

The demon Agdaš is the Lie of repudiation, which makes the creatures repudiate righteous things.

26. čryōn gōwēd kū kē tis ī ān dāhēd kē mardōm az tis ī frārōn nakkīrā dārēd ēg-iš ʾagdaš ī dēw šnāyēnid bawēd kē tis ī ān tan dāhēd kē dād īn kū dastwar nē abāyēd dāštān ēg-iš xēšm ī dēw šnāyēnid bawēd kē tis ī ān tan dāhēd kē dād īn kē gōwēd kū mārjan nē abāyēd dāštān ēg-iš ahreman abāg hāmist dēwān šnāyēnid bawēd

As one says: “Whoever gives something to that mortal who repudiates righteous things, then he has praised the demon Agdaš; whoever gives something to that person whose law is such that one must not have any religious authority, then he has praised the demon Wrath; whoever gives something to that person whose law is such that he says that one must not have any killer of snakes, then he has praised Ahreman together with all the demons.”

---

\(^{857}\) Written ʾktʾš in Madan (1911) and K43 (Dresden 1966).

\(^{858}\) Pakzad (2005 322) reads Akataš.

\begin{enumerate}
\item L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. \textit{Mf2}, K9, (G); E4 paiti.parıne; FK1 \textit{paiti.parne}. \ldots stiöš \ldots
\item L4, K1, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G) varænia; D62 varænia; P2 \textit{vâra}naïa; T44 varæniâs; B2, T46, P1 varæniâ; L5 varæniâ; \textit{Mf2} varænia; K9 varænia
\item L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. \textit{Mf2}, K9, (G); E10. R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 daënuï; L1, B2, P1 daëniô
\item L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 \textit{above} the line, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, L5. \textit{Mf2}, K9, (G); K1 \textit{paiti.parne}. vâto. daënu; \textit{paiti.parne}; E4 paiti.parıne
\item D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10 \textit{above} the line \textit{(P10a \textit{above} the word -um)}, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. \textit{Mf2}, K9, (G); \textit{D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, P10 nmâne; P2 nmâne; B1. R278, P1 nmâne; L5 nmâne}
\item L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. \textit{Mf2}, K9, (G); T44, E10. L5 vîse
\item L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. K9, (G); \textit{Mf2} haca. zântu; haca
\item L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5. \textit{Mf2}, K9, (G); P5 zântô; L2 zântu
\item L4, D62, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. E4; P2, P5. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. \textit{G} dâjhu; G34, E10. \textit{Mf2}, K9 dâjhu; T46 dâjhu
\item P5, K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5. \textit{Mf2}, K9; \textit{L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G) haca. \ldots stiöš} \ldots
\item P5, K2. häniaša.tanïno; L1, R278, T46, G42 häniaša.se.tanïno; B2, Br1, L2 häniaša.se.tanïno; P1. K9 häniaša.se.tanïno; E4 häniaša.se.tanïno; L5 häniaša.se.tanïno; \textit{Mf2} häniaša.tanïno
\item P5, K2. L1, R278, P1, L2, G42, L5. \textit{Mf2}, K9; B2, E4 hacañi; T46 nñ
\item P5, K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4; L5 paiti.\textit{risto}; \textit{Mf2}, K9 paiti.\textit{risto}
\item P5, K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. \textit{Mf2}, K9; E4, L5 nãrike
\item Br1, G42, P5 paiti.\textit{risto}; K2 paiti.\textit{risto}; L1, R278, L2 paiti.\textit{riste}; B2, T46, P1 paiti.\textit{ristabe}; E4 paiti.\textit{arsta}; L5 paiti.\textit{risti}; \textit{Mf2} paiti.\textit{risti}; K9 paiti.\textit{riste}
\item L1, B2, T46, L2, G42. \textit{Mf2}, K9; P5, K2 \textit{nmâne}; R278, P1, E4 \textit{nmânahe}; Br1 \textit{nmâne}; L5 \textit{nmâne}
\item L1, Br1, L2, G42. \textit{Mf2}, K9; P5 \textit{nmâno.patoïs}; K2 \textit{nmâno.patoïs}; B2, T46, P1 \textit{nmâno.patoïs}; R278, E4, L5 \textit{nmâno.patoïs}
\item K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. \textit{Mf2}, K9; P5 viša
\item P5. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. \textit{Mf2}, K9; K2. L5 višpatoïs; E4 viš.patoïs
\end{enumerate}
Av. $^\chi$var$niiu$a (10.14a)

There are two problems regarding this substantive. Firstly, the Nom. Pl. $^\chi$var$niiu$a disagrees with the Nom. Sing. da$\tilde{e}$nu$\tilde{u}$o. Secondly, its meaning and etymology are unclear.

As far as the first problem is concerned, Av. $^\chi$var$niiu$a appears as a plural in the parallels of Y 27.1, Yt 5.22, 10.97 and 13.137, where it designates a class of evil beings. Hence we expect, on one hand, the Acc. Pl. $^\chi$var$niiu$ag instead of the Nom. Pl. and, on the other hand, the Acc. Pl. da$\tilde{e}$nu$\tilde{u}$q (Pirart 1992 106) instead of the Nom. Sing. da$\tilde{e}$nu$\tilde{u}$o.

Concerning the etymology and meaning of Av. $^\chi$var$niiu$a, Spiegel (1852-1863 1.177) translated it as “Daeva des Regens”, surely because of a confusion...

---

[baca. zantōu$\~s$. 480 zantupatoi$\~s$. 481 baca. da$\tilde{\eta}$hōu$\~s$. 482 da$\tilde{\eta}$hupatoi$\~s$. 483 baca. vi$\tilde{\eta}$pa$\tilde{t}$i$\tilde{a}$. a$\tilde{\eta}$a$\tilde{\eta}$no$\tilde{\eta}$. sto$\tilde{\eta}$.]

[a] I fight the Vara$n$ii$a demons, I fight the demon V$\tilde{a}$ta, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the own body, away from the defiled man, away from the defiled woman, away from the master of the house, away from the headman of the clan, away from the headman of the tribe, away from lord of the country, away from all the righteous existence.

[a] BRA pwltnym wlnyk 57 ŠDYA 488 BRA pwltnym w’tyk 59 ŠDYA [w’tyl] 590 MN m$n^\prime$ w$\tilde{\text{MN}}$ 595 w$\tilde{\text{ys}}$ 590 MN 595 znd MN 595 MTA 595

[a] bē purdēnam waranīg dēw bē purdēnam wādīg dēw [wādīgar] az mān $^\chi$az wis az zand az deh

[a] I fight the demon of Lust, I fight the demon of the Wind [who causes Wind (to blow)], away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country.
between the PT waranīg and Phl. wārānīg “rainy”. cf. Av. vār- “rain” (Bartholomae 1904 1410).

Westergaard (1853 83) said that this word stem from Av. van-, attested in V 1.17⁴⁹ and Yt 5.33, which he interpreted as the extreme western limits of the sky where the boundary between heaven and earth is found and the sun conceals itself. That is why Av. xvarṇiia- would refer to evil beings, according to Westergaard. I must add that his interpretation was based on the wrong etymological connection between Av. var-, Ved. váruna- and Gr. oúranos.

De Harlez (1881 cxxx) denied Westergaard’s interpretation and agreed with the native interpretation of Av. xvarṇiia, according to which it stems from Av. var- “to choose, to desire” (Bartholomae 1904 1360-1361). Nevertheless, he translated it as “déva de l’égarement” in V 10.14 (1.122), but also admitted the translation “déva de la luxure” and even Spiegel’s (1852-1863 1.177) “déva de la pluie”.

Bartholomae (1904 1373) continued the idea that Av. xvarṇiia- stems from Av. varna- of V 1.17 and Yt 5.33, but interpreted it as a toponim. Thus, Av. xvarṇiia would be the name of the Varṇiia demons, that is, the demons from Varṇa.

As we observe, Av. xvarṇiia can be explained at least by means of two possible etymologies: the root Av. var- “to choose, to desire” and the toponim Av. varna-. Although I cannot discard these interpretations, I must point to a further possibility: its connection with Ved. vāraṇa- “Crataeva roxburghii, name of a magic tree”, whose etymology is not clear (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.513-514).

On one hand, we have seen that in Av. xvarṇiia is mentioned together with the demon +vātō “(evil) Wind”. It is noteworthy that the Vedic word possibly connected with Av. xvarṇiia also appears together with Ved. vāta- “wind” in an interesting parallel in the Atharvaveda: AVŚ 10.3.13 = AVP 16.64.3 (Whitney & Lanman 1905 574), (Petr & Vavroušek 1996):

yātha vātā vánapśātūṁ vṛksāṁ bhanākyā ṣāsā
evā sapātmāṁ me bhāṅgdhi pūrvāṁ jātāṁ utāparāṁ vārṇās tvābhī rakhāt
As the Wind breaks the trees, lords of wood, with force,
so break my rivals, those born before and after; let the vāraṇā- protect you.

The main difference between both texts is that Av. xvarṇiia is not a singular and designates a collective of evil beings.

On the other hand, Av. xvarṇiia is accompanied by IIr. xdaitya-. Surprisingly, the same word is placed after Ved. varanā-, for instance, in AVŚ 10.3.11 = AVP 16.64.1-2 (Whitney & Lanman 1905 573), (Petr & Vavroušek 1996):

ayāṁ me vāraṇā úrasi rājā devō vánapśātāb
sā me śātryāṁ vā bādathāṁ indro dáṣyāṁ ivāṣuṁ
This vāraṇā- in my breast, the divine lord of wood, oh King, let it drive away my enemies, like Indra the Dāsyus, the Ásuras.

⁴⁹ Regarding the possible location of this land, vid. (Cantera under preparation A 1.17).
Although Ved. *devó* is referred properly to *vánaspátiḥ* (Nom. Sing.) “divine lord of woods” it is clear that *devó vánaspátiḥ* (Nom. Sing.) “divine lord of woods” is used as an epithet of Ved. *varaná* (Nom. Sing. in samhdi). Therefore, AVŚ 10.3 offers a good parallel to V 10.14 and can point to an Indoiranian connection. Actually, in both texts OInd. *yərana-/* OIr. *yəraniya-/* Hr. *yaHata-*, on one hand, and OInd. *yərana-/* OIr. *yəraniya-/* Hr. *datta-*, on the other hand, are mentioned together. Because of this, we can suppose that Av. *yəraniya* are the demons related to the *yərana-* (tree), whose magic properties were invoked in the Atharvaveda. The association of this tree with magic could have meant that it gave its name to a type of demons in Zoroastrianism.

This old connection between Wind and *yərana-* was continued in the Pahlavi literature: in Dd 36.31 (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 122-123), (Pirart 2007a 121-123), where a completely different list of demons is found, Way and Waran are also mentioned together.

In the PT of Av. *yəraniya* in V 10.14a, Phl. *waranīg*, we see the plurality of Varəniia demons merged into one single demon called Waran, the personification of Lust, and this remains so in the Pahlavi literature. Its importance was already manifested in the Dēnkard, where it was considered the adversary of Spandarmad, as we see in Dk 8.9.3 [M 685.12-15] (West 1892 21):

```
ud an i wahman ud spandarmad ud sroś ud abrīšwang <ud> was yazdān ud an i akōman ud waran ud xešm <ud> anahl ud was dēwān
```

And that of Wahman, Spandarmad, Sroś, Ahrišwang and many (other) divinities and that of Akōman, Lust, Wrath, Unrighteousness and many (other) demons.

Apart from Dk 9.32.3, where Waran is called the destroyer (*waran-iz i abesibēnīdār* “the destroyer Lust”), in Great Bundahišn we find specific features of this demon, as we observe in GrBd 1.47 (Pakzad 2005 20), (Anklesaria 1956 1.48 in 14-15):

```
u-š az stī i xwad-dōšagīh waran i wad i nēst-kirb frāz kirrēnīd čīyōn waran abāyist
```

And from the essence of selfishness he miscreated the evil Lust without body, since Lust was necessary.

--


898 cf. Dd 36.42 (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 126-127), where Waran is accompanied by the epithet *xwad-dōšag* “selfish”. Also in Dk 6.1b (Shaked 1979 2-3), partially quoted in Dd 94.2 (West 1882 270), Lust is assimilated to Selfishness (Phl. *xwad-dōšagīh*), while Wisdom (Phl. *xrād*) is equated to Religion (Phl. *dēn*). Regarding this latter passage, as Shaked (1979 229) notices, the ambiguity of the Pahlavi script makes that Phl. *xrād* “wisdom” could be read as Phl. *ard* “Ard” (=Ahrišwang). Nevertheless, Shaked prefers to edit Phl. *xrād* and I agree with his interpretation. Concerning Phl. *xwad-dōšagīh* as “Eigenwilligkeit”, referred to the opposition against the authority of the religion, and the association of Waran with *xwad-dōšagīh*, vid. (Cantera 2003 22 ff.).

899 The fact that Lust has no body (Phl. *nēst-kirb*), or simply its mention together with Av. *vāta-* “Wind” in V 10.14, could explain why Lust appears together with Way, the personification of the evil wind, in the list of Dd 36.31 (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 122-123).
The association of Lust with selfishness gives as a result its connection with sexual practices condemned by Zoroastrianism, as it is corroborated by GrBd 27.29 (Pakzad 2005 323), (Anklesaria 1956 27.30 in 238-239):

waran dēw ān kē abārōn marzišnīh kūnēd čiyōn gōwend waran ī a-rāb

The demon Lust is that which practises sinful fornication. As one says: “Lust the stray one”.

Av. \( ^{+}vātō \) (10.14a)

There is a textual problem in the choice of this reading. On one side, the oldest PV manuscript, namely L4, attests \( vātum \), which in its turn seems to be on the basis of the variant \( vātīm \) in the IrVS manuscripts. On the other side, the group of K1 and the IndVS manuscripts agree in the variant \( vātō \).

Pirart (1995 414) notices that these two variants are problematic, but he does not find a solution. He believes that the reading \( vātīm \) implies to correct it as \( ^{+}vātīm \). This emendation is followed by de Vaan (2003 548) “without hesitation”. However, no epenthetic vowel is attested in the manuscripts. Conversely, as he also notices, if we choose \( vātum \), an infection of –ā- + -Cu- > -ō- + -Cu- would be expected.

Since the variant in L4 and that of the IrVS add phonetic problems to our choice, I would prefer that of K1 and the IndVS manuscripts, namely \( vātō \), according to which the name of the demon mentioned here is not Vātiia (Bartholomae 1904 1410), (Gray 1929 216), (Christensen 1941 33, 35), but Vāta.

Regarding the function of this demon, apart from this text, it appears only in two passages of the Anthology of Zādspram, namely WZ 8.1-2 (Molé 1963 288), (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993 62-63):

1. ka-š nazd būd ō zāyišn abreman tab dēw ud dard dēw ud \( ^{+}wād \) dēw har ēk abāg sad ud panjāb dēw bē ō ozadan ī zardušt frēstād hēnd

When it became near to his birth, Ahreman sent the demon Fever, the demon Pain and the demon Wād, each one with one hundred and fifty demons in order to kill Zardušt.

2. u-š \( ^{+}mēnōghā frāz ō mādar śud hēnd ud az tab ud dard ud wād awištābīhist

And spiritually they came inside his mother and she was afflicted by Fever, Pain and Wād.

In this passage the function of the demon Wād is to contribute to provoke abortion. This idea seems to be confirmed by WZ 31.2 (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993 112-113), where it is said that Wād fights against the foetus before the birth:

\( sē rōz pas az marg ka ruwān andar bīm handāzag sē rōz ī pēš zāyišn ka wād andar tan kōxūdār \)

Three days after death, when the soul is frightened, it is like the three days before birth, when Wād is fighting inside the body.

\(^{902}\) vid. Dd 36.63 (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 134-135), where the same syntagm Phl. waran ī a-rāb is found and Dk 5.7 (Pirart 2007a 133-134), where we find the equivalent Phl. abē-rāb waran. In Dk 6.274 (Shaked 1979 106-109) lust and bodily desire (Phl. waran ud tan-kāmagīh) are mentioned together, while in Dk 6.C39 (Shaked 1979 158-159) the adjective Phl. waranīg “lusty, greedy” is referred to sexual desire which drives to fornication with prostitutes (Phl. fēh-marzīh).
10.15. [a] ime. aete. vaca. yōi. hōnti. gādāhuṇa. biśāmrūta. ime. aete. vaca. yōi. hōnti. gādāhuṇa. drīśāmrūta. ime. aete. vaca. yōi. hōnti. gādāhuṇa. cadrūśāmrūta. [a] “These are the words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gādās, these are the words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gādās, these are the words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gādās.”

901 D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, T44 imē
902 L4c above the line, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 ~ aete ~; P2 aete; E10 aeti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete
903 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Br1, FK1, (G); P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, yōi; E10 yō
904 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, T44 hantu; E10 hantu; B5 hantu. L5 hantu
905 L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9, (G); P2, P5, B1 . L5 . Mf2 gādā. huṇa
906 K1, D62, P5, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); L4 biśāmrūta; P2 biśā. mruuta; K2, F10 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 biśā. mruita; G34 biśā. maruita; T44 biśā. mruita; E10 biśāmrūti; R278 baē. mruita; E4 baśi. maruita; L5 biśā. maruita; Mf2, K9 biśāmrūta
907 K1, D62, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, T44 imei; P2 ~ ime. aete. vaca ~; P2a above the line aete; E4 imae; FK1 aite; D62 aeti; P5 imeite; K2 ite; G34 vaca; T44 aeti; P10 ite
908 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; D62 aei; P2a above the line aete; P5 imeite; K2 ite; G34 vaca; T44 aeti; P10 ite
909 L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); E10 yōi; L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; D62 aei; P2a above the line aete; P5 imeite; K2 ite; G34 vaca; T44 aeti; P10 ite
910 L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); E10 yōi; L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; D62 aei; P2a above the line aete; P5 imeite; K2 ite; G34 vaca; T44 aeti; P10 ite
911 L4, D62, K2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; D62 aei; P2a above the line aete; P5 imeite; K2 ite; G34 vaca; T44 aeti; P10 ite
912 L4, D62, K2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; D62 aei; P2a above the line aete; P5 imeite; K2 ite; G34 vaca; T44 aeti; P10 ite
913 L4, D62, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 imē; FK1 aime
914 K2, P10, M3 . L1, (G); L4, D62 drīśāmrūta; P2 drīś. mruuta; P5, F10, B1 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 drīśā. mruita; G34 drīśāmaruita; T44 drīśā. mruita; E10 drīśāmrūti; E4 drīśā. maruita; L5 drīśā. maruita; Mf2, K9 drīśāmrūta
915 K1, D62, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 imē; FK1 aime
916 K1, L4, P2, G34, B1, M3 . Mf2, (G); D62, K2, P10 (P10a above the line ~- before ~-) | uī; P5 aete; F10, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; T44 aei; K9 aeti
917 K1, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); L4, E10 yōi; D62, G34 | yōi. hōnti |; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yōi
918 D62, P2, P5, K2, E10, B1, P10, M3, L4a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 hantu; T44 hantu; E4 yōhantu; L5 hantu; FK1 hantu
919 D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, B1, L5, FK1 gādāhuṇa; P10 ~ gādāhuṇa ~; L4a gādāhuṇa
920 D62, B1, M3 . L1, (G); L4 cadrūśāmrūta; P2 cadrūśa. mruuta; P5, T44 cadrūśa. mruuta; K2 cadrūśa. mruita; G34 cadrūśa. maruita; F10 cadrūśa. mruita; E10 cadrūśāmrūta; P10 cadrūśāmrūta; B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 cadrūśa. mruuta; E4 cadrūśa. mruita; L5 cadrūśa. maruita; Mf2, K9 cadrūśāmrūta
These are the words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gāϑās, these are the words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gāϑās, these are the words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gāϑās.”

936 K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, T44 ime; L4a MNW MN
937 P5, G34, F10, B1, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; K2 itē; T44 aēta; E10 aeti; P10 iti (P10a above the line –e- before –e- and –e instead –i-); L4a OLE-šn
938 D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4a 939
939 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, L5, (G); P2 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 hōnta; T44 honti; E10 yōhtati; L5 hinti; FK1 Yoshōnta
940 L4 (L4a –be), K1, D62, P5, K2, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, E10 aetra; G34 azyrahabe; F10 azyrabe; T46 azyrahabe K1, K2, B1, P10 maiūšūs. D62, P5, F10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9, (G) maiūšūs. P2 maiūšūm; G34 maiūšiūs; T44 maiūšūs; E10 maiūšiūs; L4a miniūšiūnt; L5 azyrahaimaiūšūs. Mf2 maiūšūs K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E10 maiūšu; L5 sadaimūn
941 K1, D62, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9, (G); L4 (L4a at–) aime; K2, G34, T44 ime; R278 imia; FK1 aete; Mf2 ime. ime L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 aiti; K2 aētē; T44 aētē; E10 aeti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); E10, L4a yō; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 yōi K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 hōnta; T44 honti; L5 hinti
944 P5, M3 . Mf2, K9; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, (G) aēšmabe. K2 aēšmōm. G34, T44 aēšmabe; F10 aēšmōabe; E10 aēšma; L4a ašmēbe; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aēšmabe; L5, FK1 aēšmabe G42, L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . (G) xruum.draoš; P2 xruum.druš; E10 xruum.drušm; L1, L2, E4 xruuiūdraoš; B2, R278, T46, P1 xruuiūdraoš; Br1 xruuiūdraoš; L5 xruiiū.urauxiūs; FK1 xruuiūdruuxiūs; Mf2, K9 xruuiūdraoš
945 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 sadaimūn; R278, L5 sadaimūn K1, D62, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 ime; L1 aete; FK1 aime K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, (G); L4 vae; K2 itē; T44 aēta; E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; K9 aeti
947 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44 honti; B1 honti; E4 yōhtata; L5 hinti
948 L4 māzaiuinām; K1 māzaiuinām; D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, P10 . FK1 . K9 māzaiuinām (P10a above the line adds visiupām); G34 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 māzaiuinām; E10 māzaiuinām; B1, M3 māzaiuinām; L1, T46, P1, (G) māzaiuinām; E4 māzaiuinām; L5 māzaiuinām; Mf2 māzaiuinām

248
These are the words which are a blow against the Evil Spirit. These are the words which are a blow against the Wrath of the bloodstained stick. These are the words which are a blow against the Māzānīa demons. These are the words which are a blow against all the demons.

ZNE OLE-š'v gwbšn' MNW HWE-d gnk k mynwg sn'h  |

In the left margin, L1 dainuamqm; T44 P1 dainuamqm; B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 dainuamqm; FK1 dainuamqm.

L4, K1 . MF2, (G); D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . K9 daēuwanqm; E10 daēuwanqm; L1 dainuamqm; T46, P1 dainuamqm; B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 dainuamqm; FK1 dainuamqm.

L4, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, FK1 . MF2 above the line, K9, (G); D62, P10, M3 . R278, L5 sanadqm; T44 = snadm = ; G42 ḡsnadm.

P2, P5, E10, B1, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . MF2, K9, (G); L4, K2, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44 ḕn̄i; K1, D62, F10, P10 = inte. ... snadm = ; L5 imi.

L4, P2, P5, G34, B1, M3 . K9, (G); K2 ʾū; F10 in the left margin . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 ætea; T44 ætea; E10 . L5 ætea; E4 ætea; MF2 æti.

L4, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . MF2, K9, (G); B1 ʾk'cā.

L4, P2, P5, G34, T44, B1, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); K2a above the line, F10 in the left margin yō; E10 bi yō; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . MF2, K9 yōi.

P2, P5, G34, F10 in the left margin, E10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . MF2, K9, (G); K2a above the line, T44 hanti; B1 hante; L1 hante; E4 yōhante; L5 hanti.

L1, T46, P1 . MF2, (G); L4 ḡntovispanqm; P2, P5, K2, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, B1, M3 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 vispanqm; FK1 vispanqm.

L4 . MF2, (G); P2, K2, G34, T44, B1, M3 . K9 daēuwanqm; P5, F10 in the left margin, E10 . R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 daēuwanqm; L1 dainuamqm; B2 daēuwanqm; T46, P1 daēuwanqm; FK1 dainuamqm.

L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK; P2, E10 hnd AYK; T44 HWE-d PWN; (Jmp) HWE-n AYK.

(Jmp); D62, P2, F10, P10 gn'k.

D62, P2, F10, P10, (Jmp); G34, E10, B1 gn'gmynwg; T44 gn'gmynwg; M3 ʾkīkā; L4 ḡhwmānās.

D62, F10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line ʾcš), M3; P2 ḍuου/ ʾ; G34, T44, E10 ʾcš sn'h; L4a sn'h MN; (Jmp) snyš.

G34; L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK; E10 hnd AYK; (Jmp) HWE-n AYK.

D62, P2, G34, F10, E10a under the line, B1, M3; L4, T44, P10, (Jmp) ḡsm; E10 = hyšm = |

G34, (Jmp); L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 = ʾy = |

(Jmp); L4, G34, T44 ḡlwlwš; D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 ḡlwlwš; E10 ḡlwlwš.

L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3; P2 snyh; B1. (Jmp) snyš.

K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp); L4, G34 = gwbšn' = |

L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp); F10 = MNW = |

P2; L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK; (Jmp) HWE-n AYK.

(Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 ʾmžnʾkʾn; D62 ʾmznšnʾzʾn; P2 ʾmznʾng ʾny ZK; F10 ḡšmāt, P10 ḡšmāt (P10a on the top of the page ršš) ; B1 ḡšmāt, M3 ḡšmāt, Ġšmāt.

L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10a on the top of the page. (Jmp); D62, F10, P10 = ʾSYDA-ʾn = ... HWE-d = (but F10 supplied it prima manu in the left margin); M3 ʾSYDA-ʾn.

G34, T44, E10, M3; L4, F10 in the left margin snyh; P2 = sn'h = ; B1, (Jmp) snyš.
|a| ēn awēšān gōwišn kē *hēnd gannāg mēnōg snah  |b| ēn awēšān gōwišn kē *hēnd xēm i xruuī' druš snah  |c| ēn awēšān gōwišn kē *hēnd māzanīgan dēwān snah  |d| ēn awēšān gōwišn kē *hēnd harwisp dēwān snah

|a| “These are the words which are a blow against Gannāg Mēnōg.  |b| These are the words which are a blow against the Wrath of the bloodstained stick.  |c| These are the words which are a blow against the Māzan demons.  |d| These are the words which are a blow against all the demons.”

Av. snaṭam (10.16a-d)

There are three parallels of of the Dat. Sing. snaṭāi appearing instead of the Acc. Sing. snaṭam attested here⁹⁸: Y 27.1, Y 57.32 and V 9.13:


This (is) to give him (a present), to the Almighty, to the Lord and Judge Ahura Mazdā; to (smite a) blow against the liar Aŋra Mańiiu, to (smite a) blow against the Wrath of the bloodstained stick, to (smite a) blow against the Māzańiia demons, to (smite a) blow against all the demons and the Varṇiia liars.


dəuuanṭm. *varṇīianṭcma. druṇatām.

To (smite a) blow against the liar Aŋra Mańiiu, to (smite a) blow against the Wrath of the bloodstained stick, to (smite a) blow against the Māzańiia demons, to (smite a) blow against all the demons and the Varṇiia liars.

*māzanīianṭm. daēuuanṭm. snaṭāi. viśpaṇṭm. daēuuanṭm.

And this Lie will be knocked down⁹⁸ at every one of the words to (smite a) blow against the liar Aŋra Mańiiu, to (smite a) blow against the

---

⁹⁸ L4, P2, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, B1, M3; K1 ZNE ... sn’h │
L4, P2, G34, F10 in the left margin, E10, B1, M3; (Jmp); T44 gbbšn’
P2, L4, T44, E10, B1, M3 HWE-d AYK; G34 HWE-d AYK; F10 in the left margin HWE-d AYK hw; (Jmp) HWE-n AYK
L4, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, D62, P2, F10, P10 hlwpyn’n’; B1, M3 hlwp’n’; (Jmp) hlwp
L4, D62, P2, G34, F10 and F10 in the left margin, T44, P10, (Jmp); E10 ŠDYA-n; B1, M3 ŠDYA-n’
L4, D62, G34, F10 and F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, P10; P2 ŠDYA, B1, M3, (Jmp) snyś
Pirart (1995 415) emends it by *snaṭāi because of the parallel of Y 27.1. I have preferred to maintain snaṭam and to consider it as a variation in the formula in Vidēvdād.
Wrath of the bloodstained stick, to (smite a) blow against the Māzañiai demons, to (smite a) blow against all the demons.

The comparison between these lists and that of V 10.16 offers some interesting points. The parallel of V 9.13 is the most closely related to that of V 10.16. On one hand, the context is the same in both of them, namely the Barašnūm ceremony. On the other hand, the order and the elements in the list are the same. Contrary to this, those of Y 27.1 and Y 57.32 add ʰvarəniiən Amanda druuatqam at the end of the list.

Phl. *snah* (10.16a-d)

Regarding the correct reading of Phl. *snʾh* as *snah* instead of MacKenzie’s (1971 75) *snah*, vid. (Cantera 1998 369, n.42) and the commentary to V 4.26a in (Cantera under preparation A 4.26).

---

988  Av. ānuāstriiete (< ānu + ā + star- “to knock down” (Bartholomae 1904 1596)) is parallel to Av. ānuāstriata in Yt 1.29: spəntaičə, ārmətöšt. döibrābía. ānuāstriata. mairišt “by the eyes of Spəntā Ārmaiti the vile was knocked down”.
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“These are the words which are the subduer of that Lie, of that Nasu, which from the dead hurls itself into the living. [b] These are the words which are the subduer of that Lie, of that Nasu, which from the dead contaminates the living.”

ZNE OLE-š’n 1011 gwbs’n 1019 MNW HWE-d 1020 OLE 1021 dlwc 1022 x OLE 1023 nswš 1024 hmyst’1 1025 xMNW 1026 MN 1027 OLE 1028 lyst’ 1029 OL 1030 zywnkd 1031 QDM dwb’lyt’ [PWN 1032 hmylt’] [b] ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbs’n 1010 MNW HWE-d 1034 OLE 1036 dlwc 1037 OLE 1038 nswš 1039 hmyst’1 1039 MNW 1040 MN 1041 OLE 1042 lyst’1 1043 w 1044 zywnkd 1045 QDM gwmyhyyt’ 1046 [PWN ptlyt’ 1047]
Av. druj. … nasāuuō (10.17a-b)

Nasu is called druj- “Lie” in several passages of Vīdēvdād. This association is usually expressed by means of the syntags Av. aēša. druxš. yā. nasuš (V 3.14, 5.27-32, 6.30, 6.33, 6.36, 6.39, 7.1-4, 7.9-10, 7.24, 7.27, 8.16-18, 8.41-72, 9.40-41, 9.48) and Av. hā. druxš. yā. nasuš (V 9.15-26).

Av. nasāuuō (10.17a-b)

This form shows an unexpected presuffixal lengthened grade –ā-. From Av. nasu- we would expect a Gen. Sing. *nasuuō < IIR. *načyās < IE. *nekỳēs.1041

As Cantera (2007a 13, n.11) notices, Av. nasāuuō (Gen. Sing.) is analogical to Av. nasāuuō (Nom. Pl.), which attests a presuffixal lengthened grade –ā-.

---

1041 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp); P2, M3 – MN –
1042 L4, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, (Jmp); K1, D62, B1, P10, M3 OLE y
1043 D62, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, F10, T44, E10 lyst; P2 lyst’n
1044 D62, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 OL OLE; P2 OLE; F10 ’w
1045 P2, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, P10 zyndk; E10 zynd
1046 P2, B1, L4, G34, T44, E10, (Jmp) gwmyhtyt; D62, P10 gwmyšt; F10 gwmyht?; M3 gwmyht?1047
1047 (Jmp); L4, T44, E10 pytlyt; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 pytlyt; G34 pytlyt; F10 pytlyt
1048 According to Cantera (2007a 13, n.11), Av. *nasuuō would suggest a holokynetic inflection *nekỳōs / *n(e)kỳēs. But Tremblay (1996 142) remarks that the parallel of Gr. νέκυς denies that a holokynetic was implied. Indeed, unlike holokynetics, this Greek parallel shows both root accent and full grade in the root. Accordingly, Tremblay proposes that Av. nasu- would belong to an “anakynetical” *nekỳōs / *nekỳs. As Cantera (2007a 13, n.11) says, if Tremblay’s analysis is right, this apophonic type would be the only one where the accent in the weak cases moves back with regard to the strong ones.
L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9, (G); Mf2 ②
1069 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1068 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1067 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1066 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1065 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1064 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1063 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1062 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1061 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1060 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1059 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1058 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1057 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1056 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1055 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1054 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1053 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1052 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1051 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1050 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
1049 L. L. 2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. G; G42, E4, L5.
And you, Zarašuštra, must dig nine holes, in this earth where there were least water and fewest plants, not drinkable by both flock and men. “Who endows with life force the birth even for the mortal, the best.” This, the Mazdean (religious) conscience, Zarašuštra, is what endows (it) with life force. “Who purifies his conscience by means of good thoughts, good words and good deeds.”
Then you, Zardušť, must dig nine holes, |b| which in this earth are the most separate from water and the most separate from plants, |c| [not drinkable for flock and men] [the (earth) which for one year and a day is improper for the same use, is proper to another use; if it is dug when moist, (it is) impure]. |d| “Purification (is) for the mortals [purity for the soul] the best after birth” [when they are born, then one thing (is) good for the soul: purification]. |e| [Say] the (formula of) purification, Zardušť, which is [manifest] in the religion of the Mazdeans. |f| “Who purifies one’s own conscience [that is, keeps it pure from sin] by means of good thoughts, good words and good deeds [that is, daēnām. (and) ānbhuām. are both the same].”

The same Avestan text and PT as V 10.18d-f with only slight differences are found in V 5.21c-e (Cantera under preparation A 5.21):

|c| yaozdā, mašiā. aipī. zādām. vabistā, |d| bā. yaozdā, zaraduštṛa. yā. daēnā. māzdaiasni. |e| yō. huuām. ānbhuām. yaozdāte. humatāiš. būxtāiš. huuārtāiš. dēnām. aŋhuuām. yaozdāite. humatāiš. |d| yōǰdāsrih ān ī xwēš yōǰdāsrēnēd [kū az wināh pāk dārēd] pad humat ud hūxt ud huuārt [ay ‘ ānbhuām. daēnām. / har dō ēk]

|c| ywšd’slyh ANŚWTA [p’kh JPN lwbn’] AHL MN YLYDWN-šn’ p’hlwm [AMT BRA YLYDWN-t HWE-’d ’-š’n’ MNDOM-1 ywšd’slyh JPN lwbn’ ŠPYL] |d| ywšd’slyh [YMRRWN-m] zltwhšt JPN dyn’ y m’ždšn’n’ [pyt’k] |e| ZK y NPŠE ywšd slnty [AYK MN’ns p’k YHSNN-yt] JPN hwmt W hwnt W hwlst [’y ‘ānbhuām. daēnām. / KRA 2 ’ywk]


As we observe, the Avestan texts of V 5.21e and V 10.18f differ in one word: Av. ānbhuām in V 5.21e and Av. daēnām in V 10.18f. Both fit the context, so that they can be considered as a mere variation.

The beginning of V 10.19a, where we find Av. daēnām. erzzuō. yaozdaiṭiša, shows that at least in V 10.18f the right reading was Av. daēnām. Furthermore, in V 5.21e the PT of Av. ānbhuām, namely Phl. axw, lacks, so that

1132 L4, M3; D62, P2 (but P2a adds -w- before -h-), G34, T44, E10, (Jmp) hwnt; F10, P10 hwnt; B1 hwnt’
1133 G34, T44, E10; L4, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) | W |
1134 G34, F10a, T44, E10, P10; L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, M3 yy; (Jmp) | ’y ... ’ywk |
1135 L4; D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 daēnām; E10 daēnām
1136 L4; D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ānbhuām
Av. daēnām is possibly the right variant. Nevertheless, the variant Av. aŋhuuām is older than the Pahlavi commentaries of both passages, where we find ay / aŋhuuām. daēnām. / har dō ēk (V 5.21e) and ay / daēnām. aŋhuuām. / har dō ēk (V 10.18f). Therefore, it is clear that it existed in V 5.21e, in spite of not having been translated in the PT.

But these commentaries provide much more important information: the Pahlavi commentary on V 5.21e presupposes the commentator’s knowledge of V 10.18f and viceversa.

The variation in the order of the Avestan words quoted in each of them can be explained by taking into account the Avestan variant in each case and this mutual reference. Indeed, in V 5.21e the Avestan variant is aŋhuuām, so that the commentator places it firstly and equates it with the one found in V 10.18f. On the contrary, since in V 10.18f the Avestan variant is daēnām, the commentator places it firstly and equates it with that of V 5.21e.

Av. *anaijīš.xārōdāa* (10.18c)

The form of this word which can be inferred from the manuscripts’ evidence is Geldner’s ana.xārōdāa. If it is right, it is a hāpax legōmenon in Avestan to be analysed as *an-ā-xārōdāa* “with no food”. In such case, ana” would be interpreted like “an-ā” in Av. an-a-bdātā- “nicht (mit dem Hemd) bekleidet”, Av. an-a-bdāti- “Sichnichtbekleidet mit - , Nichtanziehen (des Hemds)”, Av. an-a-mo-roždika- “erbarmsglos”, Av. an-a-saxta- “der den Ablauf der (bestimmten) Zeit noch nicht erreicht hat”, Av. an-a-spərə-nahb- “Unvollständigkeit”, Av. an-a-zgāda- “noch nicht geboren”, Av. an-a-štīa- “unbewohnbar”, Av. an-a-baxta- “der nicht berechtigt (geeingeschaffnet und ermächtigt) ist (etwas zu tun)” or Av. an-a-xāsta- “ungekocht” (Bartholomae 1904 118-122).

However, the parallel of V 6.32 (repeated in V 6.38 and 41) might shed some light on what I think to be the original form implied: Av. ana<ijīš>xārōdāa.

In V 10.18c this supposed ana.xārōdāa is followed by a dvandvā compound Av. pasu.vīra. This syntagm seems an explanation to V 10.18b, which was possibly added later. It indicates that the place where the holes must be dug not only is to be separate from pure things, but also must have no drinkable water. Otherwise these pure things and the pure water would be contaminated.

In V 6.32, 38 and 41 Ahura Mazda says that the water is pure after removing the impurity caused by Nasu, and then it can be drunked by both flock and men: pasca. nasānu. nizbōrdi. pasca. āpō. parahīxiti. aēša. āfși. yaoždiia. baunaiti. vaskō. aišiš.xūrōdāa. pasubīa.vīrēbiia. hamādā. yada. paretīt “Nach der Entfernung der Leiche (aus dem Wasser) und nach der Ausschöpfung des Wassers, ist dieses zu lüternde Wasser nach Belieben trinkbar für Vieh und Mann genauso wie zuvor” (Cantera under preparation A 6.32, 38, 41).

The syntagm aišiš.xūrōdāa. pasubīa.vīrēbiia in V 6.32, 38 and 41 is parallel to the syntagm ana.xūrōdāa. pasu.vīra in V 10.18c. The only differences would be the negative an-, the preposition ā added to xūrōdā instead of aišiš, and the use of an “ungrammatical” dvandvā compound pasu.vīra in V 10.18c instead of the
dvandva compound pasubīa.vīraēibiīa. In any case, Av. anā.xārōda in V 10.18c is used as the antonym of aįjīs.xārōda in V 6.32, 38 and 41. But was Av. anā.xārōda the right form? In my opinion it was not, and this can be inferred from its PT, which shows to be crucial to see how the old form was progressively corrupted in the written transmission.

In V 10.18c Av. anā.xārōda is rendered by Phl. an-abar-xwariiš, which however does not translate Av. *an-ā-xārōda. As a matter of fact, Av. ā is never translated by Phl. abar. This Pahlavi preposition and preverb, however, does render Av. aįjī, either separate or in compounds. Accordingly, Phl. an-abar-xwariiš is translating not Av. *an-ā-xārōda, but Av. *an-aįjīs-xārōda, that is, the antonym of the Avestan form aįjīs-xārōda of V 6.32, 38 and 41. And this is just what we find in V 6.31.

In V 6.31 the following text is attested: višpem. ā. aŋhat. aįśa. āf. aiiaozdia. aṇaijis.xārōda. yauat. aįśa. nasu. niizbarēta “(Sechs Schritte in jede Richtung) ist dieses Wasser nicht zu läutern (und) ungenießbar so lange bis diese Leiche entfernt wird” (Cantera under preparation A 6.31). As expected, Av. aṇaijīs.xārōda is rendered by Phl. an-abar-xwariiš.

According to this parallel, in my opinion, Av. anā.xārōda is not to be interpreted as *an-ā-xārōda, but as a haplography of Av. *an-aįjīs-xārōda → Phl. an-abar-xwariiš. Also in this case the PT helps us to notice the corruption of an Avestan word through the written transmission. Accordingly, I have emended Geldner's anā.xārōda by *an-aįjīs-xārōda in my edition.

So we expect a syntagm Av. *aṇaijīs.xārōda. pasubīa.vīraēibiīa (or *pasu.vīraēibiīa) “not drinkable for both flock and men”, referred to water (Av. āf). However, Av. *aṇaijīs.xārōda refers to the adjective Av. *vi.āpō.tommca (Nom., Acc. Sing. Neut. / Acc. Sing. Masc.). Since Av. āf does not appear in this passage, we must suppose that Av. *aṇaijīs.xārōda. pasu.vīra is either a very ungrammatical syntagm that belongs to V 10.18b or rather a gloss added to explain Av. *vi.āpō.tommca. *vi.uruarō.tommca and rendered into Pahlavi. In my opinion, the second possibility is more likely, despite the fact that Avestan glosses inserted in the PT were not usually rendered into Pahlavi.

Av. pasu.vīra (10.18c)


1137 This parallel seems to have been noticed at least by the scribe of P5. Actually, only the manuscript P5 attests the variant pasubīa.vīra instead of pasu.vīra. On one hand, the dual pasubīa.vīraēibiīa is attested only in V 6.32, 38 and 41. On the other hand, it seems very unlikely that a later manuscript like P5 created the right dual form pasubīa in V 10.18c. Accordingly, at least the scribe of P5 was thinking of V 6.32, 38 and 41 when copying V 10.18c.

1138 See for instance Av. aįjī → Phl. abar in V 2.30, 2.38, etc.; Av. aįjī.gati- → Phl. abar-rasīnib in V 8.4, Av. aįjī.varōta- → Phl. abar-warzinib in V 5.14, ec.; Av. an-aįjī.pixta- → Phl. an-abar-zad in V 7.29; Av. an-aįjī.duatu- → Phl. an-abar-drōzīn in Y 65.11; Av. an-aįjī.vastra- → Phl. an-abar-wastarag in V 8.10; Av. an-aįjī.varmtia- → Phl. an-abar-wārān in V 6.50; Av. an-aįjī.srauana- → Phl. an-abar-xniud in V 3.40; Av. an-aįjīāsti- → Phl. an-abar-rasīnib in V 18.30-31, etc.
In Avestan it is attested either separate or as a *dvandva* compound in dual\(^{1139}\) in the following passages:

a) Separate: Y 31.15 (*pasūš. vīrāça*), Y 45.9 (*pasūš. vīrōṅ*), Y 58.6 (*pasūš. ... vīrōṅ*).

b) *Dvandva* compound in dual:

Av. *yaoždā* ṅ *mašiīāi. *aipi..zaθēm. *vahištā* (10.18d)

This quotation from Y 48.5c is found in V 5.21c and 10.18d. Each of its words has been interpreted differently by some scholars and these are the main problems regarding each word:

1. Av. *yaoždā*.

The first problem of this word concerns its interpretation either as an adjective Av. *yaoždāh-* or a root-noun Av. *yaoždā*.

Bartholomae (1904 1236) thought that an adjective Av. *yaoždāh-* “vollbringend, vollkommen machend” was attested in the Nom. Sing. *yaoždā* of Y 48.5, and in its quotations of V 5.21 and V 10.18.

On the contrary, Humbach (1959 2.77), Kellens (1974 204), Schmidt (1975 2), Insler (1975 287), Narten (1982 113), Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærø (1991 2.199), Pirart (1995 416) and Cantera (under preparation A 5.21) considered that Av. *yaoždā*: the Nom. Sing. of a root-noun Av. *yaoždā*-. Nevertheless, the choice is difficult, as Kellens (1974 205) observed, because in both cases the Nom. Sing. is the same.

Most scholars agree in the interpretation of this word as a root-noun. They disagree, however, about the type of root-noun and consider it either a *nomen agentis* or a *nomen actionis*:

- *Nomen agentis*:
  - “die ... gesund macht” (Humbach 1959 1.139, 2.77).
  - “qui donne force vitale” (Kellens 1974 204) in Y 48.5, but “purificatrice” in V 5.21.
  - “die heilbringende” (Narten 1982 113), (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærø 1991 2.199).
  - “mit (Lebens-)Kraft versehen” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.420).
  - “die Läuternde” (Cantera under preparation A 5.21).

- *Nomen actionis*:
  - “perfection (or purification)” (Schmidt 1975 2).
  - “vitalization” (Insler 1975 287).
  - “préparation” (Pirart 1995 416).

\(^{1139}\) When the dual is used in these compounds, both elements of the formula show a dual ending, also in oblique cases (Duchesne-Guillémin 1936 44-45), (Szemerényi 1980 227), (Hintze 1994 184).

\(^{1140}\) vid. (de Menasce 1973 120).
In order to solve this question, we must take into account all the root-nouns with *dā-. In Avestan there are nomina agentis as well as nomina actionis expressed by root-nouns with *dā-. The first ones are represented by:

- Av. akō.dā- “who creates evil things”.
- Av. aštawuasta.dā- “who gives sanctity”.
- Av. azrazdā- “infidel”.
- Av. āzuiti.dā- “who gives invigoration”.
- Av. ʼusadā- “who gives the sources”.
- Av. gaiio.dā- “who gives life”.
- Av. xšadro.dā- “who gives power”.
- Av. cagodā- “who gives a present”.
- Av. ʼcīdrā.dā- “who gives bright things”.
- Av. puhrō.dā- “who gives sons”.
- Av. baēṣazaδā- “who gives the cure”.
- Av. fraxšti.dā- “who gives supplication”.
- Av. vədžjō.dā- “who gives flocks”.
- Av. xārmanō.dā- “who gives xārmanah-”.
- Av. vaŋhudā- “who gives the best”.
- Av. vaŋhudā- “who gives good things”.
- Av. rauuacdā- “who gives liberty”.
- Av. zrazdā- “faithful”.
- Av. hauuayhō.dā- “who gives prosperity” (Kellens 1974 201-220).

Only Av. mazdā- “Wisdom”, Av. ădā- “oblation” and Av. viuadā- “ritual distribution” belong to the second ones (Kellens 1974 201-220). Among these three, Av. mazdā- can be interpreted as “sage” too, that is, as a nomen agentis (Kellens 1974 203).

Although there are at least two sure nomina actionis with *dā-, most root-nouns with *dā- in Avestan are nomina agentis. Moreover, there are two Avestan nomina actionis from the same root as Av. yaozh-dā-, namely Av. yaozdādra- and Av. yaozdāiiti- “purification”, and a third one from the same root as Av. yaozō, namely Av. yaoštī- “purification” (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 2.125). Accordingly, although we cannot rule out that it was a nomen actionis, the interpretation of Av. yaozdā- as nomen agentis seems more likely.

The second main problem of Av. yaozdā- concerns its first element yaozō < yaoš. As an independent word, Av. yaoš is attested only in Old Avestan, concretely in Y 43.13 (kāmabīā. țōm.mōi. dātā. daragahiā. +yaoš. yōm. vā. načiš. dārēšt. itē), 44.9 (kādā.mōi. ygm. yaoš. daēnq. yaoš. dānē) and 46.18 (yē. maibīā. yaoš. ahmāi. asčīt. vahištā). However, its meaning remained obscure until its Vedic parallel yōs(-) was noticed.

Although Ved. yōs(-) was already connected with Lat. iūs by Kuhn (1855), until Justi (1864 242) the relation between Ved. yōs(-) and Av. yaoš had not been noticed. This connection was followed by Bartholomae (1904 1233-1234), Dumézil (1948), de Bie (1955 146), Duchesne-Guillemin (1970 205), Schindler (1975 266), Szemerényi (1978), Narten (1986 199, n.22) and Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø
(1991 2.188). However, these authors disagreed with regard to the morphology and semantics of Av. yaoš / Ved. yóṣ(-).

Justi (1864 242) simply noticed the parallel between these words and, following the native tradition, interpreted Av. yaoš as “pure”.

Bartholomae (1904 1234, n.5) added an etymological approach. According to him, Av. yaoš stems from *iaus-/*äiu, which would be a “Kompositionsform neben *iaus-”. This *iaus- would stem from IE. *iaw-, where -w- is a laryngeal; it is the same form which would give Lat. iūs as well.

Taking for granted the connection between Lat. iūs, Ved. yóṣ(-) and Av. yaoš Dumézil (1948) equated Av. yaoždā- with Lat. iūsta facere “to perform the ceremonis called denicales feraie”. According to him, both originally meant “to purify from defilement by death”. Nevertheless, he did not state precisely how Av. yaož must be interpreted morphologically.

According to de Bie (1955 146), the Indoiranian form which appears as *iaus- in composition was not *iaus- < *iauHš-, but IIr. *iaus- < IE. *iawos-. In his opinion, Lat. iūs, which would stem from IE. *iojé/lesai, was related.

Duchesne-Guillemin (1970 210) proposed a different etymology. He (1970 206) firstly said that Av. yaožo could stem from IE. *iawes- < IE. *iēy- “young” and be related to Skr. yōsa- “woman” and Sogd. ʾyənc < *iaonikā- < *iaunikā- < *iaunikā “young woman” (Duchesne-Guillemin 1966 74). But finally he (1970 210) admitted that it was related to Lat. iūs, which would stem from IE. *iawes- “fitting; what is exact, unmixed, pure” < IE. *iēy- “to join, to fit”.

Insler (1975 287) translated Av. yaoždā- as “vitalization” and considered it a root-noun. However, he did not mention any further relation either with Ved. yóṣ(-) or with Lat. iūs.

Schindler (1975 266) interpreted Av. yaoždā- as IIr. *iaus dʰ ā- < IE. *iēy-su dʰ eβj-. “Heil setzen, heilwirkend machen”. He thought that Lat. iūs probably stems from IE. *iūs-, but he did not specify whether or not this Latin word is related to IIr. *iaus-. According to him, this IIr. *iaus would be present in Av. yaožo and Ved. yóṣ(-), which he translated as “Heil!”.

Previously most scholars had thought that Lat. iūs, Ved. yóṣ(-) and Av. yaoš were etymologically related and had interpreted Av. yaožo in Av. yaoždā- as an accusative of the verb dā-. But Szemerényi’s (1978) study about Av. yaožo and Ved. yóṣ(-) changed this view.

As he (1978 160) stated, all the authors who dealt with this problem were “content with an atomistic approach” and simply gave different etymologies, but did not fully explain these words. Actually, in spite of having noticed the etymological parallel between Av. yaožo and Ved. yóṣ(-), nobody knew what Ved. yóṣ(-) really meant before Szemerényi.

From his comprehensive study about these words three main conclusions can be derived:

a) With regards to morphology, he concluded that these words must be understood as the Gen. Sing. of Av. āiun- and Ved. āyuh- respectively, as the

---

1141 Although Bartholomae did not mention it, this reconstruction was already proposed by Brugmann (1897 1.301).
1142 He followed the reconstruction already proposed by Schleicher (1876) for Lat. iūs.
syntagma daragahiiā. yaoš in Y 43.13 demonstrates. He denied that Lat. iūs, stemming from IE. *yē̄s and having a different meaning, was related to Av. yaož( -), and reconstructed the paradigm of the latter ones as IE. *yē̄- (direct case) / *yō̄s / *yē̄yī. Already Thieme (1951 176) had suggested that Ved. yōs(-) was connected with Ved. āyir-, but did not define exactly how.

b) Concerning syntax, he discarded the interpretation of Av. yaož( -) in Av. yaožda- as an accusative expressing the direct object of the verb dā- and stated that it must be understood rather as a “genitive of sphere”.

c) As far as their meaning is concerned, Szemerényi followed Benveniste (1937) and translated them as “life force”. According to Szemerényi (1978 162-163, 166), OAv. yaoš “life force” firstly referred to strenght and afterwards developped into the idea of cleansing and ritual purification in YAv. yaoždā-, as most of its contexts demonstrate.

Szemerényi’s study about Av. yaož( -) and Ved. yōs(-) has gone unnoticed for Narten (1986 199, n.22), who follows Schindler (1975 266).

Also Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærø (1991 2.188) do not mention Szemerényi’s article. Actually, although they state that the first element of this compound is Av. yaoš and interpret it as the Gen. Sing. of Av. āiu- “duration, lifetime, age”, they (1991 2.188) translate Av. yaoš as “of use, useful” in Y 46.18 and Ved. yōs(-) as “welfare”\(^{*}\). Furthermore they say that Av. yaoš was petrified as an indeclinable word in Av. yaoždā-, which they translate as “to purify, conserve, make durable”. Therefore, in spite of not having quoted his article, Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærø agree with Szemerényi’s morphologically analysis. However, they disagree with regards to the meaning they assigned to the Avestan and Vedic words, without explaining why.

In my opinion, Szemerényi’s (1978) interpretation is right for OAv. yaoš. However, it does not explain a surprising fact: why would Av. yaoždā- be the only first member of a compound which presents a genitive in Avestan?

Although the Avestan verb dā- is used more frequently with accusative and dative for the direct and indirect object respectively, it is also attested with genitive, not necessarily the so-called genitive of sphere (Bartholomae 1904 713-718). In Avestan, however, no compound attests a genitive in the first member\(^{1144}\). Therefore, it seems unlikely that Av. yaoždā- was the only exception to this. Accordingly, Szemerényi’s (1978) proposal for OAv. yaoš seems not to explain the compound Av. yaoždā-.

Nevertheless, Av. āiu- attests another exception which could support Szemerényi’s (1978) explanation: Av. yauuaēi.\(^{1144}\) Actually, this dative of Av. āiu- is used as a first element of compound in Av. yauuaējī- and Av. yauuaēsū- (Bartholomae 1904 1266), (Duchesne-Guillemin 1936 127), (Narten 1986 260).

\(^{1144}\)Surprisingly, Szemerényi (1978 166) quotes Lat. *lucrī facere “to put down under the heading, profit, consider as profit” as example of the genitive of sphere and after this example translates Av. yaoždā- as “to place within the sphere of vital power”. Did Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærø (1991 2.188) slip from this Latin example when translating Av. yaoš?\(^\text{Humbach}\)

\(^{1144}\)Duchesne-Guillemin (1936 127) said that Av. vāxš. brati- and maybe Av. bāzuš. aojah- included a genitive as a first element of compound. However, Kellens (1974 40) demonstrated that this is false.
(Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.172). No other Avestan compound attests a dative as a first element, so that Av. ʰyaunādō is an exception.

All the scholars agree about the interpretation of Av. ʰyaunādō as the dative of Av. ʰiiu- and the first element of these two compounds, although they are exceptions in Avestan.

In my opinion, despite being a further exception, Szemerényi’s (1978) interpretation of Av. ʰyaoždō as the genitive of Av. ʰiiu- and the first element of this compound must be accepted, because it is parallel to the exceptional use of the dative Av. ʰyaunādō. Accordingly, I interpret Av. ʰyaoždā- as “who endows with life force”. I cannot explain, however, why only Av. ʰiiu- is used in genitive and dative as a first element of compound in Avestan.

2. Av. +ʰmašiīāi.

Concerning the ending of Av. +ʰmašiīāi, three readings have been proposed: 1. ʰāī; 2. ʰā; 3. ʰān.

The first one, represented by Geldner’s (1896) mašiīāi, was considered by Narten (1982 112) as the most likely one because of the parallels of V 5.21 and V 10.18, where ʰāi is the most attested variant. Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.177, 2.199) eventually adopted the variant +ʰmašiīāi and translated it as “for mankind”, that is, as a Dat. Sing.º

However, Humbach (1959 1.139) corrected it by +ʰmašiūā. Kellens (1974 204), Schmidt (1975 2) and Insler (1975 90-91, 287, 333) followed Humbach’s emendation in Y 48.5. Nevertheless, Kellens maintained the reading +ʰmašiīāi in V 5.21, although he said that +ʰmašiūā is to be preferred in Y 48.5 because it represents the lectio difficilior. While Kellens (1974 204) and Schmidt (1975 2) interpreted +ʰmašiūā as an Instr. Sing., Insler (1975 90-91, 287, 333) stated that it is a Voc. Sing. because of its position before the caesura. Later, Kellens & Pirart (1988-1991 3.223) added that it is not sure that +ʰmašiūā designated here the man, and that a metrical argument lacks.

The third reading ʰān is only present in Pirart (1995 416-417), who conjectures a Loc. Sing. +ʰmašiīāu from Av. məɾiūdīu-, although he is not sure of this emendation. Its main problem is that it cannot be supported by the manuscriptsº evidence.

In my opinion, +ʰmašiīāi is to be preferred in V 5.21 and V 10.18 for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is the most attested variant in V 5.21 and V 10.18 in the Pahlavi as well as in the Sāde manuscripts and it is also found in Y 48.5. Since these passages quoted that of Y 48.5, there is no reason to edit in Yasna a different variant from the one attested in Viđēvdād. Secondly, there is no need to correct the well attested variant ʰāi by the non-attested one +ʰmašiūā. Thirdly, that we should prefer a Dat. Sing. ʰāi in V 10.18 is corroborated by the parallel syntagm Av. yaoždāitiš.-varsāči in V 10.19a. Actually, Av. +ʰvarsāči is placed in the same position as Av. +ʰmašiīāi, while Av. yaoždāitiš in V 10.19a is a variation of Av. yaoždā in V 10.18d. Fourthly, Av. +ʰvahištā is accompanied by a dative in other Old

---

1145 The same ending of Dat. Sing. –āi was adopted by Smith’s (1929 134) ʰmašāi, following Bartholomae (1879). This reading, however, cannot be supported on the basis of the manuscriptsº evidence.
Avestan passages, like in Y 31.1 (aēibiō. vahištā), 35.3 (vahištā. ... ubōibiiā. ahubiiā), 47.5 (ašāunē. ... vahištā) and 48.3 (vaēdāmnāi. vahištā). Therefore, *maštatāi seems the most likely choice.

3. Av. *aipī. zāϑəm
   There are two main problems regarding these words: a) the syntactic relation between Av. aipī and zāϑəm; b) the morphology and meaning of Av. zāϑəm.


   Smith (1929 134), Morgenstierne (1938 260) and Lommel (1971 149) followed Bartholomae (1904 85) in translating *aipī.zāϑəm as “the future birth”. Moreover, Morgenstierne (1938 260) added the parallel of Yidya-Munji ʋəzə χo “womb, pregnant (animal)”, which according to him would stem from *upaθ or *api-zaθa-. Because of this parallel, Morano (1987 945) agrees with Morgenstierne (1938 260).

   Dumézil (1969 35, n.1), following Bartholomae’s (1904 85) emendation Av. *aipī.zāϑəm, compared it with Gr. ἐπιγόνη and accordingly translated it as “descendancy”. Dumézil’s interpretation and translation were followed by Kellens (1974 204) and Pirart (1995 416-417).

   Schmidt (1975 2) and Narten (1982 113), however, disagreed with Dumézil (1969 35, n.1) and understood it as “at (her) birth” and “bei ihrer Entstehung” respectively.

   Kellens & Pirart (1988-1991 2.126) add a syntactic argument to their interpretation of Av. *aipī.zāϑəm as one word. As they noticed, there is no Indoiranian *aṗi + Acc. Accordingly, Av. aipī. zāϑəm cannot be interpreted as a prepositional syntagm “after birth”, as the Pahlavi translators did when translating them as Phl. pas az zāyišn “after birth”. They interpret Av. *aipī.zāϑəm as a preverb plus verbal noun, following Morano (1987 945, 990). However, they do not specify that, although there is no Indoiranian *aṗi + Acc., Av. api is used as a preposition with accusative, according to Morano (1987 986).

   Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.177, 2.199), followed by Cantera (under preparation A), agree with Kellens & Pirart (1988-1991 2.126) with regard to the impossibility of considering Av. aipī. zāϑəm as a prepositional syntagm. However, Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.177, 2.199) do not think that these words must be put together. In their opinion, Av. aipī like Ved. api can stand in front of or after the noun to which it refers. Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.177, 2.199) think that Av. aipī refers to Av. zāϑəm and translate them as “also birth”.
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Cantera (under preparation A) continues Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø’s (1991 1.177, 2.199) observation about the double position of Ved. āpi, but separates Av. āipi from Av. zaθem. According to him, Av. āipi refers not to Av. zaθem but to Av. +mašiāāi. Following Bartholomae (1904 83), he states that Av. āipi usually modifies the previous word in Avestan.

Regardless of the interpretation of Av. āipi, all the authors consider that Av. zaθem stems from Av. zaθa- “begetting, birth” (< Ir. *jān(H)θa-), a noun in –θa- from the root Av. zan- “to beget, to give birth” (cf. Ved. jā-, to beget, to give birth” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.567-569)). Only Insler (1975 91, 287) interpreted Av. +āipi.zaθem as an adverb with suffix –θam with the meaning “on earth”.

In my opinion, Insler’s (1975 91, 287) interpretation must be ruled out on account of the parallels of Av. zaθa-. Actually, this word means “begetting, birth” in all the passages where it is attested, namely in Y 19.8, 43.5, 44.3, 48.5, 48.6, 65.2, Yt 13.93, V 5.21, 10.18, 21.4, 6, 10, 14 and Vyt 49. Of these, the most closely related parallel to Y 48.5 (= V 5.21, 10.18) appears in Y 65.2 (Szemerényi 1978 170) yā. vişpanām. *aṁi. *xudrā. yaoždāāiti. yā. vişpanām. *hāišiṁ. zaθāi. garoža. yaoždāāiti “who gives life force to the semen of all the males, who gives life force to the wombs of the females for begetting” and in V 21.6, 10 and 14 frā.θē. zaθemca. *vaṣāθemca. azm. iθa. frasnāieni. frā.θē. kḥṛpomca. *tviθišma. yaoždaŋāi. kōromaomi. δ̣̣̣ša. hucat.πuθm. hucat.πaθmaniŋ̲̲̲q̲̲̲̲m̲̲̲ “I will cleanse here your birth and groth, I will endow with life force your body and strenght, I will make you rich in children, rich in milk”. Obviously in these parallels Av. zaθa- has nothing to do with “earth”, but with “begetting, birth”.

Moreover, in Y 65.2 the use of Av. yaoždā- as a verb with Acc. and Dat. is parallel to that of the nomen agentis Av. yaoždā- with Acc. and Dat. in Y 48.5, V 5.21 and 10.18. The only difference is that in the latter ones Av. zaθa- appears as Acc., but in Y 65.2 as a Dat. On the contrary, in V 21.6, 10 and 14 Av. zaθa- is found in Acc., like in Y 48.5, V 5.21 and 10.18. The only difference between these passages and those of V 21 is the verb Av. fra-snā “to cleanse” instead of Av. yaoždā-, which however appears in the following and parallel verbal syntagm frā.θē. kḥṛpomca. *tviθišma. yaoždaŋāi.

4. Av. +vahištā.

This word was interpreted by Bartholomae (1904 85) as a Nom. Sing. feminine referred to Av. cistōś. Bartholomae’s interpretation of this word in Y 48.5 was followed by Humbach (1959 2.77), Kellens (1974 204), Narten (1982 113) and Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.177, 2.199).

On the contrary, Smith (1929 134) interpreted Av. +vahištā as an Acc. Pl. neuter and translated the whole sentence as “consume for man the future birth, the best-things”.

Nevertheless, Kellens (1974 204), Pirart (1995 416) and Cantera (under preparation A 5.21) considered that the same word agree with Av. yaoždā in V 5.21 and translated this syntagm as “purificatrice excellente”. The latter interpretation, according to which Av. +vahištā accompanies Av. yaoždā, was also followed by Schmidt (1975 2) and Insler (1975 91, 287) for Y 48.5. Therefore, this word is interpreted as a Nom. Sing. Fem.

In my opinion, Av. *vahištā agrees with Av. yaoždā in Y 48.5, V 5.21 and V 10.18.

Phl. ay 「daēnām. aŋhuam.」 har dō ōk (10.18f)

Regarding the relation of the gloss of V 5.21e with that of V 10.18f, vid. the commentary to this gloss in (Cantera under preparation A 5.21).

[a] “You, righteous, must purify your (religious) conscience, for thus there is for everyone of the material life purification of this, of his own

---

[1146 L4, K1. Mf2, (G); D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. K9 daēnām; P5 daēnām. ãk̃hīš; E10. B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 daēnām; L1, T46, P1 daēnām; FK1 dāinām.

1147 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); B2, R278, T46, P1 arszū; Br1 maraζinū; (G); L4 yaozdādīša; D62, P2, F10 yaozdātīš; P5, P10 yaozdāši; K2, E10. L5 yaozdātīš; G34 yōzdādīša; T44 yaozdādīša; B1, M3. Br1, L2, G42 yaozdātīš; L1 yaozdātīš; B2, R278, T46, P1 yaozdātīš; E4 yaozdādīš; FK1 yaozdādīša; ... asti │; Mf2, K9 yaozdādīša

1148 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44 in the left margin, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); P2, E10 ađaζi

1149 D62, P2, K2, P10. L5; L4, G34, T44 in the left margin, B1, M3, (G) ãk̃hīš; P5, F10, E10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 ãk̃hīš

1150 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44 in the left margin, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 ãk̃hīš

1151 P2, P5, K2, E10. FK1, (G); L4 yaozdādīša; D62, F10, T44 in the left margin, P10 (P10a above the line -a- instead of -ã- yaozdādīš; G34 yaozdādīš; B1 yaozdātīš; M3 yaozdātī; L1, Br1, L2, G42 yaozdātīš; B2, R278, T46, P1. Mf2, K9 yaozdātīš; E4 yaozdātīš; L5 yaozdātīš

1152 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, P10. P2 kahmāicīț; G34 kāmpīcīț. E10. FK1 kāmpīcīț; B1 kahmāicīț; M3 kāmāicīț. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9, (G) kahmāicīț; L5 kahmāicīț

1153 L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9, (G); P5, K2, G34, E10. R278, T46, L5, FK1 aṣtwātō

1154 D62, K2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); L4 bʰiɾanā; P2 bauwāiā; P5 bauwāiā; F10 bauwāiā; T44 bauwāiā; L5 bauwāiā; Mf2 bauwāiā. K9 bauwāiā

1155 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1.

1156 L4, K1, K2, G34, F10, M3. Mf2, K9, (G); B2, T46, P1 arszinī; E4 arszamāo

1157 L4, K1, K2, G34, F10, M3. Mf2, K9, (G); D62, B1, P10. L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 daēnām; T42, P2, E10 daēnām; P5, K1 daēnām; B2, T46, P1 daēnām

1158 P5, K2, E10. E4, L5, FK1, (G); L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 yōi; L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9 yōi; T46 yōi

1159 L4, K1. L1, T46, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10. M3. B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1. K9 bauwāi; M3 bauwāi; G42 bauwāi; Mf2 bauwāi

1160 L4, K1. Mf2, (G); D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. K9 daēnām; P5, E10. B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 daēnām; L1, T46, P1 daēnām; FK1 daēnām. daēnām

1161 K1. Br1, L2, E4, (G); D62 yaozdātī; P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L4a. L5 yaozdātī; L1, G42 yaozdātī; B2, T46 yaozdātī; R278, P1. K9 yaozdātī; FK1 yaozdātī; Mf2 yaozdātī

1162 L4, T44, E10, B1, M3. L1, R278, P1, L2, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2, K2, P10. B2, T46, Br1, E4, L5 bauwarstāissā; G34 bauwarstāissā; F10 bauwarstāissā

1163 L4 (L4a -sc), P2, G34, T44, B1, M3. L1, B2, R278, P1, L2, G42, FK1, (G); D62, K2, P10. T46, Br1, E4, L5 būxātissā; F10 būxātissā; E10 būxātissā; Mf2, K9 būxātissā

1164 G34. L1, Br1, L2, (G); L4 (L4a bauwarstāissā), T44, M3. B2, R278, P1, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9 bauwarstāissā; D62, K2, P10 (P10a above the line -a- after -a-) bauwarstāissā; P2, P5. T46 bauwarstāissā; F10 bauwarstāissā; E10 bauwarstāissā; B1 bauwarstāissā; E4 bauwarstāissā; L5 bauwarstāissā
...conscience, righteous, |b| (for everyone) who purifies his conscience by means of good thoughts, good words and good deeds.”

If dyn’ x’dpyk 1165 ywp’d’slynyt’ ME 1166 y’twn’ OLE 1167 AYT’ ywp’d’slyh 1168 kt’l-c-HD 1169 hw’ y ’st’wmnd 1170 ZK y 1171 NPSE 1172 dyn’ x’dpyk’ |b| MNW 1174 ZK’ y NPSE dyn’ ywp’d’slynyt’ PWN hwmt 1176 W 1177 hwht 1178 W 1179 hwklst 1180 [‘y 1181 daenam. 1182 ahyuuam. 1183 KRA 1184 2 ’ywtk]

|a| dēn ʾx’abezag yōǰdāsrēnēd ċē ʾedōn ʿōy ast yōjdāsīrb kadār-iz-ē axw i ʾstōmand ān ī xwēš dēn abezag |b| kē ān ī xwēš dēn yōjdāsrenēd pad humat ud būxt ud huwaršt [’y ʿdaenam. ahyuuam. ] har dō ēk]

|a| You, pure, will purify (your) conscience, because thus there is purification for him, for everyone (in their own conscience, pure, |b| who purifies his own conscience by means of good thoughts, good words and good deeds [that is, daenam. (and) ahyuuam. are both the same].”

Av. ʾərəzurnal (10.19a-b)

Av. ʾərəzurnal was interpreted either as an adverb or as a Voc. Sing. It was considered as an adverb by Geldner (1884). Bartholomae (1904 355, n.1) followed Geldner and said that the interpretation of this word as a Voc. Sing. referring to Zaraštšra is less likely.

On the contrary, Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 2.96), Hoffmann & Forssman (1996 130), Josephson (1997 54) and Cantera (under preparation A 5.17) analyse Av. ʾərəzurnal as the Voc. Sing. of Av. ʾərəzu- “straight, righteous” (cf. Ved. ḫū- “gerade, richtig” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.252-253)). Moreover, according to Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 2.96), the Voc. Sing. ʾərəzurnal “O straightforward one” always refers to Zaraštšra in Young Avestan. In order to support his interpretation, they add the parallel of RV 2.27.9 ḫāve mártỹąya “to
the straightforward mortal”, where Ved. ṣju- does not refer to the path, as usual, but to a mortal.

I agree with their interpretation of Av. əruzūō as the Voc. Sing. of Av. ərzu- “straight, righteous” in V 10.19 too. However, I must remark two syntactic peculiarities of this vocative in this passage. On one hand, the same vocative is repeated in V 10.19a. On the other hand, the second vocative Av. əruzūō is placed in the midst of the syntagm hauuaiā. daēnaiā.

As regards the repetition of the two vocatives, it represents no syntactic problem, as far as the first one appears in the apodosis and the second one in the protasis. Concerning the position of the vocative in the midst of the syntagm hauuaiā. daēnaiā, I have found a possible parallel in FrW 4.1 (Westergaard 1852 332) airiianamē. xē. iš̄im. mazīštēm. mraomē. spitāmē. vispanām. əruzūō. srauuaŋhām “I recite to you the Airiiaman Išiia, o Spitama, the most powerful, o righteous, of all the formulas”. Actually, like in V 10.19a, in FrW 4.1 Av. əruzūō is placed in the midst of a syntagm in genitive. Therefore, though rare, it is not exclusive of Vidēvdād. Furthermore, the presence of the preceding vocative Av. spitama confirms Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø’s (1991 2.96) statement, according to which Av. əruzūō refers to Zaraũustra.
10.20. [ə] yaddā. 1184 abhū. vairiū. 1186 aṯā. ratūs, aṯācīt. hacā. vayhūs, dazād. manayhā. sūdhānānām. abhūs. mazdāi. ṣaadāmācā. abhurāi. ā. yim. drigūiū. dadaṯ. vāstārtaṃ. (= Y 27.13)1187
dō. vōdār, ā. pōi. sōyā. yōi. hōnt. cīrā. mōi. dām. ahīmsū. ratūm. cīdīī. aṭ. bōi. vohū. sāvōsō. jāntū. manayhā. mazdā. ahīms. yahmāi. vāsī. kahmācīt. (= Y 44.16)1192

1184 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, E4, L5, FK1, (G);
L4 (L4a ya-) yaddā; L1, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yaddā
1185 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42,
E4, L5, FK1, (G); P5 aḥūh; Mf2, K9 aḥī
1186 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 . T46, (G); P5, M3 vairiū. 'yw; K2 vairiū. /iā /
/y ekk (in NP.); L1 vairiu (ik in Pāzand); B2, G42 vairiū. l; R278, L5, FK1 vairīū (iak in Pāzand);
P1 vairīū (iak in Pāzand); Br1, L2, E4 vairiū (yiak in Pāzand); Mf2, K9 vairīū. 'yw gwptn'
digne de choix par l’existence (rituelle), le modèle des actes de l’existence de la divine Pensée et leur
emprise sont attribués au Maître Mzdā, dont (cette emprise) fera un pâtre pour les nécessiteux”;
(Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.115): “Just as (a judgment) is worthy of being chosen by
the world, so the judgement, (which) in accordance with truth itself, (is to be passed) on the actions
of good thought of the world, is assigned to the Wise One, and the power (is assigned) to (Him),
the Ahura, whom (people) appoint as a shepherd to the poor”.
1187 L2, P5 . T46, (G); L4 (L4a anā) G34, T44, B1, M3 . R278, Br1, E4, L5, FK1 kōmānā; K1, D62,
K2, F10, E10, P10 . L1, B2, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 kōmā
1188 K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, L4a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 .
Mf2, K9, (G); P5 mazdā. mazdā; K2, G34, T44 | mazdā |
1189 L4, T44 |iā | taunaite. mā | | K1, G34, P10 |iā | taunaite. "apa.nasiiehi | | D6 .
Br1 |iā | taunaite. " gaēō | | P2, P5, K2, E10, B1, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5
|iā | taunaite. astnuuaitē | | F10 . FK1 | taunaite. " gaēō | | Mf2, K9 |iā | taunaite. ... "apa.nasiiehi |
āghē | LOYŠE gwptn’; (G) | taunaite. "apa.nasiiehi |
vid. (Insler 1975 83): “Whom hast Thou appointed as guardian for me, Wise One, if the deceitful
one shall dare to harm me? Whom other than Thy fire and Thy (good) thinking, through whose
actions one has nourished the truth, Lord? Proclaim that wondrous state to me for the shake of the
(good) conception”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.160): “Qui me désignes-tu comme protecteur, ŏ
Mzdā, chaque fois que le partisan de la Tromperie cherche à me contraindre, à faire tort, sinon ton
feu et la pensée, par les actes (rituels) desquels, ŏ Maître, vous engraissez l’Harmonie? Proclame
mon enseignement à la conscience!”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.169): “(But) whom
dost Thou appoint (as) guardian for one such as me, O Wise One, when the deceitful one tries to
seize me in order to injure (me), (whom dost Thou appoint) other than Thy fire and thought, with
whose [du.] actions one nourishes truth, O Ahura? Proclaim a message about that to my religious
view”.
1190 vid. (Insler 1975 71): “This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord. How shall smash the obstacle (of
deceit) in order to protect, in accord with Thy teaching, those pure ones who exist in my house? As
world-healer, promise us a judge, and let obedience to him come through good thinking, to him
whomsoever Thou dost wish him to be, Wise One”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.153): “Quel est
le briseur d’obstacles parmi les Existants, afin qu’il (me) protège suivant ton explication? Que des
cadeaux remarquables me soient faits! Ō guérisseur de l’existence (rituelle), fournis-moi le modèle!
Et que l’obéissance à ce (...) vienne en raison de la divine Pensée, ŏ Mzdā, à celui, quel qu’il soit,
auxel tu veux qu’elle vienne!”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.161): “Who (is) a
resistance-breaker (able) to protect (those) who exist, by Thy proclamation? Accord (as) a
judgement bright (things to be) in my house, O Healer of existence. Let (recompense for) obedience
come to him through good thought, O Wise One, to him, to whomsoever Thou wishest”.
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ašom. voḥū. vahīstam. ast. uštā. ast. uštā. apāi, biuṭ, aṣāi. vahīstāi. ašm. (= Y 27.14)  

[a] 'hlʾdyh  

[pʾtyh]  

y  

[pʾtyh]  

[mām ašm ṣaš]  

[pʾtyh] ... AYT  

[a] Truth is the best prosperity.

[1195] vid. (Kellens 1984 120) and (Pirart 1995 418-419).  
[1196] L4 aeniš; K1 māmāncinī; G34 māmāngacinī; T44 māmācinī; P10 māmāngacinī (P10a above the line -n- instead of -m-, -i- before -n-); (G) māmāngacinī. Regarding the emendation Av. "mā. "mērāncisā, vid. (Kellens 1984 166, n.10) and (Pirart 1995 418-419).  
[1197] D62. FK1, (G); L4 astauaitis; K1. Br1 astauaitis; G34, T44, P10 astauaitis; F10 astauaitis  
[1198] K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10 . B2, T46, P1, (G); K2, E10, M3 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 anash; L4a asthe  
[1200] L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); Br1 ḫašm  
[1201] (G); L4, K1, D62, G34, B1, P10, M3 = vohū =’. P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10 . L1, T46, P1 vohū; B2, G42 vohū. 1; R278, L5, FK1 vohū (yak in Pāzand); Br1, L2 vohū (yak in Pāzand); E4 vohū (yak in Pāzand); Mf2, K9 vohī  
[1202] vid. (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærø 1991 1.115): “Truth is the best (part of all that) is good. As desired (all) the desired (things) are available (as) truth for (that) which (is) best truth / or: for (him) who (is) Best Truth / or: for (him) who (represents) best truth”.  
[1203] L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, K2 /āā /’hlʾdyh; F10, (Jmp) = ‘hlʾdyh ... AYT |  

T44, E10, L4, G34 W ’pʾtyh; K1, D62, K2, B1, P10, M3 =’pʾtyh ... AYT |; P2 ’pʾtyy  
[1204] T44, L4, P2, G34, E10 = y =‘  

L4, G34, T44; P2 AYT; E10 ‘st'
Beginning of the eleventh book


[a] Zarathustra asked Ahura Mazda: “O Ahura Mazda, most benificient Spirit, Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how should I purify the house, [c] how the fire, how the water, how the earth, how the cattle, how the plants, how the righteous man, how the righteous woman, how the sun, how the moon, how the endless lights, how all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth?”

[AYK OD]
airime.] |1264| L4, T44, E10, (Jump); K1, B1, P10, M3 \(\text{airime}\); D62, F10 \(\text{airāme}\); P2 \(\text{airāmi}\); G34 \(\text{airimē}\)

|1265| L4, K1, P2, G34, T44, E10, M3, (Jump); D62, F10, B1 W LA; P10 YMRWN

|1266| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, (Jump); E10 YHWNN-yyt; M3 hwlsp

|1267| G34, F10, T44, E10, M3, (Jump); L4 a\(\text{ anusō}\); D62, B1, P10 anusō; P2 anaoso

|1268| D62, B1; L4, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3, (Jump) YMRWN-yyt; G34a above the line YMRWN

|1269| D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); L4 YMRWN

|1270| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); F10 \(\text{ anusō}.\)

|1271| L4, G34, T44, (Jump); D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 \(\rightarrow \) y \(\rightarrow\)

|1272| D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); P2, G34 \(\text{hlw}^\prime\)

|1273| L4, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); P2 YHWNN-yyt

|1274| L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); P2 n'lyk; F10 n'ylk

|1275| L4, (Jump); D62 ZY; P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 \(\rightarrow\) y \(\rightarrow\)

|1276| L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); G34 \(\text{hlw}^\prime\)

|1277| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jump); P10a above the line YMRWN sl \(\text{cygwn PWN}\)

|1278| D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10a above the line, M3, (Jump); L4, G34, T44 sl \(\text{cygwn PWN}\)

|1279| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jump); L4, G34, T44 sl \(\text{cygwn PWN}\)

|1280| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); F10 YHWNN-yyt

|1281| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); T44 \(\rightarrow\) ZK \(\rightarrow\)

|1282| L4, K1, F10, M3; D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jump) \(\rightarrow\) y \(\rightarrow\)

|1283| K1, P2, P10, (Jump); L4, M3 \(\text{sl} \text{y lwšnyh}\); D62 \(\text{hlw} \text{sl} \text{lwšnyh}\); G34, T44, E10 \(\text{sl} \text{y lwšnyh}\) (G34a above the line corrects \(\text{sl} \text{by} \text{sl}\)\); F10 \(\text{'nyl'' sl} \text{lwšnyh}\); B1 \(\text{sl} \text{lwšnyh}\)

|1284| L4, K1, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jump); D62, F10, P10 \(\text{cygwn PWN} \rightarrow\)

|1285| L4, K1, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jump); D62, F10, P10 hlwp; P2 hlwpyn

|1286| L4, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, M3, (Jump); K1, D62 (but \(\text{p} \text{y} \text{h} \text{above the line})\), B1, P10 \(\text{'thš}\)

|1287| K1, G34, T44, (Jump); L4, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 \(\rightarrow\) y \(\rightarrow\); D62 ZY

|1288| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jump); F10 \(\text{pyt'k}\)
In NM 1.7.10-11 (Dhabhar 1912 34-35), (West 1880 2.307-308) we find the quotation of this text from Vīdēvdād with some variants:

10. u-š wandīdād\(^{1271}\) yazīnīh-iz abastāg gōwīnīh-iz wāz gīrīn<št>–iz čiyōn-aš pursīd zarduxšt az ohrmazd kū čiyōn <pad mān> yōjāsānem kū tā ‘airiīeme.\(^{1272}\) / nē bawēd ast kē hamāg ‘anusō.\(^{1273}\) gōwēd

11. čiyōn pad ātāxī čiyōn pad āb čiyōn pad gōspand čiyōn pad urwarzā čiyōn pad mard i ašō čiyōn pad nārig i ašōnī\(^{30}\) čiyōn pad star čiyōn pad māh čiyōn pad xwarīsē čiyōn pad ān i asar rōšnīh [čiyōn pad anagr\(^{1275}\) rōšn\(^{1276}\)] čiyōn pad harwisp ābādīh\(^{1277}\).<št>–iz ohrmazd-dād kē az ablayīh paydāgīh

10. And he must celebrate the Wandīdād ceremony and recite the Avesta and take the (introductory) prayer\(^{1278}\) so as Zarduxšt asked Ohrmazd: “how shall I purify<št>–iz ohrmazd-dād kē az ablayīh paydāgīh

11. “how (shall I purify) the fire, how the water, how the earth, how the cattle, how the plants, how the righteous man, how the righteous woman, how the stars, how the moon, how the sun, how the endless lights [how the endless lights], how all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth?”

A parallel of this Pahlavi translation of V 11.1-7, partially written in Pārsē and Pāzand, is attested in MU 1.609.14-613.6 concerning the purification of different things too. Here I reproduce its first part, MU 1.609.16-17 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):

|a| porsaṭ. zaradūstro. ahurīm. mazdām. ahura. mazed. mainīō. spōnistā. dātarī. gaēdānām. astuwaitānām. ašām. |
|b| kuḍā. nmānīm. yaodādāmī cūn. pad. mān. yaozdādīranām. [kuḍā. airīman. na. bāt. hušt. anuṣo. guīt.] |

\(^{1271}\) Dhabhar (1912 34) edited <wndydʾt W>, which must be <wndydʾt>'. cf. the variant <wndydʾt> in Supp. Šnī 13.19 [K20 172v.20]. For the interpretation of this wrong variant, which seems the origin of the New Persian reading Vandīdād / Vendīdād, vid. (Cantera 2006 53-54, n.6).

\(^{1272}\) Of course Av. ‘airīme was wrongly written here.

\(^{1273}\) Dhabhar (1912 34-35) edited <W cygwyn> in all cases, but the comparison with the text from Vīdēvdād makes clear that we must not edit <W>.

\(^{1274}\) Phl. <šwknynḏ> is a transliteration of Av. ʾaṣāonī-.

\(^{1275}\) Dhabhar (1912 35) edited <ngl>, which surely comprise <ngl> or maybe <ʾngl y>.

\(^{1276}\) As the text of Vīdēvdād demonstrate, <cygwyn PWN ‘ngl lwšn'> is a gloss which explains <cygwyn PWN ZK y ʾšlwšn>' as it is written in Vīdēvdād.

\(^{1277}\) Dhabhar (1912 35) edited <ʾhlʾdyh>, like W and BK, but he preferred in the footnote <ʾpʾyh>, as it is written in Vīdēvdād.

\(^{1278}\) For the meaning and passages of wāz grīstān as terminus technicus for the first part of the prayer after a ritual lustration vid. (Chacha 1936 51-52) and (Boyce 1971a 58).

\(^{1279}\) West (1880 2.307) did not understand this sentence, because he thought that here the Avestan phrase ʾa. airiṣmā. ʾīsiō from Y 54.1 was quoted. Hence he translated “where he does not attain unto the Airyemā” and explained it as “how is the purification to be effected when all the spells are not recited?”, which in this context makes no sense.
Zardušt asked Ohrmazd: “O Ohrmazd, bountiful Spirit, Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, how shall I purify the house [so that it does not become ‘airiman.’] [there is (a commentator) who says ‘anuḵo.’], |c| how (shall I purify) the fire, how the water, how the earth, how the cattle, how the plants, how the righteous man, how the stars, how the moon, how the sun, how the endless lights, how all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth?”

As we observe, this Pārsi and Pāzand translation follows the PT of Vīdēvdād together with its glosses, but not that of NM.

Av. strāś (11.1c)
vid. (de Vaan 2003 512, 520-521).

Pārsi and Pāzand translation:
[a] Zardušt asked Ohrmazd: “O Ohrmazd, bountiful Spirit, Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, how shall I purify the house [so that it does not become ‘airiman.’] [there is (a commentator) who says ‘anuḵo.’], |c| how (shall I purify) the fire, how the water, how the earth, how the cattle, how the plants, how the righteous man, how the stars, how the moon, how the sun, how the endless lights, how all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth?”

As we observe, this Pārsi and Pāzand translation follows the PT of Vīdēvdād together with its glosses, but not that of NM.

Av. strāś (11.1c)
vid. (de Vaan 2003 512, 520-521).

Pārsi and Pāzand translation:
[a] Zardušt asked Ohrmazd: “O Ohrmazd, bountiful Spirit, Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, how shall I purify the house [so that it does not become ‘airiman.’] [there is (a commentator) who says ‘anuḵo.’], |c| how (shall I purify) the fire, how the water, how the earth, how the cattle, how the plants, how the righteous man, how the stars, how the moon, how the sun, how the endless lights, how all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth?”

As we observe, this Pārsi and Pāzand translation follows the PT of Vīdēvdād together with its glosses, but not that of NM.

Av. strāś (11.1c)
vid. (de Vaan 2003 512, 520-521).

Phl. kū tā /airime./ nē bawād (11.1b)
Bartholomae (1904 189) established for Av. airime the meaning “still, ruhig”, which Narten (1968) agreed with. However, this meaning makes no sense in the context of V 11.1b. On the other hand, Humbach (1985) compares Av. airime with Ved. ārma- “verlassener, öder Platz” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 I.120, s.v. ārma-), which in its turn is related to Germ. *arma- “vereinsamt, verlassen” (de Vries 1962). Av. airime would then be a locative of an Av. arma-. Therefore, he accepts for Av. airime the meaning “lonely or isolated place/region”, an option already proposed by Dhabhar (1932 394), who understood it as “secluded”. Cantera (under preparation C) states more precisely that the Avestan structure airime. gātu.m.bē. ni-had- in V 9 and 16 is a terminus technicus for the isolation of somebody who is considered a source of impurity 1280.

Therefore, in this text it would be stated how the purification should be performed in order that the house which has become impure does not just turn into an isolated place. By means of this interpretation it could also be implied a reference to, though not a proper quotation of, V 9.

1280 cf. (Dhabhar 1932 394): “airime. gātu a secluded place where an armesht (i.e., a woman who has brought forth a still-born child) or any person defiled by nasā should remain until the impurity is removed”.
Av. anusō (11.1b)

The quotation here of this Avestan word can be explained with regard to the preceding Av. airime. If we accept that Av. airime is used as a terminus technicus, probably Av. anusō can also be explained in the same way. Indeed, in V 9.41 we also find Av. anusō in the context of the purification of a house and here it is stated that the sun, the moon and the stars warm “unwillingly” (Av. anusō) the impure ones. V 9.41 was quoted as a resource of authority regarding purification, as NM 2.3.5 (Dhabhar 1912 67), (West 1880 2.338), (Kanga 1975), where part of the PT of V 9.41 is quoted, indicates:

ēg ašmā yōǰdāsrga rīh kardan frēzwānīg būd ē ān kār ēdōn awizīrišnīg kū ān kē abar rīst kū rēman būd ēstēd ā-š star-iz ud māb ud xwarāšd ahunsandihā padiš tābēnd ōwōn frayādihān kū meh šnāyēnīdērīh ī ātaxš ud āb ud zamig ud gōspand ud nar <i> ablaw ud nārig ī “ablawe” padiš ast</i>

Then it was obligatory for you to perform the work of the purification, for this action is so unavoidable that even the stars, the moon and the sun warm unwillingly him who has been in contact with (someone) dead, namely impure. (This action is also) so helpful that by means of it there is a great propitiation of the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the righteous man and the righteous woman.

From the quotation of this passage on, Av. anusō became a terminus technicus in a context of purification, as is shown by the parallel where V 9.41 is quoted, namely NM 1.4.2-3 (Dhabhar 1912 17-18), (West 1880 2.292-293):

2. čīyōn pēšēnīgān guft ēstēd kū ka az kār hilihēd bar āb ātaxš urwar ud mard ī ašō ud gōspand ud harvisp dām ī ohmazd bēšīd ud kāst ud šaspēnīd bawēd
3. čīyōn gōwīhēd pad dēn kū ōy tan ī rist kē-š nasuš abar dwārīd ēstēd [anusō. zi. spitama. zaraḏuštə. aēša. yā. paiti.irista. auuα. huuar. ā.tāpaite. anusō. hāu. mā. anusō. auue. stāρō. / ... ]

2. As the ancients have said: “When someone ceases to celebrate it (the bareśnūm ceremony) every water, fire, plant, righteous man, cattle and all the Ohrmazd’s creation becomes damaged, decreased and gone astray.”


1282 One more time Dhabhar (1912 67) edited <lysτ’>, but I think that we must prefer here <’lysτ’>, Phl. rist.

1283 I follow Kanga’s (1975 29) emendation, who read kū instead of the ka written here.

1284 Dhabhar (1912 18) edited <’y>, which was read by Kanga (1975 29) as ē. In my opinion, Phl. <ʾhlwb’ y> could represent an attempt of translating the Avestan feminine by means of a Pahlavi feminine –e. vid. The Pahlavi translation of V 12, chapter 1.5.1.3 of the introduction, regarding the Pahlavi endings for the feminine.

1285 With regards to NM 1.7.10, where V 11.1 ff. is quoted, also West (1880 2.307) stated that this anusō was a quotation from Vidēvdād.

1286 Dhabhar (1912 18) edited <lsyt’>, but I prefer here <’lysτ’>, not only because of the context but also because of the variant <lsyτ’> in MR and J, which surely corresponds to <’lysτ’>, namely Phl. ristag “corpse”. This erroneous reading <lsyt’> can be explained from the script of the united characters y+s (229).

1287 I follow Dhabhar’s (1912 18) interpretation, who related Phl. <šspynyt’> with NP. شمس "leaping, absence", and I translate “gone astray” because of the context.
3. As it is said in the Religion regarding this dead body, whom Nasu has run through, “for unwillingly, o Spitama Zarabuṣṭra, that sun, unwillingly that moon, unwillingly those stars warm them, the polluted ones” ...

As already mentioned, Av. airime seems to be the terminus technicus for the secluded place where somebody impure is temporarily isolated. Thus, the first gloss seems to indicate that, unless the house is purified, it becomes so impure as an airime, that is, as a place of isolation. In the second gloss Av. anusō seems also to be used as a terminus technicus, but it appears to be applied to something impure. Thus, according to the second gloss, unless the house is purified, it becomes not a place of isolation, but simply impure.

I cannot specify whether or not Av. anusō refers to a special form or degree of impurity. That it is a terminus technicus for something impure can also be inferred from the parallel of V 12.2 ff., where its antonym Av. vasō appears. Actually, in V 12.2 ff., when the house where someone is dead is purified, the waters, the plants and the Beneficient Immortals can enter at will (Av. vasō).

Av. Direct Object + yaoždā- → Phl. pad + name + yōjḍāsrerīdan (11.1b-c)

It is striking that the Avestan transitive structure DO + yaoždā- was translated by an unusual intransitive Pahlavi structure with pad. Av. yaoždā- is mostly translated in Pahlavi by the transitive DO + yōjḍāsrerīdan, yōjḍāsreṇ-: V 7.16 (Av. bā. mē. āpō. yaoždaštī → Phl. an ā man āb yōjḍāsreṇād), 9.1 (Av. tanum. yaoždaštīn → Phl. tan yōjḍāsreṇād), 9.37-38 (eight times Av. DO + yaoždāō → Phl. DO + yōjḍāsreṇād), 21.6 (Av. kāhrōma. tōnušimca. yaoždaštīn → Phl. kirb <ud> tuxšīn yōjḍāsre<na>m), N 55.1 (Av. ādrasca. tišró. društiš. yaoždaštāt → Phl. ātāš sē sraxt yōjḍāsreṇād) and 56.1 (Av. ādrasca. aēnuum. društim. yaoždaštāt → Phl. ātāš ēk sraxt yōjḍāsreṇād).

Complements with pad of the verb Phl. yōjḍāsreṇidan, yōjḍāsreṇ- indicate means of purification, e. g.: V 5.21 (Av. hūuam. ayyhuuam. yaoždaite. humatašiša. hūxtašiša. hūwārštiša → Phl. ān ā xuēš yōjḍāsreṇād pad humad hūxt huwaršt), 8.36 (Av. hūuam. tanum. pairi.yaoždaištīa. gāmš. maēšdana. apāca → Phl. ān ā xuēš tan abar yōjḍāsreṇād pad gōmez pad-iz āb) and Dd 31.10 (pad ān ā abardom šoştānih pad ān ā widāxta āhan bē yōjḍāsribēnd az gast rēbag “through that supreme washing with molten metal, they become purified from the horrible deceit” (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 103)). The periphrastic structure yaoždārōm. barāni instead of yaoždaštīn in V 19.12, where Av. kudā. narām. ašauvanām. yaoždaštīni. kudā. nārīkṣam. ājānām. yaoždārōm. barāni is translated by Phl. čiyou mard ā ablāw yōjḍāsre<na>m čiyou nārig ā ablāw yōjḍās abar baram, also does not attest this rare use of an intransitive Phl. yōjḍāsreṇidan, yōjḍāsreṇ- with pad.

The direct object of Phl. yōjḍāsreṇidan, yōjḍāsreṇ- is never expressed by Phl. pad + noun. As a matter of fact, this latter syntagm is actually used as the complement of the noun Phl. yōjḍāsreb. Actually, in V 3.39 Av. nauua.bē. asti. yaoždārōm “and there is no purification for it” is translated by Phl. ud nē òy ast
yōjdāsrīh [pad ruwān] “and there is no purification for it [for the soul]”\(^\text{1288}\). Furthermore, the syntagm Av. yaoždāta + noun is systematically translated in V 11.2 by Phl. yōjdāsrīh pad + noun, where Phl. yōjdāsrīh pad + noun must be understood as “purification for + noun”.

Phl. pad + noun + yōjdāsrēnidan, yōjdāsrēn- instead of the expected syntagm noun + yōjdāsrēnidan, yōjdāsrēn- “to purify + noun” could apparently be explained as a contamination due to the influence of the correct syntagm Phl. yōjdāsrīh pad + noun, “purification for + noun”. However, we must take into account that the same structure Phl. cīyōn + pad + noun + transitive verb is also found in other PTs, as we see for example in V 10.1b cīyōn pad ɹ̄y druz pahikārēm ... cīyōn pad ɹ̄y nasuš pahikārēm “how shall I fight this Lie ... how shall I fight this Nasu”. So it seems that Phl. pad + noun was also used to express the direct object of transitive verbs in the PT.

Av. aṣa.ćiдра - → Phl. az ahlāyīh paydāgīh (11.1c)

There is a problem regarding the PT of the second element of this Avestan compound, namely ściдра-, because of the supposed polysemy of this Avestan word, which was understood either as “evident, manifest” or “seed, origin”.

Bartholomae (1904 586-587) distinguished two different Av. ściдра-: 1ściдра- “offenbar, klar, sichtbar” and 2ściдра- “Same, Ursprung”, and considered unlikely that both words were etymologically one and the same. As far as Av. aṣa.ściдра- is concerned, Bartholomae (1904 240) translated it as “der seinen Ursprung im Aṣa hat”, because he explained the second element of this compound from 2ściдра- “Same, Ursprung”, vs. 1ściдра- “offenbar, klar, sichtbar”. Also Wolff, who translated this syntagm as “alles mazdâhgeschaffene aṣaentstammte Gute”; Lommel (1927 14), who translated it as “alles gute, das von dem Weisen geschaffen der Wahrheit entstammt”; and Panaino (2002 38), who understands it as “all good things created by Mazdâ having their seed in Truth”, accepted Bartholomae’s explanation.

More recently, Pirart (2009 244-245) has continued Bartholomae’s (1904 586-587) 2ściдра- “Same, Ursprung”, since he understands Av. aṣa.ćiдра- as “(astres) Apćiдра (=qui sont apparentés à l’eau [ou de nature hydrique])”, Av. zamacićiдра- as “(astres) Zmćiдра (=qui sont apparentés à la terre [ou de nature terreuse])” and Av. gaocićiдра- as “(la Lune) apparentée au lait [d’aspect ou de nature laiteuse]” respectively.

On the contrary, Duchesne-Guillemin (1955 98 n. 6) denied Bartholomae’s skepticism regarding the identity of both words and adduced the parallel of Lat. speciēs “id.” (cf. Lat. spiciō “I see, I behold”). According to Gershevitch (1967 213-214), the polysemy of Av. ściдра- is also inherited by some Middle and New Iranian words. Regarding Avestan compounds with ściдра- as second element, Mayrhofer (1977 I/28-29) hesitated whether it meant “Glanz, glanzvolle Erscheinung” or

\(^{1288}\) cf. the use of Phl. yōjdāsrīh pad ruwān “purification for the soul” in the glosses of V 5.21c and 10.18d.
“Same, Herkunft” in the personal name ātērā.cīdra- of Yt 13.1021269, that is, he accepted that both meanings existed.

Other scholars only took into account 1cīdra- in their interpretations of some Old Iranian compounds, although they did not deny that 2cīdra- existed. Schmitt (1982 IV/22) stated that the Lycian personal name kizada-prīna- stems from OP. ściça-farnā, where OP. ściça- < PrIr. ścidra-<, and translated it as “mit strahlendem Glanz”, namely by 1cīdra-. Also Gignoux (1986 268) and (2003 85) thought that the first element of the Middle Persian compounds čihr-ohrmsazd and čihr-burzin stem from OrIr. 1cīdra- “resplendissant”. In the Avestan compound gacīdra-, Kellens (1996 86) interprets the second element as “caractéristique-remarquable” or “marque-distinctive”, that is, as 1cīdra-.

However, Soudavar (2006) went one step further. He denied that Av. 2cīdra-ever existed and stated that the only meaning of Av. cīdra- and their cognates in Old, Middle and New Persian was “appearance, radiance, etc.”. According to him (2006 168-169), the Avestan compound aša.cīdra- cannot mean “containing the seed or principle of Aša”, but only “of just appearance” or “he who radiates justice”. Also Panaino (2009 208-214) has recently stated that it is not necessary to postulate another stem Av. 2cīdra-.

Like Soudavar and Panaino, I think that Bartholomae’s 2cīdra- “origin” cannot be taken for granted in Avestan. All the passages to which Bartholomae (1904 587) assigned the meaning “origin” can also be easily understood if we translate Av. cīdra- as “appearance”. Because of this, I have translated Av. aša.cīdra- as “which (have) the brightness of Truth”. Moreover, I think that Bartholomae’s (1904 587) 2cīdra- “origin” is motivated by the Pahlavi exegesis of this word in compounds.

Av. aša.cīdra- is translated by Phl. kē az abłāyiḥ paydāgiḥ “whose manifestation (stems) from Truth”. This translation indicates that the Pahlavi translators understood that the right meaning of Av. 2cīdra- in this compound was “manifest”.

Nevertheless, the PT of other Avestan compounds whose second element is 2cīdra- disagrees with this interpretation. In several compounds, Av. cīdra- was interpreted as “origin, seed”, as their PT töhm mag demonstrates: Y 58.1 (Av. hucīdra- → Phl. hutōhmag), Vr 16.1 (ātārš.cīdra- → Phl. ātaxš töhmag), Yt 3.8 and 3.11 (Av. ažicīdra- → Phl. azdāhāg töhm 1260), Yt 3.8 and 3.11 (Av. vōhrkō.cīdra- → Phl. šagr ud gurg töhm), Yt 3.8 and 3.11 (Av. bizəŋrō.cīdra- → Phl. dō-zangān töhm 1279), Yt 3.15 (Av. ažicīdra.ažicīdrōtmā → Phl. azdāhāg töhm meh azdāhāg töhm), Yt 3.15 (Av. vōhrkō.cīdra.vōhrkō.cīdrōtmā → Phl. šagr ud gurg töhm meh šagr ud gurg töhm), Yt 3.15 (Av. bizəŋrō.cīdra.bizəŋrō.cīdrōtmā → Phl. dō-zangān töhm meh dō-zangān töhm), Yt 6.4, Ny 1.14, V 5.62, 8.80 and 18.76 (Av. ṭomascīdra- → Phl. ṭom töhmag 1292), V 8.21, 9.27-28 and 10.20 (Av. daēnūc.cīdra- →

1269 In the parallel Av. hucīra.cīdra- of Yt 13.98, however, Mayrhofer (1977 I/52) did not hesitate, because he translated it as “Sonnen-prächtig”, that is, he thought that 1cīdra- was implied.
1260 In Yt 3.9 Av. ažicīdranām remains untranslated.
1279 In Yt 3.12 Av. bizəŋrō.cīdranām is not translated.
1292 Dhabhar (1927 20) read tom tomīgān in Ny 1.14, but U3, U4, D, Mf2 and DR attest <twmkn'>, which must be corrected by <twnmk'n'> and surely contains the right reading tö<b>magin.
Phl. dēw tōhmag), V 8.75 and 18.52 (Av. ātra.čiđra- → Phl. ātaxš tōhmag), V 13.16 (Av. spaciđra- → Phl. sag tōhmag), V 21.13 (Av. afš.čiđra- → Phl. āb tōhmag\(^{1293}\)), Vyt 56 (Av. raēuuat.čiđra- → Phl. rāyōmand tōhmag) und HN 2.9 (Av. raēuuasciđra- → Phl. rāyōmand tōhmag).

In other cases, Phl. čihr, either “appearance, shape” or “seed, origin” (MacKenzie 1971 22), is used in the PT: V 20.3 (Av. viš.čiđra- → Phl. viš-čihr), S 1.13 (Av. afš.čiđra- → Phl. āb čihr(ān); but AK, E āb tōhmag\(^{1294}\)), S 2.13 (Av. afš.čiđra- → Phl. āb čihrag; but AK, E āb tōhmag), S 1.13 (Av. zamasciđra- → Phl. zamig čihr(ān); but AK, E zamig tōhmag), S 2.13 (Av. zamasciđra- → Phl. zamig čihrag; but AK, E zamig tōhmag), S 1.13 (Av. uruarō.čiđra- → Phl. urwar čihr(ān); but AK, E urwar tōhmag) and S 2.13 (Av. uruarō.čiđra- → Phl. urwar čihrag; but AK, E urwar tōhmag). The variants with Phl. tōhmag instead of Phl. čihr indicate that the Pahlavi translators understood Phl. čihr as “seed, origin” in these passages.

To summarise, it is evident that the Pahlavi translators rendered Av. ciđra- by two different words, but this does not imply that the Avestan word was polysemic. Therefore, in my opinion, the meaning of Av. \(^2\)ciđra- “origin” can be rejected.

---

1293 The same Avestan compound, however, is translated as Phl. āb čihr(ān) in S 1.13.

1294 Sometimes tōhmag and čihr alternate. This is the case of HN 2.9 too, where the gloss [kū-š tōhmag az yazdān] after rāyōmand tōhmag is a mere stilistic variation of the epigraphic Middle Persian kē čihr az yazdān.
112. | a | āt. mrao; 1295 aburō. mazdā. yaoždaðrōm. 1296 srāunuiaiōs. 1297 zaraðnrāta. 1296 | b | yaoždaata. 1299 pascaēta. 1302 būn. 1301 nmnā. 1302 | c | yaoždaata. 1303 ât. 1304 yaoždaata. 1335 ârpm. yaoždaata. 1336 zm. yaoždaata. 1338 gm. 1339 yaoždaata. 1340 uruwarām. 1341 yaoždaata. 1342 narm. ašauranām. 1343 yaoždaata. 1344 nārikām. 1345 ašonīm. 1346 yaoždaata. strō. 1348

1295 L4, D62, P2, P5, F10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, (G); K2 . L1, T46, P1 . Mf2 mrao; G34 mrao; T44, E10 | mrao; aburō. mazdā | ; FK1 mrao; K9 ātā | mrao; aburō | .

1296 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L1 y'aoždaðrōm; B2, P1 . Mf2 yaoždaðrōm; R278 yaoždaðrōm; T46, G42 yaoždaðrōm; K9 yaoždaðrōm.

1297 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, (G); T44 srāunuiaiōs; E10 srāunuiaiōs; L1 srāunuiaiōs;FK1 srāunuiaiōs; K9 srāunuiaiōs.

1298 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 zaraðnrāta; L5 zaraðnrāta.

1299 L4, K2, G34, B1, P10, M3 . Br1, L2, L5, FK1, (G); D62 yaoždaaita; P2, P5, F10, T44, E10 yaoždaaita; L1, B2 . Mf2, K9 yaoždaaita; R278 yaoždaaita; T46, G42 yaoždaaita; P1 yaoždaaita; E4 yaoždaaita.

1300 L4, G34 . Mf2, (G); D62, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1 pascaaita; P2, P5, F10, T44, E10 . E4 pascaaita; K2 pascaaita; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 pascaaita; K9 ât. pascaaita.

1301 L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, (G); D62, B1. FK1 bunā; P10 b'na; M3 bunā; E4 baon; Mf2, K9 bin

1302 L4, K1, P10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10 mnān. G34, B1 . R278 namāna; T44, M3 . E4, L5, FK1 namān

1303 D62, K2, G34, F10, P10 . L2, G42, L5, FK1, (G); L4, T44, M3 yaoždaaita; P2, P5, E10, B1 yaoždaaita; L1, R278, B1 yaoždaaita; B2 yaoždaaita; T46, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždaaita; E4 yaoždaaita

1304 L4, D62, K2, P10 . L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3 . R278, T46, E4, L5, FK1 ât. pascaaita

1305 L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, P10 . Br1, L2, L5, FK1, (G); P2, P5, E10 yaoždaaiti; T44, B1, M3 yaoždaaita; L1, B2, R278, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždaaita; T46, G42 yaoždaaita; E4 yaoždaaita

1306 L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, P10 . L5, FK1, (G); P2, P5, E10, B1 yaoždaaiti; F10 yaoždaaita; T44, M3 yaoždaaita; L1, B2, T46, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždaaita; R278, Br1, L2, G42 yaoždaaita; E4 yaoždaaita

1307 L4 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10 in the left margin, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, L1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 ām

1308 L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, P10 . Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1, (G); P2, P5, E10, B1 yaoždaaiti; T44, M3 yaoždaaita; L1, B2, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždaaita; R278, T46 yaoždaaita; E4 yaoždaaita

1309 L4 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 nārikām; FK1 nārikām

285
And Ahura Mazdā said: “you shall rectify the (formula) of purification, Zaraphštra. [b] Then the houses will be purified[31], [c] the fire (will be) purified, the water (will be) purified, the earth (will be) purified, the cattle (will be) purified, the plants (will be) purified, the righteous man (will be) purified, the righteous woman (will be) purified, the stars (will be) purified, the moon (will be) purified, the sun (will be) purified, the endless lights (will be) purified, all goods made by Mazdā which (have) the brightness of Truth (will be) purified.”

which (have) the bright purified, the endless lights (will be) purified, the stars (will be) purified, the sun (will be) purified, the moon (will be) purified, the sun (will be) purified, the endless lights (will be) purified, all goods made by Mazdā which (have) the brightness of Truth (will be) purified.”

[31] L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . R278, G42, L5, (G); P2, P5 ašaunanim; E10 . Br1, L2, E4, FK1 ašaunim; L1, B2, T46, P1 . Mf2, K9 ašaunim

[32] L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, P10 . Br1, L2, FK1, (G); P2, P5, E10, B1 yaoždāi; T44, M3 yaoždāita; L1, B2, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždāita; R278 yaoždāita; T46, G42 yaoždāita; E4 yaoždāite; L5 yaoždāita

[33] L4, D62, K2, F10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); M3 māyhom

[34] L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, (G); P2, P5, B1 yaoždāi; T44, M3 yaoždāita; E10 yaoždāita; L1, G42 yaoždāita; B2 yaoždāita; T46, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždāita; E4 yaoždāite

[35] L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 hauara

[36] L4a yaoždāita; L1, B2, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždāita; R278 yaoždāita; T46, G42 yaoždāita; E4 yaoždāite

[37] L4a anagrapa. raoc. yaoždāita | L5 anagrapa

[38] L4a – anagrapa. raoc. yaoždāita

[39] L4a, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10 . Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1, (G); P2, P5, E10, B1 yaoždāi; T44, M3 yaoždāita; L4a yaoždāita; L1, B2, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždāita; R278 yaoždāita; T46, G42 yaoždāita; E4 yaoždāite

[40] L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, P5, vispa; E4 vispa; L5 vispe

[41] L4, (G); L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 vōbi; B1, E10 vōbi; P10 vōbi; Mf2 vōbi; K9 vōbi

[42] L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E10 mazdašāta; L1 mazdašā; L5 mazdašāta

[43] L4, K2, T44, B1, M3 . FK1; D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, L4a . L1, B2, T46, P1, (G) ašačida; F10 ašačida; E10 ašačida; R278, G42 ašačida; B1, L2 ašačida; E4 ašačida; L5 ašačida; Mf2 ašačida; K9 ašačida


L4, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . (Jmp); P2 yвиды; F10 yвиды

L4, G34, T44, L4, P2, F10, E10 zltwhs; D62, B1, P10, M3 . (Jmp) zltwšt

P2, F10, B1, P10, M3; L4, T44, E10, (Jmp) ywtdywd’ t; D62 ywtd dyw d’t HD; G34

L4, K1, D62, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . (Jmp) yвиды

L4, G34, T44, E10, K1, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . (Jmp) yвиды; D62 in the right margin yвиды; PWN ZY ‘thš yвиды; PWN MYA
zmyk ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³⁴ PWN ᵃ¹³⁴ gwspnd ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³² PWN ᵃ¹³³ wlwł ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³⁴ PWN ᵃ¹⁴⁶ GBRA y ᵃ¹³⁶’hłwb’y ᵃ¹³⁴ ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³⁶ PWN ᵃ¹³³ stl ᵃ¹³⁴ ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³⁶ PWN ᵃ¹³³ m’h ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³⁴ PWN ᵃ¹³³ hwlšyt’h ᵃ¹³⁶ ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³⁶ PWN ’šl ᵃ¹³⁶ lwšnyh ᵃ¹³⁶ ywšd’slyh ᵃ¹³⁶ PWN ᵃ¹³⁶ hlwpş p’tyh’h ᵃ¹³⁶ ’whrzmzd d’t’ MNW MN ’hł’d’yḥ ᵃ¹³⁶ pyt’kyh’ ᵃ¹³⁶

[a] And Ohrmazd said: “the (formula of) purification must be recited, Zarduxšt [that is, celebrate a Juddéwdād]. [b] Then there will be purification for the house, [c] purification for the fire, purification for the water, purification for the earth, purification for the cattle, purification for the plants, purification for the righteous man, purification for the righteous woman, purification for the stars, purification

1337 G34, T44, E10; L4, K1, D62 in the right margin, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1338 G34, T44, E10, L4a; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl; P5, K2 ᵃ’ywyd’sl
1339 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, M3, L4a, (Jmp); T44 ᵃ³⁴⁸ PWN
1340 L4, G34, T44, E10; D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1341 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); P10a PWN
1342 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1343 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1344 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); P10a PWN
1345 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); B1 ᵃ PWN ᵃ P10a PWN
1346 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1347 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P10a PWN
1348 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P10a PWN
1349 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4 ᵃ PWN ᵃ E10, P10a PWN
1350 L4, T44, (Jmp); K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 ᵃ y ᵃ
1351 L4, K1, D62, P2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 ’hłwb’y; ’F10 ᵃ’hłwb’y
1352 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1353 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); P2, B1 ᵃ PWN ᵃ P10a PWN
1354 L4, D62, P2, F10, (Jmp); K1, G34, B1, P10, M3 stwl; E10 stl y
1355 E10; L4, K1, T44, E10, B1, M3 ᵃ ywšd’slyh PWN ᵃ D62, P2, F10, P10, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1356 P2, F10, E10, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 ᵃ PWN ᵃ W; D62, P10 ᵃ PWN ᵃ
1357 E10; L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 ᵃ ywšd’slyh PWN ᵃ P2, (Jmp) ywšd’sl
1358 P2, E10, (Jmp); L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 W
1359 L4, K1, P2, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62, G34, P10 hwlšyt; F10 ᵃ Wʾhlwb’y
1360 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, (Jmp) ywšd’sl; M3 ywšd’sl
1361 L4, K1, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62, F10, P10 ᵃ’šl’
1362 D62, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp); L4, G34 y lwšn’yh; P2 lwšn’yh; T44 y lwšnyh; M3 lwšn’y
1363 L4, G34, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, F10, P10, M3, (Jmp) ywšd’sl; B1 ywšd’sl
1364 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 ᵃ PWN ᵃ G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4 hlwpş ᵃ y; D62 ᵃ hlwpş; P2 ᵃ hlwpşyf; F10, P10 hlwpş
1365 L4, D62, G34, T44, E10, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 p’tyh’h ᵃ’hlwp; F10 ᵃ’hlwpšt; B1 ’tš
1366 L4, K1, G34, T44, E10; D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp) ᵃ y ᵃ
1367 L4, K1, D62, P2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 ’hlwyf; F10 ᵃ’tš
1368 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 pyt’kyh’
for the moon, purification for the sun, purification for the endless lights, purification for the all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth.”

The Pārsī translation of this passage is attested in MU 1.610.7-16 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):

[a] āaț. mraț. ahurō. mazdā. yaożdāṛṃ. srāuuaiōiš. zara thùśira.
 آش گفت اورمزد کو ایوژدیسرایشن اشو زرتخت کو آن جدیدوداد به یز د
[b] yaożdāta. pascaēta. bun. nmāna

ایوزداتا پید پو مان

ایوزداترپد اتاش ایوزداتر پد اب ایوزداتر پد زمین ایوزداتر پد اورور ایوزداتر پد مرد اشو ایوزداتر پد ناریگ اشو ایوزداتر پد ستور ایوزداتر پد ماه ایوزداتر پد خورشید ایوزداتر پد اسر روشن ایوزداتر پد هروسب آبادی اورمزدا کو ار امیو

Pārsī translation:
[a] And Ohrmazd said: “the (formula of) purification must be recited, Zardušt [that is, celebrate the Juddēwād].] [b] Then there will be purification for the house, [c] purification for the fire, purification for the water, purification for the earth, purification for the plants, purification for the righteous man, purification for the stars, purification for the moon, purification for the sun, purification for the endless lights, purification for the all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth.”

It should be noticed here that the purification for the cattle is not mentioned, because ایوزداتر پد گوسیند is lacking. On the other hand, it seems that this text has been adapted from a manuscript of the group of K1, because the variant ایوزداتر, which agrees with the variant Phl. yōjāsṛ, is used instead of ایوزداتر, which would fit the variant Phl. yōjārsṛ of L4 and the manuscripts of its group.

Av. yaożdāṛṃ. srāuuaiōiš (11.2a)

Among all the texts where Av. yaożdāra- “purification” (Bartholomae 1904 1235-1236) is attested, this is the only passage where this noun is the direct object of a verbum dicendi. Because of this, I have preferred to translate it here as “(formula of) purification”.

1370 Av. ātrəm. yaożdāta in the right margin.
Phl. srāyīšn (11.2a)

All the PV manuscripts agree in the variant <sl’dšn’>. However, this seems to be a corruption from the oldest reading <sl’dyh>, which represents a Pahlavi optative.

Actually, the first part of the PT of V 11.2a is included in a Pahlavi text older than the oldest PV manuscript, namely in NM 1.7.12 (Dhabhar 1912 35), (West 1880 2.308):

\[ u-\text{š guft ohrmazd kū yōjdāsrīh srāyē zarduxšt [kū wandidād-ē bē yaz] yōjdāsr pas bawēd } \]

And Ohrmazd said: “you shall recite the (formula of) purification, Zarduxšt [that is, celebrate a Wandidād]. Then it will be pure.”

Dhabhar (1912 35) edited <sl’dyh>, which surely corresponds to a 2nd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Act. <-yḥ>, namely srāyē\footnote{For the optative forms preserved in the old Pahlavi of the PT vid. (Cantera 1999a 187-193)}. The variant <sl’dyšn’ y> in the manuscript MR of NM fits with the variant <sl’dšn’> in Vīdēvdād except for the ezafe, which could imply a wrongly written Phl. srāyišníh.

It seems that <-yḥ> was confused by the scribes with <-š> along the written transmission. This supposed <-š> was the source of the interpretation of this Pahlavi 2nd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Act. <-yḥ> as <-šn>, which finally turned into <-šn’>. This variant was transmitted in the PV manuscripts and eventually passed to the Pārsī translation of this passage in MU 1.610.7-16, where we find سرايشن. However, the attested variant <sl’dyh> srāyē seems to be the oldest translation and here the correct reading, as it translates exactly the Avestan 2nd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Act. srāuuaitōš.

As we have already observed in NM 1.7.11 regarding the gloss čīyōn pad anagr rōšn, it seems that Manuščihr used a slightly different PT of Vīdēvdād from that which is preserved in the PV manuscripts.

1371 P1 . Mf2, (G); L4, K1 . T46 imāṃ; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, E4, L5, FK1 imāṃ; L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 imā

1374 L4, B2, T46, P1, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, K2, P10 dānjaioiś; P2 dānjaioiś; P5 dānjaioiś; G34 dānjaioiś; F10, T44 . FK1 dānjaioiś; E10 dānjaioiś; B1 dānjaioiś; M3 dārmaṇjaioiś; L1 dānjaioiś; R278 / tā / dānjaioiś. ... vāriśa.; Br1 dānjaioiś; L2, E4 / tā / dānjaioiś. ...

vārabhīyiyioiś. tammata.; L5 dārmaṇjaioiś

1375 L4, K1, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); D62 yōi.Ś P2 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, G42 . Mf2, K9 yōi; P5 yaoi; E10 yō

1377 D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . FK1; L4 vārabhīyiyioiś. tammata.; Mf2 vārabhīyiyioiś. tammata.; G34 vārabhīyiyioiś. tammata.; L5 vārabhīyiyioiś. tammata.

1379 P5, L4, K1, G34, E10 | baśazhiioiś. tammata.; D62 biṣaṭhiioiś. tammata.; P2 baśazhiioiś. tammata.; K2 biṣaṭhiioiś. tammata.; F10, B1, M3 . L1, T46, P1, B1, G42, L5, FK1 biṣaṭhiioiś. tammata.; T44 baśaṣṭhiioiś. tammata.; P10 b; B2 baśaṣṭhiioiś. tammata.; L2 baśaṣṭhiioiś. tammata.; E4 baṣaṣṭhiioiś. tammata.; Mf2, K9 baśaṣṭhiioiś. tammata.; (G) baṣaṣṭhiioiś. tammata.

1381 D62, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, T44, E10 panca; P2 pānca

1383 L4, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, (G); K1 abhuṇa; K2 abhuṇa; T44 . FK1 abhuṇahe; Mf2, K9 abhunō

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.101): “Harmonieux comme un (maître est harmonieusement) digne de choix par l’existence (rituelle), le modèle des actes de l’existence de la divine Pensée et leur emprise sont attribués au Maître Mazdā, dont (cette emprise) fera un pâtre pour les nécessiteux”;
(Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.115): “Just as (a judgement) is worthy of being chosen by the world, so the judgement, (which) in accordance with truth itself, (is to be passed) on the actions of good thought of the world, is assigned to the Wise One, and the power (is assigned) to (Him), the Ahura, whom (people) appoint as a shepherd to the poor.”
manayhō, šiāo∂aηanm, aηbūs, mazdāi, xāηdramcā, ahurāi, ā, yim, drigbiuidd, dadaη, vāṣtārom. (= SrB 2 + Y 27.13) |d| kōm.nā. mazdā. mānuaiē. pāiiūm. "dadaη, bīaη, mā, druguā, didaraśtāt. "xenajēh, "aηiīs, patial, adrascā, manayhāscā, yaiη, šiāo∂aηanit, aηηm, dρaoštā, ahurā, tām, mōi, gāstuiμ, daēnaiāi. frāauacoa. (= Y 46.7) 1394
kō, vərədram.jā, ḍaηā, pūi, sōŋbā, yōi, bami, cīdā, mōi, gām, aṃbīmūt, rātūm, cīdū, at. bōi, vōhū, sraoštō, jāntū. manayhā. mazdā. ahmāi. yahmāi. vaηi. kahmāicīt. (= Y 44.16) 1395

L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3  1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); Mf2, K9 abi 1388
L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3  1. L1, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5  . Mf2, K9, (G); B2 vairiiō. īak. (in Pāzand) 1 (in Pahlavi numeral); R278, FK1 vairiiō. īak. (in Pāzand); G42 vairiiō. 1 (in Indian numeral) 1389
vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.101): "Harmonieux comme un (maître est harmonieusement) digne de choix par l'existence (rituelle), le modèle des actes de l'existence de la divine Pensée et leur emprise sont attribués au Maître Mazdā, dont (cette emprise) fera un pâtre pour les nécessiteux";
(Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjarvø 1991 1.115): "Just as (a judgement) is worthy of being chosen by the world, so the judgement, (which) in accordance with truth itself, (is to be passed) on the actions of good thought of the world, is assigned to the Wise One, and the power (is assigned) to (Him), the Ahura, whom (people) appoint as a shepherd to the poor".
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3  1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42  . Mf2, K9 kōmā; P5 ʰywk kōmā; G34, T44, B1, M3  . E4, L5, FK1 kōmānā 1390
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10  1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); Mf2, K9 mazdā 1391
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10  1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42  . Mf2, K9 ʰaη 1392
vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.160): "Qui me désignes-tu comme protecteur, ô Mazdā, chaque fois que le partisan de la Tromperie cherche à me contraindre, à faire tort, sinon ton feu et la pensée, par les actes (rituels) desquels, ô Maître, vous engarezz l'Harmonie? Proclame mon enseignement à la conscience!";
(Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjarvø 1991 1.169): "(But) whom dost Thou appoint (as) guardian for one such as me, O Wise One, when the deceitful one tries to seize me in order to injure (me), (whom dost Thou appoint) other than Thy fire and thought, with whose [du.] actions one nourishes truth, O Ahura? Proclaim a message about that to my religious view".
vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.153): "Quel est le briseur d'obstacles parmi les Existants, afin qu'il (me) protège suivant ton explication? Que des cadeaux remarquables me soient faits! Ô gardeur de l'existence (rituelle), fournis-moi le modèle! Et que l'obéissance à ce (…) vienne en raison de la divine Pensée, ô Mazdā, à celui, quel qu'il soit, auquel tu veux qu'elle vienne!";
(Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjarvø 1991 1.161): "Who (is) a resistance-breaker (able) to protect (those) who exist, by Thy proclamation? Accord (as) a judgement bright (things to be) in my house, O Healer of existence. Let (recompense for) obedience come to him through good thought, O Wise One, to him, to whomsoever Thou wishest".
L4, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3  . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, E10  1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 aṣahe; L5 aṣahe 1393
vid. (Wölf 1910 134, 367): "Schütz uns vor dem Feind, o Mazdāh und o heilige Ārmatay! (Ver)schwinde daēvische Drug, (ver)schwinde daēvaentstamme, (ver)schwinde daēvageschaffene, (ver)schwinde daēvaerzeugte! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde völlig, o Drug, im Norden sollst du verschwinden, nicht sollst du die stoffliche Welt des Aṣa zunichte machen!".
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Thus you will murmur these words, which are the most victorious and most healing. P10 1400

Five Ahunawar must be pronounced: yaḏāhūwāryō [say it five (times)]. P10 1401

The Ahunawar (is recited) for the protection of the body [once and one more time].
In MU 1.610.18-611.1 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394) we find the Pārsī translation of this text, where [a] is omitted. It is noteworthy there the mix of Pārsī, Pāzand and Avestan parts:

\[|a| a\text{ā} \text{. imā. vacō. drəmjaioiš. yōi. aŋhēn. } \text{`iā} / \text{ paŋca. ahunra. vairīi. frəsrāmjaioiš. yaδā. abû. vairīi.} |\]

5 """"""

Pārsi and Pāzand translation:

[a] Five (Ahunawar) must be recited: *yaδāhūwawryō* [it must be said five (times)]. “The Ahunawar (is recited) for the protection of the body [once and one more time].”

[b] *ahunm. vairīm. tanūm. pāitī. ahuwawrau. pa. pān. gi. tan. rā. yak. daṭ.*

*ašabe. nama.* کنما مزدآ تا سر

The Srōš Bāǰ as a formula of purification

In V 11.3 the recitation of five *yaδā. abû. vairīi* and part of Srōš Bāǰ 2 is prescribed as a formula of purification\(^{1421}\). With regards to the *yaδā. abû. vairīi*, several sources prescribe the number of *yaδā. abû. vairīi* to be recited in each occasion. In the Südgar Nask, according to Dk 9.2.7 [M 787.17; K43b 139.1-2], five Ahunawar are prescribed to remove the *druz*: *panj ka ō druz bē barišnih “five (Ahunawar), when (it is) to remove the *druz*. Also according to *SnS* 19.5 (Dhabhar 1932 11-12), (West 1880 1.405), (Kotwal 1969 78-79) one must recite five Ahunawar in order to remove the *druz*: *panj kē ō wināh wizārdan šawēd druz bē barišnih rāy čē pādifrāh pad dastwarīh ī ēn panj kas šayēd wizārdan mānbed wisbed <zandbed> dehbed ud zarduxštrōtom u-š ašemwohū <ud> ahunawar panj pad sar bē gōwišn*.

Five (Ahunawar must recite) he who comes to redeem a sin in order to remove the *druz*, for he can redeem the punishment with the authority of these five persons: the master of the house, the clan headman, the headman of the tribe, the headman of the country and the zarduxštrōtom, and he must say the ašemwohū (and) the Ahunawar five (times) in the beginning\(^{1421}\).

---

\(^{1417}\) Here it is written Pārsi 5 prāj srāyišn, that is, “Five (Ahunawar) must be recited”.

\(^{1418}\) The Pāzand translator inverted the Pahlavi word-order of Phl. “pad tan pānagīh rāy” and wrote Pāz. “pa. pān. gi. tan. rā”, which turned into Pahlavi would be “pad pānagīh tan rāy”. Moreover, he omitted the conjunction Phl. “ēk ud did” and wrote Pāz. “yak. did”.\(^{1419}\)

\(^{1419}\) cf. MU 1.14.9 (Dhabhar 1932 10):

داواد اورمژد زرتشت فرموده است که ایثاهووریو زوار دیوانست و پاسبان تن

The Maker Ohrmazd has prescribed to Zartušt that the *yasā-āhū-wawryō* is a helper against the *dēwān* and a bodyguard.

\(^{1420}\) Regarding the combination of the Srōš Bāǰ with the prayers *km.nā. mazdā* (Y 46.7), *kē vordrōm.jā.* (Y 44.16) and the formula *pāta.nō* (...) (V 8.21). vid. Cantera’s (unpublished) communication “Daēuwas vertreibende Worte”.

\(^{1421}\) vid. (Kotwal 1969 111), who explains that here the beginning of the *Patet* and the five Ahunawar devoted to Srōš, which are recited before the *Patet*, are also mentioned. s. MU 1.15.2 (Dhabhar 1932 13):
Av. drənjaiiōiš → Phl. dranjēnēd

The PT of V 11.3a only appears in P2, where Av. drənjaiiōiš is translated by Phl. <dlncynyt> dranjēnēd. The Pahlavi ending <-yt> of this verb can be interpreted as a 3rd. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act., 2nd. Pl. Pres. Ind. Act. or as a 2nd. Pl. Imper.

It seems more likely that the optative Av. drənjaiiōiš was translated by an imperative, not by an indicative, so that I prefer to understand the ending <-yt> of <dlncynyt> in P2 as a 2nd. Pl. Imper.

For the ceremony of Srōš five yasāhwauryō must be recited.

vid. other PTs of Av. drənjaiiōiš in the parallels of V 9.27 and Hōsbām 1 in (Cantera 2004 167-168, 233).
11.4. |a| imq.t. ntnāmt. 1421 x yaoždaðāmi. 1422 imq.t. 1425 + at. 1426 vaco. 1427
framāni.a. 1428 |b| at. 1429 mà. 1430 yau.inā. 1431 + bōndu.o. 1432 + pafrē. 1433 mazištō. 1434 yō. dižōdaðī. cīsinā.ā. aṣa. mazdā. vaŋhi. āda. gādi. mōi. āmōi. ararā. ahīa. voōb. aōi. vidā. manāryptā. (= Y 49.1) 1435 |c| imq. ātrpt. 1436 x yaoždaðāmi. 1437 imq.t. 1438 + at. 1439 vaco. 1440 + framāni.a. 1441 |d| ahīa. 1442 ḏā.
"If I want to purify this house, then pronounce these words:" |b| at. mà. yauñā. bōndunō. pāfrē. māzištō. yā. duśrēdriī. cixnušā. ašā. mazdā. vaŋ"hi. ašā. gādi. mōi. a. môi. ariā. ahiā. vohū. a.ô. vidā. manayhā. ( = Y 36.1) |c| "If I want to purify this fire, then pronounce these words:" |d| ahiā. ða. a.ðō. *vōrasinga. *pairi. jasaaimade. mazdā. ahiā. ða. ða. maniūi. spōništā. yā. a. axtiś. *a.ţiś. yām. axtiūi. daŋê. ( = Y 36.1) |a| [AMT] 'ytwn' PWN m'n' ywsd'slynd; 1440 ADYN' ZNE 1450 gwbšn 1450 pr'c YMRRNW1452 |b| 'ytwn' L 1457 hm'y OD 1460 OL 1457 ZK y 1456 bytwm 1457 zm'n' <p'nyh mhst [AYK-m OD tn'y psyn> 'hm'y y p'nyh 1455 <y> d'm'n' krttn'] [AYT' MNW 'ytwn' YMRRNW-yt 1460 y 'hm' y > AYK KON 1462 MNW 1463 BYN YATWN-t'
This text is rendered into Pāzand in MU 1.611.2-11 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):

[a] imat. mānem. yaozdaēane. imā. īda. vacō. framranua.
i. īdi. in. yaozdaēranā. āyi. īn. guuši. pārāj. guua.
[b] at. mā. yauuā. bēndmuō. pāfrā. mazišēō.
idīn. ham. tā. āni. bitim. zamān. bēndmā. xānigi. 1473. dō. mān. kirdan. hast.
i. īdin. guuē. ki. nūn. ka. ādar. maṭ. hā. ut. ābāram.
[c] imat. ātāram. yaozdaēane. imā. īda. vacō. framranua.
i. īdin. pa. ātē. yaozdaēranā. agi. īn. guuši. pārāj. guua.
iīm. ōi. tu. ātaş. pordum. pa. varoži. bi. varožom. ōrmāzda. pa. pahrozi. vaṇnāsidār.

1462 L4, D62, P2, G34a above the line, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); G34 ʾyt; T44 ʾyt, E10 ʾyt
1463 K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); L4, G34, T44, E10 AMT
1464 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Imp); P2 YATWN-yt; M3 YATWN-1
1465 L4, D62, B1, P10, M3 LA ŠBKWN-η, P2, E10, (Imp) ŠBKWN-η; G34 ŠBKWN-ηm; F10 ŠBKWN-ηm; T44 ŠBKWN-ηm. I have preferred not to edit <LA> following IM (Jāmāsp 1907 434), which omits it.
1466 L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); P2 ZK ’thē; F10 ’tī
1467 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34a above the line, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); G34 → ZNE →
1468 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); E10 gwbsīn’
1469 L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp) YMRW
1470 L4, G34, T44, E10, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp) ’w
1471 D62, P2, F10, P10, (Imp); L4, G34, E10, B1 ’y; T44, M3 → HNA →
1472 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34a above the line, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); G34 PWN
1473 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); D62 YHMWTWN-ηm
1474 L4, G34, T44, E10, P10; D62, P2 p’hlcīn’; F10 phlycīn’; B1, P10, M3, (Imp) p’hlycīn’
1475 MU 1.611.2-11 (Unvala 1922) bānigi.
Av. $yao\bar{\text{d}}a\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}i$ (11.4a and c)

From V 11.4 onwards there is a surprising change of grammatical person: the 1st. Sing. $yao\bar{\text{d}}a\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}i$ instead of the expected 2nd. Sing.

In V 11.3 Ahura Mazda prescribed the recitation of several texts. Since he answers Zaradustra’s question, he uses the 2nd. Sing. in his admonition. In the following passages, namely V 11.4-7, there is a sequence where each polluted thing requires the recitation of a formula of purification. Ahura Mazda is supposed to tell Zaradustra which formula must be recited in each case, so that the expected enumeration would imply a sort of conditional clause “if you want to purify X, you must pronounce the following words”. However, the subject is changed and a 1st. Sing. $yao\bar{\text{d}}a\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}i$ appears and, furthermore, there is no conditional conjunction.

On one hand, the use of Av. $yao\bar{\text{d}}a\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}i$ can be interpreted as a pasted copy of the 1st. Sing. of V 11.1b, thus acting as a more efficient litany. On the other hand, the use of a conditional clause without a conditional conjunction finds a parallel in Y 53.7: “vīzāhīvādā. maq̄ām. tām. aṭ. vī. va. vāiōi. ayyāti. apōm. vacō “(If) you abandon this sacrament, then ‘woe’ will be your last word” (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.194, 2.246).

According to Cantera (in his communication “Daēuas vertreibende Worte”), this change of grammatical person can be explained because the formula “X $yao\bar{\text{d}}a\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}i$. imq. $aṭ$. vacō. framraua” was never recited in the ritual, but just added as a sort of nērang to the Avestan text. This is why both verbs do not agree. I think that Cantera’s explanation is very likely.

With regards to its PT, this Avestan conditional clause in V 11.4 ff. was correctly interpreted by the Pahlavi translators: the 1st. Sing. $yao\bar{\text{d}}a\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{a}}\bar{\text{n}}i$ was translated by the 2nd. Sing. $yō\bar{\text{d}}āsrēnē$, instead of the expected 1st. Sing. $yō\bar{\text{d}}āsrēnām$ used in V 11.1, while the 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. $framraua$ is translated by the 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. $frāz$ gōw. Furthermore, they understood the conditional meaning of this clause, as the use of $ka$ ēdōn illustrates.

Av. $aṭ$. mā. $yau\bar{\text{m}}. +bōn\bar{\text{d}}\bar{\text{u}}vō. +pafrē$. mazištō (11.4b)

The recitation of two Old Avestan texts, namely Y 49.1a (= V 11.4b) and 36.1a (= V 11.4d), is prescribed in V 11.4 in order to purify the house and the fire.

Concerning Y 49.1a, I wonder why this text must be recited in V 11.4b to purify a house. In Y 49.1 no house (Av. $nm\bar{\text{a}}nā$-) appears, unlike other incantations in V 11, where that which is to be purified is always mentioned in the text. The answer might be found in a wrong interpretation of $mānaiieiti$ in Y 49.2. Av. $mānaiieiti$ belongs to the verb $mānaiia$– “to think” (Kellens 1984 153), so that there is no etymological relation with Av. $nm\bar{\text{a}}nā$-, but its phonetic similarity could have induced the composers of V 11 to link both words. Therefore, the recitation of Y 49.1 was prescribed.

\[1476\]

Insler (1975 112-113) also interprets this text as a conditional clause.
Comparison between the PT of V 11.4b and d and the PT of Y 49.1a and 36.1a

With regards to Y 49.1a, it is remarkable that the PT of V 11.4b differs from it:

Y 49.1a (Dhabhar 1949 213)
ʾytwn L hmʾy OD 'w ZK y bytwm zmʾn' pʾnkyh mhst [AYK-m OD tn' y psyng hmʾy pʾnkyh y dʾmʾn KN OBYDWN-šn] ʾédon man hamẽ tā ʾān ī ḏědom zamān pānagīh mahist [kū-m tā tan ī ī pasēn hamẽ pānagīh ī dāmān ŏh kunišn]
Thus I (will) always (be) to the end of the time the greatest protection [that is, I must always provide protection to the creatures till the Future Body]

V 11.4b
ʾytwn L hmʾy OD OL ZK y bytwm zmʾn' θpʾnkyh mhst [AYK-m OD tn' y psyng > ʾhmʾy pʾnkyh <y> dʾmʾn krtn] [AYT MNW ʾytwn YMMRN-yt ʾy <hmʾy> AYT KON MNW BYN YATWN-t HWE-ŷd ʾ-t BRA ŠBKWN-ŋ]
ʾédon man hamẽ tā ʾān ī ḏědom zamān <pānagīh mahist [kū-m tā tan ī pasēn] ʾhamẽ pānagīh <i> ī dāmān kardan] [ast kē ʾédon göwēd ay <hamẽ> kū nūn kē andar āmand hē ā-t bē ī hilam]
Thus I (will) always (be) to the end of the time the greatest protection [that is, I will always provide protection to the creatures till the Future Body]

Cantera (2006a 62-63) has already compared both PTs. On one hand, and leaving aside the insertion of the gloss and the explanation in V 11.4b, it is evident at a first glance that the omission in V 11.4b must be explained as a saut du même au même. The scribe of the archetype from which Vīdēvdād stems would have missed out the line from the first pānagīh to the second one. This explains why the PT of Y 49.1a is semantically coherent by itself, unlike that of V 11.4b.

On the other hand, Cantera (2006a 63) noticed that the Pahlavi translators made three main mistakes. Firstly, they ascribed Av. ʾaunuā not to Av. ʾaunu- “corn” but to Av. ʾaiu- “duration”, so that they translated it by Phl. hamẽ “always”. This mistake was still repeated by Bartholomae (1904 1265) and Insler (1975 95). Insler translated this Avestan passage as “Yes, throughout my lifetime I have been condemned as the greatest defiler”. On the contrary, Kellens & Pirart (1988-1991 1.171) and Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.179) understood rightly this word and translated “Le (mauvais) chef Bāṇdua s’emplit depuis toujours de mon grain” and “The chieftain Bāṇdva has stuffed himself with my barley” respectively.

Secondly, Av. bāṇduuō was misunderstood too, because it was translated by Phl. bēdom (+ zamān) “last (time), end (of the time)”, probably due to phonetic similarity.
Finally, Av. *pafrē*, 3rd. Sing. Perf. Ind. Act. of Av. 'par- “to fill”\(^{1477}\), was translated by Phl. *pānagīh* “protection”, because this word was derived from Av. *pā* “to protect”.

The PTs of Y 36.1a and V 11.4 are almost identical, except for the position of Phl. *fradom*:

Y 36.1 (Dhabhar 1949 169)

ʾytwn' 'w' HNA y LK 'thš PWN wlcšn' pltwm BRA YHM TWN-m ʾwhrmzd [PWN pʾhlyc W ʃnʾdynytʾlyh]

ēdōn o ʾēd ʾi ṭō ātāxš pad warzišn fradom bē rasam ohrmazd [pad pahrēz ud šnāyēnidārīh]

V 11.4d

ʾytwn' OL HNA ʾy LK 'thš pltwm PWN wlcšn' BRA YHM TWN-m ʾwhrmzd [PWN pʾhlyc <W> ʃnʾdynytʾlyh]

ēdōn o ʾēd <i> ṭō ātāxš fradom pad warzišn bē rasam ohrmazd [pad pahrēz šnāyēnidārīh]

Thus I will arrive firstly by means of (this) deed to this Thy fire, Ohrmazd [as protection and propitiation].

While in Y 36.1a Phl. *pad warzišn fradom* renders exactly the syntax of Av. *varoznā. paournīē*, in V 11.4b there is an anteposition of Phl. *fradom* in Phl. *fradom pad warzišn*.

Finally, we must say something about the Pāzand translation of these above mentioned texts. Obviously it is based on the PT of V 11.4. This can be inferred not only from the fact that it omits the same words, but also because it adds the same gloss and explanation as V 11.4a. Although there are fewer differences between the PT of V 11.4d and that of Y 36.1a, we can state that the Pāzand translation of this text is also based on the PT of V 11.4d. Actually, the position of Pāz. *pordum. pa. varoznāni* reproduces that of Phl. *fradom pad warzišn* in V 11.4d.

Av. *imq. +āt. vacō* → Phl. ʾēg ēn gōwišn (11.4a and c)

Most PV manuscripts attests Av. *iδa* in this syntagm, while the VS usually show Av. *aδa*. Because of them, Geldner (1896) edited *aδa*. Neither Av. *iδa* nor Av. *aδa* are ever placed in any other Avestan text between a substantive and its adjective, with the exception of V 11.4-7. The structures with Av. *aδa. imq. vacō* in V 11.3, 8, 11, 14 and 17 are semantically parallel to this Av. *imq. aδa. / iδa. vacō* and are also followed by quotations of other Avestan texts. However, Av. *aδa* is never placed between substantive and its adjective in these passages, so that the unexpected position of Av. *aδa / iδa* in this syntagm must be explained.

In this regard Lommel’s (1928 140) emendment of Av. *aδa* in V 11.4 ff. must be taken into account. According to Lommel, Av. *aδa* in V 11.4 ff. must be corrected by Av. *āţ* to obtain a metric sequence of 8 syllables. In such case, the text of V 11.4 ff. would be *imq. +āţ. vacō. +framrauua*.

---

\(^{1477}\) Bartholomae (1904 852) and Insler (1975 95) misunderstood the text. The first ascribed it to an Av. 'par- “verhindern”, only attested here, and the second to Av. 'par- “verurteilen”.
Apart from the metrical support of Lommel’s emendation, I must add that there is also a syntactic one. The sequence Acc. + ā(a)ē + Acc. at the beginning of a phrase has two good parallels in the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti, as clearly demonstrated in Y 35.9 (imā. āt. uxa. vacā. ahurā. mazdā. ašēm. *manīiā. vahehīā. frauuaocāmā) and 38.1 (imāmēn. āat. zmā. gomāktī. haďra. yazamaidē) (Narten 1986 40, 43). Of these, Y 35.9 is the most closely related parallel of V 11.4 ff, as we observe when comparing imā. āt. uxa. vacā. ... frauuaocāmā of Y 35.9 with imā. āt. vacō. *framrauua.

Thus Lommel’s emendation must be accepted on the basis not only of metrical, but also of syntactical criteria. Only we must emend Av. āaδa instead of Av. āa. As Kellens & Pirart (1988-1991 2.106) noticed, Av. āt is found after –ā in the YH, while in the rest of contexts Av. āat or āt is attested. If Av. āt / āat, āt present the same distribution in Vidēvdād, then āat, āt must be edited. Since Av. āt is attested in some manuscripts, I have preferred to edit āt instead of āa. Therefore, Av. aāa and īa are to be interpreted as mistaken forms of Av. āt which slipped into the written transmission.

In the PT of this Avestan structure we find the expected Phl. ēg ēn ēgōwišn. Although the PT normally follows the same order of the Avestan text, Phl. ēg is always placed in the initial position, so that the exact reproduction of Av. imā. āt. vacō can never have been translated by Phl. *ēn ēgōwišn.

Phl. ast kē ēdōn gōwēd ay <hamē> ... (11.4b)

The commentary added to the gloss of V 11.4b introduces a short explanation of Phl. hamē which has remained unnoticed to scholars, due to Jāmāsp’s (1907 434) mistake when editing this passage. Nobody seems to have noticed that Phl. ay kū cannot follow the verbum dicendi Phl. guftan, gōw-. Provided that we follow Jāmāsp’s edition, either ay or kū should be deleted.

The solution to this textual problem is given by IM. This is the only manuscript which adds Phl. <hm’y> hamē after ay. Jāmāsp (1907 434) marked that IM added this word, but considered that it must be deleted, according to the rest of PV manuscripts, which did not include it. However, on one hand, the introduction of this adverb between ay and kū avoids the problem of the juxtaposition of two conjunctions for the same verbum dicendi. On the other hand, it gives a clue to understand this commentary: the Pahlavi commentator proposed his own emendation to the passage.

We have observed that the PT of V 11.4b disagrees with that of Y 49.1a. The starting point of the deviation is Phl. hamē in V 11.4b. If we do not correct it by means of the PT of Y 49.1a and we do not include the commentary of V 11.4b, this PT would read as follows:

ēdōn man hamē tā ē an ē bēdom zamān *hamē pānagib <ī> dāmān kardan

“Thus I (will) always provide protection to the creatures to the end of the time always”.

The mistaken repetition of Phl. hamē, written secondly as Phl. <hm> in the PV manuscripts, seems to have been noticed by a Pahlavi commentator, who added the following gloss:
"the latter 'always' that you have added, I will delete it to you (= from your translation)"

Only IM attests Phl. hamē in this gloss and Phl. bè hilam instead of bè nē hilam, the reading of the rest of PV manuscripts. If we accept the correction by means of IM, a Pahlavi commentary not understandable by itself would become clearer: it introduces a conscious emendation to a previous PT. Although its commentator did not notice that the repetition of Phl. hamē was due to a saut du même au même in another PT, at least he noticed that it was a mistaken translation and said that he would delete (ā-t bè hilam) the latter hamē (in his words hamē kū nūn).

Av. paouruiē (11.4d)
This Avestan word has been interpreted either as an Instr. Sing. or as a Loc. Sing.
On one hand, Kellens (1986 226) and de Vaan (2003 423-424), stated that is Instr. Sing. However, as Narten (1986 139) observed, IIr. *pyHyūjā (Instr. Sing.) > Plr. *pary(i)jā should have yielded OAv. *paoruiā, namely *-iiā, but not OAv. paouruiē.

According to Narten (1986 139), the ending –ē in this Avestan word must be interpreted as a Loc. Sing. Actually, IIr. *pyHyūjai > Plr. *pary(i)jai developed into OAv. *paouruiē, with epenthesis of –u- after –r-, and then with metathesis of the group *-aryā > *-auryā to YAv. paoiriē (cf. for instance YAv. baoiriia- < Plr. *bary(i)ja-). The attested form in Old Avestan is, however, paouruiē. The vowels –aou- in this Old Avestan word must be explained as an influence of YAv. –ao-, where *-aryā > *-auryā > *-aori- > *-aoiri-1479, because *paoruiia- is expected in Old Avestan.

1478 cf. YAv. hāuuaiia(-ca), hāuuōiia < Plr. *ḥayā (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 57). The exceptions of kaine, fraŋrase and pāδauue, where –e < *-iā (de Vaan 2003 401), must be explained by the YAv. vocalism, because the group *-iā remains in OAv.
1479 Regarding the Plr. group *-aryi- in its development in Old and Young Avestan vid. (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52).
11.5. | imät, árpm. 1490 | yaoždaðání. 1491 | imät. 1492 | aț. 1493 | vacó. 1494
*framrauna. 1495 | [b] | aț. 1496 | yazamide. 1497 | maekaiantișća.

bőhuantișća. 1498 | frauza哪bo. 1499 | aburaniñ. aburabiiñ. bauonaphañ.
hupraññajóśc. và, huuññayásñ, huuññaññajósñ, uuññiññiññañ. abuññiññ. cagññañ. (= Y 38.3, 67.6) 1492 | c | imät. 1493 | ząm. 1494 | yaoždañi. 1495 | imät. 1496 | aț. 1497 | vacó.

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); R278 ațim; G42 ațim.

L4, B1, P10, M3; D62, P2 yaoždañ; P5, G34, (G) yaoždaññ; K2, F10, T44, E10. L2, E4, L5, FK1 yaoždañ; L1 yaoždañ; B2, P1 yaoždañ; R278, T46 yaoždañ; Br1, G42 yaoždañ; Mf2, K9 yaoždaññì.

1491 T46, P1. | Mf2, (G); L4, K1 imät; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. FK1 imät; F10 L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. K9 imät.

R278, FK1; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1 iññ; E10 ațin; L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9, (G) ațin.

1492 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); G34, E10 ațin.

1493 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9; D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (G) framrauna; G34, M3. FK1 framrauna; E4 framrauna; L5 fra.maruna.

1495 K2, (Narten 1986 43) and (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.147); L4, G34 maekantișća; K1, D62, P2, P10, M3 maekantisća; P5 maekinćisća; F10 měkainćisća; T44 maikäianisća; E10 maekäianisća; B1 maekaimćisća; L1, B2, R278, P1, G42, E4 maekäianisća; T46, L2 maikäianisća; B1 maekäianisća; L5 maikäianisća; FK1 maekäianisća; Mf2, K9, (G) maekäianisća.

1496 D62, P2, B1, P10, (G); L4 bőhuantișća; P5 bőhuantișća; K2 bőhuantișća; G34 bőhuantișća; F10, M3. FK1. Mf2, K9 bőhuantișća; T44 bőhuantișća; E10 bőhuantișća; L1, L2 bőhuantișća; B2, G42 bőhuantișća; R278 bőhuantișća; T46 bőhuantișća; P1 bőhuantișća; Br1 bőhuantișća; E4 bőhuantișća; L5 bőhuantișća.

1497 L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2 frauzañño; R278 frauzañño; L5 frauzañño; FK1 frauzañño.

vid. (Narten 1986 43): “Die Wasser verehren wir, die funkeln, saftbringenden, die durch die Wohlwirksamkeit des Herrn dahineilenden göttlichen Herrinnen – euch, ihr gut zu überquerenden, gut fließenden, mit guten Badestellen versehen – ein Geschenk für beiderlei Dasein”; (Kellens & Pírat 1988-1991 1.137): “Nous faisons consécration aux eaux, à celles qui ... à celles qui ..., ô épouses, (filles) du Maitre, qui véhiculez et avez du savoir-faire, (nous) vous (faisez consécration), à vous qui êtes aissées à traverser, ... et qui offrez de bons bains; nous vous apportons un cadeau pour les deux existences”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.147): “Wir verehren die Wasser, diessig und frisch, die Ahuraniñs, die ihr die Flüsse gewöhnlich überqueren; wir verschenken ihnen ein Christlicher Zeichenwasser der Ahura. Und wir verleihen Ihnen (O Wasser), die einen guten Weg finden, und gut zu schwimmen, und (so) gehört es zu den beiden Existenz”.

1499 P5, G34; L4 yaoždañ; D62, P2, F10 yaoždaññ; K2, B1, M3, (G) yaoždaññ; T44, E10. T46, L2, L5 yaoždañ; P10 yaoždaññ; L1, R278, P1 yaoždaññ; B2 yaoždaññ; Br1, E4 yaoždañ; G42 yaoždañ; FK1 yaoždaññ; Mf2, K9 yaoždaññ
T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); L4 imqm; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . FK1 imqm; F10 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 imqm
R278, G42, E4, L5, FK1; L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1 iša; L2 . Mf2, K9, (G) aša
T44 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, (G) framruua; G34 framruua; M3 . E4 framruua; L5 framruua; FK1 framrič
L4 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 aš.at; E4 āt
L4 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 aš.at; E4 āt
L4, K1, D62, P2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 gaēnābīš; K2, G34 gōnābis; F10 gōnābis; G42 gōnābis; L5 gōnābis
L4, K1, P2, K2, G34, F10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P5, T44, B1, P10 . FK1 barādrā; E10 barādrā
L4, D62, K2, P10, (G); P5 yazamađe; P5 yazamađe; G34 yazamađe; F10 yazamađe; T44 yazamađe; E10, B1, M3 . Br1, L2, E4 yazi; L1, R278, P1, G42, F1K yaz; B2 yazamađe; T46 yazamađe; L5 y.; Mf2, K9 yazamađe
vid. (Narten 1986 43): “Diese Erde hier verehren wir nun mit den erhabenen Frauen zugleich. (Sie), die uns trägt und deine erhabenen Frauen, o Weiser Herr, die aufgrund der Wahrheit vortrefflich sind, die verehren wir”; (Kelless & Pirart 1988-1991 1.136): “Nous faisons consécration à la terre en même temps qu’aux déesses; elle qui nous porte et tes déesses harmonieusement dignes d’élection, ô Maitre Mazdā, nous leur faisons consécration”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.147): “We worship this earth together with (its) females, (this earth) which carries us, and (those) females who (are) Thine, O Wise Ahura, (who are) worthy of being chosen in accordance with truth, those we worship”.

Regarding the meaning and etymology of *maēkaintišcā. hōbuantišcā* vid. (Narten 1986 43) and (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.147).

L4, K1, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62 ywš’dslonym; P2 ywš’dslon; F10 ywš’dslonym; P10 ywš’dslon
L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 gwbšnyh
D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3; L4, F10, P10, (Jmp) YMRRN
D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, E10 ycm; T44 ycm
L4, T44, E10 xāan; D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 ywm, G34 xāan the Pazand text of L4 above the line, G34a under the line, T44 above the line šwm; F10 šum. xā; (Jmp) xā.
L4, E10, L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 aça; the Pazand text of L4 above the line, G34a under the line, T44 above the line aja; (Jmp) a ā;
L4, K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); the Pazand text of L4 above the line, G34a under the line, T44 above the line jām
If thus you perform the purification for the water, then pronounce these words:

"Thus I worship the water (which are) flowing, crystal line (water)."

If thus you perform the purification for the earth, then pronounce these words:

"I worship this earth together with the women to together with the righteous fraward of the many women γniiehe."

This text is rendered into Pāzand in MU 1.611.12-19 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):

Comparison between the PT of V 11.5b and d and the PT of Y 38.3a and 1a

As far as the PT of Y 38.3a, it shows several differences in comparison with that of V 11.5b:

Y 38.3a

1514 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); T44 MNW
1515 G34, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3 – ? PWN – ? P10a
1516 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 gwbšn’ BRA
1517 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 BRA; F10 Wpr’c
1518 L4, D62, P2, G34, E10, B1, M3; F10, T44, P10, (Jmp) YMRWN
1519 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 AMT ’ytwn’ ZNE
1520 K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, E10 ycm; T44 yc’m
1521 L4, G34, F10, T44, E10, (Jmp); K1, D62, P2, B1, M3 – ? LWTE ... y – ? P10a – ? LWTE ’it’y plw’t’y NK
1522 L4, G34, (Jmp); F10 ’it’
1523 L4, G34, F10, (Jmp); T44 y’ – ? E10 γniiehe
1524 (Jmp); L4, G34, F10, T44, E10 ’y
1525 (Jmp); L4, G34, E10 NKB-š’n; F10 NK- ’t’n’; T44 γniiehe
1526 (Jmp); L4, G34, F10, T44, E10 – ? y –
1527 L4, P2, G34, (Jmp); K1, D62, T44, E10, B1, P10 γniieh; F10, M3 γniieh.
Thus I worship the water(s) /maēkaiti/ [exudation which lays on the plants, dew], ḫaēbuuaṭ [strong flowing] and frauuāz [rainy] too.

V 11.5b

Thus I worship the water(s) [which (are) /xvāi. ʾtāca/ crystalline (water)].

The most striking difference between each of these is found in the glosses. On one hand, the Pahlavi translators of Y 38.3a understood that maēkaitišcā, ḫōbuuaṭišcā, frauuazaybō were three kinds of water, and glossed them as exudation or dew, strong flowing and rainy water. On the other hand, the Pahlavi translators of V 11.5b added a rare gloss which could make us think that they did not understand these Avestan words.

In my opinion, however, this rare gloss of V 11.5b implies just a different translation, but a similar interpretation. Although the corruption of the written transmission of this gloss does not help much to solve the problem of its interpretation, I think that the Pahlavi translators of both Y 38.3a and V 11.5b considered that three kinds of water were mentioned. While the translators of Y 38.3a interpreted them as Phl. paśšing / miznē “exudation / dew”, Phl. garān tazišn “strong flowing” and Phl. wārānīg “rainy”, the translators of V 11.5b chose Pāz. xvāi “perspiration” (cf. Phl. xvēy “sweat, perspiration”, NP. xwai), Pāz. ʾtāca (surely representing Phl. tāzag “flown, poured”, from Phl. tāxtan, tāz- “to cause to run, to flow, to pour”) and Phl. jām “glass” (maybe understood as crystalline water).

If I am right, there would have been a similar interpretation, although the words chosen in the Pahlavi translation were different in Yasna and in Vidēvdād:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avestan word</th>
<th>PT of Yasna</th>
<th>PT of Vidēvdād</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maēkaiṇtišcā</td>
<td>Phl. paśšing / miznē “exudation / dew”</td>
<td>Pāz. xvāi “perspiration”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫōbuuaṇtišcā</td>
<td>Phl. garān tazišn “strong flowing”</td>
<td>Pāz. ʾtāca “flown, poured”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frauuazaybō</td>
<td>Phl. wārānīg “rainy”</td>
<td>Phl. jām “crystalline (water)”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This could imply that a similar exegesis was followed by two schools of Pahlavi translators, which only differed in the words used.

Regarding the PT of Y 38.1a, it is not exactly the same as that of V 11.5d:

Y 38.1a

ZNE ẓmyk LWTE NKB-ʾn ʾytwn ʾYDBHWN-m ēn zamīg abāg mādagān ēdōn yazam
I worship thus this earth together with the women.

V 11.5d

ZNE ẑmyk LWTE NKBl. y YĐBHWN-m [LWTE ʾlty plwlt y NKBl. y KBD ʾyniehe.]

ēn zamīg ʾbāg mādagān yazam ʾabāg ardā fraward ī mādagān ī was ʾyniehe.

I worship this earth together with the women [together with the righteous fraward of the many women ʾyniehe.].

They attest two divergences, mentioned by Cantera (2006a 62). Firstly, the PT of Y 38.1 translated Av. āaṯ̄ by Phl. ēdōn correctly, but in the PT of V 11.5 it is lacking. And secondly a gloss is added only in Vidēvdād after Phl. yazam, where Av. gənābiš was interpreted by the commentator of Vidēvdād as the frauwaši- of the women. Nevertheless, using this gloss alone we cannot know whether this Avestan word refers to goddesses, to feminine frauwaši- or to any other feminine being.

Finally, we must notice that once again the Pāzand translation mentioned above stems from the PT of V 11.5b, because the PT of Y 38.3 and Y 38.1 differs from it in several words.

Phl. pad zamīg yōjdāsrēnē (11.5c)

Unlike the previous passages, none of the Pahlavi manuscripts attest in V 11.5c pad in the structure pad + object (here zamīg) + yōjdāsrēnīdan, yōjdāsrēn-. Only P10a supplied it above the line. However, I have followed Jamasp’s addition of pad because it is generally documented in this structure in V 11. Otherwise, there would be a discordance regarding the rest of passages of V 11.

Av. ʾyniehe. (11.5d)

In the gloss of V 11.5d, Av. ʾyniehe is probably a corrupted and thematised Gen. Sing. ʾyniehe of Av. gənā-.1528, parallel to the thematic Gen. Sing. of Av. gənā- in Vyt 50 ʾyanabe. In the glosses of Vidēvdād, there is also another thematised Gen. Sing. of a non-thematic substantive: Av. spānahe (< Av. span-, instead of sūnō) in V 13.48j.

Nevertheless, I cannot explain why Av. ʾyniehe is quoted here, and it is impossible even to know whether or not it belongs to a quotation of a non-preserved Avestan text. The only passages where gənā- appears in connection with frauwaši- are Y 1.6 and 2.6, but these also shed no light on V 11.5.

---

1528 For the meaning of Av. gənā- in this and other texts, vid. (Narten 1986 189-194).
11.6. a) imat. gām. 1529 +yaozdađānī. 1530 +yaozdađānī. 1532 imat. 1531 aṭ. 1532 vacō. 1533 +framrauna. 1534 b) gauue. aōis. tāis. šiaodnāis. ſaiš. 1539 vahbistsāis. 1537 fraēšīāmabī. 1540 ſramācā. vāstrmācā. dazdīāi. asuruvnūtasāc. asuruvnūtasāc. šiaiūsāc. šiaiūsāc. (= Y 35.4) c) imat. 1542 uruuarām. 1543 +yaozdađānī. 1544 + aṭ. 1545 vacō. 1547 +framrauna. 1548 d) aṭ. 1549 ašīāi. 1550

| L4 | T46, P1 | Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | K9 gām
| K2, B1, P10, M3 | L4 yaozdađāmī; D62 yaozdađāmī; P2, F10 yaozdađāmī; P5, (G) yaozdađāmī; G34, T44, E10 | Br1, L2, L5, FK1 yaozdađāmī; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 yaozdađāmī; G42 yaozdađāmī; E4 yaozdađāmī. Me; Mf2 yaozdađāmī; K9 yaozdađāmī
| L4, K1 | T46, P1 | Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | FK1 imqm; K2 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | K9 imq; F10 imqm |
| R278, G42, E4, L5, L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G); K1 vacā
| L4 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. | Mf2, K9, K1, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (G) fraēšīāmabī; D62, G34, M3 fraēšīāmabī; E4, L5 fraēšīāmabī; FK1 fraēšīāmabī
| D62, P5, F10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G); L4, G34 gauue; P2, T44, E10 | R278, L5, FK1 gauue; K2 gauue; Mf2, K9 gauue
| L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G); R278, G42 adāiī; L5 tāis
| L4, D62, P2, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 | R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); G34 šiaodnāis; E15 šiaodnāis; L1, B2, T46. | Mf2, K9 šiaodnāis
| L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | E4, (G); L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G); P5 vahbistsāi; K2, G34, B1, P10, M3 | E4 vahbistsāi; L5 vahbistsāi
| L4, D62, P2, K2, B1, P10, M3 fraēšīāmabī; P5 fraēšīāmabī; G34 fraēšīāmabī; F10 fraēšīāmabī; T44 fraēšīāmabī | E4 fraēšīāmabī | R278, L5 fraēšīāmabī; B1, T46, P1, L2, G42 fraēšīāmabī; Br1 fraēšīāmabī; FK1 fraēšīāmabī; Mf2 fraēšīāmabī; K9 fraēšīāmabī; (G) fraēšīāmabī

vid. (Narten 1986 39): “Der Kuh hierdurch, durch diese Werke, die die beste sind, Frieden und Weide zu schaffen, treiben wir die Hörenden und die Nichthörenden, die Herrschenden und die Nichtherrschenden an”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.133): “Pour la Vache ... nous invitons ceux qui écoutent et ceux qui n’écoutent pas, ceux qui ont emprise et ceux qui n’ont pas emprise, à lui assurer paix et pâture”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.144): “Through these, (namely) through the actions that (are) the best, we urge those who listen as well as those who do not listen, those who exercise power as well as those who do not exercise power, to establish peace and (to provide) a pasture for the cow”.

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, Mf2, K9, (G); P1 maṭ; FK1 imata
| L4 | T46, P1 | Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | K9 uruuarām
| P5, K2, B1, P10, M3 | L4, G34, T44, (G) yaozdađāmī; D62 | Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 yaozdađāmī; P2 yaozdađāmī; F10 yaozdađāmī; E10 yaozdađāmī; L1 yaozdađāmī; B2, P1 yaozdađāmī; R278 yaozdađāmī; T46, G42 yaozdađāmī; Mf2, K9 yaozdađāmī
| L4 | T46, P1 | Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | FK1 imqm; K2, G34a above the line | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, K9 imqm; G34 | imqm |
| E4, L5, L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | FK1 iðā; F10 imqā; | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G); aśa
| L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G); P2 vaca

308
ašā. mazda. urunārā. vacṣat. aburō. aḥḥāsī. zāḥī. paourmiičiā. (= Y 48.6)

[a] “If I want to purify these cattle, then pronounce these words:” | [b] gauue. ašāšī. tāšī. šiaodniāsī. yāi. vabištāsī. fraččiāmahī. rāmācā. vāstomčā. dazdiiā. šurunmiičasā. asurunmiičasā. xšaiintāsā. axiainiintāsā. (= Y 35.4) | [c] “If I want to purify these plants, then pronounce these words:”

[a] [AMT] 'ytwn' PWN gwspnd ywšd šnynd ADYN' ZNE gwbsn prʾc YMRRWN | [b] ZK y gwspndʾn' dhšn' [MYA W' ṭstl] ZK y OLE-šʾn' kwnšni [pʾhstʾv > OLE-šʾn' ANŠWTA-ʾn' ] pʾhlwm ʾlmʾšn [AYK-šʾn' gwspndʾn' lʾd pʾhlwm kʾl ZNE krt' YHWWN-yt AYK pʾhst-1 Bra OŠYDN-xj AP-š MYA W' ṭstl YHBWN-ʾd ] [c] [AMT] 'ytwn' PWN

1548 L4. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9; D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (G) framruua; G34 framruua; E10 framruua; E4 framruua; L5 framsuua; FK1 framsuua

1549 L4. K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); E10. Mf2, K9 asā

1550 L3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9 (G); K1, D62, P2, K5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9 (G); L4 urunārā

1551 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, L4a. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. Mf2, K9; G34, (G) vacṣat; R278 vacṣat. aburō; E4 vacṣī; FK1 vacṣī

vid. (Insler 1975 91): “And the Wise One shall increase the plants for her through truth, He (who is to be) Lord at the birth of the foremost existence” (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.169): “Et pour la (Vache), que Mazdā fasse donc pousser les plantes en raison de l’Harmonie, lui, le Maître au moment de l’engendrement de l’existence fondamentale!”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.177): “For her, the Wise One shall make the plants grow with truth, the Ahura, at the begetting of the primal existence”.

1552 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp); M3 ʾyešāšī. Ḍ62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 gwbsny

1553 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, D62, F10, P10, (Jmp) YMRWN

1554 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2, T44, E10 = y ʾl

1555 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 = W ʾl

1556 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); M3 wstl

1557 L4, G34; K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) = y ʾl

1558 G34a above the line; L4, D62, P2 ʾyeṭuologalik, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, ʾyeṭuologalik, M3 YMYHWW-ʾd; G34 KRYTWN-ʾsn'; E10 ʾyeṭuologalik (Jmp) ktwšnʾ

1559 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34, T44 pʾhst; E10 pʾhst y BRA OŠYDN-xj

1560 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, P2, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 OLE

1561 L4, G34, F10, T44, E10; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ANŠWTA

1562 L4, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34, T44, E10 ʾpʾhlwm ʾl

1563 L4, K1, P2, G34, T44, E10, M3, (Jmp); D62, B1, P10 plmdšnʾ; F10ʾpʾhlwmplmdšnʾ

1564 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 kʾIZNE

1565 L4, G34, T44, E10; D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) YHWWN-ʾt

1566 L4, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62, P2 ṭṣuṣṣ; F10 pʾhstʾ; P10 pʾhstʾ hst-1

1567 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 ṭstl
Also this text is rendered into Pāzand in MU 1.611.19-612.11 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):

[a] imať. gâm. yaoždaďâne. imâ. ëda. vacö. framâruua. ki. ëdin. gaospay. yaoždaďânanâi. ayî. în. guuśîni. përaj. gua.  
[b] gaune. aââiš. tâiš. šiaoaâdâiš. yâiš. vahîştâiš. fraeştâmâbi.  

1571 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. [Jmp]; G34 YHBWN-t  
1572 K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3. [Jmp]; L4, G34 ’wlwl’n; T44, E10 ’wlwl’n’  
1573 P2, F10, B1, M3. [Jmp]; L4, G34, T44 ywsďslynyd. YHBWN-yd; D62 ywsďslynyd YHBWN-yd; E10 ywsďslynyd YHBWN-yd; P10 ywsďslynyd, and P10a YHBWN-yd  
1574 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10. [Jmp]; K1 BA; D62, B1, P10, M3 BRA; F10 BRA gwbśn’  
1575 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, M3; D62, F10, P10. [Jmp] YMRWN  
1576 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. [Jmp]; E10 = y —  
1577 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. [Jmp]; L4a = AMT —  
1578 G34, T44, L4a; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 TWRAy; F10, E10, [Jmp] = y —  
1579 G34, E10, L4a, [Jmp]; K1 ‘ywkd’t; D62, B1, P10, M3 ‘ywkd’t; P2 ‘ywkd BRA ‘d’t; F10 BRA ‘ywkd’ d’t; T44 ‘ywkd’ d’t  
1580 K2, G34, T44, E10, L4a; D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3. [Jmp] whîņyṭ  
1581 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. [Jmp]; E10, L4a AYK  
1582 [Jmp]; D62, F10, B1, P10 ‘pz’dyynyt’; P2, G34, T44, E10, M3 ‘pz’dyynyt’; L4a ‘pz’dyynyt’  
1583 We must notice that the incorrect writing <KTNW-sn>, instead of the expected and right <kwnšn > kunšn, originates the wrong interpretation of this word as <KRTWN-sn > / KLYTWN-sn >, here Pâzand xöniš < Phl. xwândan, xwân-. 

310
Comparison between the PT of V 11.6b and d and the PT of Y 35.4a and 48.6a

There are some differences between the PT of Y 35.4 and that of V 11.6b, mainly regarding the glosses (Cantera 2006a 63-64):

Y 35.4

ZK y gwspnd’n’ dhšn’ [MYA] ZK y OLE-š’n’ kwnšn’ [p’hst <y> OLE-š’n’ ANšWTA-’n’ y BYN ZNE gyh’n’ k’l y] p’hlwm pl’mdšn’
ān ī gosspandān dahišn [āb] ān ī awēšān kunšn [pahast <i> awēšān mardōmān ī andar ēn gēbān kār ī phlom framaḥyšn
The gift for the cows [water], this deed for them [the fold of these men in this world] must be ordered as the best [deed].

V 11.6b

ZK y gwspnd’n’ dhšn’ [MYA W w’stl] ZK y OLE-š’n’ kwnšn’ [p’hst <y> OLE-š’n’ ANšWTA-’n’ y BYN ZNE gyh’n’ k’l y] p’hlwm pl’mdšn’
ān ī gosspandān dahišn [āb ud wāstar] ān ī awēšān kunšn [pahast <i> awēšān mardōmān ī phlom framaḥyšn [kū-šān gosspandān rāy phlom kār ēn kard bawēd pahast-e bē kunēnd u-š ab ud wāstar dabhēn]
The gift for the cows [water and fodder], this deed for them [the fold of these men] must be ordered as the best [that is, for their cows this will be done as the best deed. They will gather a fold and they will give them water and fodder]

At a first glance, the main difference is that the PT of Y 35.4 attests a shorter first gloss, but its second gloss is longer than that of V 11.6b. On the contrary, the PT of Y 35.4 adds no gloss after Phl. framaḥyšn.

However, the PTs of Y 48.6 and V 11.6d are mostly identical:

Y 48.6

ʾytwn’ PWN ZK y OLE tlks’syh [AMT TWRA y ʾywkd’t tn’ BRA YHBWN-t] ʾwhrmzd ʾwlwl ṣhwynyt [AYK-š BRA ʾpzʾdynty]
ēdōn pad ān ī ʾy tarsagābih [kā ġāw ī ēkdād tan bē ḏād] ohrmazd urwar ṣwxšēnīd [kū-š bē abzāyēnīd]
Thus because of his reverence to it [when he created the cow of the sole-created body], Ohrmazd made the plants grow [that is, he made them increase].

V 11.6d

ʾytwn’ PWN ZK y OLE tlks’syh [AMT TWRA y ʾywkd’t tn’ BRA d’t] ʾwhrmzd ʾwlwl ṣhwynyt [AYK-š BRA ʾpzʾdynty]

Obviously this mistake reflects the addition of Phl. <YHBWN-yd> dabē stemming from L4: L4, G34, T44 ywsdʾsλynyt; YHBWN-yd; D62 ywsdʾsλynyt; E10 ywsdʾsλynyt YHHWN-yd; P10 ywsdʾsλynyt, and P10a YHBWN-yd
As we observe, the PT of Y 48.6 shows hardly any variation from that of V 11.6d, because it simply writes ďăd by <YHBWN-t> instead of <d’t>. 
“If I want to purify this righteous man, if I want to purify this righteous woman, then pronounce these words:” |b| ā. airtūmā. īšīō. rafšōrā. jantiū. nāgriūascā. nārirībascā. zaraḫūstrate. |c| vaḥbūš. rafšōrā. manaybū. yā. daēnā. vartīm. hanūt. miḏām. |d| ašāiūi. yāsā. ašīm. yām. īšiūm. abūrū. mašatā. maḏā. |a| [AMT] ṣytwn' PWN GBRA |b| hwbw ywyṣ'd slyɛy 'ytwn' PWN |c| n'ylyk y ṣytwn' hwbw ywyṣ'd slyɛy ywyṣ'd sly[y 'ytwn' ADYN' ZNE gwbšn' prc YMRWN' |b| ZK 'y lm n ṣytwn' 'ytwnt YHMTWN-sn' |b| [AYK' p'yt 1635 mtn' |b| [1629 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, T46, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34 bātāq; F10 1630 vaḥrūmānāt |b| B2, T46, (G); L4, D62, P2, P5, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . FK1 miḏām; K2 miāḏām; G34 miḏām; E10 miḏām. ṣṣ. Mf2, K9 miḏām |b| 1631 K1, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3, (G); L4, T44, E10 . FK1 . Mf2, K9 ašāiūi; D62 ašiūiū; B2, T46 ašayā |b| 1632 L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10 . FK1, (G); P5 yā.ūsā; K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 yā.ūsā; B2, T46 yā.ūsā; Mf2, K9 yāsā |b| 1633 D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, T46, FK1, (G); L4 īšiūm; G34, T44 ašiūm; E10 ašīm īšūm; Mf2 ašīm; K9 ašīm |b| 1634 T46, L4 ašiūm; K1 . Mf2, (G) īšiūm; D62, P2 ašīmām; P5, K2, B1, P10 ašīmām; G34, T44 . FK1 īšiūm; F10, M3 . K9 ašīm; E10 ašīm; B2 īšīμ |b| 1635 L4, K1, D62, P2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, (G); P5, F10 mašaītā; K2, G34 . R278, E4 . K9 maštā; G42 maštā; L5 maštā; FK1 mašaītā; Mf2 maštā |b| 1636 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5, T44, E10 . L5, FK1 maḏā |b| 1637 vid. (Wolff 1910 72): “Her komme der liebe Airyaman zur Unterstützung zu den Männern und Frauen des Zaraḫūstra, zur Unterstützung des gutes Sinns. Welches Ich den köstlichen Lohn verdient, (dem) erbitte ich den Preis der Gerechtigkeit, den begehrenswerten, welchen Ahura Mazdāh zuteilen wird”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.195): “Que la tribu vigoureuse aille au secours! / Aux hommes et aux femmes de Zaraḫūstra / Pour le secours de la divine Pensée / La conscience qui gagne une récompense de choix / Je demande l’octroi de l’Harmonie / La (...) vigoureuse dont le Maître Mazdā s’est enivré” or “Que la tribu vigoureuse aille au secours! / Aux hommes et aux femmes de Zaraḫūstra / Pour le secours de la divine Pensée, je demande à la conscience, qui gagne une récompense de choix, l’octroi de l’Harmonie, (octroi) que le Maître Mazdā pense vigoureuse”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjaervø 1991 1.195): “Let the tribe, provided with invigoration, come to the support of the men and women of Zaraḫūstra, to the support of good thought, a religious view which will deserve a desirable prize. I entreat for the invigoration reward of truth which the Wise Ahura has devised”. |b| 1638 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 mlh |b| 1639 L4, G34, F10, T44, (Jmp), K1, D62, P2, E10, B1, P10, M3 y y |b| 1640 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 'hlwb' y' |b| 1641 D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 ywyṣ'd slyyd |b| 1642 K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 W'ytwn' |b| 1643 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 PWN y |b| 1644 K1, (Jmp); L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 y y |b| 1645 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 'hlwb' y' |b| 1646 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 ywyṣ’dnlyyd |b| 1647 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 gwbšn'y |b| 1648 D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3; L4 YMRWN P2, F10, P10, (Jmp) YMRWN |b| 1649 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; E10 (Jmp) ZK y |b| 1650 L4, F10, T44, E10, M3, (Jmp); K1, D62, B1, P10 'ylm'n; P2 'ylym'n; G34 'ylym'n"
AP-t PWN l’mšn’ ‘p’yynḍ̣ 1636 kṛtnt’m 1638 ZK, n’lyk’n’ <y> zltwhšt,i 1642 [c whwmn’ l’mšn’twm 1658 HWE-d [AYK LK-c ‘p’yt’ mtn’ 1642 AP-t PWN l’mšn’ ‘p’yynḍ̣ 1659 kṛtnt’ 1644 MNW 1647 ZK y’ 1649 dyn’ k’mk’ ‘lc’nyk YHWWN-yt’ PWN mzdz [y’ 1650 LTME W 1651 ZK, y 1653 TME 1655] d| ZK y’ 1658 hl’dyh tsk’sh 1658 hw’s’l HWE-d [h’wšt’ 1656 AYK-m PWN ZK, tsk’sy h’ 1658] ZK, y 1659 whrmzd msyh [YHWWN-t 1660 mwgpwyh’ 1662] [a |[ka] edōn pad mard i ablaw yōjdārsēnē edōn pad nārīg i ablaw yōjdārsēnē ēg ēn gūwšn frāz gow [b] ān ērmān xwāhīsīhī ā-t o rāmīsīn rāsi[n kū abāyēd madan u-t ēl pad rāmīsīn abāyēnd kārdu] narān ud nārīgān <i> zarduxāt |c| waft mān rāmīsīntom hēnd [kū tō-z abāyēd madan u-t ēl pad rāmīsīn abāyēnd kārdu] kē ān ī dēn kāmān arzāngī bawēd pad mizd [i ādār ud ān ī ānōh |d] ān i ablayīh tarsagāh xwāstār hēnd [hāwšt] [kū-m pad ān tarsagāhīh ān ī ohrmzd mē nhīh [bawād’ mowbādān mowbedīh]
[a] [If] thus you perform the purification for the righteous man and if you perform the purification for the righteous woman, then pronounce these words: [b] “May the desirable Ērmān come to please you, Zarduxšt’s men and women [that is, he ought to come and they ought to please you]; [c] they please Wahman the most [that is, you ought to come too and they ought to please you]. Who loves the religion deserves a reward [that from here and that from there]. [d] The reverent ones [the disciples] for the Truth [that is, with reverence to me] are eager for Ohrmazd’s supremacy [may they achieve the highest priesthood]."

This text is rendered into Pāzand in MU 1.612.13-613.6 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):


Comparison between the PT of V 11.7b-d and the PT of Y 54.1

We must remark once again that the Pāzand translation stems from the PT of V 11.7, which is very different from the PT of Y 54.1:

Come, desirable Ėrmān, to please Zardušt’s men and women [that is, please them], to please Wahman too [you must do this deed too], so that, if he [the believer] loves the religion, will deserve a reward [spiritual reward]. May the reverent ones [the disciples] be eager [the good disciples] for the Truth, may they fulfil with the prayer Ohrmazd’s supremacy [so that in connection my religion may come. There was (a commentator) who said: “the highest priesthood”].

For the details about both versions, vid. (Cantera 2006a 50-54).
Thou appoint (as) guardian for one such as me, O Wise One, when the deceitful one tries to seize ...
me in order to injure (me), (whom dost Thou appoint) other than Thy fire and thought, with whose [du.] actions one nourishes truth, O Ahura? Proclaim a message about that to my religious view. 1620

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 1.153): “Quel est le briseur d'obstacles parmi les Existants, afin qu’il (me) protège suivant ton explication? Que des cadeaux remarquables me soient faits! Ô guérisseur de l'existence (rituelle), fournis-moi le modèle! Et que l'obéissance à ce (...) vienne en raison de la divine Pensée, ô Mazdâ, à celui, quel qu'il soit, auquel tu veux qu'elle vienne!”.

(Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.161): “Who (is) a resistance-breaker (able) to protect (those) who exist, by Thy proclamation? Accord (as) a judgement bright (things to be) in my house, O Healer of existence. Let (recompense for) obedience come to him (me) in order to injure (me), (whom dost Thou appoint) other than Thy fire and thought, with whose [du.] actions one nourishes truth, O Ahura? Proclaim a message about that to my religious view. 1620

vid. (Wolff 1910 134, 367): “Schütz uns vor dem Feind, o Mazdah und o heilige Armatay! (Ver)schwinde daèveische Drug, (ver)schwinde daèvevaentstamme, (ver)schwinde daèvevageschaffene, (ver)schwinde daèvevaerzeugte! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde völlig, o Drug, im Norden sollst du verschwinden, nicht sollst du die stoffliche Welt des Asa zunichte machen!”.

L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3; F10 | 8... yt’hwwlywyk    | 8 BRA YMRWN

[a] Eight Ahunawar must be pronounced: yadâhîwârayryo [say it eight (times)].
According to the Persian Rivāyats, namely MU 1.15.3-4 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 13), eight Ahunawar are prescribed in the Xšnūman of Vīsparad:

\[\text{For the ceremony of) Vīsparad in the Xšnūman of the righteous eight yasābūwayryō (must be recited).}\]

In its following lines, this Persian Rivāyat relates the recitation of eight Ahunawar at the ceremonies for the souls of the righteous. It seems that these eight Ahunawar in V 11.8 could be linked to the mention to the righteous man and the righteous woman in V 11.7. However, these eight Ahunawar might also represent the eight things to be purified, namely house, fire, water, earth, cattle, plants, righteous man and righteous woman.

L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10 and M3 continue V 11.8 without PT and also without any strong pause until nāsīm.

L4, G34 aēçm; D62, P5, K2, T44, B1, P10 aēçm; P2, F10, M3, (G) aēçm; E10. L1 aēçm; B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aēçm; L5 aēçm; FK1 aēçm; M2, K9 aēçm

L4, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1. M2, K9, (G); K2 pòrne; E10 pòrne; E4 pòrne.

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); T44 nāsīm. pòrne. M2, K9 nāsīm

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. M2, (G); E10 pòrne; FK1 pòrne; K9 pòrne.

L4, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. L2, G42 hgm.raēdžam; L1 hgm.riēdžam; B2 hgm.riēdžam; T46 hgm.riēdžam; FK1 hgm.riēdžam; P5, K2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. M2, K9 hgm.riēdžam; B1. M2, K9 hgm.riēdžam; E4, L5 hgm.riēdžam

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, M2, K9, (G); L5 pòrne; FK1 pòrne. paiti.riēdžam

L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, M2, K9, (G); P10 paiti.riēdžam; E10. R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 paiti.riēdžam; E4 paiti.riēdžam; FK1 paiti.riēdžam. pòrne. paiti.riēdžam

L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, M2, K9, (G); E4 pòrne; FK1 pòrne.

L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); P5 x̔r̔̄; L5 x̔r̔̄; M2, K9 x̔r̔

L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, M2, K9, (G); E4 pòrne; FK1 pòrne. bùdija; K2 bùdija; P1 bùdija; M2 above the line, K9 bùdija

L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, M2, K9, (G); F10 pòrne; FK1 pòrne.

L4, D62, K2, B1, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); L4, E10 bùdija; P5, F10 bùdija; G34 bùdija; T44 bùdija; P10 bùdija; R278 bùdija; E4 bùdija; L5 bùdija; FK1 bùdija; M2, K9 bùdija

L4, P2 kundy; P5, D62, K2, G34, E10, B1, M3 kundy; F10, T44 kundy; P10 kundy. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G); L4, G34, T44, E10 kundyja; D62, P2, K2, F10, B1, M3 kundai; P5 kundai; R278 kundai; T46 yàzarine. pòrne. bùdija. pòrne. kundai; L5 kundai; FK1 kundai; M2 gunduâda; K9 gunduâda

L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, M2, K9, (G); P2 pòrne; P1 pòrne. B2, T46 pòrne. bùdija. yà. zairina |

P1; L4, K1 bùujusta; D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, B1, P10 bùujusta; K2, T44. L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 bùujusta; E10 bùujusta; M3 bùujusta; FK1 bùujusta; M2 bùujusta; K9 bùujusta; (G) bùujusta

L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10. E4, L5, (G); L1, R278, P1, L2, G42, FK1. M2, K9 yà

M2, K9, (G); K1, D62, P5, K2, B1, P10 zaireni; P2 zaireni; G34 zaireni; F10, E10. R278, P1, L2, G42, FK1 zaireni; T44 yàzarine; M3 yàzarine; L4a zairine. L1 zairine. Br1 yàzarine; E4 zairina; L5 zairine
būšiašta. yā. darāyo. gauna. | pareme. mūdi. pareme. kapastiš. \| pareme. pairikam. yā. āi. ātrom. ārom. zam.

1710 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P1, E4 pareme. pareme.
1715 T46, P1; K1 būšiašta; D62 : FK1 būšiašta; P2, G34, L4a būšiašta; P5, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 būšiašta; E10 būšiašta; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 būšiašta; Mf2 būšiašta; K9 būšiašta; (G) būšiašta
1711 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, L4a . E4, L5, (G); T44 yazariene; M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9 yā.

R278, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, (G); K1, B1, M3 darāgına; D62 darāgına; P2 d'ragına; P5 dragına; K2 darāgō.guna; G34 . B2, T46, Br1 drāyō.guna; F10 darāya.guna; T44 . FK1 darāyō.guna; E10 darāyō.guna; P10 darāyō.guna; L4a darāyō.guna . L1, P1 drāgō.guna; L5 darāgō.guna; K9 d'ragō.guna
1713 P5, K2, G34a in the right margin, F10a in the right margin, T44, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 pareme. mūdi. pareme. kapastiš ; E4 pairine
1714 P5, K2, G34a in the right margin . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . F10a in the right margin, T44, E10 . FK1 mūida; G42 mūidi; E4 mūaidi; L5 mūiδi; Mf2, K9 mūiδi.
1715 P5, K2, G34a in the right margin, F10a in the right margin, T44, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 pairina
1716 P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . G34a in the right margin kapastiš + its PT pwltynm mwtk kl'l pwltynm kltʾl pwltynm F10a in the right margin kapastiš + its PT pwltynm mwtk kl'l pwltynm T44 kapastiš + its PT pwltynm mwtk kl'l pwltynm E10 kpašiš + its PT pwltynm mwtk kl'l pwltynm 322; Mf2 kapastiš
1717 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44, E10 . L2 pareme. pairikam.
1719 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, G42, L5, FK1, (G); L1, P1, Br1, L2, Mf2, K9 yā
1720 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, Mf2, K9, (G); K1 ātrom; D62 ātrom; F2, P5, F10, T44, E10, M3 . E4, L5, FK1 ātrom
1721 L4, K1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 zām

322
gm. 1724 ῥυναρά. |g| para. ᵃherent. 1725 ya. 1726 aŭi. 1727 aŭin. 1728 aŭi. 1729 gm. ῥυναρά.

[a] I fight the Wrath, I fight Nasu. [b] I fight the Direct defilement, I fight the Indirect defilement. [c] I fight Xrū, I fight Xruuiyni, I fight Būiśin, I fight Būiśiän, I fight Kundia, I fight Kundian, I fight Būśiściastā the Long-handed. [d] I fight Mūśin, I fight Kapasti. [f] I fight the Pairika, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants. [g] I fight the maculation, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants.

|a| pwl'tynm ῥυςm pwl'tynm ῥυςm [LOYN 1735 W 1736 AHL y 1738 pwtm KN 1740 ptkʾlym 1741 AP-š AHL KN 1742 ptkʾlym 1743 ] b| pwl’tynm MNW 1744 PWN hml’t’ [lymn’ YHWNW-t 1746 YKOYMWN-yt 1747 ] pwl’tynm 1748 MNW 1749 PWN
The list of demons in V 11.9

In V 11.9 there is a list of demons which must be exorcised in order to fulfil the purification. Some of them are known from other texts, such as Aēšma, personification of Wrath, Nasu, which embodies the corpse’s impurity, the personified Direct and Indirect defilement, and Būšāsp, the demon of Sloth. The rest, however, are hapax legōmena, whose grammatical case is problematic.

The answer to this first problem depends on the interpretation of the hapax legōmena, which have not been fully explained. Indeed, all of them are supposedly written in Nom. Sing., instead of the Acc. Sing. which we would expect because of the transitive verb Av. pərəné. Thus, they have been considered as ungrammatical forms. Nevertheless, unless we explain exactly the etymology and meaning of these words, we do not know whether they are really “ungrammatically” written, corruptly transmitted, dialectal forms or simply if their forms are due to peculiarities of the daevic words, as Kellens (1974 59) pointed out.

The second main problem concerns the omission of the PT of Av. pərəné. xrū. ... pərəné. kundīža. This sequence is preserved in the Pahlavi as well as in the Sāde manuscripts, but it has not been translated in the first ones. Only P5 translates it, but this is clearly due to a modern attempt of the reformist schools in Surat to fill the gaps of the old PV manuscripts. The omission of this PT in the PV manuscripts has led to the conclusion that this sequence is an Avestan gloss or a
Compositional correspondences between V 10 and V 11: the lists of demons

From the point of view of the composition of these lists, it is striking that in V 11 Aēšma appears at the beginning instead of the Evil Spirit. In the other lists the Evil Spirit is mentioned at the end. The three evil beings related to impurity, nasu-, ham.raēδja- and patti.raēδja-, as we have seen, are placed in the same position in both lists. The triad formed by inдра-, sauru- and nāyhađua- in V 10 finds its counterpart in three couples of evil beings of V 11 xru – xruuiyi, būiō – būiōža and *kunđa – kunđiža.

The couple of *tauruui- and *zairici- in V 10 finds an equivalence in the two +būšiṣ̣a, one called zairina and the other darṣ̣yö.gauña. I am not able to decide if the latter could refer to *tauruui-, but I think that there is an equivalence between the *zairici of V 10 and the +būšiṣa. yā. zairina of V 11.

The next couple, that of aēšma- +xruui.drū- and +akataša- in V 10, is parallel to that of mūiō and kapastiś in V 11, although I do not think them to be equivalent. Apart from V 11, Av. kapastiś is attested only in Yt 8.56. If my interpretation of this word as “foot-soldier” in this passage is right (see the commentary to Av. kapastiś in V 11.9), aēšma- +xruui.drū- “Wrath of the blood-stained stick” of V 10 could be parallel to kapastiś “foot-soldier (?)” of V 11. That +akataša- of V 10 be paralleled by mūiō of V 11 has no further textual support.

The following and last couple of demons on the list of V 10, namely that formed by *varaṇiua and vātō, finds an equivalence at least in the last couple on the list of V 11, that of pairikam and abhitim. At a first glance there is no relation between *varaṇiua in V 10 and pairikam in V 11. The Pahlavi translators, however, seem to have interpreted them as equivalents: they translated Av. *varaṇiua by Phl. waranīg dēw “the demon Lust”, personified as an evil being, and Av. pairikam by Phl. ān i pariñ [kāmagi] “the Pārīn [Desire]”. The connection between Lust and Desire is also found in other Pahlavi texts, such as Dk 6.274 (Shaked 1979 106-109), where lust and bodily desire (Phl. wan ud tan-kāmagi) are mentioned together.
This could be the reason why the Pahlavi translators saw such an equivalence between Phl. *waranīg dēw* “the demon Lust” and Phl. ān ī pariğ [kāmagī] “the Paris [Desire]” and thus equated Av. *varṇīīa* in the list of V 10 with Av. *pairīkām* in that of V 11.

Av. *xṛū* ... *xruuiñī* (11.9b)

Av. *xṛū*- (fem.) is not a *hápax legómenon* in the Avesta. It means “(raw) flesh” in Yt 14.33. In V 11, however, we do not know its exact meaning, but it might be the either personification of the impurity of raw flesh (Gray 1929 218) or even the personification of cruelty, here mentioned as an evil being.

But Av. *xruuiñī*-1792 (fem.) is a *hápax legómenon*. It is a compound whose first element Av. *xruui*” is used in compounds for *xṛūra-* “bloody, cruel” (Kellens 1974 157) and is part of a Caland’s system (cf. Gr. krēás “flesh”, Ved. kravīs- “raw flesh” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.411)). Its second element is Av. òjan- “smiting, killing” (cf. Ved. òghnī- (fem.).793, òhān- (masc.) “idem”). Therefore, in agreement with Bartholomae (1904 540), we can understand it as “she who kills bloodily or cruelly”. cf. Gray’s (1929 218) translation “Raw-Striker”.

Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.182, n.12) suggested that both *xṛū* and *xruuiñī* were epithets of the demon of Wrath of the bloodstained stick (av. aēśma- *xruuidru-*) and meant “murder” and “murderer” respectively. However, I cannot be certain whether or not they are really epithets of Wrath or of any other evil personifications.

It seems that the Pahlavi translation of these words in P5 agrees with Darmesteter’s interpretation. Indeed, only the scribe of P5, which belongs to the reformist school of Surat, translated Av. *xṛū* by means of Phl. <hlwydlwš>, which is actually the PT of Av. *xruuidru-. Regarding Av. *xruuiñī*, he reproduced the same translation, but for Av. òγnī he added Phl. <znnk>, which must be read as zanag. Thus, the result is a surprising <hlwydlwš Žnnk>. Therefore, according to his PT, the Pahlavi translator of P5 understood that Av. *xṛū* and *xruuiñī* referred to Wrath of the bloodstained stick. Or he simply did not know how to translate them and chose the PT of the only similar word he found, namely Av. *xruuidru-.*

Av. *būişi* ... *būişiža* (11.9b)

These words, as de Vaan (2003 303) states, have no sure etymology. However, there have been some attempts to explain them.

Darmesteter (1877 196, n.4), followed by Lommel (1912 49 ff.) and Dhalia (1994 273), proposed that *būişi* and the demon *būti* in V 19.1, 2 and 43 were one and the same. Moreover, he said that *būişi* and *būişiža* (sic) were related to the same

1792 I disagree with de Vaan’s (2003 260) correction of Geldner’s *xruuiñī* as òxruuiñī, because all the oldest PV, IndVS and IrVS manuscripts agree in variants with short vowel ò*i* in V 11.9, 11.12, 11.15 and 11.18.

1793 For instance in Ved. asuraghnī- “killer of Ásuras” and Ved. raksoghnī- “killer of demons” (Böhtling & Roth 1855 1.556, 6.222).
root *bū- present in Av. *būšiāsta- and explained *būṭīja (sic) as *būṭī + za, where Av. za would find its Vedic cognate in Ved. ja- “offspring”.

Bartholomae (1904 968) gave no etymology for this word, but stated that it designated a *daēuua-, that is, a masculine evil being, and he read it as Av. *būṭī-.

Nyberg (1938 339 ff.) interpreted Av. *būṭī as a feminine *būṭī-and linked it with the root *baγd-, with the meaning “to be conscious”, and supposed that it was a goddess of the oracle, worshipped by the Median tribe of the Boūdioi that Herodotus 1.101 mentioned. Christensen (1941 34) quoted Nyberg’s supposition, but linked this word with the root *budh- with the meaning “to smell, to perceive”.

Kellens (1974 60) stated that *būṭī- is a feminine formation with –ī from the root *budh-, but he did not clarify whether this root means “to smell” or “to perceive”.

According to Cheung (2007 14-16) there are two different Iranian roots *baγd-, one with the meaning “to feel, to perceive” and another with the meaning “to smell”. Nevertheless, he thinks that the second meaning could be a development from the first. This chance is clearly adopted by Mayrhofer (1992-2001 2.234) as the only possible one in Iranian (“wahrnehmen > riechen”).

Therefore, according to the preceding interpretations, Av. *būṭī would be ascribed to an Iranian root *baγd-, which, according to Mayrhofer and Cheung, means “to perceive, to sense” and also develops the meaning “to smell”. However, still we do not know what Av. *būṭī means. In order to find out, I have searched for other formations from the same root in Avestan.

Apart from Av. *būṭī, Iranian *baγd- is attested in Avestan in: a) other nominal formations; b) compounds.

Regarding other nominal formations, with the meaning *baγd- “to smell” we find Av. *baōda- “smoke” and Av. *baoiī- “scent, fragrance” (Bartholomae 1904 918). From *baγd- “to perceive, to sense”, the often attested nominal formation Av. *baōšah- “consciousness” (Bartholomae 1904 919) is also found. Since both meanings are represented in Avestan, to relate Av. *būṭī to one of them still seems a problem. If we link *būṭī with *baγd- “to smell”, we could suppose, because of the daēvic context in V 11.9, that it is opposed to Av. *baoiī- “scent, fragrance” and that it would mean “stench, stink”. However, there would be no further argument to support this assumption. And if we link *būṭī with *baγd- “to perceive”, it would have to mean something like “(evil) consciousness, malice” in opposition to Av. *baōšah- “consciousness”. No further nominal formations shed light on the meaning of Av. *būṭī.

Let’s then look to the compounds with the root *baγd- in Avestan. Leaving aside Av. *būṭīža in the same passage, which seems to be a compound of *būṭī and *za, and the possibly corrupted Av. *baōša.baxtica in Vyt 33, we find three compounds in which Av. *baōšah- “consciousness” is the first element:

1. the often attested Av. *baōša.varšta- “maliciously done, wilful (action)”
2. the hápax legōmenon Av. *baōša.jaiti- in N 49.21. It has been interpreted by several authors in different ways, depending on the syntactic relation postulated between the first and the second elements of the compound. Bartholomae (1904 919) understood it as “Schlagen, Ertöten des Wahrnehmungsvermögens, Bezeichnung eines Delikts”, and he is followed by Kotwal & Kreyenbroek (2003 227, n.919) in their interpretation as “killing consciousness”. Klingenschmitt (1968...
199 ff.), however, interpreted it as “Schlagen mit Bewusstsein, vorsätzliches Schlagen”, that is “intentional injury”, which surprisingly is Kotwal & Kreyenbroek’s (2003 227) English translation of the PT of N 49.21.

3. Av. baođaja in FiO 680. According to Klingenschmitt (1968 199 ff.), Av. baođaja, translated by Phl. <bwtwzyt>, is a corrupted form from Av. baoō.aji-ti-, which he translated as “Schlagen mit Bewusstsein, vorsätzliches Schlagen”, according to its explanation in FiO 682.

Therefore, Av. baoō “consciousness” is the first element of the compounds Av. baoō.varštā-, Av. baoō.aji-ti- and Av. baođaja.

Since Av. baoō- “consciousness” is a substantive with an –ah- stem, it can be part of a Caland’s system. Actually, we find the adjective with –ra- Av. zaēni.łuora- “awake, watchful” (Bartholomae 1904 1652) in V 13.39. Thus, to complete the sequence only a compound with –i° would be needed in Avestan, and it could be found in Av. būi-ža. Since the other members of this system belong to a root *baođ- with the meaning “to perceive”, we expect that in Av. būi-ža the same meaning is applied. Nevertheless, if we accept that the first element būi° of the compound Av. būi-ža is part of a Caland’s system būora- / baoōah- / būi°, we cannot explain why baoō is also used as a first element of compound. Furthermore, Av. būi would also remain unexplained in this Caland’s system.

Let’s now turn to the second element of the compound Av. būiža.

Darmesteter (1877 196, n.4) read būiža, but interpreted it as būižā- in his translations (Darmesteter 1887 142, n.5), (Darmesteter 1892-1893 2.182). Geldner (1896) also edited būiža, which was followed by Nyberg (1938 339 ff.) and Christensen (1941 35). In order to choose būiža and būiža, and also between kuṇḍiža and kuṇḍiža, we must firstly take into account the manuscripts’ evidence.

The graphems z / ž / j are usually confused in the written transmission of the Avesta because of their phonetic similarity, as we see in the following examples: V 11.10a: E4 daojāda (for dužda); 11.12f: L5 jām (for zam); 12.12b: E4 jaođā (for zaodṛa); 12.22b: G25a znuō (for jnuū); 12.22b: P1 bijiŋrō (for bizangrō); 12.22b: G25a zaiñti (for jañtī); 12.22c: L1 ajañti; P1 ajaite (for azaiti); 12.22d: K2, T44, R1 znū (for jnuū); 12.22d: K2, R1 . L1, P1, L5 ji (for zi). As Hintze (in JamaspAsa 1991 xviii-xix) noticed, the confusion z / j is also found in F1. This is what we find in V 11 regarding būiža / būiža and kuṇḍiža / kuṇḍiža:

a) –ž-: the oldest IndVS and IrVS in V 11.9; the oldest PV, IndVS and IrVS in 11.12; the oldest IndVS and IrVS in 11.15 and 11.18 (the PV abbreviated them).

b) –j-: the oldest PV in V 11.9.

Therefore, from the point of view of textual criticism, obviously we must prefer būiža and kuṇḍiža.

Regarding the interpretation of the second element of the compound, namely źa, Darmesteter (1877 196, n.4) analysed it as būiōi + źa- (cf. Ved. Já- “offspring” < IE. *gph₁- (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.567-568)) and translated it as “the offspring of Būidhi” (Darmesteter 1887 142, n.5) and “l’engeance de Bûidhi” (Darmesteter 1892-1893 2.182).

Nyberg (1938 339 ff.), followed by Christensen (1941 35), interpreted it as būižā-, where źa- would mean “effort, aspiration, zèle religieux”, and supposed
that Būiōža and Kundīža were personifications of extatic elements related to a cult with hemp to Būiō and Kund / Kundī.

Darmesteter’s interpretation might stem from a possible RUKI of *-f after –i- (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 104 3a.) in *būiōža- > būiōža and can be supported by the manuscripts’ evidence. Nyberg’s hypothesis could be explained by means of a confusion between ī and ū, because it is not unusual in the written transmission of the Avesta, in spite that no manuscript attests ०iža with the long vowel –i-. Nevertheless, I prefer another etymological explanation for ०ža.

In my opinion, there is a correlation between xuuiyn, būiōža and kundīža in the same passage. Since the second element of the compound xuuiyn stems from ०yni-, feminine of Av. ०jan- “smiting, killing”, it is possible that the same root IE. *gub- “to smite, to kill” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.800-801) was implied in the second element of the other two compounds in this passage. If so, the second element ०ža of this compound could represent a dialectal form ०žan- from Av. ०jan- < IE. *gub-. However, this is only a possibility.

To summarise, it is difficult to explain the formation of Av. būiō in connection with Av. būiōža, if we accept that the first element of the compound Av. būiōža is part of a Caland’s system ०buora- / bauah- / būiō. Only the possibility that Av. ०žan- is derived from IE. *gub- “to smite, to kill” is likely, if we compare this second member of compound with the preceding ०yni- of Av. xuuiyn. In such case, Av. būiōža would be the Nom. Sing. Masc. of Av. būiōžan- “he who kills būiō”.

Av. *kunda ... kundīža (11.9b)

While the name Av. kundīža only appears in V 11, Av. kunda is attested in V 11, V 19.41 and Vyt 26. The latter was commonly read as kundī in V 11, while in the other two passages it was read as kunda. Jackson (1895 661), followed by Bartholomae (1904 474), Gray (1929 208), Widengren (1965 115) and Dhal (1994 272), Kundī is the feminine counterpart of the Avestan demon Kund of V 19.41 and Vyt 26. Notwithstanding, kundī is not the only reading in V 11 and can be the same as kunda. As a matter of fact, the variants in the manuscripts point out to four different readings of Av. kunda depending on the passage and the branch of the written transmission:

a) kunda- (V 11, 19.41):
- kundom (V 19.41): the oldest PV, IndVS and IrVS (L4, K1 . B2, T46 kundom; L1 . Mf2 kundom)

b) kundī / kundin- (V 11): the oldest PV and IndVS in V 11.9 (kundī); the oldest PV in V 11.12; the oldest IndVS in V 11.15 (kunde, kunde < *kundi / *kunda ?) and 11.18.

c) kauandar- (Vyt 26): all the manuscripts (G18a kauandarom; L5 kauanādōm).


Among these readings, *gundām* in V 11 is seemingly a special development in the written transmission of the IrVS group and cannot be the reading to be reconstructed for the prearchetype of Vīdēvdād. The reading *kauuandām* of Vyt 26 is isolated within the written transmission of the Vīštāsp Yašt. Although this variant is old enough, because it appears in the manuscript G18a (1627 A.D., copied from a manuscript of 1344 A.D.), it cannot be traced back to the prearchetype of Vīdēvdād, because it is not shared by any manuscript of Vīdēvdād. Therefore, the readings *gundām* and *kauuandām* must be discarded and we must choose either *kunda* or *kundi*.

It is clear that *kundām*, Acc. Sing. of Av. *kunda-*-, is the original reading of V 19.41, because the oldest PV, IndVS and IrVS manuscripts agree in this reading. On the contrary, in V 11 both *kunda* and *kundi* are attested and we do not know for sure whether they represent *kunda-* or *kundī- / kundīn-*-. Actually, on one hand, *kundi* may be a variant of *kunda* and viceversa, because of the usual confusion in the manuscripts between –<i>i</i> and –<i>a</i>. On the other hand, the variant *kunde* could stem from both, so that it does not help us to choose *kunda* or *kundi*. Thus, the parallel *kundām* of V 19.41 plays a decisive role in this choice. Since *kundām* in of V 19.41 can be only the Acc. Sing. of Av. *kunda-*-, I think that the same demon Kunda is referred to in V 11. Because of this, I have preferred to edit *kunda* in V 11, which would be the Voc. / Instr. Sing. of *kunda-*-. In such case, the supposed demon Kuṇḍī of V 11 and the demon Kuṇḍa of V 19.41 would be one and the same.

As far as the etymology and meaning of Av. *kunda-* is concerned, it was explained according to different etymologies:

1. IE. *kayandʰa-* (Darmesteter 1877).
2. OIr. *kunda-* “stupid”, “hero” or “wise, magician”; cf. NP. क (Jackson 1928).
3. OIr. *kunda-*/*kunta-* “blunt > defective > bad” (Bailey 1955).
4. IE. *sqey-* “cutting, sharp” + t/d, with a nasal infix and without s-mobile (Wüst 1966).
5. OIr. *kunda-* “sage, seer” (Grantovskij 1970), (Rossi 2006).

Darmesteter (1877 54, n.2) mentioned Justi’s identification of Av. *kauuanda- / kunda-* with Ved. *kávandha-* “barrel, belly, trunk” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.327), in its turn equated by Kuhn (1859 133-134) with Gr. *kaánthos* “Káanthos, brother of the nymph Melía” in Pausanias 9.10.5. According to Darmesteter, this word would stem from Indo-European, although its meaning is unknown.

---

1795 In Vedic it is also written *kábándha-*, which is preferred in Sanskrit. In Indian epics, clearly shown in *Valmiki, Kámašastra* 3.69.25 ff. (Mudholakara 1990), we find a demon Kabandha who has neither head nor legs, but only one eye and a big mouth on his belly, and two long arms, with which he devours all the creatures he catches in the forest.
Jackson (1928 96, n.26) said that Av. *kunda- stems from OIr. *kunda-, either “stupid”, “hero” or “wise, magician”, attested in NP. دک (Steingass 1930 1053, s.v. *kunda).

Bailey (1955 72-73) assumed a possible variation of –tand –d- in the same root OIr. *kunda*/*kunta- “blunt”, from which a secondary meaning “defective” and eventually “bad” developed. The meaning “bad” would be represented in Av Avestan by the demon *kunda-*, its feminine *kundi- and *kundīzā-, in some Middle Iranian words and in NP. دک “stupid” and “astrologer, magician”.

According to Wüst (1966 59-60; 68, n.29), who accepted Bailey’s variation of –tand –d- in the same root, some words developed from IE. *sqey- “cutting, sharp” + t/d, with a nasal infix and without s-mobile: OInd. *kunta- “spear”, on one hand, and Av. *kunda- and *kundi- and OP. *kunduru- “incense”, on the other hand. Moreover, following Nyberg’s (1938 177, 341) statement, according to which Av. *kunda- in V 19.41 is a pre-Zoroastrian god of drunkenness worshipped with hemp, Wüst argued that OP. *kunduru- “incense” and the supposed use of hemp in the cult of Kunda were linked.

Later on Grantovskij (1970 288) stated that Av. *kunda- cannot stem from a variation of IIr. *kunda-/*kunta-, because NP. دک could only stem from OIr. *kunta- or *kunda-. According to him, in NP. دک two meanings merged: *kunda- “stupid” and *kunda- “sage, seer”. This second meaning, applied to an extatic and, according to Grantovskij, positive context, would be represented by Av. *kunda-*, which he interpreted not as a demon, but as an old god related to divination and the use of hemp. This interpretation, which stems from Nyberg (1938 177, 341), was partially followed by Rossi (2006) in his own analysis of Phl. *kundāg* as “soothsayer”, related to the practice of astragalomantics.

Bailey (1972 41) changed his own interpretation of Av. *kunda-*, and he proposed that it was connected with Ved. *kukūnda- (“Bezeichnung gespenstischer Wesen” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.360) in AVŚ 8.6.11 (= AVP 16.80.1, but written *ka-kundha-). The only difference between Vedic and Avestan would be the presence or absence of the pejorative prefix kw’/.ka/.

To summarise, I must comment that Darmesteter’s (1877 54, n.2) etymological connection between Av. *kauuanda- / kunda-*, Ved. kávandha- and Gr. kaanthos is suggestive, although it implies to assume that Av. *kunda- is a corruption of Av. *kauuanda-*. As far as the reading kundom of V 19.43 is confirmed by the kunda of V 11, I have no argument to prefer the reading kauuandom of Vyt 26 instead of kundom of V 19.43 and therefore I cannot explain why that of Vyt 26 is supposed to be older.

In my opinion, the rest of explanations are more or less imaginative. Among them, I think that Bailey’s (1955 72-73) first explanation is highly hypothetical, while those of Wüst (1966 59-60; 68, n.29) and Grantovskij (1970 288), stemming from Nyberg’s (1938 177, 341) belief about extatic cults related to Kunda, are not confirmed by the textual evidence of the Avesta. On the contrary, Jackson’s (1928 96, n.26) and Bailey’s (1972 41) proposals rest upon two different but equally possible etymologies. However, I have no argument to prefer one against the other, so that I prefer to leave the question regarding the meaning and etymology of Av. *kunda- open. The same could be said regarding Av. *kundiža*, of which only the
second element of the compound could be Av. ʿəzan- < IE. *gʰub-en- “to smite, to kill”.

Av. būšiasta (11.9c-d)  
vid. (Benveniste 1945 13-16), who interprets Av. būšiasta- as an abstract formation with –tā- from the future participle Av. būšiānt- “futurus” and considers that it is the demon of procrastination.

Av. zairina → Phl. zahr-gar (11.9d)  
Av. zairina is the variant to be edited here according to the manuscripts’ evidence. Darmesteter (1887) translated Av. zairina- as “yellow” because he linked it with Ved. hārī- “yellowish” and Ved. harinā- “yellowish animal” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.805-806). This interpretation was continued by Nyberg (1938 12), followed by Christensen (1941 35), who translated Av. zairina as “de couleur d’or” and supposed that this was referred the use of the juice of hemp in an ecstatic cult to Būšiāsta. On the contrary, Bartholomae (1904 1681) translated it as “aufreibend, erschlaffend”, according to the etymology from IE. *ǵerh₂- “to grind, to grow old, to decrease”.

The variant zairina in V 11.9d has not only a Vedic cognate, but also is confirmed by the parallels of 11.15a and 11.18a, where the manuscripts attest either zairina or zairini, and by Yt 18.2, where F1, the oldest manuscript of the Yašt, shows zairinom as epithet of Būšiāsta (Jamaspa 1991 251).

Besides zairina, the variants zairici (L4), zairicai (G34) and zairica (D62, P2, P5, B1, P10, M3) in V 11.12c must be explained. In the manuscripts of Vīdēvdād I have found no other confusion between –n- and –c-, so these variants would be exceptions. In my opinion, they are due to reinterpretation of the Sasanian exegetes, who maybe thought that Av. zairina, epithet of the demon Būšiāsta, was a corruption of Av. zairici-, name of a demon in V 10. Accordingly, they might have supposed that the demon Zairici of V 10 was the same as the demon Būšiāsta of V 11. The assimilation of two demons also attests the parallel of Nanhais and Tarōmad in GrBd 34.27 and therefore would not be an isolated case.

Av. mūiōi (11.9e)  
Av. mūiōi is another hapax legómenon. It was interpreted by Bartholomae (1904 1188) as a feminine mūiō- and as the name of a daēuuī-, but he failed to explain its etymology.

In order to understand this, we must take into account that there are two semantically antonymous Old Iranian roots *maud- (Cheung 2007 270-271):

a) *maud- “to mourn”.

b) *maud- “to be glad, to rejoice”.

The first is found in MMP. mwy- “to mourn”, Phl. mōy(ag) “mourning, lamentation”, Phl. must “mourning”, NP. of the Šāhnāmeh mōyeh “mourning, lamentation”, NP. mōyīdan “to mourn, to weep and cry aloud” and NP. must
“distress, lamentation”. If Av. mūiōī stems from *maʊd- “to mourn”, this word would be referred to a daevic entity related to mourning.

The second possibility connects Av. mūiōī with *maʊd- “to be glad” and was already proposed by Kellens (1974 62-63). According to him, this root produced a feminine noun Av. mūiōī-, but also two other daevic words: YAv. maoōanō.kairīiāī “she who gives pleasure” in Y 9.32 and OAv. ahōmusta- “unsatisfied” in Y 46.4. I agree with Kellens’ explanation.

After considering the possible etymology and meaning of the Avestan word, I must add something about its PT. Although this word is never translated in the oldest PV manuscripts (and in the PV manuscripts of an old type), the reformist schools of Surat and Navsarī created PTs for this word. In P5 this Avestan word was simply adapted into the Pahlavi phonetics by means of Phl. <mwdt> mūd (V 11.9) or a Pahlavi equivalent <mwdtk> mūdag (V 11.12 and 15) was created. But the Pahlavi translators of G34a, F10a, T44 and E10 actually tried to translate it by means of Phl. mūdag-kardār. This latter PT is found in Y 9.32 for Av. maoōanō.kairīiāī and also in Y 11.6 for Av. mīrakāca, although Phl. mūdag-kardār actually represents the PT of Av. maoōanō.kairīiāī. In both passages, Phl. mūdag-kardār is explained by the gloss kū čiš tabāh kunēd “that is, it destroys something”. Following the interpretation of this gloss, Dhabhar (1949 159) translated Phl. mūdag-kardār as “weakening”, while Josephson (1997 78, 115) translates it as “maker of destruction” and “doer of destruction” respectively.

I think that the Pahlavi translators of G34a, F10a, T44 and E10 did not know exactly what Av. mūiōī meant and they simply wanted to fill the gap in the PT. Therefore, they seem to have copied the PT of Av. maoōanō.kairīiāī and pasted it as that of Av. mūiōī, only omitting the gloss of the former.

Av. kapastiš (11.9e)

This Avestan word has been interpreted according to two different etymologies:

a) as related to NP. kabast “colocynth”

b) as related to Lat. pestis “pest”

The first explanation was firstly proposed by Spiegel (1864 1.290) and was followed by Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.182, n.14) and Johansson (1901 336-337). They connected Av. kapasti- with NP. kabast “colocynth”, the meaning of which also developed into “poison”, and with Skr. kappitha- “Feronia elephantum”. In the Šāhnāme NP. kabast means “poisonous plant, poison” (Wolff 1935 631), and in NP. kabast keeps the meaning “colocynth”. That the same word means either “poisonous plant, poison” or “colocynth” can be explained by the fact that some kinds of colocynth were used as poison in ancient times (see, for example, Bible, Kings 2, 4.39-40).

Bartholomae (1904 436) in his turn doubted about this connection and proposed to analyse the word as ka-pasti-, thus relating it to Lat. pestis “pest” with a pejorative prefix ka-, like in Av. ka-maʊd̂a-. Duchesne-Guillemin (1936 145-146) and Panaino (1990-1995 1.144) agree with Bartholomae.
This second interpretation depends on a second text where it is attested: Yt 8.56 (Panaino 1990-1995 1.79). In this passage Av. kapasti- is mentioned in the context of a war:

...nōi. idra. airīnā. ḫānā. wēnā. nōi. vōynā. nōi. ṭama. nōi. kapasti. nōi. haēnā. rādo. nōi. uzgārātō. draśō.

“... then neither an army would have reached here the Aryan countries, nor would famine, nor scabies, nor mange [?], nor a hostile chariot, nor the uplifted standard (of war).”

But in my opinion the meaning of Av. kapasti- in this context of war of Yt 8.56 is different from that in V 11. In Yt 8.56 Av. kapasti- can be related not to Lat. pestis but to OP. pasti- (DNb.43-45) and Ved. patti- “foot-soldier” < IE. *ped-ti- (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.74). Although we do not find a pejorative prefix in this case neither in Old Persian nor in Vedic, there are some parallels in Sanskrit military terms with other pejorative prefixes, such as Skr. kad-ratha- “bad carriage” and ku-sāratī- “bad charioteer” (Böhtlingk & Roth 1855 2.49, 2.371).

According to this interpretation, we could translate Yt 8.56 as “nor would famine, nor scabies, nor a (bad or hostile) foot-soldier, nor a hostile chariot, nor the uplifted standard (of war)”.

In V 11, on the contrary, there is no military context, so that there is no justification for Av. kapasti- meaning here “bad or hostile foot-soldier”. But if Av. kapasti- does not mean “pest” in Y 8.56, we have no more reason to suppose that it means “pest” in V 11. Therefore, as I cannot support without doubts that “colocynth > poison” was the right interpretation, I prefer to leave this question unanswered.

Nevertheless, the first interpretation as “colocynth > poison” seems to have been preferred by the local tradition. Actually, the scribes of the manuscripts of the reformist school of Navsārī F10a, T44 and E10 understood Av. kapasti- as “colocynth” and translated it accordingly. G34a in the right margin ḫānā, F10a in the right margin ḫānā, T44 ḫānā and E10 ḫānā must be interpreted as wrong writings of a “re-Pahlavised” <kystwk> from NP. ḫānā “colocynth” (Steingass 1930 1069, s.v. kīstū). On the contrary, the scribe of P5 translated it in V 11.9 as Phl. <kpyc> kābīz “a grain measure” (MacKenzie 1971 s.v. kābīz), but tried to adapt it in V 11.12 as Phl. <kpst> and in V 11.15 as Phl. <kpšt>. Apparently the Pahlavi translator of P5 did not know what this Avestan word meant and simply improvised an adaptation in each passage.

Av. parōne → Phl. purdēnam

As already mentioned regarding V 10.5b, Av. parōne is the 1st. Sing. Pres. Ind. Mid. of the Avestan verb par- “to fight, to struggle”.

Phl. *purdēnidan, purdēn- was not included in Nyberg’s nor in Mackenzie's lexica, but it must be analysed as a denominative verb from Phl. *purd “fight” < I Ir. *pṛt- “fight”. The root nouns Ved. pṛ- “battle, fight” and YAv. pṛat- “battle, fight”, and their thematic derivates Ved. pṛana- (masc.), Ved. pṛtanā- (fem.) “battle, fight” and YAv. pṛañā- “battle, fight” stem from it (Bartholomae 1904 891, 896-897) (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.160). From this zero grade, two
denominative verbs were formed: Ved. \textit{prtanyáti} “fights” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.160) and Phl. \textit{*purdēnīdan, purdēn-} (< MP. \textit{*pard-}).

The same Indoiranian root, but in full grade, is also present in some verbs. In Old Iranian it is attested in YAv. \textit{parat}– “to fight” (Bartholomae 1904 868-869). In Middle West Iranian we find the verbs Phl. \textit{ni-bardīdan, ni-bard-} “to fight” and Parth. \textit{n-brd-} “to fight” (Ghilain 1939 53) and the participle Phl. \textit{nibardag} “tried, experienced, brave” (NP. \textit{nabardah}), but also the substantive Phl. \textit{nibard} “fight, struggle” (NP. \textit{nabard}) (MacKenzie 1971 59), (Nyberg 1974 140-141), (Cheung 2007 298).

L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2, B1, P10 ḏiγm; M3 ḏim
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, (G); E4 daọjạ; FK1 dużda; Mf2, K9 duždā
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, B1, P10, M3 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 . L1 anhra; T44 aŋhara; E10 aŋr; R278, E4, L5 aŋhara; L2 aŋhara
L4, G34, F10 . L5 mainiiti; K1, D62, P2, K2, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G) mainiiti; P5, E10 mainiiti; T44 mainiiti; Mf2 mainiiti; K9 mainiiti
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34a in the right margin, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, Mf2, K9, (G); E10 zu maŋ; E4 zu maŋ; FK1 aŋat (but corrected in red ink as zu maŋat)
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); R278 buaŋmaŋ. haca; FK1 haca. gaqā (but added above the line ba. gmaŋ) . R278, Br1, L2, G42 gomat; L1 gomat; B2, T46, P1, L2 . Mf2 (but -ma- added in the right margin next to -t), K9 above the line gomat; E4, L5 gumaŋ
L4, K1, D62, P5, G34, T44, E10, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 haca. haca
L4, D62, K2, B1, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10 . R278, E4, FK1 wumariait
L4, K1, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . R278, T46, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62 aṣa unanam; E10 . L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aṣauanam; FK1 aṣauanam
L4, K1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 nārikam; G42 nārikam
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . T46, G42, L5, FK1, (G); E10 . R278, Br1, L2, E4 aṣaınım; L1, B2, P1 aṣaınım; Mf2, K9 aṣaınım
L4, Mf2, (G); L4, K1, D62, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . K9 strās; P2, T44, E10, M3 . E4, L5 starōs; P5 strā
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); K9 maŋm
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 baŋnara; L5 baŋnara; FK1 bhēro
L4, D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 . L5 anayara; G34 anayara; E4 anayara
L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, (G); L1, B2, P1 . Mf2, K9 raçā; FK1 anayara raçā
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L5 vispe
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[a] I fight you, harmful Evil Spirit, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

[a] pwlytnm LK 1821 dwšd n’k gn’n’k mynwg 1822 MN m’n’ [MN 1823 wys 1824 MN 1825 znd 1826 MN 1827 MTA 1828 ] MN ‘thš MN 1829 MYA 1830 MN 1831 zmyk MN 1832 gwspnd 1833 MN 1834 wwlw 1835 MN 1836 GBRA y 1837 hlwb 1838 MN 1839 n’ylyk 1840 y 1841 hlwb 1842 MN 1843 stl MN m’h MN 1844 hlwsyt MN 1845 ZK 1846 <y> ‘sl lwšnyh 1847 MN 1848 hlwp 1849 ’p’ty 1850 ’y’ whrmzd d’t’ MNW 1852 MN ‘hl’dyh pyt’kyh
I fight you, ignorant Gannag Mēnōg, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth.

Av. ṛβā. dužda. aŋra. ṡmāniō (11.10a)

It is striking that the Evil Spirit was addressed to by means of the personal pronoun Acc. Sing. ṛβā instead of the Acc. Sing. *duždam. aŋram. *māniium. As a matter of fact, in the parallel of V 10.5b we only find paiti.porme + aŋrom. *māniium, that is, the formula without personal pronoun.

The only passage where Zaraduštra addresses directly to the Evil Spirit by means of the vocatives dužda. aŋra. *māniō are V 19.5 uzuuaečaiaat. zaraduštrō. aŋrum. *māniium. dužda. aŋra. *māniō. janāni. ḍaṁna. daēūu.doatm (…) “Zaraduštra let the Evil Spirit know: ‘Harmful Evil Spirit, I shall kill the creation created by the demons (…)’”, and 19.9, where the vocatives aī. dužda. aŋra. *māniō are isolated in the midst of the phrase. The same vocative dužda. aŋra. *māniō is found in 19.12, but an Abl. Sing. is expected in this case: kuṇda. ḍhī. azəm. karaṇuūāni. baca. awiwaḥāt. druṭaṭ. baca. dužda. aŋra. *māniō “How shall I make them (free) from that Lie, from the harmful Evil Spirit?”. However, in these passages no personal pronoun Acc. Sing. ṛβā is used.

Av. nmānaṭ (11.10a)

There is a case of apparent athematisation of a thematic noun in the wrong ending -aṭ in Av. nmānaṭ instead of the expected nmānāṭ in V 11.10a, 13a, 16a, 19a. Since it is repeated in all these passages, it cannot be interpreted as a mere mistake in the written transmission.

All the baca in these passages are used as prepositions, so that nmānaṭ seems not to be properly an example of the usual shortening due to a postposition baca in nmānaṭ.baca (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 60 be.) (De Vaan 2003 112 ff.). According to De Vaan (2003 114), Av. nmānaṭ has been influenced by the sequence of Abl. Sing. -aṭ in aḏraṭ, apaṭ and zomaṭ. I agree with him.

1803 L4, K1, P2, G34, T44, E10, M3, (Jmp); D62 ʾtyh; F10; B1, P10 ʾthš
1831 L4, G34, T44, (Jmp); K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 ʾ y ʾ
1832 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 ʾ MNW ʾ

1853 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); FK1 ahi
1864 T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); L4, K1 ima; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, L5, FK1 ima; L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 ima; E4 im
1865 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 voc
1866 L1, B2, T46, P1, G42 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 — |a| drōnaiōiō. ...
1859 P5 . T46, FK1; L1, B2 . K9 vārōvīniō.1860 vairī.ō; P1 vārōvīniō.1861 vairī.ō; Mf2 vārōvīniō.1862 K1 tīmica; L1, B2, Br1 baēsazūniō.1863 R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5 baēsazūniō.1864 FK1 baēsazūniō. ca; Mf2, K9 baēsazūniō.1865 K1, D62, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4 baēsazūniō; P2, P5, T44, E10 . FK1 cidāō
1866 L4, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1 abura; D62 aburuha. na; T44 . P1, E4 aburuha; L5 aburu; FK1 aburuha
1868 Y 27.13. vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.101): “Harmonieux comme un (maître est harmonieusement) digne par le choix (rituel) du modèle des actes de l’existence de la divine Pensée et leur emprise sont attribués au Maître Mazdā, dont (cette emprise) fera un pâtre pour les nécessiteux”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.115): “Just as (a judgement) is worthy of being chosen by the world, so the judgement, (which) in accordance with truth itself, is to be passed) on the actions of good thought of the world, is assigned to the Wise One, and the power (is assigned) to (Him), the Ahura, whom (people) appoint as a shepherd to the poor”.
1869 T46, G; L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, E10, P10 . L1, B2, R278, P46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 kāmna; P2, F10, T44, B1, M3 . E4, L5, FK1 kāmna
1870 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); Mf2, K9 mazdā
1871 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 — mawai.ē. ... ašāb — |b| P2, P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, (G) lā — mawai.ē. ... astuaitiī — |b| 1. K9 lā — mawai.ē. ... ašāb — |b| FK1 mawai.ē. ... astuaitiī — |b| Mf2 lā sar guftan — mawai.ē. ... ašāb —
manayhāscā. yaūā. šīaodanāiī. aṣm. ṣraoštā. aburā. tṣm. mōi. āstuuqm. daēnaiiāi. frānaaocā. (= Y 46.7)
kō. varādāmā. ṣēā. pōi. sūngbā. yōī. ḫnxī. cīdā. mōi. dām. abīmhī. raṭūm. cīdī. ṣē. bōi. vōhō. sraoštāi. jāntūi. manayhā. mazdā. abhmā. yahmhā. vāṣī. khamāciqt. (= Y 44.16)
|a| “Then you shall murmur these words, which will be the most victorious and most healing. You shall pronounce four Ahuna Vairiia: yaūā. aburū. vairriiō. ađā. rați. aṣāçiē. ḫacā. vayhmā. dazdā. manayhbō. šīaodananim. avbe. zmadāi. sāaotmācā. abhrāi. ʿā. yım. driguhiō. dadaṭ. vāstårm. (= Y 27.13) |b| kō. mām. y. mazdā. maunā. pāśīm. ṣdādā. hūtā. mā. drūgūnā. didarāstāt. ʿaēnāybe. ʿaṇiūm. ṣdrhmāt. adrascā. manayhāscā. yaūā. šīaodanāi. aṣm. ṣraoštā. aburū. tṣm. mōi. āstuuqm. daēnaiiāi. frānaaocā. (= Y 46.7) kō. varādāmā. ṣēā. pōi. sūngbā. yōī. ḫnxī. cīdā. mōi. dām. abīmhī. raṭūm. cīdī. ṣē. bōi. vōhō. sraoštāi. jāntūi. manayhā. mazdā. abhmā. yahmhā. vāṣī. khamāciqt. (= Y 44.16)
|a| 4.1876 ḫnwl 1877 prʾc slʾdšnʾ1878 ytʾhwwylywʾ1879 [4.1882 BRA YMRRWN1881] |a| čahār ahunawar frāz srāyišn yaḏābūwayryō [čahār bē gōw]

1872 vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.160): “Qui me désignes-tu comme protecteur, ô Mazdā, chaque fois que le partisan de la Tromperie cherche à me contraindre, à faire tort, sinon ton feu et la pensée, par les actes (rituels) desquels, ô Maître, vous engraissez l’Harmonie? Proclame mon enseignement à la conscience!”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.169): “(But) whom dost Thou appoint (as) guardian for one such as me, O Wise One, when the deceitful one tries to seize me in order to injure (me), (whom dost Thou appoint) other than Thy fire and thought, with whose [du.] actions one nourishes truth, O Ahura? Proclaim a message about that to my religious view”.

1873 vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.153): “Quel est le briseur d’obstacles parmi les Existants, afin qu’il (me) protège suivant ton explication? Que des cadeaux remarquables me soient faits! Ô guerisseur de l’existence (rituelle), fournis-moi le modèle! Et que l’obéissance à ce (...) vienne en raison de la divine Pensée, ô Mazdā, à celui, quel qu’il soit, auquel tu veux qu’elle vienne!”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.161): “Who (is) a resistance-breaker (able) to protect (those) who exist, by Thy proclamation? Accord (as) a judgement bright (things to be) in my house, O Healer of existence. Let (recompense for) obedience come to him through good thought, O Wise One, to him, to whomsoever Thou wilt”.

1874 P2, P5, (G); K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, F1 aṣābe

1875 vid. (Wolff 1910 134, 367): “Schützt uns vor dem Feind, o Mazdā und der heilige Ārmatay! (Ver)schwinde deävische Drug, (ver)schwinde deävastentstamme, (ver)schwinde deäväntschaffe, (ver)schwinde deäväntschaffe! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde völlig, o Drug, im Norden solist du verschwinden, nicht solist du die stoffliche Welt des Aša zunichte machen!".

1876 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp); F10 5
L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp) ’ḥnwvl
E10, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 slʾdšn’; P2 slʾdšn’; F10 slʾdšn’
L4, G34, T44, E10, M3; K1, F10, B1, P10 ytʾhwwylywʾ; D62 ytʾhwwylywʾ; P2 ytʾhwwklywʾ; (Jmp) ytʾhwwylywʾ

1877 D62, P2, G34, F10, (Jmp); L4, K1, T44, E10, B1, M3 5; P10 4, but P10a 5
L4, D62, P2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3; F10, (Jmp) YMRRWN; T44 YMRRWN- ym
Four Ahunawar must be pronounced: \textit{yaṭāḥūwayryō} [say it four (times)].

1882 L4, F10, T44, E10. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); K1, B1, P10, M3 paršite; D62 parštas; P2 paršita; K2 paršiai; G43. T46, L5 paršita; FK1 paršia. L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 and M3 continue V 11.11 without PT.

1883 D62, K2, F10, P10; L4, K1, G34, B1, M3. FK1 aėšm. P2. Mf2, K9 aėšm. P5 aėšm.; T44 aėšm.; E10. L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 aėšm.; B2 aėšm. (B2a -a- before -m); E4 aėšm.; L5 išm.; (G) aėšm.

1884 L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, M3. L1, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34. B2, L5 paršia; P5 paršta; K2 paršia; B1, P10 paršiū; nasiūm. ... paiti.raidžom |; E4, FK1 paršia.

1885 D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10. R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, L5, (G); L4. L1, B2 nasiūm; K1, B1, M3 nasiūm; K2 nasiūm; Mf2, K9 nasiūm.

1886 P5, G34a in the left margin, F10a in the left margin, T44 in the left margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 | paršta. ... paiti.raidžom |; K2 paršia; E10 paršia; E4, FK1 paršia; L5 paršia.

1887 (G); P5, F10a in the left margin, T44 in the left margin. FK1 bėm.raidžom; K2, G34a in the left margin bėm.raidžom; E10. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 bėm.raidžom; T46 bėm.raidžom; E4 bėm.raidžom; Mf2, K9 bėm.raidžom.

1888 P5, G34a in the left margin, F10a in the left margin, T44 in the left margin, E10. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršia; P5 paršite; K2 paršia; E4, FK1 paršia; L5 paršta.

1889 P5, K2, F10, E10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 xvi. L5 xvi.; Mf2 xvi.

1890 L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršia; P5 paršite; K2 paršia; G42 bparšia; E4, FK1 paršia; L5 paršta.

1891 L4, D62, F10, K2, G34, F10, P10. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1, (G); P5, T44, E10, B1. T46 būiūža; M3 būiūža; E4 būiūža; L5 būiūža; Mf2 būiūža; K9 būiūža.

1892 L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršia; K2 paršia; G34a. E4, FK1 paršia.

1893 L4, P2, G34, F10, T44. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); K1 būiūžia; D62 būiūžia; P5 būiūžia; K2 būiūžia; E4 būiūžia; B1 būiūžia; M3 būiūžia; R278 būiūžia; E4 būiūžia; L5 būiūžia; FK1 būiūžia; Mf2 būiūža.

1894 L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10. L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršia; P5 paršite; K2 .5 paršia. ... kundža |; E4, FK1 paršia.

1895 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1, (G); L4 kundžia; K1, D62, F10, T44, B1, P10 kundžia; P2, G34 kundža; P5 kundža; K2 kundža; E4 kundža; L5 kundžia; Mf2 gunia; K9 gunia.

1896 L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10. L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršia; P5 paršite; K2 .5 paršia; E4, FK1 paršia.
[a] The Wrath has been fought, Nasu has been fought. [b] The Direct defilement has been fought, the Indirect defilement has been fought. [c] Xrū has been fought, Xruuiyũ has been fought, Būiši has been fought, Kunda has been fought, Kondišan has been fought. Būšiṣtā the Yellowish has been fought. [d] Būšiṣtā the Long-handed has been fought. [e] Muiši has been fought, Kapasti has been fought. [f] The Pairikā, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants, has been fought. [g] The maculation, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants, has been fought.

192 {L4, F10, T44, E10} . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2 in the left margin, (G); D62 . E4 hāitiim; P2 āitiim; P5 āiti; G34 āhari; P10 on the margin āhariim; B1, M3 āiti
192 {L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10 in the margin, M3 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1} . Mf2 on the left margin, (G); D62, P2 āitäi; P5 āitä; P1 yāitäit; E4 yāitä
192 {L4, K1, B1 . L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4} . Mf2 in the left margin, (G); D62, P2, P5, F10, T44, E10, P10 in the margin, M3 . T46, L5, FK1 ātara; G34 āpam
192 {L4, K1 D62, P2, P5, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 in the margin, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1} . Mf2 in the left margin, (G); G34 āpam
192 {L4, K1 . T46, P1 . Mf2 in the left margin, (G); D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 zaqm; P10 in the margin zaqm
192 {L4, K1 . T46, P1 . Mf2 in the left margin, (G); D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 gām; P10 in the margin gām
192 {P2, P5, F10, E10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, (G); L4, K1, T44, B1, P10 in the margin, M3 urukara; D62 . FK1 urukara; G34 urukara; Mf2 in the left margin urukara.

parśta
193 {F10a in the left margin, E10; L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3} > ptk’lym hšm ...
193 AHL > ptk’lym ⌣ (Jmp) ptk’lm
193 {F10a in the left margin, E10; (Jmp) ptk’lm
193 E10, (Jmp); F10 > ḫy ... AHL > ptk’lym ⌣
193 (Jmp); E10 > > y ... AHL > ptk’lym ⌣
193 (Jmp) ptk’lm
193 (Jmp) ptk’lm
193 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; E10 W ptk’lym; (Jmp) ptk’lm
193 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp); G34 > PWN ⌣
193 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10; D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) bw
194 L4, P2, G34, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); D62 YKOYMWN-yt; F10 YKOYMWN-yt T44, E10 YKOYMWN-yt
194 M3; L4, T44 pytylyt; D62, G34a under the line, B1, P10 pytylyt; P2 pytylyt; G34 ptk’lyt; F10 pytylyt; E10, (Jmp) pytyt
194 D62, P2, E10, P10; L4, G34, F10 YHWWN-yt T44, B1, M3, (Jmp) bw
194 L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34, E10 YKOYMWN-yt
194 L4, G34, T44; D62, P2, F10, P10 ⌣ E10, B1, M3, (Jmp) > y ⌣
194 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp); F10 ḫytlklyh; M3 ḫlkl
194 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 > y
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1947 D62, B1, P10; P2, T44, (Jmp) HLMWN-yt; G34, E10 HLMWN-yt; F10 HLMWN-yt; M3 HLMWN-yt'; L4a HLMWN-yt'
1948 L4, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34, F10, T44, E10 Wzhl
1949 L4, D62, P2, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 YHWWN-yt'; T44 YHWWN-ty BRA YHWWN-yt;
E10 YHTMTWN-ty YHWWN-ty
1950 L4, K1, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10a above the line, M3, (Jmp); D62, P2, F10 - AYT' ... BRA YHWWN-ty -
1951 K1, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10a above the line, M3, (Jmp); L4a - MNW -
1952 L4, K1, B1, P10a above the line; G34, T44, E10, M3, (Jmp) YMRWN-yt
1953 L4, G34, T44, E10, P10a above the line, (Jmp); K1, B1, M3 yy
1954 L4, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10a above the line, (Jmp) MNW-c MNW
1955 G34a above the line, E10, L4a, (Jmp) HLMWN-ty; T44 YRMWN-ty; G34, P10a above the line
YLMWN-ty'; M3 HLMWN-ty'
1956 L4, P2, B1, P10a above the line, M3, (Jmp); G34, T44, E10 Wzhl
1957 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 pt lym
1958 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, M3, (Jmp); G34, T44, P10 bwš'sp; E10 BRA bwš'sp'
1959 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, M3; P2, E10, (Jmp) - y |- P10 OD
1960 L4, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; D62 dglnd g'w; P2 ṣ$m'; F10 dglnd-gwyy; (Jmp) dglnd-gw
1961 P2, E10, (Jmp); L4, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 yy; F10 |- 'y |- -
1962 L4, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10a; G34 (G34a in the right margin
dglnd), B1 M3 F10 ṣ$m'; E10 ṣ$m'; (Jmp) dglndgw'ya
1963 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp); B1, M3 |- AYT |- -
1964 L4, P2, G34, T44, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62, F10, E10, P10 AYS
1965 L4, K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62 YHMTWN-ty; P10 YHMTWN-ty
1966 L4, K1, G34, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62, P2, F10, P10 in the margin |- ZK y |- -
1967 L4, K1, G34, T44, B1, M3; L4, P2, G34, E10, P10 in the margin, (Jmp) - y |- -
1968 L4, K1, G34, F10, E10, M3, (Jmp); D62, T44, P10 in the margin k myh; P2 AMT; B1 k'mky
1969 K1, F10, T44, B1, M3; L4, P2, G34, E10, P10 in the margin, (Jmp) - y |- -
1970 P5, T44, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4, D62, P2, G34 'wcdys'; F10 ṣ$m' ṣ$m'; P10 in the margin ṣ'$wcdys
1971 L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 in the margin, M3, (Jmp); P2 plst'kyh
1972 L4, B1, M3; D62, E10, P10 in the margin 'hwkynyt MNW; P2 'hw ynyt MNW; G34 'hwkynnyt; F10 ṣ$m' 'hwkynyt MNW (F10a adds the second 'hw-'); T44, (Jmp) 'hwkynyt
1973 D62, P2, F10, B1, P10 in the margin, M3, (Jmp); L4, K1, G34, T44, E10 W MYA
1974 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, M3, (Jmp); E10 W zmyk; P10 in the margin zmyk
1975 K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, E10 W gwsnd; P10 in the margin gwsnt
1976 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, E10 W gwsnd; P10 in the margin, M3, (Jmp); T44, E10 W 'wlwl
1977 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 pt lym; E10 pytk lym
1978 E10, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 ZK y ; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 |- ZK |- -
1979 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, (Jmp); P2 'hwkwnyt'; E10, M3 'hwkynyt'
1980 K1, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 MNW; P2 |- y |-; E10 MNW
1981 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 OL
1982 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) 'hwkynyt' MNW; G34 'hwkynyn' MNW
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I fight the Wrath, I fight Nasu [before and afterwards, that is, I fight her firstly and I will fight her afterwards]. I fight him who [has become impure] by direct defilement, I fight him who [has become impure] by indirect defilement. I fight the poisoner Būšāsp [that is, poisoning (means) that she becomes a poison for him who sleeps (too) much] [There is a commentator who says that that she becomes a poison also for him who does not sleep]. I fight the long-handed Būšāsp [that is, having long hands (means) that she reaches everybody]. I fight the Parīg [Desire] [the idolatry], which defiles the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants. I fight the defilement [its means], which defile the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants.

Av. parśta. mūiōi. parśta. kapastiš (11.12e)

Unlike the sequence pərne. mūiōi. pərne. kapastiš in V 11.9, in this case the Pahlavi translators of the manuscripts from Navsarī F10, T44 and E10 did not translate parśta. mūiōi. parśta. kapastiš. The attempt to fill all the gaps in the PT with a newly created PT, as we see, is not systematic in these manuscripts. However, F10a supplied it in the right margin with the same PT of V 11.9.

Av. parśta → Phl. pahikārēm

There is a problem with the etymology of this word in this context. As Bartholomae (1904 878) already noticed, Av. parśta cannot be related to the verb parst- “to struggle, to fight” and it cannot be its PPP. Otherwise, we would expect Av. *parsta < Ir. *pyt-ta-.

Av. parśta is the PPP. of Av. pars- “to ask”, but it makes no sense here. I cannot imagine why these evil personifications were supposed to be asked in a context of purification. Moreover, the same personifications are exorcised by the previous formulas. The only likely explanation, therefore, is a corruption in the transmission, confusing Av. parśta < Ir. *pyt-ta-, namely the PPP. of Av. pars- “to ask”, with the expected Av. *parsta < Ir. *pyt-ta-, namely the PPP. of Av. parst- “to struggle, to fight”. Furthermore, and like in Av. yaoždāta in V 11.2, there is no concordance between PPP. and noun in this passage. The same form is repeated regardless of the syntactic function of the other elements to which it refers.

---

1983 P2, T44; L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) W MYA
1984 T44, E10, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, B1, P10, M3 W zmyk
1985 F10, T44, E10, M3, (Jmp); L4, P2, G34 W gwspnd; K1, D62, B1, P10  gwspnd
1986 K1, D62, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, P2, G34, F10 W ’wlwl

347
Surprisingly the Pahlavi translators did however understand the meaning of *paršta as a synonym of *pərəne and translated it as Phl. pahikārēm “I fight”. They simply did not notice that it was a PPP. and translated it as an active present indicative. Not less surprising is that in this instance they failed to use purdēnam, etymologically related with *parsta, instead of using it for *pərəne. At least these translators apparently noticed that the underlaying Avestan verbs were different and also translated them with different Pahlavi verbs.
raoq. baca. višpa. 2007 mazdaša. 2009 +aːsā.čidā. 2010

1987 L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34 . L5 paršta; P5 paršta; K2 paršta; E4 paršta; FK1 paršta 1988 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, (G); K2 . E4, L5 dužā; K9 dužā 1989 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, (G); P5 . P1 . Mf2, K9 ayyro; F10 . FK1 ayyra; E4 ayyra; L5 aybaru 1990 L4, T44 mainiūs; K1, D62, B1, P10 mainiiūs; P2, P5 mainiūs; K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9, (G) mainiū; G34 mainiūs; F10, E10 mainiūs; M3 mainiiūs; L5 mainiiū; Mf2 mainiiū 1991 K1, P2, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, T44, M3 . R278, Br1, E4, FK1 . K9, (G) mainiū; G42 mainiū; Mf2 mainiū 1992 K1, P2, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9, (G) mainiū; G34 mainiūs; F10, E10 mainiūs; M3 mainiiūs; L5 mainiiū; Mf2 mainiiū 1993 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, B1, E10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); FK1 haːkā 1994 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 zimāt 1995 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P10 haːt, and P10a above the line baca 1996 L4, K1, F10, T44, (G); D62 . R278, P1, L5, FK1 guma; P2, P5, K2, G34, E10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . P10 aːrwa; P10 aːrwa 1997 L4, K1, G34, T44, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62 urunniarāt; P2, P5, F10, E10, P10 . R278, E4, L5 urunniarāt; K2 | urunniarāt; baca |- B1 urunniarāt; FK1 urunniārā
You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

|a| You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the righteous woman, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.
away from all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth.
| x-vārēdriyōt.tamọma. | 2040  baēśaziōt.tamọma. | 2041  cādrjō. | 2042  mazdā. at. mōi. |
| 2043  fraṃrauiaiōt. | | b | 2044  mazdā. at. mōi. |
| 2045  vahīstā. | 2046  srauuācā. | 2047  baēšānācā. | 2048  vācō. | 2049  tā. | 2050  tā. | 2051  xvoh. | 2052  manahē. ašācā. | 2053  isdām. |
| 2054  stiō. | 2055  xādrā. | ahūm. | 2056  ḳaraśm. | 2057  vasnā. haidūm. | 2058  ḳa. | 2059  abūm. |

(= Y 34.15)
[a] “Then you shall murmur these words, which will be the most victorious and most healing. You shall pronounce four mazdā. at. mōi.

[b] mazdā. at. mōi. vabīštā. vabīštā. sraunāscā. šāoθanāscā. vaocā. xītā. xīvohū. manayhā. ašācā. išudm. stūtō. xśmākā. xśaθrā. ahurā. xfasōm. vasnā. haiθiθm. dā. ahūm. (= Y 34.15)”

[a] Four mazdātmō must be pronounced.

Also in V 10.12 and in N 18.1–2 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 100–101) it is stated that mazdā. at. mōi. vabīštā is one of the formulas to be recited four times:

kaiia. caθrus.āmrūta.

Which are the (formulas) to be recited four times?

yaθā. ahū. vairiiō. mazdā. at. mōi. ā. vabīštā. airiiōmā.

The yaθā. ahū. vairiiō, the mazdā. at. mōi. vabīštā, the ā. airiiōmā. (ištiiō).
11.15. |a| parane. 2064 +aēšm. |2064 parane. 2063 nasim. 2064 parane. 2067 hām.raēdjam. 2064 parane. paiti.raēdjam. 2063 parane. xū. 2071 parane. 2072 xūuiyni. 2073 parane. būii. parane. būiiža. 2077 parane. kunda. 2079 parane. būšiasta. 2081 parane. būšiasta. 2083 parane. būšiasta. 2086 parane. parane. parane. 2089 maē. parane. parane. 2091

2063 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 paromi. L4, K1, D62, B1, P10 and M3 continue V11.15-16 without any strong pause.

2065 P2 . R278; L4, K1, G34, T44, B1 aēšm; D62, K2 aēšm; P5 aēšm; F10, M3, (G) aēšm; E10 aēšm; P10 66." L1 aēšm; B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 aēšm; E4, L5 aēšm; FK1 aēšm; Mf2, K9 aēšm

2067 P2, K2, F10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3 | parane. nasim. ... aša.čīra |; P5 parane; T44, (G) 'iā | parane. nasim. ...

2069 P2, P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9; K2 nasim; F10 | nasim. ...

2071 aša.čīra |; Mf2 nasim

2073 P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2075 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2077 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2079 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2081 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2083 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2085 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2087 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2089 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2091 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2093 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2095 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2097 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

2099 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 paroni

354
I fight the Wrath, I fight Nasu. I fight the Direct defilement, I fight the Indirect defilement. I fight Xru, I fight Xruyunī, I fight Būiōin, I fight Būiōžan, I fight Kundā, I fight Kundān. I fight Būsiaştā the Yellowish. I fight Būsiastå the Long-handed. I fight Mūiōin, I fight Kapasti. I fight the Pairikā, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants. I fight the maculation, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants.

\[ \text{pwltynm hšm } /\text{iā/ pyt'ky} \]
\[ \text{purdēnām xešm } /\text{iā/ paydāgīh} \]
\[ \text{I fight the Wrath ...} \]
I fight you, harmful Evil Spirit, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazdā which (have) the brightness of Truth.
Then you shall murmur these words, which will be the most victorious and most healing. You shall pronounce four ā. airiūmā. īsīō: ā. airiūmā. īsīō. ...

|2161| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2162| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 aesm. E4, L5, FK1 ašmam; Mf2 ašam"; K9 ašam
|2163| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 pairšta; Mf2 parašta
|2164| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; Mf2 nasi; K9 nasim
|2165| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2166| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 hgm.raedžom; T46 hgm.raedžom; P1 hgm raidžom; Br1, L2, G42, L5 hgm.raedžom; E4 hgm raidžom; FK1 hgm raidžom; Mf2, K9 hgm raedžom
|2167| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2168| Mf2, K9, L1, T46 pauti raidžom; FK1 Br1, L2, G42, L5 pauti raidžom; R278, P1 pauti raidžom; E4 pauti raidžom; FK1 para raidžom
|2169| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2170| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1; L5 xarui; Mf2, K9 xri
|2171| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2172| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 xruui; Br1 xruui; E4 xruui; L5 xruui; gaun; FK1 xruui; Mf2, K9 xumi
|2173| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2174| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1; L5 xarui; Mf2, K9 xri
|2175| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2176| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 būu; Br1, E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2177| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2178| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 būu; Br1, E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2179| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 būuša; Br1 paraštabūuša; Mf2 būuša; K9 būuša
|2180| E4, FK1; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 ūa
|2181| R278 . Mf2, K9; L1 zairi; B2, T46, Br1, L2, E4 zairin; P1 zairin; G42 zairine; L5 ūarana; FK1 zarinie
|2182| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2183| T46, P1; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 būuša; Mf2 būuša; K9 būuša
|2184| L2, E4, L5, FK1; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42 . Mf2, K9 ūa
|2185| L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; R278 darag. gauna; E4 zaradag. gauna; L5 darag. guuna
|2186| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2187| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1; L5 miui; Mf2, K9 miui
|2188| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2189| L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, L5; T46 kapaši; G42 mukapaši; E4 kapaša; FK1 kapaša; Mf2, K9 kapaši
|2190| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4 parašta; L5 parašta; FK1 parašta
|2191| T46, P1 . Mf2; L1, B2, R278, L2, G42 . K9 pairikam; Br1 pairikam; E4, FK1 parokam; L5 pairikam
|2192| L1, T46, L2, G42, L5, FK1; B2, R278, P1, Br1 . Mf2, K9 ūa
|2193| L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . K9; E4 ūaiti; Mf2 | ūaiti |
The Wrath has been fought, Nasu has been fought. The Direct defilement has been fought, the Indirect defilement has been fought. Xrū has been fought, Xruiyī has been fought, Būiōn has been fought, Būiōžan has been fought, Kunda has been fought, Kūndžan has been fought. Būjiāštā the Yellowish has been fought. Būjiāštā the Long-handed has been fought. Mūiōn has been fought, Kapasti has been fought. The Pairikā, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants, has been fought. The maculation, which attacks the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants, has been fought.
You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, away from the water, away from the earth, away from the cattle, away from the plants, away from the righteous man, away from the stars, away from the moon, away from the sun, away from the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazdā which (have) the brightness of Truth.
2231. L4. T46, P1, (G); K1. Mf2 imām; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. R278, E4, L5, FK1. K9 imām; L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 imā
2232. L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); K2 vò
2233. L1, B2, T46, Br1, G42. Mf2, L4, T44, E10 (ātā) > drājāvīō. ... baēsāziūīimāmtca |
2234. L4, K2 above the line, G34, F10, T44, E10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); K1 pαsα; D62, P5 above the line, B1, M3 pαsα; P2 pαsα; P10 pasca
2235. L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); P5 abunam; K2 above the line abunam; T44 abunabē; E4 abunai; L5 abune
2236. L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); E4, L5 vairī; P5 vairin; K2 above the line vairīa
2237. K1, D62, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); L4 (ātā) > frasārūnaitūiōi; |
2238. L5, D62, P2, G34 – yādā. abū. vairīō | K1, D62, P10 ythwkwlywk; F10 ythwwy lwk; T44, E10 ythwlywk; B1 ythwlyyklywk; M3 ythwlyyklywk; L1, P1, Br1, G42. Mf2, K9 yādā
2239. P5, K2. B2, R278, T46, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L4, P2, G34 – yādā. abū. vairīō | K1, D62, P10 ythwkwlyyklywk; F10 ythwyy lwk; T44, E10 ythwlywk; B1 ythwlyyklywk; M3 ythwlyyklywk; L1, P1, Br1, G42. Mf2, K9 yādā
2240. P5, K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); Mf2, K9 abī
2241. P5. L1, (G); K2 vairīō (ātā) > B2 vairīō. 5 (in Indian numeral) 5 (in Pahlavi numeral); R278, P1, L2, E4, L5 vairīō. 5; T46 vairīō. 6 gw; Br1 vairīō. (yak. in Pāzand); G42 vairīō. 5 (in Pahlavi numeral) 5 (in Indian numeral); FK1 vairīō. (yak. in Pāzand); Mf2 vairīō. 6 gwptn; K9 vairīō. 5 gwptn
2242. Y 27.13. vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.101): “Harmonieux comme un (maître est harmonieusement) digne de choix par l’existence (rituelle), le modèle des actes de l’existence de la divine Pensée et leur emprise sont attribués au Maître Mazdā, dont (cette emprise) fera un pâtre pour les nécessiteux”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.115): “Just as (a judgement) is worthy of being chosen by the world, so the judgement, (which) in accordance with truth itself, (is to be passed) on the actions of good thought of the world, is assigned to the Wise One, and the power (is assigned) to (Him), the Ahura, whom (people) appoint as a shepherd to the poor”. (G); L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, E10, P10. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9 kōmā; D62, F10, T44, B1, M3. R278, E4, L5, FK1 kōmā
2243. L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, P10 – maunaitē. ... aṣāhe | | P2, P5, K2, E10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) (ātā) > maunaitē. ... astuunaitē | | B1, M3 (ātā) > maunaitē. ... aṣāhe | | B1 (ātā) > maunaitē. ... aṣāhe | | Mf2, K9 (ātā) sar guftan (ātā) > maunaitē. ... aṣāhe | vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.160): “Qui me désignes-tu comme protecteur, ô Mazdā, chaque fois que le partisan de la Tromperie cherche à me contraindre, à faire tort, sinon ton feu et la

[|a|] 5 "hknvl pr̓c sl̓ d̓sn̓ 2234 yt̓ ħkwkwywk 2235 |b| hl̓dyh 2236 p̓tyh 2257 <y> p̓hlwm 2258 AYT"

pensée, par les actes (rituels) desquels, ô Maître, vous engraissez l’Harmonie? Proclamez mon enseignement à la conscience!" ; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.169) ; "(But) whom dost Thou appoint (as) guardian for one such as me, O Wise One, when the deceitful one tries to seize me in order to injure (me), (whom dost Thou appoint) other than Thy fire and thought, with whose [du.] actions one nourishes truth, O Ahura? Proclaim a message about that to my religious view" .

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 1.153) ; "Quel est le brouilleur d’obstacles parmi les Existant, afin qu’il (me) protège son explication? Que des cadeaux remarquables me soient faits! O guerisseur de l’existence (rituelle), fournis-moi le modèle! Et que l’obéissance à ce (...) vienne en raison de la divine Pensée, ô Mazdâ, à celui, quel qu’il soit, auquel tu veux qu’elle vienne!" ; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.161) ; "Who (is) a resistance-breaker (able) to protect (those) who exist, by Thy proclamation? Accord (as) a judgement bright (things to be) in my house, O Healer of existence. Let (recompense for) obedience come to him through good thought, O Wise One, to him, to whomsoever Thou wishest."

vid. (Wolff 1910 134, 367) ; "Schütz uns vor dem Feind, o Mazdâ und o heilige Ärmatay! (Ver)schwinde daëvische Drug, (ver)schwinde daëväentsstamme, (ver)schwinde daëvägeschaffene, (ver)schwinde daëväerzeugte! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde völig, o Drug, im Norden sollst du verschwinden, nicht sollst du die stoffliche Welt des Åsa zunichte machen!".

vid. (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.115) ; "Truth is the best (part of all that) is good. As desired (all) the desired (things) are available (as) truth for (that) which (is) best truth / or: for (him) who (is) Best Truth / or: for (him) who (represents) best truth ."
Five Ahunawar must be pronounced: yaḏāhūwāryō. Truth is the best prosperity.
I. How long the defilement produced by each relative lasts and how the house must be purified

duŷa. 2269 haca. 2270 màtar. 2271 [d] cuina. 2272 +daṉanım. 2273 cuina
tanu.pordändanım. 2274 [e] āāṭ. mraō. 2275 abhūrō. mazdā. 2276 | | drisar. 2276 +daṉanım. 2277 +x̱uwaštīm. 2277 tanu.pordändanım. 2279

2280 R3, K2, G25a pl guilt dv’cdhwm bwn; F10 pl guilt dv’cdhwm bwn; T44 → dv’cdhwm pl guilt bwn →
R1 dv’cdhwm pl guilt bwn PWN SM y d’tl ‘whrmzd; L1, B2, R278, T46 12; P1 parağt. duužadabom; Br1, L2 12 parağt. duužadabom 12; G42 parağat. duužadabom. nivisim; E4 12 duužadabum. parağt. bwn 12; L5 12 parağat. duužadabum; FK1 prgt. duužadum. bwn; Mf2, K9
dv’cdhwm pl guilt’ bwn
2282 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, R278, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . B2, P1, B1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9

2284 K2, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, B1, L2, G42, E4, (G); G25a, F10, T44 . R278, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9

2285 K2 . L1, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); G25a, R1, R3 . E4 para.irdiüeti; F10 para.irdiüeta; T44 para.irdiüeta; B2, P1 para.irdiüeti; L5 para.irdiüeta; FK1 pari.irdiüeta
2286 K2, F10, T44, R1 . E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42
mācā; L5 màcī
2288 K2, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); G25a, R3 . E4 para.irdiüeti; T44 para.irdiüeta; P1 para.irdiüeti; L5 para.irdiüete; FK1 pari.irdiüeta
2290 Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, R3 . K9 aēšam; T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 aēšam; R1 . T46, P1 aēšam; E4 aēšam; (G) aēšam
2291 T46, P1 . Mf2, K2, T44, R3 . FK1 'upa.mañaqi. G25a, F10. L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 'upa.mañaqi; R278 'upa.mañaqi; (G) 'upa.mañaqın
2292 G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2

2293 cuina. da pūdro; P1 pōdro
2294 F10, T44, R1 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 . L1, P1, L5, FK1 paitar. 31
31 G25a paitar. 31 paitar;
2296 L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 dugdō; G25a, F10, T44, R1 . T46 duŷo;
R3 daogdō; L5 duğa. RA FK1 duğa
2298 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); R1
ba
2299 G25a, F10, T44 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, R1, R3
mātar
2300 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4
cuina
2302 Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 dabmanım; R1 . T46, P1, (G)
dabmanım; E4 dabmanım; L5 dabmanım; FK1 daṉanım
2304 Mf2, (G); T44 . L1, R278, Br1, G42, L5 . K9 tanu.pordändanım; K2 tanu.pordändanım; G25a, F10 . E4 tanu.pordändanım; R1 haca. tanu.pordändanım; R3 haca. tanu.pordändanım; B2, FK1 tanu.pordändanım; T46 tanu.pordändanım; P1 tanu.pordändanım; L2 tanu.pordändanım
2306 K2, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); G25a liā/ + mraō. abhūrō.
mazdā | ; R278, P1 . Mf2 mraō. L5 + mraō | ; K9 'liā/ + mraō. abhūrō |
“And when the father dies or the mother dies, |b| how long shall they wait (because) of them (before entering into the house), |c| the son with regard to his father, the daughter with regard to her mother? |d| How long for the pious? How long for the tanu.pərədə- sinners?” |e| And Ahura Mazdā said: |f| “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanu.pərədə- sinners.”
A. [a] “When the father dies or the mother dies, [b] how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house), [c] the son with regard to his father, the daughter with regard to her mother? [d] How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” [e] And Ohrmazd said: [f] “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty (days) for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

B. [a] “When [someone’s] father dies or [someone’s] mother dies, [b] how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house), [c] the son with regard to his father, the daughter with regard to her mother? [d] How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” [e] Thus Ohrmazd said: [f] “Thirty [days] for the pious and sixty [days] for the tanāpuhl sinners [this (means) that that passage (refers) to the wait, but this passage refers to the death].”

Phl. ēd kū ān gyāg mānišnīh bē ēd gyāg widerišn ast (12.1f)

This gloss, only found in F10, is obscure and demands a closer examination.

In my opinion, the nominal and very concise style of V 12.1, with omission of the verb Av. upa.mńa·a·i·a·q in 12.1d and f, made this text no more fully understandable for the Pahlavi translators. Its word-by-word PT seemed not clear enough to the Pahlavi translator of F10, who felt the need of further gloss completing the meaning of the sentence and added this one: ēd kū ān gyāg mānišnīh bē ēd gyāg widerišn ast by “this (means) that that passage (refers) to the wait, but this passage refers to the death”.

In order to clarify the text, someone supplied 12.1f by means of the words he missed, namely Phl. mānišnīh and Phl. widerišn, in each part (Phl. gyāg) of the sentence. According to the gloss of F10, we could restore the following interpretation:

sīh rōz *[mānišnīh]* dahmān *[widerišn]* ud šast rōz *[mānišnīh]* *tanāpuhlagān*[widerišn]*

“Thirty days [one must wait] (because of) the [death of] pious and sixty days [one must wait] (because of) the [death of] tanāpuhl sinners”.

367
12.2. |a| dātar. 2292 gāedanām. 2293 x̱ astuvāti. 2294 ažāt. kūda.

mntānāt. 2295 + yaožḍādādi. 2296 kūda. ḇn. 2297 yaožḍā. 2298 |b| ažāt. mraot. aburō. 2299 mazi. 2291 + dri.frasnaɪt. 2292 tanuṇām. 2293 + dri. frasnaɪt. 2294 vastraṇām. 2295 + dri. frasnaɪt. 2296 gāedanām. 2297 |c| imā. nā. 2298 ātṛam. 2299 yazaeta. 2310 barsma. 2311 staraṇa. 2312 . aśū. 2313 + vaṉhubi. 2314 zaōda. 2315

---

K2, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G25a dātar

Mf2; K2, R1, R3 . R278, P1 . K9 tā | gāedanām. astuvāti. | | G25a, F10, T44 . FK1, (G) | gāedanām. astuvāti. ažāt | | L1 gāedanām. astuvāti. | | B2 gāedanām; T46 gāedanām; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | tā | gāedanām. astuvāti. ažāt | | T46 stmtānaṇāt; B2 stmtānaṇāt; Mf2 astuvāti

K2, T44, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); G25a, F10 . R278, E4, L5, FK1 nātānām; R3 kūdaṇānām

K2, G25a yaožḍādādi; F10, T44 . T46, L2, E4, L5, (G) yaožḍādādi; R1 . B2, Br1, G42 yaožḍādādi; R3 yaožḍādādi; L1, P1 yaožḍādādi; R278 yaožḍādādi; FK1 yaožḍādādi; Mf2, K9 yaožḍādāt

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); Br1 būn; Mf2, K9 būn

K2 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, (G); G25a yaožḍāta; F10 yaožḍāta; T44 . L5, FK1 yaožḍāta; R1 yaožḍāta; R3 yaožḍāta; L1, R278, P1; Mf2 yaožḍāta; E4 yaožḍāta

K2, G25a, F10, R1 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); T44 + mraot. aburō. mazi | | tā | dā | L1, R278, P1 . Mf2 mrao; L5 mrao; K9 tā | mraot. aburō | |

K2, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); G25a + aburō. mazi

---

K2, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, (G); FK1 mazi

G25a, F10, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . K9, (G); K2 dri. frasnaɪt; T44 dri. frasnaɪt; R3 dri. frasnaɪt; R278 dri. frasnaɪt; E4 dri. frasnaɪt; L5 dri. frasnaɪt; FK1 dri. frasnaɪt; Mf2 dri. frasnaɪt

R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 tanuṇām

K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; T44 dri. frasnaɪt; L1 dri. frasnaɪt; E4 dri. frasnaɪt; L5 dri. frasnaɪt; FK1 dri. frasruaɪt (but corrected above the line in red ink nātāt); Mf2, K9 dri. frasnaɪt; (G) dri. frasnaɪt

R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 vastraṇām; G25a tanuṇām. vastraṇām; F10, T44, R3 vastraṇām; E4 vastraṇām; L5 vastraṇām; FK1 gādina (but corrected above the line in red ink vastraṇām)

G25a . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); K2 dri. frasruuata; F10 . FK1 dri. frasruuata; T44, R1 dri. frasruuata; R3 dri. frasruuata; B2, T46 dri. frasruuata; E4 dri. frasruuata; L5 dri. frasruuata; FK1 frasruuata; Mf2, K9 dri. frasruuata; (G) dri. frasruuata

T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 gādina; R1 gādina; G25a vastraṇām (but corrected above the line in red ink frasruuata)

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 imānā; L5, FK1 imānā

K2, R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); G25a, F10, T44 . E4, L5, FK1 ātaraṇ; R1 ātaraṇ; T46 nātār

(G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . T46, FK1 yazaeta; R1 yazaeta; L1, P1, G42 yazaeta; B2, R278, Br1, L2 yazaeta; E4 yazaeta; L5 yazaeta; Mf2, K9 yazaeta

F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, G25a barsma; R3 barsma; FK1 barsma

(G); K2, R3 starānata; G25a . FK1 starānita; F10, T44 starānata; R1 starānata; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 starānata; E4 starānata; L5 starānata; Mf2, K9 starānata

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T46 aēliūi

[a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?”  

[2318] K2, G25a, R3; F10, T44, R1. B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) vahūhiū; L1, P1 vahūhiū; Mf2, K9 vahūhiū  

[b] And Ahura Mazdā said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gāthās thrice.  

[c] He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barsman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters.  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Ṡpītama Zaraṇūṣṭra.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.  

[2314] K2, G25a, R3; F10, T44, R1. B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) vahūhiū; L1, P1 vahūhiū; Mf2, K9 vahūhiū  


HLLWN-\(\text{yt}\) 2336 \(\text{wstl}\) 2342 \(3 \, \text{b}'\, \text{p}' \, \text{c}' \, \text{sldyt}\) 2343 \(\text{g}' \, \text{s}' \, \text{n}' \, \text{d}' \, \text{ZNE} \, \text{KON}\) 2344 \(\text{ths} \, \text{yct bslm}\) 2346 \(\text{ASLWN-x}\) 2349 \(\text{p} \, \text{y}' \, \text{SPYL} \, \text{zwil} \, \text{bl} \, \text{[AYK} \, \text{n}' \, \text{p} \, \text{BYN} \, \text{h}' \, \text{nk} \, \text{YDBHWN-yt]}\) 2349 \(\text{e}' \, \text{ywsd}' \, \text{s}' \, \text{aHL} \, \text{YHWNN-} \, \text{m}' \, \text{y}' \, \text{k}' \, \text{mk} \, \text{lpd}\) 2350 \(\text{MYA}\) 2351 \(\text{k}' \, \text{mk} \, \text{lpd}\) 2352 \(\text{wlwl} \, \text{k}' \, \text{mk} \, \text{lpd}\) 2353 \(\text{mhrspnd}' \, \text{n}' \, \text{spyt}' \, \text{m}' \, \text{n}' \, \text{zltwhst}\) 2359

B. \(\text{a}' \, \text{d}' \, \text{cylgwn} \, \text{m}' \, \text{y}' \, \text{ywsd}' \, \text{slynm} \, \text{cylgwn}\) 2364 \(\text{YHWNN-} \, \text{y}' \, \text{ywsd}' \, \text{sl} \, \text{b}' \, \text{AP}' \, \text{sgwpt} \, \text{whrmzd} \, \text{AYK}\) 2366 \(\text{3} \, \text{YWM} \, \text{pr}' \, \text{cylHLLWN-} \, \text{y}' \, \text{tn}' \, \text{[n}' \, \text{AYK} \, \text{OD} \, \text{3} \, \text{YWM} \, \text{tn}' \, \text{DKYA YHSNN-} \, \text{y}' \, \text{LWTE} \, \text{2364} \, \text{DKYA-} \, \text{y}' \, \text{AL} \, \text{2366} \, \text{gwymhyt}' \, \text{tn}\) \(\text{OD}\) 2366 \(\text{3} \, \text{YWM} \, \text{HLLWN-} \, \text{y}' \, \text{wstlg} \, \text{[YHSNN-} \, \text{y}' \, \text{AYK} \, \text{wstlg-} \, \text{DKYA nhwmbyt}\) 2369 \(\text{OD}\) 2370 3
A. |a| دادار گهان استواماندان ابلا چیون مان یوپدارنده چیون به یوپدار |c| یـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ~

B. |a| دادار چیون مان یوپدارنـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ~
The purification of the house
The question in V 12.2 ff. about how to purify the house in which a relative has died is answered by Ahura Mazda by means of some ritual prescriptions.

On one hand, the living relative must wash his body and clothes thrice and also recite the Gāϑās thrice.

On the other hand, another threefold process continues the purification. The relative must worship the fire, spread the barsman- and offer libations to the good Waters. As soon as the house becomes pure again through this last process, the elements used and worshipped can again enter into the house, together with the Beneficent Immortals. Thus, we find a symbolism between ritual elements and their counterparts in daily life:
- barsman- - Plants (uruurarāṃ).
- Libations to the Good Waters (zaodrā. aiβiō. *vaŋhubiō) - Waters (apām).
The only discordance appears in the mention of the Beneficent Immortals (*amašanam, spontanam*) instead of the fire (*ātrum*).

The Pahlavi translators of B added in glosses further ritual prescriptions to those already found in the Avestan text. A high fire had to be kindled, and together with the binding of the *barsom* they prescribed the *stōš* ceremony during three days, the ceremony of the libations (Phl. *zōbr yazišn*) and the consecration of the *drōn* of Srōš. Afterwards another consecration of the *drōn* had to be performed, the *mizd* had to be given and the Āfrīnagān prayers had to be recited.

The *stōš* are the prayers and ceremonies in honour of the dead, said and performed by the relatives during the first three days after his death (Dhabhar 1932 179, n.2), (Dhabhar 1963 121, n.4), (Williams 1990 2.150).

Phl. *zōbr yazišn* refer to libations consisting either of water or of fat. If water is implied here, it would prescribe the pouring of water over the *barsom* in the *barsom* ceremony, as it is mentioned by Modi (1922 266). On the contrary, if Phl. *zōbr yazišn* is applied to libations of fat, it can be related to the libations of cow’s fat offered to the fire on the dawn of the fourth day after the death, as we observe in the last testament of Dastur Nōširwan Marzabān Kermānī (Dhabhar 1932 175) and also in other New Persian Rivāyats (Dhabhar 1932 177). vid. (Kotwal 1969 98, n.7).

According to the Dāmdād Nask, quoted in Šnš 12.5 (Kotwal 1969 26-27), a high fire must be kindled and fueled with *zōbr*, that is, with a libation of cow’s fat, in the home where the relative has died, because the soul of the dead goes firstly to the nearest fire, then to the stars, then to the moon and then to the sun.

The *drōn* is the consecrated portion offered to the gods and in Pahlavi texts it specifies the wheaten bread shaped as thin round cakes. In the *drōn* of Srōš, where a *xēnuiman* is dedicated to this god, six breads are consecrated in each of the five gāh during the three days which follow a death (Boyce & Kotwal 1971a 63-64). By means of such offering the protection of Srōš is invoked against the demons which try to torment the dead. Regarding the offering and meaning of the *drōn*, vid. PRDd 56 and 58 in (Williams 1990 2.92-94, 2.94-104).

According to Modi (1922 368-370) Phl. *mizd* is referred to the *drōn*, fruits, flowers, wine, milk, etc. offered, and specially to the fruits. According to Kotwal (1969 157), Phl. *mizd* are the fruits offered up during the *stōm, āfrīnagān* and *drōn* ceremonies and hence it designates these ceremonies themselves.

During the offering of the *drōn* and the *mizd* the Āfrīnagān prayers were recited. For these ceremonies, vid. (Modi 1922 354-384). He (1922 370) reports that in Navsarī the word *mizd* eventually meant the ceremony of the Āfrīnagān. Since the manuscripts of the group B, which included the gloss where these ceremonies are mentioned, belong to the reformist school of Navsarī, it is not surprising that the *drōn*, the *mizd* and the Āfrīnagān prayers appear together.

2394 In this text it is said that Ādur and the rest of Beneficent Immortals assist the soul when cow’s fat is offered as a libation to the fire on the dawn of the fourth day.
Av. ḍriṣ (12.2b)

In V 12.2 and its repetitions, both Av. ṝfrasnāiṭi and ṛfrasṛūiṭi are nouns accompanied by the numeral Av. ḍriṣ “thrice” and can be interpreted either separately, as Geldner did, or as compounds ṛfriṣ.frasnāiṭi- and ṛfriṣ.frasṛūiṭi- respectively.

Multiplicatives were mainly used in verbal syntagms and also accompanied deverbative nouns as first element of bahuvrīhi compounds in both Old Indian and Avestan. With regards to Old Indian, Ved. sak ėt “once”, Ved. dvīṣ “twice” and Ved. trīṣ “thrice” appear as first element of compounds, for instance, in Ved. sakytsū- “bringing forth once”, Ved. sak ėd-abhīṣuta- “pressed once”, Skr. dvīr-ukta- “said twice”, Skr. trīṣ-tāvā- “thrice as great” (Monier-Williams 1899 384, 506, 1124). The only example where a multiplicative appears with substantives with –ti- is found in Skr. sakty-gati- “only a possibility” in a scholium to Pāṇ 7.1.50 (Monier-Williams 1899 1124), but this is not a bahuvrīhi, but an endocentric tatpurṣa.

Concerning Avestan, YAv. hakarət “once”, YAv. biś “twice”, YAv. ḍriṣ “thrice” and YAv. cadrūs “four times” is represented as a first element of bahuvrīhi compounds through the adjectives YAv. hakarət.gan- “killing once, killing by one blow” in Yt 14.15; YAv. biśmrūṭa- “(formulas) to be said twice”; YAv. ḍriṣmrūṭa- “(formulas) to be said thrice” in V 10.2b, d, 7a, b, 9a, 15a and N 15.2 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 96-97); and YAv. cadrūśmrūṭa- “(formulas) to be said four times” (Bartholomae 1904 579, 967, 1743) (Duchesne-Guillemin 1936 16, 73, 122, 137). The only examples where a multiplicative is used with substantives with –ti- in Avestan would be ṛfriṣ.frasnāiṭi- and ṛfriṣ.frasṛūiṭi-.

As Wackernagel (1930 424) observed, sometimes Ved. dvīṣ- and trīṣ- are equivalent to dvi- and tri- respectively, like for example in Ved. trir-āṣri- “threecornered” or Skr. dvīr-āṃsaka- “having two shoulders”. Likewise Ved. catür- means “four times” as well as “four”, like in Ved. catur-āṣri- “four-cornered”. This seems also to be the case of YAv. biś.hastram “in two groups”, ḍriṣ.hastram “in three groups” in N 13.2 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 84-85) and YAv. ḍriṣ.urmrarā- “having three stalks” in N 90 (Waag 1941 97), where Av. biś and ḍriṣ are equivalent to bi- and ḍri-.

This use of multiplicatives in compounds as equivalents of cardinals seems to be a development from that of multiplicatives as first elements of deverbative nouns, like in ṛfriṣ.frasnāiṭi- and ṛfriṣ.frasṛūiṭi-.

Av. yazaēta, stōrnaēta, baraēta (12.2c)

Morphologically these three prescriptive optatives can be interpreted either as 3rd. Sing. Pres. Mid. or as 2nd. Pl. Pres. Mid. The choice depends thus on textual parallels in a similar context or with the same verbs in Avestan.

Prescriptive optatives in this context are expressed by the following persons (Kellens 1984 299-304):

2935 Multiplicatives as first element of compounds are found in Greek as well, like for instance in διόξβος “twice young”, δασκνής “twice dead”, δασκξμως “twice ravished”, etc. (Liddell & Scott 436 ff.).
a) Active
- 2nd. Sing.: aišiō. zaoḍrā. frabarōtiś “you must bring libations to the Waters” (Y 65.10); drisum. barǭma. frarēnuṇiś “you must spread the third part of the barōsmān−” (Yt 12.3).
- 3rd. Pl.: zaoḍrā. ḥē. uzbāraiain. ariuṇ. daįbānu. barǭma. ḥē. stōrmaiaiin “the Aryan countries must bring libations for him, they must spread the barōsmān− for him” (Yt 8.58).

b) Middle
- 2nd. Sing.: ana. mām. yasna. yazaēśa “you must worship me by means of this worship” (Yt 5.91).


To summarise, in prescriptions the optative is used in 2nd. Sing. (both active and middle), 3rd. Sing. (both active and middle) and 3rd. Pl. Mid., but I have found no 2nd. Pl. Mid.

Now, since in this passage a 1st. Sing. person is asking, a 2nd. Sing. is expected in the answer and a 2nd. Pl. could have substituted it. Although Av. yazaēta, stōrmaēta and baraēta could be the only cases where the 2nd. Pl. Pres. Opt. Mid. appear and are seemingly required by the context, I prefer to interpret them as 3rd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Mid. In my opinion, this morpho-syntactical discordance must be reflected in the translation. Indeed, it could help in the understanding of the compositional patterns of Viđevdād.

Av. *vasō. upāiti. apaṁ ... amaṇānu. spaṇtānu (12.2d)

Av. upāiti can be interpreted either as a verb or as a substantive. As a verb, it would be morphologically a 3rd. Sing. Subj. Pres. Act. demanding an accusative. cf. V 5.2 (upa. ūtam. vaṇgam. aetī), V 13.28 (aetēm. ... āsiśēm. zāurūmāns. upāī), V 15.9 (yō. kainam. upāī), H 14.1 (kōm. aēm. āāt. aēdrapaitim upaiiāt (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992 68-69)) (Bartholomae 1904 150). But in V 12.2 ff. this alleged verb is accompanied by the Gen. Pl. apaṁ, urūāranūm and amaṇānu. spaṇtānu. Provided that Av. upāīti is understood as a personal verbal form, these genitives would have substituted expected accusatives.

Bartholomae (1904 397-398) was aware of this problem and interpreted Av. upāīti as an infinitive, that is, a non-personal form, in order to avoid the unexpected use of the genitives. However, to my knowledge, there is no Avestan infinitive with the ending –ti (see Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 240-243).

But Av. upāīti can be understood as the Instr. Sing. of an abstract noun with –ti, as Spiegel (1864 292), who interpreted it as a compund *vasō. upāīti, already noticed. In such case, it is to be interpreted as Av. *upa-ā-iti, since Av. *upa-iti would have produced Av. *upaēti. cf. V 16.5 upāēta (Loc. Sing. of upaēti-). The main problem of Av. *upa-ā-iti is that the verb Av. upa + ā + aii-, from which it
would be formed, finds no parallel in Avestan. Nevertheless, this verb is attested in Vedic, for instance in RV 8.20.22 úpa ... bhrātytvām āyati “he attains brotherhood” or in RV 10.124.1 imāṁ no agna úpa yajñām ēhi “come, o Agni, to this our sacrifice”. Therefore, the existence of Av. *upa-ā-iti, in spite of having no Avestan parallel, can be supported on account of the existence of the Vedic verb úpa+ā+ay-.

I agree with Spiegel (1864 292), so that I interpret Av. *upāiti as part of a compound +vasō.upāiti in Instr. Sing, also accompanied by a Gen. Pl. Therefore I prefer to emend Geldner’s and Bartholomae’s vasō. upāiti by means of a compound +vasō.upāiti. In support of this hypothesis one may adduce other compounds with Av. vasōo as a first element, mentioned by Duchesne-Guillemin (1936 193). Among them, OAv. vasā.iti- is worthy of mention, because it attests the same first element (OAv. vasā, YAv. vasōo) and the abstract iti- (from the same verbal root aii-) as its second element in Y 53.9 vasā.itōiśca. So YAv. +vasō.upāiti-finds a good morphologic parallel in OAv. vasā.iti-.

On the other hand, I think that there is a syntactic parallelism between +dṛiš. frasāiti- and +dṛiš. frasāiti- + Gen. Pl. and +vasō.upāiti- + Gen. Pl., because in all these three cases we find compounds with an adverb as a first element and a substantive with –ti- as a second element, accompanied by a Gen. Pl.

Finally, I must explain my translation “with the coming of (+ Gen. Pl.) at will”. As we have seen, in RV 10.124.1 the Vedic verb úpa + ā + ay- appears in a ritual context to beg for the presence of Agni at the ceremony. Likewise, in V 12.2 ff. Av. +vasō.upāiti implies the coming of the waters, the plants and the Beneficent Immortals at will in the ritual of purification that cleanses the house. The relatives of the dead perform the lustration, and then the waters, the plants and the Beneficent Immortals enter into the house at will, because it has been purified.
12.3. [a] ἀατ. ἀατ. 2396 πυθρό. 2397 para.irišiieiti. 2398 δυγδά. 2399 νά. 2400 para.irišiieiti. 2401 [b] συναι. +αέχαμ. 2402 + upa.маиναι. 2403 pita. 2404 baca. πυθρό. 2405 μάα. 2406 baca. δυγδάμ. 2407 [c] συναι. ἑδραν. 2408 συναι. tanu.пαρ.δαν. 2409 [d] ἀατ. τραο. 2410 ἀρυο. мазда. 2411 дрісам. 2412 "дρανάμ. 2413 + xiiuaším. " tanu.пαρ.δαν. [a] “And when the son dies or the daughter dies, [b] how long must they wait (because of them) (before entering into the house), the father with regard to his son, the mother with regard to her daughter? [c] How long for the pious? How long for the tanu.пαρ.δαν. sinners?” [d] And Ahura

2396 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9
2397 K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10
2398 para.irišiieiti; P1 πυθρό
2399 F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.irišiieiti; G25a para.irišiieiti;
T44 para.irišiieiti; R3 para.irišiieiti; Br1 pairirišīieiti; E4 para.irišiieiti; L5 pairirišīieiti; FK1 pairi.irišiieiti
2400 G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 dugda; L5
dugāda; FK1 δυγδά
2401 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); R3
dugšadā
2402 F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.irišiieiti; G25a, R3
para.irišiieiti; T44 para.irišiieiti; Br1 pairirišīieiti; E4 para.irišiieiti; L5 pairirišīieiti; FK1
pairi.irišiieiti
2403 Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, R3 . R278, FK1 . K9 αεχάμ. T44 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 αεχάμ. R1
T46, P1 αεχάμ; (G) αεχάμ
G42 upa.маиνίγ; R278 upa.маиνίγ; (G) upa.маиνίγ
2405 T46, L2, G42, E4, (G); K2, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9 paiit; G25a
paiit; R3 paiit
2406 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T46
pbraim
2407 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G); Mf2
māca
2408 G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, R3 . L5
dugāram; F10 dugāram; FK1 dugāram
2409 Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . K9 dahman; R1 . T46, P1, (G)
dahman; L1 dahman; upa.мн; E4 dahman; FK1 dahman; R1 . Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; G25a, R3 . R278, L2, G42, L5 . K9 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; F10, T44 . L1, B2, Br1, G42, tanu.пαρ.δαν.; T46 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; P1 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; FK1 tanu.пαρ.δαν.;
2410 K2, G25a, F10, R1 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); T44 — трао. аурыо. мазда │ R3 — "йа/дай", L1, P1 Mf2 трао.; K9 "йа/дай" — трао. аурыо │ R1 (—а- scratched). L1, B2, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 дрісам. енам; G25a, F10, T44,
R3 дрісам; R278 дрісам; Br1 дрісам; E4 → дрісам. ... tanu.пαρ.δαν. │; L5 дарісам; FK1
дрісам
2412 Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 in the left margin . K9 dahman;
R1 . T46, P1, (G) dahman; L5 dahman; FK1 дарісам
2413 R1 . L1, R278, P1, L2, FK1 . Mf2, K2 хиаиасти; G25a хиаиасти; F10, T44, R3 . Br1 хиаиасти; B2 хиаиасти; T46 хиаиасти; G42 хиаиасти; L5 ха иаиасти; K9 хиаиасти; (G) хиаиасти
2414 R1 . P1 . Mf2, (G); K2, R3 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; G25a, T44 . L1, R278, G42, L5 . K9 tanu.пαρ.δαν.;
F10 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; B2, Br1, L2 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; T46 tanu.пαρ.δαν.; FK1 tanu.пαρ.δαν.
Mazdā said: “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanūpahul sinners.”

A. [a] ADYN’ MNW BRE2415 BRA YMYTWN-yt BRTE2416 ‘ywp BRA YMYTWN-yt |b| cnd OLE-s’n’ QDM KTLWN-d2417 pyt MN BRE m’tl MN dwht2418 |c| cnd dhm’n’ cnd tn’pwhln’n’2419 |d| AP-š gwpt ‘whrefzd2420 30 dhm’n’ 602421 tn’pwhlkn’n’.2422

B. [a] ADYN’ MNW BRE BRA YMYTWN-yt2423 ‘ywp BRTE BRA YMYTWN-yt’ |b| OD cnd OLE-s’n’ QDM KTLWN-yt2424 [AYK ḶYN ZK m’n’ m’nšn’ OBYDWN-yt W ‘pst’k KRYTWN-yt’] pyt MN BRE m’tl MN dwht |c| OD cnd dhm’n’ l’d OD cnd tn’pwlgn’n’ l’d |d| AP-š gwpt ‘whrefzd 30 YWM dhm’n’ 602425 YWM tn’pwhlg’n’2426 [gš n’n’y2427 pst’k KLYTWN-d2428]

A. [a] ēg kē pus bē mīrēd duxt ayāb bē mīrēd |b| čand awēšān abar mānēnd pid az pus mādar az duxt |c| čand dahmān čand tanāpuhlagān |d| u-š guft ohrmazd sīh dahmān šast tanāpuhlagān

B. [a] ēg kē pus bē mīrēd ayāb duxt bē mīrēd |b| tā čand awēšān abar mānēd [kū andar ān mān mānišn kunēd ud abastāg xwānēd] pid az pus mādar az duxt |c| tā čand dahmān ráy tā čand ‘tanāpuhlagān ráy |d| u-š guft ohrmazd sīh rōz dahmān šast rōz tanāpuhlagān [gāhān ay abastāg xwānēd]

A. [a] “When the son dies or the daughter dies, |b| how long must they wait (because of) them (before entering into the house), the father with regard to his son, the mother with regard to her daughter? |c| How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhul sinners?” |d| And Ohrmazd said: “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanāpuhul sinners.”

B. [a] “When the son dies or the daughter dies, |b| how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house) [that is, he waits in that house and recites the Abastāg], the father with regard to his son, the mother with regard to her daughter? |c| How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhul sinners?”
And Ohrmazd said: “Thirty days for the pious, sixty days for the *tanāpuhl* sinners [they will recite the Gāḍās, namely the Abastāg].”

Phl. *gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd* (12.3d)

It is noteworthy that this gloss appears after the prescribed days of waiting, since it does not appear in V 12.1 and 12.5, where the same number of days is prescribed.

This gloss could indicate that the Gāḍās, i.e. the Abastāg, must be recited after this period of waiting. Nevertheless, the recitation of the Gāḍās is prescribed in V 12.2 ff. as part of the ceremony of purification. So here this prescription makes no sense.

In my opinion, this gloss is misplaced, maybe in one of the copies from which the manuscripts of the group B stem. This gloss is more understandable if we replace it after 12.2b *gāhān frāz srāyēd [ay gāhān wēš xwānēd tā sē rōz]. In such case, this would be the expected text of this passage:*

*gāhān frāz srāyēd [ay gāhān wēš xwānēd tā sē rōz] [gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd]*

“you will recite the Gāḍās [that is, he will recite the Gāḍās during three more days] [they will recite the Gāḍās, namely the Abastāg]”

Another possibility is that it could have been misplaced from the preceding passage of 12.3b. In such case, this is the reconstructed text of this passage:

*tā čand awēšān abar mānēd [kū andar ān mān mānišn kunēd ud abastāg xwānēd] [gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd]*

“how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house) [that is, he waits in that house and recites the Abastāg] [they will recite the Gāḍās, namely the Abastāg]”

In any case it is evident that the Pahlavi translators of B understood that the Gāḍās and the Abastāg were synonyms.

|249| K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 |249| dātar. ... mazādā |249|

|250| Mf2; K2, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46 . K9 "tāj " gaēdanām. xastuaitinām |251| |252| G25a, F10, T44 . FK1 |253| gaēdanām. xastuaitinām. aśāum |254| |255| P1 |256| gaēdanām. xastuaitinām |257| |258| Br1, L2, G42, L5 "tāj " |259| gaēdanām. xastuaitinām. aśāum |260| |261| (G) |262| gaēdanām. ... zarānūtā |263|

|250| Mf2 xastuaitinām |251|

|252| K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . |253| L1, B2, R278, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; F10 . L5, FK1 nmānaṃ; T46 nmānaṃ; Br1 nmānaṃ |254|

|252| K2, F10, R3 . |253| Br1, L2, L5 yaoḍadāmāi; G25a, R1 . G42 yaoḍadāmāi; T44 . FK1 yaoḍadāmā; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 yaoḍadāmāi; Mf2, K9 yaoḍadāme |254|

|252| K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; Mf2, K9 bin |253|

|252| K2 . Br1, L2; G25a yaoḍātāi; F10 . L5, FK1 yaoḍātūtī; T44 yaoḍātāi; R1 yaoḍātā; R3 buna yaoḍātāi; L1, R278, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoḍātā; B2, T46 yaoḍātā; G42 yaoḍātūtī |253|

|252| K2, G25a . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) " mraoṭ. aburō. mazādā |253|

|254| " R3 "tāj da; L1, T46, P1 . Mf2 mraọg L5 mraọg K9 "tāj " mraoṭ. aburō |255|

|254| G25a, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5; K2 driś.frasṇūtī; T44 . E4 driś.frasṇūtī; L5 driś.frasṇūtī; FK1 driś.frasṇūtī; Mf2, K9 driś.frasṇūtī |255|


|254| K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; F10, T44 " driś.frasṇūtī. ... spoṭitānām |255|

|254| R1 . P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 vastranām; R3 vastranām; T46 vastranām; L5 vastranām; E4, FK1 vastranām |255|

|254| G25a . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42; K2, R3 driś.frasṇātā; R1 driś.frasṇātā; L1, P1 driś.frasṇūtī; E4 driś.frasṇūtī; L5 driś.frasṇūtī; FK1 driś.frasṇūtī; Mf2, K9 driś.frasṇūtī |255|


|254| K2, G25a, R1 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; L1, P1, E4, L5 imānā |255|

|254| R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; K2, G25a . E4, L5, FK1 āṭarām; R3 imānātāram |255|

|254| K2, G25a, R3 . Br1, L5, FK1 yazaēta; R1 . G42 yazaēta; L1, L2 yazaēta; B2 yazaēta; R278, P1 yazaēta; T46 yazaēta; E4 yazaēta; Mf2, K9 yazaēta |255|

|254| G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; K2, R1 . FK1 barasa; R3 barasa |255|

|254| Mf2, K9; K2, R3 storaṇā; G25a storaṇā; R1 storaṇēta; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 storaṇēta; R278 storaṇēta; E4 storaṇēta; L5 storaṇēta; FK1 storaṇētī |255|

|254| K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 aṭiū |255|

|254| K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 vaṭhībīū; T46 vaṭhībīū; Mf2 vaṭhībīū; K9 vaṭhībīū |255|

|254| K2, G25a, R1 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5; L1, T46, P1 . Mf2, K9 zaodrā; FK1 zaodrā |255|

|254| Mf2, K9; K2, G25a, R1 . L5 baraitī; R3 zaodrābaitī; L1, P1 baraitī; B2, R278, T46, L2, G42 baraitī; Br1 bariū "tā; E4 barote; FK1 barati |255|

|254| R3 . G42, L5, FK1; K2 yaoḍātā; G25a, R1 . T46, Br1, L2 yaoḍātā; L1, B2, R278, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoḍātā; E4 yaoḍātī |255|

380
A. [a] “Maker, Righteous, [b] how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” [c] And Ahura Mazda said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gādās thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the bārāsman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Śpitama Zarāduṣṭra.”
A. [a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how will he purify the house? How will it be purified?” [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. [d] He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. Then the house will be purified. The waters will enter at will, the plants will enter at will, the Beneficent Immortals will enter at will, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt.”

B. [a] “Maker, [b] how will I purify the house and how will it be purified? …” [c] As written.


2494 K2, F10, T44. B2, T46, E4, L5, FK1. (G); G25a, R1. L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9 āat; R3 yada

2495 G25a, R3. B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, (G); F10, T44, R1. L1, R278, E4, L5, FK1. K9 bārāta

2497 G25a, R1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, (G); K2 para.irdīiata; F10 pari.irdīiata; T44 para.irdīiata; R3 para.irdīiata; E4 para.irdīiata; L5 pari.irdīiata; FK1 pari.irdīiata; K9 para.irdīiade

2498 T44 in the right margin, (G); K2, G25a, F10, R1. B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 xānha; R278 = x’ānha. vā. para.irdīiata =; L5 xāyha; FK1 xāyhe

2499 K2, G25a, F10, T44 in the right margin, R1. B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); R3. L1, P1 xāyha.vā

2500 K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); T44 writes para.irdīieata in the right margin; E4 para.irdīiata; FK1 pari.irdīieata

2501 Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, R3. R278, FK1. K9 aēṣg; T44. L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aēṣg; R1. T46, P1 aēṣg; (G) aēṣg

2502 R1 (second -ae- scratched). T46, P1, K2, F10, T44. E4, FK1 upa.mgnaı̈; G25a. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5. K9 upa.mgnaı̈; Mf2 upa.mgnaı̈; (G) upa.mgnaı̈

2503 K2, G25a, R1. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); F10, T44. R278, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9 bārāta; R3 upa.mgnaı̈barātā

2504 (G); K2, R1, R3. E4. K9 xāybrım; G25a, F10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. Mf2 xāybrım; T44. FK1 xāybrım

2505 (G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9 xānha; E4 xāyhe; FK1 xāyhe

2506 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); L5 xāyhaça

2507 R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, (G); K2, G25a. Br1, L2, G42 bṛātəm; F10, T44, R1 (second -a- scratched). E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9 bārātərəm

2508 Mf2, K2 aēṣg. dahmanm; G25a, F10, T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4. K9 dahmanm; R1. T46, P1, (G) dahmanm; R3 dahmanm; L5 dahmanm; FK1 daṇṇam

2509 R1. P1. Mf2, (G); K2, T44. L1, R278, L2, G42, L5. K9 tanu.pərdənən; G25a, F10, R3. B2, Br1, E4 tanu.pərdənən; T46 tanu.pərdənən; FK1 tanu.pərdənən

2510 K2, G25a, R3. B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) - mrao. ahurō. maždā -; L1, P1. Mf2 mrao; L5 mrao. K9  aslı / - mrao. ahurō -

2511 G25a. L1, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); K2, F10, T44, R1, R3. R278, E4 əristəm; B2 ərist /blank/ om; T46, L5 əristə; FK1 ərəs (t-added later) frənnaı̈ı̈

2512 G42. Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5. K9 dahmanm; R1. T46, P1, (G) dahmanm; FK1 ñamanm (correcting a previous tanumən)

2513 F10, R1. R278, Br1, L2, E4. K9, K2, T44, R3. G42 xšiwašīm; G25a. L1, P1 xšiwašīm; B2, T46 xšiwašīm; L5 xšiwašīm; FK1 xšiwašīm (x- correcting a previous d-); Mf2 xšiwašīm; (G) xšiwašīm

2514 R1. P1. Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.pərdənən; G25a, F10. B2, E4 tanu.pərdənən; T44. L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5. K9 tanu.pərdənən; R3 tanu.pərdənən; T46 tanu.pərdənən; FK1 tanu.pərdənən
“And when the brother dies or the sister dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) of them (before entering into the house), the brother with regard to his sister, the sister with regard to her brother? How long for the pious? How long for the tanupara-sinners?” And Ahura Mazda said: “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanupara-sinners.”
for the tanāpuhl sinners? |d| And Ohrmazd said: “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

Phl. <BLWL> (12.5a-b)

This rare form translates Av. brāta, that is, the Nom. Sing. of Av. brātar-, while the usual Phl. <bl’t> is used for its Acc. Sing. brātaram in V 12.5.

As Dan Sheffield has told me by e-mail (29-1-2009, 6:52 p.m.), this writing is attested in some manuscripts of the Frāhang ī Pahlavīg in the passage 11.13 (Utas 1988 9, 46) after <AH>, <bl’t’>, <bl’tl> brād, brādar; in the ViD 21.1 of his edition (under preparation), with the variant <blwl>l; in the text Sē wināh ī wuzurg of the manuscript MU29 at the bottom of p. 58, with the variant <blwl> LWTE blwl (Mzdāpūr 1999 218); and in the PT of the Xwaršēd Nyāyišn in the manuscript Cod. Zend. 49 (Junker 1914 48).

Junker (1914) derived <blwl> from a Caspian dialectal variant, specifically from the Gabri dialect, where Phl. brādar developed into /bror/ and therefore was written <blwl>2532. Moreover, he added other examples from the Frāhang ī Pahlavīg where traces of the Gabri dialect are found, so that his explanation for the presence of the variant <blwl> in some manuscripts of the Frāhang ī Pahlavīg can be in no doubt, or at least for very likely.

Therefore, <blwl> /bror/ represented the Gabri variant of Phl. brādar and slipped into some Pahlavī texts from the Frāhang ī Pahlavīg. This is confirmed by the PT of the Xwaršēd Nyāyišn in the manuscript Cod. Zend. 49, whose Pahlavī translator, according to Bartholomae (1915 15-31) was well acquainted with the Frāhang ī Pahlavīg. Likewise, the Pahlavī translators of V 12 surely used a similar frāhang where <blwl> was written instead of <bl’t/l>, so that the variant <blwl> of this frāhang slipped into their PTs. Since they did not understand that <blwl> was a dialectal variant instead of Phl. <bl’tl>, they just reproduced it as a pseudo-heterogram. That is why I have edited <BLWL> instead of <blwl>.

2532 cf. the variants boro-ar “brother” in the Tālešī dialect of Māsule, borar “brother” in Gilakī (Lecoq 1989 299, 305) and Paštō wor < Proto-Paštō *brāyar (Dir. Sing.) < OIr. *brātar(um) (Skjærvø 1989 406).


K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 | B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G) | L1 | dātra || 2534 | Mf2, K2 | L1, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | K9 | āj. | gaękänąm. astuwaćinąm. aṣāum | 2535 | astuwaćinąm. | 2536 | x yaozdādāni | 2537 | kǔda. 2538 | bun. 2539 | yaozdāta. 2540 | āj. mrao. abu. mazā. *drī. Frances. tānu. 2542 | gaękänąm. 2544 | vāstranąm. 2545 *drī. Frances. gādn. 2546 | imā. no. 2548 | ātrem. x yazaēta. 2551 | baroms. 2552 | starsnāeta. 2555 | aiđū. 2556 | vayhubbī. 2554 | zaōdrā. 2555 | baraēta. 2556 | yaozdāta. 2557 | pascaēta. bun. 2559 | nmāna. 2560 *vāso. upa. 2562

K2, G25a, T44, R1 | L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2 | Mf2, F10, R3 | R278, T46, E4, L5, FK1 namān. 2540 | K2, T46, B, L2, G42, G25a yaozdāi; | R1 | yaozdāta; | R3 | ỵāoōzdāta; | L1, P1 | Mf2, K9 yaozdāta; | B2, R278 yaozdāta; | E4 yaozdāta; | L5, FK1 yaozdāi 2542 | K2, G25a | B2, T46, B, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; | R1 (with a blank) | mrao. abu. mazā. 2540 | R3 āj. | dā; | L1, R278, P1 | Mf2 mrao. K9 2544 | ūd. | mrao. abu. 2540 | K2, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; E4 drī. Frances. naīta; L5 drī. Frances. naīta; FK1 drāi. Frances. naīta; Mf2, K9 drī. Frances. naīta 2540 | K2, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, B, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; K2 baun; | B2, T46. K9 būn; | Mf2 būn | K2, T46, B, L2, G42; G25a yaozdāi; | R1 yaozdāta; | R3 ỵāoōzdāta; | L1, P1 | Mf2, K9 yaozdāta; | B2, R278 yaozdāta; | E4 yaozdāta; | L5, FK1 yaozdāi 2542 | K2, G25a | B2, T46, B, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; | R1 (with a blank) | mrao. abu. mazā. 2540 | R3 āj. | dā; | L1, R278, P1 | Mf2 mrao. K9 2544 | ūd. | mrao. abu. 2540 | K2, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; E4 drī. Frances. naīta; L5 drī. Frances. naīta; FK1 drāi. Frances. naīta; Mf2, K9 drī. Frances. naīta 2540 | K2, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | K9 gādnām; | R1 gātanąm; 2540 | K2, G25a, R1 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 | Mf2, R3 | E4, L5, FK1 | K9 imān. 2540 | K2, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4 | Mf2, K9, G25a, R1 | L5 ātām | G42 ātrom; | FK1 a|mănā| no. ātrem 2540 | K2, G25a, R3 | R278, T46, L5, FK1 yazata; | R1 | L1, P1 yazata; | B2, Br1, L2 yazaēta; | G42 yazaēta; | E4 yazta; | Mf2 yazaēta; 2545 | K9 yazaēta 2540 | G25a | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | Mf2, K9, K2 brsma; | R1 brsma; | R3 barsts; | FK1 barsts 2540 | K9, K2, G25a, R1, R3 starsnāetai; | L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 starsnāeta; R278 starsnāeta; E4 starsnāeta; L5 starsnāeta; FK1 starsnīti; Mf2 starsnāeta 2540 | K2, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | Mf2, K9; K9 aiūiō 2540 | K2 above the line, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | FK1 vayhubbī; | Mf2, K9 vayhubbī 2540 | K2, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1; L1 zaōdrā. 2545 | br; | P1 | Mf2, K9 zaōdrā 2540 | Mf2, K9, K2 barats; G25a, R1 | Br1 baraiti; | R3 baraiti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 barats; E4 barats; L5 zaōdrābaraiti; FK1 barats 386
A. [a] “Maker, Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” And Ahura Mazda said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gātās thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barasman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficient Immortals at will, o Spitama Zaradvāstra.”

...
ASLWN-x₁ ṭ₂₅₈₃ y ŠPYL zwhl bld ywšdʾsl₂₅₈₄ |d| AHL YHWWN-ᵗ ZK mʾnʾ kʾmk lpd MYA kʾmk lpdʾwlw kʾmk lpdʾmhrspndʾnʾ₂₅₈₅ spytʾmʾnʾ₂₅₈₆ zltwhšt₂₅₈₇

B. [a] dʾtʾl₂₅₈₈ [b] cygwn npšṭ₂₅₈₉

A. [a] dādār gēhān astōmandān ahlaw [b] čīyōn mān yōjdāsrēnēd čīyōn būd yōjdsr [c] u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār tan sōyēd sē bār sōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srayēd gābān ēn nūn ātāxī yāzēd barson bandēd āb ī weh zōhr bard yōjdāsr [d] pas būd ān mān kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

B. [a] dādār [b] čīyōn nibišt

[a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how will he purified the house? How will it be purified?” [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. [d] Then the house will be purified. The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zardušt.”

12.7. \( a \) āt. yat. 2390  \( n \) nānō.paitiś. 2391 \( n \) nānō.padī. 2392  \( vā. \) para.iriđīeti. 2393 \( b \) cūaṭ. + aēśam. 2394  upa.māṇātiṃ. 2395 cūaṭ. + dāpāṇāṃ. 2396 cūaṭ. tanu.pārādaṇāṃ. 2397 \( c \) āt. mṛaō. ahuṛō. mazāḍa. + xānua. 2602 maṭbō. 2603 + dāpāṇāṃ. 2604 duadaṣa. 2605 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ. 2606 [kainīno. 2607 x'ato. pūdṛō.] 2608

\[ \text{[a]} \] “And when the master of the house dies or the mistress of the house dies, \( b \) how long must (one) wait (because) of them (before entering into the house)? How long for the

\[ \text{[k]} \]

| 2592 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 | B2, T46, E4, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 |
| 2593 | K2, G25a, R1 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10, R3 . FK1 nānō.patiś; T44 nānō.patiś; E4 nānō.patiś; L5 nānō.patiś |
| 2594 | K2, G25a, R1 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 para.iriđīeti; T44 para.iriđīaeti; R3 para.iriđīeti | L1, P1 para.iriđīaeti; T46 para.iriđīaeti; E4 para.iriđīaeti; L5 para.iriđīaeti; FK1 para.iriđīaeti |
| 2595 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 | B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); R3 nānō.patiś; L1, P1 nānō.patiś |
| 2596 | K2, G25a, R1, R3 | L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 para.iriđīeti; T44 para.iriđīaeti; B2 para.iriđīaeti; E4 para.iriđīaeti; L5 para.iriđīaeti; FK1 para.iriđīaeti |
| 2597 | K2, G25a, R1 | L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aēśam; R1 . T46, P1 aēśam; FK1, (G) aēśam |
| 2598 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 | L1, R278, B1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; K2 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; F10 B2 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; T46 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; FK1 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ |
| 2600 | K2, F10, T44, R1, R3 | B2, R278, T46, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, G25a . L1, P1, Br1, E4 xānuaṣa. L5 xānuaṣa. (G) xānuaṣ |
| 2601 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); FK1 xānuaṣaṁyōho |
| 2602 | K2, K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 dābhaṇāṃ; R3 (‘- scratched) dābhūmaṇāṃ; T46, P1, (G) dābhūmaṇāṃ; E4, L5 dābhūmaṇāṃ; FK1 dābhūmaṇāṃ; K9 dābhūmaṇāṃ |
| 2603 | K2, K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, G42 . K9 du̲aṇa.duṣa; Br1 du̲aṇa.duṣa; FK1 du̲aṇa.duṣa |
| 2604 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9 . G25a | xātu o. tānu.pārādaṇāṃ; F10 . B2, Br1 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; R3 . FK1 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; L1 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; T46 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; P1 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ; E4 du̲aṇa. dastu.pārādaṇāṃ; L5 tanu.pārādaṇāṃ |
| 2605 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 kainīno; L5 in the right margin kaṇenō |
| 2606 | (G); K2, G25a xātu o; F10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9 xātu o; T44, R1 xātu o; R3 kainī. nōxta o; L5 in the right margin xāneto |
| 2607 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 in the right margin, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 pudrō |
And Ahura Mazdā said: “Six months for the pious, twelve for the tanu.pəɾƏθə-sinners [son of the girl herself].”

A. [a] ADYN’ m’n’ pt BRA YMYTWN-yt m’n’ ptk; [b] cnD OLE-š’n’ QDM NTLWN-šnk; [c] A - š’ gwpt ’wrmzd 6 BYRH dhm’n’ 12 BYRH tn’pwlh’n’ [knyk W hwt pws]

B. [a] ADYN’ MNW’ m’n’pt BRA YMYTWN-yt’ [’y ktk hwt’y] ’ywp m’n’ptk [’y ktk b’nwk] BRA YMYTWN-yt’ [b] OD cnD OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-šn’ cnD dhm’n’ cn’d tn’pwlh’n’ 6 12 BYRH dhm’n’ 12 BYRH tn’pwlh’n’ [knyk W hwt pws]

A. [a] ēg mānbed bē mīrēd mānbedag ayāb bē mīrēd | b| čand awēšān abar pāyišnag čand dahnān čand tanāpuhlagān | c| u-š guft ohrmazd šaš māh dahnān dwāzdah māh tanāpuhlagān [kanīg xwēš pus]


A. [a] “When the master of the house dies or the mistress of the house dies, | b| how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” | d| And Ohrmazd said: “Six months for the pious, twelve months for the tanāpuhl sinners [son of the girl herself].”

B. [a] “When the master of the house dies [namely the householder] or the mistress of the house dies [namely the lady of the house], | b| how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” | d| “Six months for the pious, twelve months for the tanāpuhl sinners [the girl and the son himself].”

---

2610 K2, R3; G25a, (Jmp) m’nptk; R1 m’n’ ptk yn’
2611 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a - ’ywp -
2612 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a OLE- š’n; R3 OLE- š’š’n’
2613 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a NTLWN-šnk’; R3 NT LWN-šnk
2614 R1, (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 dhm’n’y
2615 (Jmp); K2, R1, R3 tn’pwlh’n’; G25a tn’pwlg’n’
2616 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R1, R3 | A - š gwpt ’wrmzd |
2617 R1, (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 | BYRH |
2618 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 tn’pwlh’n’; R1 tn’pwlg’n’
2619 R1; K2, (Jmp) | knyk NPŠE pws |; G25a knk’; R3 knyg
2620 T44; F10 | MNW |
2621 F10; T44 m’npt
2622 F10; T44 W cnD
2623 F10; T44 tn’pwlg’n’
2624 F10; T44 OD 6
Av. kainīnō. xᵛatō. puḥrəm (12.7c)

This syntagm, attested in all the VS manuscripts (and obviously in the PV which copied their text from these manuscripts), makes no sense in this passage and seems an Avestan gloss embedded in the Avestan text. Indeed, in the rest of parallels in V 12 there is no further text after the formula “X damanam. X tanu.parədanam”. Therefore, we must try to explain where this gloss comes from.

According to Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.185, 189), this gloss slipped into the Avestan text of the VS from the lost Pahlavi commentary of V 12. Therefore, Darmesteter took for granted that a PT of V 12 existed and was lost in the PV manuscripts. Glosses in the Avestan text of the VS manuscripts usually slipped into them from the Pahlavi commentaries of the PV manuscripts. When both traditions merged, some glosses of the PV manuscripts were added to the VS ones.

Cantera (under preparation D), who does not accept that there was a PT of V 12, thinks that this is an Avestan gloss to the Avestan text of V 12.7. If so, we can try to find its possible relation with other Avestan texts, in order to know if it could have slipped here from another Avestan text due to a mistake in the oral or written transmission of the VS.

This will not be surprising if we take into account the structure of V 12. As we have already observed in the introduction, V 12.7 breaks the sequence of relatives, because it adds the master of the house (Av. nmānō.paiti-) and the mistress of the house (Av. nmānō.padnī-) in the list. Moreover, after the formula cuuət. +aēšəm. +upə.m나나ıən we expect “X haca. nmānō.paiti- X haca. nmānō.padnī-”, but these syntagms lack too and therefore also break the sequence. As a matter of fact, the whole V 12.7-8 seems an addition between V 12.5-6 and 9-10. Therefore, the addition of Av. kainīnō. xᵛatō. puḥrəm is just another discordance in such a peculiar text, which could have emerged either during the oral or during the written period of transmission.

The syntagm Av. kainīnō. xᵛatō. puḥrəm is not attested as such in any preserved Avestan texts. The only chance for determining where this gloss could come from is to search for Avestan parallels where these three words, or at least two of them, appear together, and to clarify whether or not they fit the context of V 12.

There is a text where this gloss could fit, as Darmesteter (1892-1893 3.49) already noticed: V 15.11-12. In this passage it is mentioned the great sin committed both by a father and a mother when she becomes pregnant and, because of shame, she hurts her foetus and aborts:

V 15.11
yō. kainīnəm. upāiti. stātō.ratūm. vā. astātō.ratūm. vā. paradātəm. vā. aparadātəm. vā. puḥrəmca. hē. daāiti. mā. nō. aēša. yā. kaine. mašuənəm. parō. fsərmət. xᵛatō. garašəm. raəšəitiət
“Who comes close to a girl having a ratu- appointed or having no ratu-appointed, engaged or not engaged, and he makes her with a child, let not this girl, because of shame of the people, hurts by herself her foetus”.

V 15.12
yezica. aēša. yā. kaine. mašuənəm. parō. fsərmət. xᵛatō. garašəm. irišiəiti. (…)
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“And if this girl, because of shame of the people, hurts by herself her foetus (...)

In V 15.11-12 it is noteworthy that Av. kainīn- and xōlō appear in the same context, and that instead of Av. puḍrōm we find Av. garābom. Thus, in V 12.7c there would be a mere substitution of Av. garābom by Av. puḍrōm. Accordingly, the gloss of V 12.7 could be linked to the Avestan text of V 15 in a previous oral transmission. Moreover, Av. kainīnō. xōlō. puḍrōm could have glossed Av. xōlō. garābom in V 15.11 or 15.12, either in the Avestan text or in the commentary to its PT, and it could have been extracted later from this fragard. If so, this gloss would mean “son of the girl herself” and Av. kainīnō would be interpreted as a Gen. Sing. As in V 15.11-12 the girl who aborts is an example of a sinner, the Avestan gloss kainīnō. xōlō. puḍrōm of V 12.7 after tanu,parāda- could simply exemplify a case of a tanu,parāda- sinner with the girls who hurt their foetus and abort. Therefore, the gloss of V 12.7 could refer to V 15.11-12.

The addition of this gloss related to V 15.11-12 could have been due to another fact too. In the commentary to the PT of V 15.10 a list of relatives and members of the house is mentioned: az pid ud mād <az> xwah ud az brād <az> šōy ud sālar <az> bandag ud paristār az xwadāy <ud> bānūg “by the father and the mother, by the sister and the brother, by the husband and master, by the servant and the maidservant, by the lord and the lady”. Since in V 12 there is a parallel list of relatives, and the lord of the house and the mistress of the house are mentioned there too, the oral composers of V 12 could have mixed both texts.

Besides the possible link between this gloss and the Avestan text of V 15, I cannot rule out Darmesteter’s (1892-1893 2.185, 189) explanation. So I think that perhaps it belonged to the commentary of a lost PT of V 12 and slipped into the VS from it.
12.8. |\(a|\) dātar. gaëčanąm. x astnuaitingąm. ašūm. |\(b|\) kūda. mūn. |\(x|\) yaozdač🍃. kūda. bun. yaozda. aā. mrao. aburö. mazā. driš. frasna. tanuč. driš. frasna. vaustran. driš. frasna. rū. gādanąm. ina. nō. atro. x yazača. barošma. svarana. ajiņo. vanpurbiō. zaožra. barača. yaozda. pasac. bun. mūn. mū. vasō. upa. iti.

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L1 dātar
Mf2; K2, R3 . L1, R278, T46, P1 . K9 |\(i|\)ā. gaëčanąm. astnuaitingąm |\(\rightarrow\) G25a, F10, T44, R1 . FK1 |\(\rightarrow\) gaëčanąm. astnuaitingąm. ašūm |\(\rightarrow\) B2 gađanąm; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 |\(i|\)ā. gaëčanąm. astnuaitingąm. ašūm |\(\rightarrow\) (G) gaëčanąm. ... zarabūštra |\(\rightarrow\)
B2 astnuaitingąm; Mf2 astnuaitingąm
K2, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 kūdā
K2, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; G25a kūdānamanč. F10, T44 . R278, E4, L5, FK1 namūn
K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . T46, L2, G42. Mf2 yaoždačai. K1 R1, B2, R278, G25a yaoždačai; R1 yaoždača; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždača; E4 yaoždačai; L5 yaoždačai; FK1 yaoždačai
K2, G25a . L1a, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4; R1 (with a blank) |\(\rightarrow\) mrao. aburö. mazā |\(\rightarrow\) R3 |\(i|\)ā. dā. L5, FK1 maraom; Mf2 mrao; K9 |\(i|\)ā. mrao aburō |\(\rightarrow\)
K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5; E4 driš. frasna. FK1 driš. frasna. Mf2 driš. frasna
K2, G25a, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; R3 . L5 driš. frasna. R278 driš. frasna. FK1 driš. frasna. Mf2, K9 driš. frasna
K2, G25a, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; R1 driš. frasnuič. R3 driš. frasnuič. E4 driš. frasnuič. FK1 driš. frasnuič. Mf2, K9 driš. frasnuič
K2, G25a, R1 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; R3 . L1, E4, L5 imanč
K2, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, G25a . R278, E4, L5, FK1 atarom
K2, R3 . E4, L5 yazata; G25a, R1 yazata; L1, P1 yazeta; B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 yazeta; R278 yazeta; FK1 yazeta; K9 yazeta
G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; K2, R1, R3 barsma
Mf2; K2, R1, R3 starsnač. G25a starsnač. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 starsnač. E4 starsnač. L5 starsnač. FK1 starsnač. K9 starsnač
K2, G25a, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; R3 . E4 ajiņo
R1; K2, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 vanpurbiō; G25a vanpurbiō; E4, FK1 vanpurbiō. Mf2, K9 vanpurbiō
K2, G25a, R3 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R1 zaodai; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 zaodra
Mf2, K9; K2 . E4 barmę; G25a, R1 . G4, L5 bars metres; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1 barsmeta
G25a . T46, L5; K2 yaoždeta; R1 . R278, Br1, L2, G42 yaoždeta; R3 baraitiyaoždeta; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždeta; B2, FK1 yaoždeta; E4 yaoždeta
A. [a] dʾtʾl 2663 gyhʾn 2664 xʾst wmnʾn 2665 xʾhlwbʾ 2666 |b| cygwn mʾnʾ ywšʾdʾslynyt cygwn YHWNN-t DKYA [c] AP-š gwptʾ whrmzd 3 bʾl HLLWN-šnʾ 2667 3 bʾl HLLWN-šnk 2668 ṣwlʾy 2669 3 bʾl prʾc slʾdšnk gʾsʾnʾ |d| ZNE 2670 KON ’thš YĐBHWN-yt 2671 bslm ASLWN-x₁ MYA y 2674 ŠPYL zwhl bld DKYA AHL

2651 G25a. Mf2, K9; K2, R1, R3 pascaita; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 pascaeta; E4, FK1 pascaita
2652 K2, G25a, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; Mf2, K9 bīn
2653 K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; G25a, R1 nmāne; R3 . L5 nmāne; E4 namāna; FK1 nāmāna
2654 K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . K9; E4 vasō.upaīta; FK1 vasō.upaīte; Mf2 vasō.upaīti
2655 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9 apāmt; G25a bāpājm; L5, (G) apamt ... uruuaran. vasō. upāiti —
2656 K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . K9; E4 vasō.upaīta; FK1 vasō.upaī; Mf2 vasō.upaīti
2657 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, R3 uruuarāṁ; G25a uruuarāṁ; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9 uruuarāṁ
2658 K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 vasō.upaīta
2659 R1; K2, R3 . L5, FK1 . K9 amāšāṁ; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 amāšāṁ; T46, P1 . Mf2 amāšāṁ; E4 amāšāṁ
2660 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 spītanāṁ; L5 spītanāṁ; FK1 spītanāṁ
2661 K2, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; G25a spōtama; T44 spītami; E4, FK1 spītama
2662 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10 spītama zaradiśtrā; R3 spītama zaradiśtrā; E4 zaradiśtrā; L5 zaradiśtrā
2663 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3 — dʾtʾl ... ’hlwbʾ —
2664 K2 ’st wmnʾnʾ —
2665 K2 ’hlwbʾy
2666 R1, (Jmp); K2, G25a ’ywšʾdʾslynyt; R3 ’ywyslynd KN
2667 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a, R3 HLLWN-šnʾ
2668 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R1, R3 tnʾhl
2669 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a HLLWN-šnʾk; R3 HLLWN-šnk
2670 K2, G25a, R1, R3; (Jmp) wstlg
2671 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3 ZNM
2672 G25a; K2, R1, R3, (Jmp) ycyt
2673 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R1, R3 — y —
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YHWWN-t mʾn kʾmk lʾd MYA kʾmk lʾd 'wlw lʾm lʾd mʾrsnpndʾn spyt mʾn zltwšt

B. |a| dʾtʾl |b| cygwn npšt'

A. |a| dādār ħēhān āstōmandān āblaw |b| čyōn mān yōjdārnēd čyōn būd pāk |c| n-š guft ohrmazd sē bār šōyišnag tan sē bār šōyišnag wasṭaray sē bār frāz srāyišnag gāhān |d| ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb ī weh zōhr bard pāk pas būd mān kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān spitāmān zardūšt

B. |a| dādār |b| čyōn nibišt

A. |a| “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, |b| how will he purify the house? How will it be pure?” |c| And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. |d| He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. Then the house will be pure. The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zardūšt.”

B. |a| “Maker ...” |c| As written.

---

2675 G25a, R3, (Jmp); K2 → kʾmk ... zltwšt ←; R1 cygwn NPŠE kʾmk
2676 (Jmp); G25a lpt; R1, R3 lwd
2677 G25a, (Jmp); R1, R3 'p'
2678 G25a, (Jmp); R1, R3 lwd
2679 (Jmp); G25a, R1, R3 lwd
2680 G25a; R1, R3 'mhrspndʾn; (Jmp) 'mārsnpnd
2681 (Jmp); G25a spyt mʾn; R1, R3 → spyt mʾn zltwšt ←
2682 G25a; (Jmp) zltwšt

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 yāt. 2682

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); R1 niṅkā; L1 niṅkō. 2684

K2, G25a, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.airīdāiitā; T44 pairi.iriṅdiieiti; R3 para.airīdāiitā; P1, Br1, L2 para.iriṅdiieiti; E4 para.iriṅdiie; L5 para.iriṅdiieite; FK1 pairi.iriṅdiieiti K9 para.iriṅdiieiti

K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 cuṅat. 2681

K2, G25a, F10 . Mf2, K9, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aṅkāt; R278, FK1 aṅkām; T46, P1 aṅkā; (G) aṅkām. 2680

R1 (second -a- scratched). P1; K2, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 upa.manāįiṅ; G25a, F10, T44 . E4, L5 upa.maniṅ; R3 upa.maniṅ; L1 upa.mā; T46 upa.maniṅ; FK1 upa.maniṅ; (G) upa.maniṅ

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 (but k- corrected by n-). Mf2, K9 above the line, (G); L1 niṅāo

K2, F10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, (G); G25a, T44 . E4 napta; R1, R3 . Mf2, K9 above the line napta; FK1 niṅpati 2681

K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 above the line, (G) niṅkā; L5 niṅkāk; FK1 n’ākae


Mf2, K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5 dahanāṁ; R1 . T46, P1, (G) dahanāṁ; G42, FK1 . K9 dahanāṁ 2680

P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.porādānt; G25a, T44 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . K9 tanu.porādānt; F10 . B2 tanu.porādānt; R1 anu.porādānt; R3 tanu.porādānt; T46 tanu.porādānt; E4 tanu.porādānt; FK1 tanu.porādānt

K2, G25a, F10 . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); T44, R1 | maṛaṭ. abhū. mazāṅ |; R3 ṡaḥā | ṡaḥā | L1, B2, P1 . Mf2 maṛaṭ; L5 maṛaṭ; K9 ṡaḥā | ṡaḥā | maṛaṭ. abhū. |

G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 pāncācā; FK1 pācācā 2702

Mf2; K2 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, (G) viṅsita; G25a . K9 viṅsita; F10 viṅsita; T44, R1 . R278, G42, FK1 viṅsita; R3 viṅsita; E4 viṅsita; L5 viṅsita 2702

Mf2; K2, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, L5 dahanāṁ; G25a dhahanāṁ; R1 . T46, P1 (G) dahanāṁ; G42 . K9 dahanāṁ; E4 dahanāṁ; FK1 dahanāṁ

B2, R278, P1, Br1, (G); K2, F10, T44, R1 . T46, E4 pāncā. 2702 G42 . F1K pāncā. 2702 G42 . K9 pāncā. 2702
“And when the grandfather dies or the grandmother dies, how long must (one) wait (because) of them (before entering into the house), the grandson with regard to his grandfather, the granddaughter with regard to her grandmother? How long for the pious? How long for the tanupāuḥl sinners?”

And Ahura Mazda said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the tanupāuḥl sinners.”
granddaughter] with regard to her grandmother? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

Av. niāka- (12.9a)

This Avestan word corresponds to OP. niğaka-. According to Szemerényi (1950 235-236), OP. niğaka- stems from *ni-āyaka-, which in its turn would stem from IE. *aɣo- “grandfather”. Since Old Persian lacks contractions found in later periods, he explained the alleged contraction of this Old Persian word because of the influence of Middle Persian and the reduction of a quadrisyllabic *ni-āyaka- “on account of their frequent occurrence (...) to reduce their volume” (sic).

I must add that Szemerényi simply forgot that OP. niğaka- is confirmed by Av. niāka-, where no contraction occurs. As far as it is very unlikely that the same contraction occurred in both languages, I think, against his explanation, that a form *niğaka- already existed in Old Iranian.

Av. pANCACA. visaitica (12.9b)

Regarding Av. pANCa⁸, vid. (Miyakawa 1998), who explains the long vowel – ā⁸ as an Indoiranian saḿdhi *pANCa-ca of an old collective in parathetic numbers.
12.10. |a| dātara. gaēdanam. 2715 |astuaita| |ngam. 2716 a'āum. ku'da. 2717 |yao|da|ān|i| |ku'da. 2719 bun. 2720 yao|ā|da|ā|a|; 2721 a'ā|t. ma'at, 2722 aburō. mazā|ā|, 2723 *dri|s.|frasnā|ti|; tanunąm. 2724 *dri|s.|frasnā|ti|; 2725 vastaran|ā|m, 2726 *dri|s.|frasrūi|ti|, 2727 gādanam. 2728 imā|ā. 2729 ātr. |yaza|ē|ta, 2730 barosma. 2731 staroma|ē|ta. 2732 a'ūjū. 2733 var|p|hūbii|ū. 2734 za|ō|dvā, 2735 bara|ē|ta. 2736 yao|ā|da|ā|a; pasc|ā|ta, 2730 bun. 2731 nāmā. 2732 *vasō.|up|ā|ti|.

2715 Mf2; K2, R3 . L1, R278, P1 . K9 |ī'ā|/ |gā|da|ā|n|am. |astuaita| |ngam. |a'āum. |k|u|d|a. |G25a, F10, T44, R1 . FK1 |gā|da|ā|n|am. |astuaita| |ngam. |a'āum. |k|u|d|a. |B1, L2, G42, E4, L5 |ī'ā|/ |gā|da|ā|n|i| |ku'da. 2719 |yao|da|ā|n|i|; B1, L2, G42, E4, L5 |ī'ā|/ |gā|da|ā|n|am. |astuaita| |ngam. |a'āum. |k|u|d|a. |Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 |ī'ā|/ |gā|da|ā|n|am. 2721 a'ā|t. ma'at, |a|burrō|mazā|ā|2, 2723 *dri|s.|frasnā|ti|; tanunąm. 2724 *dri|s.|frasnā|ti|; 2725 vastaran|ā|m, 2726 *dri|s.|frasrūi|ti|, 2727 gādanam. 2728 imā|ā. 2729 ātr. |yaza|ē|ta, 2730 barosma. 2731 staroma|ē|ta. 2732 a'ūjū. 2733 var|p|hūbii|ū. 2734 za|ō|dvā, 2735 bara|ē|ta. 2736 yao|ā|da|ā|a; pasc|ā|ta, 2730 bun. 2731 nāmā. 2732 *vasō.|up|ā|ti|.
“Maker, Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” And Ahura Mazda said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gādās thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barasman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Spitama Zaraduṣṭrā.”

A. |a| d’t’l |gh| n |st’wmnd’ n |hlwb |cygwn m n |ywš’d’slynyt |cygwn YHWWN-t DKYA |c| AP-š gwpt ‘wrhmzd’ 3 b’l HLLWN-yt tn |3 b’l HLLWN-yt wstly |3 b’l pr’c sl’dšnk g’s’n` ZNE KON `thš yct |blsm

|a| apāṃ. |vāsō.upāiti. |uriaraṇaṃ. |vāsō.upāiti. |amšaṇaṃ. |spontanam. |spitama. |zaraduṣṭra.

|b| “Maker, Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” And Ahura Mazda said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gādās thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barasman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Spitama Zaraduṣṭrā.”
ASLWN-x₁²⁷⁶² MYA y²⁷⁶³ ŠPYL zwhl²⁷⁶² bld DKYA AHL YHWNN-t²⁷⁶³ m’n’ |d|
k’mk lpd MYA²⁷⁶⁴ k’mk lpd’wlwl k’mk lpd²⁷⁶⁵ mhrspnd’n²⁷⁶⁶ spy’t’m’n²⁷⁶⁷ zltwhšt²⁷⁶⁸

B. [a] dʾtʾl²⁷⁶⁹ [a] cygwn npšt’

A. [a] dādār *gehān *astōmandān ablāw [b] čiyōn mān yōjdārēnēd čiyōn būd pāk [c] u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār soyēd tan sē bār soyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srayišnag gābān ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb ī web zōhr bard pāk pas būd mān |d| kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

B. [a] dādār |a| čiyōn nibišt

A. [a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how will he purify the house? How will it be pure?” [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. Then the house will be pure. [d] The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt.”

And when the grandson dies or the granddaughter dies, how long must (one) wait (because of them) before entering into the house, the grandfather with regard to his grandson, the grandmother with regard to her granddaughter? How long for the pious? How long for the

---

2770 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2 yaṭ
2771 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); K2 para.iriđiæeiti; F10 para.iriđiæi; T44 para.iriđiæi; R3 para.iriđiæi; E4 para.iriđiæi; L5 pari.iriđiæe; FK1 para.iriđiæi; K9 para.iriđiæi
2772 F10 . B2, Br1, L5, FK1, (G); K2 . L1, P1, L2, G42 nipti; G25a, T44 napta; R1 . E4 nipti; R3 . Mf2 napte; R278 = nipti. va. para.iriđiæi | K9 napte
2773 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B1, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T46 naptivā
2774 G25a, R1 . L1, B1, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); K2, R3 para.iriđiæi; F10, T44 para.iriđiæi; E4 para.iriđiæi; L5 para.iriđiæe; FK1 para.iriđiæi; K9 para.iriđiæi
2775 Mf2; K2, G25a . FK1 . K9 aēşim; F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aēşim; R1 . T46, P1 aēşim; (G) aēşim
2776 T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, F10, T44, R3 . FK1 upa.māṇiṇi; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 upa.māṇiṇi; R1 upa.māṇiṇi; E4 upamāṇiṇi; L5 upamāṇiṇi; (G) upa.māṇiṇi
2777 K2a in the right margin, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, R1 = niākō. ... napti ~
2778 R3 . E4 . K9, (G); K2a in the right margin, G25a, F10, T44 in the right margin . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G) niākē; F10 . L5 niākē; FK1 niākē
2779 K2a in the right margin, G25a, F10 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, (G); T44 . R278, P1 napta; R3 . Mf2, K9 napte; E4, L5 FK1 napati
2780 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5 dābmanām; R1 . T46, P1, (G) dābmanām; R3 dābhāṅgam; G42, FK1 dābhāṅgam; K9 aēşim. dābhāṅgam
2781 R1 . P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 tānapu.oroṇāṃ; G25a, F10, R3 tānapu.oroṇāṃ; T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . K9 tānu.oroṇāṃ; T46 tānu.oroṇāṃ; E4 tānu.oroṇāṃ; FK1 tānu.oroṇāṃ
2782 K2, G25a . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) | mraot. abhūrō. mazā | R3 = iā/ da; L1, B2, P1 . Mf2 mrao; L5 mrao; K9 iā | mraot. abhūrō =
2783 F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, G25a (but corrected prima manu in the right margin as paṇcāca); R1 paṇca.ḍasa; L1 paṇcā.ca
2784 K2, R1 = viṣātica | F10 viṣātica; T44 viṣāta; G25a in the right margin . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2 . Mf2, (G) viṣātica; R278, G42 viṣātica; Br1 viṣātica; E4, L5 viṣātica; FK1 viṣātica; K9 viṣātica
2785 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 dābmanāṃg; R1 . T46, P1, (G) dābmanāṃg; R3 viṣāti.ca.dabmanāṃ; L5 dabmanāṃg; FK1 . K9 dabmanāṃg
2786 R278, T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2, G25a (but corrected prima manu in the right margin as paṇcā.ṣatam), R1 ḍrīṣtam; F10, T44, R3 . E4, L5 paṇcā.ṣatam; L1, L2, G42 paṇcā.ṣatam; B2 paṇcā.ṣatam; Br1 paṇcā.ṣtam; FK1 paṇcā.ṣtam
2787 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 tānapu.oroṇāṃ; G25a, R3 tānapu.oroṇāṃ; F10 tānapu.oroṇāṃ; T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . K9 tānu.oroṇāṃ; E4 tānu.oroṇāṃ; L5 tānu.oroṇāṃ
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And Ahura Mazdā said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the tanu.ərəϑa- sinners.”

A. |a| ADYN’ MNW nyy’k²⁷⁹⁰ BRA YMYTWN-yt nyy’k²⁷⁹¹ ’ywп BRA YMYTWN-yt cnd OLE-s’n’ QDM NTLWN-šnk²⁷⁹² ny’k MN npk²⁷⁹³ ny’yk²⁷⁹⁴ MN npyh²⁷⁹⁵ cnd dhm’n’ cnd tn’pwlk’n’²⁷⁹⁶ |b| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd 15²⁷⁹⁷ dhm’n’ 30²⁷⁹⁸ tn’pwlg’n²⁷⁹⁹

B. |a| ADYN’ MNW npk BRA YMYTWN-yt’ ’ywп npky BRA YMYTWN-yt’ cnd²⁸⁰² OLE-s’n’ QDM KTLWN-šn’ ny’k MN npk W ny’ykyk MN npky²⁸⁰¹ OD²⁸⁰² cnd dhm’n’ OD cnd tn’pwlk’n’²⁸⁰³ |b| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd 25 dhm’n’ 50 tn’pwlg’n’

A. |a| ēg kē niyāg bē mīrēd niyāg ayāb bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar pāyišnag niyāg az nabag niyāyī az ’nabagi čand dahmān čand ’tanāpuhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd pānzdbah dahmān sīh ’tanāpuhlagān

B. |a| ēg kē nabag bē mīrēd ayāb nabage bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar mānīsn niyāg az nabag ud niyāge az nabage tā čand dahmān tā čand ’tanāpuhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd wīst ud panǰ dahmān panǰāh ’tanāpuhlagān

A. |a| “When the grandfather dies or the grandmother dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house), the grandfather with regard to his grandson, the grandmother with regard to her granddaughter? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Fifteen (days) for the pious, thirty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

B. |a| “When the grandson dies or the granddaughter dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house), the grandfather with regard to his grandson, the grandmother with regard to her granddaughter? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”
Av. *pañcāca*; *vīṣaïtica* and *pañcāsatōm* (12.11b)

Most manuscripts agree in the number of days in V 12.11, namely 25 for the pious and 50 for the *tanu.paraṇa*-sinners. However, K2 and R1 differ and prescribe 15 and 30 respectively:

a) 25 / 50 (G25, R3; F10, T44; VS)
b) 15 / 30 (K2, R1)

The PV manuscripts of the group β K2 and R1 differ from the rest. A further unexpected fact regarding the group β must be noticed. R3, which stems from K2, agrees with the VS manuscripts and the PV manuscript of the group γ. The scribe of G25, in his turn, copied the variants of the group β, but he compared with the PV manuscripts from Navsarī and introduced corrections. As I have already mentioned regarding the *stemma codicum* of the PV with the PT of V 12, this fact can be due to the *contaminatio* of β₁, which also affected R3.

The origin of these rare variants in K2 and R1, which are translated accordingly in the PT of V 12.11b in K2 and R1, is unknown to me. From the point of view of textual criticism, they could be explained as the result of two different recensions. Notwithstanding, from the point of view of the structure of V 12, it is more likely that the scribe of K2 simply made a mistake and that this was again copied by the scribe of R1. Actually, from V 12.11 onwards, there is a numerical regression of 25 / 50 days (12.11) > 20 / 40 days (12.13) > 15 / 30 days (12.15) > 10 / 20 days (12.17) > 5 / 10 days (12.19).

Numerical progressions and regressions are a usual compositional feature in the Avestan and Vedic literatures. In V 12 the numerical regression is parallel to that of the importance of the relatives. Hence the variant of K2, followed by R1, must be interpreted as a mistake, because in the numerical regression its variants 15 / 30 days of 12.11 and 20 / 40 days in 12.15 would break the sequence. Therefore, I have preferred the variant common to the VS manuscripts and to the rest of PV manuscripts in my edition.

2604 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G) . T46 dātra
2605 Mf2, K2, R3 . L1, R278, T46, P1. K9 /tā/ | gaēdanām. astuaitinām |; G25a, F10, T44, R1 . FK1 | gaēdanām. astuaitinām. aṣāum |; B2 gaēdanām; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 /tā /| gaēdanām. astuaitinām. aṣāum |; (G) | gaēdanām. ...
2606 B2 stunaītanām; Mf2 astuaitinām

2607 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 . F10 . E4, L5, FK1 namānām; R3 kuḍnānām
2608 K2, G25a, F10, R3 . L2, L5 yaoždañāmi; T44 yaoždañāmi; R1 /tā/ | yaoždañāmi .. bun |; L1, B2 yaoždañāmi; R278 yaoždañāmi; T46, P1, Br1, G42 yaoždañāmi; E4 yaoždañāmi; FK1 yaoždañāmi; Mf2 yaoždañāmi; K9 yaoždañāme

2609 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, R1 /tā/ | āṭat ...

2610 pascaēta |

2611 K2, G25a . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1; R3 /tā/ | dā; L1, R278, P1 . Mf2 mrao; L5 marao; K9 /tā/ | mrao. aburō |

2612 K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; R3 dris.frasnāiti; E4 dris.frasnāita; L5 ārū. frasnāiti; FK1 dris.frasnāiti; Mf2, K9 dris.frasnāiti


2614 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, FK1; Br1 dris.frasnūti; E4 dris.frasnāiti; L5 ārū. frasnūti; Mf2, K9 above the line dris.frasnāiti

2615 T46, P1 . Mf2, K2, R3 vastrañām; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 vastrañām; E4, L5, FK1 vastrañām; K9 above the line vastrañām

2616 R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42; K2 | dris.frasnūti. gādanām |; G25a dris.frasnūti; T46 dris.frasnūti; E4, FK1 dris. frasnāiti; L5 ārū. frasnāiti; Mf2, K9 dris.frasnūti


2618 K2, G25a . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9, R3 . FK1 imānō; L1, E4 āimānō

2619 K2, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42 . Mf2, K9, G25a; E4, L5, FK1 āṭaran; L2 ārōm

2620 K2, G25a, R3 . E4, L5, FK1 yazata; L1, P1 yazata; B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2 yazeta; G42 yazaeta; Mf2, K9 yazaeta

2621 G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9, K2, R3 barasā; E4 barasā; FK1 barasā

2622 Mf2, K9, K2, G25a, R3 staroṃita; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 staroṃeta; E4 staroṃita; L5 staroṃeta; FK1 staroṃiti

2623 G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9; K2 zuoḍrā. ajiū; L5 ajiū

2624 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 vaṃhibū; Mf2, K9 vaṃhibū

2625 K2, G25a . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; R3 zaṣdrā; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 zuoḍrā; E4 zuoḍrā

2626 Mf2, K9, K2 baraṭa; G25a . Br1, L5, FK1 baraṇi; R3 baraṭai; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 baraṇeta; E4 baraṇa

2627 K2 . FK1; G25a . Br1, L2, G42 yaoždāta; R3 yaoždāta; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždāta; B2, R278 yaoždāta; T46 ajiū>yaoždāta; E4 yaoždāta; L5 yaoždāti
apāṃ. 2834 + vasō.upāiti. 2835 uruārānāṃ. 2836 + vasō.upāiti. 2837 x amāṣānāṃ. 2838 spōntaṇāṃ. 2839 spitama. 2840 zaraṇḍuṣṭra. 2841
[a] “Maker, Righteous, [b] how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” And Ahura Mazdā said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gādhas thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barāsman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Spitama Zaraṇḍuṣṭra.”

A. [a] d’t’l gyh’n 2842 ’st’wmnd’n 2843 ’hlwb’ 2844 [b] cygwn m’n 2845 yws’d’slynvt 2846 cygwn YHWNN-t DKYA |c| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd 3 b’l HLLWN-yty tn 2847 3 b’l HLLWN-yt wstl 2848 3 2849 b’l pr’e slyt g’s’n’ ZNE KON ‘ths 2850 ycyt bslwm 2851
B. [a] d’t’l [b] cygwn npšt’

A. [a] dādār gēhān astōmandān ahlaw [b] čīyōn mān yōjdāsreṇēd čīyōn būd pāk [c] u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār sōyēd tan sē bār sōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyēd gāhān ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb weh zōhr bard yōjdēr pas būd mān [d] kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

B. [a] dādār [b] čīyōn nibišt

A. [a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how will he purify the house? How will it be pure?” [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. Then the house will be purified. [d] The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt.”


---

2852 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 ŠPYYL
2853 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 ʾywydʾsl
2854 (Jmp); K2, R3 lpt; G25a ŠGYTWN-d
2855 K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) ʾmṛspndʾn’
2856 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 spytmʾn
2857 G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) zltwšt’
2858 T44; F10 | cygwn npšt’ |


[a] “And when the nephew dies or the niece dies, how long must (one) wait (because) of them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanu.irdāṅga- sinners?” [b] And Ahura Mazdā said: “Twenty (days) for the pious, forty for the tanu.irdāṅga-sinners.”

A. [a] ADYN 2875 MNW BLWL-ŶLYDWN-k 2876 BRA YMYTWN-yt’ BLWL-zʾtkyh 2877 ywp BRA YMYTWN-yt cnd OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-šnk cnd dhm’n’ cnd tn pwlg’n’ 2878 [b] AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd 20 dhm’n’ 40 tn pwlg’n’ 2879

2873 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, T46, P1, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 2874 yāt. 

K2, R1 brātūrii; G25a, F10, T44 brātūrii; R3 . Mf2, K9, (G) brātūrii; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 brātūrii; R278 barā-turi. 2875 viisati. E4, FK1 barāturi; L5 barā-tuiri. 2876 R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G) K2 para.irdīieti; G25a para.irdīieti; F10, R3 para.irdīieti; T44 pari.irdīiati; E4 para.irdīiati; L5 para.irdīiati; FK1 pari.irdīiati 2877 K2, R1 brātūrii; G25a, F10, T44 brātūrii; R3 . Mf2, K9, (G) brātūrii; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 brātūrii; R278, L5 barā-turii; E4 barāturi; FK1 barāturi; 2878 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, Mf2, K9 above the line, (G) 2879 G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.irdīieti; F10 para.irdīieti; T44 pari.irdīiati; Br1 para.irdīieti; L5 para.irdīiati; FK1 pari.irdīiati 2880 K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G) L5 ¬ cuia. aēşim. upa.manaṅi ¬ 2881 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, R3 . FK1 . K9 aēşim; T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aēşim; R1 . T46, P1 aēşim; (G) aēşim 2882 R1 (second — scratched). T46 . Mf2; K2, F10, T44 . E4, FK1 upa.manaṅi; G25a . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 upa.manaṅi; R3 upa.manaṅi; L1, P1 upa.manaṅi; (G) upa.manaṅi 2883 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 daḥmaṅi; R1 . T46, P1, (G) daḥmaṅi; E4, L5 daḥmaṅi; FK1 daḥmaṅi 2884 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.irdāṅgam; G25a tanu.irdāṅgam; F10 tanu.irdāṅgam; T44 tanu.irdāṅgam. 2885 R3 . FK1 tanu.irdāṅgam; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 tanu.irdāṅgam 2886 K2, G25a . B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) ¬ mrao. abuṛo. mazdā ¬ 2887 R3 4a / dā; L1, R278, T46, P1 . Mf2 mrao; K9 4a / ¬ mrao. abuṛo ¬ 2888 K2, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); G25a viisata; R3 . Mf2, K9 viisata; R278 viisata 2889 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 daḥmaṅi; R1 . T46, P1, (G) daḥmaṅi; L5 daḥmaṅi; FK1 daḥmaṅi 2890 L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, G25a, R1, R3 . FK1 caďārāsati; F10, T44 caďārāsati; T46, G42 caďārāsati; L5 caďārāsati 2891 R1 . T46, P1, (G); K2 tanu.irdāṅgam; G25a, R3 tanu.irdāṅgam; F10 tanu.irdāṅgam; T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . K9 tanu.irdāṅgam; E4 tanu.irdāṅgam; Mf2 tanu.irdāṅgam 2892 G25a, R3, (Jmp); K2, R1 A ¬ 5 gwpt ’whrmzd ADYN’ 2893 R1; K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp) /blank/ ¬ BLWL-ŶLYDWN-k ¬; G25b BRE BLWL 2894 R1; K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp) /blank/ ¬ BLWL-zʾtkyh ¬; G25b BRTE BLWL 2895 R1, (Jmp); K2, R3 tn pwlg’n’; G25a tn pwlg’n’
When the nephew dies or the niece dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpulb sinners? |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty (days) for the pious, fourty for the tanāpulb sinners.”

Av. *brātūriiō, *brātūriiā (12.13a)

Following the IrVS manuscripts, Geldner (1896) edited Av. brātruiiō and brātruiie in V 12.13, but Av. tūriiō and tūriiā in 12.15. Geldner’s first mistake was to have edited —ō (Masc.) / —ē (Fem.) in 12.13, but —ō (Masc.) / —a (Fem.) in 12.15. The second one was not to have taken into account their respective etymologies.

Av. *brātūriiā- stems from OIr. *brātərəja- < OIr. *brātərəja –< IIr. *bʰraHtryiia- < IE. *bʰreb₂tryiío–; cf. Ved. bhratrəya- “nephew” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.281), (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52, 94), (Fischer 1998 83). Av. tūriiā- stems from OIr. *tərəja- < *(p)tərəja- < IE. *ph₂tryiío–; cf. Ved. pitṛṣya- “uncle” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.130), (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52, 94), (Fischer 1998 84). In both cases the same syllabic sequence, namely IE. *ṛṃ̣ỹjo–, is repeated. So we expect that the same result appears in both, as noticed by Hoffmann & Narten (1989 73, n.126). According to them the variant brātūriiā- of some manuscripts lead to a reconstruction as OIr. *brātṛyriiä-. 2882

Hoffmann & Forssman (1996 52) thus corrected Geldner’s brātruiiia- by +brātūriiia-, which however must be corrected as *brātūriiō and *brātūriiā respectively, since as such it is not attested in any manuscript.

Regarding the meaning “nephew” and “niece” for Av. brātruiiia- and brātruiiä- respectively, vid. (Wackernagel 1916 2).

2879 R1, (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 tn’pwlk’n’
2880 F10; T44 A -ṣ gwpt ‘whrmzd ADYN’
2881 F10; T44 tn’pwlk’n’
2882 F10; T44 tn’pwlk’n’
2883 The same development of IIr. *ṛỵiia- > OIr. *ṛỵiia- > Av. *tūriiā- is found in Av. apūriiā- and siỵiia- (Cantera 1999c 45-46).
12.14. \[a\] dātara. 2889 gaēdanam. 2885 * astuwaitingam. 2886 aṣāṃ. \[b\] kuḍa. 

\[a\] ndānmem. 2883 yaoždaḍaṃi. 2889 bun. 2890 yaoždāna. 2892 aṭṭ. mraoṣ. aburō. 2893 mazā. * diṛi. frasnāitī. 

vastaranam. 2897 * diṛi. frasnāitī. 2898 gādaṇam. 2899 imā. nō. 2900 āṭram. 

yazaṛā. 2902 barasam. 2903 starmaṇa. 2904 aiṣū. vaṇhubhiū. 2905 zoaḍā. 

baraṇa. 2907 yaoždāna. pascaṭa. 2908 bun. 2909 nmaṇa. + vaṣo. upāitī.

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam. 

\[a\] gaēdanam. astuwaitingam. aṣāṃ \[b\] gaēdanam.
A. [a] “Maker, Righteous, [b] how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” And Ahura Mazdā said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gādās thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the 

"barasman," he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Špitaṃa Zarāthuštra.”

G25a . Mf2; K2, R3 pascita; L1, P1, E4 pascita; B2 pasca; R278, Br1, L2, G42 pascaeta; T46 pascata; L5 pascaeta; FK1 pascaeta; K9 pascaeti

K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; Mf2, K9 bin

L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; K2 nmāni; G25a nmāne; R3 namāni; Br1 ṇmāna; E4 namāna; L5, FK1 namāne

K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . K9; E4 vasō.upāita; Mf2 vasō.upāiti

T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 apām

K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5; E4 vasō.upāita; FK1 vasō.upāiēi; Mf2, K9 vasō.upāiti

T46, P1 . Mf2; K2 ūriaranām; G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 ūriaranām; L5 ūriaranām; FK1 ūriaranām

G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; K2 vasō-| upāi |-; E4 vasō.upāita; Mf2, K9 vasō.upāiti


T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9 spōnānām; L5 spōnānām

F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); K2, R3 spītma; T44 spītami

K2, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; G25a . T46 spītamazarāthuštra; R3 . E4, L5 zarāthušτara

K2, R3 gh'n'; G25a gh'n'; R1, (Jmp) -| gh' n' ... 'hlwb' -

G25a; K2' stmn'd n; R3' st mn'd n

G25a; K2, R3 'hlwb'y

G25a, R1, (Jmp); K2, R3 cy cygwn

G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 m'n; R1 NPSE -| m'n' ... zlhwšt' -

(Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 'ywys'd'slynyt

G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) HLLWNYnšnk

(Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 tn'h

G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) HLLWNYnšnk

K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) wstlg

G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) sl'dšnk

G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 'tš

G25a; K2, R3 yct; (Jmp) yct

G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) bslm

G25a, (Jmp)
B. [a] dʾtʾl [b] cygwn npʾtʾ

A. [a] ḏādār ġēḥān astōmandān ahlaw [b] čīyōn mān yōjdārēnēd čīyōn būd pāk [c] u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār šoyēd tan sē bār šoyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyišn gābān ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb weh zōhr bard pāk pas būd mān [d] kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān spitāmān zardušt

B. [a] ḏādār [b] čīyōn nibišt

A. [a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how will he purify the house? How will it be pure?” [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. Then the house will be pure. The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zardušt.”

And when the uncle dies or the aunt dies, how long must (one) wait (because of them) before entering into the house? How long for the pious? How long for the 
tanu.ẓerādā- sinners? “Fifteen (days) for the pious, thirty for the pious?” And Ahura Mazdā said: “Fifteen (days) for the pious, thirty for the 
tanu.ẓerādā- sinners.”
B. [a] ADYN’ MNW 4-wm BRE BRA YMYTWN-yt’ ʾywq 4-wmyh BRTE BRA YMYTWN-yt’ ʿqd 2968 OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-š’n’ OD ʿqd dhm’n’ ʿqd 2969 tn’pwlk’n’ 2972 [b] AP-š gwpt’ ʾwrhmzd 15 dhm’n’ 30 tnʾpwlgʾnʾ

A. [a] ʾeg kē rid brādar bē mīrēd rid brādarēn ayāb bē mīrēd çand awēšān abar mānīnag çand dāhmān çand ʾtanāpuhlagʾn |b| u-š guft ohrmazd wīsṯ dāhmān čehel ʾtanāpuhlagʾn

B. [a] ʾeg kē čahārom pus bē mīrēd ayāb čahārome duxt bē mīrēd çand awēšān abar mānīn tā çand dāhmān çand ʾtanāpuhlagʾn |b| u-š guft ohrmazd pānzdah dāhmān sih ʾtanāpuhlagʾn

A. [a] “When the uncle dies or the aunt dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty (days) for the pious, fourty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

B. [a] “When the fourth son dies or the fourth daughter dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Fifteen (days) for the pious, thirty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

Av. tūirīa- → Phl. čahārom pus; Av. tūirīā- → čahārome duxt (12.15a)

Only the Pahlavi translators of B and R1 translated Av. tūirīa- and tūirīā-, while the translator of R1 interpreted correctly Av. tūirīa- by Phl. pid brādar “brother of the father > uncle” and created a feminine Phl. pid brādarēn “sister of the father > aunt” from the Pahlavi masculine.


2962 R1; G25a (G25b adds 4-wm) BRTE; R3 dwht
2963 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a NTLWN-šnʾk
2964 G25a; K2, R1, R3, (Jmp) tnʾpwlgʾnʾ
2965 K2, R1; G25a 10; R3, (Jmp) 15
2966 K2, R1, R3; G25a 20; (Jmp) 30
2967 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a tnʾpwlkgʾnʾ
2968 F10; T44 OD ʿqd
2969 F10; T44 OD ʿqd
2970 F10; T44 tnʾpwlgʾnʾ
But a further confusion must be taken into account regarding the PT of B: Phl. čahârom pus and čahârome duxt do not render exactly Av. tūriia- and tūriiā-. As a result of the above mentioned mistake, we would expect simply Av. tūriia- → Phl. čahârom and Av. tūriiā- → čahârome. The addition of Phl. pus and duxt respectively is to be explained because either the Pahlavi translators of B felt the need to add these kinship names to make clear that Phl. čahârom and čahârome were not just numerals or rather because they just slipped into the PTs of the following Av. *tūriia.puṭra- and *tūriia.dvṛgar-. Indeed, according to the mistaken correspondence between Av. tūriia- → Phl. čahârom, the PTs čahârom pus and čahârome duxt translate correctly Av. *tūriia.puṭra- and *tūriia.dvṛgar-, which are just the PTs of these Avestan words in V 12.17a and 12.19a.

Av. paṇcā.dasa and ḍrisatən (12.15b)

As in the case in V 12.11, in this passage there are many differences in the number of days in the manuscripts. As far as the PV manuscripts are concerned, there are three main variants:

a) 20 and 40 (K2, R1)
b) 10 and 20 (G25)
c) 5 and 30 (L1, L2)
d) 15 and 30 (F10, T44; the rest of VS)

Although the VS manuscripts agree in the number of days prescribed for the tanu.parəda- sinners, they differ in those prescribed for the pious. Indeed, in L1 and L2 only paṇca is written. The scribe of P1, which stems from L1, also wrote only paṇca, but when collating another manuscript he added dasa above the line; this is also found in Br1.

It is not easy to explain why so many discrepancies originated in the transmission of this passage, either orally or written. In any case we find a numerical regression from V 12.11 onwards (25 / 50 days in 12.11; 20 / 40 days in 12.13; 15 / 30 days in 12.15; 10 / 20 days in 12.17; 5 / 10 days in 12.19), so that we expect 15 / 30 days in V 12.15 in order to follow the sequence of the regression. Because of this, I have preferred to edit paṇca.dasa and ḍrisatən respectively.

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9, (G); T46 dätar Mf2; K2, R3. R278, T46, P1. K9 āta / ~ gaëdanām. astuwaitinüm | | G25a, F10, T44, R1. FK1 ~ gaëdanām. astuwaitinüm. aśāum | | B2 gaēdanām; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. āta / ~ gaëdanām. astuwaitinüm. aśāum | | (G) ~ gaëdanām. ... zarādūśīra | | B2 stuwaitanām; Mf2 astuwaitinüm K2, G25a, T44, R1. B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, F10. L1, R278, P1, FK1 namānum; R3 kuda namānum; E4, L5 kuda namānum K2, G25a, F10, T44. Br1, L2, G42. K1 yaozdādāmī. R1 āta / ~ yaozdādāmī. ... spitāma | | R3 yaozdādāmī; L1, B2, R278, P1 yaozdādāmī; T46, G42 yaozdādāmī; E4, FK1 yaozdādāmī; Mf2, K9 yaozdādāmā K2, G25a. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9; F10 ~ kuda. ... spitāta | | T46 ~ kuda. ... spitāta | | K2, G25a. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R3. T46 kudābun; Mf2, K9 bin K2, G25a, F10, T44. Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R3. T46 kudābun; Mf2, K9 bin K2, G25a, F10, T44. Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R3. T46 kudābun; Mf2, K9 bin K2, G25a. B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R3 āta / dā; L1, R278, P1. Mf2 mraot. K9 āta / ~ mraot. aburō | | K2, G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. E4 drīf. frasnaśī; L5 daris. frasnaśī; Mf2, K9 drīf. frasnaśī T46, P1. Mf2; K2. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42. K9 vastranām; G25a. E4, L5 vastranām; FK1 vastranāṁga | | G25a. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42; K2 drīf. frasruata; R3 vastranām; drīf. frasruata; Br1 drīf. frasnaśītī; E4 drīf. frasūtī; L5 daris. frasūtī; FK1 drīf. frasūtī; Mf2 drīf. frasūtī; K9 drīf. frasūtī P1. Mf2; K2 gāṇmā; G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5. K9 gāṇmā; T46 gāṇmā; E4 gā. dānum. K2, G25a. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9; R3. L1, L5. FK1 mānō R3. L1. B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9; K2, G25a. R278, E4, L5. FK1 ātārām K2, G25a, R3. T46, L5. FK1 yazāta; L1 yazāta; B2, R278, Br1, L2 yazāeta; P1, G42 yazāeta; E4 yazīete; Mf2, K9 yazāeta G25a. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, L5. Mf2, K9; K2, R3. FK1 barasā; Br1 barasā; E4 barasāmā; L5 barīṣa FK1. Mf2; K2, R3 staranāta; G25a starmaētī; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 staranāta; E4 staranāta; L5 staranāta; K9 staranāta G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. FK1. Mf2, K9; K2 ~ ajiū; vayuhūbī | | G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 vayuhūbī; T46, E4 vayuhūbī; L5 vayuhūbī; Mf2, K9 vayuhūbī K2, G25a. B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5; L1. P1. Mf2, K9 zaodṛā; FK1 zaodṛā Mf2, K9; K2 brātā; G25a. L5 barātī; R3 zaodṛābarātā; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 baraēta; FK1 baraēti
Maker. Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?" And Ahura Mazda said: "By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gādās thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barasman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficient Immortals at will, o Śpitama Zarađuśra."

\[ \text{apām.} + \text{vasō. upāiti.} + \text{uruvanām.} + \text{vasō. upāiti.} + \text{amānām.} + \text{spatanām.} + \text{spitama.} + \text{zaraddvāra.} \]

A. \[ \text{dṭl gyh} \text{ān.} \text{st} \text{wmnd} \text{ān.} \text{hlwb.} \text{cygwn} \text{m} \text{ān.} \text{yωshl'slynt} \text{cygwn.} \text{YHWWN-t DKYA} \text{|a| AP-š gwpt 'wrhmzd 3 b} \text{āl' HLLWN-} \text{yt } \text{tn} \text{3 b} \text{āl HLLWN-} \text{yt} \text{wstly 3 b} \text{āl prc sl'yt g's n' ZNE KON 'tš} \text{ycyt blswm} \]\n
995 \text{R} \text{3} \text{. L} \text{5} \text{; K} \text{2} \text{yaozdāta; G25a yaozdāta; L1 yaozdāta; B2, R278, P1. Mf2, K9 yaozdāta; T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 yaozdāta; E4 yaozdāta.}

996 \text{G25a. Mf2, K9, K2, R3 pascita; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 pasceta; E4 pascita; L5 pascatā; FK1 pascātē.}

997 \text{K2, G25a, R3. L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; B2, T46 bin; Mf2, K9 bin.}

998 \text{K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9; G25a namān; R3 namān; E4 namān; L5, FK1 namān.}

999 \text{K2, G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; E4 vasō. upāita; Mf2, K9 vasō. upāiti.}

1000 \text{T46, P1. Mf2; K2, G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 apām.}

1001 \text{K2, G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; E4 vasō. upāita; Mf2, K9 vasō. upāiti.}

1002 \text{T46, P1. Mf2; K2, G25a. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 uruvanām; R3 uruvanām.}

1003 \text{K2, G25a. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; R3 vasō. upāiti; E4 vasō. upāita; Mf2, K9 vasō. upāiti.}

1004 \text{K2. R278, E4, L5, FK1. K9 amānān; G25a. L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 amānān; R3 amānān; T46, P1. Mf2 amānān.}

1005 \text{T46, P1. Mf2; K2, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, FK1. K9 spatanač; G25a spatanač; G42 spatanač.}


1007 \text{K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9; R3 spītama.}

1008 \text{E4 zṛaddvāra; L5 zaraddvāra; FK1 spatanačmazāraddvāra.}

1009 \text{K2, R3; G25a gyhān; R1. (Jmp) + gyhān 'hlwb' +}

1010 \text{G25a; K2 stmnān; R3 'stmn d'n'.}

1011 \text{G25a; K2, R3 'hlwb'y}

1012 \text{K2, G25a, R3 mān; R1 npšt.}

1013 \text{K2, R3 'ywyo'slynt; G25a 'ywyo'sl}

1014 \text{K2, G25a, (Jmp); R3 cygwa}

1015 \text{K2, G25a, (Jmp); R3 bār}

1016 \text{K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a HLLWN-yt}

1017 \text{G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 tn'hl}

1018 \text{K2, G25a, (Jmp); R3 HLLWN-yt}

1019 \text{K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) wstlg}

1020 \text{(Jmp); K2, R3 'sl'yt +; G25a sl'dšn'.}
B. [a] d’ťl [b] cygwn npšt

A. [a] dādār x gēhān astōmandān ahlaw [b] cīyōn mān yōjdāsrēnēd cīyōn būd pāk [c] u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār sōyēd tan sē bār sōyēd wastarāy sē bār frāz srāyēd gāhān ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bāndēd āb weh zōhr bard pāk pas būd mān [d] kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

B. [a] dādār [b] cīyōn nibišt

A. [a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how will he purify the house? How will it be pure?” [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. Then the house will be pure. [d] The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt.”


3020 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 `tš
3021 G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) blsm
3022 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 zwl
3023 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a YBLWN-t
3024 K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) YHWWN-yt
3025 (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd; G25a SGYTWN-t
3026 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a lwd
3027 K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) `mhrs`nd’n`
3028 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 spytm’n`
3029 G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) zltwšt
And when the male cousin dies or the female cousin dies, how long must (one) wait (because) of them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanu.pārāda- sinners?”
A. [a] “When the fourth son dies or the (...) daughter dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” [b] And Ohrmazd said: “Ten (days) for the pious, twenty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

B. [a] “When the fourth son’s son dies or the fourth daughter’s daughter dies, how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” [b] And Ohrmazd said: “Ten (days) for the pious, twenty for the tanāpuhl sinners.”


|3065| B2 astunaitaṇaṃ; Mf2 astunaitaṇaṃ

|3066| K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 ; F10 namāṇaṃ ; L1, R278, P1, FK1 namāṇaṃ; E4, L5 kuḍānamāṇaṃ

|3067| K2, F10, T44 . Br1, L2, G42, L5 yaoḍaḍaṇi; G25a . T46 yaoḍaḍaṇi ; R1 |tā/ |→ yaoḍaḍaṇi. ... spitama . ; R3 . FK1 yaoḍaḍaṇa ; L1, B2, P1 yaoḍaḍaṇi ; R278 yaoḍaḍaṇa ; E4 yaoḍaḍaṇa; Mf2, K9 yaoḍaḍaṇe

|3068| K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9 ; F10 |→ kuḍa. ... spiṭaṇaṃ . ; T44 |→ kuḍa. ... spitama .

|3069| K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 ; R3 kuḍābun ; Mf2, K9 bīn

|3070| R3 . B2, Br1, L2; K2 yaoḍaṇa ; G25a . L5, FK1 yaoḍaṇi ; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoḍaṇa ; R278 yaoḍaṇa ; T46 yaoḍaṇa G42 yaoḍaṇa ; E4 yaoḍaṇa

|3071| K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 aṭ

|3072| K2 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; G25a |→ mraoṭ. abhuro. mazad ; ; R3 |tā/ dā;

|3073| L1, P1 . Mf2 mraoṭ. K9 |tā/ |→ mraoṭ. abhuro ;

|3074| K2 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2 ; L1 abhuromāṇa

|3075| K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 tanun ; R3 tanun ng

|3076| K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 ; R3 dṛi. frasnāṭi ; E4 dṛi. frasnāṭi ; L5 darii. dṛi. nāṇīti ; FK1 dṛi. frasnāṭi ; Mf2, K9 dṛi. frasnāṭi

|3077| T46, P1 . Mf2, K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 tanun ; R3 tanun ng

|3078| K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 ; R3 dṛi. frasnāṭi ; E4 dṛi. frasnāṭi ; L5 darii. dṛi. nāṇīti ; FK1, Mf2, K9 dṛi. frasnāṭi

|3079| T46, P1 . Mf2, K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 vastraṇaṃ ; E4, L5 vastrārṇaṃ ; FK1 vastrārṇaṃ

|3080| G25a . R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; K2, R3 dṛi. frarsaṇaṭa ; L1 dṛi. frasnāṭi ; B2 dṛi. frasnāṭi ; E4 dṛi. frarsaṇaṭa ; L5 darii. frarsaṇaṭe ; FK1 dṛi. frarsaṇaṭe ; Mf2, K9 dṛi. frarsaṇi

|3081| T46, P1 . Mf2, K2, R3 gāḍaṇ ; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 gāḍaṇaṃ

|3082| K2, G25a . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5; R3 . L1, E4, FK1 . Mf2 imānō; K9 imānō

|3083| K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, R278, L5, FK1 ataram ; E4 atāro

|3084| K2, G25a, R3 . E4, L5, FK1 yazaṭa ; L1, R278, P1, G4 yazaṭa ; B2, T46, L1 yazaṭa ; Mf2, K9 yazaēta

|3085| G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9; K2, R3 baroṃa ; L5 baroṃa

|3086| Mf2; K2 starmaṇa ; G25a starmaṇi ; R3 staraṇa ; L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 starmaṇa ; B2, T46 starmaṇa ; E4 starmaṇa ; FK1 staraṇi ; K9 starmaṇa

|3087| K2, G25a, R3 . B2, R278, T46, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, L1, P1 aeviiū ; Br1 aeviū

|3088| K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 vakhyabùi ; L5 vakhyabùi ; Mf2, K9 vakhyabùi

|3089| K2, G25a . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; R3 zuḍrā ; L1, R278, P1 . Mf2, K9 zuḍrā ; E4 zuḍrā

|3090| Mf2; K2 barata ; G25a barati ; R3 . Br1, L5, FK1 barati ; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 baratha ; E4 braite ; K9 baraṇī

|3091| K2, R3 . L5, FK1; G25a yaoḍaṇi ; L1, B2, R278, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoḍaṇa ; T46, Br1, L2, G42 yaoḍaṇa ; E4 yaoḍaṇa

|3092| G25a . Mf2; K2 pascaṇa ; R3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 pascaṇa ; L1, E4, L5, FK1 pascaṭa
“Maker, Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” And Ahura Mazdā said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gaḏas thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barasman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Śpitama Zaraūdštra.”
B.  [a] d’t’l  [b] cygwn npš’t

A.  [a] dādār  xgēhān  xastōmandān  xahlaw  [b] čiyōn mān yōjdāsrēnēd čiyōn būd pāk  
   [c] u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār šoyēd tan sē bār šoyēd washtaray sē bār frāz srāyišnag  
   gāhān ēn nin ātaxš yaz  bār šōyēd barsoh bandēd āb ḃe ḃeh zōhr bārd pāk pas būd mān  
   [d] kāmag ōb kāmag ōraw ōwar kāmag ōraw amahraspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

B.  [a] dādār  [b] čiyōn nibišt

A.  [a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous,  [b] how will he purify the  
   house? How will it be pure?”  [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body  
   thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. His will  
   worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good  
   Waters. Then the house will be pure.  [d] The waters will come at will, the plants  
   will come at will, the Beneficents Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān  
   Zarduxšt.”


---

3119  G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd
3120  (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd; G25a SGYTWN-t
3121  K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) ’mḵspnd’n’
3122  (Jmp); K2 ʿ spytʾmʾn’  ; G25a, R3 spytmʾn’
3123  G25a; R3 zwltwšt; (Jmp) zltwšt
3124  F10; T44 ʿ dʾtʾl ʿ

|a| “And when the male cousin’s son dies or the female cousin’s daughter dies, how long must (one) wait (because of them) before entering into the house? How long for the tanu._DEST- sinners?” |b| And Ahura Mazdā said: “Five (days) for the pious, ten for the tanu._DEST- sinners.”

3125 K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R3. B2, R278, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1. L1, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 |āt. 3126 K2, G25a in the margin, R1. L1, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, F10. R278, E4, L5, FK1 |tūrīio.pudrō; 3127 T44 tūrīia.pudrō; B2 tūrīia.pudrō; Mf2, K9 tūrīia.pudrō; (G) tūrīia. pudrō 3128 K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); R3 tūrīia.pudrōvā; E4, L5 |vā. pudrō | 3129 K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R1 above the line, R3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); R278, G42 |vā. pudrō | 3130 G25a in the margin, R1. B2, R278, L2, G42. K9, (G); K2 para.iriđieiti; F10 para.iriđieiti; T44 pari.iriđieiti; R3 para.iriđieiti; L1 para.iriđieiti; T46, Br1 para.iriđieiti; E4 pari.aria.iriđieiti; L5 pari.aria. 3131 K2, G25a in the margin, R1. R278, Br1, L2, G42; T44 tūrīia.dųgās; R3 tūrīia.dųgās; L1 tūrīia.dųgās; B2, T46 tūrīia.dųgās; P1 tūrīia.dųgās; E4 tūrīia.dųgās; L5 tūrīia.dųgās; FK1 tūrīia.dųgās. Mf2, K9 tūrīia.dųgās; (G) tūrīia. dųgās 3132 R3. R278, P1 above the line, Br1 above the line, L5. Mf2, K9. K2 (with a blank), G25a in the margin, T44, R1 (with a blank). L1, B2, T46, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G) |vā. dųgās. para.iriđieiti |; 3133 F10 tūrīie.dųgārivā 3134 P1 above the line, Br1 above the line; F10. R278, L5 |dųgās |; Mf2, K9 dųgāsare 3135 R278; G25a in the margin. Br1, L2, G42 irt; F10 para.iriđieiti; R3 dųgāsapar.ariđieiti; P1 above the line iriđieiti; L5 pari.đieite; FK1 ari; Mf2, K9 |para.iriđieiti | 3136 R1. Mf2, K2, F10. FK1. K9 aēşm; G25a in the margin aetēşm; T44, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aēşm; T46, P1 aēşam; (G) aēşm 3137 T46, P1. Mf2, K2, F10, R3. E4, L5, FK1 upa.māṇi; G25a in the margin upa.māṇi; T44 upa.māṇi; R1 upa.māṇi; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42. K9 upa.māṇi; G25a upa.māṇi 3138 Mf2, K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, L5 dabmān; R1. T46, P1, (G) dabmān; G42. K9 daṃṇi; E4 dabmān; FK1 daṃṇi 3139 R1. T46, P1. Mf2, (G); K2, R3 tanpa._DEST. G25a in the margin tanpa._DEST. F10 tanpa._DEST. T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. K9 tanu._DEST. G25a tanu._DEST. L5 tanu._DEST. 3140 K2, G25a in the margin, F10. B2, T46, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); T44, R1 (with a blank) |mraot. abu. mazdā |; R3 |tā/j daļ; L1, R278, P1. Mf2 mraoģ. Br1 m'ōg; K9 |tā/j |mraot. abu. 3141 Mf2, K2, R3 dabmān; G25a in the margin, F10, T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42. K9, (G) dabmān; R1. T46, P1 dabmān; E4, L5 dabmān; FK1 daṃṇi 3142 K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); FK1 pandāsa 3143 R1. P1, (G); K2, R3 tanpa._DEST. G25a in the margin, F10 tanpa._DEST. T44. B2, R278, P1, G42, FK1. K9 tanu._DEST. T46 tanu._DEST. E4 dasatani._DEST. L5 daśatani._DEST. Mf2 tanu._DEST.
A. [a] ADYN’ \^MNW \^/blank/ BRA YMYTWN-\^yt \^/blank/ \^yw\^p \^BRA YMYTWN-\^yt cnd OLE-\^s’n’ QDM KTLWN-d \^cnd dhm’n’ cnd tn’\^pwl\^g’n’ |b| AP-\^s gwpt \^\^w\^h\^r\^m\^z\^d pnc dhm’n’ 10 tn’\^pwl\^g’n’

B. [a] ADYN’ MNW 4-wm BRE l’d BRE BRA YMYTWN-\^yt \^yw\^p 4-wm dwht cnd OLE-\^s’n’ QDM KTLWN-\^s’n’ OD cnd dhm’n’ OD cnd tn’\^pwl\^g’n’ |b| AP-\^s gwpt \^\^w\^h\^r\^m\^z\^d pnc YWM dhm’n’ 10 YWM tn’\^pwl\^g’n’

A. [a] ēg kē /blank/ bē mīrēd /blank/ ayāb bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar mānēnd čand dahmān čand x\^tanāpuhlagān |b| u-\^s guft ohrmazd pānj dahmān dah x\^tanāpuhlagān

B. [a] ēg kē čahārom pus rāy pus bē mīrēd ayāb čahārom duxt čand awēšān abar mānišn tā čand dahmān tā čand x\^tanāpuhlagān |b| u-\^s guft ohrmazd pānj rōz dahmān dah rōz x\^tanāpuhlagān

A. [a] “When (…) dies or (…) dies, how long must they wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Five (days) for the pious, ten for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

B. [a] “When the fourth son’s son dies or the fourth daughter’s (daughter dies), how long must (one) wait (because of) them (before entering into the house)? How long for the pious? How long for the tanāpuhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Five days for the pious, ten days for the tanāpuhl sinners.”

Av. tüiriia.duy\^da. \^vā. \^duy\^da. \^para.iri\^di\^i\^eiti (12.19a)

This very corrupt passage was not edited correctly by Geldner (1896), so that it was not fully understood. In order to shed some light on it, we must analyse the expected text according to the preceding passages of V 12.

At the beginning of V 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a and 17a we always find the sequence ā\^a\^t. yat. + masculine relative + para.iri\^di\^i\^eiti + feminine relative + vā + para.iri\^di\^i\^eiti. However, in V 12.19a we find the sequence ā\^a\^t. yat. tüiriia.pudrō. vā. pudrō. para.iri\^di\^i\^eiti. tüiriia.duy\^da, where the expected | vā. duy\^da. para.iri\^di\^i\^eiti | is lacking. So the sequence is broken in tüiriia.duy\^da, which shows variants like tüiriia. duy\^dairi which deserves an explanation.

---

\(^{3142}\) K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a in the margin ADYN’ MNW BRE BRA YMYTWN-\^yt \^yw\^p BRTE

\(^{3143}\) ADYN’ ... 10 tn’\^pwl\^g’n’ | R3 \^t ADYN

\(^{3144}\) K2, R1, (Jmp); R3 \^\^\^M\^N\^W \^|

\(^{3145}\) K2, R1, (Jmp); R3 YMYTWN-\^yt c

\(^{3146}\) K2, R3, (Jmp); R1 KTLWN-t

\(^{3147}\) In R3 -g n written under the line.
This variant can be explained in two ways: a) it reflects part of a compound; b) it is a corruption instead of τūiriia. duγδa. vā. duγδa. para.iriδieiti.

The first hypothesis was proposed by Bartholomae (1904 748). Although he followed Geldner’s edition τūiriia. duγδairi, he reconstructed a form *τūiriia. duγδades. duγδa. Thus Av. τūiriia. duγδairi, a corrupted form of *τūiriia. duγδades, would reflect the first two members of a longer compound, whose last member would be lost in the written transmission.

Bartholomae’s (1904 748) explanation is likely, but it neglects the parallelism attested in the rest of passages of V 12. Even if Av. τūiriia. duγδairi reflected *τūiriia. duγδades, would lack. The scribe of K2 already noticed that there were some missing words, so he left a blank in order to complete it at a later stage.

I propose a second hypothesis; in my opinion, the exact feminine counterpart of the sentence τūiriia. puδrō. vā. puδrō. para.iriδieiti would be τūiriia. duγδa. vā. duγδa. para.iriδieiti. If my interpretation is correct, the variant τūiriia. duγδai would not reflect *τūiriia. duγδades, but rather a copyist’s omission τūiriia. duγδa.< vā. duγδa. para.>iriδieiti>.

In some manuscripts there are traces of the words omitted. After τūiriia. duγδa R3, R278, P1 (above the line), Br1 (above the line), L5, Mf2 and K9 attest vā. After vā the IōRS manuscripts Mf2 and K2 preserve a variant of duγδa, but merged with the expected verb para.iriδieiti (Mf2, K9 τūiriia. duγδa. vā. duγδaire), but R3 and P1 (above the line) attest the right duγδa. Finally, only R278 attests the expected para.iriδieiti, while in P1 above the line the verbal form iriδieiti is written, and in L5 we find pari.δiete. The result is τūiriia. duγδa.iri in P1 and vā. duγδa. iriδieiti added above the line, that is, a sequence τūiriia. duγδa.iri. vā. duγδa. iriδieiti in P1. In L5 the result is τūiriie. duγδa. vā. pari.δiete. Accordingly, although both manuscripts are closer to the expected sequence, in P1 the preverb para is omitted, while in L5 duγδa is missing.

With so many error in the written transmission, we can understand why Geldner did not see any solution. Each manuscript proves to be important to find out that the parallel sentence τūiriia. duγδa. *vā. *duγδa. *para.iriδieiti was the basis of this confusion.

As for the source of this omission, I think that the common written source of Vidēvdād probably was a manuscript where both verbs para.iriδieiti were written para.iri.δieiti and *iri appeared at the beginning of the line in both cases:

āaτ. yaτ. τūiriia. puδrō. vā. puδrō. para.
iri.δieiti. τūiriia. duγδa. vā. duγδa. para.
iri.δieiti. cuuata. aeσam. upa.manaπaτ.

When copying τūiriia. duγδa this old source of all our extant manuscripts probably slipped into the next line due to a saut du même au même, omitted <vā. duγδa. para.> and copied the following *iri:

---

3148 cf. the variants where *iri is written between dots in V 12: L5 para.aere.δiiaeiti (12.1a); L5 para.iri.δiiaeite (12.3a); T46 para.iri.δieteiti (12.7a); L5 para.iri.δiiaeite (12.7a); FK1 piroari.iri.δiiteiti (12.7a); FK1 pairi.iri.δieteiti (12.9a); R3 τūiriopuδrōiriδiata (12.17a); FK1 pairi.airi (12.19a).
The result was not only the variant $tūiriia.\, duγδa.\, iri.$ but also an omission due to a confusion which only was partially noticed by the scribes of later manuscripts, like those of P1, Br1 and L5.
12.20. |a| dātā, gaṇḍām, x astuṇātan. aṇ. kaḍ. 

K2, G25a in the margin, F10, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9, (G); T44 dātā, T46 dātā


K2, G25a in the margin, T44, R1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Ms. 2, F10. E4, L5, FK1. namāṇa; R3 kāyastea

K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R3. B2, T46, Br1, L2, L5 kāyastea; R1 /ā/ — kāyastea. L5, FK1. kāyastea; R3 kūḍānāṇa; R1 /ā/ — kāyastea; R3 /ā/ — kāyastea; Ms. 9 kāyastea

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. R3 dṛṣṭ. kānāṇa; E4 dṛṣ. kānāṇa; L5 dṛṣṭ. kānāṇa; Mf2, K9 dṛṣṭ. kānāṇa

Ms. 2, F10, P1. Ms. 2, K2, G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. K9 tānuṇa; FK1 tānuṇa

K2, G25a in the margin, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. P1 dṛṣṭ. kānāṇa; E4 dṛṣṭ. kānāṇa; L5 dṛṣṭ. kānāṇa; Mf2, K9 dṛṣṭ. kānāṇa

Ms. 2, F10, P1. Ms. 2, K2, G25a in the margin, R3. B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, vāstāna; L1 vastra; E4, L5. K9 vāstāna

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. K2, G25a in the margin, R3 dṛṣṭ. karaṇa; R278 dṛṣṭ. karaṇa; E4 dṛṣṭ. karaṇa; L5 dṛṣṭ. karaṇa; Mf2, K9 dṛṣṭ. karaṇa

Ms. 2, F10, P1. Ms. 2, K2, R3 gāṇḍām; G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 gāṇḍām

K2, G25a in the margin. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. Ms. 2, L1, FK1 imānā; E4 āimānā


K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; T46. Ms. 2, K9 zaodrā

Ms. 2, K9. Ms. 2, K2 barata; G25a in the margin. Br1, L2, FK1 barata; R3 zaodrābarata; L1, B2, R278, P1, L2, G42, barata; T46 barata; E4 barata

B2, FK1. K2 zaodrā; G25a in the margin. L5 zaodrā; R3 zaodrā (with a hole at the end); L1, R278, P1. Ms. 2, K9 zaodrā; T46, Br1, L2, G42 zaodrā; E4 zaodrā

428
“Maker, Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?” And Ahura Mazdā said: “By the washing of their bodies thrice, by the washing of their clothes thrice, by the recitation of the Gādās thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barasman-, he must bring libations to the good Waters. Then the houses will be purified with the coming of the waters at will, with the coming of the plants at will, with the coming of the Beneficent Immortals at will, o Spitama Zaradūṣtra.”

A. [a] ʾd tʾl 3181 x g˚h ʾn 3182 x stdʾmn ʾn 3185 x hlwb 3186 |b| cygwn mʾn 3189 ywšdʾslynt cygwn bwd 3190 DKYA |c| AP-š gwpt 3192 whrmzd 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt tn 3193 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt wstly 3194 3 bʾl prʾc slʾdʾnk 3195 ʾssʾnʾ ZNE KON ʾss tš 3196 yct blsm
A. |a| dādār ḡēbān ḡastōmandān ḡahlaw |b| čyōn mān yōjādānēd čyōn būd pāk |c| uš guft ī ohrmazd sē bār sōyēd tan sē bār sōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyišnag gāhān ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb weh zōhr bard pāk pas būd mān |d| kāmag rāwd āb kāmag rāwd urwar kāmag rāwd amahrāspandān |e| spitāmān zardušt

B. |a| čyōn nibišt

A. |a| “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, |b| how will he purify the house? How will it be pure?” |c| And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gāϑās thrice. He will worship this fire now, he will bind the barsom, he will bring libations to the good Waters. Then the house will be pure. |d| The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, |e| o Spitāmān Zardušt.”

B. |a| As written.
II. Defilement when an infidel relative dies

12.21. |a| ąaṭ. 3204 ẏaṭ. 3202 kampaṭ. 3206 vā. 3207 taocularan. 3208 para.iriśīeti. 3209 yaḍa. 3210 ḍini.varṇa. 3211 ḍini.ṭkaeśa. 3212 cniṭ. spōntbhe. 3213 kaiču. 3214 dāman. 3215 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti. 3216 cniṭ. patti.raeśīeti. 3217 [a] “And when any other of the relatives dies, like one of another faith, of another doctrine, how many creatures of the Beneficent Spirit does he defile directly, how many does he defile indirectly?”

A. [a] ADYN’ MNW kt’l-c-HD 3218 ywp 3219 thwm’n’ BRA YMYTWN-yt’ cygwn 3220 xZK-yh 3231 k’mk 3222 xZK-yh 3223 DYNA 3224 cnd sp’mynwg 3225 d’m’n’ hm gwmhyt wnd QDM gwmhyt [PWN ptylyt] 3226

3204 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); Br1 ąt
3205 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9
3206 ẏaṭ
3207 Mf2, (G); K2 . R278, Br1, L2, E4 kampćī; G25a, R3 . G42, FK1 kampaṭī; P1 . L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9
3208 taocularan; G25a, T44 . B2, L2, G42 taocularan; F10 taocularan; R1 . P1 . Mf2 taocularan; R3 . L5, FK1 taocularan; L1, R278 . K9 taocularan; Br1 taocularan; E4 vataocularan
3209 G25a, R1 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.iriśīeti; F10 para.iriśīeti; T44 pari.iriśīeti; R3 pari.iriśīeti; L1, P1 para.iriśīeti; E4 para.iriśīeti; L5 para.iriśīeti; FK1 pāra.iriśīeti
3210 K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44
3211 = vā =
3212 T46, (G); K2 taocularan; G25a, T44 . B2, L2, G42 taocularan; F10 taocularan; R1 . P1 . Mf2 taocularan; R3 . L5, FK1 taocularan; L1, R278 . K9 taocularan; Br1 taocularan; E4 vataocularan
3213 G25a, K2 . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.iriśīeti; F10 para.iriśīeti; T44 pari.iriśīeti; R3 pari.iriśīeti; L1, P1 para.iriśīeti; E4 para.iriśīeti; L5 para.iriśīeti; FK1 pāra.iriśīeti
3214 K2, G25a, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . K9, (G); T44 spoḍta; R3 spoḍ be (with a hole in the expected –a–); E4 spoḍta; L5 spoṭbhe
3215 Mf2; K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9, (G) mainiśī; F10 mainiśī; L5 mainiśī; FK1 spoṭmamtāiśī
3216 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 dāman
3217 Mf2, (G); K2 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; G25a ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; F10 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; T44 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; R1 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; R3 . G42 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; L1, B2, R278 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; T46 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; P1 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; Br1 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; L5 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti; E4 ḍaṃ.raeśīeti
3218 K2, G25a, (Jmp); R1 ktl-c-HD; R3 ktl-c-H
3219 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3 ywp ywp spoṭmynwg
3220 K2, G25a, (Jmp); R1 cnd
3221 K2, R1, (Jmp) ZK; G25a ZK ZK-yh
3222 G25a; K2, R1, (Jmp) /blank/ k’mk
3223 K2, R1, (Jmp) ZK; G25a ZK ZK-yh
A. [a] “And when any other of the relatives dies, like one of another desire, of another law, how many creatures of the Beneficent Spirit does he defile directly, how many does he contaminate [with indirect defilement]?”

B. [a] “And when any other of the relatives dies, like one of another desire and another doctrine [that is, he has another religion], how many creatures of the Beneficent Spirit does he defile directly [with direct defilement], how many does he contaminate [with indirect defilement]?”

cf. V 5.35c (Cantera under preparation A 5.35) for cuuaṭ. spọntahe ... paiti. raēθaiieiti.

Av. șəniio. varma. șəniio. ṭkaēša (12.21a)

Only in V 12.21 and 15.2 both compounds appear together, while the second one is found in a fragment of the Nigādom Nask (Darmesteter 1886) and in VN 25, 30, 34, 37, 41, 78 and 82 (Humbach & JamaspAsa 1969).

According to Panaino (1993), both compounds would refer to some other faith different from the worship of the daēnuua-; otherwise Av. daēnuaiiasna- would be the term used. As he believes that Vidēvdād, the Vaeθā Nask and this fragment of the Nigādom Nask are late texts, he assumes that these Avestan compounds would refer not to the daēnuaiiasna-, but to the followers of the new religions with which the Zoroastrians came into contact.

In my opinion, it must be noticed that Av. șəniio. varma- and șəniio. ṭkaēša- appear in normative texts and probably refer to technical terms whose meaning is difficult to precise as a result of the sparse material we have at our disposal.
That they were attested in normative texts does not however imply that they are late. No linguistic study has demonstrated yet why texts like Vīdēvdād should be regarded as late compositions, simply because they have been transmitted in Young Avestan with some “ungrammatical” passages, as Skjærvø (2007a 108 ffl.) rightly notices.

Nor does the fact that the term Av. daēuuiiasna- was not used instead of Av. ñaniiō. varōna- and ñaniiō. tkaēsa- imply that the worshippers of the daēuu- were excluded by these compounds. Indeed, two passages could also reveal that they were included: VN 78 and 82: yezi. abe. ñaniiatkaēsa. narō. druuatō. ñaũhāiti “if there should be this of another doctrine, a liar man” (Humbach & JamaspAsa 1969 43-44). As we observe, ñaniiatkaēsa is equated with narō. druuatō. Since Av. druunant- usually designates in Avestan the worshipper of the daēu-, in my opinion there is no reason to think that the daēuuaiiasna- were excluded when the term Av. ñaniiō. tkaēsa- ñaniiatkaēsa- was used.
12.22. |a| āaŋ. mraŋ|3230| aburō|3230| mazdā. yada|3232| vayazaci;|3231| viš.husko.|3234| tarō. yare|3230| matori|3238| |b| jun|3234| zi|3239| spitama. zaraduštra|3240| matriio. druia|3242| bizangro. auadara. ašmaogy. |3236| anašana. spantahe. |3240| x maišius. damaŋamt. |3240| hapt.raeβiaiutei. |3231| |c| jun. patti.raeβiaiutei. |3232| jun. āpom. jaini. |3233| jun. ātrem. |3235| 

3252 K2, G25a, F10 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); T44, R1 (with a blank) |= mraŋ aburō. mazdā |=; R3 |= mraŋ. aburō |=; L1, P1 . Mf2 mraŋ; K9 |= ta |= mraŋ. aburō |=

3252 K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); F10 |= aburō. mazdā |=

3252 K2, G25a, F10, T44 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, P1, G42 . Mf2, K9 yada

3253 G25a . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, F10, T44, R1 vayazici; R3 yadavayazici; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 vayazici; R278, E4 vayazici; L5 vayazci.

3254 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; (G) / ta / viš.husko. ... apa.baraiti |

3254 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 trō

3254 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R1 . L1, P1 yāra; Mf2, K9 yāraṃ

3255 K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10, T44 . E4, L5 mario;

3256 K2, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; G25a . R278 zišū; L5 šįniūo

3256 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10 ži; E4 žiuōzi

3256 K2, G25a, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2; T44 spitama; E4 spitama; K9 spitama

3256 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2; F10 zarabušrī; R3 juvažispitamazarabuštra; E4 zarabuštra; L5 zarabuštra; K9 zarabuštra

3256 K2, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; G25a . Mf2, K9 murtio

3256 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 darrua

3256 Br1; K2, R1, R3 bizaryro; G25a bizaryro; F10 bizaryro; T44 bizaryro; L1, B2, R278, T46, L2, G42 bizaryro; P1 bizaryro; E4 bizaryro; L5 bizaryro; FK1 bizaryro; Mf2, K9 bizaryro

3256 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; G25a abuuda

3256 G25a, T44, R1: K2, R3 ašmōro; F10 . FK1 ašmōro; L1 ašmōro; B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4 ašmōro; R278 ašmōro; P1 ašmōro; L5 ašmōro; Mf2, K9 ašmōro

3256 R1; K2, R3 . B2, T46, L5 . K9 anašauna; G25a, F10 . FK1 anašauna; T44 anašauna; L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2 anašauna; E4 anašauna

3256 K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; T44 spantahe; R278 spantahe; E4 spantahe; L5 spinta

3256 K2, G25a, T44 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 mainišūs; F10 mainišūs; R1 mainišūs; R3 mainišūs; L5, FK1 mainišūs; Mf2 mainišūs

3256 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 damanījī; R3 damanījī

3256 K2 hapt.raeβiaiutei; G25a hapt.raeβiaiutei; F10 hapt.raeβiaiutei; T44 hapt.raeβiaiutei; R1 (second -a-scratched) . T46, P1 hapt.raeβiaiutei; L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 hapt.raeβiaiutei; R3 hapt.raeβiaiutei; R278 hapt.raeβiaiutei; E4 hapt.raeβiaiutei; L5 hapt.raeβiaiutei; FK1 hapt.raeβiaiutei; Mf2 hapt.raeβiaiutei; K9 hapt.raeβiaiutei

3256 K2 . K9 patti.raeβiaiutei; G25a . R278 patti.raeβiaiutei; F10 patti.raeβiaiutei; T44 patti.raeβiaiutei; R1 (third -a-scratched) patti.raeβiaiutei; R3 junopatti.raeβiaiutei; L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42 patti.raeβiaiutei; T46 patti.raeβiaiutei; E4 patti.raeβiaiutei; L5 patti.raeβiaiutei; FK1 patti.raeβiaiutei; Mf2 patti.raeβiaiutei

3256 K2, F10, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; G25a zainiti; T44 jantii; L5 jantii; FK1 jantii

3256 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; P1 jūō
frānuaieti. 3226 jūu. gam. 3227 varatām. 3228 azaiti. 3229 jūu. narānt.
āšuuuanti. 3230 fra-zAADAVAHYM. 3231 nədiAmb. 3232 vikaraushānta.
jaunti. 3233 dl | noiu. 3234 auuad. marāt. 3235 jūu. zi. spitaMAA.
zarađuṣṭra. 3237 e] marītu. dura. bizaŋrō. 3238 auuad. ašmoγō. 3239 x
āsaIuMA.
3240 } naraṇt. ašuuuanti. 3241 =haM bI. 3242 x arāduheca.
As desired (all) the desired (things) are available (as) truth for (that) which (is) best truth.

(And) which cuts its life off, whilst alive he defiles them indirectly. Whilst alive he kills the water, whilst alive he blows out the fire, whilst alive he drives the cattle captured, whilst alive he strikes the righteous man a blow by which consciousness goes away (and) which cuts its life off, (but) not so when dead. Whilst alive indeed, o Spitama Zarathustra, (the vile, the liar) whilst alive he defiles them indirectly. Whilst alive he blows out the fire, whilst alive he drives the cattle captured, whilst alive he strikes the righteous man a blow by which consciousness goes away (and) which cuts its life off, (but) not so when dead.

A. |a| AP-š gwpt 'whrмzd cygwn wzk-c |b| wyš hwśl t|b| ŠNT YMYTWN-yt |b| zynd `nd |b| spyt 'm n |b| zltwšt |b| ml dlwnd 2 zng `ytwn `šmyw |b| n `sw |b| spyn g mynwg `m hm |b| gmyhtyt |c| zynd QDM gmyhtyt |c| zynd MYYA znd
zynd QDM gmyhyt' zynd MYA znd zynd 'thš pr'c znyt3332 zynd3333 gwspnd PWN wltynš' (?) 3334 zynd GBRA y 3335 'hlwb' pr'c bwd sn'h ywdt'k BRA OBYDWN-yt' HYA MHYTWN-yt' |d| LA 'ytwn' YMYTWN-yt' 3336 [LA lynn'] zynd 'nd spyt m'n zltwhšt' |c| ml dlwnd 2 zng 'ytwn' 'šmwg 'n 'šw'3337 |f| GBRA 'hlwb' hwlšnk |g| LA 'ytwn' YMYTWN-yt' |h| 'hl' dyh3338 'p' tyh y p'hłwm AYT'

A. [a] u-š guft ohrmazd čiyön wazay-iz wēš-hušk tar sāl mīrēd |b| zįndag and spitāmān zarduxšt mar dручwand dō zang ādemōy anašō spenāg mēnōg dām ham gumēxtēd |c| zįndag abar gumēxtēd zįndag āb zand zįndag ātaxš frawēd zįndag gōspand wardage bē rawēnēd zįndag mard ahlaw frāz bōy sme bē kūndēd gyan zanēd |d| nē ēdōn mīrēd zįndag and spitāmān zarduxšt |e| mar dручwand dō zang ādēmōy anašō |f| mard ahlaw sagrih ud xwarišnag ud wastaray ud dār ud namad ud āhan-iz bē bard |g| nē ēdōn mīrēd |b| ahlāyīh ābādīh i pahlom ast

B. [a] u-š guft ohrmazd čiyön wazay-iz wēš-hušk tar sāl murdāg |b| ē zįndag and spitāmān zarduxšt mar dручwand dō zang ādemōy anašō spenāg mēnōg dām ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēb] [kē abāq oyy ka rasēd pad xēm wattar bawēd] [ōy rāy oyy abāyēd] |c| zįndag abar gumēxtēd zįndag āb zand zįndag ātaxš frāz zanēd zįndag gōspand pad wardenisn rawēnēd (?) zįndag mard i ahlaw frāz bōy smah jūdāg bē kūndēd gyan zanēd |d| nē ēdōn murdāg [nē rēman] zįndag spitāmān zarduxšt |e| mar dручwand dō zang ādemōy āanašō |f| mard ahlaw xwarišnag |g| nē ēdōn mīrēd |b| ahlāyīh ābādīh i pahlom ast

A. [a] And Ohrmazd said: “So many as a frog too, very dried up, dead more than a year ago. |b| Whilst alive, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt, the vile, the liar biped, so an impious heretic defiles directly the creation of the Beneficent Spirit. |c| Whilst alive he contaminates them, whilst alive he kills the water, whilst alive he blows out (?) the fire, whilst alive he drives the cattle to captivity, whilst alive he strikes the righteous man a blow by which consciousness goes away (and) which cuts its life off, |d| (but) not so when he dies. Whilst alive, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt, |e| the vile, the liar biped, so an impious heretic |f| deprives the righteous man of his satiation, his food, his clothes, his wood, his brushwood and his metallic implement(s) too, |g| (but) not so when he dies.” |h| Truth is the best prosperity.

B. [a] And Ohrmazd said: “So many as a frog too, much more dried up, dead a year ago. |b| Whilst alive indeed, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt, the vile, the liar biped, so an impious heretic defiles directly [with direct defilement] the creatures of the Beneficent Spirit [everyone who comes in touch with him, his nature becomes worse] [it is necessary to wash him]. |c| Whilst alive he contaminates them, whilst alive he kills the water, whilst alive he blows out the fire, whilst alive he drives the

3332 T44; F10 znt
3333 T44; F10 W zynd
3334 F10 Ɬ, T44 Ɪꞯ
3335 T44; F10 Ʞ y Ʇ
3336 F10, T44 YMYTWN-yt'
3337 F10, T44 Ʇ Ɪ Ꭓ
3338 F10, T44 Ɪ 'hl' dyh ... AYT' Ʞ
cattle in distress, whilst alive he strikes the righteous man a blow by which consciousness goes away (and) which cuts its life off, |d| (but) not so when dead [he is not impure]. Whilst alive indeed, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt, |e| the vile, the liar biped, so an impious heretic |f| (deprives) the righteous man of his food, |g| (but) not so when he dies.” |h| Truth is the best prosperity.

This passage is parallel to V 5.36-38. For the commentary of this Avestan passage and its PT, vid. (Cantera under preparation A 5.36-38). It is translated in (Dhabhar 1932 152) and also (Schmidt 1994 249-250).

Comparison between the PT of V 12.22 and that of V 5.36-38

In V 5.36-38 the same Avestan text and its PT are repeated. As the PT in V 12 does not follow the same division as that of V 5.36-38, I have preferred not to edit V 12.22 as 12.22-24, in order not to separate Avestan texts which were divided by the Pahlavi translators of V 12 otherwise than those of V 5.36-38.

Conversely, the comparison between the PT of V 5.36-38 and those found in V 12 is interesting to know how the Pahlavi translators of V 12 proceeded, so that I reproduce here the PT of V 5.36-38 according to Cantera’s (under preparation A 5.36-38) edition:

5.36. |a| u-š guft ohrmazd čiyōn wazag i wēš-hušk tar sāl murd |b| čē zīndag spitāmān zardušt mar i druwand i dózang [anēr] ēdōn ašemōg i anahlaw |c| spennāg menōg dāmān o ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēh ke abāg őy ē rasēd pad xēm wattar bawēd]|d| u-šān zīndag abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēh ke-z abāg őy ē rasēd ke abāg őy ē mad ēstēd a-z pad xēm wattar bawēd] 5.37. |a| zīndag āb zanēd zīndag ātaxš frawēnēd ud zīndag gōspand pad wardagīh be rawēnēd ud zīndag mard i ahlaw pad ān i frāz az bōy snah jud kirrēnīd gyan zanēd ud nē ēdōn ka murd [nē rēman] 5.38. |a| čē zīndag spitāmān zardušt mar i druwand i dózang [anēr] ēdōn ahlamōg anahlaw |b| az mard i ahlaw sagrih i xwarišn ud wastarag ud dār ud namad ud āhan bē bard nē ēdōn ka murd [nē rēman] 5.36. |A| ēn az abestāg paydāg anēr margarzan hamē ēdōn bawēd čiyōn agdēn |B| sōşyans guft ay amā pad ān i awēšān rēman nē bawēm čē awēšān zīndag druwand murd margarzan hænd awēšān pad ān i amā rēman ēh bawēnd čē nasuš pad dād āmār nē kunēnd |C| gōgušasp guft ay awēšān pad ān i amā rēman nē bawēnd čē nasuš har ān kē-š nē pad dād ā-š abar nē dwarēd |D| amā pad ān i awēšān rēman őh bawēm čē andar har dād mardom ahlaw őh bawēd čē az [tūriianam. dašiuum. ān] paydāg]

The PTs of A and B share the following deviations from that of V 5.36-38:

a) Omission of the Pahlavi words which do not find a direct correspondence in Avestan, including some Pahlavi glosses:
   - 12.22: lack of ezāfe.
   - 12.22b: lack of the gloss anēr after dó zang.
- 12.22b: *ham gumēxtēd* instead of *ō ham gumēxtēd*, because Phl. ō finds no correspondence in Avestan.
- 12.22c: omission of *u-šān*.
- 12.22c: lack of the gloss *pad payrēh ... bawēd*.
- 12.22g: omission of the gloss *nē rēman* and the following long commentary. K2 left a blank for this commentary, which was completed with the text in Pāzand in R3.

b) Omission of the PT of Avestan parts which the Pahlavi translators did not understand:

- 12.22c: omission of the PT *bē rawēnēd* of *Av. varətām* (cf. the rare variant F10 PRINTF, T44 PRINT; with the exception of K2, the rest of manuscripts of the group α completed it).
- 12.22d: omission of *čē*, because the Pahlavi translators did not understand *Av. zī*.
- 12.22f: omission of the most part of the PT, partially completed only in the manuscripts of the group α G25a, R1 and R3. The Pahlavi translators of V 12 surely did not understand some of the words in this passage.

c) Phonetic adaptations from Avestan:

- 12.22b and e: *anašō* instead of *anahlaw* (cf. *Av. anašauua*).
- 12.22e: *ašemō* instead of *ahlamōg* (cf. *Av. ašēmaŋō*).

d) Different PTs:

- 12.22a: –*iz* instead of *i*, probably because of pseudo-etymology equating *Av. ʰiiz* with Phl. –*iz*.
- 12.22c: different PT of *Av. viðəktəštānām: bē kunēnd gyān* in the group α and *frāz bōy snah judag bē kunēnd gyān* in the group β, instead of *jud kirrēnīd gyān*. The PT of A shows an attempt of morphological analysis and, because of pseudo-etymology, equated *Av. viu* with Phl. *bē*, *Av. ʰkərə* with Phl. *kunēnd* and *Av. ʰuštāna*- with Phl. *gyān*.
- 12.22e: *mirēd* instead of *ka murd*, surely because Phl. *ka* finds no direct correspondence in *Av. juuō*.

The group α (K2, G25a, R1, R3) attests the following deviations from that of V 5.36-38:

a) Omission of the Pahlavi words which do not find a direct correspondence in Avestan, including some Pahlavi glosses:

- 12.22c: omission of the PT *pad before wardagīh* (K2 omits *wardagīh* too).
- 12.22d: omission of the gloss *nē rēman* after *murd*.

b) Partial omission of the PT of Avestan parts which the Pahlavi translators did not understand:

- 12.22c: *frāuuiæiti* → *<pr’c>* in 12.22 (K2, R3), because their Pahlavi translators only understood the preverb. G25a omitted even the preverb, but G25b made a phonetic adaptation *<plwyt>* and R1 innovated with a different PT *<pr’c OD gwpt>*.

c) Different PTs:

- 12.22a and d: *mirēd* instead of *murd*
- 12.22b: *and* instead of *če*
- 12.22b: *dām* instead of *dāmān*
The group $\beta$ (F10, T44) shows the following deviations from that of V 5.36-38:

a) Addition of new glosses:
- 12.22b: addition of the gloss $\ddot{o}y$ rāy $\dddot{s}oy$ abāyēd after the gloss pad hamrēd ... bawēd.

b) Different PTs:
- 12.22a and d: murdag instead of murd
- 12.22c: frāuawaiiti $\rightarrow$ <pr’c znyt> frāz zanēd in 12.22 (T44).
- 12.22c: wardēnišn instead of wardagīh.
- 12.22c: rare PT of Av. varətām (F10, T44) instead of bē rawēnēd.

It seems that the PTs of V 12 in this passage were partially copied from that of V 5.36-38, as they are fairly consistent with one and another. However, they show enough deviation to consider that they were directly copied from it. On the contrary, it seems that this PT was their model, but the Pahlavi translators of V 12 consciously omitted some parts which they did not fully understand and created new PTs for some Avestan words and compounds. Therefore, the PT of V 12 must be taken as a further remake of that of V 5.36-38.

Av. vazayacīt, vi̞.hu̞škō, tarō. yārə. məratō (12.22a)
Av. vazayacīt, either Nom. Sing. Fem. or Instr. Sing. Masc., is used instead of the expected *vazayacīt (Nom. Sing. Masc.), as Bartholomae (1904 1389) already noticed. Accordingly, there is lack of consistency between the Nom. Sing. Masc. vi̞.huškō and məratō.

Av. vi̞.huškō in its turn was analysed by Geldner (1881 207, n.2) as $vī + huška$- and translated as “durch und durch, gänzlich ausgetrocknet”, mainly due to its PT $\ddot{w}ēš-hušk “more dried”, where the Pahlavi translators wrongly equated Av. $vī$- with Phl. <wyš> $\ddot{w}ēš “more”. Bartholomae (1904 1475) and Cantera (under preparation A 5.36) also followed Geldner’s interpretation.

Lubotsky (1999 318-319), however, does not accept these interpretations. According to him, Av. vazaya- does not exist and only the feminine vazayā- is attested in Avestan, so that viš.huškō and məratō cannot agree with vazayā-, but must be part of another syntagm.

Regarding Av. viš.huškō, he disagrees with Geldner’s analysis because of two main reasons. Firstly, he denies that $vī$ meant “durch und durch” in Avestan. Secondly, he considers aberrant the group šb in Av. viš.huškō, which would be an exception to the expected result *vihuškō (cf. paiti..bottomi, paiti.hištāmnā, pairi.haraštiente, varši-harša-, pairi.aharša- /pairi.aharša-/).

He compares viš.huškō, tarō. yārə. məratō in V 5.36 with hiškuŋm. tarō. yārə. mərohtam in V 8.33 and concludes that Av. huškō is a corruption of Av. hišku-., and that Av. viš.huškō must be corrected by *vā. hiškuš. vā, because “the syntax of V 5.36 demands one or two times vā ‘or’”. According to his emendation, the meaning of the passage would be “just as a frog [or] a dried up dead body, (lying) longer than a year”.
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In my opinion, Lubotsky’s interpretation is incorrect for a number of reasons. Let me examine them further.

1) He denies the existence of the masculine vazaya-, but the Gen. Pl. vazayam of V 14.5 and 18.73 can be interpreted as masculine, feminine or even neuter. Thus, not being there any real prove that a masculine vazay- did not exist in Avestan, the emendation Av. viš.huškō lacks this support.

2) Concerning Av. viš.huškō, he emends the text obviating both that V 5.36 is repeated in V 12.22 and that the variants of the manuscripts in both passages still have not been fully analysed. Although he noticed that the variants agree in the reading viš.huškō, he did not take them into account. From the manuscripts’ evidence it is clear not only that no trace of this supposed *vā. hiškuš. vā is found neither in V 5.36 nor in V 12.22. Furthermore, in both passages none of the PV nor the VS manuscripts ever attest hiškō instead of huškō. Therefore, the emendation as *hiškō cannot be supported by the manuscripts’ evidence.

3) It is hardly explainable why vā should be expected here at all. There is no reason to suppose that in Av. yaϑa. vazayacīt. viš.huškō. tarō. yāro. morātō a conjunction vā is needed. Even if we accept that one vā is needed to explain viš.huškō, the second vā of Lubotsky’s emendation *vā. hiškuš. vā cannot be justified.

4) Av. viš.huškō is rendered into Phl. wēš-hušk, which obviously demonstrates that Av. viš.huškō existed as such when the PT was made. If this Avestan compound was a corruption from *vā. hiškuš. vā, it would be older than our extant PT and could hardly be explainable as a corruption in the written transmission.

5) Av. viš “poison” exists as a first element of compound in other compounds, such as Av. viš.gaintenance- “which smells like poison” or viš.cidra- “having poison’s aspect > medicament” (Bartholomae 1904 1473). In each case, this first element is rendered into Phl. wiš “poison”.

6) If we interpret that Av. viš stems from vi̞, the result šh would not be an exception. cf. for instance Av. nišhara-tar- and nišhara-dī- (Bartholomae 1904 1088).

7) According to his emendation, the passage would indicate that a frog, when alive, is not impure. Nevertheless, as a daevic creature, it always defiles the living beings, unless it is dead. Therefore, even from the point of view of the meaning, Lubotsky’s emendation must be ruled out.

To summarise, I cannot discard Jamasp’s (1907 245) translation of Av. viš.huškō as “whose venom is dried up”. Nevertheless, I prefer Geldner’s (1881 207, n.2) explanation because of two reasons. Firstly, *vi in Av. viš.huškō is not necessarily to be understood as “durch und durch, gänzlich”. Since the image is that of a dried frog, dead more than a year ago, Av. *vi could just imply that the dried frog is so dried that it is split. So Av. *vi would fit the usual meaning “separated”. Secondly, Lubotsky is not right when stating that the group šh in Av. viš.huškō would be an exception as compared to other results of the same group, i.e. paiti.hištaiti, paiti.hištāmona, pairi.baršuente, varši-baršta-, pairi.aybaršta-/pairi.baršta-. Moreover, he does not pay attention to the fact that in Av. viš.huškō, unlike in these examples, Av. vi is monosyllabic. Whether or not this
fact was decisive in its result as š.h, I cannot state. Nevertheless, I think that this result is parallel to that of Av. niš.barətar- and niš.barədrī-, where Av. ni' is also monosyllabic. Therefore, I have preferred to understand Av. viš.huškō as *vi + huška- and to translate it as “split”.

Av. *hanbōš (12.22f)

Since Bartholomae (1904 1768), this word has been interpreted by the scholars as Av. haŋbus- and related to Av. hahiia- “related to corn, frumentarius” (Bartholomae 1904 1800). cf. Ved. sasya- “Saat aus dem Felde, Feldfrucht” and Ved. sasa- “Saatfeld, Getreide, Feldfrucht” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.717).

Apart from V 5.38, this word is also found in Avestan only in the corrupted passage of Y 53.4, where it appears as Av. haŋbus. Because of this parallel, Bartholomae and other scholars considered that this word belonged to a consonantal stem with –us-.

In my opinion, however, only this corrupt passage cannot by itself justify this choice, so that we must try to explain if Av. haŋbus- fits V 5.38 and 12.22.

To begin with, we must take into account that the verb Av. apa.baraiti, unlike Bartholomae’s (1904 936) opinion, is never accompanied by two accusatives. So Av. haŋbus could not be an accusative.

Secondly, Av. *xe arədābeca cannot be interpreted as the complement of Av. haŋbus, because the former is followed by the enclitic –ca, a fact that hitherto remained unnoticed. Here a sequence of genitives in singular united by the enclitic –ca accompanies the verb Av. apa.baraiti. So it makes more sense to interpret the supposed form haŋbus as a further Gen. Sing. united to Av. *xe arədābe by means of the enclitic –ca. If we interpret this word as Bartholomae did, namely as Av. haŋbus-, a Gen. Sing. *hanbūšo would be expected. In my opinion, however, the variant aŋbus of three of the oldest IndVS manuscripts and the variant haŋbus of the IrVS could point to a form *hanbōš, that is, to the Gen. Sing. of Av. haŋbu-.

Accordingly, accepting that Av. haŋbu- is related to Ved. sasá- “corn, food”, I have interpreted Av. narm. ašauanam. *hanbōš. *xe arədābeca. ... apa.baraiti as “deprives the righteous man of his food and drink ...”.
APPENDIX

The Pahlavi translations of P5 and K2

P5

V 10

10.1. [a] pwrsyt zltwšt' OD 'hlwb'y |b| cygwn PWN OLE-š'n' dlwc ptk'lym MNW MN 'w' lyštk 'w' QDM zyndyhy QDM dwb'lyt cygwn PWN OLE-š'n' nswš ptk'lym MNW MN OLE wltk QDM zyndyhy QDM gwmhytyt [AYK cygwn stwš W dlwc ZK nsws l'd BRA OBYDWN-m MNW QDM zyndyy QDM dwb'lyt' MNW wltk nsws dlwc OBYDWN-m MN zyndyy gwmhytyt]

10.2. [a] AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWWN MNW hnd PWN g'š'n' byš'mlwt [AYK 2 b'1 KRYTWN-yt] |b| ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWWN MNW hnd PWN g's'š'n' slyš'mlwt [AYK 3 b'1 KRYTWN-yt] |c| ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWNN MNW HWE-d ZK g's'š'n' cslyš'mlwt [AYK ch'1 b'1 KRYTWN-yt] |d| ZNE OLE-š'n' zwbšn' pr'c YMRWWNN MNW hnd s's'n' byš'mlwt' slyš'mlwt' cslyš'mlwt' [yw PWN 'yw PWN ywdtywdt']

10.3. [a] d't'l kt'1 OLE-š'n' gwbšn' MNW HWE-d PWN g's'š'n' byš'mlwt |b| AP-š gwpt' 'whrmzd AYK ZNE OLE-š'n' gwbšn'k MNW hnd PWN g's'š'n' byš'mlwt ZNE gwbšn' 'š 2 b'1 pr'c YMRWNN

10.4. [a] Without PT

10.5. [a] ZK AHL byš'mlwt' ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWWN 'cš pylwcll byš'clynyt' |b| BRA pyltnm gn'k mynwg MN m'n' MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN NPŠE tn' W MN GBRA-'n' QDM lyštk MN n'lyłk QDM wltk MN m'n' m'npt' MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhyw'pt' MN hlwspyn' 'hlwb'n' stwk

10.6. [a] BRA pyltnm nswš BRA pyltnm hnltyt' [krt YKOYMWNN-yt] BRA pyltnm pytlyt' [krt' YKOYMWNN-yt] MN m'n' MN wys W MN znd MN MTA MN NPŠE tn' W MN GBRA QDM wltk MN n'lyłk QDM wltk MN m'n' m'nptk MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA d'h'1-pn pt MN hlwspyn' 'hlwb'' stwk

10.7. [a] d't'l MNW kkt'1 OLE-š'n' gwbšn' MNW hnd g's'n' 'y slyš'mlwt |b| AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd AYK OLE-š'n' gwbšn'y AMT hnd PWN g's'n' slyš'mlwt' 'y OLE-š'n' ZK gwbšn' 3 b'1 pr'c YMRWWNN

10.8. [a] Without PT

10.9. [a] AP-š AHL slys'mlwt' ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWWN pylwckl byš'clynyt' |b| BRA pyltnm 'ndl [ŠDYA] BRA pyltnm swl [ŠDYA] BRA pyltnm nähbda
ŠDYA-ʾn' MN mʾn' MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN hwš tn' MN GBRA QDM wltk MN nʾlyk QDM lystk MN mʾnʾ mʾnʾt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhywpt MN hmʾk 'hlwbʾnʾ stwk

10.10. |a| Omitted in P5

10.11. |a| dʾʾl ktʾl OLE-ʾšʾn gwbšn MNW hnd PWN gʾsʾn cslyšʾmlwt |b| AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd ZNE OL-ʾšʾn gwbšn prʾc YMRWN MNW hnd gʾsʾn csłwšʾmlwy ZNE gwbḥy chʾl-bʾl prʾc YMRWN

10.12. |a| Without PT

10.13. |a| ZK AHL csłšʾmlwt gwbšnyy ZNE gwbšn prʾc YMRWN pylwcgl byšʾcyntyʾl |b| BRA pwltynm hšm hlwydlhwš BRA pwltynm ʾytš ŠDYA-ʾnʾ MN mʾnʾ MN wys MN znd MN TA MN NPŠE tnʾ W MN GBRA QDM lystk MN NYŠE QDM wltk MN mʾnʾ mʾnʾpt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhywpt MN hmʾk 'hlwbʾnʾ stwk

10.14. |a| BRA pwltynm wlnyk ŠDYA BRA pwltynm wʾtyk ŠDYA MN mʾnʾ MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN NPŠE tnʾ MN GBRA QDM lstk MN nʾlyk QDM wltk MN mʾnʾ mʾnʾpt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhywpt MN hlswpn 'hlwbʾnʾ stwk

10.15. |a| ZNE gwbšn MNW hnd PWN gʾsʾn byšʾmlwt ZNE OL-ʾšʾn gwbšnyy MNW hnd gʾsʾn slyšʾmlwt ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn gwbšn MNW hnd PWN gʾsʾn csłšʾmlwt

10.16. |a| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn gwbšn MNW hnd PWN gnʾk mynwg snyy |b| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn gwbšn MNW hnd hšm hlwydlhwš snʾh |c| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn gwbšn MNW hnd mʾzng nʾ ŠDYA-ʾnʾ snʾh |d| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn gwbšn MNW hnd hlwsypn ŠDYA-ʾnʾ snyy

10.17. |a| ZNE AP-šʾn gwbšn MNW hnd ZNE ZK dlwc ZNE ZK nswš hmystʾl [hnd] MNW MN lystk QDM zywnindy QDM ʾwʾ dwbʾlytʾ |b| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn gwbšn MNW hnd ZNE dlwc ZK HÑA nswš hmystʾl MNW MN lystk ʾwʾ zywnindy QDM gwwmyhtʾ [PWN pyltyt]

10.18. |a| ADYNʾLK zltwšt ʾ9 my BRA PSKWN-šnk |b| MNW hnd ZNE zmyk ywdt-MYA-twm ywdt ZK ʾwlwl-twm |c| ʾnʾQDM-hwlšʾn pʾh wyl |d| ywydʾslk ANŠWTA-ʾnʾ QDM YLYDWN-šnʾ ZK pʾhlwm ʾhwʾnʾ |e| ZK ywydʾslyh zltwšt MNW dynʾ mždyšʾnʾ [pytʾk] |f| AMT NPŠE dynʾ ywydʾslyt ĥwmt PWN ZK hwht ʾnʾ PWN hwwlšt

10.19. |a| [dynʾʾhwʾnʾ] 3339 pyck [AYK] ywydʾslyntyʾytwnʾʾwʾ ZNE AYT ywydʾslytʾ ktʾl-c-HD ʾhw yʾstʾwmnd NPŠE yʾpyckʾ dynʾy |b| MNW NPŠE dynʾ

---

3339 This is the PT of the Avestan gloss daēnām. aybnuqām in V 10.19b.
ywδ'slkynnyt PWN hwmt W hwht hwwlšt' ['y ʾ[אֱהוּעֵּמ. daenām.' ] ['hw'n dyn']

10.20. |a| 'hl'dyy 'p'tyh p'hlwm AYT

V 11

11.1. |a| pwrsyt zltwšt MN 'whrmzd AYK 'whrmzd mynwg 'pzwnyk d't'l ghy'n ZY 'st'wmnd'n' 'hlwwb' |b| cygwn PWN m'n' ywδ'd'slym [AYK /blank/] |c| cygwn PWN 'tš cygwn PWN MYA cygwn PWN ųmyk cygwn PWN gwspnd cygwn PWN 'wlwl cygwn PWN GBRA 'hlwb'y cygwn n'ylyk 'hlwb' cygwn PWN stl cygwn PWN m'h cygwn hwštšy cygwn PWN ZK 'sl lwšnyh cygwn hlwsp wyh 'whrmzd d't PWN 'hl'dyy pyt'k

11.2. |a| AP-s gwpt 'whrmzd AYK ZK ywδ'd'slyh sl'dšn' zltwšt |b| ywδ'd'slyh AHL YHWWN-yt PWN m'n' |c| ywδ'd'slynt 'tš ywδ'd'slynt MYA ywδ'd'slym ywδ'd'slyd gwspnd ywδ'd'slyd PWN 'wlwl ywδ'd'slyd PWN GBRA 'hlwb'y ywδ'd'slyd PWN n'ylyk 'hlwb' ywδ'd'slyd PWN stl ywδ'd'slyd PWN m'h ywδ'd'slyd PWN hwšnyt ywδ'd'slyd PWN ZK 'sl lwšnk ywδ'd'slyd PWN hm'k 'p'tyh 'whrmzd d't PWN 'hl'dyy QDM twhmк

11.3. |a| 'ytwn' ZNE 'y gwbšn' pr'c dlncynt MNW hnd pylvcktwm W ZK- y bš'zynttwm 5 'hwwnwl pr c'slyt' [AYK KRYTWN-yt] |b| 'hwwnwl tn' l' p'ŋkyy AYT

11.4. |a| ZNE 'ytwn' m'n' ywδ'd'slynyd ADYN' ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRNW |b| 'ytwn' L hm'y ZK bytwn ˒zm n' y p'ŋkyy mzdsн'n' L ŠBKWN-yd |c| ZNE 'ytwn' PWN 'tš ywδ'd'slynyd ADYN' ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRNW |d| 'ytwn' ZNE LK 'tš 'w' wlcnyyd pltnw BRA YHMTWN-yd 'whrmzd [p'hlycšny]

11.5. |a| ZNE 'ytwn' MYA ywδ'd'slynyd ADYN' ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRNW |b| MYA 'ytwn' YDBHWN-m |L ˒wált ZK OZLNW-t PWN ˒dx |c| ZNE 'ytwn' ųmyk ywδ'd'slynyd ADYN' ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRNW |d| ZNE ųmyk ywδ'd'slynyd LWTE ˒dx YDBHWN-m

11.6. |a| ZNE 'ytwn' gwspnd ywδ'd'slynyd ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRNW |b| ZK gwspnd'n' dhšn' [MYA W w'stl] OLE-˒š'n' kšwnšn' kwnšn' MNW-˒š p'hlwm pr'c OLE YHWWN-˒t |c| ZNE 'ytwn' 'wlwl'n ywδ'd'slynyd ADYN' ZNE gwbšn'y pr'c YMRRNW |d| 'ytwn' PWN OL tšls' 'hlwb'y 'whrmzd 'wlwl'n whšnytyyd [AYK 'pzd'y]

11.7. |a| ZNE 'ytwn' ZK GBRA 'hlwb'n' ywδ'd'slynyd ZNE 'ytwn' n'ylyk 'hlwb'y ZK- y ywδ'd'slynyd ADYN' ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRNW |b| ZK 'ylym'n' hwš'nyh OL l'mšnyy YHMTWN-˒sn' ZKL-˒n' n'ylyk'n' |c| AYK zltwšt hnd |d|

3340 This gloss is added by a second hand.
3341 Added by a second hand.
This interpretation seems to be implied in the writing antium.
11.17. [a] ʾytwnʾ ZNE gwbšnʾ dlncynyd MNW hnd pylwckltwm byšʾcytʾltwm 5 ʾhnwl prʾc šlʾdsnʾ [b] ʾhlʾdyhʾ pʾtyh pʾhlwm AYT

K2

V 10

10.1. [a] pwrsyt zltwštʾ MN ʾwhrmzd dʾtʾl ghʾnʾ stʾwmndʾn ʾhlwby [b] cygwn PWN OLE-šʾn dlwc ptkʾlym MNW MN ʾwʾ lystkʾw ʾwʾ QDM zywndyh QDM dwʾbyt cygwn PWN OLE nswš ptkʾlym MNW MN OLE wltk QDM zywnd gwynyht [AYK-š cygwn stwŠ W dwʾl MN wltk dlwc W nswš lʾd BRA OBYDWN-m MNW QDM zywndyh BRA dwʾbyt AMT cygwn MN wltk nswš dwʾl OBYDWN-m QDM zywndyh gwynyhty]


10.3. [a] dʾtʾl ktʾl OLE-šʾn gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN gʾsʾnʾ byšʾmlwt [b] AP-š gwpt ʾwhrmzd AYK ZNE OLE-šʾn gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN gʾsʾnʾ byšʾmlwt 3346 [c] ZNE gwbšnk AP-š 2 bʾl prʾc YMRWN

10.4. [a] Without PT

10.5. [a] ZK AHL byšʾmlwt ZNE gwbšnʾ ʾprʾc YMRWN ʾcš pylwckl byšʾznycʾl [b] BRA pwltynm gnʾk myṃng MN mʾnʾ MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN ZK hwʾś tnʾ W MN GBRA QDM wltk W MN nʾlyk QDM wltk MN mʾnʾ mʾnʾp MN wys wyspt MN znd zndp MN MTA MN wʾshp ʾhlwʾnʾ ʾst


10.7. [a] dʾtʾl MNW ktʾl1347 OLE-šʾn gwbšnʾ AMT hnd gʾsʾnʾ slyšʾmlwt [b] AP-š gwpt ʾwhrmzd AYK OLE-šʾn gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN gʾsʾnʾ slyšʾmlwt ʾc] ZNE ʾy gwbšnk 3 bʾl prʾc YMRWN

3343 K2a above the line
3344 K2a above the line
3345 K2a in the left margin ZNE ... OBYDWN-šnk
3346 K2a in the right margin ZNE gwbšnk -š 2 bʾl prʾc YMRWN
10.8. [a] Without PT

10.9. [a] AP-š AHL slyš’młwt ZNE gwbšnk pr’c YMRWN pylwcł wyš’znyt’l |b| BRA pwltynm indar [ŠDYA-n] BRA pwltynm swł [ŠDYA-n] BRA pwltynm n aşhaša ŠDYA-n MN m’n MN wys MN znd MN MTA |c| MN hwys tn’ MN GBRA QDM wltlk MN n’lyyk QDM wltlk MN m’n m’n’p MN wys wysyt MN znd zndpt MN MTA MTA-pt MN hlwsp ’hlwb’nst

10.10. [a] Omitted in K2

10.11. [a] d’t’l kt’l OLE-š’n gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ ctwš’młwt |b| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd ZNE gwbšnk pr’c YMRWN MNW hnd g’s’n’ ctyš’młwt |c| ZNE gwbšn 4 b’l p’r’c YMRWN

10.12. [a] Without PT

10.13. [a] ZK AHL ctwš’młwt gwbšny ZNE gwbšn’ pr’c YMRWN pylwcl byš’zyn’l |b| PWN pwltynm hšmy hlwydwlhwš BRA pwltynm ’γtš ŠDYA MN m’n MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN hwys tn’ MN GBRA QDM wltlk MN NYŠE QDM wltlk MN m’n m’npt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA MTA-pt MN hlwsp ’hlwb’nst

10.14. [a] BRA pwltynm wlnyk ŠDYA BRA pwltynm w’tk ŠDYA MN m’n MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN hwys-tn’ MN GBRA QDM wltlk MN n’lyyk QDM wltlk MN m’n m’npt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA MTA-pt MN hlwsp ’hlwb’nst

10.15. [a] ZNE gwbšn MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ byš’młwt ZNE gwbšn’ MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ slyš’młwt ZNE bšn’ MNW hnd g’s’n’ ctwš’młwt

10.16. [a] ZNE OLE-š’n gwbšn’ MNW hnd AY ŽK gn’k mynwg snyh |b| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ MNW hnd AY ŽK hšm hlwdlwš snyh |c| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ MNW hnd m’zng’n’ ŠDYA snyh |d| ZNE OLE-š’n gwbšn’ hlwsp ŠDYA snyh

10.17. [a] ZNE OLE-š’n gwbšn’ MNW hnd OLE dlwc OLE-š’n nswš hmyst’l [hnd] MNW MN lystk QDM zyndy QDM dwb’lyt [PWN hmlyt] |b| ZNE OLE-š’n gwbšn MNW hnd OLE dlwc OLE nswš hmyst’T’wmnd MNW wltlk QDM zyndy QDM gwymyhtyt [PWN p’tylyt]

10.18. [a] ADYN’ LK zltwšt 9 my BRA PSKWN-šn’ |b| MNW hnd PWN ZNE zmyk ywdt MYAyt-twmy ywdt wwlw-twmy |c| ’n’-QDM-hwlšn p’h wyl /blank of 1 ½ line/ |d| ywyd’slyh ANŠWTAW ‘n PWN YLYDWÅ-šn’ p’hlwm /blank of 1 ½ line/

3347 K2a above the line kt’l OLE-š’n gwbšn’
3348 K2a above the line stwk
3349 K2a adds -wk

450
10.19. [a] dyn'y 'pyck ywyd'slynyt 'ytwn' AYT 'w' ywyd'slyh kt'l-c-yk 'hw y 'st'wmd ZK y hwyš 'pyck dyn' [b] MNW hwyš dyn'y 'ywyd'slynyt PWN hwmt hhwht hwwļšt [「daēnām. anḥuwaṃ.」KRA 2 'yw'k]

10.20. [a] 'hl'dyy 'p'tyh p'hlwm AYT

V 11

11.1. [a] pwrsyt zlwšt OD 'hlw'by [b] cygwn PWN m'n' 'ywyd'slym /blank/ [c] cygwn PWN 'thš cygwn PWN MYA cygwn PWN zmyk cygwn PWN gwspnd cygwn 'wlwl cygwn PWN GBRA 'hlw'by cygwn PWN n'lyyk 'hlw'by cygwn PWN sls cygwn PWN m'h cygwn PWN hwlšyt cygwn PWN ZK 'sl lwš cygwn PWN /hlwsp 'p'tyh 'whrmzd d't' MNW MN 'hl'dh py't'kyh

11.2. [a] AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd AYK ywyd'slyh sl'dšn' zlwšt /blank/ [b] ywyd'sl AHL YHWWN-yr PWN m'n' [c] PWN 'thš PWN MYA ywyd'sl PWN zmyk ywyd'sl PWN gwspnd ywyd'sl PWN 'wlwl 'ywyd'sl PWN GBRA 'hlw'by n'lyyk 'hlw'by ywyd'sl PWN sls ywyd'sl m'h hlwsp 'p'tk 'whrmzd d't' MNW MN hl'by py't'k

11.3. [a] adša. 'ytwn' ŽNE YMRWN-yt dlnyynyď MNW hnd pỳlwcgtl 5 'hwnwl PWN sl'dšnyk [5 BRA YMRWN] [c] 'hwnwl tn' p'inkh y't 'hwwylyw

11.4. [a] 'ytwn' m'n' PWN 'ywyd'slynyď ADYN' ŽER ŽNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRN [b] 'ytwn' L hm'y OD 'w' ZK bytwm zm'n' p'inkh d'm'n' krt'n'/ /blank/ [c] [AMT] 'ytwn' PWN 'thš ywyd'slynyď ADYN' ŽNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRRN [d] 'ytwn' 'w' HNA ŁK 'thš 'w'wlcyn'k pltwm BRA YHMWN-m 'whrmzd [PWN p'lyčš'n' šn'dnty'lyh]

11.5. [a] [AMT] 'ytwn' PWN MYA 'ywyd'lslynyď ADYN' ŽNE gwbšn'k pr'c YMRRN [b] MYA 'ytwn' YĐBHWN-m /blank/ [c] ŽNE zmyk 'ywyd'lslynyď AMT 'ytwn' gwbšn' pr'c YMRWN [d] ŽNE zmyk LWTE NKB- n /blank/ YĐBHWN- m

11.6. [a] 'ytwn' gwspnd 'ywyd'slynyď ADYN' ŽNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWN [b] ZK gwspnd'n /blank of three lines/ [c] 'ytwn' 'wlwl ywyd'slynyď ADYN' ŽNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWN [d] 'ytwn' ZK 'w' tlsk'syh AMT 'hlw'by 'whrmzd 'wlwl whšnyt /blank/

11.7. [a] AMT GBRA 'hlw'by 'ywyd'slynyď AMT n'lyyk 'hlw'by 'ywyd'slynyď ADYN' ŽNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWN [b] ZK 'ylm'n hw'dšnyh 't OL I'mšn'

3350 K2a dyn' hw'ny' /blank/
11.8. |a| 'ytwn' ZNE gwbn' OD 8 'hnwl pr'tc sl'dšn yt'hwwlyw [8 BRA YMRWN]

11.9. |a| pwltnm hšm pwltnm nswš /blank/ |b| pwltnm hm-gwmyhtyt pwltnm QDM gwmyhtyt /blank/ |c| pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm bwš'sp MNW W zhkl f'y W zhklkły 'y AYT MNW KBD HLMWN-yt |d| pwltnm bwš'sp MNW dlwd dlng gw BYN |e| pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm plyk [k'myh] [KBD plstkyh] MNW 'hwk ynyt' 'thš MYA źmyk gwspnd 'wlwl |f| pwltnm 'n' MNW 'hwg ynyt 'thš MYA źmyk gwspnd 'wlwl

11.10. |a| pwltnm LK dwšdʾnʾk gnʾk mnwg MN mʾn MN 'tš MN' MYA MN źmyk MN gwspnd MN 'wlwl MN GBRA 'hlwby MN n’ylyk 'hlwby MN stl MN m’h MN hwšytn MN 'sl lwšn' MN hl wsp 'p’tyh 'whrmžd d’t 'hl’dyhy pyt’k

11.11. |a| 4 'hnwl pr’tc sl’dšnyh yt’hwwlyw [4 BRA YMRRNW]

11.12. |a| ptkʾlym hyšm ptkʾlym ZK nswš |b| ptkʾlym hm-gwmyhtyt ptkʾlym QDM gwmyhtyt /blank/ |c| pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm bwš'sp MNW [KBD HLMWN-yt] pwltnm bwš'sp dlng gw BYN |d| pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm plyk [k’mk] MNW 'hwk ynyt 'tš MYA źmyk gwspnd 'wlwl

11.13. |a| ptkʾlym 'w' dwš dʾnʾk gnʾk mnwg MN mʾn MN 'thš MN MYA MN źmyk W MN gwspnd MN 'wlwl MN GBRA 'hlwby MN n’ylyk 'hlwby MN stl MN m’h MN hwšytn MN ZK 'sl lwšnyh MN hl wsp 'p’tyh 'whrmžd d’t MN 'hl’dyhy pyt’k

11.14. |a| 4 bʾl mazdā. at. mői. pr’tc sl’dšnk

11.15-16. |a| pwltnm hšm pwltnm nswš pwltnm hm gwmyhtyt pwltnm QDM gwmyhtyt pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm bwš’sp MNW zhgl pwltnm bwš’sp MNW dlng gw [dlwd] pwltnm /blank/ pwltnm plyk kʾmk MNW /blank/ atram MYA źmyk gwspnd 'wlwl pwltnm LK dwš dʾnʾk gnʾk mnwg MN mʾn MN 'thš MN MYA MN źmyk MN gwspnd MN 'wlwl MN GBRA 'hlwby MN n’ylyk 'hlwby MN stl MN m’h MN hwšytn MN 'sl lwšn MN hl wsp 'p’tyh 'whrmžd d’t 'hl’dyhy thmʾk

11.17. |a| ytwn' ZNE gwbn' OD 5 'hnwnl pr’tc sl’dšnk yt’hwwlyw 5 gwptn' |b| 'ywki 'hl’yk 'p’tyh AYT
AVESTAN GLOSSARY

a-: “this”. 10.18b, 19a, 12.1b, 3b, 5b, 7b, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a.
aēša- (masc.), aēšā- (fem.), aēta- (neut.): “this”. 10.3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b.
aēšma- (masc.): “Wrath”. 10.13b, 16b, 11.9a, 12a, 15a, 18a.
akataša- (masc.): “Akataša, name of a demon”. 10.13b.
aṭ: “then”. 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a.
aṭa: “then, thus”. 10.19a, 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.
ap- (fem.): “water”. 11.1b, 2c, 5a, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.2c, d, 4c (2), 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2), 22c.
aipi: “even”. 10.18d.
aŋra-ṃnaṇīiua- (masc.): “Evil Spirit”. 10.5b, 11.10a, 13a, 16a (3), 19a.
anaγra-: “endless”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
aṇaauuan- (masc.): “unrighteous”. 12.22b, e.
ƛanaijō, xurāda-: “not drinkable”. 10.18c.
aniō, ḫkaēša-: “having another doctrine”. 12.21a.
aniō, varōna-: “having another faith”. 12.21a.
amāṣa- spōnta- (masc.): “the Beneficent Immortals”. 12.2d, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
aii-: “to go”.
ā + aii- “to go against, to attack”. āiti (3rd. Sing. Subj. Ind. Act.) 11.9f, g, 12f, g, 15a (2), 18a (2).
aiiab- (neut.): “metal, metallic implement”. 12.22f.
aunā-: “that”. 10.17a (2), b (2).
aunāda: “thus, so”. 12.22b, d, e, g.
astuũat- (masc., neut.), astuuaii- (fem.): “material”. 10.1a, 3a, 7a, 19a, 11a, 11.1a, 12.2a, 4a, 6a, 8a, 10a, 12a, 14a, 16a, 18a, 20a.
aša: “eight”. 11.8b.
aśa- (neut.): “Truth”. 10.20a, 11.3d, 8c, 11b, 20b, c, 12.22h.
aśa, ciṭra-: “which (have) the brightness of Truth”. 11.1a, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
așaunuun- (masc., neut.), āṣaont- (fem.): “righteous”. 10.1a, 3a, 5b, 6a, 7a, 9b, 10a, 11a, 13b, 14a, 11.1a, c (2), 2c (2), 7a (2), 10a (2), 13a (2), 16a (2), 19a (2), 12.2a, 4a, 6a, 8a, 10a, 12a, 14a, 16a, 18a, 20a, 22c, f.
aḥštājoṣa- (masc.): “heretic”. 12.22b, e.
ah-: “to be”. 10.18b. hantī (3rd. Pl. Pres. Ind. Act.) 10.2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b. aḥbat (3rd. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act.) 10.18b. asti (3rd. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act.) 10.19a. aḥban (3rd. Pl. Pres. Subj. Act.) 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.
ahunā- vairīia- (masc.): “the prayer Ahuna Vairiia”. 11.3b, c, 8b, 11a, 20a.
ahura- mazda- (masc.): “Lord, Ahura Mazda”. 10.1a (2), 2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 11.1a (2), 2a, 12.1e, 2b, 3d, 4c, 5d, 6b, 7c, 8b, 9b, 10a, 11b, 12b, 13b, 14b, 15b, 16b, 17b, 18b, 19b, 20a, 22a.
ā. airijōma. išiō: “the prayer ā. airijōma. išiō”. 11.17a (2).
āaṭ: “and, then”. 10.2a, 3b, 5a, 7b, 9a, 11b, 13a, 18a, 11.2a, 12.1a, e, 2b, 3a, d, 4c, 5a, d, 6b, 7a, c, 8b, 9a, b, 10a, 11a, b, 12b, 13a, b, 14b, 15a, b, 16b, 17a, b, 18b, 19a, b, 20a, 21a, 22a.
āxtūrim: “four times”. 10.11c.
ātar- (masc.): “fire”. 11.1c, 2c, 4c, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a, 22c.
āṭbitim: “twice”. 10.3c.
ādritim: “thrice”. 10.7c.
āhiti- (fem.): “maculation”. 11.9g, 12g, 15a.
ārūt: “righteous”. 10.19a (2).
iṇdra- (masc.): “Iṇḍra, name of a demon”. 10.9b.
imā-: “this”. 10.2a, b, c, d, 3b, c, 5a, 6b, 7a, c, 9a, 11b, c, 13a, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 11.3a, 4a (2), c (2), 5a (2), c (2), 6a (2), c (2), 7a (3), 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a, 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
ūpa: “upon, over, on”. 10.1b (2), 17a, b.
ka- (masc., neut.), kā- (fem.): “who, which (interrogative)”. 10.3a, 7a, 11a.
kapasti- (masc.): “Kapasti, name of a demon”. 11.9e, 12e, 15a, 18a.
kañin- (fem.): “girl”. 12.7c.
kaia-: “which (interrogative pronoun)”. 10.3a, 7a, 11a.
kām.nā. mazdā: “the prayer kām.nā. mazdā”. 11.3d, 8c, 11b, 20b.
kūḍa: “how”. 10.1b (2), 11.1b, c (12), 12.2a (2), 4b (2), 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).
kūṇḍa- (masc.): “Kūnda, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.
kūṇḍižan- (masc.): “Kūndižan, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

gāaṭā- (fem.): “creature, fold, property”. 10.1a, 3a, 7a, 11a, 11.1a, 12.2a, 4a, 6a, 8a, 10a, 12a, 14a, 16a, 18a, 20a.
gāu- (masc., fem.): “cattle”. 11.1c, 2c, 6a, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.22c.
gāḍā- (fem.): “Gāḍā, sacred chant”. 10.2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 12.2b, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

xrū- (fem.): “Xrū, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.
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caṇṇaṃrūta-: “(Avestan texts) to be said four times”. 10.2c, d, 11a, b, 13a, 15a.
-čit: “any, too, even”. 12.22a.
čuṇantu-: “how many, how much”. 12.1b, d (2), 3b, c (2), 5b, c (2), 7b (3), 9a (3), 11a (3), 13a (3), 15a (3), 17a (3), 19a (3), 21a (2).
juua- (adj.): “alive”. 12.22b, c (5), d.
taoxman- (neut.): “seed, relative”. 12.21a.
tat (neut.): “this”. vid. ha-, hā-, ta-
tanu.ṛṣṭa-: “whose body is forfeit, tanu.ṛṣṭa- sinner”. 12.1d, f, 3c, d, 5c, d, 7b, c, 9a, b, 11a, b, 13a, b, 15a, b, 17a, b, 19a, b.
tani- (fem.): “body”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 11a, 11.3c, 12.2b, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
tarō: “through, over, during”. 12.22a.
tauruui- (masc.): “Tauruui, name of a demon”. 10.10a.
tūriia- (masc.): “uncle”. 12.15a.
tūriia- (fem.): “aunt”. 12.15a.
tūriia.puṛa- (masc.): “male cousin”. 12.17a, 19a.
tūriia.duṛā- (fem.): “female cousin”. 12.17a, 19a.
daēnā- (fem.): “religious conscience”. 10.18e, f, 19a (2), b.
daēnau- (masc.): “false god, demon”. 10.9b, 13b, 14a (2), 16c, d.
daēṛuhu- (fem.): “country”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2).
daēṛupuṛaii- (masc.): “lord of the country”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a.
darō.γāhu-: “long-handed, epithet of Būšiāsta”. 11.9d, 12d, 15a, 18a.
daṣa- (masc.): “pious, member of the Zoroastrian community”. 12.1d, f, 3c, d, 5c, d, 7b, c, 9a, b, 11a, b, 13a, b, 15a, b, 17a, b, 19a, b.
dāṭar- (masc.): “Maker”. 10.1a, 3a, 7a, 11a, 11.1a, 12.2a, 4a, 6a, 8a, 10a, 12a, 14a, 16a, 18a, 20a.
dāman-, dāman- (neut.): “creature”. 12.21a, 22b.
dāru- (neut.): “wood”. 12.22f.
dim: “this, it” (enclitic pronoun 3rd. Sing. Acc.). 10.
duṟā- (fem.): “daughter”. 12.1c, 3a, b, 19a.
duṛie: s. duṇa-
duṛdāb-: “harshful”. 11.10a, 19a.
duṇadasa: “twelve”. 12.7c.
duṇan-: “to twirl, to hurl”.
upa + duṇan-: “to hurl into”. upa.duṇasaiti (3rd. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act.).
10.1b, 17a.
draoī: “wood”. vid. dāru-
draṇj- (fem.): “Lie”. 10.1b, 17a, b.
**druuānt-** (masc.): “liar”. 12.22b, e.

**dhr̥ars-**: “to cut”.


dhr̥ā: “you” (enclitic pronoun 2nd. Sing. Acc.). 11.10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.

dhr̥isant-: “thirty”. 12.1f, 3d, 5d, 15b.

dhr̥isāmṛtā-: “(Avestan texts) to be said thrice”. 10.2b, d, 7a, b, 9a, 15a.

dhr̥is.frasnāiiti- (fem.): “washing thrice”. 12.2b (2), 4c (2), 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).

dhr̥is.frasrūiti- (fem.): “recitation thrice”. 12.2b, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

**paiti.rædhr̥a-** (masc.): “Indirect defilement”. 10.6a, 11.9b, 12b, 15a, 18a.

pæca: “five”. 11.3b, 9b, 11b, 20a, 12.19b.

pæca.dasă: “fifteen”. 12.15b.

pæncāsant-: “fifty”. 12.9b, 11b, 27c (2).

par-: “to fight”. pæraṇāne (1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Mid.) 10.1b. pæraṇe (1st. Sing. Pres. Ind. Mid.) 11.9a (2), b (2), c (7), d, e (2), f, g, 10a, 15a (16), 16a. pæṣṭa (PPP.) 11.12a (2), b (2), c (7), d, e (2), f, g, 13a, 18a (16), 19a.

paiti + par- “to fight”. paiti.pæraṇe (1st. Sing. Pres. Ind. Mid.) 10.5b, 6a (3), 9b (3), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2).

pairikā- (fem.): “Pairikā, an evil feminine being”. 11.9f, 12f, 15a, 18a.

pasu- (masc.): “flock”. 10.18c.

pasca: “after”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.

pascaēta: “then, afterwards”. 11.2b, 12.2d, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.


pāraṣat: “asked”. vid. fras-

pīta- (masc.): “father”. 12.1a, c, 3b.

pūdra- (masc.): “son”. 12.1c, 3a, b, 7c, 19a.

baēṣāziia-: “healing”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.

baēṣāziī.țoma-: “the most healing”. 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.

bar-: “to bring”. barāēta (3rd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Mid.) 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.


barāsman- (neut.): “barāsman-”, sacred twigs”. 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

bīṣāngra-: “biped”. 12.22b, e.

bīṣāmṛtā-: “(Avestan texts) to be said twice”. 10.2a, d, 3a, b, 5a, 15a.

bū-ː “to become, to be”. būn (3rd. Pl. Aor. Subj. Act.) 11.2b, 12.2a, d, 4b, c, 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).

būiōn- (masc.): “Būiōn, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

būiōžan- (masc.): “Būiōžan, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

būiōštā- (fem.): “Būiōštā, the demon of sloth”. 11.9c, d, 12c, d, 15a (2), 18a (2).

brātar- (masc.): “brother”. 12.5a, b (2).


frasábaođab-: “(a blow) by which consciousness goes away”. 12.22c.

apāt- (masc.): “grandson”. 12.9a, 11a (2).
naptī- (fem.): “granddaughter”. 12.9a, 11a (2).
nauua: “nine”. 10.18a.
nar- (masc.): “man”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 11.1c, 2c, 7a, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a, 12.22c, f.
nasu- (masc., fem.): “Nasu, the corpse’s demon”. 10.6a, 17a, b, 11.9a, 12a, 15a, 18a.
nārīkā- (fem.): “woman”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 11.1c, 2c, 7a, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
namata- (masc.): “brushwood”. 12.22f.
nō: “our, us” (enclitic pronoun 1st. Pl. Acc., Gen., Dat.). 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
nōi: “not”. 12.22d, g.
ṇŋhai (masc.): “Ṇŋhaiϑiia, name of a demon”. 10.9b.
mama: “to remain, to wait”. upa + mama-: “to wait (till the house be purified)”. upa.mamaia (3rd. Pl. Pres. Subj. Act.) 12.1b, 3b, 5b, 7b, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a.
mamaui- (masc.): “spirit”. 10.1a, 5b, 11.1a, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
mara: “to die”. mara (PPP.) 12.22a, d, g.
mairiia- (masc.): “vile”. 12.22b, e.
mazdaia: “created by Mazdā”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
mazdaia (masc.): “(Ahura) Mazdā”. 10.1a (2), 2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 11.1a (2), 2a, 12.1e, 2b, 3d, 4c, 5d, 6b, 7c, 8b, 9b, 10a, 11b, 12b, 13b, 14b, 15b, 16b, 17b, 18b, 19b, 20a, 22a.
mazda. at. mōi: “the prayer mazda. at. mōi”. 11.14a, b.
mazua- (masc.): “mortal”. 10.18d.
mātar- (fem.): “mother”. 12.1a, c, 3b.
māzaunia: “Māzaunia, name of a class of demons”. 10.16c.
mazdaiiasni: “Mazdean, related to the Mazdā’s worshippers”. 10.18e.
māb- (masc.): “moon”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a, 12.7c.
mūiōin- (masc.): “Mūiōin, name of a demon”. 11.9e, 12c, 15a, 18a.
mīrī-: “to say”. mīroq (3rd. Sing. Pres. Inj. Act.) 10.2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 11.2a, 12.1e, 2b, 3d, 4c, 5d, 6b, 7c, 8b, 9b, 10a, 11b, 12b, 13b, 14b, 15b, 16b, 17b, 18b, 19b, 20a, 22a.
mīrī-: “to recite”. framrauna (2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. Act.) 10.2a, b, c, d, 3c, 5a, 7c, 9a, 11c, 13a, 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a.
ya-: “who, which” (relative pronoun). 10.1b (2), 2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a (2), b (2), 18e, f, 19b, 11.3a, 8a, 9c, d, f, g, 11a, 12c, d, f, g, 14a, 15a (4), 17a, 18a (4), 20a.
yaoždā- (verb): “to purify”. yaoždāite (3rd. Sing. Aor. Subj. Mid.) 10.18f, 19b. yaoždaišiša (2nd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Mid.) 10.19a. yaoždān (1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Act.) 11.1b, 4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a (2), 12.2a, 4b, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a; yaoždāta (PPP.) 11.12b, c, d, 12a, d, 4b, c, d, 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).
yaoždā-ite (fem.): “purification”. 10.19a.
yaoždāiša: “when, how, that, so much, so many, like”. 12.21a, 22a.
yat: “when, if, until, where”. 10.18b, 12.1a, 3a, b, 4a, 6b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
yaz-: “worship”. yazaēta (3rd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Mid.) 12.2c, 4b, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
yār- (neut.): “year”. 12.22a.
vac-: “word, voice”. 10.2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, c, 5a (2), 7a, b, c, 9a (2), 11a, b, c, 13a (2), 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 11.3a, 4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.
vaiia-: “to blow”.
varə-: “captured”. 12.22c.
vaŋhu-: “good”. 10.20a, 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 17c, 19a, 20c, 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a, 22f.
vazār- (fem.): “coming at will”. 12.2d (3), 4c (3), 6b (3), 8b (3), 10a (3), 12b (3), 14b (3), 16b (3), 18b (3), 20a (3).
vastra- (neut.): “clothes”. 12.2b, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a, 22f.
vā: “or”. 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a, 21a.
vāṛdṛyaṇi-: “victorious”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.
vāṛdṛyaṇio.țama-: “the most victorious”. 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.
vohu-: “with least water”. 10.18b.
vit. vrnuaro.țama-: “with fewest plants”. 10.18b.
vikoro.ṭiśāna-: “which cuts the life off”. 12.22c.
vīra- (masc.): “man”. 10.18c.
vīs- (fem.): “clan”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2).
vīsan-: “twenty”. 12.9b, 11b, 13b, 17b.
vīspa-: “all, every”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 16d, 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
vipati- (masc.): “headman of the clan”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a.
raēβaiia--: “to mingle, to defile”.


paiti + raēβaiia--: “to defile indirectly”. paiti.iriista-- (PPP.) 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2). paiti.raēβaiieiiti (3rd. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act.) 12.21a, 22c.


raocab-- (neut.): “light”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.

riđ--: “to die”. irista (PPP.) 10.1b (2), 17a, b.


uruuarā-- (fem.): “plant”. 11.1c, 2c, 6c, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.21a, 22c.

sauru-- (masc. / fem.): “Sauru, name of a demon”. 10.9b.

star-- (noun; masc.): “star”. 11.1c, 2c, 6c, 9a, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.


zaro- (fem.): “libation”. 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

zana- (masc.): “tribe”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2).

zanta- (fem.): “headman of the tribe”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a.

zam- (fem.): “earth”. 10.18b, 11.1c, 2c, 5c, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.3b, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

zaraϑuśtra- (masc.): “Zaraϑuśtra”. 10.1a, 18a, e, 11.1a, 2a, 12.2d, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a, 22b, d.

zairi- (fem.): “Zairici (the Yellowish), name of a demon”. 10.10a.

zairina-: “Yellowish, epithet of Būsiāstā”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

zą- (neut.): “birth”. 10.18d.

zi: “indeed, for”. 12.22b, d.

ha- (masc.), bā- (fem.), ta- (neut.): “this”. 10.18d, e.

haca: “from, regarding”. 10.1b (2), 5b (12), 6a (12), 9b (12), 10a (12), 13b (12), 14a (12), 17a, b, 11.10a (13), 13a (13), 16a (13), 19a (13), 12.1c (2), 3b (2), 5b (2), 9a (2), 11a (2).

hayhu- (neut.): “food”. 12.22f.
hamaēstar- (masc.): “subduer”. 10.17a, b.
h(a)una-: “his / her / its own”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 18f, 19a.
hauuaūāsλ: vid. h(a)una-
ham. raēθa- (masc.): “Direct defilement”. 10.6a, 11.9b, 12b, 15a, 18a
humata- (neut.): “good thoughts”. 10.18f, 19b.
hūxta- (neut.): “good words”. 10.18f, 19b.
huuar- (neut.): “sun”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
huuarštā- (neut.): “good deeds”. 10.18f, 19b.

xv atō: “by himself, by herself”. 12.7c.

xv arūda- (neut.): “food, drink”. 12.22f.

xv añhar- (fem.): “sister”. 12.5a, b (2).
QUOTATIONS FROM OTHER AVESTAN TEXTS IN VĪDĒVDĀD

V 10.4a: abhū. yāsā. nmaŋhā. xstānazastō. raʃōrabiā. ṁaŋhā. paouruim. spōtauiā. aṣā. vispō. ʃiūodana. vaŋhūs. xratū. manahō. yā. xšnūiṣā. gaḥśa. uruāñni. (= Y 28.1)
V 10.4a: humanahū. xhuixahū. ṣhuudānā. ɣiudāc. xaniudāc. ʃvarzīamnāmca. xvaumzīamnāmca. mahī. aibī.jaratāro. xnaēnātāro. ʃyaθṇā. voθunahū. mahī. (= Y 35.2)
V 10.4a: aʃahū. ʃat. sairī. aʃahū. xvarzī. ʃkaŋhīc. bâtām. ʃjiʃ. ʃvaθiʃ. adā. uboiuiə. ahūbiui. (= Y 35.8)
V 10.4a: yadā. tu. i. xahurā. mazdā. mōnghācā. vaocascā. dāscā. xvarācā. yā. xvobī. adā. ti. xdadmābi. adā. cīsmābi. adā. ḍā. āi. xyaθamaidē. adā. nmaŋhīamahī. adā. išūidīamahī. ḍā. mazdā. ahurā. (= Y 39.4)
V 10.4a: humāim. ḍā. āim. yazatm. aṣyābcim. xdadmāidē. adā. τ. xnih. xgaiascā. xastōtāscā. ʃiāθ. uboiū. ahyunū. xhāt. xhudastm. (= Y 41.3)
V 10.4a: ḍβi. staoartascā. māθranascā. ahurā. mazdā. xagogmadaēcā. xusmāhīcā. xvisamadacecā. hiiat. mīdēm. xmauēdēm. xfradadā. daēnābiu. mazdā. ahurā. (= Y 41.5)
V 10.4a: uštā. ʃaqā. yaxīi. uštā. ʃkaŋhīc. vaʃ.ʃxiuiq. mazdā. daiiat. ahurō. xutaiuii. xtuuiim. ga. ti. xvamē. aʃm. doroθiui. taθ. nōi. dā. xarmitē. rāiō. aʃi. vaŋhūs. xgām. manahō. (= Y 43.1)
V 10.4a: spoθ. ʃmanii. vaθišcā. ʃmaŋhā. xhaθ. aʃat. xšiūoθanac. vacac. xqā. xdan. xhurucac. amērōtac. mazdā. xšadrā. xarmiti. ahurō. (= Y 47.1)
V 10.4a: xvolū. xšadrūm. vairīm. bāγm. aibī. baθirθam. xvīdīθmāi. iθācī. aʃa. xantara. xcaθti. xšiūoθanac. mazdā. xvaθiθam. taθ. nō. xniθt. xvarhō. (= Y 51.1)
V 10.4a: vaθiθ. iθī. xraθ. zaraduθraθe. xspīm. xmaθic. xyeθi. bōi. dāθ. aθiθ. aθ. hac. ahurō. mazdā. xvaiui. vispā. x. xhuñahunin. xyaθ. bo. xdbom. xsaŋnc. xdaθnā. vaŋhui. xθa. xšiūoθanac. (= Y 53.1)
V 10.8a, 10.20a, 11.20c, 12.20θ: aʃm. xvolū. vaθiθam. ati. uštā. ati. uštā. ʃaqi. hiiat. aʃi. vaθiθa. aʃm. (= Y 27.14)
V 10.8a: yā. xsauiθ. ahurō. mazdā. xsaθcā. xarmitisca. xatmc. xfratθgēθm. manac. xvobū. xšadrūm. xraθ. mo. xmoθxdat. mo. daθ. xkahuθiç. paiti. (= Y 33.11)
V 10.8a: xhuθadrū.θomāi. bāθa. aθ. xšadrūm. xamāt. hiiat. xaiθi. xdamābic. xcīmābic. xhuθm. hiiat. mazdāi. ahurāi. ašic. vaθiθi. (= Y 35.5)
V 10.8a: xhuθmaθnāi. xvaiθ. raθ. to. nareθ. xraθi. xaθnas. dajθ. arat. xpaθ. tamiθ. ku. xajθu. ahurō. yā. iθ. juθθiθ. bxθ. miduyθ. vaθ. itoc. xat. xtaθ. xbrux. xahurī. xsrak. xmoθxdat. mo. daθ. xkahuθiç. paiti. (= Y 53.9)
V 10.12a, 20a, 11.3b, c, 8b, 11a, 20a: yadā. ahū. vairiθ. adā. rauθ. ajθç. hac. vaŋhūs. dazdā. manahō. xšiūoθanac. ahyunū. mazdāi. xšadrūm. ahurāi. aθ. ym. drugbui. dadaθ. vāθrām. (= Y 27.13)
V 10.12a, 11.14a, b: mazdā. aθ. mo. vaθiθa. xraθ. xšiūoθanac. vaθ. xθ. τ. xvobū. manahā. ajθc. iθdθm. stūθ. xsmāk. xšadrū. ahurō. foraθm. vsnā. haiθum. da. ahūm. (= Y 34.15)
V 10.12a, 11.7b-d, 17a: ą. airiīmā. ışiiō. rafōrāi. jaṇṭū. nərəbiisca. nāiribiisca. zaraďustrahe. vəi̱bōuš. rafōrāi. manaybhō. yā. daēnā. vairīm. hanāṭ. miždôm. ažābiā. yāsā. ąšim. ątram. ahurō. masatā. mazdā. (Y 54.1)
V 10.20a, 11.3d, 8c, 11b, 20b: kōm.nā. mazdā. manaybhsc. gayā. sūaodhaais. ašim. ąraoštā. aburā. ątam. mıi̱. dəştum. mānaybhsc. frāuazhō. (Y 46.7)
V 10.18f, 19b: daēnām. ayhuuam. “conscience (and) life”
V 11.1b: airime. “secluded” (cf. V 9 and 16 airime. gātûm.äh. ni-had-).
V 11.5d: ymībe. “of the lordly woman”.

AVESTAN WORDS OR PHRASES IN THE PT OF VĪDĒVDĀD

V 10.9b: indar “Indar, name of a demon”.
V 10.9b: nəŋha’dā “Nəŋha’dā, name of a demon”.
V 11.6b: xōii. +təca “perspiration; flown, poured (water)”

PĀZAND WORDS IN THE PT OF VĪDĒVDĀD
PAHLAVI GLOSSARY

abar dwārīdan, dwār- <QDM dwb’lytn’, dwb’l->: “to run about, to run through”. abar dwārēd 10.1b, 17a, b.
abar gumēxtan, gumēxt- <QDM gwmyhtn’, gwmyh->: “to contaminate”. abar gumēxtēd 10.1b, 17a, b, 12.21a, 22c. abarīg <ʾp’ryk>: “other”. 10.18c.
abar rawēnīdan, rawēn- <QDM SGYTWN-nytn’, SGYTWN-yn->: “to go, to enter”. abar rawēnēd 12.2b [A (2)].
abar rist <ʾlyst>: “defiled”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2).
abastāg <ʾpstʾk>: “the Avesta”. 12.3b [B], 3d [B].
abāg <LWTE>: “with”. 11.5d (2), 12.2b [B (2)], 22b [B].
abāyēd 11.7b, c, 12.22b [B].
abāyēh 11.7b, c.
abāyēnīdan abāyēn- <ʾpzʾdynytn’, ʾpzʾdyn->: “to make increase”. bē abāyēnīd 11.6d.
abzār <ʾpzʾl>: “means”. 11.9g, 12g.
abzāyēnīdan abzāyēn- <ʾpzʾdynytn’, ʾpzʾdyn->: “to make increase”. bē abzāyēnīd 11.6d.
ahlaw <ʾhlwb’>: “righteous”. 10.5b, 6a, 11.1a, c (2), 2c (2), 7a (2), 10a (2), 13a (2), 12.2a [A], 4a [A], 6a [A], 8a [A], 10a [A], 12a [A], 14a [A], 16a [A], 18a [A], 20a [A], 22c, f.
ahlāyīh <ʾhlʾdyh>: “Truth”. 11.1c, 2c, 7d, 10a, 13a, 20b, 22h.
ahunawar <ʾhnwl>: “the prayer Ahunawar”. 11.3b, c, 8a, 11a.
amabraspad <ʾmhrspnd>: “Beneficent Immortal”. 12.2e [A] / d [B (3)], 4e [A], 6d [A], 8d [A], 10d [A], 12d [A], 14d [A], 16d [A], 18d [A], 20d [A].
an-abar-xwarišn <ʾ-n-QDM-hwlš’n>: “not drinkable”. 10.18c.
andar <BYN>: “in, inside, between”. 12.2d [A] / c [B], d [B], 3b [B].
andar āmadan, āy- <BYN YATWN-tn’, YATWN->: “to introduce, to add”. andar āmad hē 11.4b.
any <AHRN>: “other”. 10.1a.
any-dādestān <ZK-yh DYNA>: “having another law”. 12.21a [A].
any-kāmag <ZK-yh kʾmk>: “having another desire”. 12.21a [A].
āpāk <ʾ-DKYA>: “impure”. 10.18c.
āpākīb <ʾ-DKYA-ylh>: “impurity”. 12.2b [B].
arādā <ʾltʾy>: “righteous”. 11.5d.
arzānīg <ʾlcʾnyk>: “worthy”. 11.7c.
asar `<ʾsl>`: “boundless”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.
ast `<AYT’>`: s. v. b-
astomand `<st wmnnd>`: “material”. 10.19a, 11.1a, 12.2a [A], 4a [A], 6a [A], 8a [A], 10a [A], 12a [A], 14a [A], 16a [A], 18a [A], 20a [A].
ay `<ʾy>`: “that, that is”. 10.18f, 19b, 11.4b, 9a, c, d, 12a, c (2), d, 12.3d [B], 7a [B (2)].
ayādēnidan, ayādēn- `<by’d tynt’n`, `by’d tynt->`: “to remind”. ayādēnēnd 12.2d [B].
awēsān `<OLE š’n’>`: “they, those”. 10.3a, b, 7a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 11.6b (2), 12.1b, 3b, 5b, 7b, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a.
āfrīnagān `<ʾply<n>gʾn’>`: “the Āfrīnagān prayers”. 12.2d [B].
āhan `<ʾhyn’>`: “metallic implement”. 12.22f [A].
āhōgēnī dan, āhōgēn- `<ʾhwkynytʾl`, ʾhwkyn- `>`: “to defile”. āhōgēnēd 11.9f, g, 12f, g.
ān `<ZK / ʾn’>`: “that, the”. passim.
ānōh `<TME>`: “there”. 11.7c.
ātaxš `<ʾthš>`: “fire”. 11.1c, 2c, 4c, d, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 12.2d [A] / c [B], 2e [A] / d [B (2)], 4d [A], e [A], 6c [A], d [A], 8d [A (2)], 10c [A], d [A], 12c [A], d [A], 14c [A], d [A], 16c [A], d [A], 18c [A], d [A], 20c [A], d [A], 22c.
ābādīh 2c, 10a, 13a, 20b, 12.22h.
avesān `<OLE-š’n’>`: “they, those”. 10.3a, b, 7a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 11.6b (2), 12.1b, 3b, 5b, 7b, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a.
ābūr `<bʾl>`: “time”. 10.3c, 7c, 11c, 12.2c [A (3)], 4c [A (3)], 6c [A (3)], 8c [A (3)], 10c [A (3)], 12c [A (3)], 14c [A (3)], 16c [A (3)], 18c [A (3)], 20c [A (3)].
bēl `<BRA>`: “verbal particle”. 10.1b (2), 2a, 5b, 6a (3), 9b (3), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2), 18d, 11.2a, 3b, 4b, d, 6b, d (2), 8a, 9c, d, 11a, 12c (2), d, 12.1a (2), 2d [B], 5a (2), 7a (2), 9a (2), 11a (2), 13a (2), 15a (2), 17a (2), 19a (2), 21a, 22c [A (2)] / [B], f [A].
bēl `<BRA>`: “but”. 12.1f [B].
bēdom `<bytwm>`: “furthermost, end”. 11.4b.
bēsāzēnīdār `<byš cynyt l’>`: “healing”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.
bēsāzēnīdārtom `<byš cynyt l’twm>`: “the most healing”. 11.3a.
bēšārūd `<byš’ mlwt’>`: “to be said twice”. 10.2a, d, 3a, b, 5a, 15a.
brād <AH / AH-dl / bl’t / blwl>: “brother”. 12.5b. brādar 12.5a, b (3).

brādar-zādak <BLWL-LYLYDN-k>: “nephew”. 12.13a [A].

brādar-zādage <BLWL-z’tkyh>: “niece”. 12.13a [A].


burdan, bar- <YBLWN-tn’, YBLWN- / bwltn’, bl’->: “to bring, to offer”.

bē bawēd 11.9c, d [B], 12c (2).

bē ba 12.22f [A].
drahnā <dlhn’y>: “length, duration”. 10.18c.
drōn <dlwn>: “sacrificial bread”. 12.2c [B], 2d [B].
druz <dlwc>: “Lie”. 10.1b, 17a, b.
duxt <dwhtʾ>: “daughter”. 12.1c, 3a, b, 15a [B], 17a [A] / [B (2)], 19a [B].
duxt brādar <BRTE BLWL>: “niece”. 12.13a [B].
dwāzdah <12>: “twelve”. 12.7c.

(-)ē(w) <HD / 1>: “one, a”. 10.2a, 18c, d, 11.2a, 6b, 9d, 12d.
ēd <HNA>: “this”. 11.4d, 9c, d, 12c, d, 12.1f [B (2)].
ēdar <L’TME>: “here”. 11.7c.
ēdon <ʾytwn>: “thus”. 10.19a, 11.3a, 4a, b (2), c, d, 5a, b, c, 6a, c, d, 7a (2), 12c, 12.1e [B], 22b, d, e, g.
ēg <ADYNʾ>: “then”. 10.18a, 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a, 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a, 21a.
ēk <ʾywk>: “one”. 10.2d (2), 18f, 19b, 11.3c.
ēk-dād <ʾywkʾt>: “sole-created”. 11.6d.
ēn <ẔNE>: “this”. 10.2a, b, c, d, 3b, c, 5a, 7b, c, 9a, 11b, c, 13a, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 18b, 11.3a, 4a, c, 5a, c, d, 6a, b, c, 7a, 12.2d [A], c [B], 4d [A], 6c [A], 8d [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A].
ērmān <ʾylmʾnʾ>: “Ērmān”. 11.7b.
frāz guftan, gōw- <prʾc HLLWN-tnʾ, HLLWN- / gwptnʾ, gwb->: “to recite”. frāz gōw 10.2a, b, c, d, 3c, 7c, 9a, 11c, 13a, 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a. frāz gōwē 10.5a.
frāz srūdan, srāy- <prʾc HLLWN-tnʾ, HLLWN->: “to pronounce, to recite”. frāz srāyīn 11.3b, 8a, 11a, 14a, 20a, 12.14c [A]. frāz srāyēd 12.2c [A] / b [B], 4c [A], 6c [A], 12c [A], 16c [A]. frāz srāyīṣnag (pseudo-Phl.) 12.8c [A], 10c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A].
frāz sūstān, sōy- <prʾc HLLWN-tnʾ, HLLWN->: “to wash”. 12.2b [B].
frāz zadan, zan- <prʾc ztnʾ, zn->: “to blow out”. 12.22c [B].
gannāg mēnōg <gn(n)ʾk mynwg / gn(n)ʾgmynwg>: “Gannag Mēnōg, the Stinking Spirit”. 10.5b, 16a, 11.10a, 13a.
gāh <gʾs>: “Gāḥā, sacred chant”. 10.2a, b, c, d (2), 3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 12.2c [A] / b [B (2)], 3d [B], 4c [A], 6c [A], 8c [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A].
gāw <TWRA>: “cow”
gēhān <gyhʾnʾ>: “creatures, world”. 11.1a, 12.2a [A], 4a [A], 6a [A], 8a [A], 10a [A], 12a [A], 14a [A], 16a [A], 18a [A], 20a [A].
gōspand <gwspnd>: “cattle”. 11.1c, 2c, 6a, b (2), 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 12.22c.
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gōwīšn <gwbšn‘>: “word”. 10.2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, c, 5a (2), 7a, b, c, 9a (2), 11a, b, c, 13a (2), 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 11.3a, 4a, c, 5a, 6a, c, 7a.
guftan, gōw- <YM(R)WN-tn‘, YMR(R)WN- / gwptn‘, gwb->: “to say, to speak”. guft 10.2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 12.21a, 2c [B], 3d, 4c [A], 5d, 6c [A], 7c [A], 8c [A], 9b, 10c [A], 13b, 14c [A], 15b, 16c [A], 17b, 18c [A], 19b, 20c [A], 22a. gōw 10.18e. bē gōw 11.3b, 8a, 11a. gōwēd 11.1b, 4b.
gumēxtan, gumēxt- <gmymhtn‘, gwmyht->: “to mix”.
gumēxtēd 12.21a, 22b.
gumēxt ‘: “to mix directly”.
ham gumēxtēd 12.21a, 22b.
hamēstār <hmystʾl>: “subduer”. 10.17a, b.
hamkār <hmkʾl>: “the same use”. 10.18c.
hamēstār <hmystʾl>: “subduer”. 10.17a, b.
hamkār <hmkʾl>: “the same use”. 10.18c.
hāwišt <hwʾšt>: “disciple”. 11.7d.
hištan, hil- <ŠBKWN-tn‘, ŠBKWN->: “to abandon, to delete”. bē hilam 11.4b.
humat <hwmt‘>: “good thoughts”. 10.18f, 19b.
huwaršt <hwwlšt>: “good deeds”. 10.18f, 19b.
hūxt <hwhtʾ>: “good thoughts”. 10.18f, 19b.

-iz: vid. -z
iʾ <y>: “ezafe, connective particle”. passim.
iʾ <y>: “who, which, what (relative)”. 10.2d (2), 18c.

jām <yʾm>: “glass; crystalline (water)”. 11.5b.
jorā <ywltʾk>: “grain”. 12.2d [B].
jūd <ywtdt>: “separate, different, another”. 12.21a [B].
jūd-āb-tom <ywdt-MYA-twm>: “the most separate from water”. 10.18b.
jūdāg <ywtdtʾk>: “separate”. 12.22c [B].
jūdēwdaḏ <ywtdt­ywdt>: “the Ḫūdēwdaḏ (= Vīdēvdaḏ) ceremony”. 10.2a, 11.2a.
jūd-kēs <ywtdt kyš>: “another doctrine”. 12.21a [B].
jūd-urwar-tom <ywtdt-­wlwl-twm>: “the most separate from plants”. 10.18b.
jūd-xwāyišn <ywtdt hwʾdšn‘>: “another desire”. 10.21a [B].

ka <AMT>: “when, if”. 10.18c, d, 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, d, 7a, 12.22b [B].
kadag-bānūg <ktk bʾnwk>: “lady of the house”. 12.7a [B].
kadag-xwadāy <ktk hwtʾy>: “householder”. 12.7a [B].
kadār <ktʾl>: “which”. 10.3a, 7a, 11a.
kaniq <k’nyk>: “girl”. 12.7c.

kas <AYŚ>: “person, somebody”. 11.9d, 12d. kasi (pseudo-Phl.) 12.1a [B (2)].
kāmag <kʾmk>: “desirous, loving; at will”. 11.7c, 12.2e [A (3)] / d [B (5)], 4e [A (3)], 6d [A (3)], 8d [A (3)], 10d [A (3)], 14d [A (3)], 16d [A (3)], 18d [A (3)], 20d [A (3)].
kāmagīh <kʾmkyh>: “desire”. 11.9f, 12f.

cē <MNW>: “who, which”. 10.1b (2), 2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, 5b (2), 6a (2), 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a (2), b (2), 18b, e, f, 19b, 11.1b, c, 2c, 3a, 4b (2), 5b, 7c, 9b (2), c, f, g, 10a, 12b (2), c (3), d, f, g, 13a, 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a [B], 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a, 21a, 22b [B].
kurišn <kwnš>: “deed, action”. 11.6b.
kū <AYḴ>: “that, that is, so that, where”. 10.1b (2), 2a, 3b, 7b, 18f, 11b, 11.1a, 2a (2), 4b, 6b, d, 7b, c, d, 9c, d, 12c, d, 12.1f [B], 2b [B (3)], 2d [A] / c [B (2)], d [B (3)], 3b [B], 9a [B (2)], 21a [B]. kū tā “so that”. 11.1b.

-<m>: “enclitic pronoun, 1st. Sing.”. 11.7d.

ma <AL>: “not (prohibitive)”. 12.2b [B].

madan <mttn>: “to come”. 11.7b, c.

may <mγ>: “hole”. 10.18a.

man <L>: “I”. 11.4b.


mard <GBRA>: “man”. 10.5b, 6a, 11.1c, 2c, 7a, 10a, 13a, 12.22c, f.

mardūm <ANŠWT / mltwm>: “mortal, man, mankind”. 10.18d, 11.6b.
mazdātmō <mzdʾtmwk>: “the prayer mazdā. a”. mōi.
mādag <NK Ḷ>: “female”. 11.5d (2).

mādar <mtʾl>: “mother”. 12.1a, c, 3b.

māb <BYRH>: “moon, month”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 12.7c (2).

mān <mʾn>: “house”. 10.1b (2), 6a (2), 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 11.1b, 2b, 4a, 10a, 13a, 12.2b [A] / a [B], c [B], 2c [A] / d [B (3)], 3b [B], 4b, 4e [A], 6b [A], d [A], 8b [A], d [A], 10b [A], c [A], 12b [A], c [A], 14b [A], c [A], 16b [A], c [A], 18b [A], c [A], 20b [A], c [A].

mānbēd <mʾnpt>: “master of the house”. 10.5b, 6a, 12.7a.


māzanīg <mʾznyk>: “Māzan, a type of demons”. 10.16c.
māzdēm <mʾzd GPA>: “Mazdean, related to the Mazdā’s worshippers”. 10.18e.

mēb <msyh>: “supremacy”. 11.7d.

mizd <mzd>: “reward; fruits offered in a ceremony”. 11.7c, 12.2d [B].
mowbed <mgwpt>: “mowbed, a type of priest”. 11.7d.
mowbedih <mgwptyh>: “the priesthood of mowbed”. 11.7d. mowbedan mowbedih “the highest priesthood” 11.7d.
murdan, mir- <YMYTWN-tn’, YMYTWN->: “to die”. bē mirēd 12.1a (2), 3a (2), 5a (2), 7a (2), 9a (2), 11a (2), 13a (2), 15a (2), 17a (2), 19a (2), 21a. mirēd 12.22a [A], d [A], g. murdag 12.22a [B], d [B].

naḥag <npk>: “grandson”. 12.9a, 11a [A] / [B (2)].
nabērag <npylk>: “grandson, granddaughter”. 12.9a.
nāf <nʾp>: “family”. 12.22d [A].
nārīg <nʾylyk>: “woman”. 10.5b, 6a, 11.1c, 2c, 7a, b, 10a, 13a.
nāf <nʾp>: “family”. 12.2d [A].

ūn <KON>: “now”. 11.4b, 12.2d [A], 4d [A], 6c [A], 8d [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A].

ō <OL /ʾw’>: “to”. 10.1b (2), 17a, b, 11.4d, 7b, 13a.
ōh <KN>: “so, thus; maybe”. 11.9a (2).
ōy <OLE>: “he, she, it (3rd. Sing.); that”. 10.1b (6), 17a (3), b (3), 19a, 11.6d, 12g, 12.22b [B (2)].

pad <PWN>: “in, on, at, to”. 10.1a (4), 2a, b, c, d (3), 3a, b, 6a (2), 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 17a, b, 18b, c (2), d (2), e, f, 19b, 11.1b, c (12), 2b, c (12), 3c, 4a, c, d (2), 5a, c, 6a, c, d, 7a (2), b, c (2), d, 9b (2), d, 12b (2), d, 12.2c [B], 2d [B (5)], 21a [A] / [B (2)], 22b [B (2)], c [B].
pah <ʾphʾ>: “flock”. 10.18c.
pabast <ʾphʾstʾ>: “fold”. 11.6b (2).
pahikārdan, pahikār- <ptkʾltn’, ptkʾl->: “to fight”. pahikārem 10.1b (2), 11.9a (2), 12a (4), b (2), c, d, f, g, 13a.
pablam <ʾpʾhlwʾ>: “the best”. 10.18d, 11.6b (2), 20b, 12.22h.
pahrēz <p'lyc>: “protection”. 11.4d.
panǰ <5>: “five”. 11.3b (2), 20a.
panjāb <50>: “fifty”. 12.9b, 11b [B].
parig <plyk>: “Parīg, a feminine evil being”. 11.9f, 12f.
was <AHL>: “then, afterwards”. 11.2b, 9a (2), 12a (2), 12.2e [A] / d [B], 4e [A], 6d [A], 8d [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A]. pas az 10.5a, 9a, 13a, 18d, 12.2d [B].
paydāg <pytʾk>: “manifest”. 10.18e.
paydāgīh <pytʾkyh>: “manifestation”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 15a.
payrēh <ptlytʾ>: “indirect defilement”. 10.1b, 6a, 17b, 11.9b, 12b, 12.21a.
pāk <DKYA>: “pure”. 10.18f, 12.2b [B (2)], 4b [A], 8b [A], d [A], 10b [A], c [A], 12b [A], 14b [A], c [A], 16b [A], c [A], 18b [A], c [A], 20b [A], c [A].
pākīh <DKYA-yh>: “purity”. 10.18d.
pānagīh <pʾnkyh>: “protection”. 11.3c, 4b.
pērōzgar <pylwckl>: “victorious”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.
pērōzgartom <pylwcgltwm>: “the most victorious”. 11.3a.
pēš <LOYNʾ>: “before”. 11.9a, 12a.
pid <pytʾ>: “father”. 12.1a, c, 3b.
pid brād <BLWL>: “uncle”. 12.15a [A].
pid brādar <BLWL-ynʾ>: “aunt”. 12.15a [A].
*purdēnīdan, purdēn- <pwltynʾ>: “to fight, to struggle”. bē purdēnam 10.5b, 6a (3), 9b (3), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2). purdēnam 11.9a (2), b (2), c, d, f, g, 10a, 15a.
pus <BRE / pws / pwsl>: “son”. 12.1c, 3a, b, 7c [A], 15a [B], 17a [A] / [B (2)], 19a [B (2)], pusar 12.7c [B].
pus brādar <BLWL>: “nephew”. 12.13a [B].
raftan, raw- <SGYTWN-tnʾ, SGYTWN- / lptnʾ, lp->: “to go, to enter”. rawd 12.2e [A (3)], 4e [A (3)], 6d [A (3)], 8d [A (3)], 10d [A (3)], 12d [A (3)], 14d [A (2)], 16d [A (3)], 18d [A (3)], 20d [A (3)].
rasīdan, ras- <YHMWTN-tnʾ, YHMWTN->: “to arrive, to come”. bē rasam 11.4d. rasīn 11.7b. bē rasēd 11.9d, 12d. rasēd 12.22b [B].
rāmišn <lʾmšnʾ>: “pleasure”. 11.7b (2), c.
rāmišntom <lʾmšnʾtwm>: “he who pleases the most”. 11.7c.
rāy <lʾd>: “for; mark of the DO in late Phl.”. 11.3c, 6b, 12.2d [B (2)], 3c [B (2)], 17a [B (2)], 19a [B (2)], 22b [B].
rēman <lymnʾ>: “impure”. 10.6a (2), 11.9b (2), 12b (2), 12.22d [B].
rīst <lystʾ>: “dead”. 10.1b (2), 17a, b.
rōšn <lwšnʾ>: “kindled”. 12.2c [B].
rōšīh <lwšnyh>: “light”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.
rōz <YWM>: “day”. 10.18c, 12.1f [B (2)], 2b [B (5)], c [B], d [B], 3d [B (2)], 19b [B (2)].
ruwbʾ <lwbnʾ>: “soul”. 10.18d.
sagrih <sglyh>: “satiation”. 12.22f [A].
sawr <swl>: “Sawr, name of a demon”. 10.9b.
sâl <SN T>: “year”. 10.18c, 12.22a.
sê <3>: “three”. 10.7c, 2c [A (3)] / b [B (5)], c [B], d [B], 4c [A (3)], 6c [A (3)], 8c [A (3)], 10c [A (3)], 12c [A (3)], 14c [A (3)], 16c [A (3)], 18c [A (3)], 20c [A (3)].
snh <sn’h>: “blow”. 10.16a, b, c, d, 12.22c [B].
sneh <snyh>: “blow”. 12.22c [A].
spenâmg mënôg <spnʾmynwg>: “Beneficent Spirit”. 12.21a, 22b.
spitāmān <spytʾmʾn>: “Spitāmān”. 12.2e [A] / d [B], 4e [A], 6d [A], 8d [A], 10d [A], 12d [A], 14d [A], 16d [A], 18d [A], 20c [A], 22b, d.
srîšámriid <slyš mlwt ’>: “to be said thrice”. 10.2b, d, 7a, b, 9a, 15a.
srōš <slwš>: “Srōš”. 12.2c [B].
star <stl>: “star”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.
stī <sty>: “existence”. 10.5b, 6a.
stō <stwb ’>: “defeated”. 10.1b (2).
štōš <stwš>: “the stōš ceremony”. 12.2c [B].
št <š>: “enclitic pronoun, 3rd. S ing.”. 10.1b, 2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 11.2a, 6a, d, 9a, 12a, 12.1e [A], 2c [A] / b [B], 3d, 4c [A], 5d, 6c [A], 7c [A], 8c [A], 9b, 10c [A], 11b, 12c [A], 13b, 14c [A], 15b, 16c [A], 17b, 18c [A], 19b, 20c [A], 22a.
šaš <6>: “six”. 12.7c.
šān <šʾn ’>: “enclitic pronoun, 3rd. Pl.”. 10.18d, 11.6b.
šāyistan, šāy- <šʾdstn’, šʾd->: “to be proper”. 10.18c (2).
šnāyēnīdāhīh <šnʾdynytʾlyh>: “propitiation”. 11.4d.
šustan, šōy- <HLLWN-stn’, HLLWN->: “to wash”. šōyēd 12.2c [A (2)], b [B], 4c [A (2)], 6c [A (2)], 10c [A (2)], 12c [A (2)], 14c [A (2)], 16c [A (2)], 18c [A (2)], 20c [A (2)]. šōyišnag (pseudo-Phl.) 12.8c [A (2)]. šōy (pseudo-Phl.) 12.22b [B].
št <št>: “enclitic pronoun, 2nd. Sing.”. 11.4b, 7b (2), c.
tan <tn’>: “body”. 10.5b, 6a, 11.3c, 6d, 12.2c [A] / b [B (2)], 2d [B], 4c [A], 6c [A], 8c [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A].
tanāpugh <tnʾpwhlk>: “tanāpuhl sinner”. 12.1d, e [A] / f [B], 3c, d, 5c, d, 7b, c, 9a, b, 11a, b, 13a, b, 15a, b, 17a, b, 19a, b.
tar <tl>: “through, across”. 12.22a [A].
tarsâgh <tlskʾs>: “reverent”. 11.7d.
tarsâghīh <tlskʾsyh>: “reverence”. 11.6d, 7d.
tawriz <twlyc>: “Tawriz, name of a demon”. 10.10a.
tā <OD>: “until, so that; preceding numerals in late Phl.”. 11.1b, 12.2b [B (4)], c [B], 3b [B], c [B (2)], 5b [B], c [B (2)], 7b [B], 9a [B], 11a [B (2)], 13a [B (2)], 15a [B], 17a [B (2)], b [B (2)], 19a [B (2)]. tā ō 11.4b.
tō <LK>: “you (2nd. Sing.)”. 10.18a, 11.4d, 7c, 10a, 13a.
xwaršēd <hwlsyt‘>: “sun”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.

xwāhsīnḥ <hw’dsnıyh>: “prayer”. 11.7d.

xwāstan, xwān-: “to recite”. xwānēd 12.2b [B], 3b [B], xwānēnd 12.3d [B].

xwānišn <KRYTWN-šn’: “invocation”. 12.2d [B].

xwēd <hwyt>: “moist”. 10.18c.

yašṭam, yaṭ-: “to celebrate, to worship”. bē yaz 10.2a, 11.2a, yazam 11.5b, d, yazēd 12.2d [A (2)] / c [B (3)], 4d [A], 6c [A], 8d [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A]. yazēnd 12.2d [B]. bē yazēnd 12.2d [B].

yōǰdāsrēnīdan, yōǰdāsrēn-: “to purify”. yōǰdāsrēnam 11.1b, 12a [B], 4b [B], 12b [A], 14b [A], 16b [A], 18b [A], 20b [A].

zāy <z->: “too, and”. 10.2d (3), 11.7c, 12c, 12.2b [B], 22a, f [A].

zādan, zāy-: “to strike, to smite, to kill”. zānd 12.22c. zānēd 12.22c.

zābr <zhl>: “poison”. 11.9c, 12c (2).

zābr-gar <zhkl>: “poisoner”. 11.9c, 12c.

zābr-garīb <zhkllyh>: “poisoning”. 11.9c, 12c.

zānd <znd>: “time”. 11.4b.

zāndbed <zndp’t>: “headman of the tribe”. 10.5b, 6a.

zārd(u)xšt <zltw(h)sṭ>: “Zardu(x)št”. 10.18a, e, 11.1a, 2a, 7b, 12.2e [A] / d [B], 4e [A], 6d [A], 8d [A], 10d [A], 12d [A], 14d [A], 16d [A], 18d [A], 20e [A], 22b, d.

zādan, zāy-: “to be born”. bē zād hēnd 10.18d.

zārīz <z’lyc>: “Zāriz, name of a demon”. 10.10a.

zāysiš <YLYDWN-šn’>: “birth”. 10.18d.

zāndag <zywndk / zynd>: “alive”. 10.1b (2), 17a, b, 12.22b, c (5), d.

zōbr <zhwl>: “libation”. 12.2d [A] / c [B (2)], 4d [A], 6c [A], 8d [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A].
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