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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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<tr>
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<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Signs

- |a|, |b|, ... 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
* conjecture
** reconstructed word
*** impossible reconstruction
< derives from
> results in
< > in transliteration, Pahlavi word;
in transcription, word(s) supplied
# word or syllable ending
° abbreviation of part of a word or compound
→ 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”)\(^1\) 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:\(^2\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avestan Text</th>
<th>Vīdēvdād 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.
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 yaḥā. abū. vairīo and ā. airtišmā. 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 yaḥā. abū. vairīo 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 Y27.6</td>
<td>Vr 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y27.7-27.final</td>
<td>V 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Y 28-30</td>
<td>Vr 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Y 32-34.13</td>
<td>Vr 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vr 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Y 35-42</td>
<td>Vr 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Y 43-46</td>
<td>Vr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Y 47-50</td>
<td>Vr 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Y 51</td>
<td>Vr 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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 Y 52-53</td>
<td>Vr 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Y 54</td>
<td>Vr 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 Barəšnūm‘ 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. barəšnūm. vaγδanəm, 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 Barōṣnum-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. bundahišn)</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 yaϑā. abú. vairiiō and would correspond to the distribution of the staota yesnia in 22 chapters in complex rituals. According to Cantera this can be seen in the following correspondence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y 27.13 yaϑā. abú. vairiiō (4x)</th>
<th>V 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y 27.14 aϑōm. vohū (3x)</td>
<td>V 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y 27.15 yeįhē. bātām</td>
<td>V 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y 28.0 yānūm. manō</td>
<td>V 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y 29 xīmaēibiu. gūm. urunuā</td>
<td>V 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y 30 aṯ. tā. vaxšu. ištōntō</td>
<td>V 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y 31 tā. v. urunuātā</td>
<td>V 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y 32 aŋiūacā. saetūš</td>
<td>V 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y 33.1 yaϑāiš. iϑā</td>
<td>V 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y 34.1 ya. šuarādanā</td>
<td>V10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>YH</td>
<td>V11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y 43.1 uštā. abmāi</td>
<td>V12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y 44.1 taṯ. džā. pārōsā</td>
<td>V13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y 45.1 aṯ. frauaxšītā</td>
<td>V14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y 46.1 kōm. nā. mōi. zām</td>
<td>V15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y 47.1 spōntā. mainiūm</td>
<td>V16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y 48.1 yezi. adāiš</td>
<td>V17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Y 49.1 aṯ. mā. yannā</td>
<td>V18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Y 50.1 kaṯ. mōi. urunuā</td>
<td>V19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Y 51.1 vohū. xšadṛm</td>
<td>V20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Y 53.1 vahšitā. ištīš</td>
<td>V21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Y 54.1 a. aurišāma. ištīō</td>
<td>V22</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 yesniia 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: Zaraδuṣṭra’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. Zaraδuṣṭra 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 Gādās and the Yasna Haptaŋhāti 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, Akataša, Varəñiia 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 "Daēuuas vertreibende Worte" at the conference Dēmons ivranpies 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.
summary of the whole of the purification’s ceremony of Vīdēvdād. 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 Barašṇūm 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 Barašṇūm 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. zarađuśtroc) and the end of V 9.46 (Av. maṇaiın. ba. ... rađiia. varma), 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 Barašṇūm 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 Barašṇūm 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 Barašṇūm 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 Barašṇūm 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. huško.zəmōtəməmca of V 3.15c.
- V 10.18c: the text ənaibis.xərađa. pasu.vira “not drinkable by both flock and men” seems to be a gloss to V 10.18b. It is related to V 6.32c aipis.xərađa. pasubiia. viročibiiia “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 Barašṇūm-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. būxtāišca. hūuarštāišca of V 10.18f resemble the words humata, būxta, hūuaršta 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. huuqm. daēnm. yaoždāite “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. būxtāišca. hūuarštāišca 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 (daēnm. ... daēnaiiā) 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:

- Zarathustra’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 Vairia (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 Vairia (V 11.8).
- To recite the apotropaic formula parable + evil being (V 11.9-10).
- To recite four Ahuna Vairia (V 11.11).
- To recite the apotropaic formula paršta + evil being (V 11.12-13).
- To recite four mazda. aš. mōi (V 11.14).
- To recite the apotropaic formula parable + evil being (V 11.15-16).
- To recite five Ahuna Vairia (V 11.17).

According to the PV, the sequence of parable + evil being of V 11.15-16 would not be closed by the corresponding paršta + evil being. Since the previous sequence with parable + 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 parable + 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. airišmā. išiō before the five Ahuna Vairia prescribed in 11.17, then the apotropaic formula “paršta + evil being” and finally five Ahuna Vairia:

1 sequence with parable + evil being (V 11.9-10).
4 Ahuna Vairia (V 11.11).
1 sequence with paršta + evil being (V 11.12-13).
4 mazda. aš. mōi (V 11.14).
1 sequence with parable + evil being (V 11.15-16).
4 ā. airišmā. išiō (V 11.17).
1 sequence with paršta + evil being (V 11.18-19).
5 final Ahuna Vairia (V 11.20).

According to this, the recitation of the four ā. airišmā. išiō 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 parəne + evil being are closed by their correspondent paršta + evil being and the sequences (parəne + evil being) + (paršta + 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: Zarəuštra’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 parəne.
- 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 parəne.
- V 11.17: (Y 54.1) x 4.
- V 11.18-19: spells by paršta.
- 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 "Daēuuas 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 parəne or paršta + 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 bāḫ, 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.pərəϑə-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.pərəϑə-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.pərəϑə-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.pərəϑə-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.pərəϑə-sinners (V 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.pərəϑə-sinners (V 12.9).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.10).
- The uncle and the aunt: 15 days for the pious, 30 for the tanu.pərəϑə-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.pərəϑə-sinners (V 12.13).
- The uncle and the aunt: 15 days for the pious, 30 for the tanu.pərəϑə-sinners (V 12.14).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.15).
- The male cousin dies and the female cousin: 10 days for the pious, 20 for the tanu.pərəϑə-sinners (V 12.16).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.17).
- The male cousin dies and the female cousin: 10 days for the pious, 20 for the tanu.pərəϑə-sinners (V 12.18).
- Ceremonies to be performed to purify the house (V 12.19).
- The male cousin’s son dies and the female cousin’s daughter: 5 days for the pious, 10 for the tanu.pərədə- 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.pərədə- sinners, but also the list of relatives, because it adds the master of the house (Av. nmānō.paiti-) and the mistress of the house (Av. nmānō.padnī-). According to Darmesteter (1892-1893 2.186-187), Av. nmānō.paiti- 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.paiti- 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>Dead 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 ʾxšunaštim “sixty” of V 12.5 and the numeral ʾxšunaš “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 sequence⁶.

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.mānaiia 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.mānaiia 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 “Daēuas 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.mānaii. aēte. yōi. mazdaiasna. aīi.γāme. āat hama. māzdrājahīm “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.manaiaian 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 Gāϑās thrice (ṛiś.ṛasāiti. tanunăm. ṛiś.ṛasāiti. vastranăm. ṛiś.ṛasrūiti. gāϑanăm).

Then they must worship the fire, spread the barsman- and offer libations to the good Waters (imā. nō. āṯrām. yazaēta. barsma. stṛrmaēta. aįǜiō. +vaŋhubiō. zaotré. 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 Nōsīrwan 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,7 regardless of the degree of kinship (so in Mānavadharmaśāstra 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.
152-153, 218-219, 370-371) 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 tanuparāśada- sin, while according to the Indian legal codes it is longer for the lower castes. Indeed, according to Mānavadharmaśāstra 5.83 (Dave 1972-1985 vol. III) and Garuḍa Purāṇa 1.222.33 (Shastri 1979 657) the brāhmaṇa becomes pure after ten days, the kṣatriya after twelve, the vaiśya 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 vaiśya 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 vaiśya 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 dhriśfrasnāti. tanunām “by the washing of their bodies thrice”.

---

8 vid. Baudhāyana’s Dharmasūtra 1.11.27-30 (Olivelle 2000 222-223) too.
9 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.
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 Haptaŋhāti (Y 35.2-41.6) and the prayers yaϑā. ahū. vairiiō (Y 27.13), aϑm. vohū (Y 27.14) and ā. airiiō. 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 Zarāϑuštra 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 Zarāϑuštra’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 Indo-Iranian unity).
1700-1200 B.C. Old Avestan (time of composition of the YH and the Gādās, 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 Vidyadad) 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. 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. 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 Yaštks 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 Vištāspa with Darius’ father, called in Greek Hystaspe, which would date Zarāšuṣtra’s life and Vištāspa’s conversion to Zoroastrianism to the 6th century B.C. If the oldest Avestan texts, the Gāthās, 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 Vīdēvdād. 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 Vīdēvdād to the Median magi. Moulton (1917 6) partially followed Haug’s date for the Old Avestan texts and traced back the existence of Zarāšuṣtra four or five centuries earlier than the traditional date of 660-583 B.C. However, he disagreed regarding the dating of Vīdēvdād.

On one hand, he said that the ritualism of Vīdēvdād has nothing to do with Zarāšuṣtra’s ethical teaching. On the other hand, he noticed that some practices attested in Vīdēvdād 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 Vīdēvdād.

I must add that Moulton’s (1917) separation of Vīdēvdād from Zarāšuṣtra’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, Zarāšuṣtra lived 258 years (Great Bundahišn) or 300 (Ardā Wūrāz 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) critised 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 Vištāspa.
16 Christensen assigned the composition of Vīdēvdād to the Medians in (1944 35-36), but in (1941 28-29) had stated that Vīdēvdād 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 cxcii 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-, guḍa-, guṇa-. The following would derive from Greek: gaēsu-, asparana-, 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 Indo-European 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.pərəne + Acc. > paiti.pərəne + X. Out of the syntagms paiti.pərəne. aŋrəm. mainiǔm (10.5b), paiti.pərəne. nasûm. paiti.pərəne. həm.raēδ̆m. paiti.pərəne. paiti.raēδ̆m (10.6a) or paiti.pərəne. indrəm. paiti.pərəne. saurum. paiti.pərəne. nāṃhāid̆m (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.pərəne + nominative (zairici in 10.10a; *vareniia. daēnuo and *vātō. daēnuo in 10.14a) or vocative (taurunī in 10.10a), instead of the expected accusatives.

- 11.9: pərəne + Acc. > pərəne + X. The same can be said regarding the apotropaic formula pərəne + object “I fight X” in V 11.9. Out of the syntagms pərəne. *aēšməm. pərəne. nasûm. pərəne. həm.raēδ̆m. pərəne. paiti.raēδ̆m, where the objects appears in accusative, as expected, a variation is produced where
the verb *parǝne* is repeated as a formula and objects are added, regardless of their inflection. Thus, we find *parǝne* + nominative (*xruuiyi, biiöiza, kundiža, bušiğasta. yä. zairina, bušiğasta. yä. daraygo, gaua, kapastiš*) or vocative (*xru, biiöi, kunda, miiöi*), 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 Vīdēvdād 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. bun. 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:


From the point of view of the composition, 11.2c seems a pasted copy of the participle *yaoždāta* of 11.2b plus the sequence of accusatives already mentioned in 11.1c. Notwithstanding, the discordance between *yaoždāta* and its subject is confirmed by the parallel *yaoždāta. bun. vohu. manō. yaoždāta. bun. *mašiō* “the Good Thought will be purified, the man will be purified” of V 19.23 and 25, where neither *vohu. manō* nor *mašiō* agree 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.

- 11.12, 13, 18, 19: *paršta + Voc. / Acc.* (instead of Nom. Sing. Fem. / Nom. Pl. Neut.). The sequence of *paršta + X* seems to have been modelled on that of *yaoždāta + Acc.* in 11.2c. Indeed, in both cases a formulaic participle is following by a list of elements of a preceding passage, regardless of their expected inflection in the new passage.

- 12.19a: *Nom. + para.iriðiieiti > X + para.iriðiieiti*. 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.iriðiieiti* varies. All these subjects appear in nominative. In V 12.19a we find the nominal syntags *tūiriia.puðrō. puðrō* “the male cousin’s son” (Nom. + Nom.) and *tūiriia.duγđa. vā. duγđa* “the female cousin’s daughter” (Nom. + Nom.) as subjects instead of *tūiriia.puðrahe. puðrō* (Gen. + Nom.) and *tūiriia.duγđorō. duγđa* (Gen. + Nom.). Although the first could be interpreted as a compound *tūiriia.puðrō. puðrō*, the presence of the conjunction *vā* between *tūiriia.duγđa* and *duγđa* 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 *puðrō* and *duγđa* to the nominatives *tūiriia.puðrō* and *tūiriia.duγđa* of 12.17a, regardless of their inflection.

17 cf. the variation of the formula in V 19.20 *bunaq. vohu. manō. 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 **ima. nmānəm** 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 **nmānem**, but both **ima** and **yaoždaðāni** remain the same. The result is a formula **ima + X + yaoždaðāni**, where accusatives of all genders are added: **ima. nmānem. yaoždaðāni** (11.4a); **ima. ātrəm. yaoždaðāni** (11.4c); **ima. āpəm. yaoždaðāni** (11.5a); **ima. zəm. yaoždaðāni** (11.5c); **ima. əzm. yaoždaðāni** (11.6a); **ima. uuruərm. yaoždaðāni** (11.6c); **ima. narəm. ašaunəm. yaoždaðāni. ima. nārikəm. ašaunəm. yaoždaðāni** (11.7a).

Bartholomae (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 **iməm** (Acc. Sing. Masc.) or **iməm** (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 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 Yaśts. 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 Yaśts, 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 Yaśts 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><em>Fragard</em></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 *aētaṃ* (Acc. Sing. Fem.)
- 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13a, 14a, where *aṣaonō* (Gen. Sing. Masc.) is found instead of *aṣaonīitā* (Gen. Sing. Fem.).
B) Number

A discordance which implies both number and gender is only found in imā. ... āṭram 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. āṭram 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 daēnuō (Nom. Sing. Masc.) is used instead of daēnuq (Acc. Pl. Masc.).
- 10.16a, b, c, d: snāṭm (Acc. Sing. Masc.) instead of snāṭa (Nom. Pl. Masc.).
- 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a: vārəniiō. təməmc. baēšaziō. təməmc (Acc. Sing. Masc.) instead of vārəniiō. təməca. baēšaziō. 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, c, 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: baēšaziāia (Nom. Pl. Masc.) instead of baēšaziāiq (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: *aŋhuuō. zamō (Gen. Sing. Fem.) instead of aŋhe. zōmī (Loc. Sing. Fem.)
- 10.19a: aŋhōuš. astuuatō (Gen. Sing. Masc.) instead of aŋhuuō. astuuāinti (Loc. Sing. Masc.).

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

4.1.2. Prepositions and postpositions

Postpositions were still preserved as such in V 10, as the examples of Av. gādāhu (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. juuāntōn. upa.duuašaiti and upa. juuāntōm. *upa. raēθaitīti 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 haca must be observed. In Old Avestan the preposition haca usually accompanies the genitive and the ablative, while YAv. haca 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, zantu, daēbhu*), by a Gen. (*hauaiaiās.tanuūo, nmāno,patōi, vīspatōi, zantupatōi, daēhbpatōi, vīspaiū. ašaon. stōi* or even by a Nom. (*nā. paiti.iri, nārīka, paiti.iri*).

- Acc., Abl.: in 11.10a, 13a, 16a and 19a the preposition *haca* is followed in the same sentence either by an Abl. (*nmāna, aētra, ata, zōna, gāo, ururaraiaia* or by an Acc. (*narem. ašaunsan, nārīkām. ašaonim, stroī, māhām, huuara, anaia. rāo, vīspā, vohu. mazdādāta. aša,ci*). 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 + mātarom*), 12.3b (*haca + puhrām, haca + dūyārām*) and 12.5b (*haca + xəṝyārām, haca + bṛātārām*). Av. *haca* is also accompanied by Nom. in 12.9a (*haca + niākō, haca + niāka*) and 12.11a (*haca + napti*).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. *kāmcīt* appears instead of *kascīt* (Nom. Sing. Masc.) in *kāmcīt. vā. taoxmanām. para.iriḍīeiti* (V 12.21a). The use of Av. *kāmcīt* instead of the expected *kascīt* (Nom. Sing. Masc.) could be due to the anticipation of the Gen. Pl. ending of the following *taoxmanām*. So it would be a corruption in the written transmission. However, Av. *kāmcīt + 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 *kāmcīt. vā. hubaioiūtmanām. ururaranām* “or of any one of the most aromatic plants” or in V 9.13 *aāt. hā. druχā. aumāstrīeite. kāmcīt. vā. vacayāhām* “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 –*qm* in Av. *aēṣam* was reinterpreted as a Gen. Pl. ending and affected other pronominal stems. Hence in late Young Avestan Av. *kāmcīt* and Av. *aṇiṇām* (V 2.29, 2.37) were also understood as Gen. Pl. After this reinterpretation, the ending of Av. *ka* in the syntagm Av. *ka* – *ci* ū. vā + Gen. Pl. was attracted by this Gen. Pl., so that it became a fossilised syntagm Av. *kāmcīt. vā + Gen. Pl.* Subsequently *kāmcīt* 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 + naptō* was attested, as the variant *napō* in K2, F10, T44 in the right margin, L1, T46, P1, L2 and L5 confirm. However, R3, E4, Mf2 and K9 show the correct *napō*, so I agree with Geldner’s *napō* 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.manaian 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.manaian, 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.manaian in V 12 are textual corruptions. They probably represent a correct subjunctive upa.manaian.

As Kellens (1984 269-271) observed, subjunctives are used in questions whenever a prescription is requested. They are frequent in direct questions in Vidēvdād when they are introduced by Av. ka-, katāra- or cuuantu-. Consequently, as Av. upa.manaian appears in a direct question introduced by cuuatu, Geldner’s (1896) emendation upa.manaian 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 fragard, 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 pasubīia.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 fragard.

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 –ō. 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: framrâuua (2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. Act.) instead of the expected athematic framruiddī22.

---

21 vid. pərəmāne, mrao, honti, pəținte, prəne, aŋhət, yao̱zdāi̱te, yao̱zdai̱ṯi̱si̱a, asti, yao̱zdada̱ni̱, bun, aŋhən, pərəne, aži, stərənaəta, jaiṉti.  
22 vid. främəná, frəntə, frəntə, frəntə
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 aniiadacā instead of aniiadacā; B2, T46 daðomahi instead of daðomahi; B2 išiiiiāmahi and T46 išiiiiāmahi instead of išiiiiiiāmahi; B2, T46 daðomaide instead of daðomaide; L1 huðäästämā, B2 huðäästämā and T46 huðäästämā instead of huðäästämā; B2, T46 fradaðādā instead of fradaðādā.
- 10.8: B2, T46 daðmabičā instead of daðmabičā.

vid. other Young Avestan examples of thematisation of athematic verbs in (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 209, 217, 219).

46
Another example of Old Avestan consonantal adaptation to Young Avestan phonetics occurs seemingly with intervocalic *–h-*. In such case, YAv. –ŋh- appear instead of OAv. –ng-.  

- 10.4: B2, T46 *māṇhācā* instead of *māṅghācā*.

The fricativisation of OAv. –d- > YAv. –d̪- 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. –ŋh- instead of OAv. –ṅg-. In B2, T46 *māṇhācā* instead of *māṅghācā*. 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 ŋ and ng can be easily explained by the influence of the recitation, because actually they were not distinguished phonetically. Because of this, only one graphem, namely ŋ, was generalised and progressively substituted the old graphic distinction. As a matter of fact, the same generalisation of ŋ 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 ŋ 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 *ahura* instead of *ahurā*; B2 gaiASCa instead of gaiASCā; L4 staaTARASCa instead of staaTARASCā; B2 ahurā instead of *ahurā*.
- 10.8: B2 *yō* instead of *yā*.
- 10.12: B2 *jantū* instead of *jantū*.
- 11.4b: L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 *pafrē* instead of *pafrē*.
- 11.4d: L4, P2, G34 . Br1, L2, E4 *abe* instead of *abiiā*.
- 11.4d: D62, P2, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 paOIriie; L1, P1 paōuruiie; B2, T46 paōuruiie; R278, Br1, L2 paōuruiie; G42 paōuruiie; E4 paōuruiie instead of OAv. *paōuruiiē*.
- 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 *gauōi* 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 *nāiribiiasca* instead of *nāiribiiascā*.
- 11.7d: $Mf2$ masata instead of masatā.

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

Another frequent adaptation takes place in the simplification of the Old Avestan group *–(i)jV# / *–(i)jVN#. We find it in the ending of the Gen. Sing. YAv. –ahe instead of the expected OAv. –ahiā and in YAv. –im instead of the expected OAv. –īām:
- 10.4, 12: B2, T46 zarāduštrahe instead of OAv. zarāduštrahīā or even Middle Av. zarāduštrahē.
- 11.7b: zarāduštrahe instead of OAv. zarāduštrahīā or even Middle Av. zarāduštrahē.
- 10.12: L1, B2, T46 haiđīm instead of haiđīām.

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)jV# / *–(i)jVN#, only zarāduštrahe, instead of OAv. zarāduštrabīā or Middle Av. zarāduštrahā, 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 Viđēvdād. In spite of the variant zarāduštrahe 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 Viđēvdād 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.23

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 spaiieiti. draošom the oldest VS manuscripts attest spaiieiti. ṣātṿṇom (L1, T46, Mf2, K9), while others add (spaiieiti.) auuaγṇm (P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, B4)\(^\text{24}\). 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. ṣātṿṇom; T46 spaiēiti. ṣātṿṇom; P1 auuaγṇm. spaiieiti. ṣātṿṇom; L2 spaiieiti. auuaγṇm. spaiieiti. ṣātṿṇom. E4 spaiæte. auua gaṇm. spaiætei. ṣātṿṇim; L5 auuaγṇm. spaiæte. ṣātṿṇim; G42 spaiieiti. auuaγṇm. spaiieiti. ṣātṿṇim; Mf2 spaiieiti. auuaγṇm. spaiieiti. yātṿṇim; K9 spaiieiti. yā. tṿṇim. vid. (Cantera under preparation D).
The second hand of K2a followed the first group of VS manuscripts, which only attests after *spaiieiti. draošam* the Avestan text *spaiieiti. yātuγnəm*, copied this Avestan text and created a new PT for it:

```
spaiiata. yātuγnəm. <LMYTWN-yt yʾtwgnnk>
```

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

```
spaiiata. auuaγnəm. <LMYTWN-yt ʾytwn MHYTWN-tyh [ʾy H<NA> dʾnd AYK PWN KRA MNDOM y nywk ztyh LA YBLWN-m BRA dʾnd ʾAYK-š hdybʾlyh OBYDWN-m krpk]> spaiiata. yātuγnəm. <LMYTWN MN yʾtwk MHYTWN-tn'>
```

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

```
spaiēti. auuaγnəm. <LMYTWN-yt ʾytwn MHYTWN-tyh [ʾy H<NA> dʾnd AYK PWN KRA MNDOM y ztiʾy kwnm ʾm krpk BRA HNA LA YBLWN-m BRA HNA ʾdʾnd AYK-š hdybʾlyh]> spaiēti. yāṭūγnəm <LMYTWN-yt yʾtwkyh MHYTWN-yt>
```

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. *yātuγnəm*. Their PTs, however, are completely different.

The second hand of K2a created a pseudo-Pahlavi <ʾytwn>, 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 *yāṭū* ̂ 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. ʾēdōn zadīh, which obviously cannot be an old PT and makes no sense. Apparently

---

25 <dʾnd AYK-š hdybʾlyh 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 pərəne. ʻbūšiagsta. yā. darayō. gauna, all the VS manuscripts attest pərəne. müiši. pərəne. kapastiš, 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 müiši and kapastiš into Pahlavi. He therefore left a blank for them in the PT and translated only Av. pərəne → Phl. <pwltynm> purdēnam:

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 pərəne. müiši. pərəne. kapastiš. pərəne. pairikām ... is copied consecutively in K2 and its corresponding PT follows it, while in F10 and T44 we find the sequence Av. pərəne. müiši. pərəne. kapastiš + its PT + pərəne. pairikām ... + its PT.

26 Regarding the PTs <mwtk klt’l> and <kystwk>, 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

18.53. sraošō. ašio. druji. aprosi. apūṅxti. patti. vazāri. druξ. axābre. aiwarażake. <swš 'hwlb'y dlwc pwrsyt BRA MN cygwnk AYK QDM wzl 'niβāz' dlwc 'hwlhy' w wcčnik> kuta. aētaēš. arṅv. tūrii. <kt'l OLE-s'n gwšnk tsm>

18.54-55. āa. hē. hā. pati.dauuata. yā. daēnu. druξ. suša. ašia. huraoša. <AP-s ZK>
In G25 it is attested the following text:

18.52. ātā, hā. nām. fradāthā. ātar. dātam. vā. ātar. cīrom. vā. ātar. xāntum. vā. ātar. daxīum. vā. kām. čī. vā. ātar. dātabe. nām. <’yttm’ ZNE ŠM y pr’c bwlt’ twm’d t’ywp t’wtr c’tl ywp t’wtr znd’ ywp t’wtr MTA ywp cyš-m-c y’ twr d’t ŠM y [AYK ZNE cygw plznd BRA plšklt krt’lyh LNE l’d BRA ’psp’1 y spndrm’t’ bwnyk mynšn’]>  

18.53. srrsō. ašiō. drūjm. aprrasat. <slwś AHL ’hlwb’ dlwc pwrsyt [MN hwrk AYT MNW

---

27 The first hand of K2 separated Av. mārncaitī from Av. gaēdā. astamntiś. ašabe, left a blank for the first part and translated the second one. However, the second hand of K2a did not notice that Av. gaēdā. astamntiś. ašabe had been already translated and filled the blank after mārncaitī with a PT from an Avestan text where Av. mārncaitī was not separated from Av. gaēdā. astamntiś. ašabe by the PT. Because of this, the PT of Av. gaēdā. astamntiś. ašabe 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’ AYK MN hyšm AYT MNW MN gmnʾgmnwg

apatuwxšq, paiti, vazršq, <BRA MN ’ywšn’ wzl [AYK wzl HNHTWN-tn’ ’y pytʾkynyt’ AYK hwstwkyh y PWN bym LA PWN hwstwkyh YHSNN-šn’>}

drušq. asdrše. ʿuwaṣrakte. <AYK dlwc y ’hwšy [AYK nywkyl cne ’cš LOYT’] ’wlecš’ [AYK MNDOM y plʾlw LA wlcyd]>

kô. tê. ṣeṭaṭeššq. aršâššq. tûirišš. <ktʾl LK MN OLE-šʾn’ gwšnʾn ʿtswm>

18.54. āqš. hē. hâ. paiti daunata. yā. dašuššu. drušš. srapašš. ašišš. burapušš. <AP-š OL pshwynt’ MNW ŚDYA ’dlwc [AYK] slwš ’hlwš’ hwšlwt’>

bô. bâ. mē. aššēš. aršâšš. tûirišš. <ZK pl MN OLE-šʾn’ gwšnʾn’ ʿtswm>

yat. nā. jahiya. pasca. panca. dasim. saradâm. fraptatata. <MNW GBRA yʾyʾ AHL MN 15 ŠNT prʾc ’wptyt’ [AYK OBYDWN-yr]>

anaįžǐžast. vā. anaįžadast. vā. <BRA MN ’nʾyptʾdʾt ʿwptyt’ BRA MN ’YDOWYTN-tn’>

18.55. pasca. tûirišš. gəmô. baraitim. isarô. pascaita. vaim. yô. daeuuae. bakaṭ. vaim. aun. miunuambe. hizunasa. paimusacl. xšiiamana. pascaita. <AHL MN chʾl OD gʾmk tswm YBLW<N>šnyh [AYK tswm bʾl}
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. ... aiuuarzāke + its PT + Av. kuta. ... tūriiō + its PT, while in G25 we find Av. sraošō. ... aporoṣaṭ + its PT + Av. apanuixtāṭ. paiti. vazrāṭ + its PT + Av. drušš. aṣadre. aynarxzike. kō. tē. aṭaṣm. arṣām. tūriiō.

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. atara.dātah.enām was rendered into Phl. <ʼtwr dʼ ŠM> ādur-dād-nām instead of Phl. <ʼtwr dʼ ŠM> ādur-dād-dān, or in 18.55 in G25, where Av. yātu.manta was rendered into Phl. <ʼywkk mynšn’> and ʼmanta was wrongly connected with Av. man- “to think”.

b) Wrong interpretation of an Avestan word deviating from their usual PT:
- Av. ātara, daxiium → Phl. <dhšn'> in 18.52 in K2 (besides the omission of the PT of the first element of the compound ātara, Av. daįhу- “country” has been confused with Phl. dahšin “creation”).
- Av. zanda → Phl. <zywndyh> zindih in K2 in 18.55, but → Phl. <MHYTWN-d> zanēd in G25.
- Av. kān, ciť → pseudo-Phl. <cyš-m-c-HD> in G25 in 18.52, where the Avestan word has been dismembered as kā-m-c-iť and readapted as pseudo-Phl. čiś-am-iz-ē.
- Av. naiciš → pseudo-Phl. <LA ME ’-š> nē čē ā-š 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 mərzuziṭīm mašiānqnm to 19.44 avrō. xmaniūs, 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:
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. daityāt. wayzdaštāt. hasa. frakarī. frakaromāt. vāstaria. vorzvāt. pasiš. kāstām. gauue. kāstām. <nyzlyš ŠDYA Mn nzdyyk y kysyl y ywš’dslg BRA YATWN-yt pr’c kwnš’yh pr’c kwnyt [AYK pyhw OBYDWN-d ”ndst OZLWN-yt] W w’slwyš [AYK bwlcygl ’ywlt’kyšwc’] OBYDWN-yt p’h hwš’n’ l’d W TWRA [gwspnd] hwš’n’ l’d>

19.42. nizbaieiem. karō. masiō. upāpō. bun. jafraŋm. vaqtuŋm. <BRA KRYTWN-m kn’l y ms MYA bwnd zwpl y w’l’> nizbaieiem. mrazu. žpreuvu. žištō. yuštō. mainu. däm. <BRA KRYTW<N>-m ’mwlc’tl pwl hwt’yh MNW hw-hw’dšn’ mnyng’n’ d’m’n’ [’tw<sh’ti ’mhrspnd]> hwizbaieiem. bapta. srnu. bāmiu. <BRA KRYTW<N>-m hpt sr’d’l

b’myk l’d> bainďbo. puďďbo. pusuďbo. fraďduô. (19.43.) fraďduôtu. vīdaatu. framnieitu. vīmainieitu. agro. mainīsu. pouru. mahkō. <hw’wmd W pWS’il’n’ wMD W pWS’wMD YHWWN-d pr’c hw-hw’dšn’ W yWd tW hvW’dšn’ W pr’c mnyš’n’ W yWd mnyš’n’ OBYDWN-m gn’kmyng pgwmlg l’d> daďuďuďm. daďunu. <ŠDYA-’n’ ŠDYA> aďdaru. daďunu. <ndl ŠDYA [MNW dwšm n ‘twshĂ AYT’]>

sauru. daďunu. <s wwl ŠDYA [MNW dwšm n štrywr AYT’]>

nąďbaidm. daďunu. <n’gh’yt’ ŠDYA [MWN dwšm n spndrm AYT’]>

daďuďuďu. zatira. <t’lyc W z’lyc ŠDYA l’d [MNW dwšm n hwrdt W mwrdt AYT’]>
aďsm. xruim. draom. <chyšn y hlwyk dlwš l’d>

aďtišm. daďunu. <ktyš ŠDYA [MNW dwšm n y tyl AYT’] l’d>

daďuďu. daďunu. dātš. <zmst’n’

29 Written <ywš’d’>.
T44 attest the same text as F10a also in its correct position:
19.42. nizbaiatem. karō. masiiū. kāpā. bun. jafraṅam. sairian.igm. <BRA KRYTWN-m
ka1 y ms MYA bwmd zwpl y w1'n>

nizbaiatem. mārum. pōuru. xahātu. yūiāštō.
mainuū. dāmgn. <BRA KRYTWN-m
'mwlourneylpw lhw'y MNW hw-hw'ds'nmynwgn'd'm'nturtwš't'mhrspnd>'
nizbaiatem. bāpū. sruu. bāmīia.

<BRA KRYTWN-m hpt srd'l y b'myk l'd
bānūghū. xdayūghū. pāsūnūghū. baumāntī.

(19.43.)
fraduuaiti. vidhuaita. framainaiti.
vīmainiaeta. ayrō. mainiūū. paouru.mahrkō.

<hw' wmn'd W pws'nl' wmn'd pws'wmd
YHWWN-d pr'c hw-hw'ds'n W ywtd hw'ds'n
wmn'd W pr'c mnyśn' W ywtd mnyśn'
OBYDW<N>-m gn kmnywgp wmlgl l'd>
daēunāqām. daēuūnō. <ŠDYA-n' ŠDYA>
aɾdarō. daēuūnō. <ndl ŠDYA [MNW dwśmn y
'trwšt AYT']>
s'uru.daēuūnō. <ś'wwl ŠDYA

[MNW dwśmn y śṭrywr AYT]>
nāyhaḍīm. daēuūnō. <ń'ñ'h'yt' ŠDYA [MWN
dwśmn y spndrm AYT']>
taʿurūna. zaʿira. <t'lyc W z'lyc ŠDYA l'd
[MNW dwśmn y hwrdt W 'mwrdd AYT']>
aṣāsīm. xruuū. draṣīqū. <hyśm y hlwyk
dlws l'd>
aṭīṣm. daēuūnō. <ktyṣ ŠDYA [MNW dwśmn
y tyl AYT'] l'd>
ziṣm. daēuūnō. dātīm. <zqmt'n ŠDYA-'n dt
l'd>

adīeṣājō. marsṣāωnām. <ṣyc nyh'n lwbsn' l'd
[AYK 'ṣtwyd'lt']>
zaʿurūna. duʿdāfārī. kovnnaōta. <zwlw'n
SLYA OBYDW'-yk l'd>
baʿūtā. daēuūnō. <bwt ŠDYA l'd>

dājīžū. daēuūnō. <splk ŠDYA l'd>
dājīžū. daēuūnō. <plptl ŠDYA l'd>
akṣuṇū. daēuūnō. <kswyṣ ŠDYA [AYK
'KYN'A] l'd>
paitī. daēuūnō. <bws'p ŠDYA l'd>
daeuūnāqīm. daēuūnō. təmō. daēuūnō

30 <pws'wmn'd> in the right margin.
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’āmi. karō. ... vairianām + PT + Av. nizba’āmi. mārzu. ... bauuānti + PT in V 19.42, in F10a and T44 we find Av. bnizba’āmi. karō. ... vairianām + PT + Av. nizba’āmi. mārzu. ... dāmān + PT + Av. nizba’āmi. hapta. sruuō. bāmiia + PT + Av. hukāyhō. ... frabauuānti + 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. frakarṇaọt as Av. frakara.ñoit in V 19.41, surely influenced by the preceding word frakarai, and misunderstood it as Av. frakara + the negative adverb noit. Hence he rendered Av. frakara into Phl. <pr’c krt'> and made a literal equivalence in Av. frakara.ñoit → pseudo-Phl. <pr’c kltnyy>, where <kltnyy> represents <kl> + the PT <ny> nē, that is, the Pahlavi negative adverb. The same is found in Av. yōi.ōistō instead of Av. yōi.ōistō in 19.42. He divided it by a dot and interpreted that yōit 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’> ō ābān. Obviously the Pahlavi translator of K2 segmented the word as Av. upa + āpō → Phl. ō ābān. 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. vī}: in 19.43 the Avestan preverb vī 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.maimiata → Phl. <BRA mynynyt> bē menēnēd.

- Av. daunuata: in 19.44 he misunderstood this Avestan verb and rendered it into Phl. <dywʾnʾ> 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. -ājḥō of Av. hūājḥō. pudājḥō. pusūājḥō 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. hūājḥō and pusūājḥō. Moreover, they agree in some mistaken or innovative PTs:

- Av. upāpō: the Pahlavi translators of F10a and T44 only understood ṣāpō, 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. sruuō “horns”: in 19.43 it was wrongly rendered into Phl. <srʾl> 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 porane. ham.raēḏyam. porane. paiti.raēḏyam. porane. xrū. porane. xruuiyi. porane. buiōi. porane. buiōiža. porane. *kunda. porane. kundiža all the PV manuscripts omit the PT of porane. xrū. ... porane. kundiža. Only in K2 we find an attempt of PT. The copyist of K2 wrote the Avestan text, translated twice Av. porane → 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.

| <pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm /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 apaṭ haca. irišiāt and the following Avestan text yezi. taṭ. paiti. irišiieiti is lacking in all the PV manuscripts. They are also missing in T44, but in K2 the Avestan text apaṭ haca. irišiāt together with its PT and the following Avestan text were added by the second hand of K2a:

The same is found in G25:

In G25 the following Avestan text is lacking. Moreover, Phl. ɬyšt has
been misunderstood as Phl. raseḍ, as the gloss with the Pahlavi verb ɬYATWN-
yt> raseḍ 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:
- 15.21-22: the PT of višpəm. ā. aŋāt. ṣrāḍəm. kərənənət. yaḥ. aēte. yōi. spāna. uz. jəsən in 15.21 and the Avestan text yaḥ. nōiṯ. ḫaraḏram. 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. mruīā. ādrauānām. uiti. mraoṭ. aburō. mazdā. āi. aśāum. zaraudūstra and the Avestan text of 18.6 tam. dim. mruīā. ādrauānām. uiti. mraoṭ. aburō. mazdā. āi. aśāum. zaraudūstra 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></td>
<td>PT + comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9c</td>
<td>PT with blanks</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT + comm.</td>
<td>lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9e</td>
<td>PT with blanks</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT + comm.</td>
<td>PT + comm.</td>
<td>lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.21-22</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.52-57</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>partially</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 Šīrāzī’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 significativi*.

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 Navsari in 1.2.1872 Samvat (1st volume) and 14.10.1872 Samvat (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 Mehernosh Kaekobad Meherji-rana from a manuscript of Mobed Rustom 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 Sōhrābjī Frāmjī Mehrjī-Rānā of Navsari 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
be also isolated for the moment. T42 was copied from a manuscript of Mobed
Rustom 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 Sōhrābji Frāmjī 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 <hwʾh(-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. xə́ŋha-, 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 AYḴ ZK gywʾk mʾnšnyh BRA HNA gywʾk wtlyšnʾ
     AYT> at the end of the passage, namely after <tnʾpwlgnʾ>. D66 adds the
gloss <AYḴ wnʾskʾlʾnʾ SLYYA myndʾnʾlʾd> to <tnʾpwhlkʾnʾ 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 <AYḴ> after
<tn’pwlg’n’>. Furthermore, R3 added <AYḴ> and a blank of one and a half line.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that T44 did not add neither gloss nor blank nor <AYḴ>. 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’h’l; G25a tn’h’l (instead of tn’).
   - 12.6c, 8c: K2, G25a, R1, R3 tn’h’l (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”.
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 | ḍriś. ... spāntanām |- 
   - 12.8b, 10a, 12a, 14b, 20a: F10, T44 | kuḍa. ... spāntanām |- 

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

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

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 | ʾp y ŠPYL | 
     - 12.11b: K2, R1 | viṣaićica | (G25a in the right margin).
     - 12.19a: K2, R1, R3 | ʾywpr BRA YMYTWN-yt | 
     - 12.21a: K2, R1 /blank/ | kʾmk | 
     - 12.21a: K2, R1 /blank/ | DYNA |
- 12.21a: K2, R1 | ptylyt |
- 12.22f: K2, R1 | h’nk |
  - Long omissions.
- 12.11a: K2, R1 | niąkō. ... napti |
  
  b) Additions:
  - Additions of one or a few words.
- 12.5a: K2 'y'wp; R1 'y'wp
- 12.13a: K2, R1 AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd ADYN'
- 12.17a: K2 'yw'BRA; R1, R3 'ywp BRA ('ywp added).
  - Long additions due to perseveration.
- 12.9a: K2 cuua, aešam. upa.mantiąn. cuua; G25a cuua, aešam. upa.mantiąn. (2nd -a- scratched) cuua

  c) Rare variants:
- 12.11b: K2, G25a, R1 panca.dasa
- 12.11b: K2, G25a, R1 drístom
- 12.11a: K2, G25a, R1 15
- 12.11a: K2, G25a, R1 30
- 12.15b: K2, R1 viśaiti
- 12.15b: K2 ciδβarstom; R1 caδβarstom
- 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 α. 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. pančāštṃ 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 [tā] | upāiti. ... spitama |
- 12.10a: R1 lʾpšt' | mʾn' ... mʾn' |
- 12.12b: R1 [tā] | āaṭ. ... pascaēta |
- 12.12b: R1 npšt ├ mʾn' ... zltwšt' ├
- 12.14b: R1 「tā」 ├ yaoždaḏānī ... bun ├
- 12.14b: R1 ├ frasnāiti ... spāntanām ├
- 12.14b: R1 NPŠE ├ mʾn' ... zlthwšt' ├
- 12.16b, 20a: R1 「tā」 ├ yaoždaḏānī ... spitama ├

b) Omissions:
   - Omissions of one or a few words.
- 12.17a: R1 tūriiiō ├ puṭrō ├
  - 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 Ḷ wʾc BYN hʾnk Y=DBHWN-yt

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

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 └ aiḥṭiō. vayḥhabiō └
- 12.12b: K2 └ ḍriš.frasrūiti. gāḍanām └
- 12.12b: K2 └ upāiti └
- 12.14b: K2 └ upāiti └
- 12.16b: K2 – αἰβιό. vanhubiiō –
- 12.18d: K2 – spyt’m’n’ –
- 12.20a: K2 – stœrmæta. αἰβιό. vanhubiiō –
- 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 aēšam. dahmanam
- 12.9b: K2 ADYN’ gw’p AP-š
  - Long additions due to perseveration.
- 12.5a: K2 aā. yat. brāta. para.iriđaiata. xāņha. vā. para.iriđaiata. ADYN’ MNW aā

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 – ṭy ŠPYL –
- 12.7c: K2, G25a, R3 – BYRH –
- 12.11a: K2 /blank/ – nyy’k – G25a, R3 – nyy’k –
- 12.13a: K2, G25a, R3 /blank/ – BLWL-z’tkyh –
- 12.14d: K2, R3 – lwd –
- 12.16c: K2, R3 – sl’yt –
- 12.19a: K2, R1, R3 – ʾyw BRA YMYTWN-yt –
- 12.20d: K2, R3 – blsm ASLWN-x1 –
- 12.22c: K2 pr’c /blank/ – plwyt – R3 pr’c – plwyt –
- 12.22h: K2, R3 – p’hlwm –
  - Long additions due to perseveration.
- 12.12b: K2, G25a, R3 – 3 ... g’s’n’ –

  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 ʾyw BRA; R1, R3 ʾyw BRA (ʾyw added).

  c) Rare variants:
- 12.10a, 14c: K2, G25a, R3 tn’hl
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. mordīb under the line) /New Persian be in az in avar tā/ /Pāzand na. rīman. azī. avastā. pādast. aī. anāni. šr. kā. aydīn. andošq. mar. zandh. barvād. v. mördad. mrgarzā. mābi. azōrīman. nabūdam. tākaš. az. zandagi. nōshašūmārnāst. gōgōasp. goft. š. ošq. baq. mārīm. nabūvand. čā. nasuš. barq. kaski. nabādīn. ošq. nidavārad. mābi. ošq. rīman. būdam. cai. hardīn. mardūm. ašq. ōbū. czq. az. tūtoiīrinām. daxiōnām. pōdāst./.

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 ─ tūriīa. vā. para.iriēiti ─
     - 12.19a: R3 ─ MNW ─
       - Long omissions.
     - 12.8a: R3 ─ d’e’l ... ’hlwb’ ─
     - 12.21a: R3 ─ ’ywp ... spn’mynwg ─

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 panča.dasa
   - 12.15b: R3 bristam (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 – |’whrmzd |
     - 12.8d: R1, R3 – |spyt’m’n’ zltws’t |

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
     - 12.1d: R1 haca. tanu.ϕarəθɔnəm; R3 haca. tanu.ϕarəθɔnəm (haca 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 Nāvrsā Ṛ10, 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 –| BYRH |
     - 12.11a: K2 /blank/ –| nyy’k |; G25a, R3 –| nyy’k |
     - 12.13a: K2, G25a, R3 /blank/ –| BLWL-YLYDWN-k |
- 12.13a: K2, G25a, R3 /blank/ ━ BLWL-z’tk’yh ━
  - Long additions due to perseveration.
- 12.12b: K2, G25a, R3 ━ 3 ... g’s’n’ ━
  
  b) Additions:
  - Additions of one or a few words.
- 12.1a: K2, G25a BRA ʾywp (BRA added).
- 12.9a: K2 cunaṭ. aešąm. upa.mণiian. cunaṭ; G25a cunaṭ. aešąm. upa.mণiian. cunaṭ; R1 cunaṭ. aešąm. upa.mণiian. (2nd -a- scratched) cunaṭ

c) Rare variants:
- 12.10a, 14c: K2, G25a, R3 tn’hl
- 12.11b: K2, G25a, R1 (but corrected prima manu in the right margin as pαncācα) pαnc. dasa
- 12.11b: K2, G25a (but corrected prima manu in the right margin as pαncā.ṣatm), R1 dṛṣṭm
- 12.11a: K2, G25a (but corrected as 25), R1 15
- 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) pαncā (instead of the expected dasa)
- 12.17b: G25a (but corrected prima manu in the left margin as vīṣata) 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 ’n’hlwb’
- 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 β, this is the *stemma codicum* we can reconstruct for the moment:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha & \quad K2 \\
\alpha_1 & \quad G25a \\
R1 & \quad R3 \\
\beta & \quad G25b
\end{align*}
\]

3.4. Inner relations in the group β

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 │MNW │ 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 │ QDM │
     - 12.17a: T44 │ l’d BRE │
     - 12.17a: T44 │ l’d BRTE │
     - 12.21a: T44 │ ʾūā │
       - Long omissions.
     - 12.1e: T44 │ HNA ... AYT │

b) Additions:
   - Additions of one or a few words.
     - 12.2d: T44 OBYDWN-\(x_1\)
     - 12.2d: T44 OBYDWN-\(x_1\)
     - 12.7a: T44 OD 6 (OD before the numeral).
- 12.9a, 11a, 15a: T44 OD cnd (OD added).
- 12.13a: T44 *tanu.pərəðaŋm. āaț* (āaț 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'sw

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

a) Omissions:
   - Long omissions.
   - 12.2d: D66 ├ PWN k’mk ’mhrspnd’n’ l’d BRA YDBHWN-d W ’byd’tyn’nd ŃYN 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 AYK ŠPYL-’n’ W ’lc’nnyk’n’ l’d (after d’hm’n’)
   - 12.1e: D66 AYK wn’sk’l’n’ SLYYA mynd’n’n’l’d (after tn’pwhlk’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. $<tnʾpwlknʾ / tnʾpwlgʾnʾ> tanāfurgān$ instead of Phl. $<tnʾpwhlkʾnʾ> tanāpulagān$ (only attested as such in 12.1d in G25a and in 12.7b in F10, and as $<tnʾpwhlgʾnʾ> tanāpulagān$ 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. $<zwlmʾ > zōr > zur$ (K2 and R3 in 12.10, 16, 18 and 20) instead of Phl. $<zwlmʾ > zōhr$. This is also found in old PTs.
- Phl. $<zltwštʾ > zardušt$ (K2, R3) instead of Phl. $<zltwhštʾ > zarduxšt$ (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\(^{31}\). However, these new Pahlavi translators seem not to have been aware of this convention, as the following examples indicate:

- Pseudo-Phl. \(<dhmʾn’> dablish\) instead of Phl. \(<dʾhmʾn’> dabhman\) (only in 12.5d in T44\(^{32}\)). I think that a simplification of the group \(b +\) 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. بلسم barsom, where no \(<w>\) is written.

On the other hand, these late PTs reproduced the Avestan phonetics and sometimes devised themselves from the old PTs. This is the case of pseudo-Phl. \(<spytʾmʾn’> spitamān\) 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 \(<spytʾmʾn’> spitamān\), which surely tried to reproduce the first short \(–ā–\) 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 ایوزداشتر, 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 \(<ʾ>\) for Phl. \(ab\).

\(^{32}\) Nevertheless, this writing also appears in older PTs, like in V 13.35, where we find "\(daghii.cit\) \(→ \(<dhmʾn c>\) (K1), \(<dhmʾn鄄yc>\) (P2), \(<dhmʾn鄄c>\) (G25a, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3)."

\(^{33}\) Only G25a attests \(<blswm>\) in 12.6, 10, 12, 14, 16 and \(<blsm>\) 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 syntags 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.

- Accusative: 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 *zaodrāz* baraēta → *zōhr* barēd [A, B], where Av. *zaodrā* 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

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. *mādar*: Av. *māta* (Nom. Sing.) and *mātarəm* (Acc. Sing.) are rendered systematically by the oblique Phl. *mādar* 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 *pws*/*pus* is used only in V 12.7 [B]35. In the remaining passages, only the direct Phl. *pus* appears. Although the most usual PT is *Bre* or *pws*, we find the PT *pʊdə* → *pws*/*pus*/*pusarən*, that is, an oblique plural, in other late PTs like that of Vīstāsp 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. *duxtəm*.

Phl. *brād / brādar*: in all the manuscripts Av. *brāta* (Nom. Sing.) in V 12.5a and b is translated by the rare form *BWL*, used as the oblique Phl. *brādar*36. On the contrary, the oblique Av. *brātarəm* in V 12.5b is rendered unexpectedly by the direct *bł*/*d* *brād*.

Phl. *xwah / xwahar*: while in V 12.5a all the manuscripts agree in the direct case Phl. *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 –ən for the Pl. Gen., e.g. V 12.1 *aēsəm* → *awēshən* or *тану.праθданəм* → *танапухлагəн*, like for instance in V 12.2 *vastrанəм* → *wastarag*, although this is not systematic.

Dative: the only attested dative in V 12 is *aiβiiō. vəŋhubiiō*, which is an indirect object mostly translated by *əb* *in* *web*. We expect the use of the preposition *ō* and therefore the syntagm *ō* *əb*/*ən* *in* *web*, like, for instance, in Y 62.10 *yō. aŋši. aēsəm. барaitи* → *kē əy bərēd əzəm*. Nevertheless, it is usual through the tradition of the PT to place the

35 In K2 the PT of Av. *kainīnō. x*/*atō. puθəm* is omitted, but R1, R3 and G25a attest Phl. *pus*.
36 Regarding this word, see the commentary to V 12.5 *BWL*. 
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...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. aïβiiō. +vanhubiuō 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 weh, that is, by the ablative.

- Ablative: not attested in V 12.
- Instrumental: the only attested instrumental forms in the Avestan text are "frasnāiti and "frasrūiti. 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:
  - "frasnāiti → <(pr’c) HLLWN-yr’> (frāz) šōyēd. Only in V 12.2 [B] firstly we find the PT <(pr’c HLLWN-yr’> 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-yr’> 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. frasnāiti → Phl. <(pr’c šswt’) frāz šust’, that is, the noun was understood as a verb too.
- frasrūiti → <(pr’c sl’yrt) 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’yrt) 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’dśn’) frāz srāyišn: V 12.14 (G25a), 16 (G25a).

However, A omits <(pr’c sl’yrt) in 12.12 and <sl’yrt> 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’dśnyh> pad ... frāz srāyišnih. Though not translating it as a noun, the Pahlavi verb used in A and B renders correctly Av. frā-sraunaiia-“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. zaoērā → Sing. / Pl. zōbr
- Pl. yaoždāta → Sing. / Pl. yöjadiār
- Pl. nmāna → Sing. / Pl. mān
- Pl. aištīō. vayhubiō → Sing. āb (i) web

Therefore, in Phl. zōbr, yöjadiār 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. tanunām → Sing. tan
- Pl. vastranām → Sing. wastarag
- Pl. apqm → Sing. āb
- Pl. uruuanām → Sing. urwar
- Pl. dāman- (dāmanām) → 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 / <dwh / 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. ʾ-ā-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”.
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exception of R1. According to Salemann (1895-1901 277-278), Phl. –ag (<Irr. *–a-
ka-) forms only diminutives⁴¹, adjectives and nomina instrumenti. However, Horn
(1898-1901 174) noticed the use of this suffix –ag in Phl. <t’ck> 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>, <–yk> and
<–yh>⁴², is present in the following couples, all of them hápax legómena:
- <ny’k / nyy’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’ky> niyāye (Fem.) in V 12.9 in T44
secondly.
- <ny’kyk> niyāge (Fem.) in 12.11 [B].
- <npk> nabag (Masc.) / <npky> nābage (Fem.) in V 12.9⁰ and 11 [B].
- <npylk> nabērag (Masc.) / <npylkyk> (Fem.) nabērage in V 12.9 [B].
- <BLWL-ÝLYDWN-k> brādar-zādag (Masc.) / <BLWL-z’tkyh> brādar-
zādage (Fem.) in V 12.13a R1.
- <4-wm BRE> čahārom pus (Masc.) / <4-wmyh BRTE> čahārome duxt
(Fem.) in V 12.15 [B]⁴³.

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

1. –ž: Phl. <–yk> –žg usually formed adjectives from nominal roots and Phl.
<–yh> –žb formed abstract nouns, but this morphological distinction disappeared
early on as they merged phonetically in the Pahlavi texts as [iː]⁴⁴. Thus, the writing

---

⁴¹ R1 <m’n’ ptk yn’>. cf. the PT of Vr 3.3 nnnō,paṭnīm → <m’nptyn’ ... [ktk-b’nwk]> mānbedēn
... [kag-bānīg], G 4.8 nnnō,paṭnīm → <m’nptyn’> mānbedēn and Vyt 17 nnnō,paṭnīā →
<m’nptyh> mānbede (Dhabhar 1963 363), but V 7.42 nnnō,paṭtīm → <m’pt> mānbed and FrīÔ
77 nnnō,paṭnī → <ktk b’nwk> kag-bānīg (Klingenschmitt 1968).
⁴² cf. the formation of diminutives in –ak in New Persian (Lazard 1989 284), in –k in Kurdish (Blau
1989 333), in –ok in Somyuni (Lecoq 1989 343), in –aka in Feylī and Baxtīārī (Lecoq 1989 345), in
–aku in Sīvandī (Lecoq 1989 347) or in –ak in Yaḵnūbī (Zielmeier 1989 486).
⁴³ This ending is used as feminine in Vyt 17 nnnō,paṭnīā → <m’nptyh).
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-wmyh 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 Lorī dialects and in the dialects of Fārs (Lecoq 1989 343,
<y>, <yk> and <yh> did not represent different variants –i, –igroup or –ih respectively when the PTs of V 12 were made, but it surely implied a common reading, maybe –i. Since a suffix –i 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 –i from modern Iranian languages where it is used for feminine. Indeed, to my knowledge, feminine with the ending –i is found in Semnnani (Lecoq 1989 307) and Paštō (Skjærvø 1989 391).

Thirdly, they may have created feminines with –i on the basis of the Gujarati feminines with –i.

2. –i: the reading –i can be justified because of: a) the Avestan words these Pahlavi forms translated; b) the development of Phl. –ag to New Persian –e; c) the existence of feminines with –i 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. miōka appears as niēke 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. brātūriā in V 12.13 we find brātūriie in K2 and R1, baratūriie 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(ā)-.

Thirdly, a reading –i can be supported on the basis of the parallel feminine endings with –e in other modern Iranian languages, such as Semnnani (Lecoq 1989 307), Kurdish (Blau 1989 330), Gurāni (Blau 1989 337), Sivandi (Lecoq 1989 346) or Paštō (Skjærvø 1989 391), the feminine with –i in Zāzā (Blau 1989 339) or the feminine oblique –i in Yidya and Munji (Skjærvø 1989 413).

I must admit that there is not a single possibility and that both readings –i and –i 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 Sivandi (Lecoq 1989 347) and Kurdish (Blau 1989 333). The suffixes –i / –i group form adjectives in Balōčti (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 hāpax legōmena:

- <pyt BLWL> pid brādar (Masc.) / <pyt BLWL-yn'> 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 -ī- stems as a rest of OIr. *īnām (Gen. Pl.), as found in Phl. frawardīn (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 fravākaṇī ānī in Bd 15.25 (Justi 1868 37.12) or in the terminus technicus Phl. <hwsł yn'> of FīŌ 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. ahrānī-) and morphologically identical to Av. –ēnī- in Av. tiśtriāēnī- “Frauen des Tištṛīa” and Av. paoirīaēnī- “Name der Plejaden”, and to Sogd. -īn in Sogd. <ywıty yn> “queen” < OIr. *hya-tāmōnī- (cf. Sogd. <ywıty> “king” < OIr. *hya-tāyə-) (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,paṇti- → 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. vispa- → Phl. <hlwspyn'> harwispēn (Fem.) in V 10.5b in L4, G34, T44 and E10.
- Av. ašaoni- → Phl. <hlwb'yn'> ablawēn (Fem.) in V 11.10a in E10 and in V 11.13a in E10 and P10.

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.

Suffixation 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,paṇti- 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 hāpax legōmenon 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), napti (V 12.9 and 11), tūriia (V 12.13) and *tūriia.duγə (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 hāpax legōmena, 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>.
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.
  - *yaozdaþæi → <ywšd’slynyt> yōǰdāsrēnēd in A in all the passages, <ywšd’slym> yōǰdāsre<na>m in 12.2 (F10) and <ywšd’slynm> yōǰdāsreñam in 12.4 (F10). T44 writes <-ym> in both 12.2 and 4 <ywšd’slynym>, 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 <-n> -ān, there was a tendency to substitute the subjunctive by the indicative in the PT (Cantera 1999a 182-184). So the ending <-m> 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 <-m>, <-yd̄> and <-yt>:

  - yaozdaþæi → <ywšd’slymm> yōǰdāsreñam in V 11.1.
  - yaozdaþæi → <ywšd’slynyd> yōļdāsrēnē in V 11.4a in D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 and (Jmp), but <ywšd’slynyt> yōǰdāsrēnēd in L4, G34 and E10, and <ywšd’slyhynyt> yōǰdāsrēhēnēd in T44. In V 11.4c all the manuscripts attest <ywšd’slynyd> yōǰdāsrēnē. In V 11.5a, c, 11.6a, c and 11.7a we find mostly yaozdaþæi → <ywšd’slynyd> yōǰdāsrēnē too.
  - yaozdaþæi → <ywšd’slym> yōǰdāsre<na>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 <-yt> -ēd in V 12, regardless of the Avestan mode:

    - para.iriþiieiti → <BRA YMYTWN-yt'> bē mīrēd in all the passages in both A and B.
    - yazaæta → <ycyt / YḌBHWN-yt> yazēd in all the passages in both A and B.

---

47 However, as Ferrer (unpublished 57-58) observes, the ending <-ym> 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. yōǰdāsreñam. It is attested in V 11.1 in the manuscripts D62, F10 and P10 as well.
49 As a past, the injunctive Av. mraoṯ is translated by Phl. <gwpt> guft, as usual.
- *ham.raēβaiieiti* → <hm gwmyhtyt> *ham gumēxtēd* in 12.21 and 22 in both A and B.
- *paiti.raēβaiieiti* → <QDM gwmyhtyt> *abar gumēxtēd* in 12.21 and 22 in both A and B.
- *jainti* → <MHTYN-yt'> *zanēd* in 12.22 secondly in both A and B.
- *frāuxaiieiti* → <prʾc znyt> *frāz zanēd* in 12.22 only in T4450. G25b adapted it as Phl. <plwyt> *frāwēd*.
- *azaiti* → <BRA SGYTWN-ynyt> *bē rawēnēd* in 12.22 [A]. In K2 it is omitted, while in B we find the rare forms <F10> (F10) and <R3> (T44).

The exceptions to this PT with <-yt> -ēd are two optatives with <-x₁> and <-d> and two indicatives with <-d>:
- *stōramaēta* → <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 <ASLWN-st'> *bast*, 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 <YLEWLN-x₁>. Only G25a attests <YLEWLN-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 YLEWLN-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.manaiian* → <QDM KTLWN-d> *abar mānēnd* 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 12.3 (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 mānišnih* in 12.1 in both A and B, 17 (F10).

50 F10 attests <prʾc znt>, while K2 and R3 only <prʾc> and R1 the rare <prʾc OD gwpt>.
- *bun* → <YHWWN-t> *bud* in V 12.2 (but in T44 <YHWWN-yt'> *bawêd* 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. *bud* or NP. *bawad*.

Both translations *bud* and *bawêd* are incorrect, but the second translation Av. *bun* → Phl. *bawêd* 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 (*êstâdan, êst-*).

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.irīšiieiti* → <BRA YMYTWN-yt'> *bē mīrēd*; *ham.raēðjaieiti* → <hm gwmyhtyt> *ham gumēxtēd*; *paiti.raēðjaieiti* → <QDM gwmyhtyt> *abar gumēxtēd*; *jainti* → <znd / MHYTWN-yt'> *zanēd*; *frānuaiieiti* → <prʾc znyt'> *frāz zanēd*; *azaiti* → <BRA SGYTWN-nyyt> *bē rawēnēd* in 12.22 [A]; *yaoždaḏāni* → <ywšdʾslynm> *yōǰdāsrēnam* in V 12.2 [B] and 4 [B] and <ywšdʾslynyt> *yōǰdāsrēned* in the rest of forms in A; *yazaēta* → <ycyt / YĐBHWN-yt> *yazēd*.

On the other hand, while in *starmaēta* → <ASLWN-xt> and *baraēta* → <YBLWN-xt> the Pahlavi ending <-xt> can be interpreted in many ways, in *baraēta* → <bld> *bard* and *apa baraīti* → <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. *mraوط*, systematically translated by the preterite Phl. <gwpt> *guft* as usual, we find the Pres. Subj. *upa.mānatīqan*, 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 mānđ.*
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 baú-, was translated in A and B by <YHWWW-tyt> būd, <YHWWW-tyt> 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 <YHWWW-tyt> bawēd. Consequently, we can state in this case that the Pahlavi translators gave more importance to the mode than to the tense. Thus, <YHWWW-tyt / bwd> bawēd would be the right PT instead of <YHWWW-t> būd. However, both A and B prefer <YHWWW-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 ē + 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.iridıieiti → <BRA YMYTWN-tyt> bē mīrēd; ham.raēdıieiti → <hm gwmyhtyt> ham gumēxtēd; paiti.raēdıieiti → <QDM gwmyhtyt> abar gumēxtēd; jaiiti → <2nd / MHYTWN-tyt> zand/zanēd; frāuuaiieiti → <pr’c znyt> frāz zanēd; apa.baraiti → <BRA bld> bē bard.

5.2.3.2. Injunctive

The only injunctive in V 12 is mraoät, 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. 
  +yaoždašāni → Phl. <ywšd’slynm> yōjdašrēnam or <ywšd’slyn yt> yōjdašrēnēd; Av. bun → Phl. <YHWWN-t> būd, <YHWWN-yt> bawēd or <bwd> bawēd.
- Av. upa.mānaiān. When translated as a verb, the indicative appears too: <QDM KTLWN-yt> abar mānēd, <QDM KTLWN-d> abar mānēnd, <QDM NTLWN-d> abar pāyēnd, <QDM KTLWN-t> abar mānd.

5.2.3.4. Optative

Apart from the optatives Av. stərənaēta → <ASLWN-x₁> and Av. baraēta → <YBLWN-x₁>, where the Pahlavi ending <-x₁> can be interpreted in many ways, other Pahlavi endings are used when translating Avestan optatives:
- Av. stərənaēta → <ASLWN-st'> bast in V 12.4 [A], where surely <-st'> is wrongly written instead of <-yt'>. In any case, the indicative is implied.
- Av. baraēta → <bld> bard, where the indicative is used too.
- Av. yazaēta → <ycyt / YDBHWN-yt> 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. _ISRkū_ 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), _duyā. vā → duxt ayāb_ (12.3), _x̌ayha. vā → xwāh ayāb_ (12.5), _mnānopedni. vā → mānbedag ayāb_ (12.7), _nūāka. vā → niyāyī ayāb_ (12.9), _napti. vā → niyāg ayāb_ (12.11 only in R1)51, _brātruia. vā → brādar-žādage ayāb_ (12.13 only in R1)52, _tūriia. vā → pid brādar-en ayāb_ (12.15 only in R1)53 and _tūriia.duyā. vā → <...> duxt ayāb_ (12.17)54. 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 _ºfrasnāiti. tanunąm → 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. _ºfrasrūiti. gāθanąm_ 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. _brātruia_ 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. _duyāar_, by Phl. _duxt_ “daughter”.
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Avestan enclitic \textit{zī} in 12.22b are attested, they placed their corresponding PT \textit{ayāb} and \textit{čē} in the correct position. The PT of Av. \textit{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 \textit{ay gāhān xwānēd tā sē rōz} there is a strange hyperbaton, because we expect \textit{ay tā sē rōz gāhān xwānēd} (cf. the gloss in V 12.2c \textit{kū tā sē rōz stōš yazēd}). Secondly, the first gloss is misplaced in V 12.7 \textit{ēg kē mānbed bē mīrēd [ay kadag-xwadāy] ayāb mānbedag [ay kadag-bānūg] bē mīrēd} and in 12.9 \textit{nabag az nīyāg [kū nabērag] ud nabagī [kū nabēragī]} az nīyāgī. Actually, while the second glosses are placed in its correct position, namely immediately after the word which explains (\textit{mānbedag [ay kadag-bānūg]; nabagī [kū nabēragī]}), the first ones do not immediately follow the glossed word (\textit{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. \textit{<lʾd> rāy} to mark the direct object in B, as in New Persian and late Pahlavi, or Phl. \textit{<MNW> kē} instead of the expected Phl. \textit{<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. \textit{kū} after the verb \textit{guft} because these Pahlavi words did not find a direct correspondence in the Avestan text. The use of Phl. \textit{<MNW> kē} instead of Phl. \textit{<AMT> ka}, and that of Phl. \textit{<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 *hápax 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 *hápax legómena*

Some Avestan kinship nouns of V 12 are *hápax 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. *niiāka-* → Phl. *<nyʾk>* *niyāg* in 12.9a and 11a, and created its feminine equivalent Av. *niiākā-* by Phl. *<nyyʾky / nyʾkyh / nyʾyk / nyʾyk>* *niyāge / nīyāye*. On the contrary, they disagreed regarding the rest of *hápax 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. *niiāka-* and wrote Phl. *<nyyʾk>*-, that is, the PT of Av. *niiāka-*.
- *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. *napī- for Av. niāka- and wrote once again Phl. *nwy’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.

- *brātūrīa- → <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. "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-ÝLYDWN-k> brādar-zādag, which is also correct.

- *brātūrīa- → <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. "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-’ztkyh> brādar-zādag from the masculine Phl. <BLWL-ÝLYDWN-k> brādar-zādag.

- *tūrīia- → <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. *tūrīia- “uncle” (< *trayīa- < *'pʰtreỵa-; cf. Ved. pīreya- “uncle” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.130)), (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52, 94)) for the homonymous numeral Av. *tūrīia- “fourth” (< IIr. *(k)tur(i)̣a-; cf. Ved. tuṛya- “fourth” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.657)). Hence they translated Av. *tūrīia- “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. *tūrīia.pudra- of 12.17a and 12.19a. Indeed, considering the misunderstanding of Av. *tūrīia- “uncle” → Phl. čahārom, Phl. čahārom pus would be the exact Pahlavi equivalent of Av. *tūrīia.pudra-, but not of Av. *tūrīia-. 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. *tūrīia- by Phl. *pid brādar “brother of the father > uncle”.

- *tūrīia- → <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 *tūrīia-: the Pahlavi translators of B slipped into the following Av. *tūrīia.duvār- 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”.

- *tūrīia.pudra- → <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 tūriia as a feminine because of the ending –a. Nevertheless, as far as B attests tūriiō. 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. tūriia- → 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.

- tūriia.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:

- “frāsrūiti- → <prʾc slʾyt> frāz srāyēd (in A in 12.2, 4, 6, 12 and in B in 12.2), <prʾc slʾdyt> frāz srāyēd (in R1 in 12.2), <prʾc slʾdšnk> frāz srāyišnag (in A in 12.8, 10, 14, 18 and 20) and <prʾc slʾdšnʾ> frāz srāyišn (in G25a in 12.14 and 16) instead of Phl. frāz srāyišnib (PT of Y 9.14).
- xvarāda- → <hwšnk> xwarišnag in both A and B in 12.22f instead of Phl. xwarišn of other parallels, like for instance V 5.20, 38, 55, 14.17 or HN 2.36.
- varōta- → <PWN wltynšnʾ> 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.

\[\text{marota-} \rightarrow \text{<YMJWTN-ytk> \-murdag} \quad \text{(in B in 12.22a and only in F10 in 12.22d) and <YMJWTN-yt'} \rightarrow \text{mire}\]d \quad \text{(in A in 12.22d and g, and in T44 in 12.22d) instead of Phl. mured} \quad \text{(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:

\[\text{- juua-} \rightarrow \text{<zynd / zywnd / zynd 'nd>} \quad \text{(in both A and B in the five cases of 12.22c) instead of Phl. <zy(w)ndk> zindag}. \quad \text{K2 and R3 attest mostly <zynd>, but G25a and R1 wrote <zywnd>. Both A and B agree in the rare writing <zynd 'nd> in 12.22b and d, which surely represents an adaptation of NP. zendé-and “they have lived”. On the contrary, in all the passages of V 5.36-38 and 5.61 we find unanimously the writing <zywndk> zindag. In the plural in Y 45.7 it is attested <zyndk n'> zindagān. In 13.3d L4, T44 and E10 show <zyndk> and K1 <zywndk>. Although the variants without the suffix \<-k> are rare, they are confirmed by the variant <zywnd> of P2, K2 and M3 in V 13.3d.\]

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:

\[\text{- 'frasnāti-} \rightarrow \text{<HLLWN-ya} \text{t} \quad \text{šoyēd instead of Phl. frāz šoyišn, where the Pahlavi translators interpreted this noun as a verb. Although we expect an abstract noun deriving from the Pahlavi verb šustan, šoş- “to wash”, this verb is the right one in this PT\textsuperscript{56}. With regards to the Avestan preverb fraº, it is only translated in 12.2 [B] firstly as expected, that is, by Phl. frāz. The PT of A systematically omitted the preverb.}\]

\[\text{- 'upāti-} \rightarrow \text{<lpd / lwd [A] rawd} \quad \text{instead of Phl. abar rawišn, which obviously implies that the Pahlavi translators of A understood this Avestan noun as a verb. PT's without preverb are also found in <SGYTWN-ynyt} \text{rawēnd (in T44 in 12.2 firstly), <KRYTWN} \text{-šn OBDWN-x1} \text{) xwāhišn kunēd (in T44 in 12.2 thirdly) and <KRYTWN} \text{-šn (in F10 in 12.2 thirdly). On the other hand, the Pahlavi translators of A preferred <lpd} \text{and its variant <lwd} \text{rawd (Ferrer unpublished 115-116), but we also find the variants <lp} \text{raft / rawd (especially in R1), <SGYTWN-ya} \text{(12.16, 12.18 in G25a) and <SGYTWN-d} \text{rawēnd (12.15 in G25a). In spite of the}}\]

\textsuperscript{56} \text{vid. frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c HNA šwdynd> in V 7.13 and 74; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c HNA šwnd'> in V 7.14; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c HD šwdynd> in V 7.14 and 15; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c HD šwnd} in V 7.15; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c šwšynd> in V 7.74 and 75; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c HNA HLLWN-d} in V 7.75; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c HLLWN-ya} \text{ in V 7.75; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c HLLWN-ya} \text{ in V 7.75; frasnaišnte} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c 'y šwnd} in V 8.11, 12 and 13; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c 'y HLLWN-ya} \text{ in V 8.40, 9.15; frasnā} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c šwst'} \text{ in V 8.40, 9.15, 18.19, 21, 22 and 26; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c šwšt} in V 8.40, 9.15, 18.19, 21, 22 and 26; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c šwšt'} in V 8.98 and 99; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c 'y HLLWN-x} \text{ in V 16.7; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c 'y HLLWN-d} in V 16.12; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c šwšyht} in V 19.22; frasnāšātiom} \rightarrow \text{<pr'c šwystym} 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:

- \(\text{ḥām. raēd+iieiti} \rightarrow \text{ḥm gwmyhtyt} \space \text{ḥam gumēxtēd} \) (in both A and B in 12.21 and 22) instead of Phl. \(\text{ō ham gumēxt} \). The PT \(\text{ḥam gumēxtēd} \) 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. \(\text{ḥām} \) is translated by the two preverbs \(\text{ō ham} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ḥām. raēd+iieiti} & \rightarrow \langle \text{OH} \space \text{hm gwmyhtyt} \rangle \space \text{ḥam gumēxtēd} \text{ in V 5.34, 35, 36} \\
\text{ḥām. raēd+iieiti} & \rightarrow \langle \text{OL} \space \text{hm gwmyht} \rangle \space \text{ḥam gumēxtēd} \text{ in V 19.20} \\
\text{ḥām. raēd+iieiti} & \rightarrow \langle \text{OL} \space \text{hm gwmycyd} \rangle \space \text{ḥam gumēzentēd} \text{ in V 18.62} \\
\text{ḥām. raēd+iieiti} & \rightarrow \langle \text{OL} \space \text{hm gwmycynt} \rangle \space \text{ḥam gumēzentēnd} \text{ in V 19.20} \\
\text{ḥām. raēd+iantī} & \rightarrow \langle \text{OL} \space \text{hm gwmycynd} \rangle \space \text{ḥam gumēzentēnd} \text{ in N 61} \\
\text{ḥām. raēd+iandī} & \rightarrow \langle \text{OL} \space \text{hm gwmycynd} \rangle \space \text{ḥam gumēzentēnd} \text{ in N 62}
\end{align*}
\]

- \(\text{frāzābaoāb} \rightarrow \langle \text{pr’c bwd} \rangle \text{frāz bōy} \) (in both A and B in 12.22c) instead of Phl. \(\text{frāz az bōy} \). Although the preposition \(\text{<MN>} \) \(az \) lacks in A and B, all the Pahlavi PV manuscripts attest \(\langle \text{pr’c bwd} \rangle \) 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 understood 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:

- \(\text{para.iri+iieiti} \rightarrow \langle \text{BRA YMYTWN-yt’} \rangle \text{ bē mīrēd} \) in all the passages in both A and B instead of the verb Phl. \(\text{widardan, wider-} \), the only one used in the PT to translate this Avestan verb\(^{58}\).

\(^{57}\) vid. \(\text{upātī} \rightarrow \langle \text{QDM lpd} \rangle \text{ abar raewd} \text{ in V 15.9, 15.18; upātī} \rightarrow \langle \text{QDM SGYTWN-t} \rangle \text{ abar raft in Y 9.1; upātī} \rightarrow \langle \text{QDM SGYTWN-t} \text{ YKOMWN-yt} \rangle \text{ abar raft ėstēd} \text{ in V 7.12, 13. On the contrary, in two passages the verb is different: upātī} \rightarrow \langle \text{BRA ʾyʾyt} \rangle \text{ bē ayābēd} \text{ in V 8.100, 101, 102; upātī} \rightarrow \langle \text{QDM YHTWN-yt} \rangle \text{ abar raēd} \text{ in V 13.28.}\)

\(^{58}\) vid. \(\text{para.iri+iieiti} \rightarrow \langle \text{BRA wtylyt} \rangle \text{ bē widardēd} \text{ in V 5.1, HN 2.1; para.iri+iō} \rightarrow \langle \text{BRA wlt} \rangle \text{ bē widard} \text{ in HN 2.16 firstly and } \langle \text{BRA wlt HWE-yh} \rangle \text{ bē widard hē secondly; para.iri+iinti} \rightarrow \langle \text{BRA wtylyt} \rangle \text{ bē widardēd} \text{ in V 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4; para.iri+iāt} \rightarrow \langle \text{BRA wlt’} \rangle \text{ bē widard} \text{ in V 5.41, 5.42,}\)
- *upa.mānaiān* → *<QDM NTLWN-> abar pāy-* instead of *<QDM KTLWN-> abar mān-*. Although the latter is also attested in many passages in the PT of A and B and is confirmed by the old PT, where only Phl. *abar mādan, mān-* appears, in both A and B Phl. *<QDM NTLWN-> abar pāy-* is found as well.

- *yaozādātā-* → *<DKYA> pāk* in A instead of *<ywšd’sl> yōjāsr*. It is noteworthy that Phl. *pāk* usually glosses the adjective *yōjdāsr* in old PTs.

- *stōrmātā* → *<ASLWN-x₁-> bandēd* 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 PTs.

- *xē’atō* → *<NPŠE> xwēš* in 12.7 [A] and *<hwtk> 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), *<hwtk> xwad* (V 18.11) and *<BNPŠE> xwad* (V 19.13 and 34).

- *ańiīōvarma-* → *<ywrt hw’dsn’*> *jud-xwāyišn* (in B in 12.21a) and *<ZK k’mk> ān kāmag* (in G25a in 12.21a) instead of Phl. *any-kāmag*. 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 kāmag* is a wrong PT, because it confuses Av. *ańīia-* “another” with Phl. *<ZK> ān “that, the”, it is however very close to the PT *<ZK-šy k’mk>* *any-kāmag* in the only parallel of this Avestan word: V 15.2.

- *ańiīō.tkaēša-* → *<ywrt kyš*> *jud-kēš* (in B in 12.21a) and *<ZK DYNA> ān dēn* (in G25a in 12.21a). The Pahlavi translators of A, like in Av. *ańiīō.varma-* 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. *tkaēša*-. The attempt of PT in G25a by *<ZK DYNA> ān dēn* stems too from the wrong assimilation of Av. *ańīia-* “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.

- viḵraḵ-uštāna- → <ywdst ‘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 kīrɛnīd gyān. We might suppose that the PT of A simply omitted <ywdst’k>. However, in my opinion, the PT of A reinterpreted the compound as Av. vii → Phl. bē, Av. kōraḵ → 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 <ywdst klynyt’ HYA> jud kīrɛnīd gyān.

- frāwauaiti → <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 frāwauaiiōi → <plwynyt> frawēnēd, edited thus by Jamasp against the variant <plk’t> 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 nōi. āðro.frauwuitmca → <LA ZK yʾthš ′plwynš [twc’k AYK BRA LA YKTLWN-yt]> nē ān i ātaxš ′frawēnšn [tōzaḵ kū bē nē őzanēd]. In this passage Av. frauwuiti- is translated by Phl. frawēnšn and this Pahlavi word is explained by őzanēd. Thus, the Pahlavi explanation to Av. frauwuiti- in N 65 uses the same verb as the PT of Av. frāwauaiti in V 12.22, namely Phl. zadan, zan-. The only difference is that the former chose the preverb ȯ, while the latter preferred the preverb frāz.

Sometimes the variation simply reflects a different interpretation, as we see in the following example:

- ḏriš → <OD 3 YWM> tā sē rōz (in B in 12.2b) instead of <3 b’l> sē bār (in all the passages in A). All the Avestan parallels of multiplicative + Av. fra- snā- confirm that the PT of A is the right one. In this case, the Pahlavi translators of B just understood that Av. ḏriš 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 <bl’t> brād (only in 12.5b secondly). Phl. <blwl> /bror/ represented the Gabrī variant of Phl. brādar and slipped into some Pahlavi texts from the Frahang ī Pahlawīg, vid. the commentary to this word in V 12.5.

2.2.2. Wrong PTs:

- āaṭ. 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

63 vid. ḏriš. frasnāšaun → <3 b’l pr’c ’y šwdynd> sē bār frāz ē sōyēnd in V 7.14; biš. frasnāšaun → <2 b’l pr’c ’y šwdynd> dō bār frāz ē sōyēnd in V 7.75; brisataďšom. frasnāše → <30 b’l ... pr’c šwdšn> sib bār ... frāz sōyišn in V 8.98; pānca.dasa. frasnāše → <15 b’l ... pr’c šwdšn> pānzdah bār ... frāz sōyišn in V 8.99.
or simply $<$AMT$>$ $ka$, as confirmed by most parallels$^{64}$. However, in other instances Av. $āaṭ. yaṭ$ is translated by Phl. $<$cygwn$>$ $čyôn$ (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. $āaṭ. yaṭ$.

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$>$.  

- $<\text{tanu}-$ ($\text{tanuna}m$) $→ <\text{tn'g'\text{n}}>$ (12.2), $<\text{tn'hl}>$ (12.4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 18 in G25a and 20) or even $<\text{tn'}\text{phl}>$ (12.12) in the PT of A instead of $<\text{tn}'>$ $\text{tan}$, only attested in 12.2 [B] and in 12.18 in K2 above the line and R3. The variants $<\text{tn'hl}>$ and $<\text{tn'}\text{phl}>$ seem to be corruptions of Phl. $<\text{tn'plg'\text{n}}>\text{tanāpuhlagān}$, which appears in preceding passages. This means that the Pahlavi translators of V 12 wrongly took Av. $\text{tanu}$- for a synonym of Av. $\text{xv}aŋ\text{har}$-.

- $<\text{upāiti-} → <\text{KRYTWN-šn'}\text{BYDWN-xh}>\text{xwāhišn kunēd}$ (in T44 in 12.2 thirdly) and $<\text{KRYTWN-šn'}>$ $\text{xwāhišn}$ in F10 instead of $<\text{QDM SGYTWN-šn'}>$ $\text{abar rawišn}$.  

- $<\text{na- (nō)} → <\text{KON}>\text{nūn}$ (in A in all the passages) instead of $<\text{LNE}>\text{amā}$ (only in B in 12.2c). The Pahlavi translators of A surely confused the pronoun Av. $\text{nō}$ with the temporal adverb Av. $\text{nū(n)}$ because of their phonetic proximity.

- $<\text{pančāca}. \text{visaitica} → <\text{5 21}>$ (only in R3) instead of $<\text{25}>\text{wīst uδ pānj}$ (in 12.9b in both A and B and in 12.11b [B]).  

- $<\text{pančāsamat} → <\text{70}>$ (only in R3 in 12.9b and 11b) instead of $<\text{50}>\text{pānǰāh}$ (only in B and the manuscripts G25a and R1 in 12.9b and 11b).  

- $<\text{vā (emphatic)} → <\text{ywpx}>\text{ayāb}$ (in both A and B in 12.21). Surprisingly, in 12.21 T44 omitted this $\text{vā}$, but translated it by $<\text{ywpx}>\text{ayāb}$ as well.

- $<\text{viś.huška- + tarō → <\text{wyś ḫwšktl}>\text{wiś hušktar}}$ (in K2 and B in 12.22a). The Pahlavi translators in K2 and B made the same mistake, because they confused the adverb $\text{tarō}$ following $\text{viś. huškō}$ 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 $<\text{tl}>$ from $<\text{wyś hwšk}>$, so that they translated correctly. These manuscripts agree with the only parallel of this text, V 5.36, where we find $<\text{wyś hwšk}>\text{wiś-hušk}$ and $<\text{LCD-r'}>$ $\text{tar}$ separately.

---

$^{64} <\text{āaṭ. yaṭ} → <\text{AMT}>\text{ka}$ in V 3.20, 5.13, 8.10; $<\text{āaṭ. yaṭ} → <\text{ADYN’ AMT}>\text{ēg ka}$ in Yt 6.1, 6.2, 7.4, V 8.1, 8.40 (twice), 17.4, Ny 1.12, 3.6 (but U1 writes $<\text{ADYN’ MNW}>\text{ēg kē}$); $<\text{āaṭ. yaṭ} → <\text{W AMT}>\text{ud ka}$ 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.
- frāuāieiti → <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 <ʾplwynyt> 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. <znšnʾ> zanišn in P 8, where it seems to have occurred the same confusion.

---

65 vid. azaita → <BRA SGYTWN-ynyt> bē rawēnēd in V 5.37; azaēta → <SGYTWN-yt> rawēd in V 18.68; azāite → <SGYTWN-ynyt> rawēnēd in V 18.76; ʾazōiḏe → <SGYTWN-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 fjordā] “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 nabagī [kū nabēragi] “the grandson ... [namely the grandson], the grandaughter [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.ptaīš → mānbed [’ay kadag-xwadāy], and mānbedag [’ay kadag-bānūg] in 12.7 is found, as we have already observed, in Vr 3.3 nmānō.paḏnim → mānbedēn ... [kadag-bānūg].

8.2. Short explanatory glosses and brief explanations

Sometimes the Pahlavi translators of R1 and B added short explicationary 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 mānišnīh 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. نیبره “grandson”. The feminine counterpart nabērage is derived from the masculine one, like in other examples already seen.
- 12.2 (only in R1): ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb ĭ web zōhr 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 apākīh 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 ēw astarag [dārēd kū ēw astarag ham pāk x nibūmēd] “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 yōjāsrōk] gāhān frāz srāyēd [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: yōjāsrīh pas bawēd mān [kū pas az sē rōz ān mān yōjāsrīh 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-kē [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 ham.raēϑβaiieiti → <OL hm gwmyhtyt [PWN hmlyt]> ō ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēd] in V 5.34, 35 and 36 and ham.raēϑβaiieiti → <OL hm gwmyht [PWN hmlyt]> ō ham gumēxt [pad hamrēd] in V 19.20, and paītī.raēϑβaiieiti → abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēd] in V 5.33, 34, 35 and 36; paītī. raēϑβaiieiti → <OL hm gwmyht [PWN płtyt]> 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. raēϑβaiieiti is wrongly translated as Phl. ō ham gumēxt instead of abar gumēxt.

- 12.22: mar druwend dō zang ēdōn asemōg anāsōx špēnāg-mēnōg dāmān ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēd] [kē abāg ōy har ka rasēd pad xēm wattar bawēd] [ōy rāy š 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 š 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 yazišn pad kār dārēd ud drōn srōs 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 xwēs tan āb ud urwar *xwarēnd ud pad kāmag amahraspandān rāy bē yazēnd ud *ayādēnēnd 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.

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 mīrēd [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-čām rāy yazēm; 1.8c wārisnīg tištar stārag rāy yazēm; 1.8n zarrēnōmand abzār rāy yazēm; 1.9c ruwān ī xwēš rāy yazēm; 1.9d frawar ī xwēš rāy yazēm; 2.12a mibr xwadāy buland kē amarg ud ahlaw ast ūy rāy yazēm, etc.
12.9a. Actually, we expect that these synonymic glosses were placed immediately after the word they explain, namely Phl. *mănbed* 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 wēš 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 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 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. *x’arədaheca. vastrabeca. draošca. nəmataheca. aiianheca. apa.baraiti of 12.22f, only the PT of Av. *x’arədaheca 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. ʾywšdʾsl yōjdāsr).

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. *-ā-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. āat. 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
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4.2.1.1. With a different suffix (e.g. Av. \(x\vartheta\alpha\) → Phl. <hw\(\lambda\)nk> \(x\vartheta\alpha\iota\)ag instead of Phl. \(x\vartheta\alpha\iota\)).

4.2.1.2. Without a suffix attested in old PTs (e.g. Av. \(j\vartheta\alpha\)- → Phl. <zynd / zy\(\vartheta\)nd> instead of Phl. <zy(w)ndk> \(z\vartheta\iota\iota\)).

4.2.1.3. Without preverb (e.g. Av. \(\vartheta\)fr\(\vartheta\)n\(\iota\)- → Phl. <HLL\(\vartheta\)WN-\(\iota\)> \(\vartheta\iota\)\(\vartheta\)y\(\iota\) instead of Phl. \(f\vartheta\alpha\z\vartheta\iota\)).

4.2.2. Use of different Pahlavi roots

4.2.2.1. Synonymic variation (e.g. Av. \(\vartheta\)fr\(\iota\)n\(\iota\)i- → Phl. <BRA YMY\(\iota\)TN-\(\iota\)> \(\vartheta\)m\(\iota\)\(\iota\) instead of the verb Phl. \(w\vartheta\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(\vartheta\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)).

4.2.2.2. Wrong PTs (e.g. Av. \(n\alpha\)- (\(n\)\(\iota\)) → Phl. <KON> \(n\)\(\iota\) instead of Phl. <LNE> \(a\)\(\iota\)).

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 Vidēvdād, 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, Vidēvdād 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 simplified 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 \(k\iota\) 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 Vidēvdād 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.

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. Khorsheedji Bejanji (Kh1, Kh2)
   j. Mancherji Barzoji Powri (Mb1, Mb2)
4. Jamshedji Peshotanjji 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 Vidēvdād, Geldner used a total amount of 21 manuscripts, 9 of which are Pahlavi Vidēvdād 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 Vidēvdād Sāde (B2, Br1, L2, K10, L1, M2, O2, P1, Dh1) and 3 Iranian Vidēvdād 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 Vidēvdād with those included in Jāmāsp’s (1907) edition of the Pahlavi Vidēvdād. 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. Jāmāsp, 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 Jāmāsp: 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 collation

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 Bibliothèque 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 Bibliothèque 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 sraoṣīnō, which is corrected sec. manu as sraēṣomnō. This is, however, what we find in P10, as we can observe:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{P2} & \text{P10} \\
\end{array}
\]

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 nasuṣ, but the readings in P2 and P10 are:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{P2} & \text{P10} \\
\end{array}
\]

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

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. hazaŋrāiš. sūnīš. nairiūn. 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:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{P2} & \text{P10} \\
\end{array}
\]

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

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{P2} & \text{P10} \\
\end{array}
\]

- 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:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{P2} & \text{P10} \\
\end{array}
\]
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

---

76 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 ʾišiqm; but really: ʾašiqm, partially written by the second hand of L4a.
- V 11.12a: according to Geldner: L4 kunidiža; but really: knudižda.
- V 11.12f: according to Geldner: L4 urruaraža, K1 urruarauiža; but really: L4, K1 urruaraiža. 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 times. 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 nisirnuiuät, not °srinuiuät), 14.4a (L4 frastarəranaqam, not frastarəronaqam), 14.4b (K1 daŋpo,painayharštanam. daŋpo,yaozdə, not simply pairayb°), 14.4b (L4 hašənaepata, not all the manuscripts hašənaepata exc. K1; actually, there is no manuscript which attests Geldner’s hašənaepata), 14.5a (L4 udaro.Əristanam, not Əristanam), 14.6c (L4 ʃai̱pi.janiuät, not janiuät), 14.7c (L4 bidaranam, but not corrected sec. manu to k, because there is no correction by a sec. manu), 14.7e (L4 tižibərm, not tiži.bərm), 14.9i (L4, K1 aɛuməndəsə, not aɛumədašə), 14.11a (L4, K1 vərəzaiantəm, not vərəzaiantəm), 14.11c (K1, P2, M3 ərəzatö, not all Mss. ərəzatəm, exc. K1 ərəzatö), 14.11d (K1, P2, M3 əyaq, not all Mss. əyaq, exc. K1 əyaq), 14.14d (K1 barəzış, not barəziš).
1.3. Descriptio 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 Navsarī (Dhabhar 1925), 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 Navsarī, 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. 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, Ml3, 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 Navsarī 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-rana 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, Vīsparad and Vīdēvdād is carried out, including these new discoveries, it is impossible to reconstruct a trustworthy *stemma codicum* of the IndVS manuscripts. Having edited only Vīdēvdād 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-rana 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 10. The 2nd, 3rd and 18th fragard are misplaced in the following passages: 2.18c > 2.11a > 2.15a > 2.1a; 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-24e > 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-

---

3 In V 10.11a L4c attests , that is, āxtūrim instead of āxtūrim. The third hand of L4c could have copied from an IrVS manuscript, because ā is written as i, a confusion exclusively found in the Iranian manuscripts.

- **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 Dārāb from an exemplar brought from Persia by Dastur Jāmāsp Irānī74. 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 Navsari 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 Navsari. Current signature: G25.

- **G34**: PV of the group of L4 with New Persian interlinear translation copied in Navsari. 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 Navsari. 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 Kavasji Sorabji Meherji-rana in Navsari in 1.2.1872 Saṃvat (1st volume) and 14.10.1872 Saṃvat (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 Navsari (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 Navsari. Current signature: F10 of the Dastur Erachji Sorabji Meherji-rana’s collection (Dhabhar 1925 7-8).

74 “Vendidad med pehlevi Oversættelse afskrevet af Destur Darāb efter et gammelt Exemplar bragt fra Persien af Destur Jāmāsp irānī”.
- **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 Vidēvdād. 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):

- **L1:** IndVS manuscript dated 804 A.Y. (1435 A.D.) in Pāzand on folio 246 (Unvala 1940 82). If true (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena viii), it would be the oldest VS manuscript preserved. Library: British Library in London. Current signature: Mss. Avestan 1.

- **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 Hērbūţ Hīrā in Surat on the day Mihr of the month Amurdād 995 A.Y. (1626 A.D.). Library: Bombay University Library. Current signature: Nº 28.


- **T46:** IndVS manuscript copied by Ervad Erach Dastur Xorshed Dastur Hoşang 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 Xorshed Dastur Hoşang 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 šāhrewar 1161 A.Y., Saṁvat 1848 (1792 A.D.), according to its Gujarati colophon. Unknown to Geldner. Library: The First Dastur Meherji-rana Library in Navsari. 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 Mīnocōhērāzī Hērbed Kārāshāspāzī Pāvādī 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 Xuršid ban Dastur Mihirnōš ban Dastur Bhimwn ban Dastur Xuršat 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 Navsari.

Iranian Vīdēvdād Sāde (IrVS):

- Mf2: the oldest IrVS manuscript known to us, copied by Husraw Anōšīrwān Rōstām Šahryār Wahrām Dahišnyār Mihrābān 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 Vīdēvdād*

As far as Vīdēvdād is concerned, its archetype must be reconstructed on the basis of two main text-types: a) that of the Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts, that is, those which attest a Pahlavi translation of the Avestan text; and b) that of the Vīdēvdād 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 Vīdēvdād is added between Visparad and Yasna. Therefore, the Vīdēvdād 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 Vīdēvdād in order to show the fundaments of his critical edition of Vīdēvdād.

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 Sīstān to India a manuscript written by Ardašīr ī Wahman ī

---

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 Vidēvdād 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ms. of Hōmāst} & \\
\text{Ms. of Ardašīr (1205 A.D.)} & \\
\text{Ms. of Rōstām (after 1269)} & \\
| & \\
L4 (1323) & K1 (1324) \\
| & \\
Y & \\
| & \\
\text{corrections by a second hand} & \\
| & \\
P2 (1758) & K3a & M3
\end{align*}
\]

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 Bunyār in 944 Y.E. (1575 A.D.) from a copy by Šahryār Ardašīr Ėrič Rōstām Ėrič (ε) that goes back to a copy by Wēžan Wahrāmšāh Wēžan (δ), who copied it from the manuscript of Ardašīr (β). 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 Vīdēvdād 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 Vendīdās 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.

The VS certainly incorporated glosses from the PV (Geldner 1896 Prolegomena xlvi). 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, xlvi) 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. gaδβķm. yąm. aprθrm. δraiiq.</td>
<td>dātar. yō. gaδβķm. jaṃti. yąm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bāuzdri. barö đổka. pudrāca.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paēmainica. aiiața. taęca. aętaąca.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pudrąm. baraiti. sünąm. bāuzdri.</td>
<td></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 Vidēvdād 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 Vidēvdād independently.

The last study about the pre-archetype of Vidēvdād 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. jāinti. Hence Cantera
concludes that a PT where Av. jāinti 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 <s’s’n’> instead of <g’s’n’>. 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 kamāicīt and M3 kamāi.cīt instead of *kaṃśāicīt.

   Confusions are obviously more probable among similar graphems. Example: V 12.1a: G25a, R3, B2, L1, T46, P1, Br1, L2 attest māca instead of māta.

   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.n̄m and T46 vōhū.n̄m instead of *vohu̇nḡm; V 10.4a: B2, T46 aōge.madahecā instead of *aoḡe.madahecā; 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 <’hwwk ynšn’> instead of <’hwkynšn’>.

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 nārike instead of nārika (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. srāyiš, 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. ātaxš, but NP. ātaš.

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.pərənəm and D62 paiti.pərənəm instead of paiti.pərənə by influence of the following ayrən.
- V 10.9a: Br1, L5 ima instead of ime because of the preceding and following vaca.
- V 10.19a: L4 yaoždaiđiša instead of yaoždāitiš because of the preceding yaoždaiđiša in L4.
- V 11.3c: Mf2, K9 vairiiō instead of vairiō because of the preceding vairiiō.
- 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.raēβəi instead of upa.raēβaiieiti; V 10.3b: P10 gāhuua instead of gādhuua; V 11.9c: L4a <bwšsp'> instead of <bwššp'>.

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. ī <y>, omissions of one or a few words are not

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 homoearcton is found in V 10.5b: B1, M3 – | baca. nārīka. paiti.iriste | – in this context: ... baca. nā. paiti.irstō. – | baca. nārīka. ʾpaiti.irista. – | baca. nmānāhe. ... Since the following prepositional syntagms begins with baca. 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. Homoearcton

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 – | ʾāat. ... ẓrīšāmrūta | – in the following context:
  ... ẓrīšāmrūta. – | ʾāat. mraoṭ. ahurō. mazdā. ime. aēte. vaca. yōi. hənti. gādāhuu. ẓrīšāmrūta. – | ime. vaca. ...

It seems that the scribe omitted this text because of ẓrīšāmrūta. 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
way, namely by a loss of some folios in the common source of L4 and K1.

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 <ptlyt’yn’> instead of <ptlyt>; V 11.11a: L4, K1 imām instead of ima; V 12.1: K2, L1, P1, L5 paitarəm instead of pitərəm; V 12.1: L2 tanu.ərəðanəm instead of tanu.ərəðanəm.

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. kainīnō. ʿx̣atō. 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 vastranəm instead of vastranəm; V 12.4: L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5 vayhəbiiō instead of vəyəhəbiiō; V 12.9:
G25a *dhamanām* instead of *dahmanām*; V 12.13: L5 *caβarəstaim* instead of *caβarəstam*.

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. daijhu. haca. zantu* instead of *haca. zantu. haca. +daijhu*. 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 ũriša.frasrūta. gādnātm. ũrasanātī. vastrinām instead of the expected ũriš.frasnātī. tanunām. ũriš.frasrūtī. gādanām.

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 *āhitīm*. Behind this hypercorrection stands the Avestan word for a chapter of Yasna, namely *hāiti-* In V 12.2 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 and T46 attest *yazata* and R1 *yazata* instead of *yazaēta*. Obviously, the scribes corrected the optative by the Avestan word for “divinity”, namely *yazata*.

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 Vīdēvdād. 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 Vīdēvdād (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 Vīdēvdād 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 Vīdēvdād 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 + gwbspn' |.
- 10.15a: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 + OLE-s's n' | (1st).
- 10.15a: K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, L4a + OLE-šʾn' | (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, T44, B1, P10, M3 + ywšd’slyh | (after <m’h>). Only F10 above the line, T44 and E10 completed it.
- 11.9e: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 + ywšd’slyh PWN | (before <hwšyt>). Only P2 and E10 completed it.
- 11.12a-b: L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 + ptk’lym hšm ... paršta. ham.raēβom. paršta. paiti.raēβom |. These manuscripts omit the PT of paršta. ‘aēsmom. paršta. nasūm, together with its gloss and the following Avestan text paršta. ham.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 G34a, F10a, T44 and E10.

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).
- 11.12g: 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 Mihrābān 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 Navsarī, 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 — gwbsn' —
  - 11.2a: L4, G34, T44, E10 ywdtdydwt — HD — (the rest, <ywdtdydwt-HD>)
  - 11.10a: L4, G34, T44, E10 — MN MTA —

b) Additions:

- Additions of one of a few words.
  - 11.6c: L4, G34, T44 ywšd’slynyd. YHBWN-yd; E10 ywšd’slynyd YHHWN-yd (<YHBWN-yd or YHHWN-yd> 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 Navsarī 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 | mazdqm |
  - 10.1b: L4 | BRA |
  - 10.6a: L4 | paiti.parone | (3rd)
  - 10.15a: L4 | aête |
  - 11.7a: L4 | YMRRWN |
  - 11.10a: L4 | y ’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 <pwltynm mwtk kl’tl pwltynm “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.ṭamōca. huškō.zamō.ṭamōca; E10 viuruuarō.ṭamōca. huškō.zamō.ṭamōca (huškō.zamō.ṭamōca 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 | gwbšn’ |. 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 | gwbšn’ |. Only completed in F10.
  - 11.1c: K1, B1, P10 (but P10a unamiargmt. kida above the line) | kida. umniargmt |. The rest completed it.
b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
- 10.2d: K1 – e. aete; D62, M3 ime. aete; P2 ime. aiti; P5 ime. ite; K2 ime. ite; B1, P10 imi. 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 – paiti.porone. vātō. daēuuō –
- Long omissions due to a saut du même au même.
- 10.16d: K1 – ZNE ... sīn’ī –

b) Additions:
- Additions of one or a few words.
- 11.4a: K1 gwbsn’ 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 Navsārī in 1767 A.D., is actually the only one preserving the same colophon as Ml3 (Jamasp 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 nasůš by him who does not understand purifying, and yet would accomplisih 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 yaddāhūwayryō 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 Viđēvdād 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 Viđēvdād 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. x yatō. pūdrəm 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 Viđēvdād 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 → ḫorēne. būšīqsta. yā. zairina →

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

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 yāozdaðāmi. imat. nārikam. ašaonim. yāozdaðāmi
- 11.9c: T46 ẓairine. ḫorēne. būšqsta. ḫorēne. kundīža

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 abia ḫe; P1 ḫe. ḫe

b) Rare variants:
- 12.18b: L1, P1 aevīō
- 12.21a: L1, P1 yadainiō.varm
- 12.22f: L1, P1 haŋuš

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 → dātarā →
- 12.9a: L1 → niūka. vā. para. iridīẹitei →

b) Addition of one word:
- 12.6b: L1 zaōdrā. ḫā

b) Rare variants:
- 11.2c: L1 mazdaðā
- 12.9a: L1 niū. kō
- 12.9a: L1 niūō
- 12.12b: L1 vō
- 12.22d: L1 nōō

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 → parṣṭa. nasūm. ... paiti. raēβēm →
b) Additions of one word:
- 11.13a: P1 strūsca (–ca added)
- 12.4c: P1 ēriš, frasnāiti (ēriš 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 poṛne, poṛne

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.ri̯ste –
- 10.13b: R278 – xru̯i. drūm –
- 11.12g: R278 – paršta. ... uruvarā –
- 11.18a: R278 – paršta. ... uruvarā –
- 12.5a: R278 – x̣aŋha. vā. para.iri̯tieiti –
- 12.11a: R278 – napti. vā. para.iri̯tieiti –
- 12.15a: R278 – tūriiua. vā. para.iri̯tieiti –

b) Additions of one word:
- 11.6d: R278 vax̣a̯. ahurō
- 11.10a: R278 hama, 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 – poṛne. pairikam –
- 11.19a: L2 – haca. zama –

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. pụdrō –
b) Rare variants:
- 12.19b: E4 dasatanu.protchām; L5 dašatanu.protchām
- 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 ainiō.vairina. ainiō.varōna
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 | āaṭ ... drisāmrūta |
- 12.4a-c: E4 | dātarā ... 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 ašabe.caidera
- 11.16a: E4 ašabe.caidera
- 12.7c: E4 puḍrō
- 12.22f: E4 abraitī

L5 attests some errores separativi not present in the other two as well:
a) Omissions:
- 12.8b: L5 | apām. ... uruwaranām. vasō. upāiti |
- 12.13a: L5 | cuuaṭ. aēšam. upa. manaiiān |
b) Additions of a few words:
- 10.18f: L5 huuām. aŋhuuām (aŋhuuām added)
- 12.12b: L5 spōtanām. spōtanām
c) Rare variants:
- 12.9b: L5 panca.sata
- 12.10a, 14b: L5 auruwaranām
- 11.1c: L5 mazdaōātāhe
- 11.4b: L5 fpara
- 11.6b: L5 tāiś
- 12.5b: L5 xāiḥbaca

Also FK1 attests some errores separativi lacking in the other two:
a) Omissions
- 10.9b: FK1 | nmāhanhe |
- 10.14a: FK1 | paiti.pronme. ... stōiś |
- 10.19a: FK1 | yaoždaidēsā. ... asti |
b) Additions of one or a few words:
- 10.19b: FK1 daenām. daenām
- 11.9b: FK1 pārēne. pārine
- 11.9b: FK1 paiti. raθ̂̂m. pārēne. paiti. raθ̂̂m
- 11.10a: FK1 ašaone. ašaone. ašaone (ašaone added)
- 12.6b: FK1 a′mrāmām nō. ātārəm

c) Rare variants:
- 11.3b, 8b: FK1 ahunahe
- 11.15a: FK1 pārə
- 12.6b: FK1 aivīō
- 12.8b: FK1 yaodāi
- 12.9a: FK1 niipati
- 12.14b: FK1 yaodāmi
- 12.14b: FK1 vatarinām
- 12.14b: FK1 upāiēi
- 12.22f: FK1 nəmtaca

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 xlvvi) 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* 81.

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

----

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 Viñedvād, 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

---

82 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 (*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 Vīdēvdād 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 (*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 *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 Vīdēvdād 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 Vīdēvdād. 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 breviar 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 Vīdēvdād 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 xlvi, lii) as a minimum the variants of the oldest manuscripts of each class should have been recorded. For Vīdēvdād 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%).

64 14.1a (L4 astuuaatīnąm), 14.1b (K1 udēm), 14.3a (L4 vohū.gaanahē; L4 vohū.karotōī; L4 haśā.naēpatīiā; L4 bōhōōiūīkātanām; K1 nisrōnuiiāt), 14.4a (L4 bārūmāēne), 14.4b (K1 nisrōnuiiāt), 14.5b (L4 spaknām), 14.5c (L4a baēnara), 14.5e (L4 baēnara), 14.5f (L4 baēnara), 14.5f (L4 dānō.karštanām; K1 dānō.karštanām), 14.5g (L4 bywl), 14.6b (L4 baēnara), 14.6b (K1 maśīnām), 14.6d (K1 nisrōnuiiāt), 14.7d (L4, K1 bankusrom), 14.7e (L4 tīē.znūtōm), 14.8a (K1 ašiā), 14.8a (K1 nisrōnuiiāt), 14.8d (K1 xraēstrāmēn), 14.8e (L4 urūnūiā), 14.9a (L4 visōm), 14.9a (K1 nisrōnuiiāt), 14.10a (L4 ciidīm), 14.10a (L4 nisrinuiiāt), 14.11a (L4, K1 vōrōzaiiāntōm), 161
b) Sometimes significant variants are not recorded. For example, in V 11.1b Geldner edited *nimānam*, but did not record any variant. My own autopsy has shown that Geldner’s *nimānam*, 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 nimānam* and in P2, B1. E4, L5 *nimānam* 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 *imaqr* 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 *imaqr*. Only the VS manuscripts attest *imaqr*.

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 *tižidātābe*, attested in L4, T44 and T46, and recorded only K1 *taži*. We find in K1, B1, M3 *taži.dātābe*, but there are many other variants too: P2, G25. L1, P1, Br1, L2 *tiži.dātābe*; P5 *taža.dātābe*; K2 *taža.dātābe*; F10 – *tiži.dātābe* –; E10. L5 *tižādāiti*; P10 *tažādāte*; E4a in the left margin *tižidāti*; *Mf2*, K9 *tiže.dātābe*. Geldner’s note does not allow us to see the relations
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. aëšō. kasu. draonō. yađa. 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, Ml3 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 *āhe*, like L4 and L2. He not only was wrong, as L1 actually shows *ābiāahe* but he also omitted that P1 attests *āhe*. 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 *ābiī*. 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 *vāranam* and recorded no variant. Our autopsy reveals the following variants: T44, L4a, L1, T46, P1, L2, E4, K9; K3b, P10 ￨ *vāranam* ￨; K3a, P2 ￨ *vairinam* ￨; P5 ￨ *vairinam* ￨; K2 ￨ *vim ci vairinam* ￨; F10 ￨ *vāraṇa* ￨; E10 ￨ *vāranam* ￨; P10a, M3 ￨ *vairinim* ￨; L5 ￨ *vāranam* ￨. 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 višćiđram. He recorded that the right variant is confirmed by L1, K10, M2. Then he quoted Jp1, Mf2 viš. ciđram; L4, L2, Br1 višćiđram; K1 viściđram. 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 fraoirisaitė are the following ones: K1; L4, L3 fraoirisaëite; Mf2 fraōirisiëite; Jp1 fraōirisiëite; L1, L2, Br1 fraorisiëiti. 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 hāuua.iūsō.tanuuō; P2, F10, E10, M3 hāuuaiaićsō.tanuuō instead of hauuaiaićsō.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 dahmāicī is as follows:
L4 and P. V.; 

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 

On the other hand, if we test the manuscripts the result is very different: K1, P2, L1, T46, Br1, L2, Mf2, K9, P5, K2, G25, M3, kahmāici; F10, T44, kahmāici; E10, (G) dabhāici; B1, P10, 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 Šade 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) Stemmarc

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 Vīdēvdād.
C) *Constitutio textus*

1. Eclecticism.

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: L4 (1323 A.D.), L1 (1435 A.D.\textsuperscript{85}), M/2 (1618 A.D.). A dot separates each class. The PV are marked in bold letters, the IndVS in plain (because the most of manuscripts of Vīdēvdād belong to this class) and the 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, 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 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 stemma codicum of the whole Vīdēvdād is achieved. Afterwards, as already mentioned, only the main sources of each text-type will be recorded in the critical notes and the 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 š, š, š, 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: L4a is the second hand and L4b the third one of L4, P10a is the second hand of 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 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{85} L1 is not the oldest IndVS and its date is possibly wrong. Nevertheless, until the stemma codicum of the IndVS is achieved, I have for the moment no argument to change its place in the sequence of IndVS. Hence I have preferred to maintain it as the supposedly oldest 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

[a] Zarādūštra asked Ahura Mazda: “O Ahura Mazda, most beneficient Spirit, Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, [b] how shall I fight this Lie, which from the dead hursts itself into the living, how shall I fight this Nasu, which from the dead contaminates the living? 

[a] [znd] cygwn PWN AHRN gyw’k npšt; [b] cygwn PWN ‘OLE dlwc ptk lým [AYK-s] cygwn stwb; BRA OBYDW-m; MNW MN OLE lyst; OL OLE zwyndk. QDM dw̱b’lyt. [PWN hmlyt]; cygwn PWN OLE nswš ptk lým [AYK-s] cygwn stwb; BRA OBYDW-m; MNW MN OLE lyst; OL OLE zwyndk. QDM gwmyhtyt [PWN ptlyt].
\[ \text{[a] [zand čīyōn pad any gyāg nibišt] \[b] čīyōn pad *ōy druz pahikārēm [kū-š čīyōn stō bē kunom] kē az ōy rist ō ōy zīndag abar dārēd [pad hamrē] čīyōn pad ōy nasū pahikārēm [kū-š čīyōn stō bē kunom] kē az ōy rist ō ōy zīndag abar gumēxtēd [pad payrē]} \]

\[ [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 kuḍa upto *upa.raēβsaiiitei is repeated.

Av. \textit{parōnāne} (10.1b)

Av. \textit{parōnāne} was attributed to \textit{parat}—“to fight ” by Bartholomae (1904 868-869)\(^{132}\). Av. \textit{parōnāne} should then be explained as an assimilation of \(\#t- + -n-> \#tn\) to \(\#n\) (Av. \textit{parōnāne} < \textit{parōnānē} < \textit{parōnānē}). However, the usual evolution of IIR. \(\#tn\) to Av. \(\#an\) makes this explanation very unlikely. cf. Av. \textit{śānōm} < IIR. \(\#cjātāy-\) and Ved. \textit{cyautnā}—(Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.555). Indeed, if Av. \textit{parōnāne} belonged to \textit{parat}—“to fight ”, we would expect \textit{parōnānē} < \textit{pynānā}.

According to Kellens (1984 178, n.8), a root Av. \textit{par-} must be proposed. Actually, Av. \textit{parōnāne} it is the 1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Mid. of the Avestan verb \textit{par-}—“to fight” (Klingenschmitt 1968 83-85), (Kellens & Pirart 1995 33), (Cheung 2007 294)\(^{140}\). With a nasal infix in the present stem too, it is also attested in Khot. \textit{purru}—(< \textit{pynā}—(Emmerick 1968 84), (Bailey 1979 244), (Emmerick 1989 212).

\(^{132}\) K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 MN /\text{blank}/

\(^{133}\) K1, D62, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 lyst; P2 lystk; F10 lysi’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 zwndk

\(^{136}\) P2; L4 dwb'ltyt PWN pt gwnmyhtyt; K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, (Jmp) gwnmyhtyt; E10 gwnmyht‘; M3 gwnmyht‘

\(^{137}\) L4, D62, P2, G34a, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 = PWN —

\(^{138}\) E10, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 ptylyt; K1 ptylyt '; D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 ptylyt '; F10 ptylyt

\(^{139}\) A variation of this gloss is added after Phl. \textit{wānidan}, \textit{wān-} “you will overcome” in V 19.8: \textit{pad-am kadār gōwšīn wānī} [kū-š stō bē kunom] “With which words will you overcome me [that is, will you defeat me]?” and in V 19.9: \textit{pad-at an gōwšīn 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 fouind in V 19.12: čīyōn az awēšān ‘az kunom az ōy druz az ōy dūrdānāg gannāg mēnōg [kū-š čīyōn stō bē kunom]: “How will I separate it from this Lie, from this ignorant Gannām Mēnōg [that is, how will I defeat him]?”

\(^{140}\) Regarding this verb and Av. \textit{paršta}, see my commentary to V 11.12.

\(^{141}\) Cheung (2007 294), though ascribing correctly this \textit{parme} to \textit{par-} “to fight, to struggle”, confuses the adjective \textit{parme} (< Av. \textit{parānā} “full”) in V 2.8, 12, 16 ff. with the the phonetically identical verb \textit{parme} (< Av. \textit{par-} “to fight”).
Av. *upa.duvaṣaiti* (10.1b)

This verb seems an Avestan *-, (<IE. *-sk-)*\(^{142}\) present from a root Av. *dupan-,* where the vowel *-a-* entails some morphological and etymological problems.

On one hand, we expect a root in the zero grade in *-s-* (<IE. *-sk-*) present. In such case, the vowel *-a-* < *-ā-* in Av. *duṣāsa-* would denote a root *ultimae laryngalis,* that is, IE. *dhvH*-ske- > OIr. *duṃsa-* > Av. *duṇsa-*(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. *dhvāna-* “causes to float, to move in the air”. As far as the meaning of *Av. *duṇsa-,* Kellens (1992-2001 1.801). Thus, in Av. *duṇsa-*(<IE. *dhvH*-ske-), like in Ved. *dhvānta-* “dark, darkness; name of a wind” (<IE. *dhvH*-t-)*\(^{143}\), 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. *ādvānaya- “darkens” in RV 6.18.10 and Av. *uzduṇnaiait “causes to float upwards” in Yt 5.61, where the long vowel of Ved. *dhvānaya- and Av. *duṇnaiait* should stem from IE. *dghoneje-.

Conversely, the vowel *-a-* in Av. *duṇsa-* could represent an irregular full grade OIr. *duṃsa-*, 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. *ḍpāja- “in Bedrängnis geraten” (Bartholomae 1904 798). According to Hoffmann & Forssman (1996 188), the present Av. *ḍpāja-* stems from a full grade of the radical *tyenzg e < *tyeng*-ske-. Moreover, the syllabic structure is very similar: IE. *tyeng*-ske- in Av. *ḍpāja- and IE. *dghen*-ske- in Av. *duṇsa-*. Therefore, Av. *duṇsa- would not be an isolated case of an inchoative present from a full grade of the radical and it can be analysed as OIr. *duṃsa-.*

As far as the meaning of Av. *duṇsa-* is concerned, Kellens (1984 157, n.12) says that it acquired the meaning “to fly” because of “sémantique populaire” from OAv. *duṇman- / YAv. dunman- “cloud”. Although Pirart (1995 405) states that Kellens’ explanation is semantically difficult, he admits a verbal root Av. *duvan-* “to float, to move in the air”.

In my opinion, the meaning of Av. *duṇsa-* 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 *dvāman-* and proposes a root *ultimae laryngalis.* So he explains Ved. *dvānta-* as IRr. *-Cânc- < IE. *-CphHC-.* On the contrary, Pirart (1995 405) states that this Vedic word can be also interpreted as IE. *dhvH*-t- and be related to a non-attested Vedic root *dhvam-*, according to him in the same way that Ved. *śantā- “tranquilised” is related to Ved. *śam- “to be calm”* (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.610). However, he finally denies this possibility because of the causative Av. *uzduṇnaiait “to cause to float” < Av. *duvan-* in Yt 5.61.
a) the subject of Av. *duuāsa- is always Av. nasu-, which is embodied as a fly *(maṣṣi.koṛṇpa) in V 7.2 and 9.26. This image determines the interpretation of Av. *duuāsa- 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. δβʾny-, mδβʾny- “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. *duuāsa- 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.duuāsa- actually meant “to twirl to, to hurl into”.

Av. *upa. ... *upa.duuāsaiti; *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 δικαστῆριον ὑπαχθείς “being lead under the court of justice”, where Gr. ὑπάγω 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 čyōn pad any gyāg nibišt (10.1a)

In the interpretation of this passage three questions arise:
- Firstly, why the usual PT of the Avestan formula parsat. zarāduštrō. ... ašāum, namely Phl. pursīd zarduxšt ... ablaw, does not appear?
- Secondly, has it been substituted by the gloss Phl. zand čyōn 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 zarduxšt ... ablaw:

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 čyōn 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 zarduxšt ... ablaw 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 zarduxšt ... ablaw 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 Vidēvdād is only attested in this passage of V 10.1a. According to Cantera (2004a 10), Phl. zand čyōn 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 zarduxšt ... ablaw the gloss Phl. ay ohrmazd dādār ablaw pad xwānīşn abārīg 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 Vidēvdād was composed.

However Cantera overlooks two possibly relevant facts. Firstly, the PT pursīd zarduxšt ... ablaw 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
dādār abolaw pad xwānišn abārīg 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 pursīd zarduxšt ... ablaw, 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 Barašnum 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. pursīd zarduxšt ... ablaw 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 čiyōn pad any gyāg nibišt. 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 pursīd zarduxšt ... ablaw 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 čiyōn pad any gyāg nibišt 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. čiyōn pad xōy 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\(^{144}\), but we find an interesting variation in V 9.47b-c:

|b| čiyōn án druz pahikārēd [kū-š stahmagīh čiyōn bē bawād] [ast ke ēdōn göwēd ay čiyōn pad án druz pahikārēhād kū-š čiyōn stō bē kunīhād] ke az ōy rist ō ōy zindag abar dwārēd [pad hamrēh] |c| <čiyōn pad ōy nasuš pahikārēm [kū-š stahmagīh] >\(^{145}\) čiyōn bē bawād] [ast ke ēdōn göwēd ay čiyōn pad ōy nasuš pahikārēhād kū-š čiyōn stō bē kunīhād] ke az ōy rist ō ōy zindag abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēh]

|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, |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 defeated”]

\(^{144}\) The only difference is found in the PT of the second Av. parāmāne as Phl. pahikār instead of pahikārēm in the group of K1.

\(^{145}\) Omitted in L4 and K1.
defeated”), which from the dead contaminates the living [with indirect defilement].”

Apart from the different PTs of Av. ṛētā, we must notice that the PTs of the verb Phl. pahikārdan, pahikār- imply different Avestan verbs: Phl. pahikārēd implies the activ Av. pərənāiti, while the passiv Phl. pahikārīhād reproduces Av. pərənāite. However, this correspondence between the Avestan verb and its PT is not found in V 9.47b-c, as we see:

- Av. (druxš.) pərənāne → Phl. pahikārēd
- Av. (nasuš.) pərənāite/-e146 → Phl. - | ...

Actually, Phl. pahikārēd does not translate Av. pərənāne, but correctly Av. pərənāiti. 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. pərənāne → Phl. pahikārēm
- Av. pərənāiti → Phl. pahikārēd
- Av. pərənāite → 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 Vidēvdād. As a matter of fact, in Šnš 2.1 (Tavadia 1930 30) it is mentioned the 3rd fragard of the Ūuddēvdād of Mēdōmāh, which corresponds to the 7th fragard of our extant manuscripts, while in Šnš 2.12 (Tavadia 1930 36) it is mentioned the 5th fragard of the Ūuddēvdād of the same commentator, whose contents are found actually in the 6th fragard 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 pərənāiti; K1 pərənāite; K2, P5, T44, E10 pərənāne
147  Only P2 Av. pərənāiti → Phl. pahikārēnēd; K2 Av. pərənāne → Phl. pahikārēm.

148 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); G34 mraoḥ; T44, E10 | mraoḥ. ahūro. mazdā |; L1, T46 . Mf2 mraoḥ; P1 mraoḥ; K9 |ītā |; mraoḥ. ahūro | mazdā.

149 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L4, T44, E10 . Mf2, K9 ime; G34 ima; R278 ima

150 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . Br1, (G) framaṇa; P5 framaṇa; G34 framaṇa; E4, FK1 framaṇa; L5 framaṇa

151 L4, K1, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Br1, E4, L5, FK1, (G); E10 yōi; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yōi

152 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 yōihauti; T44 . P1 hauti; L5 hauti

153 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 . G42 gādāhu

154 L4, K1, D62, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, P1, (G); P2 gaḍāhau.bīṣāmṛuta; P5 biṣāmṛuta; G34 biṣāmṛuta; T44 . B2, T46, L2, G42, E4 biṣā.mṛuta; Br1 baesa.mṛuta; L5 biṣā.maruṇa; FK1 biṣā.mṛu; Mf2, K9 biṣāmṛuta

155 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); L4, G34, T44, E10 . Mf2, K9 ime; L5 ime

156 T44 . L1, R278, P1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . Br1, (G) framaṇa; G34 framaṇa; B2, T46 framaṇa; L5 framaṇa; FK1 framaṇa

157 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . E4, L5, FK1, (G); E10 yōi; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); L4, G34, F10, T44, E10 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 honti; P5 honti; T44 honti; L5 honti

158 L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 honti; P5 honti; T44 honti; L5 honti

159 L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, P5 . B2, T46, G42, E4, L5 gādāhu

160 K1, D62, K2, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, P1, Br1, E4, (G); L4, T44 drīṣāmṛuta; P2, P5 drīśa.mṛu; G34 drīṣa.mṛuta; F10 . R278, L2, G42, FK1 drīṣa.mṛuta; T46 drīṣa.mṛuta; L5 drīṣa.maruṇa; Mf2, K9 drīṣa.mṛuta

161 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1, (G); L4, G34, T44, E10 . K9 ime; E4 maś; Mf2 ima vaca. framaṇa. yōi. honti. gaḍāhu. ca dhruvaṁrūta. imē
drīṣa.mṛuta; G34 drīṣa.mṛuta; F10 . R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, K1, P2, P5, K2, T44, E10, B1, M3, (G) framaṇa; G34 framaṇa; R278 framaṇa; L5 framaṇa; FK1 framaṇa

162 L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . E4, L5, FK1, (G); D62 yōi; E10 yō; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yōi

163 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 honti; T44 honti; E4 honti; L5 honti

164 L4, K1, D62, K2, G34, E10, P10 . L1, R278, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, B1, M3 . B2, T46 gādāhu; P5 gāḍāhau; F10 gāḍāhau; Br1 gāḍāhau; FK1 gāḍāhau

165 K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); L4 ca dhruvaṁrūta; P5, T44 cidadrua.mṛūta; K2, E10 cidadrua.mṛūta; G34 ca dhruvaṁrūta; F10 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 ca dhruva.mṛu; L5 ca dhruva.maruṇa; Mf2, K9 ca dhruvaṁrūta

166 F10 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); L4, G34, T44, E10. Mf2 ime; K1 |−e| aete; D62, M3 ime. aete; P2 ime. aite; P5 ime. iete; K2 ime. iete; B1, P10 ime. aete (P10a above the line |−e instead of |−i); L5 ima; K9 ime. vaca. framaṇa. yōi. honti. gaḍāhau. ca dhruva.mṛu; imē

167 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); B2 ime vaca

183
[a] 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.”

169 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 : Mf2, K9; L4 framūma; K1, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3, (G) framūma; D62, G34, P10 : L5 framūma; FK1 framūra

170 L4, K1, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 : L2, L5, FK1, (G); P2, P5 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4 : Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34 bonti; P5 bonti; T44 bonti; L5 bonti

171 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, L5 : Mf2, K9, (G); M3 : G42, E4 gādā. hūna; FK1 gādānūa

172 L4, K1, D62, K2, B1, (G); P2 bīšāmrūta; P5, F10 : R278, T46, B1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 bīša. mṛūta; G34 : L5 bīša.mṛūta; T44 bīšāmrūta; E10, M3 : L1, B2, P1 bīšāmrūta; P10 bīšāmrūta (P10a above the line –ca); Mf2, K9 bīšāmrūta

173 L4, D62, K2, (G); P2 dṛiśāmrūta; P5, F10 : T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 dṛiśa. mṛūta; G34 dṛiśāmarūta; T44 dṛiśa. mṛūta; E10 dṛiśāmrūta; P10, M3 : b2 dṛiśāmrūta (P10a above the line –ca); L1 d dṛiśāmrūta –a; R278 dṛiśa. mṛūta; L5 dṛiśa.mṛūta; FK1 dṛiśa.mṛūta; K9 dṛiśāmrūta

174 L4, (G); D62 cadrūṣāmrūta; P2, P5 : FK1 cadrūṣa.mṛūta; K2 cadrūṣāmrūta; G34 cadrūṣāmrūta. kati. dā, F10 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 cadrūṣa.mṛūta; T44 cadrūṣāmrūta; E10 cadrūṣa.mṛūta; P10, B10 cadrūṣāmrūta (P10a above the line –ca); M3 cadrūṣāmrūta; E4 cadrūṣa.mṛūta; L5 cadrūṣa.mṛūta; Mf2, K9 cadrūṣāmrūta

175 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 gwbrny

176 K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 pr‘c‘; F10 pl‘c

177 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) YMRWN; E10 YMRWN-yt

178 K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, L4, G34, T44 HWE-nd; E10 hnd; M3 HWE; (Jmp) HWE-nd

179 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 ZK g’s n‘

180 P2; D62, F10, B1, P10 byśmlwlt; L4, G34, T44, E10, (Jmp) byś mlwlt; M3 byśmlwlt

181 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3; F10 ywdtd dyw d‘t-HD; E10, (Jmp) ywddtywd’t

182 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 BRA‘y

183 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 wprd

184 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, (Jmp); D62, B1, P10, M3 gwbrnyh; F10 gwbrny g’s n‘

185 D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 pr‘c‘

186 L4, P2, G34, E10; D62, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) YMRWN

187 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; D62 (Jmp) HWE-nd; F10 ū

188 L4, D62, G34, T44, E10, (Jmp); K1 s’s n‘; P2 ḫwtt, B1 ḫwtt, P10 ḫwtt, M3 ḫwtt

189 P2; L4, T44, E10, (Jmp) slwš mlwlt; K1 slwš mlwlt; D62, P10 slwš mlwlt; G34 slwš mlwlt; F10 slwš mlwlt; B1 slwš ymlwlt; M3 slwš mlwlt

190 L4, G34, F10, T44, E10, (Jmp); D62, B1, P10, M3 gwbrnyh; P2 gwbrnyh

191 L4, K1, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) YMRWN

192 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; L4, (Jmp) HWE-nd; E10 hnd
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 Zaraduštra who asked Ahura Mazda in V 10.1: *kuđa. aētaq. dxuq. pormâne* “how shall I fight this Lie”. As expected, V 10.2 begins with Ahura Mazda’s answer: *āa. mraot. ahurō.*
mazdā. ime. vaca. *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 Zarādūṣṭra’s question saying what he will do instead of prescribing Zarādūṣṭra 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 nāenizaiti; Yt 12.3 and 5, V 20.5 frinamahi; V 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a storanaēta; V 19.2 fraorganēta (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 209, 217, 219), etc.) as well as of non-thematic substantives (e. g. V 12.1a pito instead of pita; 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. fráz gów.

Av. bīšāmrūtaca. dērīšāmrūtaca. caḍrūšāmrūtaca (10.2d)
Regarding the shortening of –ā + ca > -a-ca in words with more than three syllables, vid. (de Vaan 2003 188-191).

Av. ōāmrūta. ... framrauua (10.2a-d)
Whenever Av. *mrau- is preceeded by a preverb, this is usually Av. fra. In such case, Av. *fra-mrau- means “to pronounce, to recite”, especially applied to prayers (Bartholomae 1904 1195). Nevertheless, we find the same meaning with the preverb ā in Av. āmrūtō 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: ā. dim framraomi. aşm. vahištom “I invoke thee, Aša Vahišta”.

Phl. ēk ān ī pad gāhān ēk ān ī 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 Barašnūm 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 Barašnūm 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 ī pad gāhān ēk ān ī 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 Barašnūm ceremony for the celebration of a Vidēvdād ceremony. Provided that the second gloss Phl. ēk ān ī pad gāhān ēk ān ī 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 ī pad gāhān) and “another thing is what is in the Juddēwdād” (Phl. ēk ān ī pad juddēwdād). Therefore, the second commentator disagreed with the first, because he thought that the recitation of the Gāthic texts in the Barašnūm 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:

uš guft ohrmazd kū ēn gōwišn frāz gōw kē hēnd pad gāhān bišāmrūd [juddēwdād-ē bē yaz] <ēk ān ī pad gāhān ēk ān ī 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>.”

In V 9.32 (Jāmāsp 1907), (Anklesaria & Kapadia 1949 242), however, Abarag prescribed two purifiers: abarag guft ay yōǰdāsragar dō ḥō 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 Gađās? [b] And Ahura Mazdā said: “these are the words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gađās, [c] recite these words twice.”

---

209 *Mf2; L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. FK1, (G) | gaēdanaṃ. astuvaitionam.

210 aśāum |; P5. Br1, L2, G42, E4. L5 /tā/ | gaēdanaṃ. astuvaitionam. aśāum |; K2. L1, B2, R78,

211 T46, P1. K9 /tā/ aśāum; G34 gaēdanaṃ

212 G34 | astuvaitionam. aśāum |; Mf2 astuvaitionam.

213 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, K9 /tā/ aśāum; G34 gaēdanaṃ

214 aśāum |; K2. L1, B2, R78,

215 T46, P1, K9 aśāum.

216 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. *Mf2; (G); D62 aētæ; E10 aët; L1 aët; B2, R78,

217 T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 aëtæ; G42 aëtæ; K9 aëtæ

218 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. P1, L5, FK1, (G); E10 yō; M3. L1, B2, R78,


220 L4, D62, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. *Mf2, K9 imë; T44 aëmē; L1, B2, T46 imë; G42 aëmē

221 L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, B1, P10, M3. *Mf2, K9, (G); K1, F10, T44. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2,

222 G42, L5, FK1 aëtæ; P2 aët; E10 aët; E4 aëtæ

223 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L5, FK1, (G); P2. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1,

224 L2, G42, E4. *Mf2, K9 yōi; E10 yō

225 K1, K2, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. *Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34 honti;

226 D62 hontæ; P2 hontæ; P5. FK1 hontä; F10 hontæ; T44. B2 honti; L5 honti

227 L4, K1, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, M3. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1.

228 *Mf2, K9, (G); P2 gādā.hūna; P5. L5 gādā.hūna; P10 gādūna (P10a above the line –ah–)

229 D62, P5, K2, G34, F10a in the right margin, B1, P10, M3. L2, (G); L4 biṣāmrūta; P2 biṣāmrūta;

230 F10 | biṣāmrūta |; T44 biṣārrha. | E10 biṣāmrūti; L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, FK1 biṣā.hrr. | L5 biṣā.hūra; *Mf2, K9 biṣāmrūta

231 K1, D62, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R78, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. *Mf2, (G); L4,

232 K2, G34, T44. K9 imë; P2 aëmē (P2a above the line æ- instead ae-); L5 imä

233 L4, (G) āḥbiṭīm; K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42,

234 E4, L5, FK1. *Mf2 āat. biṭīm, B1, P10. K9 āt. biṭīm (P10a above the line –a- after ā–); R278 āat.biṭīm

235 K2. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42. *Mf2, K9; L4 framaraua; K1, D62, P2, P5, F10, T44, E10,

236 B1, P10 (P10a above the line –a- after –r–), M3. T46, FK1, (G) framaraua; G34 framaraua; E4

237 framaraua; L5 fara.mararaua

188
dādār kadār awēšān gōw išn kē hēnd pad gāhān bišāmrūd |b| u-š guft ohrmazd |c| ʾwhrm Ẕd

|a| dʾtʾl ktʾl OLE-šʾn' gwbšn’227 MNW HWE-d228 PWN gšʾn’229 byš’ mlwt’230 |b| AP-š gwpt’ ’whrmzd231 AY K ZNE232 OLE-šʾn’ gwbšn’233 MNW234 HWE-d235 PWN gšʾn’ byš’mlwt236 |c| ZNE gwbšn237 238 bʾl prʾc YMRWN239

|a| dādār kadār awēšān gōwīn kē hēnd pad gāhān bišāmrūd |b| u-š guft ohrmazd

kū ēn awēšān gōwīn kē hēnd pad gāhān bišāmrūd |c| ēn gōwīn 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. xāṯbitīm (10.3c)

In Av. xāṯbitīm < IIr. š-ḏu(t)jam (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.767-768), the group PIr. š-ḏy- develops into Av. -tb-. But this is not the only development of this group in Avestan. As a matter of fact, PIr. šḏy (< IIr. šḏy, šd̥y) 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 byš’mwlt
230 K1; L4, D62, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp) byš’mwlt; P2 byš’mlwt; G34, M3 byš’mwlt; F10 byš’mwlt
231 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 ṹhr”mzd
232 L4, K1, D2, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; D62, (Jmp) ↑ ZNE ↑
233 L4, K1, G34 (G34a above the line ‘n), 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 byš’mwlt; P2 byš’mwlt; F10 byš’mwlt; P10 byš’mwlt
238 L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp); P2 gwbšnyh; 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
In the medial position, this group is found in Old Avestan and Young Avestan, but not in Old Persian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAv. (duu-, db-)</th>
<th>YAv. (duu-, db-, ḯb-, b)</th>
<th>OP. (duv-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAv. duu-dunāēšab⁴⁴, a-dunāēsa-, vi-dunāēša-; dunāmpaṇ-; hōn-duuār-</td>
<td>YAv. duu-dunārb⁴⁴, dunā.dasa°, dunācina, dunāفارس, api.dunānarait, apa.dunu-, uz-dunānaia-; dunav- (verb), a-duuāronta, apa.dunu-, apa.dua-, panca.sadunārqa, pairi.duav-, fra-duv-, nižduv-, bau-duv-, bau-duvār-, baubduvārna-, hām.duua-, duua- (noun), duunaēra-; paiti.dunāēš-, vi-dunāēšiunu</td>
<td>duvārta⁴⁴, duvārda⁴⁴, duvita⁴⁴, duvitiyam⁴⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAv. db-dbōištam⁴⁷</td>
<td>YAv. ḯb-a-ṭbiṣṭa-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv. db-daibisōnti⁴⁸, daibisiant⁴⁹, daibisuanta²⁵⁰; daibita²⁵¹, daibītiya²⁵²</td>
<td>YAv. ḥbaēš-, ḥbaēšab°, ḥbaēsantu₂⁵³, ḥbīsiant-, ḥbiṣiant-, a-hbaēša-, a-ṭbiṣta-, a-ṭbihit, apa.ṭbiṣta-, apa.ṭbiṣta-, nājiō, ḥbiṣ-, moyu, ḥbiṣ-, vārzhānō, ḥbiṣ-, vītara.ṭbaēšab-, vi-ṭbaēšab-, baśi, ḥbiṣ-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAv. b-biṣīia²⁵⁶, bae²⁵⁷, biṣ°²⁵⁸, biṣ, biṇuata; biṣi, frāmāta-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

²⁴⁴ Ilr. *dyā-.
²⁴⁵ Ilr. *dhār- (Kent 1953 30, 192).
²⁴⁶ °< duvāra- “door” + vardī- “cover, protection” (Kent 1953 192).
²⁴⁷ Ilr. *duvita° (Kent 1953 30, 192).
²⁴⁸ Ilr. *duvita- (Kent 1953 30, 192).
²⁵⁰ Ilr. *duśānti-.
²⁵¹ Ilr. *duśānt-.
²⁵² Ilr. *duśānt-.
²⁵⁶ According to Werba (1986 358), YAv. ḥb- must be interpreted as an “Altostiranischen” form.
²⁵⁷ Ilr. *dušānt-.
²⁵⁸ Ilr. *dušīा-.
²⁵⁹ Ilr. *dāq°.
²⁶⁰ Ilr. *duś.
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. duuaēšab- and OAv. daibisiant- 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. *dya- was preserved as OAv. duu- (OAv. duuaēšab-). On the contrary, when the vowel –i- follows this group, IIR. *dya- develops into OAv. *dbi- (OAv. daibisiant-).

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. *dy-, 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 *dy-, this group turned into OAv. db-. We can observe this evolution in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IIR. *dyV&lt; &gt; OAv. duuV&lt;</th>
<th>IIR. *dyV-CV&lt; &gt; OAv. dbV-CV&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAv. duuaēšab- (&lt; IIR. *dyājšas-)</td>
<td>OAv. daibisiant- (&lt; IIR. *dyisjant &lt; IE. *dyišenti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv. daibisiant- (&lt; IIR. *dyisjant &lt; IE. *dyišenti)</td>
<td>OAv. daibisiant- (&lt; IIR. *dyisjant &lt; IE. *dyišenti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv. duuaņman- “cloud” (&lt; IIR. *dyaņman-)</td>
<td>OAv. daibītā- (&lt; IIR. *dyitā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAv. daibītā- (&lt; IIR. *dyitā)</td>
<td>OAv. daibītiā- (&lt; IIR. *dyitiā)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only exceptions to this rule could be OAv. duuaśa- and OAv. duuaēdā, whose etymology is unknown, provided that they are to be really analysed as IIR. *dyaśa-260 and IIR. *dyādā- respectively.

---

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 charmeur”.
263 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. *ḍy V > OAv. duu V
- IIr. *ḍyV-C V > OAv. dbV-C V

Apparently 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. aduəša- (cf. Ved. advaś- (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.770)), OAv. aduwan- (cf. Ved. ādvān- (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.68)) and OAv. bāνdu-a- (if it really stems from Pfr. *bāndya-, as Werba (1986 343, n.22) states, and not from Pfr. *bāndy-) 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 Pfr. *ḍy- 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 Pfr. *ḍy is followed by the vowel –a-, the five results duu-, db-, ṭb-, ṭb- and b are found in Young Avestan. Also when the following vowel is –i- there is not a unique result: Pfr. *ḍy + –i- > YAv. ṭb-, ṭb-; Pfr. *ḍy- + –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. tbaəšaŋhuu-a- and tbišuuna- 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 Pfr. *ḍy- > 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-, ṭb-, b) and two more in medial position (–duu-, –ḍb-). 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 Pfr. *ḍy- > 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, Pfr. *ḍy- yields b- in western Middle Iranian languages like Parthian and Middle Persian, but also in modern eastern Iranian languages like Pašćo, Parāči, Ormuṛi and Waxī, as we can observe in the following table:

---

265 Possibly related to Khwar. ṭḍɔšy- “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. ᵗᵇ⁻ 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, PIr. *ᵈʸ⁻ > YAv. –ᵇ⁻ in YAv. ᵃᵗᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ 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 PIr. *ᵈʸ in each Iranian language.

Finally, I must add a brief consideration about my choice of –ᵗᵇ⁻ vs. Geldner’s –ᵈᵇ⁻. With the exception of L4 ᵃᵒᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ, all the manuscripts attest either ᵃᵃᵗᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ or ᵃᵗᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ. Obviously, this variant is due to a wrong separation of ᵃ⁻ + ᵇᵗⁱᵗⁱᵐ stemming from a misunderstanding between ᵃ⁻ + ᵃᵗ and ᵃᵃᵗ. Indeed, the scribes interpreted Av. *ᵃᵗᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ as ᵃᵃᵗ + ᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ. This is a normal confusion, since Young Avestan only attest biiia- (not ᵃᵈᵘᵗⁱⁱᵃ-, ᵃᵈᵇⁱⁱᵃ- or ᵃᵗᵇⁱⁱᵃ-).

Although the variant ᵃᵒᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ of L4 finds a parallel in YAv. a-ᵒᵇⁱšᵗᵃ- vs. a-ᵗᵇⁱšᵗᵃ-, I have preferred to emend it as ᵃᵗᵇⁱᵗⁱᵐ, because the rest of PV manuscripts and all the IrVS and IndVS agree in the variant –ᵗᵇ⁻.

---

P Ir. *ᵈʸ⁻ > ᵃ⁻<br>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parth.</th>
<th>MP.</th>
<th>Paštō</th>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Orm.</th>
<th>Wax.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;bdyg&gt; /bidig/</td>
<td>bēš</td>
<td>bōr “door”&lt;sup&gt;267&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>bē “second”&lt;sup&gt;266&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>būi “two”; bē “second”; bār “door”; būn “to winnow”&lt;sup&gt;269&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“second”; &lt;br&gt; bēl, byā</td>
<td>bēl, byā “second”&lt;sup&gt;266&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>bōr “door”&lt;sup&gt;267&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>bē “second”; bār “door”; būn “to winnow”&lt;sup&gt;269&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bēl, byā “other”&lt;sup&gt;264&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4. [a]\(\text{abhī. yāsā.}\) 270 \(\text{nāmayhā.}\) 271 \(\text{ustānazastō.}\) 272 \(\text{rāṣṭrayahā.}\) 273 \(\text{māṇiūṣ.}\) 274 \(\text{mazā.}\) 275 \(\text{paouryiím.}\) 276 \(\text{spāntahiū.}\) 277 \(\text{aśā.}\) 278 \(\text{vīṣpōng.}\) 279 \(\text{śūadāna.}\) 280 \(\text{vāṛhiū.}\) 281 \(\text{vstrātā.}\) 282 \(\text{maṇayhō.}\) 283 \(\text{yā.}\) 284 \(\text{ḥūṃyūiūīṣ.}\) 285 \(\text{gāūsā.}\) 286 \(\text{urumāṃtō.}\) 287 \(\text{═ Y 28.1}\) 288 \(\text{humatānṛ.}\) 289 \(\text{kūxurānṛ.}\) 290 \(\text{hūmarāstānṛ.}\) 291 \(\text{īiadācā.}\) 292 \(\text{āpūiađačā.}\) 293 \(\text{vōrariəmānṛ.}\) 294 \(\text{vōrariəmānṛ.}\) 295 \(\text{mābī.}\) 296 \(\text{aiśbjārātā.}\) 297 \(\text{naënaěstārō.}\) 298 \(\text{yādōṇa.}\) 299 \(\text{vōhūnṛ.}\) 300 \(\text{mābī.}\) 301 \(\text{═ Y 35.2}\) 302

270 \(\text{K1, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G); L4 yāṣe; D62 yā.śā; P2 abhī.āsā.}\) 2 bʃ; P5 . L5 yāsā. 2 bʃ; K2 yā.śā. 2 bʃ; G34 yā.śān; L1 yāsā. 2 bʃ; B2 āyśnā; R278, P1, L2, G42, E4 yāsā. 2; T46 yāsā; Br1 yāsā. 2; FK1 abhī.ūiūiū. 2 bʃ; 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, K9 humatānṛ; T46 ūurumāṃtō. 2 bʃ; K9 ūurumāṃtō
272 B2 uštā. nazāstō; T46 uštā. nazāstō; Mf2, K9 uštā. nazāstō
273 B2, T46 . K9 māṇiū.āsh; Mf2 māṇiū.āsh
274 B2, T46; Mf2, K9 mazādā
275 B2 paūnāniím; T46 paūnāniím; Mf2 paūnāniím; K9 paūnāniím
276 B2, T46 ūiū.ādānā; Mf2, K9 ūiū.ādānā
277 B2, T46; Mf2, K9 vstrātā
278 B2, T46 . Mf2, K9 māṇayhō
279 T46; B2 K9 yā
280 B2, T46 xūnūiūiūiū; Mf2 yāxūnūiūiūiū; K9 xūnūiūiūiū
281 B2 . Mf2, K9; L1, T46 gūsācā
282 L1, T46; B2 ūrūmāṃtō. 2; Mf2 ūrūmāṃtō. abhī. yāśā. 2 bʃ; K9 ūrūmāṃtō. abhī. yā. 2 bʃ
283 vid. (Insler 1975 25): “With hands outstretched in reverence of him, (our) support, the spirit virtuous through truth, I first treat 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, mes mains tendues, je (vous) demande à tous la (formule) fondamentale du bénéfice état d’esprit, à Mazādā, avec l’Harmonie et l’acte (rituel) grâce auquel tu choisis 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 treat 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”. 284 L4 . T46 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, E4, L5 . K9 humatānṛ; T46 ūrūmāṃtō. 2 bʃ; G42, FK1 humatānṛ. 2
285 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) = būxtānṛ. ... mābī ]; B2 būxtānṛ
286 B2 hūmarāstānṛ; T46 hūmarāstānṛ
287 B2, T46 yā.śā
cā
288 B2, T46 anū.Diūcā
289 B2 vōrajiū.ana.ṇaŋcā; T46 vōrajiū.ana.ṇaŋcā
290 B2 vōrajiū.ana.ṇaŋcā; T46 vōrajiū.ana.ṇaŋcā
291 T46; B2 aiśbjārātāro
292 B2 naiṇaistārō; T46 naiṇaistārō
293 B2 yāδānā; T46 yāδānā
294 L1, B2 vōbū.ṇām; T46 vōbū.ṇām
295 L1, T46; B2 mābī. humatānṛ. 2
296 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 – 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. K9 ašahiā. P10 ašahā (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 at (P10a above the line –ā– after –ā–). P5 ayt. abubiā | 2 b’l; K2 iā/ | ayt. abubiā | 2 b’l; F10, B2, T46 ayt
L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); T44 srī; E4 šairī; FK1 šru
L4, K1, D62, G34, B1, P10, M3, (G) ašahūa ... abubiā | P2, G42 ašahūa ... abubiā | 2 b’l; F10, E10. B2, T46 ašahūa; L1, R278 2 iā/ | ašahūa ... abubiā | P1, Br1, L2, E4 ašahūa ... abubiā | 2; FK1 ašhūa. 2; Mf2, K9 iā/ | ašahūa ... abubiā | ।
B2, T46 vorazōne; FK1 vorazōne. abubiā | ।
T46; B2 kahmāicīt
T46; B2 hātam
B2 ji.jišgm; T46 ji.jišgm
B2 vabešīgm; T46 vabešīgm
B2; T46 ubōibīa
L1, T46; B2 abubiā, ašahiā, at. sarī. 2; Mf2, K9 abubiā. 2 b’l
vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 i.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 & Skjærvø 1991 i.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 yaḥā. tū.ī. | L1 Mf2, K9 yaḥā
D62, B1, P10, M3. L1, L2, G42, (G); L4, P2, G34, F10 tū; P5 yaḥdū; K2, T44. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, E4, FK1 tū; L1 tū.i. aburamazda. 2 iā/ ḫī.ā. mazdā. abūrā. L5 yaḥdū; Mf2, K9 tū
L4, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (G) aburā. aburā | P2, P5, F10. FK1 aburabe; K2 aburū; B2, R278, P1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9 abura
Mf2, K9; P2, P5, F10 mazdā. 2 b’l; K2 mazdā. iā/ 2 bār; L1 aburamazda; B2 mazdā; R278 mazdā. 2 iā/ P1 mazdā; 2; T46 aburamazda; Br1 aburamazda. 2; L2, E4, FK1 mazdā. 2; G42 mazdā. 2 b’l; L5 mazdā. 2 b’l
P2, P5, K2, F10. R278, P1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 māŋgāčā. aburā | P2, T46 māŋgāčā; Mf2, K9 iā/ māŋgāčā. išūidīāmahi. ḫī.ā –
B2; T46 vačascā
B2 vorascā; T46 vorascā
B2, T46 āṭ
B2, T46 vobuḥ
B2, T46 dadāmahi
B2, T46 čiš.mahi
āiš. yazamaide. 320 adā. 321 namāxiāmahi. adā. 322 išudiāmahī. 323 ṭā. mazdā. 324 (= Y 39.4) 325 bumāim. 326 ṭā. išim. 327 yazatām. 328 ašayhācīm. 329 xadāmāide. 330 adā. 331 xū. nā. 332 x gaiiascā. 333 x astōntasā. 334 x. u. ubūūo. ahnuo. x bātām. 335 x budāstomā. 336 (= Y 41.3) 337 ṭā. x stātarscā. 338 x mádranascā. 339 ahurā. 340 mazdā. 341 x aōganaēcā. 342 x usmahiācā. 343 x visimanaēcā. 344 hiaat, mīzdām. 345 x mausaeādēm. 346 x fradadāvā. 347 x daēnābiū. 348 mazdā. ahurā. 349 (= Y 41.5) 350

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.138): “La bonne (pensée) telle que tu l’as pensée, la bonne (parole) telle que tu l’as dite, le bon (rituel) tel que tu l’as fondé, le bon (acte rituel) tel que tu l’as accompli, nous les exerçons sur toi, nous te les appliquons, par eux nous te faisons consécration, nous te rendons hommage, nous t’apportons la vigueur, ô Maître Mazdā”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.148-149): “Just as Thou, O Wise Ahura, didst conceive, and pronounce, and create, and work (all) the good (things), so we offer (and) commit (them) to Thee, so we worship Thee with them, so we revere, so we invigorate Thee (with them), O Wise Ahura”.

320 Mf2 above the line, K9, (G); L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G43, F10, E10, P10a above the line . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 bumāim; K1, B1, P10, M3 | humāim. ... mazdā. ahurā |; T44 baumāim

321 T44 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G); L4, G43, P10a above the line . L1, FK1 išim; D62, F10, E10 | išim. ... budāstomā |; P2 . R278 | išim. ... budāstomā |; P5, K2 yūžom; P1 yūž; L5 | išim. ... budāstomā | 2 b’l; Mf2 | ṭā. išim. ... ahnuo |; K9 | tā | ṭā. išim. ... ahnuo

322 K2 . B2, L4, G43, T44, (G) | yazatām. ... budāstomā |; P5 yazatām. 2 b’l; L1 2 /tā/ | yazatām. ... ahnuo |; T46 yazatām; P1, Br1, L2, E4 | yazatām. ... budāstomā | 2; G42 | yazatām. ... budāstomā | 2 b’l; FK1 yūžim

323 B2, K2 | tā | ašayhācīm. ... budāstomā | 2 bār; T46 ašayhācim; FK1 | ašayhācīm ... budāstomā | 2 bār

324 B2, T46 daōmāide

325 B2, T46 tuñā

326 B2 gaiiascā; T46 gaiiascā

327 B2, T46 astōm. tāscā

328 L1, T46 bātām; B2 . K9 bātām; Mf2 above the line bātā

329 L1 budāstomā; B2 budāstomā, humāim. ṭā. išim. 2; T46 budāstomā; Mf2, K9 budāstomā. 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, pères, (fais) qu’ils nous aident pour une communauté durable qui détienne l’invigoration et soit assez nombreuse”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 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”.

330 L1, R278, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, T44 ṭā
May the Wise Lord, who rules at will, grant wishes to him, to the person mindedness, so that (I) may seize it, (with) rewards (consisting) of wealth and a life of good thinking

...<br />

May the Wise Lord, who rules at will, grant wishes to him, to the person mindedness, so that (I) may seize it, (with) rewards (consisting) of wealth and a life of good thinking
1.181): “L’invigoration ... le très bon (...), par les actes (rituels) et l’Harmonie, ô Mazdā, à celui qui ...

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 bénéfique 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 Mazdā est avec l’emprise et la Déférence”;

The Ahura (will) remember (that) with power and right-mindedness”. (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 vohū; Mf2, K9 vohī...
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.

399 D62, P5, E10, B1, P10, M3 : L1, E4, (G); L4 biśāmrūta; P2 biśāmrūta; K2, F10, T44 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 biś.āmrūta; G34 biśāmrūta; L5 biś.āmarūta; Mf2, K9 biśāmrūta
400 D62, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 : L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K2, G43, T44 imp; P2 imp; L5 imp
401 L4, T44 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; D62, P2, K5, F10, E10, P10, (G) framruna; G34 . E4, L5 framruna; B1 framruna; M3 framrūna; FK1 framrūna
402 L4, K1, P5, K2, T44, E10, B1, M3 . R278, L2, G42, FK1; D62 vārtadrahiņi; P2 vārdadhā. 403 G34 vārdahārahiṇi; F10 vārdadhārahiṇi; P10 vārdadhārahiṇi (P10a above the line –a after –ā); L1, P1 vārtadrahiṇi; B2 vārtadrahiṇi; T46, Br1 vārtadrahiṇi; E4 vārdadhārahiṇi; L5 vārdadhārahiṇi. Mf2, K9, (G) vārdadhārahiṇi
403 L4, K2, B1, P10 . Mf2, K9; D62 baēsziazi; P2, P5, T44 . L1 baēsziazi; G34, (G) baēsziazi; F10 baēsziazi; E10 baēsziazi; M3 baēsziazi; B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 baēsziazi; FK1 baēsziazi
404 L4, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1, (G); K1, P10, M3 paiti.porone (P10a above the line –e); D62 paiti.porone; F10 paiti.porone .a; E4 paitai.porone; Mf2, K9, paiti.pirne
405 L4, P5, G34, E10 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3 aipram; T44 . L5 aipram; B2 aipra; E4 aipram
406 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) maniuā; T46 aipromanuiā; Mf2 maṇiū; K9 maṇiū
407 L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); L4, P2, G34, T44 namāne; K1, D62, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . FK1 . K9 namāne; R278, E4 namāne; L5 namāne
408 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 viśi; T44, E10 . L5, FK1 viśe
409 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 hācga
410 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34 zaṃti; Br1 zaṭu
411 L4, K1, D62, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278; P2 . Br1, L5, FK1, (G) daįjaḥ; P5 daįjaḥ; G34 . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 daįjaḥ
412 L4, G34 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1 baṅmaiśa.tanū. D62 baṅmaiśa.tanū. P2, F10, E10, M3 baṅmaiśa.tanū. P5 baṅmaiśa.tanū; K2 baṅmaiśa.tanū; T44 baṅmaiśa.tanū; B1 baṅmaiśa.tanū; P10 baṅmaiśa.tanū; L1 baṅmaiśa.tanū; B2, T46, P1, Br1, G42 baṅmaiśa.tanū; R278, FK1 baṅmaiśa.tanū; L2 baṅmaiśa.tanū; E4 baṅmaiśa.tanū; L5 baṅmaiśa.tanū
413 L4, K1, D62, P5, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 bacanā
414 L4, K1, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62 paiti.riṣṭa; P2 paiti.riṣṭabe; F10 paiti.riṣti (F10a deletes –a and writes –ō); B1, P10, M3 paiti.riṣti (P10a above the line –ō); L5 paiti.ṛṣṭo
415 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); B1, M3 . R278 – haca. nārīka. paiti.riṣte –
416 L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10 . L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1 . B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 nārīke; D62 nārīk; P2, P10 nārīk; L1 nāriye; T46 nārikae
417 T44 . L4, K1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G) paiti.riṣte; D62, P2, P5, K2, E10, P10 paiti.riṣti (P10a above the line –ō); G34 paiti.ṛṣti; F10 paiti.ṛṣti (F10a above the line –ō); E4 paiti.ṛṣti; L5 paiti.ṛṣṭa

200

[a] “And after these words to be said twice, recite these words, victorious, healing.” [b] 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.

[a] ZK 436 y 437 AHL MN 438 byš’mlw’ 440 gwbsn’ 443 ZNE 444 gwbsn’ 444 pr’c YMRRWN-yyh 445 pylwikl 449 byš’zynyt’l 440 [b] BRA 441 pwltynm 442 gnn’k 443 mynyw 444 MN m’n 445
“After the words to be said twice, recite these words, victorious, healing:” |b| 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. nmānēm. uta. viṣēm. uta. zantuēm. uta. daśiūm. uta. nmānanām. nmānō. paitiš. uta. viṣām. viṣpātiš. uta. zantunām. zantupātiš. uta. daśiūnām. *daśhupātiš. uta. daśiūnām. fraṭemađātō.

“(Miēra 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 hauwāiūs. tanuŏ. / nā. paiti. iristō. / nāirika. *paiti. irista and the substitution of viṣpātiš. ašaōnō. stōiš by daśiūnām. fraṭemađātō. In Yt 10.87, which is repeated in Y 62.5, 68.5 and Ny 5.11, Av. *daśhusastīmca completes the list after daśiūn-. nmānoma. viṣoma. zantuoma. daśiūoma. *daśhusastīmca “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>nmānīa-</td>
<td>nmānanām. nmānō. paitiš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viṣīa-</td>
<td>viṣām. viṣpātiš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zantuoma-</td>
<td>zantunām. zantupātiš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daśiūma-</td>
<td>daśiūnām. *daśhupātiš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zarađuštrō. tōma-</td>
<td>daśiūnām. fraṭemađātō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

477 cf. Y 19.18: kaiiā. ratuŏ. nmāniō. viṣiiō. zantuō. daśiūtō. zarađuštrō. puxūō “Which are the ratu-? That of the house, that of the clan, that of the tribe, that of the country, Zarađuštra (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 hauuuaiás. tanuúō. / nā. paiti. iristó. / nāirika. +paiti. irista in the list A correspond to vissaiá. ašaonó. stoíš in the list B, as we observe in the following scheme:

A           B

\[\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{nmāna} & \text{nmānahe. nmānō.patoiś} \\
\text{viša} & \text{viśo. vispatoiś} \\
\text{zantu} & \text{zantūś. zantu patoiś} \\
\text{+dajhu} & \text{+dajhūś. +dajhupatoiś} \\
\text{hauuuaiás. tanuúō} & \\
\text{nā. paiti. iristó} / \text{nāirika. +paiti. irista} & \text{vissaiá. ašaonó. stoíš}
\end{array}\]

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:

A           B

\[\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{nmāna / nmāniia-} & \text{nmānahe. nmānō.patoiś} \\
\text{viša / viśia-} & \text{viśo. vispatoiś} \\
\text{zantu / zantuma-} & \text{zantūś. zantu patoiś} \\
\text{+dajhu / daśiuna-} & \text{+dajhūś. +dajhupatoiś} \\
\text{hauuuaiás. tanuúō} & \text{hauuuaiás. tanuúō} \\
\text{nā. paiti. iristó} / \text{nāirika. +paiti. irista} & \text{vissaiá. ašaonó. stoíš} \\
\end{array}\]

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 Gāthās themselves. Indeed, each social authority finds its equivalence in the fivefold division of the Gāthās, whose beginning has been recited in V 10.4 together with five sections of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti. This equivalence was already made in Šnš 13.15 (Kotwal 1969 45), where each Gāthā is associated to a member of the fivefold social division:

\[\text{frāgām ī pad ahunawaid gāh frāz barēd mānbedān ān ī pad uštawad gāh frāz barēd wisbedān ān ī pad spandamēn gāh frāz barēd zandbedān ān ī pad wohuxšahr gāh frāz barēd dahibedān ān ī pad wahištōišt gāh frāz barēd zarduštrōdom}\]

The frāgām which one raises at the Ahunauaiti Gāthā (is) for the masters of the houses, that which one raises at the Uštawaiti Gāthā (is) for the headmen of the clans, that which one raises at the Spāntaiminiit Gāthā (is) for the headmen of the tribes, that which one raises at the Vohuxšahr Gāthā (is) for lords of the countries, that which one raises at the Vahištōišt Gāthā (is) for the zarduštrōdom.

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:
So each Gādā protects each human group and its social authority, with the only discordance of the last elements of the lists, where hauuaiiąśo.tanuuō / nā. paiti.iriṣṭo / nārīka. *paiti.iriṣṭa and its equivalent vispaḥa. ašonō. stōiš have substituted the zaraduṣtrō. tama- in the list.

Av. hauuaiiąśo.tanuuō (10.5b)

Three main phonetic features in this syntagm are remarkable: a) the preservation of a final –s in external samādhi; b) YAv. h(a)una- vs. OAv. xāa-; c) the variant hāuna- with long vowel in the manuscripts.

In external samādhi the preservation of the final –s, written here as –so before the following t-, is also found in Y 9.3, 6, 9, 12 kasa. ḍhaṃ, Y 10.13 yasa.tē, Y 10.18, V 17.9 imās.tē, Y 10.19 imās.tūmcī, Y 43.8 +vasas.xaḥrahiūā, Y 58.7 noma.so.tōi, Y 62.1, Yt 5.90, 10.30, 33, 91, 13.20, 17.61 yasa.ḍā, Hb 2, Ány 1, 3, Ny 1.1, 1.19, 2.1, 5.4, 20, V 21.1 noma.so.tē, V 15.10-11, 22.1, 8 yasa.taṭ, Yt 1.13 *iṣa.xaḥra and +iṣa.xaḥriṇtōtō, Yt 5.90, 94 yasa.taunā, Yt 8.34 napās.tō, Yt 8.43 vispaḥa.tā, Yt 10.112 yasa.taṃ, Yt 15.46 karadarso.ṇama, Yt 16.2 usa.bhiṣta and Yt 19.87 yasa.taṃō.

When followed by *tanuuō it is attested in Y 9.19 *ajhāsa.tanuuō, V 4.50-52 +aọṣaḥbaidiāśo.tanuuō, in the same hauuaijavās.tanuuō in V 16.7 and in Yt 10.23 xaḥpaitiāśo.tanuuō. It is also remarkable that OIr. *-ās + t- was written in Avestan as -āso.t-, where the “Kompromiśform” -āt- (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 112) reflects the expected result of final *-ās without samādhi. This is explained by de Vaan (2003 384-385) as an attempt to preserve the same vowel -ā by analogy with the forms without samādhi.

Regarding the degree of the first vowel in Av. hauuaijavāsō, we must explain, on one hand, why YAv. hauua- is found instead of YAv. hua-ōs and whether Av. hāo is etymologically right or it contains an anaptyctic vowel; on the other hand, the variant hāo in the manuscripts also deserves an explanation.

According to Pirart (1995 409) and de Vaan (2003 49), this -a- in Av. hauuaijavāsō must be interpreted as an anaptyctic vowel, because this word stems from IIr. *sṛjāas. More recently, however, de Vaan (2005 703) admits another possibility.

He (2005 699, 703) observes that xāa- 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-.

---

479 The variant xāa- is only present in Old Avestan, according to de Vaan (2005 703).
OAav. *xā- (and maybe YAav. *hāu-) would imply IE. *syó-, while YAav. *hāu- 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. ἕός, Lat. suus “id.” < IE. *seyóς and Gr. ὤς “id.” < IE. *syós (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 169), (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.788), (de Vaan 2005 703). Only Greek and Young Avestan 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 hauua- in Young Avestan due to other personal and demonstrative pronouns in initial *hā-.

Although I think that de Vaan’s explanation regarding the replacement of an old *hýá- by YAav. *hauua- is likely, I disagree with him concerning the existence of Young Avestan forms huua-. He states that they are to be emended by hauua-, 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 YAav. huua- in all the available manuscripts. Until this work has been fulfilled, I must just notice that variants of YAav. huu⁰ exist together with those of YAav. hauua- even in the oldest manuscripts (e. g. V 10.18f huaaṁ in K1; V 13.8b huuō in Mf2; V 13.39a huuuastrm in L4 and huuuastrastrm in Mf2). Therefore, and unlike de Vaan, I cannot confirm that only huua- existed in Young Avestan without forcing the manuscripts’ evidence.

With regards to the third problem concerning how to explain the variant hā⁰ in the manuscripts, this variant could be interpreted as a scribal particularity or as a feature of the Avestan language.

On one hand, each manuscript does not always attest the same variant. As a matter of fact, while Av. hauuaatā in V 10.19a shows no variant with hā⁰ in the PV nor in the VS manuscripts, in the rest of passages of V 10 the same manuscripts attest sometimes ha⁰ and sometimes hā⁰. No evident distribution is found in them.

On the other hand, the vowel -a- in initial syllable tends to be lengthened in Avestan, especially if the vowel of the following syllable is -a- (de Vaan 2003 105). Therefore, the variant hā⁰ originates itself from ha⁰, so that we must suppose an Avestan stem hauua-, from which *a developed into ā in initial syllable. So the correct variant would be hauua-. According to de Vaan (2003 105), this development is attested in Old as well as in Young Avestan. But as regards Young Avestan it occurred in post-Avestan times, when a strong stress in the first syllable was introduced.
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 pwltnym nswš BRA pwltnym MNW PWN hmlyt' [lymn' YHWWN-t YKOYMWN-yt] BRA pwltnym MNW PWN ptylt' [lymn' YHWWN-t YKOYMWN-yt] MN m'n' MN wys MN znd MN MTA
MN <y> hwyš tn' MN GBRA MNW QDM lyst MN n'lyk MNW QDM lyst MN' m'npt MN wys wyspt MN znd zdnyk MNW QDM lys MN MTA dhwypt MN hwsp ZK y xhlwb sty

[|a|] bē purdēnam nasuš bē purdēnam kē pad hamrē [rēman būd ēstēd] bē purdēnam kē pad payrē [rēman būd ēstēd] az mān az zand az deb az <ī> xweš tan az mard kē abar rist az nārīg kē abar rist az mān mānbed az wis wisbed az zand zandbed az deb dahibed az harwisp ān i ablāw 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.raēβam, paiit.raēβam (V 10.6a)

The Direct defilement (Av. ham.raēβa-) and the Indirect defilement (Av. paiit.raēβa-) 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.raēβa-, paiit.raēβa- is repeated in V 10 and 11, in V 19.12 there is a variation ham.raēβa-, paiit.raēβa-, nasu-.

Av. "raēβa-

Av. "raēβa- stems from a root IIIr. *(H)ri̯t̯h “to blend, to mingle” (de Vaan 2003 215-216). As a verb, it is present in Av. irid-, whose present stems are Av. iridīa-, raēβa- and raēβaia-. With Av. nasu- as subject, this verb is also preceeded 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' |
524 P2; (Jmp) W MN
524 P2; (Jmp) y
525 P2 lysty; (Jmp) lyst
525 P2; (Jmp) W MN
525 P2; (Jmp) -| MNW -
534 D62, P2, (Jmp) YMYTNW-yt'
531 P2; (Jmp) OD -| MN ... dhywpt' |
532 P2 W zndpt
532 P2 W dhwypt
534 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); T44 W MN
534 K1, B1, P10, M3; D62, F10, (Jmp) hwsp; P2 hwst'; G34, T44, E10 hwsty
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 -
537 (Jmp); L4, D62, G34 'hwb'n; K1, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 'hwb'n; P2 'hwb'n
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Apart from the verb, this root yielded some nouns:
- Av. *paiti.raēϑa*—“indirect defilement” (Bartholomae 1904 834).
- Av. *raēϑiškara*—“he who mingles; name of a priest” (Bartholomae 1904 1483).
- Av. *raēϑisbajina*—“mixing vessel” (Bartholomae 1904 1484).
- Av. *hām.raēϑa*—“direct defilement” (Bartholomae 1904 1811).
- Av. *hām.iristi*—“blend” (Bartholomae 1904 1811).

With the preverbs *hām* and *paiti* it designates in Vīdēvdād the *termini technici* for direct and indirect defilement (Bartholomae 1904 1482-1483), (Cantera under preparation A 5.33).

The evolution of OIr. *aC- CC- > YAv. –aēCC- instead of the expected –ōiCC- (de Vaan 2003 355) has been explained in two ways. According to Fortson (1994 44), the result of OIr. *aC- > YAv. –aē- instead of –ōi- before the cluster OIr. *-dy- in YAv. raēϑa- vs. OAv. rōiϑa (Y 31.7) is explained because Av. raēϑa- would stem from OIr. *raϑya-, a Sievers variant of OIr. *raϑya-. Av. rōiϑa 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. *aC- > YAv. –aē- before the cluster OIr. *-dy-*. Actually, he states that OIr. *aCC-, *aC#- yielded YAv. –aēCC-, –aēC# when the cluster was –st-, –sm-, –šm- or –ϑr-, or when the the diphthong was preceded by r- and followed by the clusters –xn-, –x-, –ϑ- or –št-. I agree with de Vaan.
10.7. [a] dātara. gaēdanam.\textsuperscript{539} × astuaitiñam.\textsuperscript{540} aśaun. kaiia.\textsuperscript{541} aete.\textsuperscript{542} vaca. yōi.\textsuperscript{543} honti.\textsuperscript{544} gādāhu.\textsuperscript{545} dhiraṁritā.\textsuperscript{546} [b] āat.\textsuperscript{547} mrao.\textsuperscript{548} abur.\textsuperscript{549} mazā.\textsuperscript{550} ime.\textsuperscript{551} aete.\textsuperscript{552} vaca. yōi.\textsuperscript{553} honti.\textsuperscript{554} gādāhu.\textsuperscript{555} dhiraṁritā.\textsuperscript{556} [c] ime.\textsuperscript{557} vaca.\textsuperscript{558} ādritīm.\textsuperscript{559} framraunā.

\textsuperscript{539} Mf2; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . FK1, (G) — gaēdanam. astuaitiñam. aśaun — | K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 . K9 /tā/ aśaun; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 /tā/ — gaēdanam. astuaitiñam. aśaun —

\textsuperscript{540} Mf2 astuaitiñam

\textsuperscript{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 kia; L5, FK1 kiaie

\textsuperscript{542} L4, K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P10, M3 aetea; P5 itē; K2 ite; E10 ñ FK1 aeti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 yōi

\textsuperscript{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 honti; E4 hontai; L5 hinti; FK1 hontai

\textsuperscript{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 . G34a . G42 . G42 . G42

\textsuperscript{545} L4, K1, D62, K2, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); P2 dhiśā. maruata; P5 dhiśā. maruata; G34 dhiśā. maruata; F10, E10 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 dhiśā. maruata; T44 dhiśā. maruata; R278 dhiśā. maruata; L5 dhiśā. maruata; FK1 dhiśā. maruata; Mf2, K9 dhiśā. maruata

\textsuperscript{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. .. dhiśā. maruata —

\textsuperscript{547} L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, M3 . Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); G34 mrao; T44 mrao abur. mazā — | P10 mrao; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 mrao; K9 above the line /tā/ — mrao abur — mazā

\textsuperscript{548} 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 imē; E10 ima

\textsuperscript{549} 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 imē; E10 ima

\textsuperscript{550} 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 imē; E10 ima

\textsuperscript{551} K1, D62, P2, P5, 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

\textsuperscript{552} 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

\textsuperscript{553} L4, K1, G34 honti; D62 hontai; T44 honti; B2 yōhintai; L5 hinti; FK1 hontai

\textsuperscript{554} 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. bhu

\textsuperscript{555} L4, K1, D62, K2, B1, M3 . L1, (G); P2 gādā. bhuadhiśā. maruata; P5, F10 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 dhiśā. maruata; G34 dhiśā. maruata; T44 . FK1 dhiśā. maruata; E10 dhiśā. maruata; P10 dhiśā. maruata; R278 dhiśā. maruata; L5 dhiśā. maruata; FK2, K9 in the left margin dhiśā. maruata

\textsuperscript{556} K1, K2, F10, E10, B1, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, T44 imē, D62, P10 ime. iit; P2 ime. ite; P5 ime. iiti; L1 iimi; L5 ima; FK1 imaе

\textsuperscript{557} L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1, B1, M3 — vaca — (M3 attests a blank)

\textsuperscript{558} 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 ādrītim; G34 ādrātim (G34a above the line —ritim); L5 ādrarītim
[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.”

And Ahura Mazdā said: “these are the words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gāϑās, recite these words thrice.”

And Ohrmazd said: “these are the words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gāϑās, |c| en gōwi 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.”


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.”

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. /īā/ 3 b‘l; FK1 vohū. 3 bār; Mf2, K9 vohū. 3 gwpn’

vid. (Insler 1975 53): “The Wise One who is the Mightiest Lord, 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, Déférence, Harmonie qui fais prospérer les troupeaux, divine Pensée et emprise, écoutez-moi et faites-moi grâce chaque fois lors de la présentation!”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 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!”.
dužūnānā, ə
vaēšō, rāstī, tōi, narēpīš, rajīš, aēšasā, dōjīl, āra. ḫūš. tamūnū. ḫu. ašānū. aburō, yā. īš. jiūtūš, hōm, mītdīāl. ṭasā. itōiscā. tāt. mazdā, tamūnā, xšaθrōm. yā. ərēžjūiō. ərāi. drīgaunē. vabiū. (= Y 53.9)

602 B2 huu. mbecā; T46 huu. mbecā
603 L1; B2 vašīštā. huxaht. tımāi. 3; T46 vašīštā
604 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”.
605 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 dužūnānā
606 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5 | vaēšō. | vabiū | | | P2 . R278, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5 | vaēšō. | vabiū | 3 | P5 . G42 | vaēšō. | vabiū | 3 b’l; K2 | itā | vaēšō. | vabiū | 3 b’l; L1 3 | itā | vaēšō. | arēžjūiō | | B2, T46 vaēšō; FK1 | vaēšō. | vabiū | 3 bār; Mf2, K9 | itā | vaēšō. | drīgaunē | |
607 B2; T46 rāstītōi
608 B2, T46 arajīš
609 B2, T46 aēšasā
610 B2, T46 pošō. tamūnū
611 B2; T46 | kū |
612 B2, T46 ašānū
613 T46; B2 ya
614 B2, T46 jiūtītūš
615 B2, T46 hōm, mādīāt
616 B2 vašā. itōiscā; T46 | vašā. itōiscā |
617 B2, T46 arēžjūiō
618 L1 drīgaunē; B2 drīgaunē; T46 daragāunē
619 T46; L1 | vabiū | | B2 vabiū. vabiśāt. īstiš. 3; Mf2, K9 vabiū. 3 b’l
620 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 Ahura). Such is Thy rule, Wise One, through which Thou shalt grant what is very good to Thy needy dependent who lives honestly”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.133): “... Où est le Maître partisan de l'Harmonie qui peut les écarter de la subsistance et de la liberté? Sur toi, ô Mazdā, s'exerce l'emprise (rituelle) en raison de laquelle tu veux bien faire le meilleur don au nécesiteux qui vit droiterement”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.194): “Through those of bad preferences poison spreads. They (are personified) obscuration [pl.] and darkness [pl.], (those) greedy violators of truth, with their bodies forfeit. Where (is) the truthful Ahura who might deprive them of (their) livelihood and liberty? That power (is) Thine, O Wise One, through which Thou mayest grant the better (part) to the poor person who lives decently”. 214

619 L4, K1, D62, K2, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); P2 dṛiśa.mrunu; P5, F10 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 dṛiśā.mru; G34 dṛiśāmarūta; T44 dṛiśāmrūta; L5 dārīśa.marūta; M2, K9 dṛiśāmrūta

620 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . M2, K9, (G); L4, T44 ime; Br1, L1 ime

621 L4, F10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . M2, K9, K1, D62, P2, K2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, (G) framrana; P5 fr.mruna; G34 framrana; E4, L5 framrana; FK1 framr

622 L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10 . Br1, L2, G42; K1, P2, B1, P10, M3 vārōdrayni (P10a above the line – instead of –); D62 vārōdrayni (D62a – after –); L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 vārōdrayni; E4 vārōdrayni; L5 vārōdrayna; FK1 vārōdrayna; M2, K9, (G) vārōdrayna

623 K1, P5, K2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . M2, K9, L4, G34, (G) baēṣa. D62, P2 baēṣa; F10 baēṣa; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 baēṣa; Br1 baēṣa

624 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . M2, K9, (G); L4 . T46 in the left margin andrōm; D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, P10, M3 . R278, E4 indrōm; G34, E10 andrōm; T44 . L5, FK1 andrōm; B1 . L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42 indrōm

625 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.pairi; M2 pai.pomo

626 K1, E10, P10 . Br1, G42, (G); L4 saum; D62, F10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, L5, FK1 surum; P2 surum; P5, K2 saum; G34 suru; F10 s'urum; L1 surum; B2, P1 surum; T46 in the left margin surum; L2 suru; E4 surum; M2, K9 saum

627 L4, D62, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . M2, K9, (G); P2 paiti.paima; K2 paiti; T46 in the left margin paima.paima

628 D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 . G42, (G); L4, T44 nājhaḍīm; K1 nājhaḍīm; P5, K2 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, FK1 . M2, K9 nājhaḍīm; G34 nājhaḍīm; F10 nājhaḍīm; E10 nājhaḍīm; L1 nājhaḍīm; L5 nājhaḍīm

629 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . M2, K9, (G); G34 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G); T44 viṣe; E10 . FK1 viṣe; G4 viṣa

630 L4, K2, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . M2, K9, (G); D62, P5, F10, E10, M3 nmāne; P2, G34a above the line namāne; G34 → nmāna. vaca. | T44 . L5 namāne; B1 . P1, E4, FK1 namāna

631 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5 . M2, K9, (G); T44 viṣe; E10 . FK1 viṣe; G4 viṣa

632 D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . B2, T46, P1; P2 daiḥpō; P5 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) daiḥpō; E10 . M2, K9 daiḥpō

633 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . M2, K9, L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . K4, haca. ... sōṣi →

634 M2; P5 hāniūṣe.tanu; K2 hāniūṣe.tanu; L1, B2, R278, T46, G42, FK1 hāniūṣe.tanu; P1, L5 hāniūṣe.tanu; Br1, L2 hāniūṣe.tanu; E4 hāniūṣe.tanu; K9 hāniūṣe.tanu

635 P5, K2 . L1, L2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . M2, K9, FK1 haca.nā

636 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, Br1 paiti.śoṣo; L5 paiti.śoṣo; FK1 paiti.śoṣo; M2, K9 paiti.śoṣo

637 P5 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . M2, K9, K2 nāirki; B2, T46 nāreka; L5 nārīke

638 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1; G42 paiti.śoṣo; E4 paiti.śoṣo; L5 paiti.śoṣo; M2, K9 paiti.śoṣo

639 L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G4 . M2, K9, P5, K2 nmāne; R278 nmānabe; P1, E4, L5 nmānabe; FK1 → nmānabe →
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And after these words to be said thrice, recite these words, victorious, healing; I fight Intra, I fight Sauru, I fight Nāghaḍīya, 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.

[...] ZK y y AHL MN slyšmlwt gwbsn ZNE gwbsn prc YMRRWN pylwcgl byšzynỳt |b| BRA pwltynm "indar" [...SDY] BRA pwltynm swl BRA pwltynm "nāghaḍa [...SDYA MN m'n [...SDYA wys y MN znd MN MTA [...SDYA
|a| ān Ḗ pas az srišāmrūd gōwiṃ Ḗn gōwiṃ Ḗraz gōw pērōzgar bēšāzenidār |b| bē purdēnam Ṛ [indor] Ṛ [dēw] bē purdēnam sawr bē purdēnam Ṛ nāḥhaḍa Ṛ dēw az mān Ṛ az wis Ṛ az zand az dēb
|a| “After the words to be said thrice, recite these words, victorious, healing:” |b| I fight [the demon] Indor, I fight the Sawr, I fight the demon Nāḥhaḍa, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the tribe, away from the country.

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 first one includes 13 demons: aŋra. Ṭm. maṇīium, nasūm, ḫm.ṛaēḍṭōm, paiti.ṛaēḍṭōm, ḫndrtm, sauru, nāḥhaiḍīm, tauruui, Ṭzairici, ṭaēśmōm. Ṭxruui.ṛum, Ṭakaṭašm, Ṭvraṇiia, Ṭvātō.

The second one is composed of 17 demons: aēśmōm, nasūm, ḫm.ṛaēḍṭōm, paiti.ṛaēḍṭōm, ṭxū, ṭxruui, ṭbūtō, ṭbūtīdi, ṭkuḍa, ṭkudi, ṭbūṣṭa. yā. ṭzairina, ṭbūṣṭa. ṭa. ṭaravō. ṭgōwia, ṭmūi, ṭkapasti, ṭpairik, ṭḥīṭīm, ṭyra. Ṭm.ṇiīo.

The third one also sums 17 demons: aŋra. Ṭm.ṇiūiš. ṭpōu.ṛmahkō, ṭindrō, ṭsaru, ṭnāḥhaiḍīm, ṭauruui, ṭzairici, ṭaēśmōm. ṭxruui.ṛum, ṭakaṭašm, ṭziṃm, ṭidōejo, ṭmāršanōm, ṭzauruua. ṭdūzdąfōrō, ṭbūtī, ṭdījii, ṭdaijii, ṭkasuii, ṭpaitiśō. If we add the demon Kuṇḍa, 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-, ḫm.ṛaēḍṭā- and paiti.ṛaēḍṭā-, 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 ṭindra-, ṭsaru-, ṭnāḥhaiḍīiia-, ṭtauruui-, ṭzairici-, ṭaēśma- ṭxruui.ṛū- and ṭakaṭaša- 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 Narten’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):

\[ \text{ka pad } ān dahišn [pad tan } ī \text{ pasēn] ablāyih druž wānēd [aśwahišt indar] (...) \]


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):

\[ \text{pas ohrmazd gannāg mēnōg ud wahman akōman ud aśwahišt } + \text{indar}^{673} \text{ ud šahrewar } \text{+ sawr}^{676} \text{ ud spandarmad tarōmad [i ast nanhais] ud hordad ud amurdad } + \text{tawriz ud } + \text{zāriz}^{677} \text{ ud rāst-gōwišnih ān } īdrō-gōwišnih ud srōš ablaw xēšn } ī ’xroidruš^{678} \text{ gīrēnd} \]

Then Ohrmazd will catch Gannāg Mēnōg, Wahman Akōman, Aśwahišt Indar, Šahrewar Sawr, Spandarmad Tarōmad [who is Nanhais], Hordād and Amurdād Tawriz and Zāriz, the True speech the False speech and the righteous Sróš Wrath of the bloodstained stick.

With slight variants, the same is found in WZ 35.37 (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993 134-135):

\[ \text{ud rōšnān jud jud } + \text{hamēstār } ī xwēš zanēd ċiyōn wahman akōman } <\text{ud>} \text{ ardwahišt indar } \text{ud šahrewar sōr } <\text{ud}> \text{ spandarmad nānghait } \text{ud hordād } <\text{ud}> \text{ amurdād tawriz ud zariz } <\text{ud}> \text{ gōšurwan druž } ī \text{ gurg-tōhmag mēnōg } ī zīr abzōr ī az zarmānīh} \]

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 ‘-’ must be read as -i- in this case, according to the Avestan name indra- 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 <z’lyc> (TD2), <z’lyc> (DH, K20, K20b).

\(^{678}\) Pakzad (2005 386) transcribes xurdruš.

\(^{679}\) cf. Dk 5.7.4 (Amouzgar & Tafazzoli 2000 38-39), where at least 9 demons plus Gannāg Mēnōg are mentioned:

\[ \text{... nikōhīdag ud zadag dāštān } ī \text{ dēwān dēw gannāg mēnōg } u-š māzan abzārān ċiyōn akōman } \text{ud indar } + \text{sawr } \text{ud nanhais } \text{ud tāriz } \text{ud zāriz } \text{ud agdaš } \text{ud āz } \text{ud xešn } \text{ud abārig māzan } \text{dēw} \]
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:

To many, when an opinion regarding the spiritual (world) is obtained afterwards by the priestly authorities, (it transpires) as has been said regarding Spitāmān Zarduxṣ: “the first time when Spitāmān saw the Beneficient Immortals, then he thought that they were Indar, Sārw, Nanhais, Tāriz and Zāriz, 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:

Gannāg Mēnōg, as contracreation, created Akōman as the first of the chief demons, then Indar, then Sawr, then Nanhais, then Tarōmad, then Tawrīz and Zāriz, which (are) the most gigantic.

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 Rivāyats. Thus, in Dk 9.21.4 [M 811.1] the number of seven demons (Phl. haft dēwān) 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:

And when the accursed Ahreman heard these words, a great distress befell him and he created seven demons in the material world: Akōman, Andar, Sāwal, Nānikhait, Tārix, Zārix and Hišm. And every one is opponent and adversary of the Beneficent Immortals.
Much has been written about the relation of the Avestan Indra with the Vedic Indra. 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 Ardwašt.

In later Pahlavi texts, like in those mentioned above, Indar is just part of an enumeration of evil beings, and no particular feature describes him. Whenever his evilish activity is mentioned, it is in connection with Sawr and Nanhais, 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):

\[ \text{abar pahrēz ī az ēzišn ī gannāg mēnōg rāy} \text{̄ anāstawān ī dēn ud ān ī az ēzišn ī indar ud ān ci<sawr x rāy} \text{ān-ēbyāst dād} \]

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 Nanhais is attested in other texts, like GrBd 27.7 (Pakzad 2005 318), (Anklesaria 1956 27.6 in 234-235) and 27.10 (Pakzad 2005 319), (Anklesaria 1956 27.9 in 234-237):

27.7. \[+\text{indar} \text{̄ dēw kār ī kū menišn ī dāman az frārōnīh kardan ōwōn afsārēd čīyōn snēxīr ī xūb-afsārd īn ō menišn ī mardōmān abganēd kū šabīg ud kustīg nē abāyēd dāštăn \]

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”.

27.10. čīyōn gōwēd kū kē tis ō ān mardōmān dahēd kē dād īn kū šabīg ud kustīg nē abāyēd dāštān ēg-ās *indar ud *sawr ud nanhais snāyēnīd 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 Nanhais”.

---

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 “déliberément évacué” from it by the Zoroastrians, who turned him into a demon.

687 The same rare structure 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):

passāx ā Ḫurmāzd ū awēšān kū dujdānāg dāwērd ū bun ī ān "ārjand" tom ēdōn āsmā harwist "kē" ēdōn hēd ā-tān az akōman-īz ast tōhmag [ku-tān tōhmag az ānōh kū akōman] ud waran-īz ī abesihēnīdār ud āz-īz ī an-hambā'īdīs ud īndar-īz ī kōšīdār ēdōn ī mēnōg ī ahlamōyīh ud frāz frēbēd mardôm stī pad huzīwīn ud amarg rwvānīh

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 the place 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. kōšīdār “fighter, slayer” of Indra. On the contrary, Pirart (2007a 63-64, 81), who denies this hypothesis, emends Madan’s (1911) <yndlc> by "<n’hlc> and interprets it as Anaš / Anārti “malchance / absence de l’envoi des pensées, paroles et gestes bons”. He reads Phl. anaš-īz ī kōšīdār ēdōn ī mēnōg ī ahlamōyīh instead of Phl. īndar-īz ī kōšīdār ēdōn ī mēnōg ī ahlamōyīh and translates it as “qu’Anārti (“malchance / absence de l’envoi des pensées, paroles et gestes bons”) 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):

و اندو دیو کار آنست که مردماندا دل تنگی دهد و غم و انده در دل مردمان افگند
و چون مردم گنه کند ایشان اندوز برد و عقوبت برآنها بهماید
مردم که پیوسته دزم روي باشنده اندو دیو کند
و سر چندب پول نخست اندو دیو پیش آید و چندب پول بر دروندان اوت تنگ کند

---

690 I follow Pirart’s (2007 63, 81) emendation.
691 I follow Pirart’s (2007 63, 81) emendation as <MNW> kē, confirmed by the PT of Y 32.3a, quoted in Dk 9.32.3: ēdōn āsmā harwist kē ēdōn hēd ā-tān az akōman-īz ast tōhmag [ku-tān tōhmag az ānōh kū akōman] (Dhabhar 1949 148).
692 Pirart (2007 63-64, 81) reads it as "<n’pwhl> anāpaž “inexpiable”.
693 Pirart (2007 63-64, 81) reads it as kōšīdār ī dēn “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. šarvā-.

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 *dajhu. 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 < *sauruum, 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 sāuru), except B2 and T46, which attest surō, 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 Śarvá, 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 Śarvá with cynegetics, on one hand, and the supposed etymological relation between Ved. śarvá-, Ved. śáru- “arrow, spear” and Ved. śar- “to break, to crush” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.617-618), on the other hand. According to the same link with cynegetics and the Vedic Śarvá, 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 Śarvá 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, Śarvá 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 Śarvá 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-:

\[\text{índrás cákṣujälābhyāṁ śárvaśeṇām amūṁ hatam}\]

And Índra, with both snare and net, Śárva, slay that army.

Although Índra only accompanies Śarvá 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 Śárva, 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 Śarvá, but rather with a personified śáru- “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. śáru- “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. saurun 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. saurun- instead of sauruuua-, 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{sawr}^{695}\text{ dew [kū sālār i dēwān] kār ēn kū duš-pādixšāyīh ud stahm ud adādestānīh 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. sār “head”. Hence he was considered the “head” or leader (Phl. sālār <sr’d’> < *sar-dār) of the demons and therefore associated with the ruleship 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 پدشاهان که ظلم کند و مصداده دوست دارد شان طراری و دزدی راه داری چه بدين ماند ساول دیو راه نماید و در دل مردمان افگند و مردمان گم راه کند تا کارهای ناشاپست کبدنیان تا بدان سبب هلک 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.

\footnote{Written either <swl>, <s’wl> or <s’lw> 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 <s’wl> or <s’lw> and their Pāzand writing sāwar (K20b in GrBd 34.27) and sārw (K20, M51 in GrBd 34.27), we must interpret these variants as Phl. sāwar and sā(w)rəw 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.}

\footnote{Pakzad (2005 318) reads sawul.}
The demon Śāval 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\(^6\).

Av. \(n\breve{a}nhy\breve{a}dim\) (10.9b)

In the Avestan lists of demons Nānghaiḍīia is always placed after Sauru in the sequence Indra - Sauru - Nānghaiḍīia of V 10.9 and 19.43, the only Avestan passages where this demon appears.

His Vedic etymological cognate nāsatya-, epithet of the Āśvināu, 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 Nānghaiḍīia 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. \(n\breve{a}nhy\breve{a}dim\) is a corruption from an old dual \(^\ast\)nāḥaidiāa > \(^\ast\)nāḥhaide > \(^\ast\)nāḥhaide\(-i\) > nāḥaidi\(-i\)m/-im, and, on the other hand, he thinks that the following demons of the list, namely Tauruui and Zairiċi, which according to him also appear in dual, refer to this dual \(^\ast\)nāḥhaide. So they would be the names of the two Indoiranian \(^\ast\)nāṣaṭi-, only manifest in Avestan. However, in p. 403 he states that the singular nāsatyaṇa in RV 4.3.6 designates one of the two Āśvināu, 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 Nānghaiḍīia are exorcised by the formulas to be recited thrice. Since Tauruui and Zairiċi 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 \(^\ast\)nāṣaṭi-. 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 nāṣaṭi- are usually two in Vedic, this correspondence would fit, if Tauruui and Zairiċi would be these two nāṣaṭi-.

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

---

\(^6\) 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. əmniiūm), Nasu (Av. nasūm), the Direct Defilement (Av. hąm.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 –i: būiδi and mūiδi (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 Nāŋhaiϑia / 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. nāsātya- as a singular in RV 4.3.6, continued in the Mahābhārata, confirms that an unique Indoiranian nāsāṭiā 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 ungirded 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):

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):

نائنبهیت دیو کار آن باشد که مردمان یک کر یکند و جون یکنی بمرد
نائنبهیت اورا نگنار و بیا شویاند و حیری دو دارد تا کرکه نکن دو در ایزد
ناسبیش شود
و جون مردمان اورا پرده ندهند او بتر باشد و نصیحت نپرند
و بی طاعین پادشاه مادر و پدر و زن در شهر و بنده در خداوند
که کنند از

Nanbhehyet "dissatisfaction".

As Pirart (2007a 80) notices, popular etymology (or Sasanian exegesis) has reinterpreted Phl. nanhais according to Phl. a-bunsandib "dissatisfaction".
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 Zairicī, away from the house, away from the clan, away from the village, 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
Av. **tauruui** (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), *tauruui* (IrVS). Indeed, while the oldest PV manuscripts attest *tauru*, the oldest IndVS agree in variants with –*a* (B2, T46 taourua; R278 taurua; 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 taouruii; 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 *tauruui* is seemingly the original one in V 19.43. In V 10.10 this agrees with the variants *tauruui* 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 *tauruui* 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 *tauruui* of the IrVS manuscripts, but there is no etymological –*i* in this Avestan word, if we trust the etymology proposed for Av. *tauruui*.

Av. **tauruui** was already connected with the Vedic root *tīrvi*- by Darmesteter (1875 33-34). Afterwards it was more precisely related to Ved. *tīrvī*- “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...
is a hápax legómenon only present in RV 9.42.3 (Pirart 2007a 44-45), where it designates one of the Áśvināu, according to Pirart (1995 22) (2007a 58-59, 149-150).

In the Pahlavi literature the demons Tauruui and Zairicē 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 ěziš ī tawriz ud zāriz rāy ěw-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 هنگ اینا ایبمک دوارشی گوئید اورا گنه چندارپیت که تاریخ و زارخ دیو را یژشی کرده و پیشه باشد

And walking bare-footed they call ē-mōk-dwārišnī (walking with one boot). Such a sin is as if Tārix and Zārix were worshipped.

Av. *zairici (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, Mt2). 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 Zairicē. Furthermore, Jackson (1895 657-658), related Av. zairica with Ved. jarās- “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 zairicī- (Fem.). However, he related them not to Ved. jarās- “old age”, but to Av. zairi- “yellowish” (cf. Ved. bāri-) + the suffix -anc- (cf. Ved. śvityānca- “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 *zairiāncā would be expected. He

---


awēšān bar sās kamālišān dēwān gōwēd abāriq hamkār ud hamayār ī awēšān hēnd

All of them are considered the arch-demons. The rest are their collaborators and assistants.

736 Written <t˝wl˝c˝> in Madan (1911) and in K43 (Dresden 1966).
adopts the variant +zāirica of the IrVS manuscripts737 and proposes that this dual stems from *zārīćā-, thematised and derived by vyddhi from *zārījānc- “yellowish”. According to him, *zāirica would be a dvandva compound together with tauruui.

Unless we accept Pirart’s hypothesis regarding Av. nānḥaiddēm as a corruption of a dual *nānḥaide, a hypothesis that I rule out in my commentary to Av. nānḥaiddēm in V 10.9, there is no need to interpret tauruui and zairica as dvandva 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. zairicī- into Av. zairici, because of an anticipation of the ending –ca of the following word baca and because of the usual confusion between final –i and –a. If my interpretation is right, we must correct zairica by *zairici, the Nom. Sing. Fem. of Av. zairici- “yellowish” (cf. Av. zairici- “Zairici, name of a righteous woman” in Yt 13.139 (Bartholomae 1904 1681) and Ved. śvīticī- (Fem.) “whitish”).

Regarding the Pahlavi literature, popular etymology or Sasanian exegesis reinterpreted Av. zairici- according to a supposed relation with Phl. zahr “poison” (Pirart 2007a 80). On one hand, its phonetic is very close to Phl. zahr “poison” and zabrag “bile, gall” (MacKenzie 1971 97). On the other hand, the PT of this demon as <zʾlyc> or <zʾlyk> could have been misunderstood by the scribes as <zhlyk> zabrxig, so that the confusion with Phl. zahr “poison” and even with Phl. zabrag can also be explained graphically.

According to Dd 36.40 (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 124-125), Zāriz poisons foods:
ud +zāriz dēw pad xwarišnān zahrēnīdan <ud> margīh wihānēnīdan
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):
čīyōn gōwēd kū *tawriz i tarwēndār ud +zāriz i zahr-kardār
As one says: “Tawriz the conquerer and Zāriz the poisoner”.

737 Nevertheless, in a recent publication Pirart (2007a 47) prefers the reading with short vowel zairica.
738 cf. FrO 192 (Klingenschmitt 1968 69), where Phl. zabrag <zhlk> is the PT of Av. zārasca “gall”.
739 Jaafari-Dehaghi (1998 124) edits zarz, but the manuscripts attest <zʾlyc>, which is an adaptation of Av. zairici-. 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):
*zawriz dēw ān kē zahr ō urwarān dāmān gumēzēd
The demon Tawriz is she who mingles poison into the vegetable creatures. Pakzad (2005 319) reads it as Tariz, but all the manuscripts attest <tptlyc>. In my opinion, this represents a deviation from the reading <tptlyc> of the PV manuscripts in V 10.10, which I interpret as Tawriz.
741 Pakzad (2005 319) reads it as Tariz, but all the manuscripts attest <tptlyc> 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.

[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.”
|a| dʾl ḏʾl OLE-šʾn \(^{761}\) gwbšn \(^{762}\) MNW \(^{763}\) HWE-d \(^{764}\) PWN gʾšʾnʾ cslwšʾmlwt \(^{765}\) |b| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd AYḴ ZNE \(^{766}\) OLE-šʾnʾ gwbšn \(^{767}\) MNW HWE-d \(^{768}\) PWN gʾšʾnʾ cslwšʾmlwt \(^{769}\) |c| ZNE gwbšn \(^{770}\) bʾl prʾc YMRRWN \(^{771}\)

|a| ḏādr ḏādr kadār aweišan gōwšn kē hēnd pad gāhān ġəsrāmrūd |b| u-š guft ohrmzd kū ēn aweišan gōwšn kē hēnd pad gāhān ġəsrušāmrūd |c| ēn gōwšn ěbār bār frāz gōw

|a| Maker, which are these words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gādās? |b| And Ohrmzd 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. ġəbrušāmrūta.

\textit{kadār aweišan gōwšn kē hēnd pad gāhān ġəsrušāmrūd}

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.

---

\(^{761}\) K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 clyšʾmwlwt; P2 gwšn
\(^{762}\) L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 W gwbšn
\(^{763}\) L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp); B1, M3 MN
\(^{764}\) L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3; F10 HWE-d; E10 hnd; (Jmp) HWE-nd
\(^{765}\) (Jmp); L4, T44, E10 clyšʾmwlwt; D62 clyšʾmwlwt; P2, B1, P10, M3 clyšʾmwlwt; G34 clyšʾmwlwt; F10 clyšʾmwlwt
\(^{766}\) L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; G34 ZNM; (Jmp) ZNE HWE-d
\(^{767}\) L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 gwšnyny
\(^{768}\) K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 HWE-nd
\(^{769}\) L4, T44, E10 clyšʾmwlwt; K1 clyšʾmwlwt; D62 clyšʾmwlwt; P2 clyšʾmwlwt; G34 clyšʾmwlwt; F10 clyšʾmwlwt; B1 clyšʾmwlwt; P10 clyšʾmwlwt; M3 clyšʾmwlwt; (Jmp) clyšʾmwlwt
\(^{770}\) L4c in the left margin, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, P10, M3, (Jmp); T44 gwbšn; B1 gwbšn
\(^{771}\) L4c in the left margin, K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); D62 W 4
\(^{772}\) L4c in the left margin, K1, P2, G34, E10, B1, M3; D62, F10, T44, P10, (Jmp) YMRWN

vid. (Inslers 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 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 nécessiteurs”; (Humbach & Ellenbein & Škjarvō 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”.

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 1.129): “Ô Mazdā, dis-moi les hymnes et les actes très bons! Rends donc plantureux, en raison de la divine Pensée et de l’Harmonie, l’apparition de vigne 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 & Škjarvō 1991 1.143): “Ô 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, Ô Ahura.”

(Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.195): “Que la tribu vigoureuse aille au secours! / Aux hommes et aux femmes de Zaraūstra / 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 Zaraūstra / Pour le secours de la divine Pensée, je demande à la conscience, qui gagne une récompense de choix, l’octroi, 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 Zarādūstra, 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”.
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829 D62, B1, P10, M3. L1, (G); L4 caḥrṣāmṛūta; P2 caḥrṣāmṛūta; K2 caḥrṣāmṛūta; G34 caḥrṣāmṛūta; F10. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 caḥrṣāmṛūta; T44 caḥrṣāmṛūta; E10 caḥrṣāmṛūta; L5 caḥrṣāmṛūta; Mf2, K9 caḥrṣāmṛūta

831 D62, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 imē; L1 eme; L5 imē; Mf2, K9 imē

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 –n– after –r–), M3, (G) frāmarīna; G34. L5 frāmarīna; FK1 frāmarīna

814 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, R278, L2, G42, FK1; P5, E10 vārådṛṣyā; K2 vārådṛṣyā; B2, T46, P1 vārådṛṣyā; Br1 vārådṛṣyā; E4 vārådṛṣyā; L5 vārådṛganīs; Mf2, K9, (G) vārådṛṣyā

816 K1, D62, K2, T44, B1, P10, M3. Mf2, K9, L4, P2, (G) baḥeziā; P5 biāziā; G34 baḥeziā; F10, E10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 baḥeziā; E4 baḥeziā

818 Mf2, K9; L4, K2 aēṣom. K1 aēṣomām; D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3, (G) aēṣom; T44. L5 aēṣomām; E10. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aēṣomām; T46 aēṣomām; P1 aēṣomām; FK1 aēṣomām

842 L4, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, (G); K1, D62, P2, B1, P10 (P10a above the line –n– before –m–), M3 daēm; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 daēm; Mf2, K9 daēum

831 L4, K1, D62, G34, P10. L1, B2, T46, P1, L2, G42. K9, (G); P2, T44 nāmāne; P5, K2, E10 nāmāne; F10. L5, FK1 nāmāne; B1. M3. R278, E4 nāmāne; Br1 nāmāne; Mf2 nāmāne

814 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4. Mf2, K9, (G); P2 viś; T44, E10. L5, FK1 viśe; L2 viša. bača

816 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, P10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); G34 dai dubious

824 L4, K1, D62, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L2, E4; P2 dāi bhō; P5. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, L5, FK1, (G) dāi bhō; G34 zantu; Mf2, K9 dāpu

834 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) = baḥa... stōī = L2 = baḥa =

824 P5 haunaiiā. tanuō; K2 haunaiiā. tanuō; L1, T46, L5 haunaiiā. tanuō; B2, P1 haunaiiā. tanuō; R278, G42, FK1 haunaiiā. se.tanuō; Br1 haunaiiā. se.tanuō; L2 haunaiiā. se.tanuō; E4. Mf2, K9 haunaiiā. tanuō

824 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. Mf2, K9; P5, K2 nāmāne; E4 nāmāne; L5, FK1 nāmāne

828 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9; P5, K2 nāmāne; E4 nāmāne; L5, FK1 nāmāne...
|a| “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 Akataša, 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 cslws mlwt gwbsn  ZNE gwbsn prc YMRRWN pylwcl byzynyl byzynyl |b| BRA pwltynm hyšm y hlwdlwš BRA pwltynm kts ŠDYA MN m’n’ MN wys znd MN MTA |

|a| an ipas az ċasrušāmūd gōwiš ēn gōwiš frāz gōw pērōzar bēšāzenidār |b| bē purdēnam xēšm i xruidrūs bē purdēnam agdaš děw az mān az wis az zand az deh |

“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. *xruui.drūm (10.13b)

I agree with de Vaan’s (2003 260) emendation *xruui.drūm, because Geldner’s (1896) xruuim.drūm is due to the influence of the ending –m on the second element of compound.

Regarding its formation, the first element xruui° belongs to a Caland’s system. cf. Av. xriira- “raw, bloody”, Ved. krūrā- “raw” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.414-415); Av. xrii- “raw flesh”. As a Caland’s system, we expect a final short vowel xruui°. However, all the manuscripts agree in the reading with long vowel xruui°. Accordingly, I have edited xruui°.

The second element *dru- of this compound can stem either from Av. dāuru- “wood” or from Av. drau- “to run”, according to Hintze (1994 245). She (1994 247) agrees with Hoffmann (1976 419) and states that it is possible that an anī verbal root Av. dru- existed together with another set verbal root Av. drū- “to run”. From the latter Av. drū-, the root-noun Av. drū- “running” would derive. Accordingly, she interprets Av. xruui.drū- 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 dru(H)- “to run” is contradicted by the inflexion of *dru-. Actually, while the root noun Av. hū- “pig” attests a Gen. Sing. huuō in the PT of V 7.52Q (Cantera under preparation A 7.52), Av. *dru- attests a Gen. Sing. *draoš, 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. *akatašm (10.13b)

There are two main problems in this compound. On one hand, its first member puts a textual problem. The reading aya° is attested in the PV of the group of L4 and in the IndVS manuscripts, while the variant aka° is found in those PV manuscripts of the group of K1 and in the IrVS manuscripts. They can be traced back to IIr. *agba-° “evil” or *aka-° “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 ake°, while all the rest agree in the reading aya°. However, although aya° 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 ake°.

On the other hand, it cannot be stated whether the second member of this compound, namely tašm, belongs to an athematic stem taš- or to a thematic one taša-. The only passages where this compound is found, namely V 10.13 and V 19.43, attest the Acc. Sing. akatašm, which can be interpreted either as an athematic or a thematic substantive. The only parallel of taš(a)- as a second element of compound is Av. vispataš(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. vīspa.taša- and doubts if taš- produced a root-noun. In any case, it seems clear that this second element of compound stems from IIr. taš- “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. akataśm 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 i x agdaś rāy duš nakkīrā-gar
And repudiating harmfully 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. *agdaš dēw druz i nakkīrāyih kē dāmān az tis i frārōn nakkīrā kunēd
The demon Agdaš is the Lie of repudiation, which makes the creatures repudiate righteous things.

26. čryōn gōwēd kū kē tis ō ān dahēd kē mardōm az tis i frārōn nakkīrā dārēd ēg-iš +agdaš dēw šnāyēnid bawēd kē tis ō ān tan dahēd kē dād ēn kū dastwar nē abāyēd dāštan ēg-iš xēsm dēw šnāyēnid bawēd kē tis ō ān tan dahēd kē dād ēn kē gōwēd kū mārjan nē abāyēd dāštan 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.”

859 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 paiti.pairōne; FK1 – paiti.porōne. ... stōs –

860 L4, K1, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G) varōnīa; D62 varōnīa; P2 vārōnīa; T44 varōnīa; B2, T46, P1 varōnīa; L5 varōnīa; Mf2 varōnīa; K9 varōnīa

861 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); E10 . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 daēnuō; L1, B2, P1 daēnuō

862 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 above the line, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1 – paiti.porōne. vātō. daēnuō – P2 paita.porōne; L2 paiti.porōne; E4 paiti.porōne

863 D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10 above the line (P10a above the word –um), M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, P10 namāne; P2 namāne; B1 . R278, P1 namāne; L5 namāne

864 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44, E10 . L5 vīse

865 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); Mf2 haca. za. haca.

866 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 zantu; L2 zantu

867 L4, D62, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . E4; P2, P5 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, (G) daēju. G34, E10 . Mf2, K9 daēju; T46 daēju

868 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G) – haca. ... stōis –

869 P5, K2 bāniñāse. tanūō; L1, R278, T46, G42 bāniñāse. tanūō; B2, Br1, L2 bāniñāse. tanūō; P1 . K9 bāniñāse. tanūō; E4 bāniñāse. tanūō; L5 bāniñāse. tanūō; Mf2 bāniñāse. tanūō

870 P5, K2 . L1, R278, P1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; B2, E4 haca; T46 nāh

871 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4; L5 paiti.risto; Mf2, K9 paiti.risto

872 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; Mf2 paiti.risto; K2 paiti.risto; L1, R278, L1 paiti.risto; B2, T46, P1 paiti.risto; E4 paiti.risto; L5 paiti.risto; Mf2 paiti.risto; K9 paiti.risto

873 Br1, G42; P5 paiti.risto; K2 paiti.risto; L1, R278, L1 paiti.risto; B2, T46, P1 paiti.risto; E4 paiti.risto; L5 paiti.risto; Mf2 paiti.risto; K9 paiti.risto

874 L1, B2, T46, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; P5, K2 nāmāne; R278, P1, E4 nāmāne; B1 nāmāne; L5 nāmāne

875 L1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; P5 nāmānā. paitiōs; K2 nāmānā. paitiōs; B2, T46, P1 nāmānā. paitiōs; R278, E4, L5 nāmānā. paitiōs

876 K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; P5 viśa

877 P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; K2 . L5 viśpatiōs; E4 viś. paitiōs
Av. \( ^\text{x} \text{var} \text{n} \text{ii} \text{a} \) (10.14a)

There are two problems regarding this substantive. Firstly, the Nom. Pl. \( ^\text{x} \text{var} \text{n} \text{ii} \text{a} \) disagrees with the Nom. Sing. \( \text{da} \text{\text{e}} \text{\text{nu}} \text{o} \). Secondly, its meaning and etymology are unclear.

As far as the first problem is concerned, Av. \( ^\text{x} \text{var} \text{n} \text{ii} \text{a} \) 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. \( ^\text{x} \text{var} \text{n} \text{ii} \text{a} \) instead of the Nom. Pl. and, on the other hand, the Acc. Pl. \( \text{da} \text{\text{e}} \text{\text{nu}} \text{q} \) (Pirart 1992 106) instead of the Nom. Sing. \( \text{da} \text{\text{e}} \text{\text{nu}} \text{o} \).

Concerning the etymology and meaning of Av. \( ^\text{x} \text{var} \text{n} \text{ii} \text{a} \), Spiegel (1852-1863 1.177) translated it as “Daeva des Regens”, surely because of a confusion

Westergaard (1853 83) said that this word stem from Av. *varəna-,* attested in V 1.17⁴⁹⁶ 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. *xvarəniiia- would refer to evil beings, according to Westergaard. I must add that his interpretation was based on the wrong etymological connection between Av. *varəna-,* Ved. *vārṇa- and Gr. *oúranos.*

De Harlez (1881 cxxx) denied Westergaard’s interpretation and agreed with the native interpretation of Av. *xvarəniiia-*, 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. *xvarəniiia-* stems from Av. *varəna- of V 1.17 and Yt 5.33, but interpreted it as a toponim. Thus, Av. *xvarəniiia* would be the name of the Varənīia demons, that is, the demons from Varṇa.

As we observe, Av. *xvarəniiia* can be explained at least by means of two possible etymologies: the root Av. *var- “to choose, to desire”* and the toponim Av. *varəna-.* Although I cannot discard these interpretations, I must point to a further possibility: its connection with Ved. *vārṇa- “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. *xvarəniiia* is mentioned together with the demon *+vātō “(evil) Wind”.* It is noteworthy that the Vedic word possibly connected with Av. *xvarəniiia* 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):

\[\text{yātha vāto vánapśātun vṛksān bhanākty ójasā} \]
\[\text{eva sapātām me bhaṅgdhi pūrvān jātān utāparān varṇās tvābhi rakṣatu} \]
As the Wind breaks the trees, lords of wood, with force, so break my rivals, those born before and after; let the *vārṇā- protect you.*

The main difference between both texts is that Av. *xvarəniiia* is not a singular and designates a collective of evil beings.

On the other hand, Av. *xvarəniiia* is accompanied by IIr. *+daiya-*. 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):

\[\text{ayāṁ me varanā úraṣi rājā devō vánapśātib} \]
\[\text{sā me sāṭrūn ū bādathām īndro dāṣyūn ivāśuvān} \]
This *varanā- in my breast, the divine lord of wood, oh King, let it drive away my enemies, like Indra the Dāṣyus, the Āsuras.*

⁴⁹⁶ Regarding the possible location of this land, vid. (Cantera under preparation A 1.17).
Although Ved. *devó is referred properly to vánaspátiḥ, it is clear that devó vánaspátiḥ (Nom. Sing.) “divine lord of woods” is used as an epithet of Ved. varanā (Nom. Sing. in saṃhīti). Therefore, AVŚ 10.3 offers a good parallel to V 10.14 and can point to an Indoiranian connection. Actually, in both texts OInd. *yaraṇa- / OIr. *yaraṇiia- + Hr. *yaHata-, on one hand, and OInd. *yaraṇa- / OIr. *yaraṇiia- + Hr. *daiya-, on the other hand, are mentioned together. Because of this, we can suppose that Av. *yaraṇiia are the demons related to the *yaraṇa- (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 *yaraṇa- 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. *yaraṇiia in V 10.14a, Phl. waranīg, we see the plurality of Varāṇiia 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 ān ī wahman ud spandarmad ud srōš ud abrišwang <ud> was yazdān ud ān ī akōman ud waran ud xešm <ud> anahl ud was dēwān
And that of Wahman, Spandarmad, Srōš, Abrišwang 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-īz ī abesibēnīdār “the destroyer Lust”), in Great Bundahiśn 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 ī xwad-dōšagīh waran ī wad ī nēst-kirb frāz kirrēnīd čīyōn waran abāyist
And from the essence of selfishness he miscreated the evil Lust without body, since Lust was necessary.

897 In other Pahlavi texts Lust is mentioned together with Greed (Phl. āx) and Wrath (Phl. xešm), like in AW (JamaspAsana 1913 89), (Asmussen 1974 238), Dk 3.33 (de Menasce 1973 49), Dk 6.23 (Shaked 1979 10-11), Dk 6.8 (Shaked 1979 188-189), ViD 12 (Molé 1967 128-129), (Asmussen 1974 238), WZ 30.41 (Shaked 1980 26, n.11), (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993 106-107), WZ 34.36 (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993 122-123) or PRDd 62.10 (Williams 1990 1.222-223, 2.107).
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. xrad) is equated to Religion (Phl. dēn). Regarding this latter passage, as Shaked (1979 229) notices, the ambiguity of the Pahlavi script makes that Phl. xrad “wisdom” could be read as Phl. ard “Ard” (=Ahrīšwang). Nevertheless, Shaked prefers to edit Phl. xrad 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):

\textit{waran dēw ān kē abārōn marzišnih kunēd čiyōn gōwēd waran i a-rāh}

The demon Lust is that which practises sinful fornication. As one says: “Lust the stray one”.

Av. $^+\text{vātō}$ (10.14a)

There is a textual problem in the choice of this reading. On one side, the oldest PV manuscript, namely L4, attests \textit{vātum}, which in its turn seems to be on the basis of the variant \textit{vātim} in the IrVS manuscripts. On the other side, the group of K1 and the IndVS manuscripts agree in the variant \textit{vātō}.

Pirart (1995 414) notices that these two variants are problematic, but he does not find a solution. He believes that the reading \textit{vātim} implies to correct it as $^+\text{vāitīm}$. 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 \textit{vātum}, an infection of –ā- + -\textit{Cu}– > -ō- + -\textit{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 \textit{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. \textit{ka-š nazd būd o zāyišn abreman tab dēw ud dard dēw ud +wād dēw har ēk abāg sad ud panjāh dēw bē ō ožadan i 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. \textit{u-š +mēnōgīhā frāz ō mādar šud 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:

\textit{sē rōz pas az marg ka ruwān andar bīm handāzag sē rōz i 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.

\textit{vid. Dd 36.63 (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 134-135), where the same syntagm Phl. \textit{waran i a-rāh} is found and Dk 5.7 (Pirart 2007a 133-134), where we find the equivalent Phl. \textit{abē-rāh waran}. In Dk 6.274 (Shaked 1979 106-109) lust and bodily desire (Phl. \textit{waran ud tan-kāmagīh}) are mentioned together, while in Dk 6.C39 (Shaked 1979 158-159) the adjective Phl. \textit{waranīg} “lusty, greedy” is referred to sexual desire which drives to fornication with prostitutes (Phl. \textit{fēh-marzīh}).}

[a] “These are the words which are to be said twice while (reciting) the Gaṇās, these are the words which are to be said thrice while (reciting) the Gaṇās, these are the words which are to be said four times while (reciting) the Gaṇās.”

---

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 ← aēte ┆ P2 aēte; E10 aēte; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete 
904 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, (G); P2, E4 hanta; T44 hanta; B2 honti; L5 hinti 
905 L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . K9, (G); P2, P5, B1 . L5 . Mf2 gaṇā. huna 

---

907 D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, (G); L4 biśāmrūta; P2 biśā. mruuta; K2, F10 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, F1 biś. ā. mruuta; G34 biś. ā. mruuta; T44 biś. ā. mruuta; E10 biś. ā. mruuta; R278 baśā. mruuta; E4 baśā. mruuta; L5 biś. ā. mruuta; Mf2, K9 biśāmrūta 
908 D62, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, G34, T44 imē; P2 ← ime. aēte. vaca ┆ P2a above the line aēte; E4 imaē; FK1 aite; D62 aēti; P2a above the line aēte; P5 imeite; K2 itē; G34 vaca; T44 aēti; P10 itē 
909 D62, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aete; D62 aēti; P2a above the line aēte; P5 imeite; K2 itē; G34 vaca; T44 aēti; P10 itē 
910 D62, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); G34 aete 
911 D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); E10 yōi; L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 yōhi̱nti; F10 . E4 hanta; T44 . L1 hantī; B2 yōhi̱nti; T46, L5 hinti 
913 D62, K2, P10, M3 . L1, (G); L4 biśāmrūta; P2 biśā. mruuta; P5, F10, B1 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 biś. ā. mruuta; G34 biś. ā. mruuta; T44 biś. ā. mruuta; E10 biś. ā. mruuta; R278 baśā. mruuta; E4 baśā. mruuta; L5 biś. ā. mruuta; Mf2, K9 biśāmrūta 
914 D62, K2, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G); L4, G34, T44 imē; FK1 aine 
915 D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K2, G34, T44 imē; FK1 aine 
916 D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); L4, E10 yōi; D62, G34 ← yōi. bantī ┆ L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yōi 
917 D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); L4, E10 yōi; D62, G34 ← yōi. bantī ┆ L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 hanta; T44 hanta; E4 yōhbanta; L5 hinti; FK1 bantī 
918 D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2a, B1, L5, FK1 gā. huna; P10 ← gā. huna ┆ L4a gā. huna 
919 D62, B1, M3 . L1, (G); L4 caḍruśāmrūta; P2 caḍruśā. mruuta; P5, T44 caḍruśā. mruuta; K2 caḍruśā. mruuta; G34 caḍruśā. mruuta; F10 caḍruśā. mruuta; E10 caḍruśāmrūta; P10 caḍruśāmrūta; B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 caḍruśā. mruuta; E4 caḍruśā. mruuta; L5 caḍruśā. mruuta; Mf2, K9 caḍruśāmrūta 
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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.”
10.16. |a| ime. 936 àëte. 937 vaca. 938 yóí. 939 hóni. 940 aγράβε. 941 xárnóuš. 942
snáðm. 943 |b| ime. 944 àëte. 945 vaca. yóí. 946 hóni. 947 +áèsmábe. 948
"xρuídraóš. 949 snáðm. 950 |c| ime. 951 àëte. vaca. yóí. 952 hóni. 953 954
mázantíanım. 955 dáewuánım. 956 snáðm. 957 958 d. ime. 959 àëte. vaca. yóí. 960
hóni. 961 vísanam. 962 dáewuánım. 963 snáðm.

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 imè; 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 aëte; K2 àëte; T44 àëte; E10 aëte; P10 iti (P10a above the line –e- before –e- and –e instead –i); L4a OLE-s' n'
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 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);
940 F10 yõóhûta; T44 húnta; E10 yóóhûta; L5 hûnta; FK1 yõóhûta
941 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 aëte
942 ; G34 aësbare; F10 aëbra; T46 aëbrahe
943 K1, K2, B1, P10 mániúš. 944 D62, P5, F10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9, (G) mainiúš;
945 P2 mainiúš; G34 mainiúš; T44 mainiúš; E10 mainiúš; L4a mainiúŋm; L5
946 aësbaramainiúš; Mf2 mainiúš
947 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G);
948 E10 sanaðm; L5 sanaðm
949 K1, D62, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9, (G); L4 (L4a aë-)
950 aëte; K2, G34, T44 imè; R278 ima; FK1 aëme; Mf2 ime. ime
951 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 aëte; K2 àëte; T44 àëte; E10 aëte; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aëte
952 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L5, FK1, (G); E10, L4a yóí; L1, B2, R278, T46,
953 P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 yóí
954 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L4a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G);
955 E10 sanaðm; T44 húnta; L5 hûnta; FK1
956 P5, M3 . Mf2, K9; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, (G) aëśmábe. K2 aëśmøm; G34, T44 aëśmábe; F10 aëśmøabe; E10 aëśmøam; L4a aśmbe; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aëśmábe; L5, FK1 aəśmábe
957 G42, L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . (G) xρuídraóš; P2 xρuí.drus; E10 xρuí drúns; L1, L2, E4 xρuídraós; B2, R278, T46, P1 xρuídraós; Br1 xρuíidraós; L5 xarái.darúxi; FK1 xρuíaidrúxi; Mf2, K9 xρuídraóš
958 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G);
959 P5 sanaðm; T48 sanaðm
960 K1, D62, P2, P5, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G);
961 L4, K2, G34, T44 imè; L1 aëte; FK1 aëme
962 K1, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, (G); L4 vaëte; K2 àëte; T44 àëte; E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aëte; K9 àëti
963 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10 . L5, FK1, (G); E10 yóí; M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yóí
964 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10 (at the bottom of the previous page, but hóni in the beginning of the following one), P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44 húnta; B1 hûnte; E4 yóóhûta; L5 hûnti
965 L4 mázáaníanım. K1 mázáæníanım; D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, P10 . FK1 . K9 mázáaníanım (P10a above the line adds vísanám); G34 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 mázáaníanım; E10 mázáaníanım; B1, M3 mázáæníanım; L1, T46, P1, (G) mázáaníanım; E4 mázáaníam; L5 mázáaníam; Mf2 mázáaníam

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 Mázañia demons. These are the words which are a blow against all the demons.

ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbsn’ MNW .hd HWE-d 977 ysn’ sn’h 970 |e| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbsn’ MNW HWE-d 977 ysn’ sn’h 970 |c| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbsn’ MNW HWE-d 977 m’nyk n 975 ŠDYA- n’ 975 sn’h 970 |d| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbsn’ MNW HWE-d 977 hls wp 974 ŠDYA- n’ 975 sn’h 966

956 L4, K1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . K9 da‘iunanqām; E10 da‘iunanqām; L1 da‘iunanqām; T46, P1 da‘iunanqām; B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 da‘iunanqām; FK1 dāiunanqām
957 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 sanadām; T44 = sanadām |; G42 sanadām
958 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 =nē; K1, D62, F10, P10 = intim. ... sanadām |; L5 imi
959 L4, P2, P5, G34, B1, M3 . K9, (G); K2 iṭī; F10 in the left margin . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 aṭe; T44 aṭe; E10 . L5 aṭe; E4 aṭe; Mf2 aṭē
960 L4, P2, P5, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); B1 ʾgʿcā
961 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
962 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 hasītu; B1 hasītu; L1 hasītu; E4 yōhsītu; L5 hasītu
963 L1, T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); L4 bātinaqasān; P2, P5, K2, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, B1, M3 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 asānqasān; FK1 asānqasān
964 L4 . Mf2, (G); P2, K2, G34, T44, B1, M3 . K9 da‘iunanqām; P5, F10 in the left margin, E10 . R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 da‘iunanqām; L1 da‘iunanqām; B2 da‘iunanqām; T46, P1 da‘iunanqām; FK1 dāiunanqām
965 L4, P2, P5, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, B1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); M3 . R278, L5 sanadām
966 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK; P2, E10 hnd AYK; T44 HWE-d PWN; (Jmp) HWE-n'd AYK
967 (Jmp); D62, P2, F10, P10 gnʾ k
968 D62, P2, F10, P10 . (Jmp); G34, E10, B1 gnʾ gmnwng; T44 gnʾ gmnwng; M3 ʾṣr; L4a hawr.
969 D62, F10, B1, P10 (P10a above the line `cš), M3; P2 ʾlōhā; G34, T44, E10 `cš snʾh; L4a snʾh MN; (Jmp) snʾy
970 G34; L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK; E10 hnd AYK; (Jmp) HWE-n'd AYK
971 D62, P2, G34, F10, E10a under the line, B1, M3; L4, T44, P10, (Jmp) hšm; E10 = hyšm =
972 G34, (Jmp); L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 = y =
973 (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 hwlwls; D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 hwlwls; E10 hlydlwš
974 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3; P2 snhʾ B1, (Jmp) snʾy
975 K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34 = gwbsnʾ =
976 L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 = MNW =
977 P2, L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 HWE-d AYK; (Jmp) HWE-n'd AYK
978 (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 mʾnyk n; D62 mʾznšnyz n; P2 mʾzn gny ZK; F10 ʾmʾznšnyz, P10 ʾmʾznšnyz (P10a on the top of the page r fā'); B1 ʾmʾznšnyz, M3 ʾmʾznšnyz
979 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10a on the top of the page. (Jmp); D62, F10, P10 = ŠDYA- n = HWE-d = (but F10 supplied it priman manu in the left margin); M3 ŠDYA-n'
980 G34, T44, E10, M3; L4, F10 in the left margin snʾy; P2 = snʾh =; B1, (Jmp) snʾy
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“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. snaθəm (10.16a-d)

There are three parallels of the Dat. Sing. snaθāi appearing instead of the Acc. Sing. snaθəm attested here: 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 Varəniiia liars.

Y 57.32. snaθāi. aŋrahe. ˣmaṇiiš. druṅatō. snaθāi. ˣaēṃməhə. ˣxrumi.драoš. snaθāi. višpaŋm. daēuuanəm. snaθāi. xmiştirəm. druṅatəm.

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 Varəniiia liars.


And this Lie will be knocked down at every one of the words to (smite a) blow against the liar Aŋra Mańiiu, to (smite a) blow against all the demons and the Varəniiia liars.

---

983 L4, P2, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, B1, M3; K1 | ZNE ... sn’h |-
984 L4, P2, G34, F10 in the left margin, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); T44 gbbšn’
985 P2, L4, T44, E10, B1, M3 HWE-d AYK; G34 HWE-d AYK; F10 in the left margin HWE-d AYK
986 hw; (Jmp) HWE-d nd AYK
987 L4, G34, F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, D62, P2, F10, P10 hlwspyn’n; B1, M3 hlwsp’n; (Jmp) hlwsp
988 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10 and F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp); E10 ŠDYA-n; B1, M3 ŠDYA-n’
989 L4, D62, G34, F10 and F10 in the left margin, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp; P2 ŠDY, B1, M3, (Jmp) snyš

Pirart (1995 415) emends it by “snaθāi” because of the parallel of Y 27.1. I have preferred to maintain snaθəm and to consider it as a variation in the formula in Vidēvdād.
Wrath of the bloodstained stick, to (smite a) blow against the Māzańiia 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 5varanānumca. druuasat 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. auuāstriieite (<auua + ā + star- “to knock down” (Bartholomae 1904 1596)) is parallel to Av. auuāstriata in Yt 1.29: spantaiā. ārmatōiū. dōirābiia. auuāstriata. mairūō “by the eyes of Spantā Ārmaiti the vile was knocked down”.
"These are the words which are the subd rer of that Lie, of that Nasu, from the dead hurls itself into the living. These are the words which are the subd rer of that Lie, of that Nasu, which from the dead contaminates the living.

ZNE OLE-š n*1019 gw bn*s*1019 MNW HWE-d*1020 OLE*1021 dwc*1022 x OLE*1023 nsws*1024 hmystl*1025 xMNW*1026 MN*1027 OLE*1028 lyst*1029 OL*1030 zywndk*1031 QDM dwblyt’ [PWN*1032 hmlyt]’ |b| ZNE OLE-š’ n* gw bn*s* MNW HWE-d* OLE* dwc*1057 OLE* nswshmystl’ |b| MNW*1040 MN*1041 OLE* lyst*1043 w*1044 zywndk* QDM gwmyhty*1046 [PWN pylty*1047]
Av. drujō. … nasāuuō (10.17a-b)
Nasu is called druj- “Lie” in several passages of Vīdēvdād. This association is usually expressed by means of the syntagms 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. *načyás < IE. *nekyēs.1046

As Cantera (2007a 13, n.11) notices, Av. nasāuuō (Gen. Sing.) is analogous to Av. nasāuuō (Nom. Pl.), which attests a presuffixal lengthened grade –ā-.

---

1041 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Imp); P2, M3 = MN —
1042 L4, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, (Imp); K1, D62, B1, P10, M3 OLE y
1043 D62, B1, M3, (Imp); L4, G34, F10, T44, E10 lyst; P2 lyst’n
1044 D62, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); L4, G34, T44, E10 OL OLE; P2 OLE’; F10 ’w
1045 P2, B1, M3, (Imp); L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, P10 zyndk; E10 zynd
1046 P2, B1, L4, G34, T44, E10, (Imp) gwmyhtyt; D62, P10 gwmyşyt; F10 gwmyhty; M3 gwmyht
1047 (Imp); L4, T44, E10 pytyt; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 pytyt; G34 pytyt; F10 pytyt
1048 According to Cantera (2007a 13, n.11), Av. *nasuuō would suggest a holokynetic inflection *nekyōs / *n(e)kyēs. 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” *nekōys / *nekus. 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.
10.18. [a] ἀατ. ὁ τιμ. ἰατ. ἀραδυστα. ἀπα. ταμα. νιδ.βερσσ. [b] 

1049 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G); Mf2 άτ.


1051 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, L5, FK1 ταραδυστα.

1052 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 ματώμ.

1053 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . L5, K9, (G); E4 ματώμ. Mf2, K9 τίμ.

1054 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, P2, G34 . FK1 αἰήθ. τιμ. Μf2, Mf2, K9, (G).

1055 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, P2, G34 . FK1 αἰήθ. τιμ. Μf2, Mf2, K9, (G).

1056 L5, K9, L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, P10; G34, T44, B1, M3 . FK1, (G) αἰήθ. Κ1 αἰήθ.; E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2 αἰήθ.

1057 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); E4 αἰήθ.μό.

1058 D62, P5, K2, E10, P10 (P10ά above the line –ίιι– instead of –ί–) . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, P2, G34 . FK1 αἰήθ. τιμ. Μf2, Mf2, K9, (G).

1059 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 πασ.β.τ.τ. Mf2, K9, (G).

1060 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 (P10ά corrects –α as –ά), M3 

1061 P5, K2, G34, T44, L4a; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 

1062 P5, K2, G34, T44, L4a; K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 


1065 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; G34 . B2, P1, E4 ϕαβετόο.; T44 ϕαβιστά, L1 . Mf2, K9, (G) ϕαβιστά; L5 ϕαβιστά.

1066 K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4a ᾨτ.

1067 D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L5, (G); F10 ϕατόο.; L4a ϕατόο.; L1, R278, P1 . Mf2, K9 ϕατόο.; B2, T46 ϕατόο.; L1, Br1, L2, G42 τόο.; E4 τόο.; FK1 ϕατόο.
And you, Zara'uṣtra, must dig nine holes; in this earth where there were least water and fewest plants. [not drinkable by both flock

who endows with life force the birth even for the mortal, the best]. This, the Mazdean (religious) conscience, Zara'uṣtra, (is) what endows (it) with life force. [Who purifies his conscience by means of good thoughts, good words and good deeds.]
Then you, Zardušṭ, 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, Zardušṭ, 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, daenaṃ. (and) anhuuām. 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):

daena. mazdaisniš. [e] yō. buuām. anhuuām. yaoždāte. humataisca.
būxtaistā. huharstaistā.

c] ywšd’slyh ANŠWTA [p’kyh PWN lwb’n’] AHL MN YLYDWN-šn’ p’hlw[n]
[AMT BRA YLYDWN-t HWE-d ’š’n’ MNDOM-1 ywšd’slyh PWN lwb’n’ SPYL] [d] ywšd’slyh [YMRRWN-m] zltwhšt PWN dyn’ y m’zdš’n’ [pyt’k] [e] ZK y NPŠE ywš’dlynt [AYK MN wn’s p’k YHSNN-yt] PWN hwmt W hwht W hwlt’ [y ‘anhuuām. daenaṃ. / KRA 2’yw]k]

As we observe, the Avestan texts and PT as V 10.18d-f and V 10.18f differ in one word: Av. anhuuām in V 5.21e and Av. daenaṃ 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. daenaṃ. arzuwō. yaoždaidīša, shows that at least in V 10.18f the right reading was Av. daenaṃ. Furthermore, in V 5.21e the PT of Av. anhuuām, namely Phl. axw, lacks, so that
Av. *daēnəm* is possibly the right variant. Nevertheless, the variant Av. *aŋhuuəm* is older than the Pahlavi commentaries of both passages, where we find *aŋhuuəm. daēnəm. har dō ēk* (V 5.21e) and *aŋhuuəm. daēnəm. 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 *aŋhuuəm*, 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 *daēnəm*, the commentator places it firstly and equates it with that of V 5.21e.

**Av. *z*anaïjīš.xāraía (10.18c)**

The form of this word which can be inferred from the manuscripts’ evidence is Geldner’s *ana.xāraía*. If it is right, it is a hápax legómenon in Avestan to be analysed as *z-an-ā-xuaraa* “with no food”. In such case, *ana* would be interpreted like “*an-ā* in Av. *an-a-bdāta*- “nicht (mit dem Hemd) bekleidet”, Av. *an-a-bdāti*- “Sichnichtbekleidet mit - , Nichtanziehen (des Hemds)”, Av. *an-a-maraždiča*- “erzärmungslos”, Av. *an-a-saxta*- “der den Ablauf der (bestimmten) Zeit noch nicht erreicht hat”, Av. *an-a-spəranab*- “Unvollständigkeit”, Av. *an-a-zəða*- “noch nicht geboren”, Av. *an-a-šita*- “unbewohnbar”, Av. *an-a-haxta*- “der nicht berechtigt (geeignet und ermöglicht) 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<ïjìš>.xāraída*.

In V 10.18c this supposed *ana.xāraía* is followed by a *dvanda* 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 Mazdā says that the water is pure after removing the impurity caused by Nasu, and then it can be drunk by both flock and men: *pasca. nasānuo. nižbärəți. pasca. āpə. parahiixti. aēša. āfš. yaoždiia. bauuaiti. vasō. aišiš.xuaraía. pasubia.vīraesībia. hamaàia. yada. paraciit “Nach der Entfernung der Leiche (aus dem Wasser) und nach der Ausschöpfung des Wassers, ist dieses zu läuternde Wasser nach Belieben trinkbar für Vieh und Mann genauso wie zuvor” (Cantera under preparation A 6.32, 38, 41).

The syntagm *aišiš.xuaraía. pasubia.vīraesībia* in V 6.32, 38 and 41 is parallel to the syntagm *ana.xuaraía. pasu.vīra* in V 10.18c. The only differences would be the negative *an-*, the preposition *a* added to *xuaraía* instead of *aišiš*, and the use of an “ungrammatical” *dvanda* compound *pasu.vīra* in V 10.18c instead of the

1137 This parallel seems to have been noticed at least by the scribe of P5. Actually, only the manuscript P5 attests the variant pasubiia.vīra instead of pasu.vīra. On one hand, the dual pasubiia.vīraebiibia 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 pasubiia 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. aįji → Phl. abar in V 2.30, 2.38, etc.; Av. aįji.gati- → Phl. abar-rasišn in V 8.4; Av. aįji.varša- → Phl. abar-warzišnib in V 5.14, ec.; Av. an-aiji.pixta- → Phl. an-abar-zad in V 7.29; Av. an-aiji.āruti- → Phl. an-abar-drōzišn in V 65.11; Av. an-aiji.avastra- → Phl. an-abar-wastarag in V 8.10; Av. an-aiji.vārmīta- → Phl. an-abar-wārān in V 6.50; Av. an-aiji.srauana- → Phl. an-abar-xšūd in V 3.40; Av. an-aiji.štasi- → Phl. an-abar-ravišnib in V 18.30-31, etc.
In Avestan it is attested either separate or as a *dvandva* compound in dual\textsuperscript{1139} in the following passages:

a) Separate: Y 31.15 (\textit{pasūš. vīrāačā}), Y 45.9 (\textit{pasūš. vīrōng}), Y 58.6 (\textit{pasūš. vīrōng}).

b) *Dvandva* compound in dual:
- Gen. \textit{pasuva.vīra}: Yt 13.10, 43, 44, Vr 7.3.

\textit{Av. yaoždā}. + \textit{mašiīāi}. + \textit{aipī. zāḍem}. + \textit{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. \textit{Av. yaoždā}.

   The first problem of this word concerns its interpretation either as an adjective \textit{Av. yaoždāb-} or a root-noun \textit{Av. yaoždā-}.

   Bartholomae (1904 1236) thought that an adjective \textit{Av. yaoždāb-} “vollbringend, vollkommen machend” was attested in the Nom. Sing. \textit{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 & Skjærvø (1991 2.199), Pirart (1995 416) and Cantera (under preparation A 5.21) considered that \textit{Av. yaoždā} is the Nom. Sing. of a root-noun \textit{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 \textit{nomen agentis} or a \textit{nomen actionis}:

   - \textit{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 & Skjærvø 1991 2.199).
     - “mit (Lebens-)Kraft versehen” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.420).
     - “die Läuternde” (Cantera under preparation A 5.21).

   - \textit{Nomen actionis}:
     - “perfection (or purification)” (Schmidt 1975 2).
     - “vitalization” (Insler 1975 287).
     - “préparation” (Pirart 1995 416).

\textsuperscript{1139} When the dual is used in these compounds, both elements of the formula show a dual ending, also in oblique cases (Duchesne-Guillemin 1936 44-45), (Szemerényi 1980 227), (Hintze 1994 184).

\textsuperscript{1140} \textit{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. akōdā- “who creates evil things”.
- Av. ašaunuastādā- “who gives sanctity”.
- Av. azrazdā- “infidel”.
- Av. azūiti.dā- “who gives invigoration”.
- Av. ʰusadā- “who gives the sources”.
- Av. gaiio.dā- “who gives life”.
- Av. xədrō.dā- “who gives power”.
- Av. cagdā- “who gives a present”.
- Av. ʰcihrdā- “who gives bright things”.
- Av. puṭrō.dā- “who gives sons”.
- Av. baēsazādā- “who gives the cure”.
- Av. fraxštī.dā- “who gives supplication”.
- Av. waḍjō.dā- “who gives flocks”.
- Av. ħūrānō.dā- “who gives ħūrānah-”.
- Av. vaŋhazdā- “who gives the best”.
- Av. vaŋhūdā- “who gives good things”.
- Av. ruauazdā- “who gives liberty”.
- Av. zrazdā- “faithful”.
- Av. huauayhō.dā- “who gives prosperity” (Kellens 1974 201-220).

Only Av. mazdā- “Wisdom”, Av. adā- “oblation” and Av. viūdā- “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. yaož-dā-, namely Av. yaoždādra- and Av. yaoždaiti- “purification”, and a third one from the same root as Av. yaož°, namely Av. yaošti- “purification” (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 2.125). Accordingly, although we cannot rule out that it was a *nomen actionis*, the interpretation of Av. yaoždā- as *nomen agentis* seems more likely.

The second main problem of Av. yaoždā- concerns its first element yaož° < yaoš. As an independent word, Av. yaoš is attested only in Old Avestan, concretely in Y 43.13 (kāmabīiā. tōm.mōi. dātā. dārgabīiā. ʰyaoš. yēm. vā. naēciṣ. dārēšt. iē), 44.9 (kādā.mōi. yqm. yaoš. dānqm. yaoš. dānē) and 46.18 (yē. maibīiā. yaoš. ahmāi. ascīt. vabīštā). 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. yós(-).

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 ṭiayuš-/*iayuš-, which would be a “Kompositionsform neben ṭiayuš-”. This ṭiayuš- would stem from IE. ṭiayuš-, where -ा- is a laryngeal; it is the same form which would give Lat. īūs as well.

Taking for granted the connection between Lat. īūs, Ved. yós(-) and Av. yaoš Dumézil (1948) equated Av. yaoždā– with Lat. īūstā facere “to perform the ceremonies called denicales feriae”. According to him, both originally meant “to purify from defilement by death”. Nevertheless, he did not state precisely how Av. yaoždā must be interpreted morphologically.

According to de Bie (1955 146), the Indoiranian form which appears as *

yóuš- in composition was not *

yóuš- < *yauHš-, but IIr. *yauš- < IE. *yeyoš-. In his opinion, Lat. īūs, which would stem from IE. *yóuš-/*e-/ ś-<, was related.

Duchesne-Guillemin (1970 210) proposed a different etymology. He (1970 206) firstly said that Av. yaoždā could stem from IE. *yeyes- < IE. *yey- “young” and be related to Skr. yosā- “woman” and Sogd. ʾynu < *iavnikā- < *iavnikā- < *iayanikā- “young woman” (Duchesne-Guillemin 1966 74). But finally he (1970 210) admitted that it was related to Lat. īūs, which would stem from IE. *yeyes- “fitting; that is exact, unmixed, pure” < IE. *yey- “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. yós(-) or with Lat. īūs.

Schindler (1975 266) interpreted Av. yaoždā- as IIr. *iáuš ḍhā- < IE. *iéy-s ḍhēj- “Heil setzen, heilwirkend machen”. He thought that Lat. īūs probably stems from IE. *iéyos, but he did not specify whether or not this Latin word is related to IIr. *iáuš. According to him, this IIr. *iáuš would be present in Av. yaoždā and Ved. yós(-), which he translated as “Heil!”.

Previously most scholars had thought that Lat. īūs, Ved. yós(-) and Av. yaoš were etymologically related and had interpreted Av. yaoždā- in Av. yaoždā– as an accusative of the verb dā-. But Szemerényi’s (1978) study about Av. yaoždā and Ved. yós(-) 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. yaoždā and Ved. yós(-), nobody knew what Ved. yós(-) 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. āiin- and Ved. āyu- 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. īūs.
syntagm *daragabiiā. yaoš* in Y 43.13 demonstrates. He denied that Lat. *ius*, stemming from IE. *yegos* and having a different meaning, was related to Av. *yaožo* and Ved. *yōś(-)*, and reconstructed the paradigm of the latter ones as IE. *yājū-*(direct case) / *yous / *yējī. Already Thieme (1951 176) had suggested that Ved. *yōś(-)* was connected with Ved. *āyir-*, but did not define exactly how.

b) Concerning syntax, he discarded the interpretation of Av. *yaožo* in Av. *yaoždā*- 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 strength and afterwards developed into the idea of cleansing and ritual purification in YAv. *yaoždā*- as most of its contexts demonstrate.

Szemerényi’s study about Av. *yaožo* and Ved. *yōś(-)* has gone unnoticed for Narten (1986 199, n.22), who follows Schindler (1975 266).

Also Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (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. *āiiu*- “duration, lifetime, age”, they (1991 2.188) translate Av. *yaoš* as “of use, useful” in Y 46.18 and Ved. *yōś(-)* as “welfare”1144. 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 & Skjærvø 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. *yaož-dā*- 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 member1144. 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. *āiiu*- attests another exception which could support Szemerényi’s (1978) explanation: Av. *yauuaē*. Actually, this dative of Av. *āiiu*- is used as a first element of compound in Av. *yauuaēji*- and Av. *yauaēśū*- (Bartholomae 1904 1266), (Duchesne-Guillemin 1936 127), (Narten 1986 260),

1144 Surprisingly, Szemerényi (1978 166) quotes Lat. *lucri 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 & Skjærvø (1991 2.188) slip from this Latin example when translating Av. *yaoš*?

1144 Duchesne-Guillemin (1936 127) said that Av. *vāxš.bratii*- and maybe Av. *bāzuš.aojab*- 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. *yauuaē* is an exception.

All the scholars agree about the interpretation of Av. *yauuaē* as the dative of Av. *āiiu*- 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. *yaoz* as the genitive of Av. *āiiu*- and the first element of this compound must be accepted, because it is parallel to the exceptional use of the dative Av. *yauuaē*. Accordingly, I interpret Av. *yaozdā*- as “who endows with life force”. I cannot explain, however, why only Av. *āiiu*- is used in genitive and dative as a first element of compound in Avestan.

2. Av. *+mašiāi*.

Concerning the ending of Av. *+mašiāi*, three readings have been proposed: 1. *āi*; 2. *āi*; 3. *āu*.

The first one, represented by Geldner’s (1896) *mašiāi*, was considered by Narten (1982 112) as the most likely one because of the parallels of V 5.21 and V 10.18, where *āi* is the most attested variant. Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.177, 2.199) eventually adopted the variant *+mašiāi* and translated it as “for mankind”, that is, as a Dat. Sing.

However, Humbach (1959 1.139) corrected it by *+mašiāi*. 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 *+mašiāi* in V 5.21, although he said that *+mašiāi* is to be preferred in Y 48.5 because it represents the *lectio difficilior*. While Kellens (1974 204) and Schmidt (1975 2) interpreted *+mašiāi* 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 *+mašiāi* designated here the man, and that a metrical argument lacks.

The third reading *āu* is only present in Pirart (1995 416-417), who conjectures a Loc. Sing. *+mašiāu* from Av. *maśidiu*-, although he is not sure of this emendation. Its main problem is that it cannot be supported by the manuscripts’ evidence.

In my opinion, *+mašiāi* 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 Vidēvdād. Secondly, there is no need to correct the well attested variant *āi* by the non-attested one *+mašiāu*. Thirdly, that we should prefer a Dat. Sing. *āi* in V 10.18 is corroborated by the parallel syntagm Av. *yaozdāitiš* +*kaṇāici* in V 10.19a. Actually, Av. *+kaṇāici* is placed in the same position as Av. *+mašiāi*, while Av. *yaozdāitiš* in V 10.19a is a variation of Av. *yaozdā* in V 10.18d. Fourthly, Av. *+vahištā* is accompanied by a dative in other Old

\[\text{[1145]}\] The same ending of Dat. Sing. –āi was adopted by Smith’s (1929 134) *+mašāi*, following Bartholomae (1879). This reading, however, cannot be supported on the basis of the manuscripts’ evidence.
Avestan passages, like in Y 31.1 (avīštā), 35.3 (avīštā. ... ubōibīā. ahubīā), 47.5 (aśāunē. ... avīštā) and 48.3 (vaēdmnāi. avīštā). Therefore, *mašītāi seems the most likely choice.

3. Av. *aipi. zədəm

There are two main problems regarding these words: a) the syntactic relation between Av. aipi and zədəm; b) the morphology and meaning of Av. zədəm.


Smith (1929 134), Morgenstierne (1938 260) and Lommel (1971 149) followed Bartholomae (1904 85) in translating *aipi.zədəm as “the future birth”. Moreover, Morgenstierne (1938 260) added the parallel of Yidya-Munjī vəzā xo “womb, pregnant (animal)”, which according to him would stem from *upa” or *api-zədə-. Because of this parallel, Morano (1987 945) agrees with Morgenstierne (1938 260).

Dumézil (1969 35, n.1), following Bartholomae’s (1904 85) emendation Av. +aipi.zədəm, compared it with Gr. ἐπιγονή and accordingly translated it as “descendance”. 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. *aipi.zədəm as one word. As they noticed, there is no Indoiranian *āpi + Acc. Accordingly, Av. aipi. zədəm 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. *aipi.zədəm as a preverb plus verbal noun, following Morano (1987 945, 990). However, they do not specify that, although there is no Indoiranian *āpi + 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. aipi. zədəm 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. aipi like Ved. āpi can stand in front of or after the noun to which it refers. Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 1.177, 2.199) think that Av. aipi refers to Av. zədəm and translate them as “also birth”.
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. aipī from Av. zāðəm. According to him, Av. aipī refers not to Av. zāðəm but to Av. +mašiāī. Following Bartholomae (1904 83), he states that Av. aipī usually modifies the previous word in Avestan.

Regardless of the interpretation of Av. aipī, all the authors consider that Av. zāðəm stems from Av. zā́də- “begetting, birth” (< Ir. *jan(H)ā-), a noun in –ā- from the root Av. zan- “to beget, to give birth” (cf. Ved. jan- “to beget, to give birth” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.567-569)). Only Insler (1975 91, 287) interpreted Av. +aipī.zāžəm as an adverb with suffix –ām 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. zā́də-. 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. viṣpanām. *aśiṇām. *xṣudrā. yaoždaātī. yā. viṣpanām. *hārišinām. zādāi. garoža. yaoždaātī “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.tē. zāðəmc. *vaxṣaṭomca. azəm. iəa. frasnauieni. frā.tē. kəhrpomca. +təuniśimca. yaoždaānī. koronaomi. diṇaṃ. hacat.puṭraṃ. hacat.pənmanuṇaṃ “I will cleanse here your birth and growth, I will endow with life force your body and strength, I will make you rich in children, rich in milk”. Obviously in these parallels Av. zā́də- 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. zā́də- appears as Acc., but in Y 65.2 as a Dat. On the contrary, in V 21.6, 10 and 14 Av. zā́də- 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-sna- “to cleanse” instead of Av. yaoždā-, which however appears in the following and parallel verbal syntagm frā.tē. kəhrpomca. +təuniśimca. yaoždaānī.

4. Av. +vahištā.

This word was interpreted by Bartholomae (1904 83) as a Nom. Sing. feminine referred to Av. cistōiš. 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 excellent”. 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. *vahīstā agrees with Av. yaoždā in Y 48.5, V 5.21 and V 10.18.

Phl. ay 「daēnäm. aŋhuuäm.」 har dō ēk (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).
“You, righteous, must purify your (religious) conscience, for thus there is for everyone of the material life purification of this, of his own
conscience, righteous, [b] (for everyone) who purifies his conscience by means of good thoughts, good words and good deeds.”

| a | dyn’ xpyck | yrwd’slynty ME | ytwν’ OLE | AYT’ yrwd’slyh | kt’l-c-HD | hw’ y ‘st’wmnd | ZK y | NPSE dyn’ pyck’ | b | MNW | ZK’ y |
|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|——|
| K1, D62, F10, B1, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) | y ‘pyck; P2 y ‘ck; E10 ‘pyck y |
| K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 QDM |
| K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ‘w’ |
| K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P2 yrwđ’sl |
| K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp); F10 ——– | B1, M3 kt’l-c-HD y |
| K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp); P2 ‘st’wmnd; F10 ‘st’wmnd; B1 ——–, M3 ——– |
| K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); D62, P2, F10 — y — |
| K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) hwys; P2 ——– |
| K1, P2, E10, L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) dyn’ y |
| P2, G34, T44, (Jmp); L4, D62, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 MN (F10A - W) |
| L4, G34, F10, T44, B1, M3 above the line; D62, P2, P10, (Jmp) — y —; E10 OD PWN |
| L4, G34, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3, P2 AMT; F10, E10, L4a, (Jmp) hwmt |
| G34, T44, E10, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, L4a, (Jmp) — W — |
| B1, M3, L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, P10, (Jmp) hwmt; P2 ——–; G34 ——– |
| L4, G34, T44, E10, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ——– |
| B1, P10, L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, (Jmp) hwls; E10 hwls; M3 hwls’ |
| L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, P10, M3 daenam; E10 daenam; B1 daenam. w; (Jmp) abyhuam |
| K1, L4 (L4a ——–), D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 abyhuam; (Jmp) daenam |

Av. āraziu(j) (10.19a-b)

Av. āraziu(j) was interpreted either as an adverb or as a Voc. Sing. It was considered as an adverb by Geldner (1884 14). Bartholomae (1904 355, n.1) followed Geldner and said that the interpretation of this word as a Voc. Sing. referring to Zaraṭuštra 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. āraziu(j) as the Voc. Sing. of Av. āraziu- “straight, righteous” (cf. Ved. ājju- “gerade, richtig” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.252-253)). Moreover, according to Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø (1991 2.96), the Voc. Sing. āraziu(j) “O straightforward one” always refers to Zaraṭuštra in Young Avestan. In order to support his interpretation, they add the parallel of RV 2.27.9 yjae marṭya(y)ya “to
the straightforward mortal”, where Ved. ṛjū- does not refer to the path, as usual, but to a mortal.

I agree with their interpretation of Av. ārəzuuō as the Voc. Sing. of Av. ārəzu- “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. ārəzuuō 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) airiiamanm. xē. išīm. mazištām. mraomi. spitama. vispaṭaṇ. ārəzuuō. srauuaṅgām “I recite to you the Airııaman Išii, o Spitama, the most powerful, o righteous, of all the formulas”. Actually, like in V 10.19a, in FrW 4.1 Av. ārəzuuō is placed in the midst of a syntagm in genitive. Therefore, though rare, it is not exclusive of Vīdēvdād. Furthermore, the presence of the preceding vocative Av. spitama confirms Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø’s (1991 2.96) statement, according to which Av. ārəzuuō refers to Zaraϑuṣṭra.
10.20. ə yaḏā. ahū. vairīū. ṣadā. ratuš, ṣaṭṣit. hacā. vaṣīhū. mazdā. manayḥā. šiādānaṃ. ahū. mazdā. šaḏrīm. ahū. yā. yim. drigūīu. dadaṭ. vāśartm. (= Y 27.13) 1183
kōm. nā. mazdā. maunatē. 1184 pauium. ṣaḏā. bhiat. mā. ṣagūmā. didāroītā. ṣenaṃ. hā. ṣahmāt. aṭraṣcā. manayḥascā. yāit. šiādānaṣcā. aṭom. ṣroaštā. ahūr. tām. mōi. ġuštum. daṇṇaṃ. frauauoč. (= Y 46.7) 1191
kō. vāvādram. jā. pāi. sōxhā. yōi. hōnti. cīdā. mōi. ḍam. ahūmībī. rātum. cīdī. at. bōi. vōhū. sraośo. jāntū. manayḥā. mazdā. ahūmāi. yahmāi. vaśi. 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-) ya đậmā; L1, P1, L2, G42. Mf2, K9 yaDelimiter.
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 ahū. Mf2, K9 abī
L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10. T46, (G); P5, M3 vairīū. ywk; K2 vairīū. /tā / yek (in NP); L1 vairīū (ik in Pāzand); B2, G42 vairīū. 1; R278, L5, FK1 vairīū (ak in Pāzand); P1 vairīū (jak in Pāzand); Br1, L2, E4 vairīū (yak in Pāzand); Mf2, K9 vairīū. /ywkw gpwt’

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 néc....”
(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”.

1185 K2, F10, E10, P10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); P5 ahū. Mf2, K9 abī

1186 K1, D62, P2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. L4. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); P5 mazdā. mazdā. K2, G34, T44 – mazdā –

1187 vid. (Insler 1975 B3): “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, 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”.

1188 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! Ô guérisseur 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 wishest”.
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[a] ʾhlʾdyh 1203 'pʾtyh 1204 y 1205 pʾhlwm AYT 1206
[a] abāiyh abādīh i pahlom ast
[a] Truth is the best prosperity.

1194 vid. (Pirart 1995 418-419).
1195 vid. (Kellens 1984 120) and (Pirart 1995 418-419).
1196 L4 aenī; K1 māmāračiši; G34 māmāračaeni; T44 māmārceni; P10 māmāramanī; (P10a above the line -n- instead of -m-, -i- before -n-); (G) māmārcaeni. Regarding the emendation Av. ʾma. ʾmāračiša, vid. (Kellens 1984 166, n.10) and (Pirart 1995 418-419).
1197 D62. FK1, (G); L4 āstuwałiti; K1. Br1 āstuwałiti; G34, T44, P10 āstuwałiti; F10 āstuwałiti
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 ʾala'be; L4a ʾala'be
1199 vid. (Wolff 1910 134, 367): “Schütz uns vor dem Feind, o Mazda und seine heilige Ārmatay! (Ver)schwinde daēvische Drug, (ver)schwinde daēvaentstamme, (ver)schwinde daēvageschaffene, (ver)schwinde daēverzeugte! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde völlig, o Drug, im Norden sollst du verschwinden, nicht sollst du die stöffliche Welt des Aša zunichte machen!”
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 ʾašūm
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 & 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”.
1203 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; K2 šāā / 'hl'd'yh; F10, (Jmp) | 'hl'd'yh ... AYT | 1204 T44, E10; L4, G34 W 'pʾtyh; K1, D62, K2, B1, P10, M3 | 'pʾtyh ... AYT |; P2 'pʾtyy
1205 T44; L4, P2, G34, E10 | y | 1206 L4, G34, T44; P2 AYT; E10 'st'
Report of the Dēnkard
Dk 8.44.51 [M 782.1-2; K43b 128.5-6]

*abar pērōzgarib i yādābuwērayrō pad druz zadārib ud bēšāzēnārib*

About the victory of the *yādābuwērayrō* for the destruction of the *druz* and for the healing.

\[\text{y'dcdhw m plght bwn}^{1207}\]

\[\text{y'zadabom fragard bun}\]

Beginning of the eleventh book

11.1. | a| pəɾəsat. zaradhūstrō. 1209 aburōm. 1209 mazdām. 1212 məniiō. 1213 spêmista. 1214 dátarə. gədənəm. 1215 astuuaitingam. 1216 aśāum. 1217 | b| kuda. tənām. 1218 yəzədaññi. 1219 | c| kuda. 1220 ātəm. 1221 kuda. 1222 āpət. kuda. zgm. 1223 kuda. 1224 gəm. 1225 kuda. uruwañnt. 1227 kuda. nərm.

1207 L4, D62, F10, M3; P2, T44, E10 | y’cdhw m plght bwn | P5, K2 | plght y’cdhw m bwn | G34 
y’cdhm plght bwn; B1 | y’cdhw plght bwn | P10 | y’cdhw plght bwn | L1, B2, R278, T46 | P1 
parəgət. yəzədabōm; Br1, L2 | 11 | parəgət. yəzədabum | G42 | pəɾəgət. yəzədabum. 11 | plght y’cdhw bwn | E4 | 11 yəzədabum. pəɾəgət. 11 | L5 | pəɾəgət. yəzədabum; FK1 | pəɾəgət. yəzədabum. bwn; Mf2, K9 | y’c’dhw plght bwn

1209 L4, K1, D62, P2, K5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G); E4, L5 zaradhūsərō

1212 L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10 | B2, T46 | Mf2, K9, (G); P5 | aburəbe

1213 L4, K1, D62, G34, P10 | B2, T46 | Mf2, K9, (G); T44 | aburəməzda; B1 aburəməzda

1214 L4, G34, T44 | məniiō. | aśāum |; | K1, (G) | tā | məniiō. | astuuaitingam |; | D62, B1, P10 
tā | məniiō. | astuuaitingam |; | P5 | məniiō |; | B2, T46 
K9 | məniiō |; | Mf2 | məniiō

1215 K9, P5 | B2, T46 | Mf2 | spêmista

1216 Mf2; P5 | gədənəm |; | Mf2; gađənəm |; | T46 | gađənəm |; | K9 | gađənəm. astuuaitingam | |

T46; P5 | astuuaitanqam |; | B2 | astuuaitanqam |; | Mf2 | astuuaitanqam

1218 K1, P5, K2 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5 | Mf2, K9, (G); L4, T44, E10, M3 |

\[aśāum |; | P2 aśāum\]

1219 K1, D62, P5, K2, F10, E10, P10, M3 | L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); L4, T44 | Mf2, K9 namān |; | P2, G34, B1 | B2, R278, E4, L5, FK1 namān

1219 K1, (G); L4, P2, G34, T44, E10 | L1, B1, L2, L5, FK1 yəozədədāmə; D62 yəozədədāmə; P5 yəozədədāmə; K2 yəozədədāmə; F10 yəozədədāmə; B1, M3 yəozədədāmə; P10 yəozədədāmə; T46, G42 yəozədədāmə; L1, B2, R278, P1 yəozədədāmə; E4 yəozədədāmə; Mf2, K9 yəozədədāmə

1220 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 kūdā

1221 L4, K1 | L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 | Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | Mf2, K9, (G); D62 kōda

1222 L4, K1 | T46, P1 | Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | K9 zgm | B1 kūdāzgm

[a] Zarādūśtra asked Ahura Mazda: “O Ahura Mazda, most beneficent 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 rightous 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?”

[a] pwrsyt1230 zltwšt1241 MN 'wrmzd AYK1232 'wrmzd mnynwg 'pzwnyk d'tl y1243 gyh'n' y1234 'st'wmnd'n' 'hlwb' [b] cygwn PWN m'n' ywśd'slynm1245 [AYK OD

| 1224 | 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, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); G34 - kuđa. gnm - |
| 1225 | L4, K1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34a in the right margin, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 gnm |
| 1226 | L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); K1, B1, P10 (but P10a ʿurwār̄. kuđa above the line) - kuđa. ʿurwār̄. - |
| 1227 | L4 . T46, P1. Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10a above the line, M3 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 ʿurwār̄.; K9 ʿurwār̄. |
| 1228 | L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | R278, T46, G42, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); E10 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1. Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 nārikām |
| 1229 | L4 . T46, P1. Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 nārikām |
| 1230 | K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10 (but P10a ʿō- above the line), M3 | L5, FK1, (G); L4 ašaonim; G34 ašaonim (G34a above the line ʿō- instead of ʿō-); E10 ašaunānim; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1. K9 ašaonian; Br1, L2, G42, E4 ašaonian; Mf2 ašaonim |
| 1231 | Mf2, (G); L4, D62, K2, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 strōš; P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10. E4, FK1 ʿaršū; L5 ʿatarūš |
| 1232 | L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1. Mf2a above the line, K9, (G); E4 hiuara |
| 1233 | L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2a above the line, K9, (G) |
| 1234 | 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); F10 anayara; B1 ana.yra; E4 anayara; L5 ana.gara |
| 1235 | L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L1, B2, P1 . Mf2, K9 ʾarṣū |
| 1236 | 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 viśpe |
| 1237 | Mf2, (G); L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, G42, E4, L5, FK1. B1 voḥi; L2 ʾam; K9 ʾam |
| 1238 | L4, D62, P2, K2, F10, P10 (but P10a ʿhe above the line), M3 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); G34, T44. L5 mazdašītabe; E10 mazdašīti; B1 mazda.āta |
| 1239 | F10, T44, M3; L4, P5, G34, B1 | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, G42, (G) aša.cīdra; D62, P2, K2 aša.cīdra; E10 . Br1, FK1 . Mf2, K9 aša.cīdra; P10 aša.cīdra; L2 aša.cīdra; E4 aša.be.cīdra; L5 aša.cīdra |
| 1240 | P2, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 ː pwrsyt ... 'hlwb' ː |
| 1241 | P2; (Jmp) zltwšt |
| 1242 | P2; (Jmp) ː AYK ː |
| 1243 | P2 ː y ː |
| 1244 | (Jmp); P2 ː y ː |
| 1245 | L4, K1, P2, G34, T44, B1, E10, M3, (Jmp); D62, F10, P10 ywśd'slym |
airime. ] 1264 LA 1267 YHWWN- 1268] [AYT' MNW 'anusō. 1269 YMRWN-yt 1272] [cygwn PWN 1274 'ths 1275 cygwn PWN MYA cygwn PWN zmýk cygwn PWN gwpnd cygwn PWN 'wlwl cygwn PWN GBRA y 1276 'hlwb' 1277 cygwn PWN 1278 n'ylk y 1279 'hlwb' cygwn PWN 1280 sl 1281 cygwn PWN 1282 m'h cygwn PWN hlwbšy' cygwn PWN ZK 1283 y 1284 sl lwšnyh 1285 cygwn PWN hlwp 1286 tyh 1287 y 'whrmzd d't MNW MN 'hl'dyh pyt'kyh

[a] pursid zarduxš asked Ohrmazd: “O Ohrmazd, bountiful Spirit, Maker of the material creatures, Righteous |b| how shall I purify the house [so that it does not become 'airime. ] [there is (a commentator) who says 'anusō. ] , [c] how (shall I purify) the fire, how the water, how the earth, how the cattle, how the plants, how the stars, how the moon, how the sun, how the endless lights, how all prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth?”
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. And he must celebrate the Wandīdād ceremony and recite the Avesta and take the (introductory) prayer so as Zarduxš asked Ohrmazd: “how shall I purify the house, [so that it does not become airīme.]

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 Pārsī 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] porosat, zaradustro, ahuram mazdam. ahura. mazda. mainio. spinya. datara. gerdanam. astuwaitinam. asaum.  

[b] kuθa. nmam. yaozdadami  

cun. pad. mān. yaozdadranam. [kuθa. airmam. na. bāt. hušt. anušo. guit.]  


1271 Dhabhar (1912 34) edited <wndydʾt W>, which must be <wndydʾt’. cf. the variant <wndydʾt> in Supp. Snš 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. airime was wrongly written here.

1273 Dhabhar (1912 35) edited <W cygwn> in all cases, but the comparison with the text from Vīdēvdād makes clear that we must not edit <W>.

1274 Phl. ʾswknyd is a transliteration of Av. ašaonī-

1275 Dhabhar (1912 35) edited <ngl>, which surely comprise <ngl> or maybe <ʾngl y>.  

1276 As the text of Vīdēvdād demonstrates, <cygwn PWN ʾngl lwšn’> is a gloss which explains <cygwn PWN ZK y ʾlwšnyh>.  

1277 Dhabhar (1912 35) edited <ʾhlʾdyh>, like W and BK, but he preferred in the footnote <ʾpʾtyh>, as it is written in Vīdēvdād.  

1278 For the meaning and passages of wāz grīstan 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 ʾ. airiṣmā, isiiō 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.
Pārsī 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 「anušo.」], |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 Pārsī and Pāzand translation follows the PT of Vīdēvdād together with its glosses, but not that of NM.

Av. strāš (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 1.120, 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. gātūm.bē. ni-had- in V 9 and 16 is a terminus technicus for the isolation of somebody who is considered a source of impurity

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”.
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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 yōǰdārīh kardan frēzwānīg būd čē ān kār ēdōn awizīrīnīg kū ān kē abar rist kū rēman būd ēstēd ā-š star-iz ud māh ud xvaršēd abunsandīhā padiš tābhēnd ēwōn frayādīnīg kū meh šnāyēnīdārīb ī ātaxš ud āb ud zamīg ud gōspand ud nar ī ablalw ud nārīg ī “ablalw” padiš ast

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 ohrmazd bēšīd ud kāst ud šaspēnīd bawēd
3. čīyōn gōwīhēd pad dēn kū ōy tan ī rist kē-š nasuš abar dwārīd ēstēd ī anusō. zī. spitama. zaraďuṣṭra. aēša. yā. paiti.irīsta. auuaṭ. hūuār. ā.tāpaite. anusō. hāu. mā. anusō. auue. stārō. / ...

2. As the ancients have said: “When someone ceases to celebrate it (the barešnūm 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 <lsyt’>, but I think that we must prefer here <ʾlyst’>, Phl. rist.

1283 I follow Kanga’s (1975 29) emendation, who read kū instead of the ka written here.

1284 Dhabhar (1912 18) edited <ʾy>, 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 <ʾlyst’>, not only because of the context but also because of the variant <lsyt’> in MR and J, which surely corresponds to <ʾlyst’>, namely Phl. ristag “corpse”. This erroneous reading <lsyt’> can be explained from the script of the united characters y+s (220).

1287 I follow Dhabhar’s (1912 18) interpretation, who related Phl. <ʾspynyt’> with NP. تُسبِب “leaping, absence”, and I translate “gone astray” because of the context.
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 + yōjdāsrēnīdan (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 + yōjdāsrēnīdan, yōjdāsrēn-. V 7.16 (Av. bā. mē. āpō. yaoždaättī → Phl. ān ān āb yōjdāsrēnēd), 9.1 (Av. tanūm. yaoždaiddīan → Phl. tan yōjdāsrēnēd), 9.37-38 (eight times Av. DO + yaoždađō → Phl. DO + yōjdāsrēnēd), 21.6 (Av. kohrpača. tuxisīmca. yaoždađānī → Phl. kirb <ud> tuxišn yōjdāsrē<na>m), N 55.1 (Av. ātrasca. tīsrō. draxtī. yaoždađāt → Phl. ātāxī sē xraxt yōjdāsrēnēd) and 56.1 (Av. āstrasca. aŋhuu. draxtim. yaoždađat → Phl. ātāxī ēk xraxt yōjdāsrēnēd).

Complements with pad of the verb Phl. yōjdāsrēnīdan, yōjdāsrē- indicate means of purification, e. g.: V 5.21 (Av. huuam. ayhuuam. yaoždāite. humataišca. buxtaišca. huwarštaišca → Phl. ān ān āb yōjdāsrēnēd pad humad buxt huwaršt), 8.36 (Av. huuam. tanūm. pairi.yaoždaidīta. gūš. mašmana. āpāca → Phl. ān ān āb yōjdāsrēnēd pad gūmēz pad-iz āb) and Dd 31.10 (pad ān ān āb abardom šōyisniḥ pad ān ān āb yōjdāsrēnēd az gast reḥag “through that supreme washing with molten metal, they become purified from the horrible deceit” (Jaafari-Dehaghi 1998 103)). The periphrastic structure yaoždađram. barānī instead of yaoždađānī in V 19.12, where Av. kuđa. narīm. ašauamōt. yaoždađānī. kuđa. nāirikam. ašaonīm. yaoždađram. barānī is translated by Phl. ėyōn mard ā abhə̄lāw yōjdāsrē<na>m ėyōn nārig ā abhə̄lāw yōjdāsr āb barəm, also does not attest this rare use of an intransitive Phl. yōjdāsrēnīdan, yōjdāsrē- with pad.

The direct object of Phl. yōjdāsrēnīdan, yōjdāsrē- 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. yōjdāsrīh. Actually, in V 3.39 Av. naua bé. asti. yaoždađram “and there is no purification for it” is translated by Phl. uđ nē őy ast.
"yōjāsrīh [pad ruwān] “and there is no purification for it [for the soul]”⁴. Furthermore, the syntagm Av. yaozdāta + noun is systematically translated in V 11.2 by Phl. yōjāsrīh pad + noun, where Phl. yōjāsrīh pad + noun must be understood as “purification for + noun”.

Phl. pad + noun + yōjāsṛṇidan, yōjāsṛṇn- instead of the expected syntagm noun + yōjāsṛṇidan, yōjāsṛṇn- “to purify + noun” could apparently be explained as a contamination due to the influence of the correct syntagm Phl. yōjāsrīh 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 ʰōy druz pahikārēm ...

Av. aša.ciдра- → Phl. az ahlāyīh paydāgīh (11.1c)

There is a problem regarding the PT of the second element of this Avestan compound, namely ‘ciдра-’, 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. ciдра-: ¹ciдра- “offenbar, klar, sichtbar” and ²ciдра- “Same, Ursprung”, and considered unlikely that both words were etymologically one and the same. As far as Av. aša.ciдра- is concerned, Bartholomae (1904 240) translated it as “der seinen Ursprung im Aša hat”, because he explained the second element of this compound from ²ciдра- “Same, Ursprung”, vs. ¹ciдра- “offenbar, klar, sichtbar”. Also Wolff, who translated this syntagm as “alles mazdāhgeschaffene ašaentstammte 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 Mazdā having their seed in Truth”, accepted Bartholomae’s explanation.

More recently, Pirart (2009 244-245) has continued Bartholomae’s (1904 586-587) ²ciдра- “Same, Ursprung”, since he understands Av. ašciдра- as “(astres) Apciдра (=qui sont apparentés à l’eau [ou de nature hydrique])”, Av. zamasciдра- as “(astres) Zmciдра (=qui sont apparentés à la terre [ou de nature terreuse])” and Av. gaociдра- 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. spicio “I see, I behold”). According to Gershevitch (1967 213-214), the polysemy of Av. ciдра- is also inherited by some Middle and New Iranian words. Regarding Avestan compounds with ciдра- as second element, Mayrhofer (1977 I/28-29) hesitated whether it meant “Glanz, glanzvolle Erscheinung” or

⁴ cf. the use of Phl. yōjāsrīh pad ruwān “purification for the soul” in the glosses of V 5.21c and 10.18d.
“Same, Herkunft” in the personal name ātāra.cīdra- of Yt 13.102\textsuperscript{1299}, that is, he accepted that both meanings existed.

Other scholars only took into account \textsuperscript{1}cīdra- in their interpretations of some Old Iranian compounds, although they did not deny that \textsuperscript{2}cīdra- existed. Schmitt (1982 IV/22) stated that the Lycian personal name kizza-prīna- stems from OP. \textsuperscript{2}cīca-farnā, where OP. \textsuperscript{2}cīca- < Pr. \textsuperscript{2}cīdra-, and translated it as “mit strahlendem Glanz”, namely by \textsuperscript{1}cīdra-. Also Gignoux (1986 268) and (2003 85) thought that the first element of the Middle Persian compounds čihr-ohrmazd and čihr-burzin stem from OIr. \textsuperscript{1}cīra- “resplendissant”. In the Avestan compound gacīdīra-, Kellens (1996 86) interprets the second element as “caractéristique-remarquable” or “marque-distinctive”, that is, as \textsuperscript{1}cīdra-.

However, Soudavar (2006) went one step further. He denied that Av. \textsuperscript{2}cīdra-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. \textsuperscript{2}cīdra-.

Like Soudavar and Panaino, I think that Bartholomae’s \textsuperscript{2}cīdra- “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) \textsuperscript{2}cīdra- “origin” is motivated by the Pahlavi exegesis of this word in compounds.

Av. aša.cīdra- is translated by Phl. kē az ahlāyīh paydāğīh “whose manifestation (stems) from Truth”. This translation indicates that the Pahlavi translators understood that the right meaning of Av. \textsuperscript{3}cīdra- in this compound was “manifest”.

Nevertheless, the PT of other Avestan compounds whose second element is \textsuperscript{3}cīdra- disagrees with this interpretation. In several compounds, Av. cīdra- was interpreted as “origin, seed”, as their PT töhm mag demonstrates: Y 58.1 (Av. hucīdīra- → Phl. hūtōmhmag), Vr 16.1 (ātārš.cīdīra- → Phl. ātāxī töhmmag), Yt 3.8 and 3.11 (Av. azicīdīra- → Phl. azdahāg töhm\textsuperscript{1296}), Yt 3.8 and 3.11 (Av. vəhrkō.cīdīra- → Phl. šagur ud gurg töhm), Yt 3.8 and 3.11 (Av. bizangrō.cīdīra- → Phl. dō-zangān töhm\textsuperscript{1297}), Yt 3.15 (Av. ażicīdīra.ażicīdrōtma- → Phl. azdahāg töhm meh azdahāg töhm), Yt 3.15 (Av. vəhrkō.cīdīra.vəhrkō.cīdīrōtma- → Phl. šagur ud gurg töhm meh šagr ud gurg töhm), Yt 3.15 (Av. bizangrō.cīdīra.bizangrō.cīdīrōtma- → Phl. dō-zangān töhm meh dō-zangān töhm), Yt 6.4, Ny 1.14, V 5.62, 8.80 and 18.76 (Av. tomascīdīra- → Phl. tom töhm\textsuperscript{1292}), V 8.21, 9.27-28 and 10.20 (Av. daēnuō.cīdīra- →

\textsuperscript{1299} In the parallel Av. huuara.cīdra- of Yt 13.98, however, Mayrhofer (1977 I/52) did not hesitate, because he translated it as “Sonne-prächtig”, that is, he thought that \textsuperscript{1}cīdra- was implied.

\textsuperscript{1296} In Yt 3.9 Av. azicīdīranam remains untranslated.

\textsuperscript{1291} In Yt 3.12 Av. bizangrō.cīdīranam is not translated.

\textsuperscript{1292} Dhabhar (1927 20) read tom tomīgān in Ny 1.14, but U3, U4, D, Mf2 and DR attest <twhnk’n>, which must be corrected by <twhmk’n> and surely contains the right reading tō<b>magin.\textsuperscript{1293}
Phl. dēw tōhmag, V 8.75 and 18.52 (Av. ātra.cišra- → Phl. ātaxš tōhmag), V 13.16 (Av. spacišra- → Phl. sag tōhmag), V 21.13 (Av. afš.cišra- → Phl. āb tōhmag\(^{1293}\)), Vyt 56 (Av. raēuuascišra- → Phl. rāyōmand tōhmag) and HN 2.9 (Av. raēuuascišra- → 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.cišra- → Phl. viš-čihr), S 1.13 (Av. afš.cišra- → Phl. āb čihr(ān); but AK, E āb tōhmag\(^{1294}\)), S 2.13 (Av. afš.cišra- → Phl. āb čihrag; but AK, E āb tōhmag), S 1.13 (Av. zamascišra- → Phl. zamig čihr(ān); but AK, E zamig tōhmag), S 2.13 (Av. zamascišra- → Phl. zamig čihrag; but AK, E zamig tōhmag), S 1.13 (Av. urwarō.cišra- → Phl. urwar čihr(ān); but AK, E urwar tōhmag) and S 2.13 (Av. urwarō.cišra- → 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. cišra- by two different words, but this does not imply that the Avestan word was polysemic. Therefore, in my opinion, the meaning of Av. \(^2\)cišra- “origin” can be rejected.

\(^{1293}\) The same Avestan compound, however, is translated as Phl. āb čihr(ān) in S 1.13.

\(^{1294}\) Sometimes tōhmag(ān) and čihr alternate. This is the case of HN 2.9 too, where the gloss [kūš tōhmag az yazdān] after rāyōmand tōhmag is a mere stiltical variation of the epigraphic Middle Persian kē čihr az yazdān.
11.2. |a| įaš. mrao. 1295 aburo. mazdā. yaoždādrum 1296 srūnaiūioš. 1297 zaradnutra. |b| yaoždāta. 1299 pascaėta. 1302 bun. 1301 nmāna. 1302 |c| yaoždāta. 1303 atrom. 1304 yaoždāta. 1305 apnm. yaoždāta. 1306 zm. yaoždāta. 1307 gm. 1309 yaoždāta. 1310 urnuaram. 1311 yaoždāta. 1312 narm. ašauanam. 1313 yaoždāta. 1314 nairikm. 1315 ašońim. 1316 yaoždāta. 1317 strōš.
yaoždāta. 1319 māŋhman. 1320 yaoždāta. 1321 hnuara. 1322 yaoždāta. 1323 anyaŋra. 1324 raocā. 1325 yaoždāta. 1326 viṣpa. 1327 yowh. 1328 mazdaŋh. 1329 aṣa.citra. 1330
[a] And Ahura Mazda said: “you shall recite the (formula of) purification, Zarathustra. [b] Then the houses will be purified[131], [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 Mazda
which (have) the brightness of Truth (will be) purified.”

[AP-š gwpt 'wṛhmzd AYK ywšd'slyh 1332 sl'dšn' zltwhšt' 1333 [AYK
ywṛtdywdʾt-HD 1334 BRA YDBHWN] [b] xywšd'slyh 1335 AHL YHWWN-yt PWN m'n' [c] ywšd'slyh 1336 PWN 'thš ywšd'slyh 1337 PWN MYA ywšd'slyh 1338 PWN[[[955]]]
And Ohrmazd said: “the (formula of) purification must be recited, Zarduxšt [that is, celebrate a Juddēwdād]. |b| Then there will be purification for the house, |c| purification for the cattle, purification for the plant 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
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] āagt. mrao. aburō. mazdâ. yaoždādram. srāuuaiiōiš. zaraʔnušira.

And Ohrmazd said: “the (formula of) purification must be recited, 
Zardušt [that is, celebrate the Juddēwdād].

[b] yaoždāta. pascaēta. bun. nmāna

Then there will be purification for the house, 

[c] yaoždāta. ātrəm.1370 yaoždāta. āpəm. yaoždāta. zm. yaoždāta. gəm.
yaoždāta. wruuəxəm. yaoždāta. nəxəm. aʃəuașəm. yaoždāta. nəxirikəm.
aʃəoini. yaoždāta. strəm. yaoždāta. mənəhəm. yaoždāta. həuəra.
yaoždāta. anəγra. raocə. yaoždāta. višpa. vohu. mazdaʔata. aʃa.ɕiθra.

Pārsi translation:
[a] And Ohrmazd said: “the (formula of) purification must be recited, Zardušt [that is, celebrate the Juddēwdād].

[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 
Av. yaoždātər 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 yōjdaś, which agrees with the variant Phl. yōjdaś, is used instead of 
Av. yaoždātər, which would fit the variant Phl. yōjdaś of L4 and the manuscripts of 
its group.

Av. yaoždādram. srāuuaiiōiš (11.2a)

Among all the texts where Av. yaoždādram- “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. yaoždāta in the right margin.
Phl. srāyiśn (11.2a)

All the PV manuscripts agree in the variant <slʾdšn'>. However, this seems to be a corruption from the oldest reading <slʾdyh>, 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-š guft ohrmazd kū yōjdāsriḥ srāyē zarēxšt [kū wandidād-ē bē yaz] yōjdașr 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 <slʾdyh>, which surely corresponds to a 2nd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Act. <ȳh>, namely srāyē\(^\text{1371}\). The variant <slʾdyšn' ȳ> in the manuscript MR of NM fits with the variant <slʾdšn’> in Vīdēvdād except for the ezafe, which could imply a wrongly written Phl. srāyiśnīh.

It seems that <ȳh> was confused by the scribes with <š> along the written transmission. This supposed <š̄> was the source of the interpretation of this Pahlavi 2nd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Act. <ȳh> 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 سرایشنش. However, the attested variant <slʾdyh> srāyē seems to be the oldest translation and here the correct reading, as it translates exactly the Avestan 2nd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Act. srāuuatōiš.

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.

\(^{1371}\) For the optative forms preserved in the old Pahlavi of the PT vid. (Cantera 1999a 187-193).
11.3.  \( a \) \( abu. \) \( vairiio. \) 1372 \( vaco. \) \( drnjaiioi. \) \( yoi. \) 1373 \( ayrh. \) \( vardvajioio. \) \( tammta. \) 1379 \( baeszazioi. \) \( tammtca. \) 1376 \( parca. \) \( abuna. \) 1379 \( vairiio. \) \( abu. \) \( vairiio. \) 1381 \( abu. \) \( rat. \) \( asht. \) \( hac. \) \( varh. \) \( dazd. \) \( manavar. \) \( sovar. \) \( abr. \) \( abr. \) \( ym. \) \( drig. \) \( dad. \) \( vair. \) \( m. \) 1383 \( vairiio. \) \( tanum. \) 1385 \( part. \) \( abu. \) \( vairiio. \) \( rat. \) \( asht. \) \( hac. \) \( varh. \) \( dazd. \)

kō. vāstārmjā. ḏā. pūī. sōngbā. yōi. hmti. cidhāi. mūi. đam. āhimbī. rațiūm. cidhī. at. hōī. vohū. sraosō. jāntūi. manathyāi. mazdāi. ahūmāi. vahši. kahmāiçit. (= Y 44.16)


[‘ytwn’ 1399 ZNE gwbśn‘ dlncynyt 1400 MNW HWE-d pylwcbcītwm ṣ 1401 W byş‘cynytltwm 1402 |b| 5 ‘hwnwl 1403 pr‘c 1404 sl’dśn 1405 ‘yḥwlyywk 1406 [5 1407 BRA YMRWN 1408举行了] |c| ‘hwnwl 1409 tn 1410 ‘p’nyk 1411 ‘l’d 1412 [‘ywkyh 1413 W 1414 TWWB 1415] [a] edōn ēn gōwśin dranjėned kē hēnd pērōzgartom ud bēsăzenidārōm [b] panj ahunawar fraž śvāyišin yađāhūwayryō [panj bē gōw] [c] ahunawar pad tan pānagih rāy [ēk ud did] [a] Thus you will murmur these words, which are the most victorious and most healing. [b] Five Ahunawar must be pronounced: yađāhūwayryō [say it five (times)]. [c] “The Ahunawar (is recited) for the protection of the body [once and one more time].”

1398 = V 9.27 and SrB 1; cf. Yt 13.20 too.
1399 P2, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 | ‘ytwn’ … byş‘cynytltwm | 1400 P2; (Jmp) YMRWN-yh | 1401 P2; (Jmp) | W | 1402 P2; (Jmp) byş‘cynytltl | 1403 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp) ‘hwnwl | 1404 L4, G34, T44, E10, (Jmp); K1, D62, F10, B1, P10, M3 PWN; P2 PWN pr‘c | 1405 M3; L4, K1, P2, G34, F10, E10, P10, (Jmp) sl‘dšnyk; D62 sl‘dšnyk; T44 sl‘dšnyk; B1 sl‘dšn | 1406 M3; L4, G34 ‘yḥwlyyw; D62, P2 ‘yḥwlyyw ‘F10 ‘yḥwlyyw ‘T44, E10 ‘yḥwlyyw ‘B1, P10 ‘yḥwlyyw ‘ywk; (Jmp) ‘yḥwlyyw ‘ | 1407 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3, (Jmp); B1 6 | 1408 L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 | 1409 L4, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3; G34 | 1410 F10, T44, (Jmp) YMRWN; E10 YMRWN-yt | 1411 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp) ‘hwnwl PWN | 1412 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp) | ‘hwnwl PWN | 1413 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp) | P‘n | 1414 L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; G34 ‘p’ngy; E10 ‘p’nyk; (Jmp) ‘p’nykyynt | 1415 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp) | ‘l’d | 1416 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp); F10 W‘ywky | 1417 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp); F10 T44 ‘W | 1418 L4, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); D62, P2, F10 TWWB
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:

\[|a|\text{ aṭa. imā. vācō. drṃjaioiś. yō. aṭhān. tā/ pačca. ahuna. vairiīa. frasrāṇaiioiś. yaṛā. ahū. vairiīo.} \]

\[|b|\text{ abhunm. vairīm. tanūm. pāṭī. ahunauuar. pa. pāṇ.gī. tan. rā. yak. daṭ.} \]

Pārsī and Pāzand translation:
[a] Five (Ahunawar) must be recited: \text{yaṛāḥḥuwayrīō} [it must be said five (times)].

“The Ahunawar (is recited) for the protection of the body [once and one more time].

|b| ahun am. vairīm. tanūm. pāṭī. ahunauuar. pa. pān. gi. tan. rā. yak. daṭ.\footnote{Kemnā mazdā to the end aṣābe by name.}

The Srōš Bāǰ as a formula of purification

In V 11.3 the recitation of five \text{yaṛāḥḥu} is prescribed as a formula of purification.\footnote{In the Sūdgar Nask, according to Dk 9.2.7 [M 787.17; K43b 139.1-2], five Ahunawar are prescribed to remove the druz: \text{panj kē o druz bē barisniḥ “five (Ahunawar), when (it is) to remove the druz”}. Also according to ŠnŠ 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: \text{panj ke o wināh wizārdan šawēd druz bē barisniḥ rāy ē pādīfrāh pad dastwarīh ī ēn panj kē sāyēd wizārdan mānbed wisbed <zandbed> debed ud zarduxštrōtom u-ś ašemwobū <ud> ahunawar panj pad sar bē gōwiśn}. 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 ašemwobū (and) the Ahunawar five (times) in the beginning.\footnote{Here it is written Pārsi 5 prāj śṛāyīṃ, that is, “Five (Ahunawar) must be recited”.}

\[\text{yaṛāḥḥuwayrīō is a helper against the dīwān and a bodyguard.} \]

\footnote{The Pāzand translator inverted the Pahlavi word-order of Phl. \text{pad tan pānagib rāy} and wrote Pāz. \text{pa. pān. gi. tan. rā}, which turned into Pahlavi would be \text{*pad pānagib tan rāy}. Moreover, he omitted the conjunction Phl. \text{ud} in the gloss ēk ud did and wrote Pāz. \text{yak. daṭ}.}

\footnote{The Maker Ohrmazd has prescribed to Zartušt that the \text{yaśā-ḥḥu-wayrīō} is a helper against the dīwān and a bodyguard.}

\footnote{Regarding the combination of the Srōš Bāǰ with the prayers \text{kām.nā. mazdā (Y 46.7), kā vartōsom.jā (Y 44.16) and the formula pāta.nō (…) (V 8.21).} vid. Cantera’s (unpublished) communication “Daēuas vertreibende Worte”.}

\footnote{Dadar Aormozd Zartušt Faramōde Est kā pāzāh-wobūro Zowar Doewonstāt W Pəsə̄ba Tən.}

\footnote{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. *drəŋjaiiōiš* → Phl. *dranjēnēd*

The PT of V 11.3a only appears in P2, where Av. *drəŋjaiiōiš* 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. *drəŋjaiiōiš* 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.

---

یشت سروش پنج ایثاهووریبو میبايد خواندن

For the ceremony of Srōš five *yasāhūwayryō* must be recited.

142 vid. other PTs of Av. *drəŋjaiiōiš* in the parallels of V 9.27 and Hōsbām 1 in (Cantera 2004 167-168, 233).
11.4. | a | imãt, ntãnt. | x'aoz'adami. | imã. | at. | vaco. | fra'mañua. | b | at. | mà. | yañã. | bünduu. | pafree. | maziöstó. | yã. diu'diis. cixšuša. aša. mazdã. vay'bi. aða. gaidi. mói. a'mói. arapã. ahũa. vobû. aoi. vidã. manayhã. (= Y 49.1) | c | imãt. átrem. | x'aoz'adami. | imã. | at. | vaco. | fra'mañua. | d | ahũa. | dũa. |

1421 D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, T44 ntainm; R278, E4, L5, FK1 ntainm
1424 Mf2, (G); L4, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 . T46, L2, G42, L5, FK1 yaoz'adami; R278, P1 yaoz'adami; Br1 yaoz'adami; E4 yaoz'adami; Mf2 yaoz'adami; K9 yaoz'adami; (G) yaoz'adami
1425 Mf2, (G); L4, K1 imam; D62, P2, P5, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . FK1 imam; K2, F10 . L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 imã; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1 imat
1426 L2, G42, E4, FK1; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3  iða; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1 - aт - ; L5 . Mf2, K9, (G) aða
1428 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
1430 L4 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, P10 . R278, FK1, (G) fra'mañua; G34, B1, M3 fra'mañua; E4 fra'mañua; L5 fra'mañua
1431 L4, K1, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 aða
1433 L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62 mà. mà; P1, L5 atñã
1435 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, G42 . Mf2 yañã; K9 iñãñua
1436 L2, L4 binduu; K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, G42, E4 binduu; P5 binduu; T46 bünduu; P1 . Mf2, K9, (G) bünduu; L5 bünduu; FK1 bünduu
1437 Mf2, K9, L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G) pafree; F10 pa,frae; L5 pava; FK1 pafree
1439 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 maziöstó
1441 vid. (Insler 1975 95): “Yes, throughout my lifetime I have been condemned as the greatest defiler, who I try to satisfy the poorly protected (creatures) with truth, Wise One. If requital is good, come to me and give support to me. Through good thinking find a means of destruction of this”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.171): “Le (mavais) chef Bândua s’emplit depuis toujours de mon grain, alors que moi, je cherche à choyer les ... avec Harmonie, ô Mazdã. Œ divine présentation, viens vers moi, aide-moi! Trouve par la divine Pensée un moyen de le réduire en cendres!”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.179): “The chieftain Bándva has stuffed himself with my barley. (Come to me), O Wise One, (to me) who try to satisfy the ill-herded (cows) with truth. Come to me (as personified) good apportionment, (and) support me! Effect his death with good thought!”

1442 L4, K1, K2, G34, B1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2, P5, F10, T44, M3 . E4, L5, FK1 átarem; E10 átarem; P10 átarem; R278 átarem
1444 L4, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 yaoz’adami; K2 yaoz’adami; L1, T46, P1 yaoz’adami; B2 yaoz’adami; R278 yaoz’adami; E4 yaoz’adami; FK1 yaoz’adami; Mf2 yaoz’adami; K9 yaoz’adami; (G) yaoz’adami
1446 T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); L4, K1 imam; D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10 . FK1 imam; K2, F10 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 imã; P5 mimmã; M3 à imã |
1448 R278, E4, L5 . L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 iða; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G) aða; FK1 aða
1449 L4, K1, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2 vaca; FK1 1440
aθrō. ẓārēnā. ẓārēnā. 1444 paouruiē. 1445 pari. jasāmaide. 1446 mazdā. 1447 abhrā. ẓā. ẓā. māni. māni. spēnītā. ẓā. ẓā.  ṣā. axtō. axtō. dāji. (= Y 36.1) 1448
[a] “If I want to purify this house, then pronounce these words:” | [b] at. mā. yauu. hē. bōndun. ẓā. māzō. tī. cixīn. ẓā. māz. ṣā. bī. ṣā. gādi. mō. ẓā. axtō. abhā. ẓā. axtō. voh. (= Y 49.1) | [c] “If I want to purify this fire, then pronounce these words:” | [d] abhā. ẓā. aθrō. ẓārēnā. ẓārēnā. ẓā. pari. jasāmaide. mazdā. abhrā. ẓā. māni. māni. spēnītā. ẓā. ẓā. axtō. axtō. dāji. (= Y 36.1)

[a] [AMT] ʿytwn. PWN mnʿ. ʿywšd. slyny. 1445 ADYN. ZNE. 1445 gwbš. 1445 prʿ YMRRWN. 1445], [b] ʿytwn. L. 1445 hmʿ. OD. 1446. OL. 1446. ZK. 1446 bytwn. 1446 zmʿ. <ʿnkhy mhst [AYK-m. OD. tnʿ. y. psynʿ. >hʿmʿ. y. ʿnkhy. 1445. <ʿy. dʿmʿ nʿ. krt.ʿnʿ] [AYTʿ. MNW. ʿytwn. YMRRWN-ʿyt. 1461. y. ʿhmʿ. y. >AYK. KON. 1462. MNW. 1463. BYN. YTWN-ʿt. 1464

1441 L4, K1, T44. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42. K9. D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. T46. Mf2, (G) framrūns; G34. E4, L5, framrūns; FK1 framrūna
1442 D62, P5, K2, G34a in the right margin, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. B2, R278, T46, G42, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, L4, P2, G34. Br1, L2, E4, (G) abe; L1 abhā. abe; P1 abe. abe
1443 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 ḍā
1444 K1, P2, P5, B1, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, G42, L5. Mf2, K9, L4, G34, (G) vārēnā; D62 vārēnā; K2, P10 vārēnā; F10 vārēnā; T44 =vārēnā; E10 vārēnā; R278, Br1, L2, FK1 vārēnā; E4 vārēnā
1445 L4, G34, T44, E10. FK1 paorriō; D62, P2, K2, F10, B1, P10, M3. (G) paorriō; P5 paorriō; L1, P1 paorriō; B2, T46 paorriō; R278, Br1, L2 paorriō; G42 paorriō; E4 paorriō; L5 paorriō; Mf2, K9 paorriō
1446 L4, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3. R278, L2, G42. Mf2, K9, (G); D62, P2 pari. jasāmaide; P5 pari. jasāmaide; T44. B2, T46, P1, Br1, E4, FK1 pari. jasāmaide; E10 pari. jasāmaide; L1 pari. jasāmaide; L5 pari. jasāmaide
1447 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, L4, (G) mazdā
1448 vid. (Narten 1986 40): “Mit der Gemeinde dieses Feuers hier nahen wir dir zu Beginn, o Weiser Herr, dir samt deinem heilvollsten Geist, der ein Übel für denjenigen ist, den du für das Übel bestimmst”; (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.134): „Avec le clan fondamental de ce feu, nous te servons, ô Maître Mazdā, (et nous) te (servons) avec ton état d’esprit très bénéfique, qui est pourtant une douleur pour celui que tu veux soumettre à la douleur”; (Humbach & Elfenbein & Skjærvø 1991 1.145): „Primarily we attend Thee, O Wise Ahura, with the community of this fire, (we attend) Thee with Thy most prosperous spirit, which is pain(ful) to the one whom Thou mayest seize for pain(ful treatment)”.

1449 D62, F10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp); L4, G34, E10 ʿywšd. slyny; P2 ʿywšd. slyny; T44 ʿywšd. slyny
1450 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp); F10 ZNE ʿy
1451 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp); K1 gwbš. ʿBRA
1452 L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp) YMRRWN
1453 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp) YMRRWN
1454 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp) YMRRWN
1455 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34a under the line and in the right margin, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. (Jmp) YMRRWN-ʿyt
1456 To be restored, following IM (Jāmāsp 1907 434).
I have preferred not to edit following IM (Jāmāsp 1907 434), which omits it.

This text is rendered into Pāzand in MU 1.611.2-11 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):

[a] imāt. nmānem. yaūzdādāne. imā. iḍā. vacō. framrauua.
ki. idūn. pa. mān. yaowzdādāranā. ayy. in. guuṣi. pārāj. guua.

[b] at. mā. yawā. bōdumī. pafūrā. mazišī.ō.
idūn. ham. tā. āni. bitim. zomān. hōmā. xpanīgī. 
dō. mān. kirdan. hast.
ki. idūn. guuṣī. ki. nīn. kā. ādar. maṭ. ḫā. ūt. bōhāram.

ki. idūn. pa. ātē. yauzdādāranā. ayy. in. guuṣi. pārāj. guua.

iin. ōi. tu. ātā. pordum. pa. varowzī. bi. varowzm. ńowzmādā. pa. pahrozī. vaownāsidār.

| 1404 | L4, D62, P2, G34a above the line, f10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); G34 ŠBKWN-mlink | T44 ŠBKWN-mlink | E10 ŠBKWN-mlink |
| 1405 | K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); L4, G34, T44, E10 AMT |
| 1406 | L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Imp); P2 YATWN-yt; M3 YATWN |
| 1407 | L4, D62, B1, P10, M3 LA ŠBKWN-ţi; P2, E10, (Imp) ŠBKWN-ţi; G34 ŠBKWN-ţi; F10 ŠBKWN-ţi; T44 ŠBKWN-ţi. I have preferred not to edit <LA> following IM (Jāmāsp 1907 434), which omits it. |
| 1408 | L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); P2 ZK ’thā; F10 ’tās |
| 1409 | L4, K1, D62, P2, G34a above the line, f10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); G34 ŠBKWN-ţi; | | |
| 1410 | L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); E10 gwub’sn’ |
| 1411 | L4, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); F10 YMRWN |
| 1412 | L4, G34, T44, E10, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp) ’w’ |
| 1413 | D62, P2, F10, P10, (Imp); L4, G34, E10, B1 ’y’; T44, M3 ŠBKWN-ţi; |
| 1414 | L4, K1, D62, P2, G34a above the line, f10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); G34 PWN |
| 1415 | L4, K1, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Imp); D62 YHMTWN-ţi; |
| 1416 | L4, G34, T44, E10, P10; D62, P2 p’hlec’n; F10 phlycs’n; B1, P10, M3, (Imp) p’hlycs’n’ |
| 1417 | MU 1.611.2-11 (Unvala 1922) bānīgī. |
Av. ʰyaoždašāni (11.4a and c)

From V 11.4 onwards there is a surprising change of grammatical person: the 1st. Sing. yaoždašāni instead of the expected 2nd. Sing.

In V 11.3 Ahura Mazda prescribed the recitation of several texts. Since he answers Zarašuštra’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 Zarašuštra 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. yaoždašāni appears and, furthermore, there is no conditional conjunction.

On one hand, the use of Av. yaoždašāni 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: ‘vīzaiādā. magṛ. tōm. aṭ. vō. va. vāiōi. aŋhaitī. apōnām. vācō “(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 yaoždašāni. imq. ʰaṭ. vācō. framrauua” 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. yaoždašāni was translated by the 2nd. Sing. yōḏāsrēnē, instead of the expected 1st. Sing. yōḏāsrēnam used in V 11.1, while the 2nd. Sing. Pres. Imper. framrauua 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. yauvā. ʰbōnduwō. ʰpafre. 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. nmāna-) 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 mānaia- “to think” (Kellens 1984 153), so that there is no etymological relation with Av. nmāna-, 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 psy’n’ hmʾy pʾnkyh y dʾmʾn KN OBYDWN-šn’]
eldo man hamʾ tā ʾān ʾbēdom zamān pānagīh mahist [kū-m tā tan ʾpasēn hamʾ pānagīh ʾī dāmān ʾōh 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’ <pʾnkyh mhst [AYK-m OD tn’ y psy’n’ > ʾhmʾy pʾnkyh <y> dʾmʾn ʾkrtn’] [AYT’ MNW ʾytwn’ YMRRWN- yt ʾy <hmʾ’y> AYT KON MNW BYN YATWN-t HWE-yd ’-t BRA ŠBKWN-ʾmj]
eldo man hamʾ tā ʾān ʾbēdom zamān <pānagīh mahist [kū-m tā tan ʾpasēn> ʾhamʾ pānagīh ʾi> dāmān kardan] [ast ké ʾedōn göwēd ay <hamʾ> kū nūn ké andar ēmand bē ē-t bēʾhilam]
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] [There is (a commentator) who says: “the latter ‘always’ that you have introduced, I will delete it to you”].

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. yauuā not to Av. aiui- “corn” but to Av. aiia- “duration”, so that they translated it by Phl. hamʾ “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 Bṇduua s’emplit depuis toujours de mon grain” and “The chieftain Bṇdva has stuffed himself with my barley” respectively.

Secondly, Av. bṇduuō 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. *2par-* “to fill”, 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)

ʾytwnʾ *w* HNA y LK ʾthš PWN wlcšnʾ pktwm BRA YHMTWN-m ʾwhrmzd [PWΝ pʰlyc ṡnʾdnytʾlyh]

ēdōn ʾēd i tô ātāxš pad warzišn fradom bē rasam ohrmazd [pad pahrēz ud šnāyēndārīh]

V 11.4d

ʾytwnʾ OL HNA <y> LK ʾthš pktwm PWN wlcšnʾ pktwm BRA YHMTWN-m ʾwhrmzd [PWΝ pʰlyc <W> šnʾdnytʾlyh]

ēdōn ʾēd <i> tō ātāxš fradom pad warzišn bē rasam ohrmazd [pad pahrēz šnāyēndārīh]

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. paournīū,*, 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. *pardum. pa. varoznā* reproduces that of Phl. *fradom pad warzišn* in V 11.4d.

Av. *imq. +at. vacō → Phl. ēg ēn gōwišn (11.4a and c)*

Most PV manuscripts attests Av. *iða* in this syntagm, while the VS usually show Av. *aða*. Because of them, Geldner (1896) edited aða. Neither Av. *iða* nor Av. *aða* 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. *aða. imq. vacō* in V 11.3, 8, 11, 14 and 17 are semantically parallel to this Av. *imq. aða. / iða. vacō* and are also followed by quotations of other Avestan texts. However, Av. *aða* is never placed between substantive and its adjective in these passages, so that the unexpected position of Av. *aða / iða* in this syntagm must be explained.

In this regard Lommel’s (1928 140) emendation of Av. *aða* in V 11.4 ff. must be taken into account. According to Lommel, Av. *aða* in V 11.4 ff. must be corrected by Av. *āṭ* to obtain a metric sequence of 8 syllables. In such case, the text of V 11.4 ff. would be *imq. āṭ. vacō. *frāṃrauua.*  

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. + a(a)ł + 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. ašəm. *manaiiā. vahehiā. frauuaocāmā) and 38.1 (iməm. aąt. zəm. gənəbiśi. hadrā. yazamaide) (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 imą. *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. aąa by Av. aą instead of Av. aą. As Kellens & Pirart (1988-1991 2.106) noticed, Av. aą is found after –a in the YH, while in the rest of contexts Av. āt or aą is attested. If Av. āt / aąt, aą present the same distribution in Vīdēvdād, then aąt, aą must be edited. Since Av. aą is attested in some manuscripts, I have preferred to edit aą instead of aąt. Therefore, Av. aąa and iəa are to be interpreted as mistaken forms of Av. aą which slipped into the written transmission.

In the PT of this Avestan structure we find the expected Phl. ēg ēn gōwišn. 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. imą. *āt. vacō. +framrauua can never have been translated by Phl. **ēn ēg gōwišn.

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 o ān i bēdom zamān *hamē pānagih <i> dāman 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:
hamē kū nūn kē andar āmad bē ā-t bē hilam

“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. bē hilam instead of bē nē hilam, the reading of the rest of PV manuscripts. If we accept the correction by means of IM, a Pahlowi 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 bē 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, Ilr. *pyHuīā (Instr. Sing.) > Plr. *pyri̯(i)jā should have yielded OAv. *pauruīā, namely *-iiā\(^{1478}\), but not OAv. paouruiē.

According to Narten (1986 139), the ending –ē in this Avestan word must be interpreted as a Loc. Sing. Actually, Ilr. *pyHuīai > Plr. *pyri̯(i)ja developed into OAv. *pauruīē, with epenthesis of –u- after –r-, and then with metathesis of the group \(^{1479}\) to YAv. paoiriē (cf. for instance YAv. baoiriia- < Plr. *hary(i)ja-). The attested form in Old Avestan is, however, paouriē. The vowels –aou- in this Old Avestan word must be explained as an influence of YAv. –ao-, where \(^{1479}\), because *pauruiia- is expected in Old Avestan.

\(^{1478}\) cf. YAv. hāuuaiia(–ca), hāuuōiia < Plr. *haryīā (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. |a| imat. āpēm. |b| yaozdaḏāni. |c| imat. āt. vacō. 1484
|framatua. |b| apō. |a| yazamaide. |c| maeḵaiaintīscā. bḥbaruuntīscā. frauuaṣe. abruniit. abrubuiit. haunapajbāa. hupraḏāscā. hva, hvaḏāscā. hušnaḏāscā, uºobuiia, abhuuiā. caqamd. (= Y 38.3, 67.6) |c| imat. 1493 zqm. |c| yaozdaḏāni. imat. āt. vacō.
If I want to purify this water, then pronounce these words:

[a] “If I want to purify this water, then pronounce these words:”

[b] apō. at. yazamaide. maękaintišcā. ḥḇuuniatišcā. fraunazayḥū. ahurānīš. aburabia. bauaperayḥā. hupuqiṭišcā. vā. huwu. yadhāšcā. hūšnārāšcā. ubuqibiu. abubriā. cagomā. (= Y 38.3, 67.6)

[c] “If I want to purify this earth, then pronounce these words:”

[d] imqm. at. zam. gōnābiš. ḥadra. yazamaide. ya.na. baraiti. yāscā. tōi. gōnā. ahurā. mazā. aṣāt. ḫacā. vairiā. tā. yazamaide. (= Y 38.1)

[AMT] y'twn' PWN MYA ywsd'slynysd ADYN' ZNE gwbśn' prc YMRRNW [MNW [xvāt. 1511 + tāca. 1512] y'm 1513]
This text is rendered into Pāzand in MU 1.611.12-19 (Unvala 1922),
(Dhabhar 1932 394):

|a| imāt. āṃm. yaoždana. imā. iđa. vacō. framrauua.
ki. iđin. pa. āv. yaoždanaː. agī. īn. guušni. frāj. guu.
|b| apō. aţ. yaz. mākaṃtiści. hōbuwaantiści. frauwažybhō.
āv. iđin. yazm. [ki. xāu. āca. zām.]
|c| imāt. zām. yaoždana. imā. iđa. vacō. framrauua.
ki. iđin. pa. zāmīn. yaoždanaː. aţī. īn. guušni. ki. frāj. guu.
|d| imām. aţat. zām. gōnābī. hābrā. yaz.
in. zāmīn. auuādīgān. yazm. [avā. artā. parvart. imādīgān. nuuš. ngniiehe.]

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
Thus I worship the water(s) /maēkaiṇti/ [exudation which lays on the plants, dew], ḫaēbuuānt [strong flowing] and frauuāz [rainy] too.

V 11.5b
MYA ’ytwn’ YDBHWN-m [MNW ‘xɔːi. +tāca.’] y’m
āb ēdōn yazam [kē ‘xɔːi. +tāca/ jām]
Thus I worship the water(s) [which (are) ‘xɔːi. +tāca/ 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 maēkaiṇtišcā. ḫbuuantišcā. 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. paššing / miznē “exudation / dew”, Phl. garān tazišn “strong flowing” and Phl. wārānīg “rainy”, the translators of V 11.5b chose Pāz. ‘xɔːi “perspiration” (cf. Phl. xwēy “sweat, perspiration”, NP. xwai), Pāz. +tāca (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. paššing / miznē “exudation / dew”</td>
<td>Pāz. ‘xɔːi “perspiration”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫbuuantišcā</td>
<td>Phl. garān tazišn “strong flowing”</td>
<td>Pāz. +tāca “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 żmyk LWTE NKB-’n ’ytwn’ YDBHWN-m ēn zamīg abāg mādagān ēdōn yazam

306
I worship thus this earth together with the women.

V 11.5d
ZNE ẓmyk LWTE NKB-ʾn Y.DBHWN-m [LWTE ʾltʾy plwlt y NKB-ʾn y KBD ʿγνιιεβε. ]
ēn zamīg ābāg mādagān yazam ʿabāg ardā fraward ī mādagān ī was ʿγνιιεβε. ]
I worship this earth together with the women [together with the righteous fraward of the many women ʿγνιιεβε. ]

They attest two divergences, mentioned by Cantera (2006a 62). Firstly, the PT of Y 38.1 translated Av. ʾāa 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. ḡnābīš was interpreted by the commentator of Vidēvdād as the frauuaši- of the women. Nevertheless, using this gloss alone we cannot know whether this Avestan word refers to goddesses, to feminine frauuaši- 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. γνιιεβε. (11.5d)
In the gloss of V 11.5d, Av. γνιιεβε is probably a corrupted and thematised Gen. Sing. gamma of Av. ḡnā-1528, parallel to the thematic Gen. Sing. of Av. ḡnā- in Vyt 50 ɣanahe. 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. γνιιεβε 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 ḡnā- appears in connection with frauuaši- are Y 1.6 and 2.6, but these also shed no light on V 11.5.

1528 For the meaning of Av. ḡnā- in this and other texts, vid. (Narten 1986 189-194).
11.6. | imat. gm. 1539 +yaooždaďäni. 1532 | imat. 1531 +at. 1532 vaco. 1533 +framrav. 1534 | bauue. aıaís. tais. siaodnais. yais. 1539 vabistais. 1539 fračšuamabi. 1540 rämäa. väästromä. dazdai. asurmumattasc. asurnumattasc. xšiuntasc. axšiuntasc. (= Y 35.4) | c | imat. 1542 urruarqm. 1542 +yaooždaďäni. 1541 | imat. 1545 +at. 1546 vaco. 1547 +framrav. 1548 | d | at. 1549 ašiái. 1550

1529 L4: T46, P1. M/2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 gm. 1550 K2, B1, P10, M3; L4 yaooždaďämi; D62 yaooždaďämi; P2, F10 yaooždaďäme; P5, (G) yaooždaďäme; G34, T44, E10. Br1, L2, L5, FK1 yaooždaďämi; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1 yaooždaďämi; G42 yaooždaďämi; E4 yaooždaďäme; Mf2 yaooždaďäme; K9 yaooždaďäme

1530 L4, K1: T46, P1. M/2, (G); D62, P2, P5, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. FK1 imqm; K2: L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. K9 imq; F10 - img -

1532 R278, G42, E4, L5; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, Br1 ida; B2, T46, P1, Mf2, K9; L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. M/2, K9, (G); K1 vaca

1533 L4: L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. M/2, K9; K1, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, (G) framrav; D62, G34, M3 framrav; E4, L5 fra.ravm; FK1 framrav

1535 D62, P5, F10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G); L4, G34 gauui; P2, T44, E10. R278, L5, FK1 gauui; K2 gauui; Mf2, K9 gauui

1536 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9; (G); P5 R278, G42 adaīi; L5 tais

1537 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); G34 siaodnaisi; E15 siaodnaisi; L1, B2, T46. M/2, K9 siaodnaisi

1538 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. E4, (G); L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9

1539 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); P5 vabistai; K2, G34, B1, P10, M3. E4 vabistai; L5 vabistai

1540 L4, D62, P2, K2, B1, P10, M3 fračšuamabi; P5 fračšuamabi; G34 fračšuamabi; F10 fračšuamabi; T44. E4 fračšuamabi; E10. R278, L5 fračšuamabi; L1, B2, T46, P1, L2, G42 fračšuamabi; Br1 fračšuamabi; FK1 fračšuamabi; Mf2 fračšuamabi; K9 fračšuamabi; (G) fračšuamabi

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 1.133): “Pour la Vache ... nous invitons ceux qui écoutent et ceux qui n’écouter 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”.
[b] "If I want to purify these cattle, then pronounce these words:"

[b] "[MT] Hymn."

[b] "If I want to purify these plants, then pronounce these words:"

[b] "[MT] Hymn."

[b] "If I want to purify these tools...

[b] "[MT] Hymn."
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].

Also this text is rendered into Pāzand in MU 1.611.19-612.11 (Unvala 1922), (Dhabhar 1932 394):

\[a\] imāt. gān. yaozdaḏāne. imā. iđā. vacō. framrauua.
\[b\] gāne. aāaš. tāiš. šīaḏnaḏāš. yāiš. vahīštāiš. fraēšūmahāi.
\[c\] gōspandān. c. dāhān. [āv. u. væstr.] qnī. oḵān. xōnīš. marḏum.
\[d\] ašūm. parṁaḏāš. [ki. āqīn. gōspandān. rā. pašūm. kār. in. kīr. bīq. ki. pīaštī. ba. kunanč. uš. āv. u. væstar. doḥaŋt.]
\[e\] imāt. uruaqām. yaozdaḏāne. imā. iđā. vacō. framrauua.
\[f\] ki. dīn. pa. uruwar. yaozdaḏraņāi. dibā. āgi. in. guuḏši. pērāj. guu>

1573 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 YHBWN-t  
1574 K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34 'wlwl'n; T44, E10 'wlwl'n  
1575 P2, F10, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44 ywšd'slynyd. YHBWN-yd; D62 ywšd'slynyd YHBWN-yd, E10 ywšd'slynyd YHBWN-yd; P10 ywšd'slynyd, and P10a YHBWN-yd  
1576 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, (Jmp); K1 BA; D62, B1, P10, M3 BRA; F10 BRA gwbšn  
1577 L4, P2, G34, T44, E10, M3; D62, F10, P10, (Jmp) YMRWN  
1578 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 - y -  
1579 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4a - AMT -  
1580 G34, T44, L4a; K1, D62, P2, B1, P10, M3 TWRAy; F10, E10, (Jmp) - y -  
1581 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  
1582 K2, G34, T44, E10, L4a; D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) whšn'yt  
1583 K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10, L4a AYK  
1584 (Jmp); D62, F10, B1, P10 'pz'dyynt'; P2, G34, T44, E10, M3 'pz'dyynt; L4a 'pz'dyynt  
1585 We must notice that the incorrect writing <KTWN-sn>, instead of the expected and right <kawnš>, kuniš, originates the wrong interpretation of this word as <KRTWN-sn> / KLYTWN-sn>, here Pāzand xōnīš <Phl. xwāndan, xwān>-.
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

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

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. frāmāyišn.

However, the PTs of Y 48.6 and V 11.6d are mostly identical:

Y 48.6
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 tlšk’syh [AMT TWRA y ʾywkdʾt tn’ BRA dʾt] ʾwhrmzdʾ ’lwľ whšynyty [AYK-š BRA ʾpzʾdynyt]
As we observe, the PT of Y 48.6 shows hardly any variation from that of V 11.6d, because it simply writes dād 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: ä. airiūšmā. išīo. rafšōrāi. jaatū. narbiāsā. nāribiāsā. zaraḏūstrate. c) vaŋbūš. rafšōrāi. manaybū. yā. daēnā. varīm. hanāt. miḏdom. d) ašāhūi. yāšā. ašīm. yām. išīq. aḥurō. mašatā. mazdā.

The righteous reward of truth which the Wise Ašāhūi will deserve a desirable prize. I entreat for the invigorating conscience, qui gagne une récompense de choix, l’octroi de l’Harmonie, (octroi) que le Maître Mazdāh zuteilen wird. I want to purify this righteous man, if I want to purify this righteous woman, then pronounce these words: ä. airiūšmā. išīo. rafšōrāi. jaatū. narbiāsā. nāribiāsā. zaraḏūstrate. c) vaŋbūš. rafšōrāi. manaybū. yā. daēnā. varīm. hanāt. miḏdom. d) ašāhūi. yāšā. ašīm. yām. išīq. aḥurō. mašatā. mazdā.

vid. (Wolff 1910 72): “Her komme der liebe Airyaman zur Unterstützung zu den Männern und Frauen des Zarathustra, 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 Zarathustra / 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 enivéré” or “Que la tribu vigoureuse aille au secours! Aux hommes et aux femmes de Zarathustra / 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 Zarathustra, 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”.

[K] y
[*AP-t* ۱۶۳۶] PWN lʾmšn' 'pʾyynd ۱۶۳۷ krtn' ] ZKL n۱۶۳۸ W۱۶۳۹ nʾlyk'n' <y> zltwhšt ۱۶۴۲ c whwmn' lʾmšn' twm ۱۶۴۱ HWE-d [AYK LK-c 'p'y' mtn ۱۶۴۲ AP-t* ۱۶۴۳ PWN lʾmšn' 'pʾyynd ۱۶۴۴ krtn' ] MNW ۱۶۴۵ ZK y۱۶۴۶ dyń ۱۶۴۷ kʾmk 'lć'nyk YHWWN-yt' PWN mzd [y۱۶۵۰ LTME W۱۶۵۱ ZK y۱۶۵۲ TME ۱۶۵۳ ] d| ZK y۱۶۵۴ hʾly dh tkš ۱۶۵۵ hwʾstʾl HWE-d [h wšt ۱۶۵۶ AYK-m PWN ZK ۱۶۵۷ tlšk syh ۱۶۵۸ ] ZK y۱۶۵۹ whrmzd msyh [YHWWN-t ۱۶۶۰ 'mgwpt n ۱۶۶۱ mgwptyh ۱۶۶۲ ]

[۱۶۶۳ L۴, K۱, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); T۴۴ 't AYT ۱۶۶۴ L۴, K۱, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); F۱۰ lʾmšn' ۱۶۶۵ L۴, K۱, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); F۱۰ sn ۱۶۶۶ YHMTWN-sn ۱۶۶۷ L۴, K۱, G۳۴, F۱۰, T۴۴, E۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); D۶۲, P۲, P۱۰ 'pyt; B۱ 'p yt ۱۶۶۸ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); K۱, E۱۰ 't ۱۶۶۹ L۴, D۶۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); P۲ 'pyynd ۱۶۷۰ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, F۱۰, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); G۳۴ ZKL ۱۶۷۱ P۲, M۳, (Jmp); L۴, D۶۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰ + W ] ۱۶۷۲ G۳۴; L۴, P۲, F۱۰, E۱۰ zltwhšt; K۱, M۳, (Jmp) zltwšt D۶۲, T۴۴, B۱, P۱۰ zltwšt ۱۶۷۳ P۲, P۱۰; L۴, T۴۴ lʾmšn' twm; D۶۲ Wlʾmšn' twm; G۳۴, B۱ lʾmšntwm; F۱۰ W lʾmšn'; E۱۰ lʾmšn twm; M۳ lʾmšntwm ۱۶۷۴; (Jmp) lʾmšn ۱۶۷۵ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); G۳۴a above the line krtn'; T۴۴ + mtn' ] ۱۶۷۶ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); F۱۰ 't ۱۶۷۷ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); F۱۰ ۱۶۷۸ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, T۴۴, P۱۰, (Jmp); F۱۰ ṣy ۱۶۷۹ E۱۰ 'p yyynd; B۱ 'pʾyyn'; M۳ 'pʾyyn ۱۶۸۰ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, E۱۰, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); F۱۰ krtn' 'pʾyynd krtn'; T۴۴ lʾmšn' krtn ۱۶۸۱ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); T۴۴ AMT ۱۶۸۲ L۴, G۳۴, F۱۰, T۴۴; K۱ ۱۶۸۳ D۶۲, P۲, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp) + y ] ۱۶۸۴ L۴, K۱, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, T۴۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); F۱۰ BYN ۱۶۸۵ L۴, G۳۴, T۴۴; D۶۲, P۲, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp) + y ]; F۱۰ W ۱۶۸۶ D۶۲, F۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); L۴, P۲, G۳۴, T۴۴, E۱۰ + W ] ۱۶۸۷ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); T۴۴ + y ] ۱۶۸۸ L۴, D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, T۴۴, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); E۱۰ ṭME ۱۶۸۹ K۱, D۶۲, F۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, L۴, G۳۴, T۴۴, E۱۰, (Jmp) + y ]; P۲ OLE ۱۶۹۰ L۴, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); D۶۲ tlškš; P۲ ۱۶۹۱ G۳۴ tlškš; F۱۰ ṭtlškš; T۴۴ + tlškš s ... PWN ZK ] ۱۶۹۲ D۶۲, B۱; L۴, K۱, P۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, E۱۰, P۱۰, M۳ hʾwšt; (Jmp) hʾwwšt' ۱۶۹۳ D۶۲, G۳۴, F۱۰, E۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp); L۴ ZK y; P۲ ZK-t ۱۶۹۴ E۱G; L۴, K۱, G۳۴, M۳ tlškšy; D۶۲ tlškšy; P۲ ṭtlškšy; F۱۰ tlškšy; T۴۴, B۱, P۱۰ tlškšy; (Jmp) tlškšy y ۱۶۹۵ L۴, F۱۰, T۴۴, B۱, M۳; D۶۲, P۲, G۳۴, E۱۰, P۱۰, (Jmp) + y ]; G۳۴a above the line adds hwʾstn' ۱۶۹۶ L۴, G۳۴, T۴۴; K۱, D۶۲, F۱۰, B۱, P۱۰, M۳, (Jmp) bʾ; P۲ bwʾ; E۱G YHWWN-yt ۱۶۹۷ L۴, P۲, G۳۴, E۱۰, M۳, (Jmp) mʾnʾtʾn; D۶۲, B۱, P۱۰ mʾnʾtʾn'; F۱۰, T۴۴ mʾnʾtʾn ۱۶۹۸ L۴, D۶۲, B۱, P۱۰, M۳; P۲ mgwptyy; G۳۴, F۱۰, T۴۴, (Jmp) mʾnʾtyh; E۱۰ ṭmʾnʾ
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 Ėrmān 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).
vid. (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 Mazdâ, dont (cette emprise) fera un pâtre pour les nécéssiteux”; (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”.

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.160): “Qui me désignes-tu comme protecteur, ô Mazdâ, 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 engagez 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".

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! O guérisseur de l’existence (rituelle), fournis-moi le modèle! Et que l’obéissance à ce (...) vienne en raison de la divine Pensée, ô Mazda, à celui, quel qu’il soit, auquel tu veux qu’elle vienne!";

(Humbach & Elfenbein & 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 through into good thought, O Wise One, to him, to whomsoever Thou wishest.”

vid. (Wolff 1910 134, 367): “Schütz uns vor dem Feind, o Mazda und o heilige Ármatay! (Ver)schwinde daëvische Drug, (ver)schwinde daëvaentstamme, (ver)schwinde daëvageschaffene, (ver)schwinde daëvauertzeugte! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde völlig, o Drug, im Norden sollst du verschwinden, nicht sollst du die stoffliche Welt des Aša zunicht machen!”.

L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3; F10 | 8 ... yt’hwwlyywk |; E10 Šv; (Jmp) aθa. imq. vačč. OL gyw’k 8

L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, P10; B1 Šv; M3 Šv; (Jmp) ‛hwňwl

L4, G34, T44, E10; D62, B1, P10 sl’dys; P2 sl’dnşyv; M3 Šv; (Jmp) sl ’b

L4, G34, T44, E10; D62, P10 yt’hwwlyyvw; P2 ‛hwňwl’n; B1 yt’hww’ywyvw; M3 yt’hwwlyyvw; (Jmp) yt’hwwlyyvw

P2, F10, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 9 (G34a corrects it by 8); D62 Š 8

L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3; (Jmp); E10 | BRA |

L4, D62, P2, G34, B1, P10, M3; F10, (Jmp) YMRRWN; T44 YMRRWN-yt; E10 YMRRWN-yt
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: 

ویسپراد در خشنومن اشوان هشت ایتاهوریو

(For the ceremony of) Vīsparad in the Xšnūman of the righteous eight yasabūwayryō (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.

1690 L4, K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10 and M3 continue V 11.8 without PT and also without any strong pause until nasūm.

1690 L4, G34 aēşim; D62, P5, K2, T44, B1, P10 aēşim; P2, F10, M3, (G) aēşim; E10 . L1 aēşim; B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aēşim; L5 aēsim; FK1 aēşim; Mf2, K9 aēşim

1690 L4, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 pārene; E10 pārene; E4 pairire

1690 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 nasūm.  pārene.  Mf2, K9 nasūm

1690 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, (G); E10 pārene; FK1 pārene; K9 pārene

1690 L4, (G); D62, P2, K5, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 . L1, B2, T46, P1 paiti-raēδiže; E10 . R278, Br1, L2, G42, L4 paiti-raēδiže; E4 paiti-raēδiže; FK1 paiti-raēδiže. pārene.  paiti-raēδiže

1690 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); L5 pārene.  FK1 pārene.  pairire

1690 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 pārene; FK1 pārene

1690 L4, K1, D62, P2, K5, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); P5 xru.  L5 xru.  Mf2, K9 xru

1690 L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 pārene; FK1 pārene

1690 L4, D62, K2, B1, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); L4, E10 buųūja; P5, F10 buųūja; G34 buųūja; T44 xruūji.  xruūji.  L1 xruūji.  B2, T46, Br1 xruūji.  R278 xruūji.  L2, G42, E4 xruūji.  L5 xruūji.  L5 xruūji.  FK1 xruūji; Mf2, K9 xruūji

1690 L4, G34, E10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G); D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 . L5 buūde; P5, T44 buūda; K2 bēde; P1 būdi; Mf2 above the line, K9 būiū

1690 L4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); FK1 buūatpāreni

1690 D62, K2, B1, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); L4, E10 buųūja; P5, F10 buųūja; G34 buųūja; T44 buųūja; P10 buųūja; R278 buųūja; E4 buųūja; L5 buųūja; FK1 buųūja; Mf2, K9 buūža

1690 L4, P2 kundi; P5, D62, K2, G34, E10, B1, M3 kundi; F10, T44 kundi; P10 k'nđe; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G) kundi; R278, L5 kundi; FK1 k'u'dine; Mf2, K9 gundan

1690 L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, (G); L4, G34, T44, E10 kundi; D62, P2, K2, F10, B1, M3 kundiža; P5 kundiža; R278 kundiža; T46 yāzairina.  pārene.  buūža.  pārene.  kundiža; L5 kundiža; FK1 kundiža; Mf2 gunduža; K9 gundža

1695 L4, D62, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2 į pārene; B1 pārene; B2, T46 į pārene.  buūža.  yā.  zairina į

1696 P1; L4, K1 buūža; D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, B1, P10 buūža; K2, T44 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 buūža; E10 buūža; M3 buūža; FK1 buūža; Mf2 buūža; K9 buūža; (G) buūža

1696 L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10 . E4, L5, (G); L1, R278, P1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9 yā

1698 Mf2, K9, (G); K1, D62, P5, K2, B1, P10 zairen; P2 zairen; G34 zairen; F10, E10 . R278, P1, L2, G42, FK1 zairen; T44 yāzairina; M3 yāzairina; L4a zaire; L1 zairina; Br1 yāzairina; E4 zairina; L5 zaire

321
[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 Xruuiynī, I fight Būidin, I fight Būidižan, I fight Kuṇḍa, I fight Kuṇḍižan, I fight Būšiāstā the Yellowish. [d] I fight Būšiāstā the Long-handed. [e] I fight Mūžin, I fight Kapasti. [f] I fight the Pairikā, 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] pwltynm ḫyśm 1732 pwltynm 1733 nswš 1736 [LOYN 1735 W 1736 AHL 1737 y 1738 PWN 1739 KN 1740 ptkʾlym 1741 AP-š AHL KN 1742 ptkʾlym 1743 ] [b] pwltynm MNW 1744 PWN hmlyt' [lymn' YHWN-t 1746 YKOYMWN-yt 1747 ] pwltynm 1748 MNW 1749 PWN

---

1723 ġm. 1723 ḫyūmär. [g] parēne. āhitīm. 1725 yā 1726 ātēm. 1728 āpēm. zām. 1729 ġm. 1760 ḫyūmär.

[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 Xruuiynī, I fight Būidin, I fight Būidižan, I fight Kuṇḍa, I fight Kuṇḍižan, I fight Būšiāstā the Yellowish. [d] I fight Būšiāstā the Long-handed. [e] I fight Mūžin, I fight Kapasti. [f] I fight the Pairikā, 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.
ptly; [nym'] YHWWY-t; YKOYMYW-yt; ] c pwltynm; y zhkl; HNA YAYK MNW KBD HLMYN-yt; y dglnd-gwgh; HNA YAYK PWN KRA 1769; YAYSH 1770; YHMWN-yr; [c] /Without PT/ [f] pwltynm ZK 1772; plyk [k'mkhy'; [ZK 1775; wcdys plstkh'], MNW hkwknyt 'ths MYA 1780; zmyk 1781; gwsnd 1762; wwl'; [g] pwltynm ZK; y 'hkwknšn' [p'z'l'n'] 1780; ths MYA 1782; zmyk 1783; gwsnd 1762; wwl'; [h] pwltynm ZK 1772; plstkh', MNW hkwknyt 1770; ths MYA 1778; zmyk 1779; gwsnd 1762; wwl'; 1774; 1773; 1772; 1769; 1764; 1760; 1758; 1757; 1752; 1748; 1747; 1746; 1745; 1744; 1743; 1742; 1741; 1740; 1739; 1738; 1737; 1736; 1735; 1734; 1733; 1732; 1731; 1730; 1729; 1728; 1727; 1726; 1725; 1724; 1723; 1722; 1721; 1720; 1719; 1718; 1717; 1716; 1715; 1714; 1713; 1712; 1711; 1710; 1709; 1708; 1707; 1706; 1705; 1704; 1703; 1702; 1701; 1700; 1699; 1698; 1697; 1696; 1695; 1694; 1693; 1692; 1691; 1690; 1689; 1688; 1687; 1686; 1685; 1684; 1683; 1682; 1681; 1680; 1679; 1678; 1677; 1676; 1675; 1674; 1673; 1672; 1671; 1670; 1669; 1668; 1667; 1666; 1665; 1664; 1663; 1662; 1661; 1660; 1659; 1658; 1657; 1656; 1655; 1654; 1653; 1652; 1651; 1650; 1649; 1648; 1647; 1646; 1645; 1644; 1643; 1642; 1641; 1640; 1639; 1638; 1637; 1636; 1635; 1634; 1633; 1632; 1631; 1630; 1629; 1628; 1627; 1626; 1625; 1624; 1623; 1622; 1621; 1620; 1619; 1618; 1617; 1616; 1615; 1614; 1613; 1612; 1611; 1610; 1609; 1608; 1607; 1606; 1605; 1604; 1603; 1602; 1601; 1600; 1599; 1598; 1597; 1596; 1595; 1594; 1593; 1592; 1591; 1590; 1589; 1588; 1587; 1586; 1585; 1584; 1583; 1582; 1581; 1580; 1579; 1578; 1577; 1576; 1575; 1574; 1573; 1572; 1571; 1570; 1569; 1568; 1567; 1566; 1565; 1564; 1563; 1562; 1561; 1560; 1559; 1558; 1557; 1556; 1555; 1554; 1553; 1552; 1551; 1550; 1549; 1548; 1547; 1546; 1545; 1544; 1543; 1542; 1541; 1540; 1539; 1538; 1537; 1536; 1535; 1534; 1533; 1532; 1531; 1530; 1529; 1528; 1527; 1526; 1525; 1524; 1523; 1522; 1521; 1520; 1519; 1518; 1517; 1516; 1515; 1514; 1513; 1512; 1511; 1510; 1509; 1508; 1507; 1506; 1505; 1504; 1503; 1502; 1501; 1500; 432
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 Būšiaštā, the demon of Sloth. The rest, however, are hāpax legómena, whose grammatical case is problematic.

The answer to this first problem depends on the interpretation of the hāpax legómena, 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. pərənə. 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. pərənə. xru. ... pərənə. kundizha. 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
text added later in the course of the written transmission. In his unpublished communication “Lost in transmission”, Cantera proposes two explanations for the omission of this passage in V 11.9 and 11.12: a) this text only belonged to the VS tradition and was secondarily added to the PV manuscripts when the PT was adapted to the Avestan text of the VS tradition; b) this passage never had a PT in the Avestan tradition; and Av. kapastiš, I have excluded it in the list of V 10, namely ān ī parīg [kāmagīh], ānĩ, attest the PT of this text added later.

A similar problem concerns the sequence Av. pərane. müiō. pərane. kapastiš and its PT. In V 11.9 both are omitted in all the PV manuscripts except P5, K2, T44 and E10, which belong to reformist schools. We do not know whether this Avestan text, together with its PT, was lost in the PV manuscripts due to an omission in their archetype or whether it simply never existed in these manuscripts. Since it is not easy to establish that it is an addition in the VS manuscripts, I have preferred to include it in my edition, as did Geldner (1896). Only the manuscripts F10a, T44 and E10, which belong to the reformist school of Navsarī, attest the PT of this Avestan sequence. As they seem to have created it ex professo, I have included it from my edition, because it cannot be traced back to the archetype of our extant PV.

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-, hām.raēḍya- and patti.raēḍya-, as we have seen, are placed in the same position in both lists. The triad formed by indra-, sauru- and nāyhađīya- in V 10 finds its counterpart in three couples of evil beings of V 11 xru – xruuiyi, būiō – būiōža and *kuṇḍa – kuṇḍiža.

The couple of *taurui- and zairici- in V 10 finds an equivalence in the two *būśiāsta, one called zařina and the other darayō.gaua. I am not able to decide if the latter could refer to *taurui-, but I think that there is an equivalence between the zairici of V 10 and the *būśiāsta. yā. zařina of V 11.

The next couple, that of aēšma- *xruui.drū- and akataša- in V 10, is parallel to that of müiō and kapastiš in V 11, although I do not think them to be equivalent. Apart from V 11, Av. kapastiš 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. kapastiš in V 11.9), aēšma- *xruui.drū- “Wrath of the blood-stained stick” of V 10 could be parallel to kapastiš “foot-soldier (?)” of V 11. That akataša- of V 10 be paralleled by müiō 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 *varanīia 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 *varanīia in V 10 and pairikam in V 11. The Pahlavi translators, however, seem to have interpreted them as equivalents: they translated Av. *varanīia by Phl. warniḏ dw “the demon Lust”, personified as an evil being, and Av. pairikam by Phl. ān i parīg [kāmagīh] “the Parīg [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. waran ud tan-kāmagīh) 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 parīg [kāmagīh]* “the Parīg [Desire]” and thus equated Av. *xvarṇīia* in the list of V 10 with Av. *pairikām* in that of V 11.

Av. *xrū... xruuiyī* (11.9b)

Av. *xrū-* (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. *xruuiyī* was a *hápax legómenon*. It is a compound whose first element Av. *xruui* was used in compounds for *xrūra- “bloody, cruel” (Kellens 1974 157) and is part of a Caland’s system (cf. Gr. *krás* “flesh”, Ved. *kravī-* “raw flesh” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.411)). Its second element is Av. *γni- “smiting, killing” (cf. Ved. *ghnī-* (fem.) 1793, *hân- (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 *xrū* and *xruuiyī* were epithets of the demon of Wrath of the bloodstained stick (av. *aēšma-xruuiydru-*) 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. *xrū* by means of Phl. <hlwydlwš>, which is actually the PT of Av. *xruuiydru-. Regarding Av. *xruuiyī*, he reproduced the same translation, but for Av. *γni* he added Phl. <žnnk>, 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. *xrū* and *xruuiyī* 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. *xruuiydru-.*

Av. *büiöi... büiöija* (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 Dhalla (1994 273), proposed that *büiöi* and the demon *büiöi* in V 19.1, 2 and 43 were one and the same. Moreover, he said that *büiöi* and *büiöja* (sic) were related to the same

---

1792 I disagree with de Vaan’s (2003 260) correction of Geldner’s *xruuiyī* as *xruuiγni*, because all the oldest PV, IndVS and IrVS manuscripts agree in variants with short vowel “*i*” in V 11.9, 11.12, 11.15 and 11.18.

1793 For instance in Ved. *asuraghnī- “killer of Ásuras” and Ved. rakṣoghnī- “killer of demons” (Böhtling & Roth 1855 1.556, 6.222).
root *bū- present in Av. būšiāstā- and explained būtiōja (sic) as būiō + 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 daēuva-, that is, a masculine evil being, and he read it as Av. būiō-.

Nyberg (1938 339 ff.) interpreted Av. būiō as a feminine būiō-and linked it with the root *bayd-, with the meaning “to be conscious”, and supposed that it was a goddess of the oracle, worshipped by the Median tribe of the Bōüdiōi 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 būiō- is a feminine formation with –ī from the root bud-, 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 *bayd-, 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. būiō would be adscribed to an Iranian root *bayd-, 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. būiō means. In order to find out, I have searched for other formations from the same root in Avestan.

Apart from Av. būiō, Iranian *bayd- is attested in Avestan in: a) other nominal formations; b) compounds.

Regarding other nominal formations, with the meaning *bayd- “to smell” we find Av. baodh- “smoke” and Av. baoiōi- “scent, fragrance” (Bartholomae 1904 918). From *bayd- “to perceive, to sense”, the often attested nominal formation Av. baojāt- “consciousness” (Bartholomae 1904 919) is also found. Since both meanings are represented in Avestan, to relate Av. būiō to one of them still seems a problem. If we link būiō with *bayd- “to smell”, we could suppose, because of the daēvīc context in V 11.9, that it is opposed to Av. baoiōi- “scent, fragrance” and that it would mean “stench, stink”. However, there would be no further argument to support this assumption. And if we link būiō with *bayd- “to perceive”, it would have to mean something like “(evil) consciousness, malice” in opposition to Av. baojāt- “consciousness”. No further nominal formations shed light on the meaning of Av. būiō.

Let’s then look to the compounds with the root *bayd- in Avestan. Leaving aside Av. būiōža in the same passage, which seems to be a compound of būiō and ōža, and the possibly corrupted Av. baojāt-baxtīca in Vyt 33, we find three compounds in which Av. baojāt- “consciousness” is the first element:

1. the often attested Av. baojāt-varštā- “maliciously done, wilful (action)”

2. the hāpax legōmenon Av. baojāt-jaitī- 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 Bewuβtsein, vorsätzlicher
Schlagen”, that is “intentional injury”, which surprisingly is Kotwal &

3. Av. baoðajaθ in FiÖ 680. According to Klingenschmitt (1968 199 ff.), Av.
baoðajaθ, translated by Phl. <bwtwzyt>, is a corrupted form from Av. baoðō.jaititi-,
which he translated as “Schlagen mit Bewuβtsein, vorsätzlicher Schlagen”,
according to its explanation in FiÖ 682.

Therefore, Av. baoðō “consciousness” is the first element of the
compounds Av. baoðō.varstå-, Av. baoðō.jaititi- and Av. baoðajaθ.

Since Av. baoðā- “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.
zaæni.buðra- “awake, watchful” (Bartholomae 1904 1652) in V 13.39. Thus, to
complete the sequence only a compound with –ro would be needed in Avestan,
and it could be found in Av. buβi-ža. Since the other members of this system belong to
a root *baurd- with the meaning “to perceive”, we expect that in Av. buïi-ža the
same meaning is applied. Nevertheless, if we accept that the first element buïiō°
of the compound Av. buïi-ža is part of a Caland’s system *buðra- / baoðā- / buïiō°,
we cannot explain why baoðō is also used as a first element of compound. Furthermore, Av. buïi would also remain unexplained in this Caland’s system.

Let’s now turn to the second element of the compound Av. buïi-ža.

Darmesteter (1877 196, n.4) read būiōjaθ, but interpreted it as būiōžā- in his
translations (Darmesteter 1887 142, n.5), (Darmesteter 1892-1893 2.182). Geldner
(1896) also edited būiīža, which was followed by Nyberg (1938 339 ff.) and
Christensen (1941 35). In order to choose between būiīža and būiōjaθ, and also
between kunđīža and kunđija, we must firstly take into account the manuscripts’
evidence.

The graphems z / ż / 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 daojaθ (for dužda); 11.12f: L5 jañm (for zãm); 12.12b: E4 jaotra (for zaotρa); 12.22b: G25a zuuo (for juo); 12.22b: P1 bijingro (for bizangro); 12.22b: G25a zainti (for jaínti); 12.22c: L1 ajaiti; P1 ajait (for azaiti); 12.22d: K2, T44, R1 zuuo (for juo); 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 būiōža / būiōjaθ and kunđīža / kunđija:

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 būiōža and kunđīža.

Regarding the interpretation of the second element of the compound,
namely °ža, Darmesteter (1877 196, n.4) analysed it as būiōi + °žā- (cf. Ved. jā-
“offspring” < IE. *gβ̣h₁- (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.567-568)) and translated it as
“the offspring of Bûidhi” (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
būiōžā-, where °žā- would mean “effort, aspiration, zèle religieux”, and supposed
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that Būiōīža and Kundīža were personifications of extatic elements related to a cult with hemp to Būiōī and Kundā / Kundī.

Darmesteter's interpretation might stem from a possible RUKI of *-f after -i- (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 104 3a.) in *būiōī-zā- > būiōīžā-1794 and can be supported by the manuscripts' evidence. Nyberg's hypothesis could be explained by means of a confusion between ī and i, because it is not unusual in the written transmission of the Avesta, in spite that no manuscript attests *ōža with the long vowel -i-. Nevertheless, I prefer another etymological explanation for *ōža.

In my opinion, there is a correlation between xruuiyni, būiōīža and kundīža in the same passage. Since the second element of the compound xruuiyni stems from *γnī-, feminine of Av. *jan- “smiting, killing”, it is possible that the same root IE. *gub’en- “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 *ža of this compound could represent a dialectal form *žan- from Av. *jan- < IE. *gub’en-. However, this is only a possibility.

To summarise, it is difficult to explain the formation of Av. būiōī in connection with Av. būiōīža, if we accept that the first element of the compound Av. būiōī-ža is part of a Caland's system *buōra- / bauōah- / būiōī. Only the possibility that Av. *žan- is derived from IE. *gub’en- “to smite, to kill” is likely, if we compare this second member of compound with the preceding *γnī- of Av. xruuiyni. In such case, Av. būiōīža would be the Nom. Sing. Masc. of Av. būiōī-žan- “he who kills būiōī”.

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 Dhalla (1994 272), Kundī is the feminine counterpart of the Avestan demon Kundā 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- / kundīn- (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) kauwand- (Vyt 26): all the manuscripts (G18a kauwandom; L5 kauwandom).

d) gundām (V 11): the IrVS in V 11.9, 11.12, 11.15, 11.18.

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 kundī.

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 kundī are attested and we do not know for sure whether they represent kunda- or kundī- / kundin-. Actually, on one hand, kundī may be a variant of kunda and viceversa, because of the usual confusion in the manuscripts between –i and –a. On the other hand, the variant kunde could stem from both, so that it does not help us to choose kunda or kundī. 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 Kūnda of V 11 and the demon Kunda 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. *kauandʰa- (Darmesteter 1877).
2. OIr. *kunda- “stupid”, “hero” or “wise, magician”; cf. NP. کَنُد (Jackson 1928).
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”1795 (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.327), in its turn equated by Kuhn (1859 133-134) with Gr. kaánthos “Kán anthos, brother of the nymph Mélía” in Pausanias 9.10.5. According to Darmesteter, this word would stem from IndoEuropean, although its meaning is unknown.

1795 In Vedic it is also written kábándha-, which is preferred in Sanskrit. In Indian epics, clearly shown in Vālmiki, Rāmāyana 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. *kūnda- stems from OIr. *kunda-, either “stupid”, “hero” or “wise, magician”, attested in NP. कुं (Steingass 1930 1053, s.v. कुंda).

Bailey (1955 72-73) assumed a possible variation of –t- and –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 kūnda-, its feminine kūndī- and kūndīžā-, in some Middle Iranian words and in NP. कुं “stupid” and “astrologer, magician”.

According to Wüst (1966 59-60; 68, n.29), who accepted Bailey’s variation of –t- and –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 kundī- 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. कुं could only stem from OIr. *kunta- or *kunda-. According to him, in NP. कुं 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. kūnda-, 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. kūnda-, and he proposed that it was connected with Ved. kukūnda- (< *ku-kūnda-) “Bezeichnung gespientischer Wesen” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.360) in AVŚ 8.6.11 (= AVP 16.80.1, but written kakūnda-). The only difference between Vedic and Avestan would be thus the presence or absence of the pejorative prefix ku/ka-.

To summarise, I must comment that Darmesteter’s (1877 54, n.2) etymological connection between Av. kauuanda- / kunda-, Ved. kāvandha- and Gr. kaánthos 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 kūnda 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. kūnda- open. The same could be said regarding Av. kundīža, of which only the
second element of the compound could be Av. ʰəzən- < IE. *ɡʰən- “to smite, to kill”.

Av. būšiāsta (11.9c-d)
vid. (Benveniste 1945 13-16), who interprets Av. būšiāstā- 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 to be edited here according to the manuscripts’ evidence. Darmesteter (1887) translated Av. zairina- as “yellow” because he linked it with Ved. hāri- “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 extatic cult to Būšiiāsta. 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 zairinəm as epithet of Būšiiāsta (Jamaspasa 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 Vidēvdād 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 Būšiiāsta, was a corruption of Av. zairicī-, name of a demon in V 10. Accordingly, they might have supposed that the demon Zairicī of V 10 was the same as the demon Būšiiāsta of V 11. The assimilation of two demons also attests the parallel of Nanhaïs and Tarōmad in GrBd 34.27 and therefore would not be an isolated case.

Av. mūïō (11.9e)
Av. mūïō is another hapax legōmenon. It was interpreted by Bartholomae (1904 1188) as a feminine mūïō- 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 *ma-yd- (Cheung 2007 270-271):

a) *ma-yd- “to mourn”.

b) *ma-yd- “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. mūiōi stems from *maęd- “to mourn”, this word would be referred to a daevic entity related to mourning.

The second possibility connects Av. mūiōi with *maęd- “to be glad” and was already proposed by Kellens (1974 62-63). According to him, this root produced a feminine noun Av. mūiōi-, but also two other daevic words: YAv. maoōano.kairīāī “she who gives pleasure” in Y 9.32 and OAv. ahōṃusta- “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. maoōano.kairīāī and also in Y 11.6 for Av. mūrakāca, although Phl. mūdag-kardār actually represents the PT of Av. maoōano.kairīāī. 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. mūiōi meant and they simply wanted to fill the gap in the PT. Therefore, they seem to have copied the PT of Av. maoōano.kairīāī and pasted it as that of Av. mūiōi, only omitting the gloss of the former.

Av. kapastiś (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-maṛaḍa-. 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. Ṛtv. áriya. ³dañ̑hāuṣu. ³frāṣuṣuṇā. ³haēna. nōi. vōiyu. nōi. pāma. nōi. kapasto. nōi. haēnii. ṛaṅdō. nōi. .bufgṛapō. dvāṣō.

“... 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-rathā- “bad carriage” and ku-sārathī- “bad charioteer” (Böhtlingk & Roth 1885 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 Navsarī F10a, T44 and E10 understood Av. kapasti- as “colocynth” and translated it accordingly. G34a in the right margin G, F10a in the right margin G, T44 G and E10 G must be interpreted as wrong writings of a “re-Pahlavised” <kystwk> from NP. किस्त् “colocynth” (Steingass 1930 1069, s.v. kistū). 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. <kpšt> 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. parəne → Phl. purdēnam

As already mentioned regarding V 10.5b, Av. parəne 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” < Ir. *pēr- “fight”. The root nouns Ved. pēr- “battle, fight” and YAv. pərət- “battle, fight”, and their thematic derivates Ved. pərəna- (masc.), Ved. pərənā- (fem.) “battle, fight” and YAv. pərənā- “battle, fight” stem from it (Barholomae 1904 891, 896-897) (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.160). From this zero grade, two
denominative verbs were formed: Ved. *pytányāti “fights” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.160) and Phl. *purdēnīdan, purdēn- (< MP. *purd-).

The same Indoiranian root, but in full grade, is also present in some verbs. In Old Iranian it is attested in YAv. parat- “to fight” (Bartholomae 1904 868-869). In Middle West Iranian we find the verbs Phl. ni-bardīdan, ni-bard- “to fight” and Parth. n-brd- “to fight” (Ghilain 1939 53) and the participle Phl. nibardag “tried, experienced, brave” (NP. nabardah), but also the substantive Phl. nibard “fight, struggle” (NP. nabard) (MacKenzie 1971 59), (Nyberg 1974 140-141), (Cheung 2007 298).
[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 rightious 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] pwltynm LK 1821 dwšd’ n’k gnn’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 ʾwlw 1834 MN 1835 GBRA y 1836 ḥlwby 1837 MN 1838 n’ylyk 1839 y 1840 ḥlwby 1841 MN 1842 sš MN 1843 hwšyt MN 1844 ZK 1845 y 1846 ’sl lwšnyh 1847 MN 1848 hwsp’ p’tyh 1849 y ʾthš MN 1850 MN ’hl’dyh pyt’kyh

1818 Mf2, (G); L4 vōbû; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10. L1, B2, R278, T46, B1, B1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 vōbû; B1, M3 vōbu
1819 L4, D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3. L1, B2, R278, T46, B1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); G34 mazdašātabe; E10 mazdašāta; P1 mazdadāta; FK1 mazdadāta
1820 K2, F10, T44, M3. K9, L4, D62, P2, G34, B1, P10. Mf2, (G) ʾašāci; E10 ašāci.cītra; L1, B2, R278, T46, B1, L2 ʾašāci; G42 ašā.cītra; E4 ʾašāci; L5 ašā.cībra; FK1 ʾašāne. ašā.cībra
1821 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); T44 ʾLK ʾy–
1822 (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, E10, B1, P10, M3 gn’gmynwg; P2 gn’kmynwg; G34 gn’gmynwg; F10 gn’gmynwg; T44 ʾywš
1823 L4, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, M3, (Jmp); T44 W MN; E10 ʾLK ʾy– P10 MN
1824 L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34, B1 wys; E10 wys
1825 L4, D62, G34, F10, E10, B1, M3, (Jmp); P2, T44 W MN; E10 ʾLK ʾy– P10 MN
1826 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); E10 znd
1827 K1, D62, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 ʾLK MN MTA ʾy–
1828 K1, B1, M3, (Jmp); D62, P10 MN; P2 MN ʾywš
1829 K1, D62, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 ʾLK MN
1830 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); M3 ʾLK MN MYA ʾy–
1831 E10, M3, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10 W MN; F10 ʾLK MN zmyk ʾy–
1832 P2, T44, M3, (Jmp); L4, D62, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10 W MN
1833 L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 ʾwlw
1834 L4, D62, P2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34, F10 W MN
1835 L4, D62, P2, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 gwspnd; E10 ʾywš
1836 D62, P2, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4, G34, F10, T44, E10 W MN
1837 T44, (Jmp); L4 ʾLK ʾy ʾhlwbʾ ʾy– K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 ʾy– y–
1838 K1, D62, P2, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34 ʾhlwbʾ ʾf; F10 ʾhl’dyh
1839 L4, K1, D62, P2, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); G34, F10, T44 W MN
1840 K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); L4 nʾylyk; P2 ʾnʾylyk; G34 nʾylykʾn
1841 K1, B1, (Jmp); L4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 ʾy– y– P2 ʾLK ʾy ʾhlwbʾ ʾy–
1842 K1, F10, B1, M3, (Jmp); L4 ʾhlwbʾ; D62 ʾhlwbʾy; G34 ʾhlwbʾ; T44 ʾhlwbʾy; E10 ʾhlwbʾy, P10 ʾhlwbʾy
1843 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); P10 MN
1844 L4, D62, G34, T44, E10, (Jmp); K1, P2, F10, B1, P10, M3 W MN
1845 G34, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, P2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 W MN
1846 L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, (Jmp); P2, F10, M3 W MN
1847 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 ʾLK ZK ʾy–
1848 K1, (Jmp); L4, G34, T44, E10 ʾLK ʾy ʾlwšnyh; D62, P10 ʾLK ʾlwšnʾ; F10 ʾLK ʾlwšnʾy; B1, M3 ʾLK ʾlwšnyh
1849 L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 W MN
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|a| purdēnam tō duǰdānāg gannāg mēnōg az mān [az wis az zand az deh] az ātaxš az āb az zamīg az ābādīh ī ohrmazd-dād kē az āhlāyīh paydāghīn

|a| 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. ϑβā. dužda. aŋra. ʷmāniō (11.10a)

It is striking that the Evil Spirit was addressed to by means of the personal pronoun Acc. Sing. ϑβā instead of the Acc. Sing. ʷduždąm. aŋrəm. ʷmāniōm. As a matter of fact, in the parallel of V 10.5b we only find paiti.porone + aŋro. ʷmāniōm. that is, the formula without personal pronoun.

The only passage where Zaraϑuštra addresses directly to the Evil Spirit by means of the vocatives dužda. aŋra. ʷmāniō are V 19.5 uzumācōsiaṭ. zaraduštrō. aŋrom. ʷmāniōm. dužda. aŋra. ʷmāniō. janāni. dāma. daēušū.datom (…) “Zaraϑuštra let the Evil Spirit know: ‘Harmful Evil Spirit, I shall kill the creation created by the demons (…)’”. and 19.9, where the vocatives āi. dužda. aŋra. ʷmāniō are isolated in the midst of the phrase. The same vocative dužda. aŋra. ʷmāniō is found in 19.12, but an Abl. Sing. is expected in this case: kuϑda. hīš. azn. koromauuānī. baca. auaṣbāṭ. druaj. baca. dužda. aŋra. ʷmāniō “How shall I make them (free) from that Lie, from the harmful Evil Spirit?”. However, in these passages no personal pronoun Acc. Sing. ϑβā is used.

Av. nmānāt (11.10a)

There is a case of apparent athematisation of a thematic noun in the wrong ending -at in Av. nmānāt instead of the expected nmānt 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 nmānt seems not to be properly an example of the usual shortening due to a postposition baca in nmānt.baca (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 60 be.) (de Vaan 2003 112 ff.). According to de Vaan (2003 114), Av. nmānt has been influenced by the sequence of Abl. Sing. -at in ādraṭ, apaṭ and zōmāṭ. I agree with him.
manayhasca. yaiū. šūaodhānāīš. ašm. ō̄raoštā. aburā. tām. mōi. dąstuumq. daēnaiāi. frānmaaocā. (= Y 46.7) 
kō. varādhām. jā. ṭū. pōi. sōṅghā. yōi. hantū. cīdrā. mōi. dąm. ahimbiš. ratūm. cīdī. at. bōi. vohū. sraoštō. jāntū. manayha. mazdā. abmāi. yahmāi. vāsī. kahmaicīt. (= Y 44.16)
[|a| “Then you shall murmur these words, which will be the most victorious and most healing. You shall pronounce four Ahuna Vairiai:

|a| 1876 hwnwl 1877 prc sl’dsn 1878 yt’hwwylywk 1879 [4182 BRA YMRWN1881]
|a| 1876 ćahār ahunawar frāz sraįyin yadahbųwayryoć [ćahār bē göw]

1872 vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.160): “Qui me désignes-tu comme protecteur, ó Mazdā, chaque fois que le partisan de la Tromperie cherche à me contraindre, à faire tort, sinon ton feu et la pensée, par les actions (rituelles) desquels, ó Maître, vous engarez 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”.

1873 vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.153): “Quel est le briseur d'obstacles parmi les Existants, afin qu'il (me) protège suivant son 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, ó 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.”

1874 P2, P5, (G); K2. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aṣābe
1875 vid. (Wolff 1910 134, 367): “Schütz uns vor dem Feind, o Mazdā und o heilige Ārmatay! (Ver)schwinde deävische Drug, (ver)schwinde daevaventstamme, (ver)schwinde daéväv tensstamme, (ver)schwinde deävagenschaffene, (ver)schwinde deävavazerguegte! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde völlig, o Drug, im Norden solst du verschwinden, nicht solst du die stoffliche Welt des Aša zunichte machen!”.

1876 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp); F10 5
1877 L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (Jmp) ’hwnwl
1878 E10, (Jmp); L4, K1, D62, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 s’ld’sn’ y; F10 s’ld’sn’y
1879 L4, G34, T44, E10, M3; K1, F10, B1, P10 yt’hwwkwylyw; D62 yt’hkkwyly wy lywª; P2 yt’hwwklywª; (Jmp) yt’hwwlywyw”
1880 D62, P2, G34, F10, (Jmp); L4, K1, T44, E10, B1, M3 5; P10 5 5, but P10a 5
1881 L4, D62, P2, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3; F10, (Jmp) YMRWN; T44 YMRWN - yt
Four Ahunawar must be pronounced: *yadhūwayyō* [say it four (times)].

1882 L4, F10, T44, E10. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K1, B1, P10, M3 paršte; D62 parštae; P2 paršta; K2 paršst; G34 . T46, L5 paršsta; FK1 paršsta. 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 aēšmām; P2 . Mf2, K9 aēšmām; P5 aēšmām; T44 aēšmām; E10 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 aēšmām; B2 aēšmām (B2a -a before -m); E4 aēšmām; L5 išmām; (G) aēšmām

1884 L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, M3 . L1, R278, T46, B1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34 . B2, L5 paršta; P5 paršta; K2 paršta; B1, P10 paršst; P1 = paršta. nasim. ... paiti. raedžam |;| E4, FK1 paršta

1885 D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, E10, P10 . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, L5, (G); L4 . L1, B2 nasim; K1, B1, M3 nasim; K2 nasim; Mf2, K9 nasim

1886 P5, G34a in the left margin, F10a in the left margin, T44 in the left margin . L1, B2, R278, T46, B1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 = paršta. ... paiti. raedžam |;| K2 paršta; E10 paršt; E4, FK1 paršta; L5 paršta

1887 (G); P5, F10a in the left margin, T44 in the left margin . FK1 bhm. raedžam; K2, G34a in the left margin bhm. raedžam; E10 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 bhm. raedžam; T46 bhm. raedžam; E4 bhm. raedžam; Mf2, K9 bhm. raedžam

1888 P5, G34a in the left margin, F10a in the left margin, T44 in the left margin, E10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršts; P5 paršts; K2 paršts; E4, FK1 paršts; L5 paršts

1889 K2, G34a in the left margin . Mf2, K9, (G); P5, F10a in the left margin, T44 in the left margin . R278, FK1 paiti. raedžam; E10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2, G42, L5 paiti. raedžam; Br1 paiti. raedžam; E4 paiti. raedžam

1890 L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); L4, K1, D62, P2, G34, T44, B1, P10, M3 xu.; L5 xarū; Mf2 xuī

1891 L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršts; P5 paršts; K2 paršts; G42 bparšts; E4, FK1 paršts; L5 paršts

1892 L4, D62, P2, K2, G34, F10, P10 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1, (G); P5, T44, E10, B1 . T46 būi; M3 buiūia; E4 buiūia; L5 būiūia; Mf2 bi.ūi; K9 biūi

1893 L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršts; P5 paršte; K2 paršte; G34a . E4, FK1 paršte

1894 L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); K1 buidža; D62 buidža; P5 buidža; K2 buidža; E10 būiūia; B1, P10, M3 buiūia; R278 būiūia; E4 būiūia; FK1 buiūia; Mf2 buiūia

1895 L4, K1, D62, F10, T44, E10, P10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34a paršts; P5 paršte; K2 5 paršte. ... kundija |;| E4, FK1 paršte

1896 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1, (G); L4 kundija; K1, D62, F10, T44, B1, P10 kundija; P2, G34 kundija; P5 kundija; K2 kūndiži; E10 kundaja; E4 kūndiži; L5 kundaiža; Mf2 gundaiža; K9 gundaiža

1897 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1, (G); L4 kundija; K1, D62, F10, T44, B1, P10 kundija; P2, G34 kundija; P5 kundija; K2 kūndiži; E10 kundaja; E4 kūndiži; L5 kundaiža; Mf2 gundaiža; K9 gundaiža
|a| The Wrath has been fought, Nasu has been fought. |b| The Direct defilement has been fought, the Indirect defilement has been fought. |c| Xru has been fought, Xruuíni has been fought, Būsān has been fought, Būšišān has been fought, Kupā has been fought, Kundūšan has been fought. Būssiaštā the Yellowish has been fought. |d| Būssiaštā the Long-handed has been fought. |e| Mūšān has been fought, Kapāši 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.

[a] I fight the Wrath, I fight Nasu [before and afterwards, that is, I fight her firstly and I will fight her afterwards]. [b] I fight him who [has become impure] by direct defilement, I fight him who [has become impure] by indirect defilement. [c] 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]. [d] I fight the long-handed Būšāsp [that is, having long hands (means) that she reaches everybody]. [e] /Without PT/ I fight the Parīg [Desire] [the idolatry], which defiles the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants. [f] I fight the defilement [its means], which defile the fire, the water, the earth, the cattle, the plants.

**Av. paršta. mūiō. paršta. kapastiš (11.12e)**

Unlike the sequence pārōne. mūiō. pārōne. kapastiš in V 11.9, in this case the Pahlavi translators of the manuscripts from Navsarī F10, T44 and E10 did not translate paršta. mūiō. paršta. 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. paršta → Phl. pahikārēm**

There is a problem with the etymology of this word in this context. As Bartholomae (1904 878) already noticed, Av. paršta cannot be related to the verb parat- “to struggle, to fight” and it cannot be its PPP. Otherwise, we would expect Av. *parsta < Ir. *pṛt-ta*.

Av. paršta 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. paršta < Ir. *pṛč-ta*, namely the PPP. of Av. pars- “to ask”, with the expected Av. *parsta < Ir. *pṛt-ta*, namely the PPP. of Av. parat- “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 ‘lwlw
Surprisingly the Pahlavi translators did however understand the meaning of *paršta as a synonym of *pərəme 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 *pərəme. At least these translators apparently noticed that the underlaying Avestan verbs were different and also translated them with different Pahlavi verbs.

1987
L4, D62, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); P2, G34 . L5 parišta; P5 parišta; K2 parišta; E4 parišta; FK1 parišta

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 dužd; K9 dužd

1990
L4, K1, D62, P2, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, (G); P5 . P1 . Mf2, K9 agra; F10 . FK1 agra; E4 agra; L5 agra

1992
L4, T44 mainiū; K1, D62, B1, P10 mainiū; P2, P5 mainiū; K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9, (G) mainiū; G34 mainiū; F10, E10 mainiū; M3 mainiū; M2 mainiū

1996
K1, P2, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10 . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2 . Mf2, K9, (G); L4, T44, M3 . R278, Br1, E4, FK1 namana; D62 ndana; P5 ndana; G42 ndana; Mf2 "ndana

1999
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 agra; P10 agra

2000
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 bašca

2002
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); E4 zima

2003
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); P10 aša

2005
L4, K1, F10, T44, (G); D62 . R278, P1, L5, FK1 guma; P2, P5, K2, G34, E10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4 goma; B1 goma; P10 aša above the line goma; Mf2 goma

2007
L4, K1, G34, T44, M3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); D62 uruvariai; P2, P5, F10, E10, P10 . R278, E4, L5 uruvariai; K2 uryvarai; haca uryvarai; B1 uryvariai; FK1 uruvariai

2009
L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, T46, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44 ašuana

2010
E10 . L1, B2, P1, L2, G42, E4 ašuana; FK1 ašauanom

2011
L4, K1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); D62, P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 nariaim; G34 nariaim

2012
L4, D62, P2, P5, G34, F10, T44, B1, P10, M3 . R278, T46, L5, (G); K2 ašauanom; E10 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 ašašm; P1 ašašm; Mf2, K9 ašašm

2013
Mf2, (G); L4, D62, K2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 straš; P2, T44 . R278, E4, L5, FK1 starš; P5 starš; P1 staršca

2014
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); P10 mānyhm

2015
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); FK1 ury variai ury varai; haca ury varai; B1 ury variai ury varai; FK1 ury variai
[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 all the endless lights, away from all goods made by Mazda which (have) the brightness of Truth.

[a] ptk’lym ʾw’, LK, dwd’n’k gnn’k mnyw; MN m’n; MN ths; MN MYA MN zmyk MN gwsnd; MN ’wlwl MN GBRA y; hlbw; MN n’ylyk ’hlbw’; MN slt MN m’h MN hlwšy’t MN ZK y ’sl lwšnyh; MN hlwsp ’pt’yḥ y’; whrmzd d’t MNW MN ’hl’dyh’ pyt’kyh

[a] pabikārēm ŏ tō dujdanāg gannāg mēnōg az mān az ātāsh ās āb az zamīg az gōspand az urwar ā mard ā ablaw ā nārīg ā ablav ā star ā māh ā xwarēd āz ān ā isar rōšīh az hawisp ābādīh ā ohrmzd-dād ā ke ā ablayīh paydāgīh

[a] I fight you, ignorant Gannāg Mēnōg, 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 prosperity created by Ohrmazd, whose manifestation (stems) from Truth.

2038 L4, 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 iḍā
2039 L4 . T46, P1, (G); K1 . Mf2 ima. ; D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3 . R278, T46, FK1 . K9 ima. ; L1, B2, L2, G42, E4 imā ; Br1 ima. 
“Then you shall murmur these words, which will be the most victorious and most healing. You shall pronounce four mazdā. aṭ. mōi. mazdā. aṭ. mōi. vahīštā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. srauvaścā. vahīštā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. vahīštā. srauvaścā. vahīštā.

Also in V 10.12 and in N 18.1-2 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 100-101) it is stated that mazdā. aṭ. mōi. vahīštā is one of the formulas to be recited four times:

Yaḥū. aḥū. vairīō. mazdā. aṭ. mōi. ā. vahīštā. aṁrūta. Which are the (formulas) to be recited four times?

Yaḥū. aḥū. vairīō, the mazdā. aṭ. mōi. vahīštā, the ā. aṁrūta. aṁrūta.
11.15. |ə| pərəne. 2063 +aēšməm. 2064 pərəne. 2065 nasîm. 2066 pərəne. 2067 hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm. 2068 pərəne. pətii.rae̱d̥əm. 2069 pərəne. x̥r̥i. 2070 pərəne. 2071 x̥nuin̥i. 2072 būi. 2073 pərəne. būi̱di̱ā. 2074 pərəne. kundai. 2075 pərəne. bəs̥u̱i̱sta. 2076 yā. 2077 zairina. 2078 pərəne. bəs̥u̱i̱sta. 2079 yā. 2080 darəgə.guuna. 2081 pərəne. 2082 mūd̥i. 2083 pərəne. 2084

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 pərəni. L4, K1, D62, B1, P10 and M3 continue V11.15-16 without any strong pause.

2065 P2 . R278; L4, K1, G34, T44, B1 aēšməm; D62, K2 aēšməm; P5 aēšməm; F10, M3, (G) aēšməm; E10 as̥məm; P10 ḫa̱da. L1 aēšməm; B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 aēšməm; E4, L5 aēšməm; FK1 aēšməm; Mf2, K9 aēšməm

2065 P2, K2, F10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, L4, K1, D62, G34, E10, B1, P10, M3 | pərəne. nasîm . . aṣ̥a.ṣṭra | P5 pərəne; T44, (G) ʿi̱ā / | pərəne. nasîm . . aṣ̥a.ṣṭra |

2065 P2, P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9; K2 nsîm; F10 | nasîm . . aṣ̥a.ṣṭra |

2065 P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; P2 ʿi̱ā / | pərəne. hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm . . aṣ̥a.ṣṭra |

2065 K2 hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm; P5 . FK1 hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm; L1, B2, R278, L2, G42, L5 hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm; T46, P1 hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm; Br1 hr̥m.p̥a̱e̱d̥əm; E4 hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm; Mf2, K9 hr̥m.rae̱d̥əm

2065 K2 . Mf2, K9; P5 . R278, FK1 pətii.rae̱d̥əm; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 pətii.rae̱d̥əm; E4 pətii.rae̱d̥əm; L5 pətii.rae̱d̥əm

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, FK1 pərəni

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; R278 x̥r̥i; L5 xarī; E4 xārī; Mf2, K9 x̥r̥i

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; E4 pərənai; FK1 pərəni

2065 P5 x̥nu.ɡanu. K2 x̥nu.ɡa. L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 x̥nu.ɡa; B2 x̥nu.ɡa; L5 xarī.ɡa. Mf2, K9 x̥nu

2065 P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9; K2 pərə; FK1 pərənai; Mf2 above the line pərənə

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; E4 būi̱di̱a; L5 būi̱da; Mf2 above the line, K9 būi̱da

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 pəirə

2065 P5 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; K2 būi̱di̱a; E4 būi̱di̱a; L5 būi̱di̱a; FK1 būi̱di̱a; Mf2 būi̱di̱a; K9 būi̱di̱a

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; E4 pərənai; FK1 pərəni

2065 G42; P5, K2 kunde; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2 kunde; E4 kunde; L5, FK1 kunde; Mf2, K9 kundən

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; E4 pərənai; FK1 pərəni

2065 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2; P5 kunde; K2 kunde; G42 kunde; E4 kunde; L5 kunde; FK1 kunde; Mf2, K9 kunde

2065 T46, P1; P5 būi̱di̱sta; K2 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 būi̱di̱sta; FK1 būi̱di̱sta; Mf2 būi̱di̱sta; K9 būi̱di̱sta

2065 P5, K2 . Br1, E4, FK1; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yā

2065 R278, T46 . Mf2, K9; P5 zaranai; K2 zaranai; L1 zairina; B2 zairina; P1, L2 zairina; Br1 zairina; G42 zairina; E4 zairina; L5 yəzarina; FK1 zaranai

2065 P5, K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2; E4 pərənai; FK1 pərənai; K9 pərənai

2065 T46, P1; K2 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 būi̱di̱sta; P5 būi̱di̱sta; L5, FK1 būi̱di̱sta; Mf2 būi̱di̱sta; K9 būi̱di̱sta

2065 P5, K2 . Br1, E4, L5, FK1; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yā

2065 B2, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; P5 . FK1 drəyə.guuna; K2 drəyə.guuna; L1, T46 drəyə.guuna; R278 drəyə.guuna; P1 drəyə.guuna; E4 drəyə.guuna; L5 drəyə.guuna

354
kapastia. 2092 porne 2093 pairikam. 2094 ya. 2095 aiti. 2096 atrom. 2097 apam. zam. 2098 gam. 2099 urnuarā. porne. 2102 abitīm. ya. 2092 aiti. 2096 atrom. 2097 apam. zam. 2098

[a] I fight the Wrath, I fight Nasu. I fight the Direct defilement, I fight the Indirect defilement. I fight Xṛū, I fight Xruuriṇī, I fight Būiśin, I fight Būiśižān, I fight Kuṇḍa, I fight Kuṇḍižān. I fight Būśiāstā the Yellowish. I fight Būśiāstā the Long-handed. I fight Mūiśin, 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.

[p] pwltynm hšm /tā/ pyt’ky 2110
[p] purdēnam xešm /tā/ paydāgīh
[a] I fight the Wrath ...

|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 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 Mazdā which (have) the brightness of Truth.
11.17. |a| aḍa. 2135 imā. 2136 vacō. dronjaioīūs. 2137 xoyī. 2138 ṛdhun. 2139 varestānīū.2140 tāmāmca. 2141 baēsziū.2142 tāmāmca. 2143 caḥjāro. 2144 a. aiṛūmā. 2145 iṣiū. 2146.frasrāniūiōī.ā. aiṛūmā. 2146 iṣiū. 2147 rafṣdrāi. 2148 jantū. 2149 nāribaicas. 2150 nāribiācas. zaraduṣṭrahe. 2151 vayhāuś. rafṣdrāi. manayhō. yā. 2152 daēnā. 2153 vairm. hanāt. mīḏdom. 2154 aṣāhīū. 2155 x. yāsā. ašīm. 2156 yām. iṣišam. abūro. masatā. mazdā. (= Y 54.1) |a| “Then you shall murmur these words, which will be the most victorious and most healing. You shall pronounce four ā. aiṛūmā. iṣiū: ā. aiṛūmā. iṣiū. ...”

2145 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2 above the line, K9; L4, K1, D62, P2, P5, K2, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3, (G) |= aḍa. ... aṣa. yōi. |
2146 L1, B2, T46, P1. Mf2; L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4 imā; R278, L5, FK1. K9 imām
2147 L1, B2, T46, G42. K9; R278, Br1, L2, E4 ː tā. ː | dronjaioīūs. ... varestānīū.2140 tāmāmca |; P1. Mf2 ḏarṃjaioīūs; L5 ː dronjaioīūs. ... baēsziū.2142 tāmāmca ː; FK1 ḏarṃjaioīūs
2148 L1, B2, T46. Mf2, K9 yōī; G42 ː tā. ː | yōī. ... varestānīū.2140 tāmāmca |; FK1 yō
2149 L1, B2, T46. Mf2, K9; FK1 aḥene
2150 L1, B2, T46, P1, FK1; Mf2 varestānīūtīmāmca; K9 varestānīūtīmāmca
2151 L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 baēsziū.2142 tāmāmca; B2 baēsziū.2142 tāmāmca; E4, FK1 baēsziū.2142 tāmāmca; Mf2, K9 baēsziū.2142 tāmāmca
2152 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9; FK1 ciḥjāro
2153 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4 . K9 above the line; G42 airolmā. Mf2 airolmā
2154 L1, B2, R278, T46, L2, G42, E4 . K9 above the line; P1 iṣiū. 4; Br1 iṣiū; L5, FK1 aīiri. māiṣiū. 4; Mf2 iṣiū
2155 L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 above the line; T46 frasrāniūiōī; P1, L5, FK1 ː | frasrāniūiōī. ... mazdā ː |
2156 L2, E4 . K9; L1, B2, G42 airolmā; R278 ā. airolmā; T46 ā. airolmā; Mf2 airolmā
2157 L1, B2, R278, T46, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; Br1 airolmāiṣiū
2158 B2, T46 . Mf2, K9; L1 ː tā. ː | rafṣdrāi. ... aṣāhīū |; R278 4 (in Indian numeral) ː tā. ː | rafṣdrāi. ... mazdā ː; Br1, E4 ː rafṣdrāi. ... mazdā ː 4; L2 ː rafṣdrāi. ... mazdā ː 4 bī; G42 ː tā. ː | rafṣdrāi. ... abuর ː |
2159 B2, T46 jantū; Mf2 ja.ṣitī; K9 jantī
2160 Mf2, K9; B2 nāra,biuiscā; T46 nara. ː tāʃ | 2161 Mf2, K9; B2 nāribaicas. zaraduṣṭrahe; T46 ː tāʃ | nāribiācas. ... abuর ː |
2162 B2 . Mf2, K9 yā
d2163 B2 . Mf2, K9; B2 daenā
2164 B2 . Mf2; K9 mīḏdim
2165 B2 aṣāhīū; Mf2, K9 aṣāhīū
2166 L1 yāsā; B2 yā. sā; Mf2, K9 yāsā
2167 B2 . Mf2, K9; L1 aṣim
2168 L1 ː yām. ... mazdā ː 4; B2 yām; Mf2 yām; K9 yām
2169 B2 . K9 iṣīuṃ; Mf2 iṣīuṃ
2170 B2, T46, G42 . Mf2; K9 mastā
2171 T46; B2 mazdā. ā. airolmā. iṣiū. ː tāʃ | mazdā ː 4 (in Indian numeral) 4 (in Pahlavi numeral); G42 mazdā. 4 bī; Mf2 mazdā. ā. airolmā. yābā. abū. vairīū. ː tāʃ | masatā; mazdā. 4 bī; K9 mazdā. ā. airolmā. ː tāʃ | mazdā. 4 bī gwptn’
The Wrath has been fought, Nasu has been fought. The Direct defilement has been fought, the Indirect defilement has been fought. Xuṛ has been fought, Xruuiγnī has been fought, Būiōn has been fought, āhitīm. Būiōžan has been fought, Kuṇḍa has been fought, Kuṇḍižan has been fought. Būśiistā the Yellowish has been fought. Būšiistā 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.

[a] You, harmful Evil Spirit, have been fought, away from the house, away from the fire, 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 Mazdā which (have) the brightness of Truth.
11.20.  |a| ađa. imā. 2231 vacō. 2232 drjñiaiōī. 2233 yōi. 2234 aḩun. vārdrāyniōt.tammaca. 2235 \textsuperscript{x}baēσaxioi.tammaca. 2236 panca. 2237 abunam. 2238 vairiōa. 2239 frasrāNNiaiōī. \textsuperscript{x}ya\d. 2240 abū. 2241 vairiōī. 2242 ađā. ratuš. ajačiṣ. baēc. vāybhuśu. dazdā. maṇayō. sūrōdantaṃ. aḩunō. mazdā. xāydrāmca. abunā. a. ym. 
drigubhūi. dadaṭ. vāstāram. (= Y 27.13) |b| kōm. nā. 2245 mazdā. maunuīte. 
frānumocā. (= Y 46.7)²²²

²²¹ L.4, 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.

²²² L.4, 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 vṭō

²²³ L.1, B2, T46, Br1, G42. Mf2; L4, T44, E10 ītā. - d) drjñiaiōī. … baēσaxioi.tammaca |; K1, D62, G34, F10, B1, P10, M3 - d) drjñiaiōī. … baēσaxioi.tammaca |; P2. FK1 darinjiiouī; P5 drinjiiouī; K2

²²⁴ R278, L2, E4 ītā. - d) drjñiaiōī. … vārdrāyniōt.tammaca |; P1 darinjiiouī; L5 darinjiiouī

²²⁵ L.5, FK1; P2 ītā. - yōi. … baēσaxioi.tammaca |; P5 yōi; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1. Mf2, K9 yōi; G42 ītā

²²⁶ | - yōi. … vairiūa |; (G) ītā

²²⁷ T46, P1, FK1; P5. L.1, B2, Br1. K9 vārdrāyniōt.tammaca; L5 vārdrā.yaniō.tammaca; Mf2 vārdrāyniōt.tammaca

²²⁸ P5 baśaxioi.tammaca; K2 omca; L.1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1 baēσaxioi.tammaca; Br1 baēσaxioi.tammaca; E4 baēσaxioi.tammaca; L5 baēσaxioi.tammaca; Mf2, K9 baēσaxioi.tammaca

²²⁹ L.4, K2 above the line, G34, F10, T44, E10. L.1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); K1 pasca; D62, P5 above the line, B1, M3 panca; P2 panca; P10 pasca

²³⁰ L.4, D62, P2, G34, F10, E10, B1, P10, M3

²³¹ L.1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); P5 abnumam; K2 above the line; T44 abnumbe; E4 abnumae; L5 abune

²³² L.4, D62, G34, F10, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L.1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G);

²³³ P2. E4, L5 vairiōi; P5 vairīm; K2 above the line vairīa

²³⁴ K1, D62, T44, E10, B1, P10, M3. L.1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); L4 ītā. - frasrāNNiaiōī |; P2. K5, K2 above the line, F10 frasrāNNiaiōī; G34 fras. vairīiōi; T46 frasrāNNiaiōī; L5 frasrāNNiaiōī

²³⁵ P5. K2. B2, R278, T46, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); L4, P2, G34 ītā. abū. vairīiōī |; K1, D62, P10 ythukwlylyw; F10 ythuwy lwk; T44, E10 ythukwlyw; B1 ythukwlylyw; M3 ythukwlylyw

²³⁶ L.1, P1, G42, L2, Mf2. K9 yādā

²³⁷ P5, K2. L.1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); Mf2, K9 abī

²³⁸ P5. L.1, (G); K2 vairīiōī ītā; B2 vairīiōī. 5 (in Indian numeral) 5 (in Pahlavi numeral); R278, P1, L2, E4, L5 vairīiōī. 5; T46 vairīiōī. 6 gw; Br1 vairīiōī. (yak. in Pāzand); G42 vairīiōī. 5 (in Pahlavi numeral) 5 (in Indian numeral); FK1 vairīiōī. (yak. in Pāzand); Mf2 vairīiōī. 6 gwptn; K9 vairīiōī. 5 gwptn

²³⁹ 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 & Ellenberg & 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’”

²⁴⁰ (G); L.4, K1, P2, P5, K2, G34, E10, P10. L.1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2. K9 kōmā; D62, F10, T44, B1, M3. R278, E4, L5, FK1 kōmā

²⁴¹ L.4, K1, D62, G34, F10, T44, P10 - maunuīte. … ağahe |; P2. P5, K2. E10. L.1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G) ītā. - maunuīte. ... astuuaitiō |; B1. M3 ītā. - maunuīte. ... ağahe |; B1 ītā. - maunuīte. … ağahe |; Mf2. K9 ītā sar guftan. - maunuīte. … ağahe | 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
kā. varātaṃ. jā. dhā. pū. sānghā. yō. haṃtī. cīrā. mō. dāṃ. abhīmū. ratūm. cīdhī. at. bōī. vohū. svātājō. jaṃtī. manayhā. mazād. abmāi. yahmāi. vāsī. kahmāicī. (= Y 44.16)\(^{2246}\)
|a| “Then you shall murmur these words, which will be the most victorious and most healing. You shall pronounce five Ahuna Vairīia: yaḥā. abhī. vairīiō. abā. ratūi. aṣācitī. hacā. vahyūś. dazād. manayhō. ḍāo�ānaṃ. ṭaḥjūś. mazādī. ṭaḍrōmā. abhūrāī. ā. yīm. drīgūbiō. dadať. vāstārām. (= Y 27.13) |b| kām. nā. mazādā. maunaitē. pāiiūm. "daddā. hiāt. mā. dṛγuŋ. dīdarōstātā. ḍēnayhī. "āniīyım. ḍḥāmātī. ḍhrāsacī. manayhbasācī. yaiū. ḍāo�ānāī. aṣtm. ḍraoštā. abhūrā. tām. mōi. dastūum. daēnāiāī. frānuwocī. (= Y 46.7) kā. varātaṃ. jā. dhā. pū. sānghā. yō. haṃtī. cīrē. mō. dāṃ. abhīmū. ratūm. cīdhī. at. bōī. vohū. svātājō. jaṃtī. manayhā. mazād. abmāi. vāsī. kahmāicī. (= Y 44.16)

|a| 5 ḍhwlp prc slḍsīn\(^{2234}\) yṛhwkwlywyk\(^{2235}\) |b| ḍlḍyḥ\(^{2236}\) ṭpṛṭh\(^{2257}\) <y> pḥlwṃ\(^{2258}\) AYT’

pensée, par les actes (rituels) desquels, ô Maître, vous engraissez l’Harmonie? Proclame 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”.\(^{2248}\)

vid. (Kellens & Pirart 1988-1991 1.153): “Quel est le braiseur d’obstacles parmi les existants, afin qu’il (me) protège suivant son 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 & 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 wouldest”.\(^{2249}\)

vid. (Wolff 1910 134, 367): “Schütz uns vor dem Feind, o Mazdāh und o heilige Ärmatyav! (Ver)schwinde daēvische Drug, (ver)schwinde daēvəxtammtam, (ver)schwinde daēvəxaschaffenne, (ver)schwinde daēvəxerzeugt! Verschwinde, o Drug, zieh ab, o Drug, verschwinde véölīg, o Drug, im Norden sollst du verschwinden, nicht sollst du die stoffliche Welt des Aša zunichte machen!”\(^{2250}\)

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”.\(^{2251}\)

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”.\(^{2252}\)

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”.\(^{2253}\)

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”.\(^{2254}\)

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”.\(^{2255}\)

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”.\(^{2256}\)

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”.\(^{2257}\)

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”.\(^{2258}\)
Panjang Ahunawar fráz sràyiñ yadāhūwārayrō. Ablāyih ābādih <i>pahlom ast</i>.

Five Ahunawar must be pronounced: <i>yadāhūwārayrō</i>. Truth is the best prosperity.
I. How long the defilement produced by each relative lasts and how the house must be purified

12.1. |a| āąt. yat. 2260 pito. 2260 para.iriđiįeti. 2262 māta. 2263 vā. para.iriđiįeti. 2264 |b| cuaț. 2265 'aęšąm. 2265 upa.ęnaiąm. 2266 |c| pūdę. 2260 haca. pitaroram. 2260
dyła. 2269 haca. 2270 mātaram. 2271 |d| cuaț. 2272 +daŋaŋąm. 2273 cuaț
tanu. pangąnaŋ. 2274 |e| āąt. mraot. 2275 ahuro. mazdā. 2276 |f| drisaram. 2276 +daŋaŋąm. 2277 +xwuaštīm. 2278 tanu. pangąnaŋ.
[a] “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.pəɾəðâ- sinners?” [e] And Ahura Mazda said: [f] “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanu.pəɾəðâ- sinners.”

A. [a] ADYN' MNW 2286 pyt 2287 BRA YMYTNW-yt' m'ṭl 'yw̱p 2288 BRA YMYTNW-yt' [b] cnd OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-šnyh 2289 [c] BRE MN pyt 2290 dwht’ MN m'ṭl [d] cnd dhm’n’ 2291 cnd tn’pwhlk’n’ 2292 [e] AP-š gwpt’ 2293 'whrmzd 30 dhm’n’ 60 tn’pwhlk’n’.

B. [a] ADYN' MNW 2294 pyt [AYŚ-y] BRA YMYTNW-yt' 'yw̱p m’ṭl [AYŚ-y] BRA YMYTNW-yt [b] cnd OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-šnyh 2295 [c] BRE MN pyt dwht’ MN m’ṭl [d] cnd dhm’n’ cnd tn’pwhlk’n’ [e] ’ytwn’ gwpt’ ‘whrmzd [f] 30 [YWM’] dhm’n’ W 60 [YWM] tn’pwḻg’n’ [HNA 2296 AYK ZK gyw’k m’n’šnyh BRA HNA gyw’k wtlyšn’ AYT]


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.mānāi 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.”
A. |d’tl gyh’n 2310 *st’wmnd’n 2331 *hlwb*2332 |b| cygwn m’n’ ywš’d’slynýt 2333 cygwn YHWWN-t’2334 ywš’d’l 2335 |c| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd 3 b’l 2336 HLLWN-yt tn 2337 3 b’l 2338

[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. [d] 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 Špītama Zarādūstra.”

[b] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, how should I purify the house? How will they be purified?”
HLLWN-yt 239 ṣwstlg 2340 b’l 2341 pr’c 2342 šl’dyt 2343 g’sn’|d| ZNE KON 2344 ths 2345 ṣycyt blšm 2346 ASLWN-x1 2347 p y 2348 ŠPYL zwhl bd [AYK n’p BYN h’nk YDBHWN-yt] 2349 [e] ywšd’sl 2350 AHU YHWNN-t m’n 2351 k’mlk pd 2352 MYA 2353 k’mlk lpd 2354 włatw k’mk 2355 lpd 2356 mhṛspnd’n 2357 ṣpyt m’n 2358 zltwhšt 2359

B. |a| d’t l cygwn m’n ‘ywšd’slnym 2360 ‘cygwn 2361 YHWNN-t ywšd’sl |b| AP-š gwpt ’wrhmžd 2362 ṣAYK 2363 3 YWM pr’c HLLWN-yt 2364 tn’ [n’ AYK OD 3 YWM tn’ DKYA YHSNN-yt’ LWTE 2365 ’-DKYA-yh AL 2366 3 YWM HLLWN-yt 2367 wštłg [YHSNN-yt AYK wštłg-c 2368 DKYA nhwmbyt 2369 ] OD 2370 3

---

2333 R1, (Jmp); K2 ‘ywûd’sl̥nyt; G25a ṣywšd’sl̥nyt; R3 ‘yw yd’sl̥nyt
2334 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a bwɐ‘ YHWN-t
2335 R1, (Jmp); K2 ‘ywûd’sl; G25a ṣywšd’sl; R3 ‘yw ydylsl
2336 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3 bâr
2337 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R1, R3 tn’g’n
2338 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3 bâr
2339 K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp); R1 HLWN-yt
2340 K2, G25a, R1, R3 (with ⟨–γ⟩ written as in NP.); (Jmp) wštłg
2341 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3 bâr
2342 K2, G25a, R1, R3 pt’c
2343 K1; K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp) sl’yṭ
2344 G25a (G25b deletes it and writes above the line LNE), R1, R3; K2 /blank/ – KON –; (Jmp)

– KON –
2345 K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp); R1 ‘t hš
2346 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a blšm
2347 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a ASLWN-yt. In R3 -x1 is written as ⟨–yyw with the stroke of w slightly to the left side.
2348 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R1, R3 ⟨y⟩ –
2349 R1; K2, G25a, R3 – ⟨AYK ... YDBHWN-yt⟩ –
2350 R1, (Jmp); K2 ‘ywûd’sl; G25a ṣywšd’sl; R3 ‘yw yd’sl
2351 K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp); R1 ZK m’n
2352 Ṣywšd’sl̥nyt; T44 ṣywšd’sl̥nym
2353 G25a; R2, K1, R3, (Jmp) ’p
2354 R1, R3; K2 /blank/ – lpt ⟨|⟩; R1 lpt; (Jmp) – lpt ⟨|⟩
2355 G25a; K2, R1, R3, (Jmp) ’p
2356 R1, R3; K2 /blank/ – lpt ⟨|⟩; G25a lwd; (Jmp) – lpt ⟨|⟩
2357 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3 k’m’n
2358 K2, R1, R3; G25a ‘mhṛspnd’n; (Jmp) ‘mḥšspnd’n
2359 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 spytn’n
2360 G25a, R1; K2, R3, (Jmp) zltwhšt
2361 F10 ywšd’sl̥nym; T44 ywšd’sl̥nym
2362 F10; T44 W cygwn
2363 F10 ‘y AYK, T44 ‘y AYK
2364 T44; F10 HLLWN-yt
2365 F10; T44 W LWTE
2366 F10; T44 LA
2367 F10; T44 W OD
2368 F10; T44 HLLWN-st
2369 F10; T44 wštłg hm
2370 F10; T44 YHSNN-yt nhwmbyt
2371 F10; T44 W OD

370
YWM [LWTE ywšd’slyh] g’s’n’ pr’e sl’yt [’y g’s’n’ wyš KRYTWN-yt’ OD 3 YWM] |c| ZNE LNE ‘thš ycyt [AYK ‘thš BYN ZK m’n’ lwšn’ YHSNN-yt W wcwlg 3HNHTWN-yt’ 2375] W blsm ASLWN-x1 [AYK OD 3 YWM stwš YDBHWN-yt’ W zwhl ycšn’ 2374 PWN k’l YHSNN-yt’ W dlwn slwš YDBHWN-yt’] MN 2375 MYA ŠPYL zwhl 2376 bld [d] ywšd’sl AHL YHWWN-t 2377 m’n’ [AYK AHL MN 3 YWM ZK m’n’ ywšd’sl 2378 xHNHTWN-yt’ 2379] PWN k’mk MYA QDM 2380 SGYTW-ynt PWN 2381 k’mk ‘wlwl [AYK ywl’t’k] QDM SGYTW-ynt 2382 PWN k’mk ‘mhrspnd’n’ KRYTWN-šn’ OBYDWN-x1 2383 [AYK dlwn W myzd W ‘ply<n>g’n’ kwnd 2384 W ‘mhrspnd’n’ l’d YDBHWN-d 2385 PWN 2386 k’mk NPŠE tn’ MYA W 2387 ‘wlwl OŠTEN-d 2388 PWN 2389 k’mk ‘mhrspnd’n’ l’d BRA YDBHWN-d 2390 W 2391 ‘byd’tyn’nd 2392 BYN ZK m’n’] ‘spyt’m’n’ 2393 zltwhšt’

A. |a| dādār gēhān astomandān ablaw |b| čīyōn mān yōǰdāsrēnēd čīyōn būd yōǰdāsr |c| u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār sōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srayēd gāhān |d| ēn nūn ātāxš yazed barsom bandēd āb ī web zōrh bard [kū nāf andar xānag yazed] |e| yōǰdāsr pas būd mān kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amrāspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

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 Gāthās 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 (uruvaranām).
- Libations to the Good Waters (zaoðrā, aibiiō. *vaŋhubiiō) - Waters (apam).
The only discordance appears in the mention of the Beneficent Immortals (amašanm, spontanm) instead of the fire (ātrom).

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 yaziśn) 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 yaziśn 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 yaziśn 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. James (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 xinūman 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 Navsari the word mizd eventually meant the ceremony of the Āfrīnagān. Since the manuscripts of the group β, which included the gloss where these ceremonies are mentioned, belong to the reformist school of Navsari, 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. ṭriṣ° (12.2b)

In V 12.2 and its repetitions, both Av. ṭfrasnāīti and ṭfrasṛūīti are nouns accompanied by the numeral Av. ṭriṣ “thrice” and can be interpreted either separately, as Geldner did, or as compounds ṭṛīṣ.frasnāīti- and ṭṛīṣ.frasṛūīti- respectively.

Multiplicatives were mainly used in verbal syntagms and also accompanied deverbative nouns as first element of bahuevrihi compounds in both Old Indian and Avestan. With regards to Old Indian, Ved. sak ĵt “once”, Ved. dvis “twice” and Ved. tris “thrice” appear as first element of compounds, for instance, in Ved. sakytsā- “bringing forth once”, Ved. sak ĵd-abhisuta- “pressed once”, Skr. dvir.ukta- “said twice”, Skr. tris-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. sakṛd-gati- “only a possibility” in a scholium to Pāṇ 7.1.50 (Monier-Williams 1899 1124), but this is not a bahuevrihi, but an endocentric tatpurusa.

Concerning Avestan, YAv. hākārāt “once”, YAv. biś “twice”, YAv. ṭriṣ “thrice” and YAv. cādṛus “four times” is represented as a first element of bahuevrihi compounds through the adjectives YAv. hākārāt.gan- “killing once, killing by one blow” in Yt 14.15; YAv. biṣamṛūta- “(formulas) to be said twice”; YAv. ṭṛīṣamṛūta- “(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. cādṛusamṛūta- “(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 ṭṛīṣ.frasnāīti- and ṭṛīṣ.frasṛūīti-.

As Wackernagel (1930 424) observed, sometimes Ved. dvis- and tris- are equivalent to ḍvi- and tri- respectively, like for example in Ved. trir-āṣri- “three-cornered” or Skr. dvir-āmsaka- “having two shoulders”. Likewise Ved. catur- “means “four times” as well as “four”, like in Ved. cātūr-āṣri- “four-cornered”. This seems also to be the case of YAv. biṣ.ḥastram “in two groups”, ṭṛīṣ.ḥastram “in three groups” in N 13.2 (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 84-85) and YAv. ṭṛīṣ.ṛuṣṭramārā- “having three stalks” in N 90 (Waag 1941 97), where Av. biś and ṭriṣ are equivalent to bi- and ṭri-.

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 ṭṛīṣ.frasnāīti- and ṭṛīṣ.frasṛūīti-.

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):

---

2395 Multiplicatives as first element of compounds are found in Greek as well, like for instance in δίσκυς- “twice young”, ἀδρβνῆς “twice dead”, ἀδρβγανῆς “twice ravished”, etc. (Liddell & Scott 436 ff.).
a) Active
- 2nd. Sing.: ajiiti. zao." frabaroti “you must bring libations to the Waters” (Y 65.10); drišum. baro." frastorunui “you must spread the third part of the barosman-” (Yt 12.3).

b) Middle
- 2nd. Sing.: ana. mām. yasna. yazaē." “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, stornaēta 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 Vidēvdād.

Av. vasō.upaēti. apam. ... amōšanām. spōntanām (12.2d)

Av. upaēti 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. tām. vanam. aēiti), V 13.28 (aētām. ... āsištām. zaavrūānām. upaēti), V 15.9 (yō. kāminām. upāiti), H 14.1 (kām. aēm. āāt. aēdrapātīm upaēti (Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992 68-69)) (Bartholomae 1904 150). But in V 12.2 ff. this alleged verb is accompanied by the Gen. Pl. apam, uruvaranām and amōšanām, spōntanām. Provided that Av. upaēti 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. upaēti 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. upaēti can be understood as the Instr. Sing. of an abstract noun with –ti, as Spiegel (1864 292), who interpreted it as a compund *vasō.upaēti, already noticed. In such case, it is to be interpreted as Av. *upa-ā-iti, since Av. *upa-īti would have produced Av. *upaēti. cf. V 16.5 upaēta (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 yajñāṁ 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. vasō 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 +driš.frasnāiti– and +driš.frasṛūiti– + 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 Beneficient 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 Beneficient Immortals enter into the house at will, because it has been purified.
12.3. [a] ἀτ. ἀτ. 2396 πυθῶ. 2397 para.iriðieit. 2398 duyp. 2399 va. para.iriðieit. 2400 [b] σιμ. αές. 2401 upa.mañai. 2402 pita. baca. 2403 puð. 2404 māta. 2405 baca. duyp. 2406 para.iriðieit. 2407 para.iriðieit. 2408 cinaat. darpañ. 2409 cinaat. tanu.porodan. 2410 [d] ἀτ. maor. abur. mazda. drisatm. 2411 "darpañ. 2412 xshuaštīm." tanu.porodan. 2413 [e] “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.porada- sinners?” [d] And Ahura
Mazdā said: “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanūpaḥl-sinners.”

A. [a] ADYN’ MNW BRE BRA YMHTWN-yt BRTE 'ywp BRA YMHTWN-yt |b] cnd OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-d pyt MN BRE m tl MN dwht |c] cnd dhm’n’ cnd tn’pwhlk n’ |d] AP-š gwpt ‘whrmzd’ 30 dhm’n’ 60’ tn’pwhlk n’

B. [a] ADYN’ MNW BRE BRA YMHTWN-yt ‘ywp BRTE BRA YMHTWN-yt’ |b] OD cnd OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-yt’ [AYḴ BYN ZK m’n’ m’nšn’ OBYDWN-yt W ’pst’k KRYTWN-yt’] pyt MN BRE m’l MN dwht |c] OD cnd dhm’n’ l’d OD cnd tn’pwlgn’ l’d |d] AP-š gwpt ‘whrmzd 30 YWM dhm’n’ 60’ YWM tn’pwhlg n’ 30 dhm’n’ 60’ YWM tn’pwhlg n’ [gš n’ y’ pst’k KLYTWN-d’]

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


A. [a] “When the son dies or the daughter dies, |b] how long must they wait (because of) them (before entering 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 tanāpuhl sinners?” |d] And Ohrmazd said: “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanāpuhl 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 tanāpuhl 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:

\[\text{gāhān frāz srāyēd [ay gāhān wēš xwānēd tā sē rōz] [gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd]}\]

“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:

\[\text{tā čand awēšān abar mānēd [kū andar ān mān mānišn kunēd ud abastāg xwānēd] [gāhān ay abastāg xwānēnd]}\]

“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.
12.4. |a| dātask. 2429 gaēdanam. 2430 astauaitanam. 2431 ašāum. |b| kuḍa.
mānām. 2432 yauždādāmī; 2433 kuḍa. bun. 2434 yauždāta. 2435 |c| āat. mraoṭ.
aburō. mazdā. 2436 *driš.frasnāītī. 2437 tanumān. 2438 *driš.frasnāītī. 2439 vastraṇām. 2440 *driš.frasnāītī. 2441 gādanam. 2442 imā. 2443 ātṛṇ. 2444 yauždāta. 2445 barasma. 2446 *storumēta. 2447 ajiūō. 2448 vauḥubīu. 2449 zaobhā. 2450 baraēta. 2451 yauždāta. 2452 pascaēta. 2453 bun. 2454 nmānā. 2455 *vauḥ.upāītī.
[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 ḫarasmān-, 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 Zarāduṣṭara.”
B. [a] dʾtʾl |b| cygwn mʾn’ ywšdʾsl|m| ćygwn YHWWN-t ywšdʾsl |b| cygwn npšt’

A. [a] dādār ʾgēhān astōmandān ahlaw |b| ċiyōn mān yōjāsṛēnād ċiyōn būd pāk |c| u-š gust ohrmazd sē bār šōyēd tan sē bār šōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyēd gāhān |d| ēn nūn ātāxš yāzēd barsoš ʾ bandēd āb į web zōhr bard |e| yōjāsṛ pas būd mān kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd ʾ urwar kāmag rawd amhāraspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

B. [a] dādār |b| ċiyōn mān yōjāsṛēnam ud ċiyōn būd yōjāsṛ |c| ċiyōn nibišt

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.
12.5. |a| āt., 2492 yat. 2493 brāta. 2494 paramiścēti. 2495 x̂'an̄ha. 2496 vā. 2497 para. iścēti. |b| cuṇat. 2498 aṭem. 2499 upa-mānaii. 2500 brāta. 2501 baca. x̂'anharan. 2502 x̂'an̄ha. 2503 baca. 2504 brātaran. 2505 |c| cuṇat. “dāntam. cuṇat. tanu. pērūdān. 2507 |d| āt. mrao. 2508 abhūro. mazda. 2509 drīsātam. 2510 "dāntam. 2511 xīnuāstītam. 2512 tanu. pērūdān.


2495 K2, F10, T44 . B2, T46, E4, L5, FK1, (G); G25a, R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yat.; R3 yada.

2496 K2, G25a, R3 . B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); FI0, T44, R1 . L1, R278, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 barāta.

2495 G25a, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); K2 para. iścētāta; F10 pari. iścētēti; T44 para. iścētēti; R3 para. iścētēti; E4 pērūrā. iścētēti; L5 pari. iścētēti; FK1 pari. iścētēti; K9 para. iścētēti

2498 T44 in the right margin, (G); K2, G25a, F10, R1 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9 x̂'an̄ha; R278 x̂'anha. vā. para. iścēti; |; L5 x̂'anhar. FK1 x̂'anyhe.

2499 K2, G25a, F10, T44 in the right margin, R1 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G);

R3, L1, P1 x̂'anyhara

2495 K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); T44 writes para. iścēti in the right margin; E4 para. iścēti; L5 para. iścēti; FK1 pari. iścēti

2496 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, R3 . R278, FK1 . K9 aṭem; | T44 . L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aṭem; R1 . T46, P1 aṭem; (G) aṭem

2500 R1 (second -a- scratched) . T46, P1, K2, F10, T44 . E4, FK1 upa-mānaii; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . K9 upa-mānaii; Mf2 upa-māniati; (G) upa-māniati

2501 K2, G25a, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, (G); F10, T44 . R278, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9 barāta; R3 upa-māniati-barāta

2502 (G); K2, R1, R3 . E4 . K9 x̂'anbrām; G25a, F10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2 x̂'anharan; T44 . FK1 x̂'anbrām

2503 (G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 x̂'an̄ha; E4 x̂'anyhe; FK1 x̂'anyhe

2504 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); L5 x̂'an̄haca

2505 R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, (G); K2, G25a . Br1, L2, G42 brātrām; FI0, T44, R1 (second -a- scratched) . E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9 barātarām

2506 Mf2; K2 aṭem. dahmanātim; G25a, F10, T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 dahmaṇātim; R1 . T46, P1, (G) dahmanātim; R3 dahmaṇātim; FK1 dahmaṇātim

2507 R1 . P1 . Mf2, (G); K2, T44 . L1, R278, L2, G42, L5 . K9 tanu. pērūdān; G25a, F10, R3 . B2, Br1, E4 tanu. pērūdān; T46 tanu. pērūdān; FK1 tanu. pērūdān

2508 K2, G25a, R3 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) | mrao. abhūro. mazda. | L1, P1 . Mf2 mrao; L5 mrao. K9 /ā/ | mrao. abhūro |←

2509 G25a . L1, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, F10, T44, R1, R3 . R278, E4 drīstam; B2 drīst- blank/ am; T46, L5 drīsta; FK1 drīsata (t added later) x̂nuasi

2510 G42 . Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5 . K9 dahmaṇātim; R1 . T46, P1, (G) dahmaṇātim; FK1 dhmaṇātim (correcting a previous tanumātim)

2511 F10, R1 . R278, Br1, L2, E4 . K9, K2, T44, R3 . G4 x̂nuasi; G25a . L1, P1 x̂nuasi; B2, T46 x̂nuasi; L5 x̂nuasi; FK1 x̂nuasi (x̂- correcting a previous d-); Mf2 x̂nuasi; (G) x̂nuasi

2512 R1 . P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 tanu. pērūdān; G25a, F10 . B2, E4 tanu. pērūdān; T44 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . K9 tanu. pērūdān; R3 tanu. pērūdān; T46 tanu. pērūdān; FK1 tanu. pērūdān
“And when the brother dies or the sister dies, how long must (one) wait (because) 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 tanu.pərəϑa-sinners?”

And Ahura Mazda said: “Thirty (days) for the pious, sixty for the tanu.pərəϑa-sinners.”
for the tanāpuhl sinners?” [H] 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. brātarəm 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 Frahang ī Pahlawīg 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>; in the text Sē wināh î wuzurg of the manuscript MU29 at the bottom of p. 58, with the variant <blwl LWTE blwl> (Mazdāpūr 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>. Moreover, he added other examples from the Frahang ī Pahlawīg where traces of the Gabri dialect are found, so that his explanation for the presence of the variant <blwl> in some manuscripts of the Frahang ī Pahlawīg 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 Pahlavi texts from the Frahang ī Pahlawīg. This is confirmed by the PT of the Xvaršēd Nyāyišn in the manuscript Cod. Zend. 49, whose Pahlavi translator, according to Bartholomae (1915 15-31) was well acquainted with the Frahang ī Pahlawīg. Likewise, the Pahlavi translators of V 12 surely used a similar frahang where <blwl> was written instead of <bl’t(l)>, so that the variant <blwl> of this frahang 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 Ţaleš dialect of Māsule, borar “brother” in Gilaki (Lecoq 1989 299, 305) and Paštō wor < Proto-Paštō *brātar (Dir. Sing.) < Olr. *brātar(əm) (Skjærvø 1989 406).

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 : B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 : Mf2, K9, (G) : L1

Mf2; K2 ; L1, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 : K9 tāj | astuaitanam. astuaitanam. aṣāum | G25a, F10, T44, R1 : FK1 | gāḍaṇāṃ. astuaitanam. aṣāum | R3 : R278 tāj | astuaitanam. astuaitanam | B2 gāḍaṇāṃ; T46 gāḍaṇāṃ; (G) | gāḍaṇāṃ. ... zaradūtra | Mf2 astuaitanam; T46 sruaitanam; B2 sturaitanam

K2, G25a, T44, R1 : L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2 : Mf2; F10, R3 : R278, T46, E4, L5, FK1 namānma
K2 yaoḍaḍāni; G25a yōḍaḍāmi; T40, T44, R3 : Br1, L2, L5 yaoḍaḍāmi; R1 : T46, G42 yaoḍaḍāmi; L1, B2, R278, P1 yaoḍaḍāmi; E4 yaoḍaḍāmi; FK1 yaoḍaḍāmi; Mf2, K9 yaoḍaḍāmi

K2, R1, R3 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 : Mf2, K9; G25a kuḍa ; F10

| kuda ... sruaitanam | ; T44 | kuda ... zaradūtra |

G25a, R1, R3 : L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; K2 baun; B2, T46. K9 bun; Mf2 bun
K2 : T46, Br1, L2, G42; G25a yaoḍaḍāti; R1 yaoḍaḍa; R3 yōḍaḍāti; L1, P1 : Mf2, K9 yaoḍaḍa; B2, R278 yaoḍaḍa; E4 yaoḍaḍa; L5, FK1 yaoḍaḍāti

K2, G25a : B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R1 (with a blank) | mraoṭ. aburō. mazdā | ; R3 tāj. L1, R278, P1 : Mf2 mraoṭ. K9 tāj | mraoṭ. aburō |

K2, G25a, R1, R3 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; E4 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; L5 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; FK1 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; Mf2, K9 driṣḥ,frasnaīti

R1 : T46, P1 : Mf2; K2, G25a, T44, R3 : L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 : K9 tamarṇṃ
G25a, R1, R3 : L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 : Mf2, K9; K2 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; R278 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; P1 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; E4 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; L5 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; FK1 driṣḥ,frasnaīti; Mf2, K9 driṣḥ,frasnaīti
R1 : T46, P1 : Mf2; K2, G25a, R3 : L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, K9 vastranāṃ; E4, FK1 vastranāṃ; L5 vastranāṃ

G25a : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; K2, R3 driṣḥ,frasnuata; R1 driṣḥ,fruṭīti; Br1 driṣḥ,frasnuata; E4 driṣḥ,frasnuata; L5 driṣḥ,frasnuata; FK1 driṣḥ,frasnuata; Mf2, K9 driṣḥ,frasnuata
T46, P1 : Mf2; K2, Gāḍāṃ; G25a, R3 : L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 : K9 gāḍāṃma;

R1 gāṭanāṃ
K2, G25a, R1 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 : Mf2; R3 : E4, L5, FK1 : K9 imāṇo
K2, R3 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4 : Mf2, K9; G25a, R1 : L5 āṭarṇ; G42 āṭarṇ; FK1 aṭmarṇāṃ. nō. āṭarṇ
K2, G25a, R3 : R278, T46, L5, FK1 yazaṭa; R1 : L1, P1 yazaṭa; B2, Br1, L2 yazaṭa; G42 yazaṭa; E4 yazaṭa; FK2 yazaṭa; K9 yazaṭa
G25a : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 : Mf2, K9; K2 brsma; R1 brsma; R3 barṣma; FK1 barṣmaṃ
K9; K2, G25a, R1, R3 starṇaṭi; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 starṇaṭa; R278 starṇaṭa; E4 starṇaṭa; L5 starṇaṭa; FK1 starṇi; Mf2 starṇaṭa
K2, G25a, R1, R3 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 : Mf2, K9; FK1 aṭiūṭo
K2 above the line, G25a, R1, R3 : L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 : K9 zaodrā ṛ; P1 : Mf2, K9 zaodṛa
Mf2, K9; K2 barata; G25a, R1 : Br1 baratai; R3 baratai; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42 barata; E4 barata; L5 zaodṛabaratai; FK1 barata
[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 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 Špitama Zarādurṣṭra.”

A. [a] d’t’l gyh n' |b] cygwn m'n' ywsdr'slynt |c] AP-š gwpt 'wrmzd 3 b'l 'tn' |K9 HLLWN-yt 3 b'l HLLWN-yt wstl 3 b'l pr c' sl'yt g's'n' ZNE KON 'thš yct blswm
A. |a| dādār gēhān astömandān ahlaw |b| čīyōn mān yōjdāsṛēnēd čīyōn būd yōjdāsr |c| u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār tan sōyēd sē bār sōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyēd gābān ēn nūn ātaxī yazēd barsom bāndēd 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 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. 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.”

B. |a| “Maker ...” |c| As written.
12.7. |a| āat. ya. 2390 mtānō.pai̯tiš. 2391 para.iri̯diei̯ti; 2392 mtānō.padi̯ni. 2393 va. para.iri̯diei̯ti. |b| cliat. + aēšam. 2396 upa.mana.ia̯n. cluat. +dāman̄am. 2399 cliat. tanu.para.dan̄am. 2399 |c| āat. mrao̯. 2602 aburō. mazādā. + xunaš. 2602 ṭapē̯ bō. 2603 + dāman̄am. 2604 duuadasa. 2605 tanu.para.dan̄am. [kainino. "x̣ ato." puiḍ].
|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

---

2590 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, T46, E4, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 yāt
2590 K2, G25a, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10, R3 . FK1
2591 namān̄o.pati̯ši; T44 namān̄o.pati̯ši; E4 namān̄o.pati̯ši; L5 namān̄o.pati̯ši
2592 K2, G25a, R1 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 para.iri̯diei̯ti; T44 para.iri̯diei̯ti; R3 para.iri̯diei̯ti; L1, P1 para.iri̯diei̯ti; T46 para.iri̯diei̯ti; E4 para.iri̯diei̯ti; L5 para.iri̯diei̯ti; FK1 para.iri̯diei̯ti
2593 K2, T44, R1 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); F10 para.iri̯diei̯ti; T44 para.iri̯diei̯ti; R3 para.iri̯diei̯ti; L1, P1 para.iri̯diei̯ti; T46 para.iri̯diei̯ti; E4 para.iri̯diei̯ti; L5 para.iri̯diei̯ti; FK1 para.iri̯diei̯ti
2594 R1 (second -a- scratched). T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a in the right margin, F10 . FK1 upa.mana.ia̯n; T44, R3 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 upa.mana.ia̯n; L1 upa.mana.ia̯n; (G) upa.mana.ia̯n
2595 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aē̯šam; R1 . T46, P1 aē̯šam; FK1, (G) aē̯šam
2596 K2 . P1 . Mf2, (G); G25a, T44, R3 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; K2 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; F10 . B2 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; T46 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; FK1 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am
2597 K2 . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) + mrao̯. aburō. mazādā − | R3 /a̯ dā̯ l1, T46, P1 . Mf2 mrao̯. K9 /a̯ + mrao̯. aburō −
2598 K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); G25a /a̯ + aburō. mazādā −
2599 K2, F10, T44, R1, R3 . B2, R278, T46, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; G25a . L1, P1, Br1, E4 xšu̯u̯n̄a̯i; L5 xšu̯u̯n̄a̯i; (G) xšu̯u̯n̄a̯i
2600 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); FK1 xšu̯u̯n̄a̯m̄yō̯
2601 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 dahban̄am; R3 (− ḷ scratched dahban̄am; T46, P1, (G) dahban̄am; E4, L5 dahban̄am; FK1 daḥ; K9 dahban̄am
2602 P1, L2 . Mf2, (G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, G42 . K9 duuadasa; Br1 duuadasa; L5 duu.dasa; FK1 duu.dasa
2603 R1 . L2 . Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; G25a, T44 . R278, L2, G42 . K9 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; F10 . B2, Br1 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; R3 . FK1 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; L1 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; T46 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; P1 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am; E4 duu.dastu.para.ri̯dan̄am; L5 tanu.para.ri̯dan̄am
2604 B2, T46 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 kaininō; L5 in the right margin kaenēn
2605 (G); K2, G25a xatō; F10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9 xatō; T44, R1 xatō; R3 kaini.nōxatō; L5 in the right margin xetō
2606 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 in the right margin, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); E4 puiḍ
A. [a] ADYN’ m’n’ pt BRA YMYTWN-yt m’n’ ptk\textsuperscript{2610} ’ywpt\textsuperscript{2611} BRA YMYTWN-yt [b] cnd OLE-š’n’\textsuperscript{2612} QDM NTLWN-šnk\textsuperscript{2613} cnd dhm’n’\textsuperscript{2614} cnd tn’pwhlg’n’\textsuperscript{2615} [c] A -š\textsuperscript{2616} gwpt ’whrmzd 6 BYRH dhm’n’ 12 BYRH\textsuperscript{2617} tn’pwhlg’n’ [knyk\textsuperscript{2618} NPŠE pws]

B. [a] ADYN’ MNW\textsuperscript{2620} m’n’ pt\textsuperscript{2621} BRA YMYTWN-yt’ [’y ktk hwt’y] ’ywpt m’n’ptk [’y ktk b’nk] BRA YMYTWN-yt’ [b] OD cnd OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-šn’ cnd dhm’n’ cnd\textsuperscript{2622} tn’pwhlk’n’\textsuperscript{2623} |c| 6\textsuperscript{2624} BYRH dhm’n’ 12 BYRH tn’pwl’n’ [knyk W hwt pws]

A. [a] ēg mānbed bē mīrēd mānbedag ayāb bē mirēd [b] čand awēšān abar páyišnag čand dahmān čand tanāpuhlagān [c] u-š guft ohrmazd šaš māh dahmān dwāzdah māh tanāpuhlagān [kanig 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 tanāpuhn sinners?” [d] And Ohrmazd said: “Six months for the pious, twelve months for the tanāpuhn 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 tanāpuhn sinners?” [d] “Six months for the pious, twelve months for the tanāpuhn sinners [the girl and the son himself].”
Av. kainīnō. xᵛatō. puθrm (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 damānām. X tanu.₇pavaθdanām”. 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. nmāṇō.paiti-) and the mistress of the house (Av. nmāṇō.pādī-) in the list. Moreover, after the formula cuuαt. +aēša. +upām.₇pavān we expect “X haca. nmāṇō.paiti- X haca. nmāṇō.pādī-”, 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. puθrm 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. puθrm 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
“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. aēsha. yā. kaine. mașiānəm. parō. fərəmət. xᵛatō. garəθrm. irišišət.
(...)
“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. kainin- and xə'atō appear in the same context, and that instead of Av. puđram we find Av. garəβm. Thus, in V 12.7c there would be a mere substitution of Av. garəβm by Av. puđram. Accordingly, the gloss of V 12.7 could be linked to the Avestan text of V 15 in a previous oral transmission. Moreover, Av. kaininō. xə'atō. puđram could have glossed Av. xə'atō. garəβm 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. kaininō 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 kaininō. xə'atō. puđram of V 12.7 after tanu.parəδa- could simply exemplify a case of a tanu.parəδa- 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 sālār <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.
A. |a| "Maker, Righteous, |b| 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 Zaraduṣṭra."

A. |a| G25a, K9; K2, R1, R3 pascaita; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, L2, G42, L5 pascaeta; E4, FK1 pascaita

K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; Mf2, K9 bin

K2 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; G25a, R1 nmāne; R3 . L5 namāne; E4 namāna; FK1 namāna

K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, L2, G42 . K9; E4 vasō.upāita; FK1 vasō.upāite; Mf2 vasō.upāite

R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L1, G42, E4, FK1 . K9 apāṃ; G25a hspāṃ; L5, (G) | apāṃ ... uruwaranāṃ. vasō. upāita |

K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, L2, G42 . K9; E4 vasō.upāita; FK1 vasō.upāi; Mf2 vasō.upāi

R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, R3 uruwarāṃ; G25a uruwarāṃ; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9 uruwarāṃ

K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 vasō.upāita

K1, K2, R3 . L5, FK1 . K9 amānāṃ; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L1, L2, G42 amānāṃ; T46, P1 . Mf2 amānāṃ; E4 amānāṃ

R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 spītānāṃ; L5 spītānāṃ; FK1 spītānāṃ

K1, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; G25a spītama; T44 spītami; E4, FK1 spītama

K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L1, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10 spītamsara dhūṣṭra; R3 spītamsara dhūṣṭara; E4 dhūṣṭara; L5 dhūṣṭara

K2, G25a, R1, (Imp); R3 | d'į ... 'hlwb' |

K2 'st mn'd'n' |

K2 'hlwb'y |

R1, (Imp); K2, G25a 'yywḍ'slynyt; R3 'yywyslynd KN

K2, R1, (Imp); G25a, R3 HLWLWN-šn'

(Jmp); K2, G25a, R1, R3 tn'hl

K2, R1, (Imp); G25a HLWLWN-šn'k; R3 HLWLWN-šnk

K2, G25a, R1, R3 (Imp) wstlg

K2, G25a, R1, (Imp); R3 ZNM

G25a, K2, R1, R3, (Imp) ycyt

(Jmp); K2, G25a, R1, R3 | y |
B. |a| dʾtʾl |b| cygwn npšṭ'

A. |a| dādār xābūn xālaw |b| čyōn mān yōjādānēd čyōn būd pāk |c| ūʾ s guft ohrmazd sē bār šōyišnag tan sē bār šōyišnag wāstaray sē bār frāz qāyān mān |d| ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb ī weh zōhr bard pāk pāk 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.

263 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9

263 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G); R1 niāke; L1 niō.ko

263 G25a, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.airiđiaita; T44 pari.iriđieiti; R3 para.airiđiaita; P1, Br1, L2 para.iriđieiti; E4 para.iriđieiti; L5 para.iriđieiti; FK1 pari.iriđieiti

263 G25a, F10, T44; K2, R1, R3 . B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G) E4 cniat.ī

263 R (second -a- scratched). P1; K2, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 upa.manaįnį; G25a, F10, T44 . E4, L5 upa.manaįnį; R3 upa.manaįnį; L1 upa.mą; T46 upa.manaįnį; FK1 upa.manaįnį; (G) upa.manaįnį

263 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 niāo

263 K2, F10 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, (G); G25a, T44 . E4 napt. R1, R3 . Mf2, K9 above the line napt.; FK1 nįpiti

263 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G) E4 cniat.ī


263 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5 dahmanąm; R1 . T46, P1, (G) dahmanąm; G42, FK1 . K9 dahmanąm

263 P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.parađanąm; G25a, T44 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . K9 tanu.parađanąm; F10 . B2 tanu.parađanąm; R1 anu.parađanąm; R3 tanu.parađanąm; T46 tanu.parađanąm; E4 tanu.parađanąm; FK1 tanu.parađanąm

263 K2, G25a, F10 . R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); T44, R1 + mraot. abun. mazdą +; R3 iū/i dā; L1, B2, P1 . Mf2 mraot; L5 mraot; K9 iū/i + mraot. abun. +

263 G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 pančasat; FK1 pācaca

270 Mf2; K2 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, (G) viisaitica; G25a . K9 viisaita; F10 viisaita; T44, R1 . R278, G42, FK1 viśća; R3 viśći; E4 viśata; L5 viśatca

270 Mf2; K2, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, L5 dahmanąm; G25a dahmanąm; R1 . T46, P1 (G) dahmanąm; G42 . K9 dahmanąm; E4 dahmanąm; FK1 dahmaįnį

270 B2, R278, P1, Br1, (G); K2, F10, T44, R1 . T46, E4 pančasat; G25a . FK1 pančasat; R3 pančasat; L1, L2, G42 panča.satąm; L5 panca.sata; Mf2 pančasatąm; K9 pančasatąm
“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 tanupahl sinners?”

And Ahura Mazda said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the tanupahl sinners.”

“A. |a| ADYN’ MNW nyʾk BRA YMYTWN-yt nyʾyk 2704 ’ywp BRA YMYTWN-yt cnd OLE-šʾn’ QDM NTLWN-šnk npk 2705 MN nyʾk nypylk MN nyʾkyh cnd dhmʾn’ cnd tnʾpwhlkʾnʾ 2706 |b| AP-š 2707 gwpt ’whrmdz 25 dhmʾnʾ 50 2708 tnʾpwhlkʾnʾ


A. |a| ēg kē niyāg bē mīrēd niyāye ayāb bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar pāyīsnag nabag az niyāg nabērag az niyāye čand dahmān čand tanāpuhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd wīst ud panj dahmān panjāh tanāpuhlagān

B. |a| ēg kē niyāg bē mīrēd ayāb niyāye bē mīrēd tā čand awēšān abar mānišn nabag az niyāg [kū nabērag] ud nabage [kū nabērāge] az niyāge čand dahmān ud čand “tanāpuhlagān” |b| u-š guft ohrmazd wīst ud panj dahmān panjāh xtanāpuhlagān

A. |a| “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 tanāpuhlt sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the tanāpuhlt sinners.”

B. |a| “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 [namely the grandson], the granddaughter [namely the granddaughter]
granddaughter] with regard to her grandmother? 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. niāka- (12.9a)

This Avestan word corresponds to OP. niāka-. According to Szemerényi (1950 235-236), OP. niāka- stems from *ni-āyaka-, which in its turn would stem from IE. *a-yo- “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. niāka- 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 *niāka- already existed in Old Iranian.

Av. pāṇcāca. visaitica (12.9b)

Regarding Av. pāncā, vid. (Miyakawa 1998), who explains the long vowel – ā° as an Indo-Iranian samādhi *pāncā-ca of an old collective in parathetic numbers.
12.10. |a| dātar. gaebanąm. 2715 astmaitiŋm. 2716 ašųm. kūdu. māna. 2717 yaoždaβa. 2718 kūdu. 2719 bun. 2720 yaoždāta. 2721 aą. mrao. 2722 aburo. mazaδa. 2723 *drī. frašnăiti. tanųm. 2724 *drī. frašnăiti. vašraŋm. 2725 *drī. frašrūiti. 2726 gūdbm. 2727 imų. n. 2728 drū. yazaβa. 2729 bāršma. 2730 stormae. 2731 aįjū. 2732 vaŋribu. 2733 zaoδa. 2734 baraβa. 2735 yaoždāta. 2736 pasca. 2737 bun. 2738 māna. 2739 *vašo.upiitt. 2740

apāṃ. 2744 + vasō.upāiti. 2745 uruvaranāṃ. 2746 + vasō.upāiti. 2747 amāṇāṃ. spōntanāṃ. 2748 spitama. 2749 zarādhūstra.

[a] “Maker, Righteous, |b| 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 Špitama Zarādhūstra.”

A. |a| dʾtʾl x gyhʾn |b| 'hlwb 2754' cygwn mʾn 2755 ywšdʾslynyt 2756 cygwn YHWWN-t DKYA |c| AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd' 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt tn 2757 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt wstly 2758 3 bʾl prʾc slʾdšnk gʾsʾn’ ZNE KON ’thš yckpt bslwm

---

2740 G25a . FK1 . Mf2, K9; K2 pasciti; R3 . L5 pascaiti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 pascaeta; E4 pascata
2741 K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; Mf2, K9 bīn
2742 R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2; K2, R3 nmāmi; G25a nmāne; E4 namāna; L5, FK1 namāne; K9 nmāna
2743 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; R1 /tā/ |tā | vasō.upāiti. ...
2744 spitama |t; E4 vasō.upāite; Mf2 vasō.upaiti
2745 T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 apāṃ
2746 K2, G25a . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; R3 vasō.upāiti; R278 vasō.upāite; E4 vasō.upāite; Mf2, K9 vasō.upaiti
2747 P1 . Mf2; K2 uruvarāṃ; G25a uruvarāṃ; R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . K9 uruvaranāṃ; T46 uruvarāṃ; L5 uruvaranāṃ
2748 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5; E4, FK1 vasō.upāita; Mf2, K9 vasō.upaiti
2749 K2, R3 . E4, L5, FK1 . K9 amāṇāṃ; G25a amāṇāṃ; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 amāṇāṃ;
2750 T46, P1 . Mf2 amāṇāṃ
2752 spōntanāṃ; L5 spōntanāṃ
2753 L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; K2 . P1 spītama; G25a spītama; R3 spōtt;
2754 T44 spītami; FK1 spītama
2755 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; F10 spītamazarādhūstra; R3 .
2756 L5 zarādhūstra; E4 zarādhūtra; FK1 zarādhūtra
2757 K2, G25a, R3 ghʾn; R1, (Jmp) | gyhʾn’ | ‘hlwb |
2758 K2, R3 ‘st mndʾn; G25a ‘st mndʾn’
2759 G25a, R3, K2 ‘hlwbʾy
2760 K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp); R1 lʾpštʾ | mʾn’ | mʾn’ | |
2761 (Jmp); K2, R3 ‘ywydʾ slynty; G25a ‘ywydʾslynyt
2762 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 tnʾtl
2763 K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) wstlg
2764 G25a; K2, R3 (Jmp) bslm
ASLWN-\textsuperscript{x}\textsubscript{1} MYA\textsuperscript{y} ŠPYL zwhl\textsuperscript{1} bld DKYA AHL YHW\textsuperscript{t}\textsubscript{2} m’n’ |d| k’mk lpd MYA\textsuperscript{2} k’mk lpd’wlwl k’mk lpd\textsuperscript{3} mhrspnd’n\textsuperscript{4} spy’t’m’n\textsuperscript{5} zltwhšt\textsuperscript{6}

B. \textsuperscript{766} [a] d’t\textsuperscript{766}’l\textsuperscript{769} \textsuperscript{7} |a| cygwn npšt'

A. \textsuperscript{769} [a] dādār \textsuperscript{8} *gēhān \textsuperscript{9} *astōmandān ablāw |b| čiyōn mān yōjdāsrēnēd čiyōn būd pāk |c| u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār sōyēd tan sē bār sōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyišnag gābān ēn nūn ātāxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb ī weh zōhr bārd pāk pas būd mān |d| kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān spitāmān zardux̠št

B. \textsuperscript{9} [a] dādār \textsuperscript{10} [a] čiyōn nibišt

A. \textsuperscript{10} [a] “Maker of the material creatures, Righteous, \textsuperscript{11} [b] how will he purify the house? How will it be pure?” \textsuperscript{12} [c] And Ohrmazd said: “He will wash his body thrice, he will wash his clothes thrice, he will recite the Gādāš 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. \textsuperscript{13} [d] The waters will come at will, the plants will come at will, the Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zardux̠št.”

B. \textsuperscript{13} [a] “Maker …” \textsuperscript{14} [b] As written.

\textsuperscript{2762} K2, R3 (Jmp); G25a ASLWN-šn’
\textsuperscript{2763} (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 \textsuperscript{y} y \textsuperscript{y}
\textsuperscript{2764} G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 zwl
\textsuperscript{2765} K2, R3 (Jmp); G25a ZNE YHW\textsuperscript{t}N-t
\textsuperscript{2766} K2, R3, (Jmp); R1 p
\textsuperscript{2768} G25a; K2, R1, R3 ‘mhrspnd; (Jmp) ‘ṃṛspnd’n’
\textsuperscript{2769} G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 spyt’m’n; R1 ‘y spyt’m’n’
\textsuperscript{2770} G25a, R1; K2, R3, (Jmp) zltwśt
\textsuperscript{2775} F10; T44 d’t’l zltwśt
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|a| “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

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, R1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, (G); K2 para.irdiieiti; F10 para.irdiieiti; T44 para.irdiieiti; R3 para.irdiieiti; E4 para.irdiieiti; L5 pari.irdiieiti; FK1 para.irdiieiti; K9 para.irdiieiti 2772 F10. B2, Br1, L5, FK1, (G); K2. L1, P1, L2, G42 nipi; G25a, T44 napta. R1. E4 nipi; R3. Mf2 napte; R278 | napti. va. para.irdiieiti |; K9 npte 2773 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3. L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G); T46 naptivā 2774 G25a, R1. L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42. Mf2, (G); K2, R3 para.irdiieiti; F10, T44 para.irdiieiti; E4 para.irdiieiti; L5 para.irdiieiti; FK1 para.irdiieiti; K9 para.irdiieiti 2775 Mf2; K2, G25a. FK1. K9 aēqm; F10, T44, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aēqm; R1. T46, P1 aēqm; (G) aēqm 2776 T46, P1. Mf2; K2, F10, T44, R3. FK1 upa.mñaiiqm; G25a. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42. K9 upa.mñaiiqm; R1 upa.mñaiiqm; E4 upa.mñaiiqm; L5 upa.mñaiiqm; (G) upa.mñaiiqm 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 | niakō. ... 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 ṇa ṇa naptō 2779 G25a, T44; K2a in the right margin, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. Mf2, K9, (G) niakē; F10. L5 niakē; FK1 niakē 2780 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 2781 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, E4, L5 dabmanām; R1. T46, P1, (G) dabmanām; R3 dabmanām; G42, FK1 dabmanām; K9 aēqm. dabmanām 2782 R1. P1. Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.porōdām; G25a, F10, R3 tanu.porōdām; T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5. K9 tanu.porōdām; T46 tanu.porōdām; E4 tanu.porādām; FK1 tanu.porōdām 2783 K2, G25a. R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1, (G); F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) | mraot. ahūrō. mazā |; R3 | iā. dā. L1, B2, P1. Mf2 mraō. L5 mraō. K9 | iā. | mraot. ahūrō | 2784 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 panca.ca), R1 panca.dasa; L1 panca.ca 2785 K2, R1 | visātica. |; F10 visātica; T44 visata; G25a in the right margin . L1, B2, T46, P1, L2. Mf2, (G) visātica; R278, G42 vistra; Br1 vistra; E4, L5 vistra; FK1 visātica; K9 vistaca 2786 Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 dabmanām; R1. T46, P1, (G) dabmanām; R3 visāticadabmanām; L5 dabmanām; FK1. K9 dabmanām 2787 R278, T46, P1. Mf2, (G); K2, G25a (but corrected prima manu in the right margin as panca.satam), R1 ḍristam; F10, T44, R3. E4, L5 panca.satam; L1, L2, G42 panca. satam; B2 panca. satam; Br1 panca. satam; FK1 panca. satam 2788 R1. T46, P1. Mf2, (G); K2 tanu.porōdām; G25a, R3 tanu.porōdām; F10 tanu.porādām; T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. K9 tanu.porōdām; E4 tanu.porādām; L5 tanu.porōdām
tanu.ʿrəϑə- sinners?” |b| And Ahura Mazdā said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the tanu.ʿrəϑə- sinners.”

A. |a| ADYN’ MNW nyyʾk 2790 BRA YMYTWN-yt nyyʾk 2791 ’ywp BRA YMYTWN-yt cnd OLE-sʾn’ QDM NTLWN-šnk 2792 nyʾk MN npk 2793 nyʾyk 2794 MN npyh 2795 cnd dhmʾnʾ cnd tnʾpwlkʾnʾ 2796 |b| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd 15 2797 dhmʾnʾ 30 2798 tnʾpwlgʾnʾ 2799

B. |a| ADYN’ MNW npk BRA YMYTWN-yt’ ’ywp npky BRA YMYTWN-yt’ cnd 2800 OLE-sʾnʾ QDM KTLWN-šnʾ nyʾk MN npk W nyʾkyk MN npky 301 OD 302 cnd dhmʾnʾ OD cnd tnʾpwlkʾnʾ 3263 |b| AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd 25 dhmʾnʾ 50 tnʾpwlgʾnʾ

A. |a| ēg kē niyāg bē mīrēd niyāg ayāb bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar pāyišag niyāg az nabag niyāyī az ʿnabagi čand dahmān čand ʿtanāpuhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd pānzdah dahmān sīh ʿtanāpuhlagān

B. |a| ēg kē nabag bē mīrēd ayāb nabage bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar mānišn niyāg az nabag ud niyāge az nabage tā čand dahmān tā čand ʿtanāpuhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd wīst ud panǰ dahmān panǰāh ʿtanāpuhlagān

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 ʿtanāpuhhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Fifteen (days) for the pious, thirty for the ʿtanāpuhhl 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 ʿtanāpuhhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty-five (days) for the pious, fifty for the ʿtanāpuhhl sinners.”
Av. pancaça. ṝveisaitica and pancaśatam (12.11b)

Most manuscripts agree in the number of days in V 12.11, namely 25 for the pious and 50 for the tanu.para-ā- 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.

2804 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G); T46 dātār
astuaitinam. ašūm | (G) | gaėdanam. ... zanbuštė |

2806 B2 stuanaitanām; Mf2 astuaitanām
2807 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; F10 . E4, L5, FK1
nāmām; R3 kūdnāmām
2808 K2, G25a, F10, R3 . L2, L5 yaoždaðāmi; T44 yaoždaðām; R1 /iā/ | yaoždaðāni. ... bun | ; L1, B2 yaoždaðāmi; R278 yaoždaðām; T46, P1, Br1, G4 yaoždaðāma; FK1
yaoždaðāma; Mf2 yaoždaðāme; K9 yaoždaðāme
2809 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; R1 /iā/ | aat. ...

spuータatām | |
2810 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1; R3 /iā/ dā; L1, R278, P1 . Mf2 mrao; L5 maraο;
K9 /iā/ | mrao. abūro |
2811 K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; R3 driś.frasnātī; E4 driś.frasnātā; L5
dariṇātī; FK1 driś.frasnātī; Mf2, K9 driś.frasnātī
2813 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, FK1; Br1 driś.frasnātī; E4 driś.frasnātā; L5
dariṇātī; Mf2, K9 above the line driś.frasnātī
2814 T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, R3 vastranām; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 vastranām; E4, L5, FK1
vastaranām; K9 above the line vastranām
2815 R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42; K2 | driś.frasnūtī. gađanam | ; G25a driś.frasnī; T46
driś.frasnūtī; E4, FK1 driś.frasnātā; L5 dariṇātī; FIK1 driś.frasnātī; Mf2, K9 driś.frasnūtī
2816 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 gađanān
2817 K2, G25a . B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; R3 . FK1 imānō; L1, E4 aimānō
2818 K2, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; G25a . E4, L5, FK1 ātron; L2 āram
2819 K2, G25a, R3 . E4, L5, FK1 yazata; L1, P1 yazata; B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2 yazaēta; G42
yazaēta; Mf2, K9 yazaēta
2820 G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; K2, R3 barasma; E4 barasma; FK1
barasma
2821 Mf2, K9; K2, G25a, R3 staronāta; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 staronāeta; E4 staronāta;
L5 staronāeta; FK1 staraṇīti
2822 G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9; K2 zaodrā. ajiūo; L5 ajiūo
2823 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 vahpūbiūo; Mf2, K9 vahpūbiūo
2824 K2, G25a . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; R3 za'drā; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 zaodrā; E4
jaodrā
2825 Mf2, K9; K2 barata; G25a . Br1, L5, FK1 baraiti; R3 baraiti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42
baraēta; E4 baraēta
2826 K2 . FK1; G25a . Br1, L2, G42 yaoždāta; R3 yōzādāta; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 yaoždāta; B2, R278
yaoždāta; T46 ajiūo; yaoždāta; E4 yaoždāta; L5 yōzādāti

405
A. |a| d’tl gyh’n 2842  ṣ’twmnd’n 2845 ḥlwvk 2844  b| cygwn m’n 2848 ywš’d slynt 2846 cygwn YHWWN-t DKYA |c| AP-š gwpt ‘whrmzd 3 b’il HLLWN-yt tn 2847 3 b’il HLLWN-yt wstl 2848 3 b’il pr’e sl’y t g’s’n’ ZNE KON ’ths 2850 ycyt blswm

“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 Spitama Zarāduṣṭra.”
ASLWN-x₁ MYA ŠPYŁ₂⁸⁵₂ zwhl YBLWN-x₁ ywšd’šl₂⁸⁵₃ AHL YHWN- Tết m’n’ [d] k’mk lpd₂⁸⁵₄ MYA k’mk lpd ’wlwl k’mk lpd ’mhrspnd’n’₂⁸⁵₅ spyt’m’n’₂⁸⁵₆ zltwšt₂⁸⁵₇

B. [a] d’tl’ |b| cygwn₂⁸⁶⁰ npšt’

A. [a] dādār gehān astōmandān ahlaw |b| cīyōn mān yōjdāsrēnēd cīyōn būd pāk |c| u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār sōyēd tan sē bār sōyēd wasataray sē bār frāz srāyēd gāhān en nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb weh zōhr bard yōjdāsr 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 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 ’ywyd’sl
₂⁸⁵₄ (Jmp); K2, R3 lpt; G25a SYTWN-d
₂⁸⁵₅ K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) ’mhrspnd’n’
₂⁸⁵₆ G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 spytm’n
₂⁸⁵₇ G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) zltwšt’
₂⁸⁶⁰ T44; F10 | cygwn npšt’ |
A. [a] ADYN ¹²⁶⁵ MNW BLWL-ELYDWN-k ²⁸⁷⁶ BRA YMYTWN-yt' BLWL-
zyktv¹²⁷⁷ ywp BRA YMYTWN-yt' end OLE-x's QDM KTLWN-šnk end dhl'n' 
cnd tr pwlq n'²⁸⁷⁸ [b] AP-s gwpt 'wrmzd 20 dhl' n' 40 tr pwlq n'²⁸⁷⁹

²⁸⁶⁵ K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, T46, P1, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9

²⁸⁶⁶ K2, R1 brâtuiri; G25a, F10, T44 barâtuiri; R3 . Mf2, K9, (G) brâtuir; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 brâtuir; R278 barâ.turi. Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G) brâtuiri; R278 barâ.turi. Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42

²⁸⁶⁷ R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; R278 barâ.turi. Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; R278 barâ.turi. Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42

²⁸⁶⁸ K2, R1 brâtuiri; G25a, F10, T44 barâtuiri; R3 . Mf2, K9, (G) brâtuir; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G) brâtuiri; R278 barâ.turi. Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; R278 barâ.turi. Mf2, K9, (G) barâ.tur; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42

²⁸⁶⁹ K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, Mf2, K9 above the line, (G)

²⁸⁷⁰ G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.irdi-ei; F10 para.irdiet; T44 pari.irdietai; Br1 para.irdieit; L5 para.irdieiet; FK1 pari.irdieieti

²⁸⁷¹ K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 . Mf2, K9, (G) L5 para.irdieiet; FK1 pari.irdieieti

²⁸⁷² K2, G25a, F10, R3 . FK1 . K9 aəsəm; T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aəsəm; R1 . T46, P1 aəsəm; (G) aəsəm

²⁸⁷³ R1 (second -ə- scratched) . T46 . Mf2; K2, F10, T44 . E4, FK1 upa.mānai; G25a . B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 upa.mānai; R3 upa.mānai; L1, P1 upa.mānai; (G) upa.mānai

²⁸⁷⁴ Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 daḥmaṇ; R1 . T46, P1, (G) daḥmaṇ; E4, L5 dāḥmaṇ; FK1 dáḥmaṇ

²⁸⁷⁵ R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; G25a taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; F10 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; T44 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ. aət; R3 . FK1 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ

²⁸⁷⁶ K2, G25a . B2, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); F10, T44, R1 (with a blank) - mṛaọt. abhuro. mazdā | - R3 | tə/də | L1, R278, T46, P1 . Mf2 mraọt; K9 | tə/də | mraọt. abhuro |

²⁸⁷⁷ K2, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); G25a viśaṭa; R3 . Mf2, K9 viśaṭa; R278 viśaṭa

²⁸⁷⁸ Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 daḥmaṇ; R1 . T46, P1, (G) daḥmaṇ; L5 dāḥmaṇ; FK1 dāḥmaṇ

²⁸⁷⁹ L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, E4 . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, G25a, R1, R3 . FK1 cādṝṣaṭ; F10, T44 cādṝṣaṭ; G42 cādṝṣaṭaṃ; L5 cādṝṣaṭaṃ

²⁸⁸⁰ R1 . T46, P1, (G); K2 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; G25a, R3 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; F10 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . K9 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; E4 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; Mf2 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ; R3 taṃpṝṣaṇāṃ

²⁸⁸¹ G25a, R3, (Jmp); K2, R1 A - s gwpt 'wrmzd ADYN'

²⁸⁸² R1; K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp) /blank/ | BLWL-ELYDWN-k |; G25b BRE BLWL

²⁸⁸³ R1; K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp) /blank/ | BLWL-z'tkyh |; G25b BRTE BLWL

²⁸⁸⁴ R1, (Jmp); K2, R3 tr pwlkg n'; G25a tr pwlkg n'
A. [a] ēg kē brādār-zādag bē mīrēd brādār-zādagāyāb bē mīrēd ċand awēśān abar mānišnag ċand dahnān ċand *tanāpuhlagān |b| u-s guft ohrmazd wist dahnān čehel *tanāpuhlagān

B. [a] ēg kē pus brādār bē mīrēd ayāb duxt brādār bē mīrēd ċand awēśān abar mānišn ċā ċand dahnān ċā ċand *tanāpuhlagān |b| u-s guft ohrmazd wist dahnān čehel *tanāpuhlagān

A, B. [a] “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 tanāpuhbl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty (days) for the pious, for forty for the tanāpuhbl sinners.”

Av. *brātūrīō, *brātūrīa (12.13a)

Following the IrVS manuscripts, Geldner (1896) edited Av. brātrūiō and brātruie in V 12.13, but Av. tūrīō and tūrīa 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. *brātūrīā- stems from OIr. *brātōrya- < OIr. *brātārya- < IIr. *bʰr̥aḥtryiā- < IE. *bʰr̥eḥtryiiō-; cf. Ved. bhrātrya- “nephew” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.281), (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52, 94), (Fischer 1998 83). Av. tūrīa- stems from OIr. *tārya- < *(p)tārya- < IE. *ph₂tṛy敷-; cf. Ved. pitṛya- “uncle” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.130), (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52, 94), (Fischer 1998 84). In both cases the same syllabic sequence, namely IE. *tṛy敷-, 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 brātūrīa- of some manuscripts lead to a reconstruction as OIr. *brātṛyfrīja-.

Hoffmann & Forssman (1996 52) thus corrected Geldner’s brātruia- by *brātūrīia-, which however must be corrected as *brātūriō and *brātūrīa respectively, since as such it is not attested in any manuscript.

Regarding the meaning “nephew” and “niece” for Av. brātruia- and brātruia- respectively, vid. (Wackernagel 1916 2).

2879 R1, (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 tn’pwlk’ n’
2880 F10; T44 A -s gwpt ’whrmzd ADYN’
2881 T44; F10 tn’pwlk’ n’
2882 F10; T44 tn’pwlk’ n’
2883 The same development of IIr. *tṛy敷- > OIr. *tṛy敷- > Av. *tūrīa- is found in Av. apūrīa- and siṣṭūrīa- (Cantera 1999c 45-46).
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 Gađas thrice. He must worship this our fire, he must spread the barsman-, 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 Špitama Zaraduṣṭra.”
t 2938 mʾn’ |d| kʾmk lpd MYA kʾmk lpd ’wlwl kʾmk lwd 2939 mhrspndʾn 2940 spyṭʾmʾn zltwḥšʾ 2942

B. |a| dʾtʾl |b| cygwn npštʾ

A. |a| dādār |b| čīyōn mān yōjdāsrēnēd čīyōn būd pāk |c|
    uʾš guft ohrmazd sē bār sōyēd tan sē bār sōyēd 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| 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 Gāḏās 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.”

B. |a| “Maker …” |b| As written.

2935 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a ASLWN-šnʾ
2936 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a wyh
2937 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a YBLWN-t
2938 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a YHWWN-ʾšt
2939 G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) ← lwd ←
2940 G25a; K2, R3 ’mhrspndʾn; (Jmp) ’mārsndʾnʾn
2941 (Jmp); K2, R3 spyṭʾmʾn; G25a spyṭʾmʾn
2942 G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) zltwḥšʾ
A. |a| "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.paritya-sinners?" |b| And Ahura Mazdā said: "Fifteen (days) for the pious, thirty for the tanu.paritya-sinners."

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9

R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); K2 para.iriđīaeta; F10, T44 para.iriđīaeta; R3 para.iriđīaeta; L1 para.eriđīaeta; Mf2 para.iriđīaeta; L5 para.iriđīaeta; FK1 pair.iriđīaeta

K2, G25a, R1 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, (G); K2 para.iriđīaeta; F10, T44 para.iriđīaeta; R3 para.iriđīaeta; L1 para.eriđīaeta; Mf2 para.iriđīaeta; L5 para.iriđīaeta; FK1 pair.iriđīaeta

K2, G25a, F10 . K9 aēšąm . T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aēšąm; R1 . T46, P1 aēšąm; (G) aēšąm

K2, G25a, F10 . K9 aēšąm . T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 aēšąm; R1 . T46, P1 aēšąm; (G) aēšąm
A. |a| ēg kē pid brādar bē mīrēd pid brādarēn ayāb bē mīrēd ḍand awēsān abar mānišag ḍand dahnān ḍand "tanāpəhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd wīst dahnān čehel "tanāpəhlagān

B. |a| ēg kē čahārom pus bē mīrēd ayāb čahārome duxt bē mīrēd ḍand awēsān abar mānišn tā ḍand dahnān ḍand "tanāpəhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd pānzdah dahnān šīh "tanāpəhlagān

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 tanāpəhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Twenty (days) for the pious, forty for the tanāpəhl 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 tanāpəhl sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Fifteen (days) for the pious, thirty for the tanāpəhl sinners.”

Av. tūiriia- → Phl. čahārom pus; Av. tūiriia- → čahārome duxt (12.15a)

Only the Pahlavi translators of B and R1 translated Av. tūiriia- and tūiriia-, while the translator of R1 interpreted correctly Av. tūiriia- 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.

The Pahlavi translators of B mistook Av. tūiriia- “uncle” (< *tayrīa- < *(p)təryja- < IE. *ph₂təryja-< cf. Ved. pityaya- “uncle” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 2.130), (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996 52, 94), (Fischer 1998 84)) for the homonymous numeral Av. tūiriia- “fourth” (< Ir. *d(ê)r(ê)jia-< cf. Ved. turīya- “fourth” (Mayrhofer 1992-2001 1.657)). Because of this confusion, they translated Av. tūiriia- “uncle” by Phl. čahārom “fourth” and created its feminine equivalent Phl. čahārome from the Pahlavi masculine.

2962 R1; G25a (G25b adds 4-wm) BRTE; R3 dwht
2963 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a NTLWN-šn k
2964 G25a; K2, R1, R3, (Jmp) tn pwlkg’n
2965 K2, R1; G25a 10; R3, (Jmp) 15
2966 K2, R1, R3; G25a 20; (Jmp) 30
2967 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a tn pwlkg’n
2968 F10; T44 OD cn’d
2969 F10; T44 OD cn’d
2970 F10; T44 tn pwlkg’n
But a further confusion must be taken into account regarding the PT of B: Phl. čahārom *pus* and čahārome *duxt* do not render exactly Av. *tūriia-* and *tūriiā-. As a result of the above mentioned mistake, we would expect simply Av. *tūriia-* → Phl. čahārom and Av. *tūriiā-* → čahārome. 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. čahārom and čahārome were not just numerals or rather because they just slipped into the PTs of the following Av. *tūriiia.puθra-* and *tūriiia.duγδar-. Indeed, according to the mistaken correspondence between Av. *tūriia-* → Phl. čahārom, the PTs čahārom *pus* and čahārome *duxt* translate correctly Av. *tūriiia.puθra-* and *tūriiia.duγδar-*, which are just the PTs of these Avestan words in V 12.17a and 12.19a.

Av. *paṇcā.dasa* and ẓrisatəm (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.pərəda-* 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 *paṇcā.dasa* and ẓrisatəm respectively.

---

K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9, (G); T46 dātā
Mf2; K2, R3 . R278, T46, P1 . K9 /tā/ | gađāņum. astuṇātim. | G25a, F10, T44, R1 . FK1 | gađāņum. astuṇātim. aṣāum | L1 | gađāņum. astuṇātim | B2 gađāņum; Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 /tā/ | gađāņum. astuṇātim. aṣāum | (G) | gađāņum ... zarābūsra |

K2, G25a, F10, T44 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; F10 . L1, R278, P1, FK1 namān; R3 kađānān; E4, L5 kūda namān
K2, G25a, F10 . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10 | kūda. ... spūntān; |

T46 | kūda. ... spūntān |

K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10 | kūda. ... spūntān |

K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10 | kūda. ... spūntān |

K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; E4, G42, K9; Mf2, K9 | kūda ...

R3 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42; K2 yozdađāta; G25a yozdađāta; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 yozdađāta; R278 yozdađāta; E4 yozdađāta; L5, FK1 yozdađāti
K2, G25a . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R3 /tā/ da; L1, R278, P1 . Mf2 mraot; K9 /tā/ | mraot. aburu |

K2, G25a . R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; E4, G42, K9; Mf2, K9 | kūda ...

T46, P1 . Mf2; K2 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 . K9 vastranān; G25a . E4, L5 vastranān; FK1 vastranān

G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42; K2 riš. frasnūata; R3 vaṣṭaraṇām; G25a; Mf2, K9; K2, G25a . R278, E4, L5, FK1 atarum
K2, G25a . R3 . T46, L5, FK1 yazata; L1 yazata; B2, R278, Br1, L2 yazata; P1, G42 yazata; E4 yazīete; Mf2, K9 yazāeta

G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; K2, R3 . FK1 barasma; Br1 barasme; E4 barasama; L5 barisma

FK1 . Mf2; K2, R3 barana; G25a starmitti; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 stormaeta; E4 stormaeta; L5 stormaeta; K9 stormaeta

G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; K2 | aijūiō. vaŋhubiiō |

G25a, R3; L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 vaŋhubiiō; T46, E4 vaŋhubiiō; L5 vaŋhubiiō; Mf2, K9 vaŋhubiiō
K2, G25a . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5; L1, P1 . Mf2, K9 zoaḍrā; FK1 zoaḍrā
Mf2, K9; K2 brāta; G25a . L5 baraiti; R3 zoaḍrābaraita; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 bārēta; FK1 bārēti
“Maker, Righteous, [a] 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 Śpitama Zarađuśtra.”

A. [a] d’tʾl gyhʾn n̄ stʾwmdʾn ̄ hlwb ̄ [b] cygwn mʾn ywšʾdšl ynt cygwn YHWWN-t DKYA c AP ̄ š gwptʾ whrmzd 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt ̄ tn ̄ 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt wstl ̄ 3 bʾl prʾc slʾyτ ̄ g ̄ s ʾnʾ ZNE KONʾ thš ycyt blswm
B. |a| dʾtʾl |b| cygwn npšt

A. |a| dādār ʾx gēhān astōmandān ahlaw |b| čīyōn mān yōjāšrēnēd čīyōn būd pāk  |c| u-š guft ohrmazd sē bār šōyēd tan sē bār šōyēd wastaray 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| 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 Gādās 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.”

B. |a| “Maker …” |b| As written.
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 sinners? [b] And Ahura Mazda said: “Ten (days) for the pious, twenty for the sinners.”
B. [a] ADYN’ MNW 4-wmyh BRE3057 l’d3058 BRE BRA3059 YMYTWN-yt’3060 ṣʾyw 4-wmyh BRTE l’d3061 BRTE BRA YMYTWN-yt’ cnd OLE-š’n’ QDM KTLWN-šn3062 OD cnd dhm’n’ OD cnd tn’pwlg’n’ |b| AP-š gwpt’ ṣ’whrmzd OD 10 dhm’n’ OD 20 tn’pwlk’n’3063

A. [a] ēg kē čahārom pus bē mīrēd ayāb čahārom duxt bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar mānēnd čand dahmān čand xtanāpuhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd dah dahmān wīst xtanāpuhlagān

B. [a] ēg kē čahārome pus rāy pus bē mīrēd ayāb čahārome duxt rāy duxt bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar mānīshn tā čand dahmān tā čand xtanāpuhlagān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd tā dah dahmān tā wīst xtanāpuhlagān

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.”
A. [a] “Maker, Righteous, [b] 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 Gaôs 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 Špitama Zaraŝtru.”

3091 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; Mf2, K9 bin
3092 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; G42 vasō.upāiti
3093 T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9 amēzanam;
3094 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4 vasō.upāita. apāmt.
3095 vasō.upāita
3096 T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, R3 upunanc; G25a . L1, B2, R278, Br1, G42, E4, L5 . K9 upunanc;
3097 L2 upunanc; FK1 above the line upunanc
3098 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; E4 vasō.upāita; FK1
3099 [+ vasō.upāiti +
3100 K2, G25a, R3 . E4, FK1 . K9 amēzanam; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 amēzanam; T46, P1 . Mf2
3101 amēzanam; L5 amēzanam
3102 T46, P1 . Mf2, (G); K2, G25a, R3 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 sopranam
3103 K2, G25a, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . K9; Mf2 sopranam
3104 K2, T44, R1, L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9; G25a sopramazaraustra; F10
3105 zaraustra; E4 saraustra; L5 zaraustra; FK1 sopramazaraustra
3106 K2, R3 gh’n; G25a, R1, (Jmp) [+ gyh’ ... ’hlwb’ +
3107 K2 ’stmn’d’ny; R3 ’stmn’d’n’y
3108 K2, R3 ’hlwb’y
3109 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 m’n; R1 npšt’
3110 (Jmp); K2 ’yywyd’šlynvt; G25a, R3 ’yywyd’šlynvt
3111 R3, (Jmp); K2 ’tn’; G25a tn’hl
3112 K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp) wstd
3113 K2, G25a, (Jmp); R3 bār
3114 K2, G25a, (Jmp); R3 ZNM
3115 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 ’tš
3116 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a — bslm ASLWN-x1 —
3117 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 y MYA
3118 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 zwl
3119 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a YBLWN-t
3120 G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) bwd
3121 (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd; G25a SGYWN-t
3122 G25a; K2, R3, (Jmp) p
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B. [a] d’a’t’l\textsuperscript{3124} |b| cygwn npšt’

A. [a] dādār xgēhān xastōmandān xahlaw |b| čiyōn mān yōjdārēnēd čiyōn būd pāk |c| u-s guft ohrmazd sē bār šōyēd tan sē bār šōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyiśnag gāhān ēn nīn ataxi jazēd barsom bandēd āb web zōhr bard pāk pas būd mān |d| kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amabrāspandān spitāmān zarduxšt

B. [a] dādar |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 Beneficent Immortals will come at will, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt.”

B. [a] “Maker …” |b| As written.

\textsuperscript{3119} G25a, (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd
\textsuperscript{3120} (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd; G25a SGYTWN-t
\textsuperscript{3122} K2, G25a, R3; (Jmp) ‘mśrspnd’n’
\textsuperscript{3122} (Jmp); K2 ‘spytm’n’ ‘; G25a, R3 spytm’n’
\textsuperscript{3123} G25a; R3 zwltwšt; (Jmp) zwltwšt
\textsuperscript{3124} F10; T44 ‘d’t’l ‘|

|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.porda– sinners?” |b| And Ahura Mazdā said: “Five (days) for the pious, ten for the tanu.porda– 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 yāt
3126 K2, G25a in the margin, R1. L1, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42; F10. R278, E4, L5, FK1 tūirīo.pudrō;
3127 T44 tūiriia.pudrō; B2 tūiriia.pudrō; Mf2, K9 tūiriia.pudrō; (G) tūiriia. pudrō
3128 K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R1. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9, (G);
3129 K2, G25a in the margin, R3. B2, R278, L2, G42. K9; K2 para.iriđięiıt; F10 para.iriđięiıt; T44 pari.iriđięiıt; R3 pari.iriđięiıt; L1 pari.iriđięiıt; T46, Br1. pari.iriđięiıt; E4 pari.aira.iriđięiıt; L5 pari.iriđięiıt; FK1 pari.airi
3130 K2, G25a in the margin, R1. B2, R278, L2, G42. K9, (G); K2 para.iriđięiıt; F10 para.iriđięiıt; T44 pari.iriđięiıt; R3 pari.iriđięiıt; L1 pari.iriđięiıt; T46, Br1. pari.iriđięiıt; E4 pari.aira.iriđięiıt; L5 pari.iriđięiıt; FK1 pari.airi
3131 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). F10, T44, R3. L1, B2, T46, L2, G42, E4, FK1. (G) vā. duđa. para.iriđięiıt |
3132 F10 tūiriie.dyuđairov
3133 P1 above the line, Br1 above the line; F10. R278, L5 vā. duđa.; Mf2, K9 dyuđaire
3134 R278; G25a in the margin. Br1, L2, G42 ird; F10 para.iriđięiıt; R3 dyuđapar.airi.iriđięiıt; P1 above the line iriđięiıt; L5 pari.iriđięiıt; FK1 airi; Mf2, K9 | para.iriđięiıt |
3135 R1. Mf2, K2, F10. FK1. K9 aēšm; G25a in the margin aetēšm; T44, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 aēšm; T46, P1 aēšm; (G) aēšm
3136 T46. P1. Mf2, K2, F10, R3. E4, L5, FK1 upa.manaįt; G25a in the margin upa.manaįt; T44 upa.manaįt; R1 upa.manaįt; L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42. K9 upa.manaįt; (G) upa.manaįt
3137 Mf2; K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, L5 dabmanām; R1. T46, P1. (G) dabmanām; G42. K9 dabmanām; E4 dabmanām; FK1 dabn.ṇm
3138 R1. T46, P1. Mf2, (G); K2, R3 tanu.ordaṇm; G25a in the margin tanu.ordaṇm; F10 tanu.ordaṇm; T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4. FK1. K9 tanu.ordaṇm; L5 tanu.ordaṇm
3139 K2, G25a in the margin, F10. B2, T46, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); T44, R1 (with a blank) mraot. aburō. mazda.; R3. īā dā; L1, R278, P1. Mf2 mraot. Br1 mō.og; K9 īā | mraot. aburō |
3140 Mf2; K2, R3 dabmanām; G25a in the margin, F10, T44. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42. K9, (G) dabmanām; R1. T46, P1 dabmanām; E4, L5 dabmanām; FK1 dabn.ṇm
3141 K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. Mf2, K9, (G); FK1 pānđa
3142 R1. P1, (G); K2, R3 tanu.ordaṇm; G25a in the margin, F10 tanu.ordaṇm; T44. B2, R278, P1, G42, FK1. K9 tanu.ordaṇm; T46 tanu.ordaṇm; E4 dasatani.ordaṇm; L5 dasatani.ordaṇm; Mf2 tanu.ordaṇm
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A. [a] ADYN* MNW 3142 /blank/ BRA YMYTWN-yt 3144 /blank/ ʾywp 3145 BRA YMYTWN-yt cnd OLE-šʾn QDM KTLWN-d 3146 cnd dhmʾn cnd tnʾpwlgʾn |b| AP-š gwpt ʾwhrmzd pnc dhmʾn 10 tnʾpwlgʾn”

B. [a] ADYN’ MNW 4-wm BRE lʾd BRE BRA YMYTWN-yt ʾywp 4-wm dwht cnd OLE-šʾn QDM KTLWN-šʾn OD cnd dhmʾn OD cnd tnʾpwlgʾn |b| AP-š gwpt ʾwhrmzd pnc YWM dhmʾn 10 YWM tnʾpwlgʾn

A. [a] ēg kē /blank/ bē mīrēd /blank/ ayāb bē mīrēd čand awēšān abar mānēnd čand dahmān čand ʾtanāpulbāgān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd pānj dahmān dah ʾtanāpulbāgān

B. [a] ēg kē čahārom pus rāy pus bē mīrēd ayāb čahārom duxt čand awēšān abar mānīn tā čand dahmān tā čand ʾtanāpulbāgān |b| u-š guft ohrmazd pānj rōz dahmān dah rōz ʾtanāpulbāgān

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 tanāpul sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Five (days) for the pious, ten for the tanāpul 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 tanāpul sinners?” |b| And Ohrmazd said: “Five days for the pious, ten days for the tanāpul sinners.”

Av. tūiriia.duγḍa. +vā. +duγḍa. ʾpara.iriθiieiti (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 āat. yaṭ. + masculine relative + ʾpara.iriθiieiti + feminine relative + vā + ē para.iriθiieiti. However, in V 12.19a we find the sequence āat. yaṭ. tūiriia.педr. vā. pedr. ʾpara.iriθiieiti. tūiriia.duγḍa, where the expected ʾvā. duγḍa. ʾpara.iriθiieiti | is lacking. So the sequence is broken in tūiriia.duγḍa, which shows variants like tūiriia. duγḍairi which deserves an explanation.
This variant can be explained in two ways: a) it reflects part of a compound; b) it is a corruption instead of τὐρίια. δὐγδα. vā. δὐγδα. para. ἱρίδιειτι.

The first hypothesis was proposed by Bartholomae (1904 748). Although he followed Geldner’s edition τὐρίια. δὐγδαιρι, he reconstructed a form *τὐρίια. δὐγδαρα. δὐγδα. Thus Av. τὐρίια. δὐγδαιρι, a corrupted form of *τὐρίια. δὐγδαρα, 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. τὐρίια. δὐγδαιρι reflected *τὐρίια. δὐγδαρα the verb para. ἱρίδιειτι 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 τὐρίια. ρυθρο. vā. ρυθρο. para. ἱρίδιειτι would be τὐρίια. δὐγδα. vā. δὐγδα. para. ἱρίδιειτι. If my interpretation is correct, the variant τὐρίια. δὐγδαιρι would not reflect *τὐρίια. δὐγδαρα, but rather a copyist’s omission τὐρίια. δὐγδα< vā. δὐγδα. para.> ἱρίδιειτι.

In some manuscripts there are traces of the words omitted. After τὐρίια. δยวδα R3, R278, P1 (above the line), Br1 (above the line), L5, Mf2 and K9 attest vā. After vā the IrVS manuscripts Mf2 and K2 preserve a variant of δยวδα, but merged with the expected verb para. ἱρίδιειτι (Mf2, K9 τὐρίια. δยวδα. vā. δยวδαιρι), but R3 and P1 (above the line) attest the right δยวδα. Finally, only R278 attests the expected para. ἱρίδιειτι, while in P1 above the line the verbal form ἱρίδιειτι is written, and in L5 we find pari.θιετε. The result is τὐρίια. δยวδα. θιετε in P1 and vā. δยวδα. ἱρίδιειτι added above the line, that is, a sequence τὐρίια. δยวδα. θιετε vā. δยวδα. ἱρίδιειτι in P1. In L5 the result is τὐρίια. δยวδα. vā. pari.θιετε. Accordingly, although both manuscripts are closer to the expected sequence, in P1 the preverb para is omitted, while in L5 δywaćδα 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 τὐρίια. δยวδα. *vā. *δยวδα. *para. ἱρίδιειτι was the basis of this confusion.

As for the source of this omission, I think that the common written source of Vīdevdād probably was a manuscript where both verbs para. ἱρίδιειτι were written para. ἱρίδιειτι and ἱρί appeared at the beginning of the line in both cases:

\[ \text{āaṭ. yaṭ. tūriiia. puḍrō. vā. puḍrō. para.} \]
\[ \text{ir. ἱρίδιειτι. tūriia. duyođa. vā. duyođa. para.} \]
\[ \text{ir. ἱρίδιειτι. cuṇāṭ. aeśañ. upa. maṇauñ.} \]

When copying τὐρίια. δยวδα this old source of all our extant manuscripts probably slipped into the next line due to a saut du même au même, omitted <vā. duyođa. para.> and copied the following ἱρί:

\[ 3148 \text{cf. the variants where ἱρί is written between dots in V 12: L5 para. aere. diuæti (12.1a); L5 para. iri. διατε (12.3a); T46 para. iri. διετε (12.7a); L5 para. iri. διατε (12.7a); FK1 piraari. iri. διατι (12.7a); FK1 pari. iri. διετε (12.9a); R3 tūriīopuḍrōirīduatā (12.17a); FK1 pari. ari (12.19a).} \]
The result was not only the variant \textit{tūiriia.duydairi} 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. だろう 219 直談た。 219 聞かん、 219 聞かん、 219 あなた。 219 あなたの、 219 あなたの、 219 あなたの、 219

K2, G25a in the margin, F10, R1, R3. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9, (G);

T44 直談; T46 直談


K2, G25a in the margin, F10, T44, R3. B2, T46, Br1, L2, L5 きょうざだま; R1 /tā/ まい 219 きょうざだま。 219 きょうざだま。 R1 きょうざだま; L1 きょうざだま; R3 きょうざだま; E4, FK1 きょうざだま; K2, K9 きょうざだま

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K2, K9; F10, T44

- きゅう、... しょんたん -

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; MF2, K9 とき

B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42; K2 きょうざだ; G25a in the margin. L5, FK1 きょうざだい; R3 うだんぼうおざだ; L1, P1, K2, K9 きょうざだ; R278 きょうざだ; E4 きょうざだ

K2, G25a in the margin. Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R3 /tā/ だ; L1, B2, R278, T46, P1. MF2 まろつ; K9 /tā/ まい 219 まろつ、あふろ -

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; R3 ずいふらすい; E4 ずいふらすい; L5 ずいふらすい; MF2, K9 ずいふらすい

T46, P1. MF2; K2, G25a, R3. L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5. K9 たんのん; FK1 たんのん

K2, G25a in the margin. R3. L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; P1 ずいふらすい; E4 ずいふらすい; L5 ずいふらすい; MF2, K9 ずいふらすい

T46, P1. MF2; K2, G25a in the margin. R3. B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42 はたたん; L1 はた; E4, L5. K9 はたたん

L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; K2, G25a in the margin, R3 ずいふらす; R278 ずいふらす; E4 ずいふらす; L5 ずいふらす; MF2, K9 ずいふらす

T46, P1. MF2; K2, G25a in the margin. R3. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. MF2; L1, FK1 いも; E4 いも

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 がざん

K2, G25a in the margin. B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5. MF2; L1, FK1 いも; E4 いも

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 がざん

K2, G25a in the margin. Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; T46. MF2, K9 ぞあぞ

MF2, K9; K2 がざんた. あじゅう. うがびう; G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. K9 がざんた; R3 がざんた

R3. G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 うがびう; MF2, K9 うがびう

K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; T46. MF2, K9 ざおど

MF2, K9; K2 がざんた. G25a in the margin. Br1, L5, FK1 がざんた; R3 ぞあど; L1, B2, R278, P1, L2, G42 がざんた; E4 がざんた

B2, FK1; K2 がざんだ; G25a in the margin. L5 がざんだ; R3 がざんだ (with a hole at the end); L1, R278, P1. MF2, K9 がざんだ; T46, Br1, L2, G42 がざんだ; E4 がざんだ
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“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 Gađas 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 Zaraduṣṭra.”

A. [a] d ʾtʾl 3183 x gḥʾnʾ 3186 x ʾst wmnndʾnʾ 3187 x hlbʾ 3188 |b| cygwn mʾnʾ 3189 ywšʾdʾslnyn't cygwn bwd 3190 DKYA |c| AP-š gwpt 3192 whrmzd 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt 3193 3 bʾl HLLWN-yt wstly 3194 3 bʾl prʾc slʾdšnk 3195 gʾsʾnʾ ZNE KON ʾthš 3196 ycť blsm 3197

3173 Mf2, K9, K2, R3 pascita; G25a in the margin. B2, R278, T46, Br1, G42 pasceta; L1, P1, L2, E4 pascita; L5, FK1 pascita
3179 K2, G25a in the margin. R3 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9 ʾpʾqʾm
3178 K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9 above the line; R3 ʾvšʾsʾpʾtʾ; E4 ʾvšʾsʾpʾtʾ
3174 T46, P1. Mf2; K2, G25a, R3 L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9 above the line; K2 ʾvšʾsʾpʾtʾ; E4 ʾvšʾsʾpʾtʾ
3175 T46, P1. Mf2; K2 ʾυρυυαράγʾm; G25a in the margin. R3 L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 ʾυρυυαράγʾm; FK1 ʾυρυυαράγʾm; K9 above the line ʾυρυυαράγʾm
3176 K2, G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1. Mf2, K9, R3 ʾvšʾsʾpʾtʾ; E4 ʾvšʾsʾpʾtʾ
3177 K2, R3 L1, B2, R278, E4, L5, FK1. K9 ʾαμʾσʾnʾm; G25a in the margin. L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 ʾαμʾσʾnʾm; T46, P1. Mf2 ʾαμʾσʾnʾm
3178 T46, P1. Mf2; G25a in the margin. L5 ʾspʾntʾnʾm; K2, R3 L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, FK1 ʾspʾntʾnʾm
3179 T46, P1. Mf2; G25a in the margin. L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4. K9 ʾ*spʾtʾ; T44 ʾ*spʾtʾ; L5 ʾ*spʾtʾ; FK1 ʾ*spʾtʾ; Mf2 ʾ*spʾtʾ
3180 K2, T44, R1 L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1. Mf2, K9; G25a in the margin ʾ*spʾtʾmzdʾzʾrʾdʾštʾ; F10 ʾ*spʾtʾmzdʾzʾrʾdʾštʾ; R3 ʾ*spʾtʾmzdʾzʾrʾdʾštʾ; E4, L5 ʾzʾrʾdʾštʾara
3181 K2, R3, R1, (Jmp); G25a – dʾtʾl ... zlwšt –
3182 K2, R3 ghʾnʾ; R1, (Jmp) – gḥʾnʾ ... hlbʾ –
3183 K2 ’stmnndʾnʾ; R3 ’st mnndʾn
3184 K2, R3 ’hlbwʾy
3185 (Jmp); K2, R3 mʾnʾ; R1 nʾst
3186 (Jmp); K2, R3 ‘ywydʾslnyn’t
3187 K2, R3; (Jmp) wwd
3188 R3, (Jmp); K2 gwpt y
3189 (Jmp); K2 tnʾhʾl; R3 tnʾbʾ
3190 K2, R3; (Jmp) wstlg
3191 K2, (Jmp); R3 slʾdšnk
3192 (Jmp); K2, R3 ’ṭš
3193 (Jmp); K2, R3 – blsm ASLWN-x₁ –
ASLWN-x₁ ʾp wyh zwhl³¹⁹⁸ bld DKYA AHL bwd mʾn |d| kʾmk lpd³¹⁹⁹ MYA kʾmk lpd³²⁰ ʾwlwl kʾmk lpd³²⁰ ʾmhrspndʾn;³²⁰ ʾe| spyt mʾn ³³⁰ zlwšṭ

B. |a| cygwn npšṭ

A. |a| dādār ḡębān ḡastōmandān ḡahlaw |b| čyōn mān yōjdarkēnēd čyōn būd pāk |c| uʾs guft i ohrmazd sē bār šōyēd tan sē bār šōyēd wastaray sē bār frāz srāyišnag gāhān ēn nūn ātaxš yazēd barsom bandēd āb weh zōhr bard pād pas būd mān |d| kāmag rawd āb kāmag rawd urwar kāmag rawd amahraspandān |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 ḡādās 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.

³¹⁹⁸ (Jmp); K2, R3 zwl
³¹⁹⁹ (Jmp); K2 lwd; R3 lwd
³²⁰ (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd
³²⁰ (Jmp); K2, R3 lwd
³²⁰ K2, R3; (Jmp) ʾmhrspndʾnʾ
³²³ (Jmp); K2, R3 spyt mʾn
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II. Defilement when an infidel relative dies

12.21. 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 twhm' n' BRA YMYTWN-yt' cygwn 3220 xZK-yh 3231 k'mk 3222 *ZK-yh 3223 DYNA 3230 cnd spn'mynwg 3225 d'm n' hm gwyhyt cnd QDM gwyhyt [PWN ptylyt] 3232

---

3204 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3  L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, L2, G42, L5, FK1  Mf2, K9, (G); Br1 ąţ

3205 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3  B2, T46, L5, FK1, (G); R1  L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4  Mf2, K9

3206 ąţ

3207 Mf2, (G); K2  R278, Br1, L2, E4 kąmcığ; G25a, R3  G42, FK1 kąmcığ; F10  K9 kąmcığ; T44

3208 L1, B2, L5 kąmcığ; R1 kąmcığ; ąţ kąmcığ; P1 kąmcığ

3209 K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3  L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1  Mf2, K9, (G); T44

3210 – wā –

3211 T46, (G); K2 taoxmanąm; G25a, T44  B2, L2, G42 taoxmanąm; F10 taxmanąm; R1  P1  Mf2 taoxmanąm; R3  L5, FK1 tuaxmanąm; L1, R278 K9 taoxmanąm; Br1 t'oxmanąm; E4 vātaxmanąm

3212 G25a, R1  B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42  Mf2, K9, (G); K2 para.iridiëiti; F10 para.iridiëiti; T44 para.iridiëiti; R3 para.iridiëiti; L1, P1 para.iridiëiti; E4 para.iridiëiti; L5 para.iridiëiti; FK1 para.iridiëiti

3213 K2, T44, R3  B2, T46, L5, FK1, (G); F10 ąţ; R1 ąţ; R278, L2, G42  Mf2, K9 ąţa

3214 K2 ainiío. varın; G25a, F10, R3  R278 ainiío. varın; T44 ainiío. varın; R1  B2  Mf2 ainiío. varın; L1, P1 ainainiío. varın; T46, L2  K9, (G) ainiío. varın; G42 iniío. varın; E4 ainiío. varın; L5 iniío. varıniniio. iniío. variriini; FK1 ainiío. varınina. ainiío. varın

3215 G25a, K2 ainiío. tkæså; F10, T44, R1, R3  L1, R278, P1 ainiío. tkæså; B2, T46, L2, G42, FK1 ainiío. tkæså; Br1 ainiiãoi. varıniniio. tkæså; E4 ainiío. tkæså; L5 akaeå; Mf2 ainiío. tkæså; K9 ainiío. tkæså

3216 (G) ainiío. tkæså

3217 K2, G25a, F10, R1  L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42  K9, (G); T44 spánta; R3 spønt be (with a hole in the expected ąţ–); E4 spánta; L5 spńtba

3218 Mf2; K2, G25a, T44, R1, R3  L1, B1, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4  K9, (G) mainiiųš; F10 mainiiųš; L5 mainiiųš; FK1 spıntamainiiųš

3219 R1  T46, P1  Mf2, (G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3  L1, B1, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1  K9 damańąm

3220 Mf2, (G); K2 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; G25a ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; F10 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; T44 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; R1 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; R3  G42 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; L1, B2, R278 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; T46 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; P1 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; Br1 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; E4 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; L5 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; FK1 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt; K9 ḫm. raedțiaiẹt

3221 B2, (G); K2 patti.raedțiaiẹt; G25a  R278 patti.raedțiaiẹt; F10 patti.raedțiaiẹt; T44 patti.raedțiaiẹt; R1  FK1 patti.raedțiaiẹt; R3 patti raedțiaiẹt; L1 patti raedțiaiẹt; T46 patti raedțiaiẹt; P1 patti raedțiaiẹt; Br1, G42 patti raedțiaiẹt; L2 patti raedțiaiẹt; E4 patti raedțiaiẹt; L5 patti raedțiaiẹt; Mf2, K9 patti raedțiaiẹt

3222 K2, G25a, (Jmp); R1 kl-t-c-HD; R3 kl-t-c-H

3223 K2, G25a, R1, (Jmp); R3  ywp ... spn'mynwg  –

3224 K2, G25a, (Jmp); R1 cnd

3225 K2, R1, (Jmp) ZK; G25a ZK

3226 G25a; K2, R1, (Jmp) /blank/  k'mk  –

3227 K2, R1, (Jmp) ZK; G25a ZK

3228 G25a; K2, R1, (Jmp) /blank/  ZK-yh

3229 G25a; K2, R1, (Jmp) /blank/  ZK-yh

3230 G25a; K2, R1, (Jmp) /blank/  ZK-yh
B. [a] ADYN’ MNW kt’l-c-HD ’ywp twhm’n’ BRA YMYTWN-yt’ cygwn ZK y’3227 ywdt hw’dšn’ W ywdt kyš [AYK dyn’ ywdt’ YHSNN-yt’] cnd spn’myng’ d’m’n’ hm gwmyhtyt’ [PWN hmylt’] cnd QDM gwmyhtyt [PWN ptlyt’] 3228

A. [a] ēg kē kadār-iz-ē ayāb tōhmān bē mīrēd ċiyōn x any-kāmag x any-dādestān čand x spenāg-mēnōg dāmān ham gumēxtēd čand abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēb]

B. [a] ēg kē kadār-iz-ē ayāb tōhmān bē mīrēd ċiyōn ān ī jūd-xwāyišn ud jūd-kēš [kū dēn jūd dārēd] čand x spenāg-mēnōg dāmān ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēb] čand abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēb]

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 cuuṭ. spontahe ...
paiti.raēb/saiiiti.

Av. x anii.o varma. x aniio. ṭkaēша (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 daēuua-; otherwise Av. daēunaiiasna- would be the term used. As he believes that Vidvêdâ, the Vaēth Nask and this fragment of the Nigādom Nask are late texts, he assumes that these Avestan compounds would refer not to the daēunaiiasna-, but to the followers of the new religions with which the Zoroastrians came into contact.

In my opinion, it must be noticed that Av. x aniio.varma- and x aniio.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.

---

3224 G25a; K2, R1, (Jmp) /blank/  DYNA |
3225 K2, G25a, R1; (Jmp) spyn’myng’
3226 G25a; K2, R1, (Jmp)  pytlyt |
3227 F10; T44  y |
3228 T44; F10 spyn’myng’
3229 T44; F10 pytlyt
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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 ff.) rightly notices.

Nor does the fact that the term Av. daēuuaiiasna- was not used instead of Av. xaniio.varōna- and xaniio.țkaēșa- imply that the worshippers of the daēuua- were excluded by these compounds. Indeed, two passages could also reveal that they were included: VN 78 and 82: yezi. ahe. xaniiațkaēșa. narō. druuatō. xayhāiti “if there should be this of another doctrine, a liar man” (Humbach & JamaspAsa 1969 43-44). As we observe, xaniiațkaēșa is equated with narō. druuatō. Since Av. druuant- usually designates in Avestan the worshipper of the daēuua-, in my opinion there is no reason to think that the daēuuiiasna- were excluded when the term Av. xaniio.țkaēșa- /xaniia.țkaēșa- was used.


3232 K2, G25a, F10 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1, (G); T44, R1 (with a blank) | mraot.

aburō. mazdā |; R3 | mraot. aburō |; R1, P1 . Mf2 mraot.; K9 tā/ | mraot. aburō |

3232 K2, G25a . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, (G); F10 | aburō. mazdā |

3232 K2, G25a, F10, T44 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1, (G); R1 . L1, P1, G42 . Mf2, K9 yaḍa

3232 G25a . Mf2, K9, (G); K2, F10, T44, R1 vaṣapaci; R3 yaḍa vaṣapaci; L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, F1K vaṣapaci; R278, E4 vaṣapaci; L5 vaṣapaci.

3232 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; (G) tā |

viś.huṣkō. ... apa.baraiti |

3232 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5 . Mf2, K9; FK1 trō

3232 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; R1 . L1, P1 yaṛa; Mf2, K9 yaṛa

3232 K2, G25a, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10, T44 . E4, L5 marītō

3232 K2, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; G25a . R278 zauō; L5 sāyūnī

3232 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; F10 ējī; E4 jūnuī

3232 K2, G25a, F10, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2; T44 spitama; E4 spitama; K9 spitama

3232 K2, G25a, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2; F10 zaraduṣṭri; R3 jauōspitamazaraṣuṣtra; E4 zaraduṣṭra; L5 zaraduṣṭra; K9 zaraduṣṭra

3232 K2, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1; G25a . Mf2, K9 mātriō

3232 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; E4, L5 daruṇa

3232 Br1; K2, R1, R3 bizagṛṅ; G25a bizagṛṅ; F10 bizagṛṅ; T44 bizagṛṅ; L1, B2, R278, T46, L2, G42 bizagṛṅ; P1 biingṛṅ; E4 biṣayagṛṅ; L5 biṣayagṛṅ; FK1 biṣayagṛṅ; Mf2, K9 bizagṛṅ

3232 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; G25a abuṇaṇa

3232 G25a, T44, R1; K2, R3 aṁśogō; F10 . FK1 aṁśogō; L1 aṁśogō; B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4 aṁśogō; R278 aṁśogō; P1 aṁśogō; L5 aṁśogō; Mf2, K9 aṁśogō

3232 R1; K2, R3 . B2, T46, L5 K9 anaṣaua; G25a, F10 . FK1 anaṣaua; T44 anaṣaua; L1, R278, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2 anaṣaua; E4 anaṣaua

3232 K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, FK1 . Mf2, K9; T44 ṣpantaha; R278 ṣpantaha; E4 ṣpantaha; L5 ṣpantaha

3232 K2, G25a, T44 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . K9 mainiṭiṣ; F10 mainiṭiṣ; R1 mainiṭiṣ; R3 mainiṭiṣ; L5, FK1 mainiṭiṣ; Mf2 mainiṭiṣ

3232 R1 . T46, P1 . Mf2; K2, G25a, F10, T44 . L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 dāmanṛṇ; R3 dām.ṇam

3232 K2 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; G25a ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; F10 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; T44 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; R1 (second a-scratched) . T46, P1 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; L1, B2, Br1, L2, G42 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; R278 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; E4 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; L5 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; FK1 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; Mf2 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet; K9 ṣham.raēbdīaṣet

3232 K2 . K9 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; G25a . R278 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; F10 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; T44 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; R1 (third a-scratched) paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; R3 jūṇapāṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; L1, B2, P1, Br1, L2, G42 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; T46 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; E4 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; L5 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; FK1 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet; Mf2 paṭī.ṛaēbdīaṣet

3232 K2, F10, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 . Mf2, K9; G25a jānti; T44 jānti; L5 jānti; FK1 jānti

3232 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 . Mf2, K9; P1 juō
| 326 | K2, R1, R3 | L1, B2, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, E4 | Mf2, K9; G25a, F10, T44 | R278, L5, FK1 átart | 326 |
| 326 | K25a, R1 | (a- scratched) | L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, L2, K2 frauuii; F10 fränuiieiti; T44 fränuiieiti; R3 frauiit; Br1 fränuiieti; G4 fränuiieiti; E4 frauiiite; F1 Kfränuiite; Mf2 frauuiiite; K9 jnuo. frauuiite | 326 |
| 326 | R1 | T46, P1 | Mf2, (G); K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 | L1, B2, R278, Br1, L2, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | K9 grm | 326 |
| 326 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 | L1, B2, T46, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | 326 |
| 326 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 | L1, B2, T46, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | 326 |
| 326 | K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 | L1, B2, T46, G42, E4, L5, FK1 | 326 |
vastraha ca. 3280 draošca. 3281 nəmataheca. 3282 aiiaŋheca. 3283 apa.baraiti. 3284 [g]
nōi. aunaḏa. maraṭo. 3285 [b] ašom. vohū.
vaḥištom. asti. uštā. asti. uštā. “aŋ. hiiaṭ. aši. vahištai. ašom. (= Y 27.14) 3286
[a] And Ahura Mazdā said: “So many as a split frog, dead more than a year ago. [b] Whilst alive indeed, o Spitama Zaradūstra, the vile, the liar biped, so an unrighteous heretic defiles directly the creatures of the Beneficient Spirit, [c] 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, [d] (but) not so when dead. Whilst alive indeed, o Spitama Zaradūstra, [e] the vile, the liar biped, so an unrighteous heretic [f] deprives the righteous man of his food and drink, his clothes, his wood, his brushwood and his metallic implement(s), [g] (but) not so when dead.” [h] ašom. vohū. vaḥištom. asti. uštā. asti. uštā. “aŋ. hiiaṭ. aši. vahištai. ašom. (= Y 27.14)

A. [a] AP-š gwpt ‘whrmzd cgwgn wzk-c 3287 wyš hwšk t1 3288 ŠNT YMYTWN-yt [b] zynd ‘nd 3290 spyṭ’ m’n 3291 zltwhšt 3292 ml dlwnd 2 zng ’ytwn ’swnyw 3293 ’n ’sw 3294 spyn’g mynwg d’m hm 3295 gwmyhtyt [c] zynd 3297 QDM gwmyhtyty 3298 zynd 3299 MYA znd

3279 K2, F10, R3 . G42, E4 xarádahca; G25a, T44 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2 xarádahca; R1 xarádahca; L5 . Mf2, K9 xarádahica; FK1 xarádahca
3280 G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42 . K9; K2, R3 . Mf2 vastrabica; E4, L5, FK1 vastrabica
3281 B2, Br1, L2, G42, FK1; K2 dryšca; G25a društa; F10, R1 društa; T44 drušita; R3 drušca; L1, P1 draōšta; R278 dryšca; T46 društa; E4 daryašca; L5 daryaša; Mf2, K9 dryšca
3282 K2, G25a, F10, T44, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5; E4 nimaheca; FK1 nimaheca; Mf2 nimaheca; K9 nimaheca
3283 K2, G25a, R3 . L1, P1, FK1; F10 . B2, T46, Br1, L2, G42 . Mf2, K9 aiaŋheca; T44 . R278 aiaŋheca; R1 nimaheca; FK1 aiaŋheca; E4 aiaŋheca; L5 aiaŋheca
3284 G25a, F10, T44, R1 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5, FK1; K2, R3 apa.baraiti; E4 abrātti; Mf2 apa.baraiti; K9 apa.baraiti
3285 K2, G25a, F10, R1, R3 . L1, B2, R278, T46, P1, Br1, L2, G42, L5 . Mf2, K9; T44 . E4 marato; FK1 mairato; (G) | marato |
3286 R1 . P1, (G); K2, R3 vohū. | tā | ašm; G25a, F10, T44 . L1, B2, T46, Br1, L2, E4, L5, FK1 . K9 vohū; R278, G42 vohū. 1; Mf2 vohī
3287 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”.
3288 K2, G25a, R1, R3; (Jmp) ZK-c
3289 G25a, R1, R3; K2, (Jmp) hwšktl
3290 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a zywnd ’nd
3291 K2, G25a, R3; R1, (Jmp) spyt’m’n
3292 G25a, R1; K2, R3, (Jmp) zltwšt
3293 G25a, R1, R3; K2, (Jmp) ’swnyw
3294 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a ‘n’hlwbl
3295 R3; K2 spyn’gmynw; G25a, R1, (Jmp) spyn’gmynw
3296 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a hmlyt
3297 K2, R1, R3, (Jmp); G25a zywnd
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B. [a] AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd cygwn wzg-c wyš hwšktl ŠNT YMYTWN-ytk [b] ME zynd 'nd spyt'm'n zlttwš ml dlwnd 2 zng 'ytwn' 'šmwk 'n'šw spyn'mynwg d'm'n' hm gwmyhtyt [PWN hmlyt] [MNW LWTE OLE KRA AMT YHMTWN-yt' PWN hym SLY-tl YHWWN-yt')] [OLE l'd šwy 'p'yt'] [c]

329 K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp); R1 gwm yht
329 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a, R3 zywnd
329 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a, R3 zywnd
329 G25a, R1, (Jmp); K2, R3 štš
329 G25b, K2, (Jmp) pršc /blank/ | plwyt |-; G25a| plwyt |-; R3 pršc |-| plwyt |- (Jmp); K2, R1 zynd; G25a, R3 zywnd
329 G25a, R1, R3; K2, (Jmp) /blank/ |-| vlkyh BRA SGYTWN-ynyty |
329 G25a, (Jmp); G25a, R3 zywnd; R1 zynd
329 G25a, R1, (Jmp); K2 'hlwb'; R3 'hlwb
329 K2, G25a, R3, (Jmp); R1 HYA HYA
329 K2, G25a, (Jmp); R1 MHYTWN-yt; R3 YMYTWN'-yt
329 K2, R1, (Jmp); G25a zywnd 'nd; R3 zyn 'nd
329 R1, (Jmp); K2, R3 spytm'n; G25a spytm'n
329 G25a, R1; K2, R3, (Jmp) zlrwšt
329 G25a, (Jmp); K2, R1, R3 dlnd
329 G25a, R1, R3; K2, (Jmp) šmwg
329 K2, R3; G25a 'n'hlwb'; R1 'nyšw; (Jmp) 'nyšw
329 (Jmp); K2, G25a, R3 'hlwb'; R1 'hlwb'
329 G25a in the left margin; K2, R1, (Jmp) |- h'nk |-; R3 h'nk
329 R3; K2, G25a, R1 |- W |-; (Jmp) W
329 K2, (Jmp); G25a hwšnk k; R1 hwšnk W h'nk; R3 hwšnk k
329 G25a, R1, R3, K2, (Jmp) /blank/ |-| W ... nmt |-;
329 R3; R1 |- W ... YBLWN-t |-;
329 K2, R3, (Jmp); G25a šn'cy
329 G25a, R2, (Jmp) bld
329 K2, G25a, R1, R3; (Jmp) |- 'hl'dyh ... AYT' |
329 G25a, R1, K2, R3 W 'p'tyh
329 G25a; K2, R1, R3 |- y |-;
329 G25a, R1, K2, R3 |- p'hwl'm |-;
329 F10; T44 cnd
329 F10; T44 'šmwg
329 T44; F10 'n'hlwb'
329 T44; F10 MN AMT
A. \([a]\) And Ohrmazed 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. \([e]\) Whilst alive, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt, \([f]\) the vile, the liar biped, so an impious heretic \([g]\) deprives the righteous man of his satiation, his food, his clothes, his brushwood and his metallic implement(s) too, \([h]\) (but) not so when he dies.” \([h]\) Truth is the best prosperity.

B. \([a]\) And Ohrmazed 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 \([c]\) the creatures of the Beneficent Spirit \([d]\) (everyone who comes in touch with him, his nature becomes worse) \([e]\) [it is necessary to wash him]. \([f]\) 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 \(F10\) \(T44\) \(W\)
3335 \(T44; F10\) y
3336 \(F10; T44\) YMYTWN-yt'
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| ē zindag spitāmān zarduxt mar i druwand i dozang [anēr] ēdōn ašemōg i anahlaw |c| spennāg menōg dāmān ē ham gumēxtēd [pad hamrēh ke abāg ūy ē rasēd pad xēm wattar bawēd] |d| u-šān zindag abar gumēxtēd [pad payrēh kē-z abāg ūy ē rasēd kē abāg ūy ē mad ēstēd ā-z pad xēm wattar bawēd]

5.37. |a| zindag āb zanēd zindag ātaxš frawēnēd ud zindag gōspand pad wardagh be rawēnēd ud zindag mard i ablaw pad ān i frāz az bōy snab jud kīrēnīd gyan zanēd ud nē ēdōn ka murd [nē rēman]

5.38. |a| ē zindag spitāmān zarduxt mar i druwand i dozang [anēr] ēdōn ablamōg anahlaw |b| az mard i ablaw sagriš i xwarišn ud wastarag ud dār ud namad ud āhān be bard nē ēdōn ka murd [nē rēman] |A| ēn az abestāg paydāg anēr margarzān hamē ēdōn bawēd čiyōn agdēn |B| sōyans guft ay amā pad ān i awēšān rēman nē bawēm ē awēšān zindag druwand murd margarzān hēnd ē awēšān pad ān i amā rēman ūī bawēnd ē nasuš pad dād āmār nē kunēnd |C| gōgušasp guft ay awēšān pad ān i amā rēman ūī bawēnd ē nasuš har ān kē-ē nē pad dād ā-ē abar nē dvarēd |D| amā pad ān i awēšān rēman ūī bawēm ē andar har dād mardōm ablaw ūī bawēd ē az |tūrīranam. dāḫiunām. ē 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 dō 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. *varatam* (cf. the rare variant F10, T44; with the exception of K2, the rest of manuscripts of the group α completed it).
- 12.22d: omission of *če*, because the Pahlavi translators did not understand Av. *zi*.
- 12.22f: omission of the most part of the PT, partially completed only in the manuscripts of the group α G25, 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* γ instead of *ahlamōg* (cf. Av. *ašemāγo*).

d) Different PTs:
- 12.22a: –*iz* instead of *i*, probably because of pseudo-etymology equating Av. *cīt* with Phl. –*iz*.
- 12.22e: *mīrēd* instead of *ka murd*, surely because Phl. *ka* finds no direct correspondence in Av. *juuţ*.

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 *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: *frāuuaiieiti → <prʾc* 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 <prʾc OD gwpt>.

b) Omission of the PT of Avestan parts which the Pahlavi translators did not understand:
- 12.22c: *frāuuaiieiti → <prʾc* 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 <prʾc OD gwpt>.

c) Different PTs:
- 12.22a and d: *mīrēd* instead of *murd*
- 12.22b: *and* instead of *če*
- 12.22b: *dām* instead of *dāmān*
The group β (F10, T44) shows the following deviations from that of V 5.36-38:

a) Addition of new glosses:
   - 12.22b: addition of the gloss ōy rāy šōy abāyēd after the gloss pad hamrēd... bawēd.

b) Different PTs:
   - 12.22a and d: murdag instead of murd
   - 12.22c: frāuuaiieiti → <prʾc znyt> frāz zanēd in 12.22 (T44).
   - 12.22c: wardēnišn instead of wardagīh.
   - 12.22c: rare PT of Av. varətəm (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. vazayacît. viš.huškō. tarō. yārə. mərətə (12.22a)
   Av. vazayacît, either Nom. Sing. Fem. or Instr. Sing. Masc., is used instead of the expected *vazayacît (Nom. Sing. Masc.), as Bartholomae (1904 1389) already noticed. Accordingly, there is lack of consistency between the Nom. Sing. Masc. viš.huškō and mərətə.

Av. viš.huškō in its turn was analysed by Geldner (1881 207, n.2) as vi + huška- and translated as “durch und durch, gänzlich ausgetrocknet”, mainly due to its PT wēš-hušk “more dried”, where the Pahlavi translators wrongly equated Av. viš- with Phl. <wyš> wēš “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 mərətə 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 vi meant “durch und durch” in Avestan. Secondly, he considers aberrant the group šh in Av. viš.huškō, which would be an exception to the expected result *vi.huškō (cf. paiti.bištaiti, paiti.bištəmna, pairi.ḥarāšiente, varši-ḥarāšta-, pairi.ḥarāšτa- /pairi.ḥaršta- /). He compares viš.huškō. tarō. yārə. mərətə in V 5.36 with hiškunəm. tarō. yārə. mərətəm 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”.
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 *vazayə-, but the Gen. Pl. *vazayənəm 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 *vazayə- did not exist in Avestan, the emendation Av. *vīš.huškō lacks this support.

2) Concerning Av. *vīš.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 *vīš.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 hiško instead of hušk. 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. yārō. margvō 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. *vīš.huškō is rendered into Phl. wēš-hušk, which obviously demonstrates that Av. *vīš.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. *vīš “poison” exists as a first element of compound in other compounds, such as Av. *vīš.gaimtaiia- “which smells like poison” or *vīš.cidrā- “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. *vīš stems from viʔ, the result šh would not be an exception. cf. for instance Av. nīšhāratār- and nīšhārōvī- (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, *vī 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. *vī could just imply that the dried frog is so dried that it is split. So Av. *vī 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.pištaiti, paiti.pištəmna, pairi.parıššuente, varshin-ularya-, pairi.aryarštā-/pairi.aryarštə-. 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.b, 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.huško as *vi + huška- and to translate it as “split”.

Av. *hanyhōuš (12.22f)
Since Bartholomae (1904 1768), this word has been interpreted by the scholars as Av. hanyhūš- and related to Av. baḥiia- “related to corn, frumentarius” (Bartholomae 1904 1800). cf. Ved. sasyā- “Saat aus dem Felde, Feldfrucht” and Ved. sasā- “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. hanyhuš. 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. hanyhūš- 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. hanyhuš could not be an accusative.

Secondly, Av. *xə arədəbeca cannot be interpreted as the complement of Av. hanyhuš, 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 hanyhuš as a further Gen. Sing. united to Av. *xə arədaha by means of the enclitic –ca. If we interpret this word as Bartholomae did, namely as Av. hanyhūš-, a Gen. Sing. *hanyhušō would be expected. In my opinion, however, the variant anyhōuš of three of the oldest IndVS manuscripts and the variant hanyhuš of the IrVS could point to a form *hanyhōuš, that is, to the Gen. Sing. of Av. hanyhu–.

Accordingly, accepting that Av. hanyhu- is related to Ved. sasā- “corn, food”, I have interpreted Av. naram. ašauanām. *hanyhōuš. *xə arədəbeca. ... apa.baraiti as “deprives the righteous man of his food and drink ...”.
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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’ lystک ‘w’ QDM zywndyh QDM dwb’lyt cygwn PWN OLE-š’n’ nswš ptk’lym MNW MN OLE wltk QDM zywndyy QDM gwmhytyt [AYK cygwn stwš W dlw MNW wltk dlwc ZK nsws l’d BRA OBJDWN-m MNW QDM zywndyy QDM dwb’lyt’ MNW wltk nsws dlw OBJDWN-m MN zywnddy gwmhytyt]

10.2. [a] AP-š gwpt ’whrmzd ZNE gwbšn’ pr’c YMRRWN MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ byš’mlwt [AYK 2 b’l KRYTWN-yt] |b| ZNE gwbšn’ pr’c YMRRWN MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ slyš’mlwt [AYK 3 b’l KRYTWN-yt] |c| ZNE gwbšn’ pr’c YMRRWN MNW HWE-d ZK g’s’n’ cslyš’mlwt [AYK ch’l b’l KRYTWN-yt] |d| ZNE OLE-š’n’ zwbšn’ pr’c YMRRWN MNW hnd s’s’n’ byš’mlwt’ slyš’mlwt’ cslwš’mlwt [’yw PWN ’yw PWN ’yw PWN ywdtdywd’t]

10.3. [a] d’t’l kt’l OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ MNW HWE-d PWN g’s’n’ byš’mlwt |b| AP-š gwpt’ ’whrmzd AYK ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ byš’mlwt ZNE gwbšn’ ’-š 2 b’l pr’c YMRRWN

10.4. [a] Without PT

10.5. [a] ZK AHL byš’mlwt’ ZNE gwbšn’ pr’c YMRRWN ’cš pylwckl byš’cynyt’l |b| BRA pwltynm gn’k mynwg MN m’n’ MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN NPŠE tn’ W MN GBRA-’n’ QDM lystk MN n’ylyk QDM wltk MN m’n’ m’nt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhyw’pt MN hlwspyn’ ’hlwb’n’ stwk

10.6. [a] BRA pwltynm nswš BRA pwltynm hmlyt’ [krt YKOYMWN-yt] BRA pwltynm pytlyt’ [krt’ YKOYMWN-yt] MN m’n’ MN wys W MN znd MN MTA MN NPŠE tn’ W MN GBRA QDM wltk MN n’ylyk QDM wltk MN m’n’ m’ntk MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA d’h’ n-pt MN hlwspyn’ ’hlwb’ stwk

10.7. [a] d’t’l MNW ḫkt’l OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ MNW hnd g’s’n’ ’y slyš’mlwt |b| AP-š gwpt’ ’whrməd AYK OLE-š’n’ gwbšnyny AMT hnd PWN g’s’n’ slyš’mlwt’ ’y OLE-š’n’ ZK gwbšn’ 3 b’l pr’c YMRRWN

10.8. [a] Without PT

10.9. [a] AP-š AHL slys’mlwt’ ZNE gwbšn’ pr’c YMRRWN pylwckl byš’cynyt’l |b| BRA pwltynm ’ndl [ŠDYA] BRA pwltynm swl [ŠDYA] BRA pwltynm nājbā
ŠDYA-ʾn' MN mʾn' MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN hwyš tn' MN GBRA QDM wltk MN nʾlyk QDM lyst k MN mʾn' mʾnpt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhywpt MN hmʾk 'hlwbʾn' stwk

10.10. |a| Omitted in P5

10.11. |a| dʾl ktʾl OLE-ʾšʾn' gwbšn' MNW hnd PWN gʾsʾn' cslyšʾmlwt |b| AP-š gwpt 'wrhmzd ZNE OL-ʾšʾn' gwbšn' prʾc YMRWN MNW hnd gʾsʾn' csłwsʾmlwty ZNE gwbŷh chʾl-bʾl prʾc YMRWN

10.12. |a| Without PT

10.13. |a| ZK AHL csłšʾmlwt gwbšnyy ZNE gwbšnʾ prʾc YMRWN pylwcgl byšʾcyntʾl |b| BRA pwltynm hšm hlwydlhwš BRA pwltynm 'ytš ŠDYA-ʾn' MN mʾn' MN wys MN znd MN TA MN NPŠE tn' W MN GBRA QDM lyst MN NYŠE QDM wltk MN mʾn' mʾnpt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhywpt MN hmʾk 'hlwbʾn' stwk

10.14. |a| BRA pwltynm wlnyk ŠDYA BRA pwltynm wʾtyk ŠDYA MN mʾn' MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN NPŠE tn' MN GBRA QDM lstk MN nʾlyk QDM wltk MN mʾn' mʾnpt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA dhywpt MN hlwsp 'hlwbʾn' 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 myngw snyy |b| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn' gwbšn' MNW hnd hšm hlwydlws snʾh |c| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn' gwbšn' MNW hnd mʾzungʾn' ŠDYA-ʾn' snʾh |d| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn' gwbšn' MNW hnd hlwspynʾ ŠDYA-ʾn' snyy

10.17. |a| ZNE AP-šʾn' gwbšn' MNW hnd ZNE ZK dlwc' ZNE ZK nswš hmystʾl [hnd] MNW MN lystk QDM zywnddy QDM 'w' dwbʾlyt' |b| ZNE OLE-ʾšʾn' gwbšn' MNW hnd ZNE dlwc ZK HNA nswš hmystʾl MNW MN lystk 'w' zywnddy QDM gwmtyht' [PWN ptyt]


10.19. |a| [dynʾ 'hwʾnʾ] 3339 ᵃʾpyck [AYK] ywydʾslynnyt ʾytwnʾ 'wʾ ZNE AYT ywydʾslytʾ krʾl-c-HD 'hw yʾstʾwmd NPŠE yʾpyck' dynʾy |b| MNW NPŠE dynʾ

---

3339 This is the PT of the Avestan gloss daēnām. ʾahyuuq in V 10.19b.
yw pytʾk[twšt MN ʾwhrmzd AYK ʾwhrmzd mynwg ʾpzwnyk dʾl ghyʾn’ ZY ʾst’wmdʾn’ ʾhlwbʾ |b| cygwn PWN mʾnʾ ywydʾsl ymyk cygwn PWN ʾtš cygwn PWN MYA cygwn PWN ʾhlʾdyy ʾpʾtyh PWN hwmt W hwht hwwlʾn” |b| cygwn PWN GBRA ʾhlwbʾ cygwn PWN stl PWN hwsp wyh ʾwhrmzd dʾt PWN ʾhlʾdyh pytʾk

11.2. [a] AP-š gwpt ʾwhrmzd AYK ZK ywydʾsl yḥyʾn’ zltwšt |b| ywydʾsl yhyʾn’ AHL YHWWN-yt PWN mʾnʾ |c| ywydʾsl yḥyʾn’ tš ywydʾsl yḥyʾn’ MYA ywydʾsl ymyk ywydʾsl gwspnd ywydʾsl PWN ʾhlʾdyy ʾpʾtyh PWN stl ywydʾsl PWN stl ywydʾsl PWN stl ywydʾsl PWN stl ywydʾsl PWN stl ywydʾsl PWN stl ywydʾsl PWN mʾh ywydʾsl PWN hwwlʾn” ywydʾsl PWN ZK ʾsl ēwnnhy cygwn PWN hwwlʾn” ywydʾsl PWN stl PWN ʾhlʾdyh pytʾk

11.3. [a] ʾytwnʾ ZNE ʾy gwbšʾn ʾprʾc dlncynyt MNW hnd pylwckltwm W ZK-ʾy byšʾzyntwtywm 5 ʾhwnwlʾnʾ slʾyʾt [AYK KRYTWN-yt] |b| ʾhwnwlʾnʾ lʾ pʾnkyy AYT

11.4. [a] ZNE ʾytwnʾ mʾnʾ ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ADYNʾ ZNE gwbšʾn ʾprʾc YMRRWN |b| ʾytwnʾ L hmʾy ZK bytwn ʾmʾnʾ ʾy pʾnkyy mždšʾnʾ ʾl ʾȘBKWN-yd |c| ZNE ʾytwnʾ PWN tš ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ADYNʾ ZNE gwbšʾn ʾprʾc YMRRWN |d| ʾytwnʾ ZNE LK tšʾwʾ wlcynyʾd ptwtn BRA YHMTWN-yd ʾwhrmzd [pʾhlycšnyʾy]

11.5. [a] ZNE ʾytwnʾ MYA ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ADYNʾ ZNE gwbšʾn ʾprʾc YMRRWN |b| MYA ʾytwnʾ YDBHWN-m [L ʾȘBKWN ZK OZLWN-t PWN ḥptʾk] |c| ZNE ʾytwnʾ ymyk ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ADYNʾ ZNE gwbšʾn ʾprʾc YMRRWN |d| ZNE ymyk ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ LWTE ʾȘBKWN YDBHWN-m

11.6. [a] ZNE ʾytwnʾ gwspnd ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ZNE gwbšʾn ʾprʾc YMRRWN |b| ZK gwspndʾnʾ ḏšʾnʾ [MYA W wʾstʾl OLE-ʾšʾnʾ ēkwšʾnʾ kwšʾnʾ MNW-ʾšʾnʾ pʾhlwm ʾprʾc OLE YHWWN-yd |c| ZNE ʾytwnʾ ʾwlwʾnʾ ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ADYNʾ ZNE gwbšʾnʾ ʾprʾc YMRRWN |d| ʾytwnʾ PWN OL tlšʾsʾ hlbʾyʾ ʾwhrmzd ʾwlwʾnʾ hšʾnytyʾy [AYK ʾpzʾdyʾ]

11.7. [a] ZNE ʾytwnʾ ZK GBRA ʾhlwbʾnʾ ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ZNE ʾytwnʾ nʾylykʾhlbʾy ZK-ʾy ywydʾsl yḥyʾnʾ ADYNʾ ZNE gwbšʾnʾ ʾprʾc YMRRWN |b| ZK ʾylymʾnʾ hwwʾnʾ hwwʾnʾ OL ʾmšʾnyʾ YHMTWN-šʾnʾ ZKL-ʾnʾ nʾylyʾkʾnʾ |c| AYT ʾhlʾdyy hnd |d|

\[3340\] This gloss is added by a second hand.

\[3341\] Added by a second hand.
I’mšn’twmy hwmn MNW dyn’ k’mk ’lc’nyk’n’ myzd YHWWN-yt |e| ’hl’dyh MNW gyw’k ’hlwb’y MNW ’hl’dyh’n’ ’whrmzd mzdgyy mzd ’y’.

11.8. [a] ’ytwn’ ZNE gwbšn’ dlncnyt MNW hnd pylwkltwmy byš’zynyttwmy 8 ’hwnwl pl’-sl’dšnyny [AYK KRYTWN-š’n’]

11.9. [a] pwłtnym hyšm pwłtnym nsws ŠDYA |b| pwłtnym hmlyt’ [lymn’ bwt YKOYMWN-yt] pwłtnym płtyt [lymn YHWWN-t YKOYMWN-yt] |c| pwłtnym hlywdlwś zñnk pwłtnym bwtk pwłtnym bwtc pwłtnym kwn’d pwłtnym kwn’dk pwłtnym bws’sp’ MNW zhl [AYK wyś HLMWN-yt W zhl hnd] |d| pwłtnym bws’sp MNW dglnd [AYK ’p’lwn’ gwbšn’] pwłtnym mwdk pwłtnym kpyc pwłtnym płyk [k’mk] MNW hnd ZK-’y ’tš MYA żmyk gwsnd ’wlwl |e| pwłtnym ’hwkynśn MNW ZK-ś ’tš MYA żmyk gwsnd ’wlwl

11.10. [a] pwłtnym LK -ǔśg’gmynwg MN m’n’ MN ’tš MN MYA MN żmyk MN gwsnd MN ’wlwl MN GBRA ’hlwb’y MN n’ylyk ’hlwb’ MN stl MN m’h MN hwlśyt MN n’ ’sl lwśn’ MN hlwsp wyh ’whrmzd d’t ’hl’dyh pyt’k

11.11. [a] AYT’ ZNE -ǔśg’ gwbšn’ dlncnyt MNW hnd pylwkltwmy byš’cyt’ltwm 4 ’hwnwl pr’c sl’dšnyny

11.12. [a] ptk’lym hšm ptk’lym ZK nsws ptk’lym hmlyt ptk’lym płtyt [AYK lymn YHWWN-t YKOYMWN-yt y] |b| ptk’lym hlywk ptk’lym hlywdlwś zñnk ptk’lym bwdt ptk’lym bwdtc ptk’lym kwn’d ptk’lym kwn’dk ptk’lym bws’sp MNW zhl [AYK wyś HLMWN-yt] |c| ptk’lym bws’sp MNW dgl zñnk ptk’lym mwdtk ptk’lym kpst ptk’lym płyk [k’mk] [MNW ’wc dys] ’tš MYA żmyk gwsnd ’wlwl |d| ptk’lym ’hwk MNW ’tš MYA żmyk gwsnd ’wlwl

11.13. [a] ptk’lym LK dwśd’n’ gn’k mynwg MN m’n’ MN ’tš MN MYA MN żmyk MN gwsnd MN ’wlwl MN GBRA ’hlwb’y MN n’ylyk ’hl’dyy MN stl MN m’h MN hwl MN ’sl lwśn’ MN hm’k ŠPYL ZY ’whrmzd d’t ’hl’dyh pyt’k

11.14. [a] ’ytwn’ ZNE ZK gwbšn’ dlncnyt MNW hnd pylwkltwmy byš’cynt’ltwm 4 mzd’tmwk pr’c sl’dšnyny [AYK KRYTWN-š’n’]

11.15. [a] ptk’lym hyšm ptk’lym nswm ptk’lym hmlyt ptk’lym płtyt ptk’lym hlyyk ptk’lym hlyyk zñnk ptk’lym bwdt ptk’lym bwdtc ptk’lym ZK kwn’dy ptk’lym kwn’dy ptk’lym bws’sp MNW zhl ptk’lym bws’sp’ MNW dgl zñnk ptk’lym mwdtk ptk’lm kpśt ptk’lym płyk k’mk MNW ZK-’y ’tš MYA żmyk gwsnd ’wlwl ptk’lym LK dwśd’n gn’k mynwg

11.16. [a] MN tš m’n’ MN ’tš MN MYA MN żmyk MN ’wlwl MN gwsnd MN GBRA ’hlwb’y MN n’ylyk ’hlwb’y MN stl MN KRKA MN ZBZBA MN ’sl lwśn’ MN hm’k ŠPYL ’whrmzd d’t ’hl’dyh twhmk

---

This interpretation seems to be implied in the writing [šḥb YHWWN-].
11.17. |a| 'ytwn' ZNE gwbšn' dlncynyd MNW hnd pylvckltwm byš'c yt'ltwm 5 'hnwl pr'c sl'dšn' |b| 'hl' dyh 'p tyh p'hlwm AYT'

K2

V 10

10.1. |a| pwrsyt zltwšt' MN 'whrmzd d't'l gh'n 'st'wmnd'n 'hlwby |b| cygwn PWN OLE-š'n dlwc ptk'lym MNW MN 'w' lstk 'w' QDM zywnydh QDM dwb'lyt cygwn PWN OLE nswš ptk'lym MNW MN OLE wtltk QDM zywnd gwmyht [AYK-š cygwn stwš W dwl MN wtltk dlwc W nswš l'd BRA OBYDWN- m MNW QDM zywnydh BRA dwb'lyt AMT cygwn MN wtltk nswš dwl OBYDWN-m QDM zywnydh gwmyhty]

10.2. |a| AP-š gwpt m 'whrmzd ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWN MNW hnd PWN g's'n' byšš'mltw [AYK 2 b'1 h'wnyt]] |b| ZNE gwbšn' pr'c YMRWN MNW hnd PWN g's'n' slyšš'mltw [AYK 3 b'1 h'wnyt)] |c| ZNE gwbšnk pr'c YMRWN MNW hnd ZK g's'nyk cslwš'mlwt [AYK 4 b'1 h'wnšnk] |d| ZNE gwbšnk pr'c YMRWN MNW hnd g's'n' byšš'mltw slyšš'mlwt cslwš'mlwt ['yw k PWN g's'n' 'yw k PWN ywtdywd't]

10.3. |a| d't'l kt'l OLE-š'n gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN g's'n' byšš'mltw |b| AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd AYK ZNE OLE-š'n gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN g's'n' byšš'mltw |c| ZNE gwbšnk AP-š 2 b'1 pr'c YMRWN

10.4. |a| Without PT

10.5. |a| ZK AHL byšš'mltw ZNE gwbšn' 'pr'c YMRWN 'cš pylvcgl byšš'znyt'l |b| BRA pwltnym gn'k mynwg MN m'n' MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN ZK ḡhwš tn' W MN GBRA QDM wtltk W MN n'lyk QDM wtltk MN m'n' m'npt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndp MN MTA MN ḡhwš MN hvsp 'hlwb'n 'st

10.6. |a| BRA pwltnym nswš BRA pwltnym hmlyt [krt YKOYMWN-yt MN m'n'] BRA pwltnym pyt'lyt QDM hmlyt YHWWW-t [YHWWW-t YKOYMWN-yt] MN m'n' MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN ḡhwš tn' MN GBRA QDM lstk W MN n'lyk QDM lstk MN m'n' m'npt MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA MTA-pt MN hvsp 'hlwb'n sty

10.7. |a| d't'l MNW kt'1347 OLE-š'n gwbšn' AMT hnd g's'n' slyšš'mltw |b| AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd AYK OLE-š'n gwbšnyh MNW hnd PWN g's'n' slyšš'mltw |c| ZNE 'yw k gwbšnk 3 bār pr'c 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 b'1 pr'c YMRWN
10.8. |a| Without PT

10.9. |a| AP-š AHL slyš'mlwt ZNE gwbšnk pr'c YMRWN pylwckl wyš'znyt' |b| BRA pwltynm indar [ŠDYA-n] BRA pwltynm swl [ŠDYA-n] BRA pwltynm nāyhaša ŠDYA-n MN m'n MN wys MN znd MN MTA |c| MN hwýš tn' MN GBRA QDM wltk MN n'ýlyk QDM wltk MN m'n' M'n' wp MN wys wysyt MN znd zndpt MN MTA MTA-pt MN hlwp 'hlwb’n’sṭ

10.10. |a| Omitted in K2

10.11. |a| d’t’l k’t’l OLE-š’n gwbšnk MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ ctlwš’mlwt |b| AP-š gwpt 'whrmzd ZNE gwbšnk pr’c YMRWN MNW hnd g’s’n’ ctlýš’mlwt |c| ZNE gwbšn 4 b’l p’ pr’c YMRWN

10.12. |a| Without PT

10.13. |a| ZK AHL ctlwš’mlw t gwbšn’ ZNE gwbšn’ pr’c YMRWN pylwckl byš’zyn’t |b| PWN pwltynm hšmy hlwydlwhš BRA pwltynm 'γtš ŠDYA MN m’n MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN hwýš tn’ MN GBRA QDM wltk MN NYŠE QDM wltk MN m’n’ M’n’ wp MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA MTA-pt MN hlwp 'hlwb’n’sṭ

10.14. |a| BRA pwltynm wlnyk ŠDYA BRA pwltynm w’tk ŠDYA MN m’n MN wys MN znd MN MTA MN hwýš-t’n’ MN GBRA QDM wltk MN n’ýlyk QDM wltk MN m’n’ M’n’ wp MN wys wyspt MN znd zndpt MN MTA MTA-pt MN hlwp 'hlwb’n’sṭ

10.15. |a| ZNE gwbš’n’ MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ byš’mlwt ZNE gwbšn’ MNW hnd PWN g’s’n’ slyš’mlwt ZNE bšn’ MNW hnd g’s’n’ ctlwš’mlw

10.16. |a| ZNE OLE-š’n gwbšn’ MNW hnd AYΚ ZK gn’k mynw snyh |b| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ MNW hnd AYΚ hšm hlwdlws snyh |c| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ MNW hnd m’zn’g’n’ ŠDYA snyh |d| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ hlwp ŠDYA snyh

10.17. |a| ZNE OLE-š’n gwbšn’ MNW hnd OLE dlwc OLE-š’n’ nswš hmyšt’l [hnd] MNW MN lystk QDM zyndyh QDM dwb’lyt [PWN hmlyt] |b| ZNE OLE-š’n’ gwbšn’ MNW hnd OLE dlwc OLE nswš hmyšt’l wmn nd MNW wltk QDM zyndyh QDM gwymyhtyt [PWN p’tyltyt]

10.18. |a| ADYN’ LK zltwš 9 my BRA PSKWN-š’n’ |b| MNW hnd PWN ZNE zmyk ywdt MYAY-twm ywdt lwl-twm |c| ‘n’-QDM-hwlšn p’h wyl /blank of 1 ½ line/ |d| ywyd’slyh ANŠWTA-’n PWN YLYDWN-š’n’ p’hlwm /blank of 1 ½ line/

---

3347 K2a above the line k’t’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'wnnd ZK y hwys 'pyck dyn' |b| MNW hwys dyn'y 'ywyd'slynyt PWN hwmt hwht hwwlšt [‘daënâm. anhwaɡm.’] 332

10.20. |a| 'hl'dyy 'p'tyh p'hlwm AYT

V 11

11.1. |a| pwr'syt zltwšt OD 'hlwb'y |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 'hlwb'y cygwn PWN n'lyyk 'hlwb'y cygwn PWN sl cygwn PWN m'h cygwn PWN hwlyt cygwn PWN ZK 'sl lwšn cygwn PWN c hl wsp 'p'tyh 'whrmd d't' MNW MN 'hl'dyḥ pyt'k'yh

11.2. |a| AP-š gwpt 'whrmd AYK ywyd'slyḥ sl'dšn' zltwšt /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 'hlwb'

11.3. |a| aṯa. i 'ytwn' ZNE YMRWN-yt dlnyynyḏ MNW hnd pylwcgšt 5 'hwntl PWN sl'dšnyk [5 BRA YMRWN] |c| 'hwntl tn' p'n'kyḥ yt 'hwntlyw

11.4. |a| 'ytwn' m'n' PWN 'ywyd'slynyḏ ADYN' ZNE gwbsn' prc YMRRNWN |b| 'ytwn' L hm'y OD 'w' ZK bytwm zm'n p'nykḥ d'm'n krt'n /blank/ |c| [AMT] 'ytwn' PWN 'thš ywyd'slynyḏ ADYN' ZNE gwbsn' prc YMRRNWN |d| 'ytwn' 'w' HNA LK 'thš 'w'lcyk'n pltwm BRA YHMTWN-m 'whrmzd [PWN p'lycšn' šn' dnyt'lyḥ]

11.5. |a| [AMT] 'ytwn' PWN MYA 'ywyd'lslynyḏ ADYN' ZNE gwbsn'k prc YMRRNWN |b| MYA 'ytwn' YḌBHWN-m /blank/ |c| ZNE zmyk 'ywyd'slynyḏ AMT 'ytwn' gwbsn' prc YMRWN |d| ZNE zmyk LWTE NKB- 'n /blank/ YḌBHWN-m

11.6. |a| 'ytwn' gwspnd 'ywyd'slynyḏ ADYN' ZNE gwbsn' prc YMRRNWN |b| ZK gwspnd'n /blank of three lines/ |c| 'ytwn' 'wlwl ywyd'slynyḏ ADYN' ZNE gwbsn' prc YMRRNWN |d| 'ytwn' ZK 'w' tsk'syḥ AMT 'hlwb'y 'whrmzd 'wlwl whšyny t /blank/

11.7. |a| AMT GBRA 'hlwb'y 'ywyd'slynyḏ AMT n'lyyk 'hlwb'y 'ywyd'slynyḏ ADYN' ZNE gwbsn' prc YMRRNWN |b| ZK 'ylm'n hw'dšnyh 't OL l'mšn'

332 K2a dyn' 'hw'n' /blank/
YHMTWN-šn ZKL-’n W n’łyk’n’ zltwšt’ /blank/ |c| whwmn l’mšn’twm whwmn hnd MNW dyn’ k’mk ’łc’nnyk byt PWN mzd [LTME ZK TME MN ˄] |d| ZK ’hl’dyh /blank of three lines/

11.8. |a| ’ytwn’ ZNE gwbsn’ OD 8 ’hnwl pr’c sl’dšn yt’hwwlyw [8 BRA YMRWN]

11.9. |a| pwltynm hšm pwltynm nswš /blank/ |b| pwltynm hm-gwmyhtyt pwltynm QDM gwmyhtyt /blank/ |c| pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm bwš’sp MNW W zhlkl [’y W zhlkly ṭ y AYK MNW KBD HLMWN-yt] |d| pwltynm bwš’sp MNW dlwnd dlng gw BYN [KBD HLMWN-yt] |e| pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm plyk [k’myh] [ZK >& X plstkhyh ] MNW ’hwk ynyt’ ṭ thš MYA żmyk gwspnd ’wlwl |f| pwltynm ’n’ MNW ’hwg ynyt ṭ thš MYA żmyk gwspnd ’wlwl

11.10. |a| pwltynm LK dwš’d’n’k gn’k mynwg MN m’n MN ’tš MN’ MYA MN żmyk MN gwspnd MN ’wlwl MN GBRA ’hlwby MN n’łyk ’hlwby MN sl MN m’h MN hwłšyt MN ’sl lwš’n’ MN hwsp ’p’tyḥ ’wrhmżd d’t ’hl’dyh pyt’k

11.11. |a| 4 ’hnwl pr’c sl’dšnych yt’hwwlyw [4 BRA YMRRWN]

11.12. |a| ptk’lym hyšm ptk’lym ZK nswš |b| ptk’lym hm-gwmyhtyt ptk’lym QDM gwmyhtyt /blank/ |c| pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm bwš’sp MNW [KBD HLMWN-yt] pwltynm bwš’sp dlng gw BYN |d| pwltynm /blank/ pwltynm plyk [k’mk] MNW ’hwk ynyt ṭ thš MYA żmyk gwspnd ’wlwl

11.13. |a| ptk’lym ’w’ dwš d’n’k gn’k mynwg MN m’n MN ’thš MN MYA MN żmyk W MN gwspnd MN ’wlwl MN GBRA ’hlwby MN n’łyk ’hlwby MN sl MN m’h MN hwłšyt MN ZK ’sl lwšnyh MN hwsp ’p’tyḥ ’wrhmżd d’t MN ’hl’dyh pyt’k

11.14. |a| 4 b’l mazdā. at. mōi. pr’c sl’dšnk


11.17. |a| ytwn’ ZNE gwbsn’ OD 5 ’hnwnl pr’c sl’dšnk yt’hwwlyw 5 gwptn’ |b| ’ywk ’hl’yk ’p’tyḥ AYT
AVESTAN GLOSSARY

\textbf{a-}: “this”. 10.18b, 19a, 12.1b, 3b, 5b, 7b, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a.
\textit{aēša}– (masc.), \textit{aēšā}– (fem.), \textit{aēta}– (neut.): “this”. 10.3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b.
\textit{aēšma}– (masc.): “Wrath”. 10.13b, 16b, 11.9a, 12a, 15a, 18a.
\textit{akataša}– (masc.): “Akataša, name of a demon”. 10.13b.
\textit{aq}: “then”. 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a.
\textit{aďa}: “then, thus”. 10.19a, 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.
\textit{ap}– (fem.): “water”. 11.1b, 2c, 5a, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.2c, d, 6c (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2), 22c.
\textit{aipī}: “even”. 10.18d.
\textit{aŋra-
\textit{anaγra}–: “endless”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
\textit{aōa}– (masc., neut.): “the Beneficent Immortals”. 12.2d, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12a, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
\textit{aii}–: “to go”.
\textit{a} + \textit{aii}– “to go against, to attack”. \textit{āiti} (3rd. Sing. Subj. Ind. Act.) 11.9f, g, 12f, g, 15a (2), 18a (2).
\textit{aiiabh}– (neut.): “metal, metallic implement”. 12.22f.
\textit{auua}– (masc., neut.):
\textit{a} + \textit{auua}– (masc., neut.): “righteous”. 10.1a, 3a, 5b, 6a, 7a, 9b, 10a, 11a, 13a, 14a, 16a, 18a, 20a.
\textit{aŋha}–: “to be”. 10.18b.
\textit{ähuru}–: “to be”. 10.18b, \textit{hōnti} (3rd. Pl. Pres. Ind. Act.) 10.2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, 7a, b, 11a, b, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 19a, b, 20a, 22b.
\textit{ahuna}–: “the prayer Ahuna Vairiia”. 11.3b, c, 8b, 11a, 20a.
\textit{ahura-mazdā}– (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.

\textit{ā. airiūmā. iśīō}: “the prayer \textit{ā. airiūmā. iśīō}”. 11.17a (2).
āat: “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.

āxtūrīm: “four times”. 10.11c.

ātar- (masc.): “fire”. 11.1c, 2c, 4c, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a, 22c.

āṭhītim: “twice”. 10.3c.

ādritīm: “thrice”. 10.7c.

āhiti- (fem.): “maculation”. 11.9g, 12g, 15a, 18a.

ārzu-: “righteous”. 10.19a (2).

indra- (masc.): “Iṇḍra, name of a demon”. 10.9b.

ima-: “this”. 10.2a, b, c, d, 3b, c, 5a, 7b, 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.

upa: “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.

kainin- (fem.): “girl”. 12.7c.

kaia-: “which (interrogative pronoun)”. 10.3a, 7a, 11a.

kōm.nā. mazdā: “the prayer kōm.nā. mazdā”. 11.3d, 8c, 11b, 20b.

kuḍa: “how”. 10.1b (2), 11.1b, c (12), 12.2a (2), 4b (2), 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).

kuṇḍa- (masc.): “Kunda, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

kuṇḍīzan- (masc.): “Kūṇḍīzan, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

gādā- (fem.): “creature, fold, property”. 10.1a, 3a, 7a, 11a, 11.1a, 12.2a, 4a, 6a, 8a, 10a, 12a, 14a, 16a, 18a, 20a.

gānu- (masc., fem.): “cattle”. 11.1c, 2c, 6a, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 15a (2), 16a, 18a (2), 19a, 12.22c.

gādā- (fem.): “Gādā, 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.

xruiyīnī- (fem.): “Xruiyīnī, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

xrui. dāru-: “of the bloodstained stick, epithet of Wrath”. 10.13b, 16b.

xšuuaš: “six”. 12.7c, 13.14c (2).

xšuuašti- (fem.): “sixty”. 12.1f, 3d, 5d.

-ca: “and”. 10.2d (3), 10a, 18b (2), f (3), 19b (3), 11.3a (2), 8a (2), 11a (2), 14a (2), 17a (2), 12.9b (2), 11b (2), 22f (5).

caδ̣bar-: “four”. 11.11a, 14a, 17a.

caḍbarasat-: “forty”. 12.13b.
caṇḍāmlīta-: “(Avestan texts) to be said four times”. 10.2c, d, 11a, b, 13a, 15a.
čit: “any, too, even”. 12.22a.
caṇānt-: “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).
juu- (adj.): “alive”. 12.22b, c (5), d.
taoxman- (neut.): “seed, relative”. 12.21a.
tat (neut.): “this”. vid. 1a, 3a, d.
tanu.pərəda-: “whose body is forfeit, tanu.pərəda- sinner”. 12.1d, f, 3c, d, 5c, d, 7b, c, 9a, b, 11a, b, 13a, b, 15a, b, 17a, b, 19a, b.
tanu- (fem.): “body”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 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.
tūrīia- (masc.): “uncle”. 12.15a.
tūrīia- (fem.): “aunt”. 12.15a.
tūrīia.puđra- (masc.): “male cousin”. 12.17a, 19a.
tūrīia.duđar- (fem.): “female cousin”. 12.17a, 19a.
daēnā- (fem.): “religious conscience”. 10.18e, f, 19a (2), b.
daēna- (masc.): “false god, demon”. 10.9b, 13a, b, 14a (2), 16c, d.
daįju- (fem.): “country”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2).
daįjhoiitəi- (masc.): “lord of the country”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a.
daɾə.ɡumə-: “long-handed, epithet of Būšiástā”. 11.9d, 12d, 15a, 18a.
daŋa- (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.
dātar- (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.
dānu- (neut.): “wood”. 12.22f.
dim: “this, it” (enclitic pronoun 3rd. Sing. Acc.). 10.
duņar- (fem.): “daughter”. 12.1c, 3a, b, 19a.
duie: s. duņa-
dużdāb-: “harful”. 11.10a, 19a.
duṇadasa: “twelve”. 12.7c.
duṇan-: “to twirl, to hurl”.
draoš: “wood”. vid. dānu-
draŋj- (fem.): “Lie”. 10.1b, 17a, b.
druuants- (masc.): “liar”. 12.22b, e.

dβrars-: “to cut”.
dβa: “you” (enclitic pronoun 2nd. Sing. Acc.). 11.10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
drisants-: “thirty”. 12.1f, 3d, 5d, 15b.
drisāṃrūta-: “(Avestan texts) to be said thrice”. 10.2b, d, 7a, b, 9a, 15a.
dris,frasnāiti- (fem.): “washing thrice”. 12.2b (2), 4c (2), 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).
dris,frasrūti- (fem.): “recitation thrice”. 12.2b, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

paiti.raēβa- (masc.): “Indirect defilement”. 10.6a, 11.9b, 12b, 15a, 18a.
panca: “five”. 11.3b, 9b, 11b, 20a, 12.19b.
panca.dasa: “fifteen”. 12.15b.
pancāsant-: “fifty”. 12.9b, 11b, 27c (2).
par-: “to fight”. parānāe (1st. Sing. Pres. Subj. Mid.) 10.1b. parone (1st. Sing. Pres. Ind. Mid.) 11.9a (2), b (2), c (7), d, e (2), f, g, 10a, 15a (16), 16a. parśta (PPP.) 11.12a (2), b (2), c (7), d, e (2), f, g, 13a, 18a (16), 19a.
    paiti + par- “to fight”. paitiparone (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.
pasčaēta: “then, afterwards”. 11.2b, 12.2d, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
parasat: “asked”. vid. fras-
pitar- (masc.): “father”. 12.1a, c, 3b.
pūdra- (masc.): “son”. 12.1c, 3a, b, 7c, 19a.

baēšaziia-: “healing”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.
baēšaziīo.toma-: “the most healing”. 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.
bar-: “to bring”. bārāeta (3rd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Mid.) 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.
barōsmān- (neut.): “barōsmān- , sacred twigs”. 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

bīzangra-: “biped”. 12.22b, e.
bīšāmrūta- “(Avestan texts) to be said twice”. 10.2a, d, 3a, b, 5a, 15a.
bū-: “to become, to be”. bun (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).
būīōn- (masc.): “Būīōn, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.
būīōīzan- (masc.): “Būīōīzan, name of a demon”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.
būēśāstā- (fem.): “Būēśāstā, the demon of sloth”. 11.9c, d, 12c, d, 15a (2), 18a (2).

brātar- (masc.): “brother”. 12.5a, b (2).
brātūriā- (masc.): “nephew”. 12.13a.
frząbaōaďab-: “(a blow) by which consciousness goes away”. 12.22c.

napāť- (masc.): “grandson”. 12.9a, 11a (2).
napti- (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.
nāirika- (fem.): “woman”. 10.5b, 6a, 9a, 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.
ŋhaiϑiia- (masc.): “Nŋhaiϑiia, name of a demon”. 10.9b.
zunga- (neut.): “house”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2), 11.1b, 2b, 4a, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a, 12.2a, d, 4b, c, 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).

māta- (masc.): “grandfather”. 12.9a (2), 11a.
mīkā- (fem.): “grandmother”. 12.9a (2), 11a.

maya- (masc.): “hole”. 10.18a.
man-: “to remain, to wait”.
umpa + man-: “to wait (till the house be purified)”. *umpa.manauiān* (3rd. Pl. Pres. Subj. Act.) 12.1b, 3b, 5b, 7b, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a.
māniu- (masc.): “spirit”. 10.1a, 5b, 11.1a, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
mar-: “to die”. *mɔrɔtɔ* (PPP.) 12.22a, d, g, 12.22b, e.
mairiia- (masc.): “vile”. 12.22d, f.
mazdašt-a-: “created by Mazdā”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.
mazda- (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.
mazdā. aṯ. mōi: “the prayer mazdā. aṯ. mōi”. 11.14a, b.
māšuia- (masc.): “mortal”. 10.18d.
māta- (fem.): “mother”. 12.1a, c, 3b.
māzaṇiia-: “Māzaṇiia, name of a class of demons”. 10.16c.
mazdašiia-: “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, 12e, 15a, 18a.
mmi-: “to say”. *marq* (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.
fras + mmi- “to recite”. *framrauua* (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.


yaoždāta (PPP.) 11.2b, c (12), 12.2a, 4b, c, 6b (2), 8b (2), 10a (2), 12b (2), 14b (2), 16b (2), 18b (2), 20a (2).


yaožda-iti (fem.): “purification”. 10.19a.

yaožda- (neut.): “(formula of) purification”. 11.2a.

yaϑa: “when, how, that, so much, so many, like”. 12.21a, 22a.

ya: “when, if, until, where”. 10.18b, 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a, 21a.

yaz-: “worship”. yazaēta (3rd. Sing. Pres. Opt. Mid.) 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

yār- (neut.): “year”. 12.22a.

vac-/vāc- (masc.): “word, voice”. 10.2a, b, c, d, 3a, b, 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- (masc.): “captured”. 12.22c.

varəniia-: “Varəniia, name of a class of demons”. 10.14a.

vašō.upāiti- (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.


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.

vaŋhu-: “the best”. 10.18d, 11.14b.

vā “or”. 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a, 21a.


vārodrayni-: “victorious”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.

vārodrayniō.tama-: “the most victorious”. 11.3a, 8a, 11a, 14a, 17a, 20a.

vohu- vid. vaŋhu-

viš.huška-: “split”. 12.22a.
raēβaiia-: “to mingle, to defile”.

paiti + raēβaiia-: “to defile indirectly”. paiti.irsta- (PPP.) 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2). paiti.raēβaiieiti (3rd. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act.) 12.21a, 22c.

raocah- (neut.): “light”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.

riδ-: “to die”. irista (PPP.) 10.1b (2), 17a, b.

para + raē-: “to die”. para.irstaieiti (3rd. Sing. Pres. Ind. Act.) 12.1a (2), 3a (2), 5a (2), 7a (2), 9a (2), 11a (2), 13a (2), 15a (2), 17a (2), 19a, 21a.

uruvarā- (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, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

stərənaēta (3rd. Sing. Opt. Mid.) 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

sna- (masc.): “blow”. 10.16a, b, c, d, 12.22c.

zaraϑuštra- (masc.): “Zaraϑuštra”. 10.1a, 18a, e, 11.1a, 2a, 12.2d, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a, 22b, d.

zia- (fem.): “libation”. 12.2c, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a.

zanto- (masc.): “tribe”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2), 9b (2), 10a (2), 13b (2), 14a (2).

zanto-paiti- (masc.): “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.

zaraϑuśtra- (masc.): “Zaraϑuśtra”. 10.1a, 18a, e, 11.1a, 2a, 12.2d, 4c, 6b, 8b, 10a, 12b, 14b, 16b, 18b, 20a, 22b, d.

zaιriκi- (fem.): “Zairici (the Yellowish), name of a demon”. 10.10a.

zaιriνa-: “Yellowish, epithet of Būśiāstā”. 11.9c, 12c, 15a, 18a.

zqδa- (neut.): “birth”. 10.18d.

zi: “indeed, for”. 12.22b, d.

ha- (masc.), bā- (fem.), ta- (neut.): “this”. 10.18d, e.

bāca: “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).

baḥu- (neut.): “food”. 12.22f.
hamaēstar- (masc.): “subduer”. 10.17a, b.

b(a)uua-: “his / her / its own”. 10.5b, 6a, 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 18f, 19a.

hauuāiūs: vid. b(a)uua-

ham. raēδβα- (masc.): “Direct defilement”. 10.6a, 11.9b, 12b, 15a, 18a

humata- (neut.): “good thoughts”. 10.18f, 19b.

huxta- (neut.): “good words”. 10.18f, 19b.

huua- (neut.): “sun”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a, 16a, 19a.

huuršt- (neut.): “good deeds”. 10.18f, 19b.

xvaṭō: “by himself, by herself”. 12.7c.

xvaṛaḍa- (neut.): “food, drink”. 12.22f.

xvaŋbar- (fem.): “sister”. 12.5a, b (2).
QUOTATIONS FROM OTHER AVESTAN TEXTS IN VİDĒVDĀD


V 10.4a: hunteṇ. hixṭaṇ. hivarrāṭaṇ. hiiadacā. haniuadacā. ṛvarīuṇamananma. ṛvāuṇaṇammanma. maḥī. aibī.jarotāro. ṛnaeṇāstāro. ṛyaṇā. vohuṇ. mahi. (= Y 35.2)

V 10.4a: aṣāhiā. ṛa. saīrī. aṣāhiū. ṛvarīnē. ṛkaṇaici. ṛtām. ṛjiṣīṃ. ṛvahītām. ādā. ubōihiā. ahūhiā. (= Y 35.8)


V 10.4a: humāim. ṛḍa. ṛiṣm. yazatim. aṣyabācīṃ. īdamaidē. ādā. tū. ṛnē. ṛgaiascā. ṛastōnta. ṛctā. uṇbōi. ahūniō. ṛḥatim. ṛbudatim. (= Y 41.3)

V 10.4a: ṛṭōi. stotavrascā. mṛṇanacā. ahuvā. mazdā. aogamadacā. usmAhi. ṛvisāmedacā. ṛhuat. ṛmīd. manuua. ṛfrada. daenāriō. mazdā. ahūrā. (= Y 41.5)


V 10.4a: spṃtu. ṛmniu. vahītacā. ṛmniu. ṛhacā. ṛaṣtā. ṛṣiauṇacā. vacacā. ṛaṃī. ṛdān. ṛhunīuātā. amrōta. ṛmzā. ṛsadrā. ārmaitē. ahuvō. (= Y 47.1)

V 10.4a: vohū. ṛxsadr. vairīm. bāgam. aibī. bairīstəm. ṛvīdīsūmē. ṛiṣāci. ī. ṛantarv. ṛcaici. ṛṣiauṇacā. mazdā. ṛvahītām. tā. tōi. ṛnūci. ṛvārscēnē. (= Y 51.1)


V 10.8a, 10.20a, 11.20c, 12.20h: āżom. vohū. vahītēm. astī. uṣṭā. astī. uṣṭā. ṛaṃī. ṛhuat. ī. aṣī. vahīt. ī. vahītī. āżom. (Y 27.14)

V 10.8a: ya. sruui. ahuvō. mazdācā. ṛārmaiticā. ṛaṃcā. ṛfrada. gaēθ. manacā. ṛvohū. ṛxsadr. vahītā. ṛma. vahītē. mā. vahītō. ma. vahītī. āżom. (Y 33.11)

V 10.8a: ṛhuxadr. ṛtmāi. ṛbā. ṛat. ṛxsadr. ṛaṃ. ṛhuat. ṛaibī. ṛdama. ṛcīmn. ṛhuqamabicā. ṛhuat. mazdā. ahurāi. aṣīcā. vahītāi. (= Y 35.5)

V 10.8a: duṇum. ṛenē. ṛva. ṛas. ṛrāptī. ṛraį. ṛa. ṛas. ṛdīj. ṛatā. ṛpātu. ṛuk. ṛaṣtā. ahuvō. ya. iṣ. ṛjātu. ṛbā. ṛm. ṛtōi. ṛvahū. tā. tōi. ṛsrōjoji. ṛdabi. ṛdigung. vahī. (= Y 53.9)

V 10.12a, 20a, 11.3b, c, 8b, 11a, 20a: yaṭa. ahuvō. vairīo. ādā. ṛat. ṛaṣtō. ṛhacā. vayhūṣ. mazdā. manayhō. ṛṣiauṇan. ahuvā. mazdā. ṛxsadr. ahuvā. ṛyav. ṛdrig. vahī. (Y 27.13)

V 10.12a, 11.14a, b: mazdā. ṛtōi. vahītā. vahītā. ṛṣiauṇ. vahītā. ṛtā. ṛtōi. ṛväb. manayhā. ṛaṣcā. ṛsū. ṛtōi. ṛm. vahītē. mazdā. ṛxsadr. vahī. ṛfrā. ṛvam. ṛvahū. hārt. dā. ahūm. (Y 34.15)
V 10.12a, 11.7b-d, 17a: ā. airīmā. išiiō. rafərāi. jaṃtū. nərəbiəscā. nəriəbiəscā. zarənustrəhe. vaŋhůuś. rafərəi. manaybə. yā. daēnā. vairīm. hanət. miždəm. aʃəbiə. yəsə. aʃim. yəqm. ahərə. masatā. mazdā. (Y 45.4)
kə, vəəνərələ. vəə. pəi, səŋəbə. yəi. hənti. ciərə. məi, dəm, ahəməbi. rațəm. ciədə. aŋ. həi, vəhə. sməəoʃə. jaŋtə. manaybə. mazdə. *əaəi. *yaŋəi, vaʃi. *kaŋəiçəi. (Y 44.16)
V 11.3c: abunəm. vairəm. tanəm. pəiət. (SrB 1)
V 11.4b: aŋ. mə. yəuni. *boŋnuə. *pafrə. məziəsət. (Y 49.1)
V 11.5b: apə. aŋ. yəzamaide. maəkəntišca. bəŋənuəntišca. frauəazənə. (Y 38.3, 67.6)
V 11.5d: iməm. aəa. zəm. gnəbiə. əadrə. yəzamaide. (Y 38.1)
V 11.6b: gaunə. aəəi. tiəi. šiəədənəiə. yəiə. vabəstəi. *fraəwiəməhi. (Y 35.4)
V 11.6d: aŋ. aəəiə. aəa. mazdə. urənuərə. vaxətə. (Y 48.6)

AVESTAN WORDS OR PHRASES IN THE PT OF VĪDĒVDĀD

V 10.18f, 19b: daēnəm. ayhuəm. “conscience (and) life”
V 11.1b: airim. “secluded” (cf. V 9 and 16 airim. gətəm. bə. ni-həd-).
V 11.5d: yəniəbe. “of the lordly woman”.

PĀZAND WORDS IN THE PT OF VĪDĒVDĀD

V 10.9b: inδər “Indar, name of a demon”.
V 10.9b: nəŋhədə “Nəŋhədə, name of a demon”.
V 11.5b: *xəii. *təca “perspiration; flown, poured (water)”
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**PAHLAVI GLOSSARY**

*abar dwārīdan, dwār-* <QDM dwbʾlytnʾ, dwbʾl->: “to run about, to run through”. *abar dwārēd* 10.1b, 17a, b.

*abar gumēxtan, gumēxt-* <QDM gwmyhtnʾ, gwmyh->: “to contaminate”. *abar gumēxtēd* 10.1b, 17a, b, 12.21a, 22c.

*abarīg* <ʾpʾryk>: “other”. 10.18c.

*abar māndan, mān-* <QDM KTLWN-tnʾ, KTLWN->: “to wait (before entering into the house)”. *abar mānišnīh* (pseudo-Phl.) 12.1b. *abar mānēnd* 10.1b, 17a, b, 12.21a, 22c.

*abar mānd* 12.3b [B], 17a [B], 19a [B], 14a [B], 15a [B], 17a [B], 19a [B]. *abar mānišnag* (pseudo-Phl.) 12.1a [A], 15a [A].

*abar pādan, pāy-* <QDM NTLWN-tnʾ, NTLWN->: “to wait”. *abar pāyišnag* (pseudo-Phl.) 12.7b [A], 9a [A], 11a [A].

*abar rawēnīdan, rawēn-* <QDM SGYTWN-nytnʾ, SGYTWN-yn->: “to go, to enter”. *abar rawēnēd* 12.2d [B (2)].

*abar rist* <ʾlystʾ>: “defiled”. 10.5b (2), 6a (2).

*abastāg* <ʾpstʾk>: “the Avesta”. 11.1a, 2c, 22d, f.

*abāg* <ʾLWTE>: “with”. 11.5d (2), 12.2b [B], 22b [B].

*abāyēnīd* 11.7b, c, 12.22b [B]. *abāyēd* 11.7b, c.

*abēzag* <ʾpyck>: “pure, holy”. 10.19a (2).

*abāyēn* 11.7b, c.

*abē* <ʾpzʾl>: “means”. 11.9g, 12g.

*abzāyēnīdan abzāyēn* <ʾpzʾdytnʾ, ʾpzʾdytnʾ>: “to make increase”. *bē abzāyēnīd* 11.6d.


*ahlāyīh* <ʾhlʾdyh>: “Truth”. 11.1c, 2c, 7d, 10a, 13a, 20b, 22h.

*ahunawar* <ʾhnwl>: “the prayer Ahunawar”. 11.3b, c, 8a, 11a.

*amabraspand* <ʾmhrspndʾ>: “Beneficent Immortal”. 12.2e [A] / d [B (3)], 4e [A], 6d [A], 8d [A], 10d [A], 12d [A], 14d [A], 16d [A], 20d [A], 22c, f.

*an-abor-xwarišn* <ʾ-n-QDM-hwlšnʾ>: “not drinkable”. 10.18c.


*andar* <ʾBYN>: “in, inside, between”. 12.2d [A] / c [B], d [B], 3b [B].

*andar āmadan, āy-* <ʾBYN YATWN-tnʾ, YATWN-tnʾ>: “to introduce, to add”. *andar āmad hē* 11.4b.

*any* <ʾAHRN>: “other”. 10.1a.

*any-dādestān* <ʾZK-yh DYNA>: “having another law” 12.21a [A].

*any-kāmag* <ʾZK-yh kʾmkʾ>: “having another desire”. 12.21a [A].

*apāk* <ʾ-DKYA>: “impure”. 10.18c.

*apākīh* <ʾ-DKYA-yh>: “impurity”. 12.2b [B].

*ardā* <ʾlʾyʾ>: “righteous”. 11.5d.

*arzānīg* <ʾlcʾnykʾ>: “worthy”. 11.7e.
asar <ʾsl>: “boundless”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.
ast <AYT’>: s. v. b-
astōmand <ʾt wmn’d>: “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)].
ayāb <ʾywbp>: “or”. 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a, 21a.
ayādēnidan, ayādēn- <ʾby’dptytn’, ’by’d’tyn->: “to remind”. ayādēnēnd 12.2d [B].
awēšān <ʾšʾn’>: “they, those”. 10.3a, b, 7a, 11a, 15a (3), 16a, b, c, d, 17a, b, 11.6b (2), 12.1b, 3b, 5b, 7b, 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a.
az <MN>: “from, away from”. 10.1b (2), 5a, b (12), 6a (12), 9a, b (4), 10a (4), 13a (4), 17a (2), 18f, 11.1a, c, 2c, 10a (17), 13a (14), 12.1c (2), 2c [B], 3b (2), 5b (2), 9a (2), 11a (2).
ā <ʾ->: “then”. 10.18d, 11.4b, 7b.
āb <MYA / ʾp>: “water”. 11.1c, 2c, 5a, b, 6b (2), 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.
ābadīh <ʾbydtytn’>: “the Āfrīnagān prayers”. 12.2d [B].
āhan <ʾhyn’>: “metallic implement”. 12.22f [A].
āhōgēn <ʾhwkynšn’>: “defilement”. 11.9g, 12g.
āhōgēnd <ʾhwkynyt’l>: “healing”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.
āhōgēndāt <ʾhwkynytʾlm>: “the most healing”. 11.3a.
bišāmrūd <ʾbyšʾmlw’t’>: “to be said twice”. 10.2a, d, 3a, b, 5a, 15a.
bōy <ʾbw’d>: “conscience”. 12.22c.
brād <AH / AH-dl / bl’t / blwl>: “brother”. 12.5b. brādar 12.5a, b (3).
brādar-zādag <BLWL-LYYDWN-k>: “nephew”. 12.13a [A].
brādar-zādage <BLWL-<t’kyh>: “niece”. 12.13a [A].

burdan, bar-<BLWN-t’n', BLWN- / bltn’, bl->: “to bring, to offer”. bard 12.2d [A] / c [B], 4d [A], 6c [A], 8d [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A]. bē bard 12.22f [A].

čahār <4>: “four”. 10.11c, 11.11a (2), 14a.
čahārom / čahārome <4-wm / 4-wmyh>: “fourth”. 12.15a [B], 17a (2), 19a [B (2)].
čand <cnd>: “how many, how long”. 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).
časrušāmrūd <csrwšʾmlwt‘>: “to be said four times”. 10.2c, d, 11a, b, 13a, 15a.
čehel <40>: “forty”. 12.13b, 15b [A].
čē <ME>: “for, because, since”. 10.19a, 12.22b [B].
čī <MNDOM>: “thing”. 10.18d.
čiyōn <cygwn>: “how; so many”. 10.1a, b (4), 11.1b, c (12), 12.2b [A (2)] / a [B (2)], 4b (2), c [B], 6b [A (2)] / [B], 8b [A (2)] / [B], 10b [A (2)] / [B], 12b [A (2)] / [B], 14b [A (2)] / [B], 16b [A (2)] / [B], 18b [A (2)] / [B], 20a [B], b [A (2)], 21a, 22a.

dagrand-gaw <dgln-d-gw>: “long-handed”. 11.9d, 12d.
dagrand-gawīh <dgln-d-gwyh>: “being long-handed”. 11.9d, 12d.
dahibed <dhwypt‘>: “lord of the country”. 10.5b, 6a.
dahišn <dhšn‘>: “gift”. 11.6b.
dahm <dhm>: “pious”. 12.1d, e [A] / f [B], 3c, d, 5c, d, 7b, c, 9a, b, 11a, b, 13a, b, 15a, b, 17a, 19a, b.
dādan1, dah-<YHBWN-tn’, YHBWN>: “to give”. dahēnd 11.6b.
dādan2, dah-<YHBWN-tn’, YHBWN>: “to create”. bē dād 11.6d.
dādār <d’t‘l>: “Maker”. 10.3a, 7a, 11a, 11.1a, 12.2a, 4a, 6a, 8a, 10a, 12a, 14a, 16a, 18a, 20a [A].
dām: “creation, creature”. 11.4b, 12.21a, 22b.
dār <d’l>: “wood”. 12.22f [A].
dāstān, dār-<YHSNN-tn’, YHSNN->: “to keep, to preserve”. dārēd 10.18f, 12.2b [B (2)], c [B], 21a [B].
deb <MTA>: “country”. 10.5b, 6a (2), 9b, 10a, 14a, 13b, 11.10a.
dēn <dyn‘>: “religious conscience, religion”. 10.18e, f, 19a (2), b, 11.7c, 12.21a [B].
dēw <ŠDYA / dyw>: “false god, demon”. 10.9b (2), 10a (2), 13b, 14a (2), 16c, d.
did <TWB>: “again”. 11.3c.
dō <2>: “two”. 10.3c, 18f, 19b.
drahnā <dlhn’y>: “length, duration”. 10.18c.
dranjēndan, dranjēn- <dln cynyt’n, dln cyn->: “to murmur”. dranjēnēd 11.3a.
drōn <dlwn>: “sacrificial bread”. 12.2c [B], 2d [B].
druz <dlwc>: “Lie”. 10.1b, 17a, b.
duḍāmāg <dwšdʾnʾk>: “ignorant”. 11.10a, 13a.
duxt <dwhtʾ>: “daughter”. 12.1c, 3a, b, 15a [B], 17a [A] / [B (2)], 19a [B].
duxt brād <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 <ʾytnʾ>: “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, 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>: “Ěrmān”. 11.7b.

fradom <pltwm>: “first(ly)”. 11.4d, 9a, 12a.
frāz srūdan, srāy- <prʾc slwtnʾ, slʾdʾ>: “to pronounce, to recite”. frāz srāyišn 11.3b, 8a, 11a, 14a, 20a, 12.14c [A]. frāz srāyd 12.2c [A] / b [B], 4c [A], 6c [A], 12c [A], 16c [A]. frāz srāyišnag (pseudo-Phl.) 12.8c [A], 10c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A].
frāz sūstan, sōy- <prʾc HLLWN-tnʾ, HLLWN->: “to wash”. 12.2b [B].
frāz zadan, zan- <prʾc ztnʾ, zn->: “to blow out”. 12.2c [B].

gannāg mēnōg <gn(n)ʾk mynwg / gn(n)ʾgmyng>: “Gannag Mēnōg, the Stinking Spirit”. 10.5b, 16a, 11.10a, 13a.
gāh: <gʾs>: “Gāhā, 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.
gōwišn <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, c, 6a, c, 7a.
guftan, gōw- <YMR(R)WN-tn’, YMR(R)WN- / gwptn’, gwb->: “to say, to speak”. guft 10.2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 12.1e, 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. gōw 10.18e.
bē gōw 11.3b, 8a, 11a.
gōwēd 11.1b, 4b, 12c.
gumēxtan, gumēxt- <gwmyhtn’, gwmyh->: “to mix”. 12.2b [B].
ham gumēxtan, gumēxt- <hm gmyhtn’, gwmyht->: “to defile directly”. ham gumēxtēd 12.21a, 22b.
ham <hm’y>: “always”. 11.4b (2).
hamēstār <hmystʾl>: “subduer”. 10.17a, b.
hamkār <hmkʾl>: “the same use”. 10.18c.
hamrēh <hmlytʾ>: “direct defilement”. 10.1b, 6a, 17a, 11.9b, 12b, 12.21a [B], 22b [B].
har <KRA>: “all, every”. 10.18f, 19b, 11.9d, 12d, 12.22b [B].
harwisp <hlwsp’: “all”. 10.5b, 6a, 16d, 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.
hašt <8>: “eight”. 11.8a (2).
hašwišt <hwʾštʾ>: “disciple”. 11.7d.
humat <hwmtʾ>: “good thoughts”. 10.18f, 19b.
huwarš <hwwlštʾ>: “good deeds”. 10.18f, 19b.
hūxt <hwhtʾ>: “good thoughts”. 10.18f, 19b.

-iz: vid. -z
ič <yʾ>: “ezafe, connective particle”. passim.
čč <yʾ>: “who, which, what (relative)”. 10.2d (2), 18c.

jām <yʾm>: “glass; crystalline (water)”. 11.5b.
jōrdā <ywltʾk>: “grain”. 12.2d [B].
jud <ywltʾ>: “separate, different, another”. 12.21a [B].
jud-āb-tom <ywltʾ-MYA-tw:m>: “the most separate from water”. 10.18b.
judg <ywltʾkʾ>: “separate”. 12.22c [B].
juddēwādā <ywltʾdywdʾ>: “the Juddēwādā (= Vīdēvdād) ceremony”. 10.2a, 11.2a.
jud-kēš <ywltʾ kyšʾ>: “another doctrine”. 12.21a [B].
jud-urwar-tom <ywltʾ-wlwl-tw:m>: “the most separate from plants”. 10.18b.
jud-xwāyišn <ywltʾ hwʾdšnʾ>: “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-bānuģ <ktk bʾnwkʾ>: “lady of the house”. 12.7a [B].
kadag-xwadāy <ktk hwtʾyʾ>: “householder”. 12.7a [B].
kadār <ktʾl>: “which”. 10.3a, 7a, 11a.
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kanīg <kʾnyk>: “girl”. 12.7c.
kardan, kun- < / krtn’, kwn->: “to do, to make”. bē kunom 10.1b (2). kardan 11.4b, 7b, c. kard bavēd 11.6b. bē kunēnd 11.6b, 12.22c [A]. kunēnd 12.2d [B (2)].
kunēd 12.3b [B]. bē kunēd 12.22c [B].
kas <AYŠ>: “person, somebody”. 11.9d, 12d. kasi (pseudo-Phl.) 12.1a [B (2)].
kē <MNW>: “who, which”. 10.1b (2), 2a, b, c, 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, 10a, 12b (2), c (3), d, f, g, 13a, 12.1a, 3a, 5a, 7a [B], 9a, 11a, 13a, 15a, 17a, 19a, 21a, 22b [B].
kunēn <kwnšn>: “deed, action”. 11.6b.
kū <AYḴ>: “that, that is, so that, where”. 10.1b (2), 2a, 3b, 7b, 18f, 11b, 11.1a, 2a, b, c, 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 <-m>: “enclitic pronoun, 1st. Sing.”. 11.7d.
ma <AL>: “not (prohibitive)”. 12.2b [B].
madan <mtn>”: “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.
mardōm <ANŠWA / mltwm>: “mortal, man, mankind”. 10.18d, 11.6b.
mazdātmō <mzdʾtmwk>: “the prayer mazdā. a”. mōi” 11.14a.
mādag <NKḆ>: “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”. 10.5b (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].
māndan <mʾnpt>: “master of the house”. 10.5b, 6a, 12.7a.
māndan, mān- <KTLWN-tn’, KTLWN->: “to wait”. mānišnīh (pseudo-Phl.) 12.1f [B], mānišn kunēd (pseudo-Phl.) 12.3b [B].
māzanīg <mʾznyk>: “Māzan, a type of demons”. 10.16c.
māzdēsm <mʾzdʾsm>: “Mazdean, related to the Mazdā’s worshippers”. 10.18e.
mebib <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.
mowbedīh: “the priesthood of mowbed”. 11.7d. mowbedān
mowbedīh: “the highest priesthood” 11.7d.
murdan, mīr- <YM YTWN>–tn’, YM YTWN–>: “to die”. bē mīrēd 12.1a (2), 3a (2),
5a (2), 7a (2), 9a (2), 11a (2), 13a (2), 15a (2), 17a (2), 19a (2), 21a. mīrēd 12.22a [A],
d [A], g. murdağ 12.22a [B], d [B].
nabag <npk>: “grandson”. 12.9a, 11a [A] / [B (2)].
nabērag <npylk>: “grandson, granddaughter”. 12.9a.
nāf <nʾp>: “family”. 12.22d [A].
nārīg <nʾlyk>: “woman”. 10.5b, 6a, 11.1c, 2c, 7a, b, 10a, 13a.
nē <LA>: “not”. 10.18c, 11.1b, 12c, 22a [B], 6b [B], 8b [B], 10b [B], 12b [B], 14b [B], 16b [B], 18b [B], 20a [B].
nihēd 12.22d [B].
nihuftan, nihumb- <nhwptn, nhwmb->: “to cover, to clothe”. 12.2b [B].
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)].
oromzad <ʾwrmzd>: “Ohrmazd”. 10.2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 11.1a (2), 2a, 4d, 6d, 7d,
12.1e, 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.

pah ast <ʾphʾst>: “flock”. 10.18c.
pah <ʾpʾh>: “flock”. 10.1b (2), 17b, a, b, 11.4d, 7b, 13a.
ōb <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, b (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.

pahom <ʾphʾhm>: “the best”. 10.18d, 11.6b (2), 20b, 12.22h.
pabrēz <p’hlyc>: “protection”. 11.4d.
panj <5>: “five”. 11.3b (2), 20a.
panjāb <50>: “fifty”. 12.9b, 11b [B].
parig <plyk>: “Parig, a feminine evil being”. 11.9f, 12f.
pas <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].
paydag <py’tk>: “manifest”. 10.18e.
paydagīh <pytʾkyh>: “manifestation”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.
payrēh <ptlyt>: “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.
pānzdah <15>: “fifteen”. 12.11b [A], 15b [B].
pērōzgar <pylwckl>: “victorious”. 10.5a, 9a, 13a.
pērōzgartom <pylwcgltwm>: “the most victorious”. 11.3a.
pēš <LOYN’: “before”. 11.9a, 12a.
pīd <pyt>: “father”. 12.1a, c, 3b.
pid <BLWL>: “uncle”. 12.15a [A].
pid brād <pyt BLWL-yyn’: “aunt”. 12.15a [A].
purdēnam <pwltyn>: “to fight, to struggle”. 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 <BRE BLWL>: “nephew”. 12.13a [B].
raftan, raw- <SGYTWN-tn’, SGYTWN- / lptn’, 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)].
rasidan, ras- <YHMWTN-tn’, YHMWTN>-: “to arrive, to come”. bē rasam 11.4d. rasēn 11.7b. bē rasēd 11.9d, 12d. rasēd 12.22b [B].
rawēnīdan, rawēn- <SGYTWN-ynyt’n’, SGYTWN-yn>-: “to drive”. bē rawēnēd 12.22c [A].
rāmišn <lʾmšn’: “pleasure”. 11.7b (2), c.
rāmišntom <lʾmšntwm>: “he who pleases the most”. 11.7c.
rāy <l’d>: “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 <lymn’: “impure”. 10.6a (2), 11.9b (2), 12b (2), 12.22d [B].
rīst <lyst’: “dead”. 10.1b (2), 17a, b.
rōsā <lwšn’: “kindled”. 12.2c [B].
rōšnib <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)].
rwān <lwb’n’: “soul”. 10.18d.
sagrih <sglyh>: “satiation”. 12.22f [A].
sawr <swl>: “Sawr, name of a demon”. 10.9b.
sāl <SNT>: “year”. 10.18c, 12.22a.
sē <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)].
snēh <snyh>: “blow”. 12.22c [A].
spēnāg mēnōg <spnʾmynwg>: “Beneficent Spirit”. 12.21a, 22b.
spitāmān <spytʾmʾn>: “Spitāmān”. 12.22e 

-ś <-ś>: “enclitic pronoun, 3rd. Sing.”. 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.
šā <6>: “six”. 12.7c.
šāyistan, šāy- <šʾdstn, šʾd->: “to be proper”. 10.18c (2).
šnāyēnīdārīh <šnʾdynytʾlyh>: “propitiation”. 11.4d.
“and”. 10.2a, 3b, 7b, 11b, 11.2a, 6b, 7b, c, 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.

ud <W>: “and”. passim.

urwar <ʾwlwl>: “plant”. 11.1c, 2c, d, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 12.2e [A] / d [B (2)], 4c [A], 6d [A], 7b, c, 9b, 10c [A], 12d [A], 16d [A], 18d [A], 20d [A].

uzdēs paristagīh <′c dys plstkyh>: “idolatry”. 11.9f, 12f.

wahman <whwmn>: “Wahman”. 11.7c.


wardagīh <wltkyh>: “captivity”. 12.22c [A].

wardenišn <wltynšn>: “distress”. 12.22c [B].

warzišn <wlcn>: “deed”. 11.4d.

was <KBD>: “many, much”. 11.5d, 9c, 12c.

wastarag <wstlg / wstlγ>: “clothes”. 12.2c [A] / b [B (2)], 4c [A], 6c [A], 8d [A], 10c [A], 12c [A], 14c [A], 16c [A], 18c [A], 20c [A], 22f [A].

wattar <SLY-tl>: “worse”. 12.22b [B].

waxšēnīdan, waxšēn- <′c dys plstkyh>: “plant”. 11.1c, 2c, d, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a, 12.2e [A] / d [B (2)], 4c [A], 6d [A], 8d [A], 10d [A], 12d [A], 14d [A], 16d [A], 18d [A], 20d [A].

wēš <wyš>: “more”. 12.2b [B].

wēš-hušk <wyš hwšk>: “more dried up”. 12.22a [A].

wēš-hušktar <wyš hwšktl>: “much more dried up”. 12.22a [B].

widardan, wider- <wlttn, wtyl->: “to pass”. widerišn ast (pseudo-Phl.) 12.1f [B].

wināh <wnʾs>: “sin”. 10.18f.

wis < wys>: “clan”. 10.5b, 6a (2), 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 11.10a.

wished <wyspt>: “headman of the clan”. 10.5b, 6a.

wir <wyl>: “man”. 10.18c.

wist <20>: “twenty”. 12.13b, 15b [A], 17b.

wist ud panj <25>: “twenty-five”. 12.9b, 11b [B].

wuzurg <wcwlg>: “big”. 12.2c [B].

xānag <hʾnk>: “house”. 12.2d [A].

xēm <hym>: “nature”. 12.22b [B].

xēšm <hyšm>: “Wrath”. 10.13b, 16b, 11.9a, 12a, 15a.

xruidruš <hlwydlwš>: “having a bloodstained stick (epithet of Xēšm)”. 10.13b, 16b.

xuftan, xufs- <HLMWN-tn', HLMWN->: “to sleep”. xufsēd 11.9c, 12c (2).

xxad <hwt>: “himself, herself”. 12.7c [B].


xxwardan, xxwar- <OŠTEN-tn', OŠTEN->: “to eat, to consume”. xxwarēnd 12.2d [B].

xxwarišnag <hwlšnk>: “food”. 12.22f.
xwaršēd <hwlsyt>: “sun”. 11.1c, 2c, 10a, 13a.
xwābšānah <hw’dshynj>: “prayer”. 11.7d.
xwānišn <KRYTWN-šn>: “invocation”. 12.2d [B].
xwāstār <hw’s’ṭḷ>: “eager”. 11.7d.
xwēd <hw’ṭ>: “moist”. 10.18c.
xwēš <NPše / hw’š>: “own”. 10.5b, 6a, f, 19a, b, 12.2d [B], 7c [A].

yaḍābūwayryō <yt’h(k)wylywk>: “the prayer yaḍā. ahū. vaṭirū.”. 11.3b, 8a, 11a, 20a.

yaštān, yaz- <YDBHWN-tn’, YDBHWN->: “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].

yazēn <ycs’tn>: “ceremony”. 12.2c [B].
yōǰdāsr <ywšd’sḷ>: “purified”. 12.2b [A] / a [B], e [A] / d [B (2)], 4b [B], 4e [A], 6b [A], c [A], 12c [A].

yōǰdāsrēn <ywšd’slytn’, ywšd’slyn>: “to purify”. yōǰdāsrēnam 11.1b, 12.2a [B], 4b [B], yōǰdāsrēnē 11.4a, c, 5a, c, 6a, c, 7a (2). yōǰdāsrēnēd 10.18f, 19a, b, 12.2b [A], 4b [A], 6b [A], 8b [A], 10b [A], 12b [A], 14b [A], 16b [A], 18b [A], 20b [A].

yōǰdāsrīh <ywšd’slyh>: “(formula of) purification”. 10.18d (2), e, 19a, 11.2a, b, c (12), 12.2b [B].

-z <c>: “too, and”. 10.2d (3), 11.7c, 12c, 12.2b [B], 22a, f [A].
zabr <zhl>: “poison”. 11.9c, 12c (2).
zabr-gar <zhkḷ>: “poisoner”. 11.9c, 12c.

zamān <z’m’n>: “time”. 11.4b.

zamāg <zmyk>: “earth”. 10.18b, 11.1c, 2c, 5c, d, 9f, g, 10a, 12f, g, 13a.
zandō <znd>: “tribe”. 10.5b, 6a (2), 9b, 10a, 13b, 14a, 11.10a.


zandbed <zndpt’: “headman of the tribe”. 10.5b, 6a.

zardu(x)št <tlw(h)š’ṭ>: “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- <LYDWN-tn’, LYDWN->: “to be born”. bē zād bēnd 10.18d.

zāriz <z’lyc>: “Zāriz, name of a demon”. 10.10a.

zāyišn <LYDWN-šn’: “birth”. 10.18d.

zīndag <zywndk / zynd>: “alive”. 10.1b (2), 17a, b, 12.22b, c (5), d.

zōbr <zwḥḷ>: “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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