

The background of the cover is a photograph of a Zoroastrian fire ceremony. A bright, intense fire burns in a large, shallow metal bowl. To the left, a person wearing a white Zoroastrian robe and a white turban is partially visible, their hands near the fire. The scene is dimly lit, with the fire providing the primary light source, casting a warm glow. The overall composition is centered, with the fire as the focal point.

ANCIENT IRAN SERIES

# zaraθuštrōtəma

*Zoroastrian and Iranian Studies in Honour  
of Philip G. Kreyenbroek*

Edited by Shervin Farridnejad

BRILL

# *zaraθuštrōtəma*

Zoroastrian and Iranian Studies in Honour of  
Philip G. Kreyenbroek

Edited by  
Shervin Farridnejad



# Ancient Iran Series

*Editor in Chief*

Touraj Daryaee (*University of California, Irvine*)

*Managing Editor*

Sherivn Farridnejad

(*Free University of Berlin, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna*)

*Editorial Board*

Samra Azarnouche (*École pratique des hautes études*)

Chiara Barbati (*University of Pisa*)

Matthew Canepa (*University of California, Irvine*)

Carlo Cereti (*Sapienza University of Rome*)

Hassan Fazeli Nashil (*University of Tehran*)

Frantz Grenet (*Collège de France*)

Simcha Gross (*University of Pennsylvania*)

Almut Hintze (*SOAS University of London*)

Nasir Al-Kaabi (*University of Kufa*)

Irene Madreiter (*University of Innsbruck*)

Antonio Panaino (*University of Ravenna*)

Céline Redard (*SOAS University of London*)

Robert Rollinger (*University of Innsbruck*)

Vesta Sarkhosh Curtis (*British Museum*)

M. Rahim Shayegan (*University of California, Los Angeles*)

Mihaela Timuş (*University of Bucharest*)

Rolf Strootman (*Utrecht University*)

Giusto Traina (*University of Paris-Sorbonne*)

Yuhan S.-D. Vevaina (*University of Oxford*)

VOLUME 10

The titles published in this series are listed at [brill.com/ais](http://brill.com/ais)



**UCI**

Jordan Center for  
Persian Studies



***zaraθuštrōtama***

Zoroastrian and Iranian Studies in Honour of Philip G. Kreyenbroek

© Shervin Farridnejad 2020

Shervin Farridnejad is hereby identified as author of this work in accordance with Section 77 of the Copyright, Design and Patents Act 1988

Cover and Layout: Kourosh Beigpour | ISBN: 978-1-949743-18-0

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers. This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, resold, hired out or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and condition is redundant.



PHILIP G. KREYENBROEK

Photo courtesy of Arne Bänsch, 2016 Göttingen



## Table of Contents

<b>Foreword</b> .....	3
Miguel Ángel Andrés-Toledo <b>Manuscripts of the Zoroastrian short liturgies at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute</b> ....	5
David B. Buyaner <b>On the Etymology of the Old Iranian Term for “Iron”</b> .....	51
Alberto Cantera <b>Avestan Texts in Context: Fragments Westergaard 6 and 7 and the Paragnā</b> .....	69
Touraj Daryaee <b>The Serpentine Man in Iranian Myth</b> .....	107
Shervin Farridnejad <b>Zoroastrian Pilgrimage Songs and <i>Ziyārat-nāmes</i></b> .....	115
Ramiyar P. Karanjia <b>Religious and Community Issues Addressed in the Early Twentieth Century by the Athornan Mandal, a Trust for Priests</b> .....	193
Jean Kellens <b>What is a ratu sarəḏa?</b> .....	215

Götz König	
<b>Studies on the History of Rationality in Ancient Iran III:</b>	
<b>Philosophy of Nature .....</b>	<b>219</b>
 Firoze M. Kotwal	
<b>Gāthū Bhārvā nī Kriyā – The Ritual of Preserving a Burning Knotted</b>	
<b>Billet Beneath the Fire-Ash .....</b>	<b>239</b>
 Maria Macuch	
<b>Descent in Frēdōn's Line: An Epic Narrative in the Light of Zoroastrian Law .....</b>	<b>253</b>
 Antonio Panaino	
<b>The Corpus of the Yašts and their Pahlavi Translations: Considering</b>	
<b>a Textual Lacuna .....</b>	<b>273</b>
 Ludwig Paul & Jonas Elbers	
<b>Caspian Calendar Names and their Etymologies .....</b>	<b>301</b>
 Jenny Rose	
<b>Mithra and Mercurius: Two Pictures of Divine Agency in the Death of Julian .....</b>	<b>311</b>

گمان مبر کہ بہ پایان رسید کارِ مغان  
ہزار بادہٴ ناخوردہ در گستاخ است

Do not believe that the work of the Magi is complete,  
With thousands of undrunk wines, the vine is still replete.

Iqbal, *Message from the East* (1923)





## **Foreword**

### **In honour of Philip G. Kreyenbroek: A life dedicated to Iranian Studies**

This volume is a collection of articles dedicated to one of the most distinguished scholars of Iranian Studies and a most prolific teacher of Zoroastrian and Kurdish literatures and religions, Philip G. Kreyenbroek, and to his scientific work, on the belated occasion of his seventieth birthday in 2018. He was professor and director of the Institute of Iranian Studies at the Georg-August University of Göttingen from 1996 to 2017. Over the past decades, he has studied, published and taught on various aspects of his interests, including Zoroastrianism, Yezidism, minority religions among the Kurds, oral literature and culture, ancient Iranian literature and languages, and memory in Iranian cultures.

Since the 1990s, Kreyenbroek has established a fresh methodological approach to reading and understanding Zoroastrian literature for the sake of a new understanding of the history of the faith, based on the consideration of orality. His research in this regard has profited greatly from his other pioneering works on Yezidis and the Ahl-e Ḥaqq as well as their oral traditions. By focusing on the oral character of the Zoroastrian tradition and highlighting the long oral transmission of Avestan texts, he has succeeded in paving a new path to permit reconstruction of pre- and early Islamic Zoroastrianism, as well as

enabling the revelation of a concrete textual history in Avestan studies. The significance of Kreyenbroek's contribution to future research on Zoroastrianism is based on its methodological combination of the study of different aspects of orality to philological and historical questions. It thereby opens the way to a dynamic reconstruction of the history of the faith, drawing on the strength of textually based history, namely the restitution of the historical circumstances and relating it to the general history of pre-Islamic Iran.

As a former student of his, I always enjoyed his keen humour and benefited beyond all description from all his dedicated attempts to provide his students with a well-rounded liberal education, to furnish them with all necessary tools for intellectual and critical grappling with different subjects. Being always optimistic and cheerful, he continues to be an encouraging voice calling others to the fascinating study of Zoroastrianism. This stunning accomplishment is a sign of his generous spirit, which, united with an original intellectual mind and great sense of wit, has made every moment of compiling this volume worth its while for me and surely for all who have contributed.

This most modestly sized Festschrift in honour of Philip G. Kreyenbroek consists of thirteen contributions, brings together some of the best known experts in their fields to reflect the love and admiration of his students, colleagues and friends, and is representative of some of his wide-ranging scholarly interests, including Zoroastrian literature and rituals as well as Iranian philology and mythology. I have been truly fortunate to have worked with such patient colleagues and friends in collecting the essays for this volume, to all of whom I would like to express my sincere thanks. Furthermore, I would particularly like to thank Touraj Daryaee (University of California, Irvine) for his generous support for the publication of this volume. I am also grateful to Arne Bansch, Aidin Farridnejad, Rebecca Stengel and Céline Redard, who have given me a great deal of help in various academic and technical matters.

Shervin Farridnejad  
Berlin, December 2019

**Manuscripts of the Zoroastrian short liturgies at the  
K. R. Cama Oriental Institute**  
Miguel Ángel Andrés-Toledo

The K. R. Cama Oriental Institute in Mumbai preserves one of the most important collections of Zoroastrian manuscripts, written in Avestan, Pahlavi, Pāzand, New Persian, Sanskrit and Gujarati.

In the last years, scholars of Avestan studies have renewed their interest in the written transmission of Zoroastrian texts, mainly for editorial purposes. More or less complete, descriptive lists of Avestan manuscripts containing Zoroastrian long liturgies have been published, but unfortunately those of the short liturgies, grouped under the general category of *Xorde Avesta* or “Minor Avesta,” have been neglected so far. The reasons for this are various, but mostly derive from the fact that manuscripts of the short liturgies are quite often complex compendia of different texts, the links between which are not always clear. I present this contribution in honor of Prof. Kreyenbroek, who always demonstrated a fine knowledge of the written transmission of the *Xorde Avesta*.

The *Xorde Avesta* is, despite its name, the most extensive part of the Avestan corpus. It contains various praises, prayers and litanies, which can be recited in short liturgies by laymen without the assistance of a Zoroastrian priest. Some were composed in Avestan (*Niyāyišn*, *Gāh*, *Āfrīnagān*, *Sih-rōzag*, *Yašt*), some others in Pahlavi and Pāzand with the intercalation of Avestan passages (*Āfrīn*, *Bāj*, *Nāmaz*, *Nērang*,

Patit, Šnūman and other short texts edited by Antiā 1909), and some others more recently in New Persian, Sanskrit, and Gujarati. All these texts are not usually included in the same manuscripts, so that we cannot speak of a closed compendium, but just of variable practical collections for the daily use.

There are mainly five types of manuscripts containing texts of the so-called short liturgies:<sup>1</sup>

- A) *Tamām Xorde Avesta* manuscripts, that is, big collections containing all or most of the texts recited in short liturgies, of which E1, preserved at The First Dastur Meherjirana Library under the current signature of F4, is the oldest witness. This manuscript was completed in AD 1601, and was edited as facsimile by Kotwal and Hintze (2008).
- B) Several anthologies of prayers and ritual texts, called “Khorda or small Avesta in the proper sense of the term” by Geldner (1886–1896: Prolegomena xl).
- C) *Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā* manuscripts, containing the texts to be recited during the ceremony of consecration of the sacred bread or *drōn*. This ceremony was edited and studied by Karanjia (2010).
- D) *Yašt Sāde* manuscripts, that is, collections of the hymns or *Yašt* (sometimes together with some other texts), of which F1 is the oldest example. This manuscript was completed in AD 1591, and belongs to the private collection of K. M. Jamasp Asa, who edited it as a facsimile (1991).<sup>2</sup>
- E) Composite manuscripts that include texts of the short-liturgies.

One of the main problems when studying the texts of the short liturgies is to find them in the descriptions of the catalogues. With the exceptions of those published by Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917), and Dhabhar (1923a, b), manuscripts of the Zoroastrian short liturgies were generally labelled as *Xorde Avesta*, without further specifying all their

<sup>1</sup> cf. König (2010: 370–71).

<sup>2</sup> See König (2015: 137–139) about the origin of this type of manuscripts.

actual contents, their exact position in the manuscript, the languages of composition of each text, the script in which they were transmitted, etc. Therefore, scholars interested in concrete texts in these witnesses basically must try their luck, and either order digital copies of the full manuscript, when possible, or visit themselves the library where it is preserved, at the risk that it does not include the texts they are looking for. Moreover, some *Xorde Avesta* manuscripts were donated recently to the library, and are therefore absent from older catalogues' descriptions.

In order to fill this gap in the research, all manuscripts of the Zoroastrian short liturgies in all libraries and private collections must be fully described. In this article, I will provide the reader with a descriptive list of all the manuscripts of the *Xorde Avesta*, *Drōn Yašt*, *Yašt Sāde*, and other composite manuscripts containing texts of the *Xorde Avesta* at the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute. I am very grateful to its Trustees, Mr. Muncherji N. M. Cama (President), Dr. Mrs. Nawaz B. Mody (Honorary Secretary), Mrs. Homai N. Modi (Honorary Secretary), and Sir Dinshaw Petit for kindly allowing me to collate all these manuscripts, and for their warm hospitality during my visit to their library in 2016, which made possible this publication.

### A) *Tamām Xorde Avesta* manuscripts

#### **R115:**<sup>3</sup>

Indian *Tamām Xorde Avesta*. 512 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 1r, 197r–v, 266r–v and 475v are blank and f. 76–77 are repeated. Completed in AD 1840 (Sāṃvat 27.04.1896) by Ervad Mānekji Šapurji Fardunji Mānekji, surnamed Homji-Tatina.

Contents: Avestan alphabet with Gujarati commentary (f. 1v);  
*yaθā. ahū. vairiio* or *Yasna* 27.13 with Gujarati commentary (f.

<sup>3</sup> The first signature is the current one at the library of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute; “MFL” plus a number corresponds to the numbering in Dhabhar’s (1923a) catalogue; “KRC No-” plus a number indicates the different code attached to the cover of certain manuscripts. I include *non vidi* in the description whenever I could not collate myself the manuscript, because it was either under preservation or not available.



1v–2r); *aṣəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 with Gujarati commentary (f. 2r); *Kalam paygāmbār Zardušt* in Pāzand with Gujarati commentary (f. 2r–v); *Nērang ī kustīg bastan* with Gujarati commentary (f. 2v–4r); *Srōš bāj* with Gujarati commentary (f. 4r–7v); *Ōšbām* with Gujarati commentary (f. 7v–10v); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* with Gujarati commentary (f. 10v–17v); *Mihr Niyāyišn* with Gujarati commentary (f. 17v–20v); *Māh Niyāyišn* with Gujarati commentary (f. 20v–24r); *Ābān Niyāyišn* (f. 24r–27r); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* (f. 27r–31r); depiction of the *ātaš-behrām* (f. 31v); description of incense offering to the *ātaš-behrām* in Gujarati (f. 32r–33r); *Āfrīn* in Avestan and Pāzand (f. 33r–34v); *Nām stāyišn* in Pāzand with Gujarati commentary (f. 34v–37v); *Patit ī Ādurbād ī Mahraspandān* in Pāzand (f. 37v–44v); *Patit ī wīdardagān* in Pāzand (f. 44v–51v); *Patit ī Īrānī* in Pāzand (f. 51v–64v); *Patit ī xwad* in Pāzand (f. 65r–71v); *Nērang ī bōy dādan* (f. 71v–76v); *Hakikat ī Āfrīnagān sāxtan* and the arrangement of the flowers, in Gujarati (f. 76v–77v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Ohrmazd* in Avestan and Pāzand with some ritual instructions in Gujarati (f. 77v–86v); *Āfrīnagān ī Wahman* (f. 83v–85r); *Āfrīnagān ī Ardwaḥišt* (f. 85r–86v); *Āfrīnagān ī Šahrewar* (f. 86v–87v); *Āfrīnagān ī Spandarmad* (f. 87v–88v); *Āfrīnagān ī Hordād* (f. 88v–89v); *Āfrīnagān ī Amurdād* (f. 89v–90v); *Āfrīnagān ī Day pad Ādur* (f. 90v–92v); *Āfrīnagān ī Ādur* (f. 92v–94v); *Āfrīnagān ī Ābān* (f. 94v–96r); *Āfrīnagān ī Xwaršēd* (f. 96r–97r); *Āfrīnagān ī Māh* (f. 97r–98r); *Āfrīnagān ī Tīr* (f. 98r–99v); *Āfrīnagān ī Gōš* (f. 99v–100v); *Āfrīnagān ī Day pad Mihr* (f. 100v–103r); *Āfrīnagān ī Mihr* (f. 103r–104v); *Āfrīnagān ī Srōš* (f. 104v–105r); *Āfrīnagān ī Rašn* (f. 105r–106r); *Āfrīnagān ī Frawardīn* (f. 106r–107r); *Āfrīnagān ī Wahrām* (f. 107r–108r); *Āfrīnagān ī Rām* (f. 108r–109r); *Āfrīnagān ī Wād* (f. 109r–110r); *Āfrīnagān ī Day pad Dēn* (f. 110r–11v); *Āfrīnagān ī Dēn* (f. 111v–12r); *Āfrīnagān ī Ahrišwang* (f. 112r–13v); *Āfrīnagān ī Aštād* (f. 113v–14v); *Āfrīnagān ī Asmān* (f. 114v–15v); *Āfrīnagān ī Zamyād* (f. 115v–17r); *Āfrīnagān ī Māraspand* (f. 117r–18v); *Āfrīnagān ī Anagrān* (f. 118v–19v); *Āfrīnagān ī Barz* (f. 119v–20v); *Āfrīnagān ī Hōm* (f.

120v–21r); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* (f. 121r–22v); *Āfrīnagān ī Panth yazd* (f. 122v–24r); *Āfrīnagān ī Nēryōsang yazd* (f. 124r–25r); *Āfrīnagān ī Haftōiring yazd* (f. 125r–26r); *Āfrīnagān ī Wanand yazd* (f. 126r–27r); *Āfrīnagān ī haft amahraspandān* (f. 127r–31r); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhān* (f. 131r–33v); *Āfrīnagān ī šaš gāhānbār* (f. 133v–37r); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Spandarmad mäh Frawardīn Ušahin gāh* (f. 137r–38r); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Hordād mäh Frawardīn* (f. 138r–40r); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Frawardīn mäh Frawardīn* (f. 140r–v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Tīr mäh Tīr* (f. 140v–41v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Mihr mäh Mihr* (f. 141v–43v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Ābān mäh Ābān* (f. 143v–44r); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Ādur mäh Ādur* (f. 144r–v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Frawardīn mäh Ādur* (f. 144v–45r); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Xwaršēd mäh Day* (f. 145r–v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Wahman mäh Wahman* (f. 145v–46v); *Āfrīnagān ī haft amahraspandān rōz Spandarmad mäh Spandarmad* (f. 146v–48r); *Nērang ī rōz Spandarmad mäh Spandarmad* in Pahlavi (f. 148r–v); *Nērang ī rēg yaštan* (f. 148v–49r); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Hordād mäh Spandarmad* (f. 149r–51v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Aštād mäh Spandarmad* (f. 151v–52r); *Āfrīnagān ī nāwar* (f. 152r–v); *Āfrīnagān ī dīgar rōz Srōš* (f. 152v–53r); *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* (f. 153r–55v); *Āfrīnagān ī rōz Mahraspand mäh Spandarmad* (f. 155v–57r); *Āfrīnagān ī Sih-rōzag* (f. 157r–67v); *Āfrīn ī dahmān* (f. 167v–71r); *Āfrīn ī wuzurgān* (f. 171r–72v); *Āfrīn ī haft amahraspandān* (f. 172v–77v); *Āfrīn ī šaš gāhānbār* (f. 177v–86r); *Āfrīn ī gāhānbār cašnī* (f. 186r–87r); *Du'ā ī ašoān* (f. 187r–88v); *Dīgar āfrīn ī ašoān* (f. 188v–89v); *Āfrīn ī myazd* (f. 189v–92r); *Āfrīn ī Zardušt* (f. 192r–96v); *Āfrīn* in Avestan and Pāzand (*ciθrəm. buiiāt.*), called *Du'ā ī Wahrām warzāwand pādixšā ī dēn ī mazdēsn* (f. 198r–200r); marriage ceremony as performed in Iran (f. 200r–204v); *Āfrīn ī nigāh bastan ī Ērān* (f. 204v–205v); *Āfrīn ī paymān bastan* (f. 205v–209v); *Āfrīn ī nigāh kardan ī Hindī* (f. 209v–13r); *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* (f. 213r–18v); *Hāwān gāh* in Avestan (f. 218v–20v); *Rapihwin gāh* in Avestan (f. 220v–21v); *Uzērin gāh* in Avestan (f. 221v–22v); *Ēbsrūsrīm gāh* in Avestan (f. 222v–24v); *Ušahin gāh* in Avestan (f. 224v–25v); *Ohrmazd yašt* (f. 225v–34r); *Haft*

*amahraspandān yašt* (f. 234r–35v); *Ardwahišt yašt* (f. 235v–40v); *Hordād yašt* (f. 240v–43v); *Ābān yašt* (f. 243v–71r); *Xwaršēd yašt* (f. 271v); *Māh yašt* (f. 271v–72r); *Tīr yašt* (f. 272r–88r); *Gōš yašt* (f. 288r–94r); *Mihr yašt* (f. 294r–327r); *Srōš yašt Hādōxt* (f. 327r–30v); *Srōš yašt aiβisrūθrəm* (f. 330v–36v); *Rašn yašt* (f. 336v–50r); *Frawardīn yašt* (f. 350r–83r); *Wahrām yašt* (f. 383r–93r); *Rām yašt* (f. 393r–403r); *Dēn yašt* (f. 403r–406r); *Ahrišwang yašt* (f. 406r–414v); *Āštād yašt* (f. 414v–16v); *Zamyād yašt* (f. 416v–33v); *Hōm yašt* or *Yašt 20* (f. 433v–34v); *Wanand yašt* (f. 434v–35v); *Bāj bavaita xwāb xwandan* in *Pāzand* (f. 435v–36r); *Bāj az xwāb xwāstag xwandan* in *Pāzand* (f. 436r–37v); *Nērang ī pahrēz kardan ī šēdan bazī* in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 438r–39r); *Nērang ī naxūn pahrēz* in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 439r–v); *Vispa. humata* or *FrW 2* in *Avestan* (f. 439v–40r); *Nērang ī kustīg burīdan* or *FrW 1* in *Avestan* (f. 440r–v); *Nērang ī gōspand halāl kardan* (f. 440v–41v); *Bāj ī panj rōz ī Frawardīn* in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 441v–42r); *Bāj ī rōz gāθā* in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 442r–43r); *Bāj ī širīnīh yaštan* in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 443r–44r); *Nērang ī lāg burīdan* in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 444r–45r); *Namāz ī gōspandān*, called *Nīrəng. badīdār. gōspəndan. xwənənt*, in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 445r–46v); *Namāz ī muktātmā* in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* (f. 446v–47r); *Nērang ī jādūgīh kuštan* (f. 447r–v); spells in *Avestan* and *Pāzand* with Gujarati explanations (f. 447v–56v); description of five kinds of fire, in *Pāzand* (f. 456v–457r); names of the twelve constellations, in *Pāzand* (f. 457r); characteristics of the sun and the moon, in *Pāzand* (f. 457r–58v); characteristics of a happy man, in *Pāzand* (f. 458v); worship of the deities, in *Pāzand* (f. 458v–59r); names of the 21 *nask*, in *Pāzand* (f. 459r); 101 names of the deity, in *Pāzand* with Gujarati translation (f. 459v–61v); the *dasturi* formula in *Pāzand* with explanation in Gujarati (f. 461v–65r); *Nērang ī yašt gāhān xwandan* in *Pāzand* (f. 465r–v); *Nērang ī dēwān škastan* in *Pāzand* (f. 465v–68v); ceremonies to be performed during the year after the death of a person, in *Avestan* (f. 468v–71v); genealogy of Zardušt, called

*kursī. zarθušt. payyam.bar*, in Pāzand (f. 471v–73r); *Bāj* to cut the *Drōn ī Wanand*, in Pāzand (f. 473r–v); *Āfrīnagān ī Ardwašīst* in Avestan and Pāzand (f. 473v–74v); colophon in Gujarati (f. 475r).

Written 19 lines to the page. European paper with the water marks “Al Masso” and “Gior Magnani”. According to a note in f. 1r, the manuscript was sold to Mobed Jamaspji and Mobed Hormasji Behram Kamdin by Mobed Kuwerji Cawasji Hirakhorina in AD 1865 (Saṁvat 25.04.1921). Presented to the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute by Ardešir Behramji Kamdin. Descriptions in Dhabhar (1923b: 160–61), and Raffaelli (2014: 51). Facsimile edition by Jamasp Asa and Nawabi (1976c, d).

Avestan alphabet: *g b k γ. η η. ś x. k h l r. z ž j. š š ś. zasn. anaiia. d δ t. θ t. β b. f p. m ṁ. vax. iiiaia. z s c. ā ā. uu ō. ý ē. qm. ūm. aeuuō. ī e. a. ṇt. ūṇ. iṇ.*

## B) *Xorde Avesta* manuscripts

### D1:

*Non vidi.* *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* and *Āfrīn ī rapihwin*. 29 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals. Completed in AD 1882 (AY 16.12.1251).

Contents: *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* in Avestan (f. 1–7); *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* in Pāzand (f. 7–29).

Written 9 to 10 lines to the page. Heading in Pāzand in red ink. Colophon in New Persian in red ink. European paper. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 3).

### D2 (MFL61):

*Non vidi.* *Āfrīn ī rōzgār* in Pāzand and *Sīh-rōzag* in Avestan. 29 folios, of which f. 14–16 are blank.

Contents: *Āfrīn ī rōzgār* (f. 1–13); *Sīh-rōzag* 1 (f. 17r–22v). *Sīh-rōzag* 2 (f. 22v–29r).

*Āfrīn ī rōzgār*, numbered in Gujarati numerals, completed in AD

1836 (AY 04.10.1205) by Mobed Maneck Šapurji Kutar for Mobed Jivanji Navroji Aga, and written 14 to 15 lines to the page. *Sīh-rōzag*, unnumbered, completed in AD 1836 (AY 02.12.1205) by Mānek Šapur Mānek Bahrām Jāmāsp Mānek Dastur Pahlon Fredon for Mobed Jivanji Navroji Aga, and written 12 to 13 lines to the page. Heading in red ink. Colophons in New Persian in red ink. European paper. Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 3), Dhabhar (1923a: 43), and Raffaelli (2014: 44–45).

**D21** (MFL29):

*Non vidi*. Iranian *Xorde Avesta*. 111 folios, of which f. 1–99 are numbered in New Persian words and the rest in New Persian numerals. Completed in AD 1704 (AY 22.08.1073) by Rustām Guštāsp Erdašīr.

Contents: Avestan alphabet; *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14; *yaθā. ahū. vairiō* or *Yasna* 27.13; *Nērang ī nān xwardan* in Avestan; *Nērang ī kiz kardan* in Avestan; the five smaller *Gāh*; *Srōš bāj*; *Nērang ī kustīg bastan*; *Nērang ī nāxun cīdan* in Avestan; *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*; *Mihr Niyāyišn*; *Māh Niyāyišn*; *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān*; *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* in New Persian characters; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn*; *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Srōš sar šab Yašt*; *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt*; the five larger *Gāh* (until f. 88); *Ābān Niyāyišn* (f. 89–92); *Āfrīn ī rapihwin*, partially in Pāzand (f. 93–98); the seven members of the body of *gōspand* (f. 99); *Patit* (f. 100–111).

Written 12 lines to the page. Ritual instructions and headings in red ink. Colophons in New Persian (f. 88, repeated in f. 98). Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 18), and Dhabhar (1923a: 25–26). Under preservation.

**D22** (MFL31; KRC No-1048):

Iranian *Xorde Avesta*, *Niyāyišn* and *Yašt Sāde*, according to the f. 1r. 216 folios, numbered in New Persian numerals, of which f. 191v–94r and 216 are blank. Completed in Mumbai by Xoršēdji Edalji Rustām Kāmdīn Barzōr Ādurweh-bād Kaykōbād Māhyār of Surat at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Contents: Avestan alphabet (f. 1v); *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 (f. 1v); *yaθā. ahū. vairiio* or *Yasna* 27.13 (f. 1v–2r); *Nērang ī nān xwardan* in Avestan with New Persian explanation (f. 2r–3r); *Nērang ī kiz kardan* in Avestan (f. 3r–5r); the five smaller *Gāh* (f. 5r–7v); *Nērang ī kustīg bastan* (f. 7v–10r); *Nērang ī nāxun cīdan* in Avestan (f. 10r–v); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* (f. 10v–16v); *Mihr Niyāyišn* (f. 16v–19r); *Māh Niyāyišn* (f. 19r–23v); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* (f. 23v–29r); *Āb zōhr* or *Yasna* 65 (f. 29r–35v); *Hāwan gāh* (f. 35v–38v); *Rapihwin gāh* (f. 38v–41r); *Uzērin gāh* (f. 41r–42v); *Ēbsrūrīm gāh* (f. 42v–45v); *Ušahin gāh* (f. 45v–47v); *Ohrmazd Yašt* (f. 47v–50v); *Ardwahišt Yašt* (f. 51r–66r); *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt* (f. 66v–72r); *Srōš sar šab Yašt* (f. 72r–82v); *Xwaršēd Yašt* (f. 82v–85v); *Drwāsp Yašt* (f. 85v–94r); *Wahrām Yašt* (f. 94r–112r); *Drōn Frawahrām (Frawardīn) Yašt* [dlwn' plw'hl'm yšt"] (*Yasna* 3–8 + *Frawardīn Yašt*; f. 112v–90v); colophon in Pahlavi (f. 190v–91r); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* (f. 194v–203r); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhānbār* (f. 203r–207r); *Āfrīn ī panjag weh* (f. 207r–211v); *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* (f. 211v–14v).

Written 15 lines to the page. Ritual instructions in Pahlavi in red ink, and in New Persian mostly in black ink. Colophon in Pahlavi (f. 190v–91r), reproduced in Pahlavi script and translated into English by Dhabhar (1923a: 93, 118). Iranian style, but written in India. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 1r. Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 18–19), and Dhabhar (1923a: 27–28).

Avestan alphabet: γ. g. ġ. k. x. η. η'. γ. š. r. z. s. n. δ. θ. t. ž. š. β. b. f. p. m. ṃ. v. x'. y. j. š. c. x'. ħ. ṇ. e. ē. a. ā. ə. ā. i. o. u. ō. ṇ. q. lr. r. uu. ii. ā. ʔ.

Colophon in Pahlavi:

mgwwt' hwlšyt yyy' y 'ydl yyy' y lwst'm ky'mdyn' blzwl 'twrwyh'  
nw't' kykwyh'ww't' m'hd'l dyhkn y bndl y mwbl'lk swlt' npšt-hwm  
ŠBKWN-t' hwm BYN plhw' bwmyk mmb'yk MN mhy'l kwkn'  
BRA dld's 'mhrspnd'n' PN g's 'tš wlhl'm



*mowbed xwaršēdji ī ēdalji ī rōstām kāmdīn barzor ādurweh  
nawād kaykobād māhyār dehgān ī bandar ī mobārak surat  
nibištom hištom andar farrox būmīg mumbāi az mahyār kokan  
bē dardās amahraspandān pad gāh ātaxš wahrām*

**D23** (MFL45):

Iranian *Xorde Avesta* and *Drōn Frawardīn Yašt*. 247 folios, numbered in New Persian words, of which f. 1–3r, 240–44r are blank and f. 204–205 were wrongly bound upside down. Completed in AD 1700 (AY 1069) by Rustom Guštāsp Erdašīr Guštāsp Erdašīr.

Contents: *Ohrmazd Yašt* (f. 3v–15r); *Hāwan gāh* (f. 15r–17v); *Rapihwin gāh* (f. 17v–19v); *Uzērīn gāh* (f. 20r–22r); *Ēbsrūsrīm gāh* (f. 22r–26r); *Ušahin gāh* (f. 26r–28r); *Māh Niyāyišn* (f. 28v–32r); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* (f. 32r–37v); *Ābān Niyāyišn*, called in its title *Ābān yašt* (MYA yst' bwn; f. 37v–44v); *Āfrīn* in Avestan and Pāzand (*ciθrəm. buiiāt. ahmi. nmāne. piθβəm. buiiāt. aṃi. nmāne. ...*; f. 44v–54v); *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi (f. 54v–56r); *Šnūman* and *Sih-rōzag* (f. 56v–75r); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* (f. 75v–82v); *Mihr Niyāyišn*, called in its title *Mihr Yašt* (mtr' yšt'; f. 82v–85r); *Šnūman ī hamkārān* in Pahlavi (f. 85v); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* (f. 86r–88r); *Āfrīnagān ī xwadāyān* (f. 88r–90r); *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* in New Persian (= PāzT 98–102; f. 90r–94r); *Drōn Yašt* (until *Yasna* 8.8, plus a list of all the Avestan *šnūman* to all divinities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated; f. 94r–119r); *Drōn Hōm Yašt*, called in its New Persian title *Drōn Hōm Yazd* (abbreviated; f. 119v); *Drōn Frawahrām* (*Frawardīn*) *Yašt* (*Yasna* 3–8 is lacking and only *Frawardīn Yašt* is attested; f. 120r–93v); colophon in New Persian (f. 193v); *Stāyišn ī Sih-rōzag* in Pahlavi (f. 194r–238r); colophon in Pahlavi (f. 238v); *Āfrīn* in Avestan with the name of the deity presiding over each day, followed by *yazamaide* (f. 239r); *Du'ā* and incantations in Avestan extracted from the *gāθā*-, written by another scribe in Indian writing, and probably not belonging to the original manuscript (f. 244v–47v).

Written 12 lines to the page. Ritual instructions and headings in Pahlavi in red ink, sometimes in New Persian in black ink. Occasional New Persian interlinear translations and glosses on the margin in red and black ink. Iranian writing. Small size manuscript. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 3r. Descriptions in Geldner (1886–1896: Prolegomena xi), who called it *Mf3*, Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 19–20), Dhabhar (1923a: 36–37), and Raffaelli (2014: 46–47).

1<sup>st</sup> colophon in New Persian (f. 193v):

*kamtarīn rustom guštāsp erdašīr 1069 izdajirdi*

2<sup>nd</sup> colophon in Pahlavi (f. 238v):

plcpt' PWN ŠRM W š'tyh npštwm  
BYN YWM 'št't' MN BYRH štrwywr ŠNT' bl 1000 60 9 AHL  
MN ŠNT' L BRA OL yzdkrt' MLKA-'n MLKA štr'dy'l'n' L y  
dyn' bndk lwst'm y gwšt'sp yltšyl gwšt'sp yltšyl MN b'hl NPŠE  
y NPŠE l'd W prznd'n' NPŠE l'd MNW OD 100 50 ŠNT-'n'  
BRA 'hl'dyh nywk ŠM y k'l plm'dym W AHL MN 100 W 50  
ŠNT-'n' BRA OL prznd hwsלב' dyn' bwlc'l 'psp'lym PWN  
yzd'n W 'mhrspnd'n' k'mk YHWWN-'t

*frazaft pad drōd ud šādih nibištōm*

*andar rōz aštād az māh šahrewar sāl abar 1069 pas az sāl man  
bē ō yazdagird šāhān šāh šahryārān man ī dēn bandag rustām  
ī guštāsp erdašīr guštāsp erdašīr az bahl xwēš ī xwēš rāy ud  
frazandān xwēš rāy kē tā 150 sālān bē ahlāyih nēk nām ī kār  
framāyēm ud pas az 150 sālān bē ō frazand husraw dēn burzār  
abespārēm pad yazdān ud amahraspandān kāmāg bawād*

**D24** (MFL51; KRC No-1504):

Iranian *Xorde Avesta*. 202 folios, numbered in New Persian numerals, of which f. 1r is blank, plus one blank folio appended at the end. Completed in AD 1884 (AY 09.04.1253) by Erajji Sohrābji Kāusji Meherjirānā.

Contents: *Ohrmazd Yašt* (f. 1v–12r); *Hāwan gāh* (f. 12r–14v); *Rapihwin gāh* (f. 14v–16v); *Uzērin gāh* (f. 16v–18v); *Ēbsrūsrīm gāh* (f. 18v–21v); *Ušahin gāh* (f. 22r–23v); *Māh Niyāyišn* (f. 23v–26v); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* (f. 26v–31r); *Ābān Niyāyišn*, called in its title *Ābān yašt* (MYA yst' bwn; f. 31r–37r); *Āfrīn* in Avestan and Pāzand (*ciθrəm. buiiāt. ahmi. nmāne. piθβəm. buiiāt. aṃi. nmāne. ...*; f. 37r–44v); *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi (f. 44v–46v); *Šnūman* and *Sih-rōzag* (f. 46v–63r); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* (f. 63r–69v); *Mihr Niyāyišn*, called in its title *Mihr Yašt* (mtr' yšt'; f. 69v–71v); *Šnūman ī hamkārān* in Pahlavi (f. 71v–72r); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* (f. 72r–74r); *Āfrīnagān ī xwadāyān* (f. 74r–75v); *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* in New Persian (= PāzT 98–102; f. 75v–78r); *Drōn Yašt* (until *Yasna* 8.8, plus a list of all the Avestan *šnūman* to all divinities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated; f. 78r–99r); *Drōn Hōm Yašt*, called in its New Persian title *Drōn Hōm Yazd* (abbreviated; f. 99r–99v); *Drōn Frawahrām* (*Frawardīn*) *Yašt* (*Yasna* 3–8 is lacking and only *Frawardīn Yašt* is attested; f. 99v–155v); colophon in New Persian (f. 155v); *Stāyišn ī Sih-rōzag* in Pahlavi (f. 156r–97r); colophon in Pahlavi (f. 197r–v); *Āfrīn* in Avestan with the name of the deity presiding over each day, followed by *yazamaide* (f. 197v–99v); *Du'ā* and incantations in Avestan extracted for the *gāθā-* (f. 200r–202v); colophon in New Persian (f. 202v).

Written 12 lines to the page. Ritual instructions in Pahlavi in red ink. European paper. Indian copy of the Iranian *Xorde Avesta* manuscript D23 (Mf3). The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 1r. Colophon in New Persian (f. 200v). Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 20), Dhabhar (1923a: 39) and Raffaelli (2014: 47).

1<sup>st</sup> colophon in New Persian (f. 155v):

*kamtarīn rustom guštāsp erdašīr 1069 izdajirdi*

2<sup>nd</sup> colophon in Pahlavi (f. 197r–v):

plcpt' PWN ŠRM W š' tyh npštwm

BYN YWM 'št't' MN BYRH štrwywr ŠNT' bl 1000 60 9 AHL  
 MN ŠNT' L BRA OL yzdkrt' MLKA-'n MLKA štr'dy'l'n' L y  
 dyn' bndk lwst'm y gwšt'sp yltšyl gwšt'sp yltšyl MN b'hl NPŠE  
 y NPŠE l'd W pržnd'n' NPŠE l'd MNW OD 100 50 ŠNT-'n'  
 BRA 'hl'dyh nywk ŠM y k'l plm'dym W AHL MN 100 W 50  
 ŠNT-'n' BRA OL pržnd hwsלב' dyn' bwlc'l 'psp'lym PWN  
 yzd'n W 'mhrspnd'n' k'mk YHWWN-'t

*frazaft pad drōd ud šādīh nibištōm*  
*andar rōz aštād az māh šahrevar sāl abar 1069 pas az sāl man*  
*bē ō yazdagird šāhān šāh šahryārān man ī dēn bandag rustām*  
*ī guštāsp erdašīr guštāsp erdašīr az bahl xwēš ī xwēš rāy ud*  
*frazandān xwēš rāy kē tā 150 sālān bē ahlāyīh nēk nām ī kār*  
*framāyēm ud pas az 150 sālān bē ō frazand husraw dēn burzār*  
*abespārēm pad yazdān ud amahraspandān kāmāg bawād*

3<sup>rd</sup> colophon in New Persian (f. 202v):

*tamām šod in ketāb-e xorde avestā o stāyīš-e sīrōze dar pahlawi*  
*naql az ketāb-e irān bardas irān be-ruz-e mobārak-e ādur izad*  
*o māh-e tištar tir izad sāl awar yek hezār o do sat o panjāh o se*  
*az šāhān-šāh izdagird šahriyār in ketāb rā barāye ketābxāne-ye*  
*mullā firoz az farmāyīš-e sayt xuršīdji rustomji kāmāji neweštām*  
*o az ketābik in ketāb naql kardam ān asl ketāb newešte irān*  
*bardas irān dar ketābxāne-ye mullā firoz hast o nām-e ketāb ān*  
*asl ketāb wtyār xš (?) cenā ke dar ān ketāb dar pahlawi newešte*  
*hast muwāfiq ān dar pahlawi dar mayān neweštām o kāteb-e*  
*in ketāb irajji dastur sohrābji bin dastur kāusji meherjirānā ke*  
*ketābdār ketābxāne-ye mullā firoz hast*

**D25** (MFL25)

*Non vidi.* Iranian Xorde Avesta with New Persian translation. 137  
 unnumbered folios.

Contents: *Mihr Niyāyīšn; Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin; Srōš sar šab Yašt;*  
*Āfrīn ī gāhānbār; Āfrīn ī ardafrawahr; Āfrīnagān ī dahmān; Srōš*

*yašt Hādōxt; Hōm Yašt or Yašt 20; ašəm. vohū or Yasna 27.14; yaθā. ahū. vairiō or Yasna 27.13; Nērang ī kustīg bastan; Srōš bāj; Ōšbām; Xwaršēd Niyāyišn; Ābān Niyāyišn; Ātaxš Niyāyišn; Māh Niyāyišn; Ohrmazd Yašt; Ardwhišt Yašt; Ātaxš ādurān kardan in Pahlavi (in a different hand); Patit ī Ādurbād ī Mahraspandān in Pārsīg, with New Persian translation in red ink.*

Written 13 lines to the page. Iranian style but copied in India. Headings in red ink and some Pahlavi explanations in red ink. No colophon, but probably written by Dastur Kaus Rustom, father of Dastur Mulla Firoz, according to Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 20). Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 20–21), and Dhabhar (1923a: 22–23).

#### **D26:**

*Non vidi.* Iranian *Xorde Avesta* with New Persian translation (f. 1–32) and some New Persian metrical texts from the *Rivāyat* (f. 33–67). 67 unnumbered folios, of which f. 1–2 are blank.

Contents: *Ardwhišt Yašt; Ohrmazd Yašt; Pāzand text of the Wanand Yašt; Ohrmazd Yašt* (upto Yt 1.9 *yasō.bərətābiiō. zaoθrābiiō.*); *Āfrīn ī Zardušt*; New Persian metrical texts from the *Rivāyat*.

Written 15 lines to the page. New Persian translations of f. 1–32 in red ink, except for the last two texts. No colophon, but probably from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, according to Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 21). Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 21–22).

#### **D29 (KRC No-1333):**

Iranian *Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation. 247 folios, numbered as pages with pencil in European numbers.

Contents: Pahlavi commentary of the *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna 27.14* (f. 1v–7v); Avestan texts, mostly extracted from the *Yasna* but also from the *Wīdēwdād* and the *Āfrīnagān*, with their Pahlavi

translations and commentaries (f. 7v–65v), including the *Āfrīnagān ī gāθā* with *Yašt* 13.49–52 together with its Pahlavi translation (f. 66r–69v); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 70r–81r); *Ohrmazd Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 81r–104v); *Āb zōhr* or *Yasna* 65 with Pahlavi translation (f. 104v–120v); *Āfrīn ī Zarduxšt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 121r–26r); *Srōš sar šab Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 126v–48r); *Šnāyišn ī dādār ī Ohrmazd* in Pahlavi (f. 148r–51v); *Drōn Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 151v–53r), including the *Hāwan gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 153r–54r), *Rapihwin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 154r–54v), *Uzērin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 154v–55v), *Ēbsrūsrim gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 155v–57r), *Ušahin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 157r–59r), and all the Avestan *šnūman* to all divinities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated (f. 164r–229v).

Written 11 lines to the page. Iranian style but copied in India. European white (f. 1–162, 247) and blue paper (f. 163–246), probably with water marks that cannot be seen after the restoration. Some Pahlavi introductions and *nērang* are written in red ink. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 1r. No colophon, but probably written by Ervad Xusro Edal, according to Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 23). Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 23), and Raffaelli (2014: 47–48).

### **D30** (KRC No-644):

Indian *Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation. 82 folios, of which f. 1, 2r, 12v, 39r are blank.

Contents: *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi with interlinear Pāzand and New Persian translations, written 15 lines to the page (f. 2v–12r); *Stāyišn ī Sih-rōzag* in Pahlavi with interlinear Pāzand and New Persian translations, written 15 to 21 lines to the page (incomplete; f. 13r–38v); *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 with Pahlavi translation; *yaθā. ahū. vairiīō* or *Yasna* 27.13 with Pahlavi translation; *Nērang*



*ī nān xwardan* in Avestan with Pahlavi translation; *Nērang ī kiz kardan* in Avestan with Pahlavi translation; the five smaller *Gāh* with Pahlavi translation; *kām.nā. mazdā* or *Yasna 46.7* with Pahlavi translation; *Nērang ī kustīg bastan* with Pahlavi translation; *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* Pahlavi translations (f. 39v–81v).

The texts of the *Nām stāyišn* and *Stāyišn ī Sīh-rōzag* were written by the same scribe, but the other texts were written by a different hand. Indian writing. Medium size manuscript. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 2r and 7v. No colophon, but most probably late. Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 23–24).

### D31:

*Non vidi.* Iranian *Xorde Avesta* with New Persian translation. 249 unnumbered folios, of which f. 207–231 are missing. Completed in AD 1706 (AY 23.03.1075) by Rustām Guštāsp Erdašīr Guštāsp for Baxtāfrīd Xosro.

Contents: *Stāyišn ī Sīh-rōzag* (f. 1–45); *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt*; *Wahrām Yašt*; *Hordād Yašt*; *Drwāsp Yašt* (f. 45–93); *Āb zōhr* or *Yasna 65*; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* (f. 93–105); *Patit ī Īrānī* (f. 105–121); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhānbār*; *Āfrīnagān ī gāhān*; second part of *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* (f. 121–33); *Nām ī xwābar*; *Āfrīn* in Avestan and Pāzand (*ciθrēm. buiiāt*; f. 133–38); *Nērang ī pahrēz kardan ī šēdan bazī* in Avestan (f. 138–39); the 21 *nask* (f. 140–51); questions and answers on religious subjects (f. 152–77); *Nērang ī nān xwardan* (f. 177–79); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* with New Persian translation (f. 180–98); *Šnūman ī rōz Hordād māh Frawardīn*; *Šnūman ī rōz Wahrām*; *Drōn ī rapihwin*; *Šnūman ī haft amahraspandān* (incomplete; f. 199–206); missing folios (f. 207–231); what to do on each day; occasions when new clothes are cut and worn; influence of the seven days of the week (f. 232–35); *Īrānī Ašīrwād* (f. 235–49); colophon in Pahlavi (f. 249); about thunder and lightning (f. 249); *Āfrīnagān ī*

*rahiwin* (f. 250–53); description of five kinds of fire (f. 253); *Rapihwin gāh*; *Uzērin gāh* (f. 254–59); *Nām stāyišn* (f. 260–62); *Stāyišn ī Srōš*; *Stāyišn ī Dēn*; *Stāyišn ī Māraspand* (f. 262–67); *Nām ī xwābar*; *Āfrīn* in Avestan and New Persian (*ciθrām. buiiāt*; f. 267–72); phases of the moon; place of the sun in the zodiac; Persian numerals from 1 to 30 with their pronunciation (f. 272–74).

Written 10 to 13 lines to the page. Headings in red ink. Colophon in Pahlavi (f. 249). Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 24–25).

### D32:

*Non vidi*. *Xorde Avesta* in New Persian script. 117 unnumbered folios. Completed in AD 1797 (AY 29.04.1166) by Asfandiyar Ratanjišah Minušah from an Iranian manuscript.

Contents: *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14; *yaθā. ahū. vairiō* or *Yasna* 27.13; *Nērang ī nān xwardan*; *Nērang ī kiz kardan*; *Nērang ī atse zadan* (recited after sneezing); the five smaller *Gāh*; *Nērang ī kustīg bastan*; *Māh Niyāyišn*; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn*; *Ābān Niyāyišn*; *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*; *Mihr Niyāyišn*; *Hāwan gāh*; *Rapihwin gāh*; *Uzērin gāh*; *Ēbsrūrim gāh*; *Ušahin gāh*; *Šnūman ī hamkārān*; *Nām stāyišn*; *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt*; *Srōš sar šab Yašt*; *Wahrām Yašt*; *Patit*; *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān*; *Āfrīnagān ī Srōš*; *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin*; *Namāz ī Ohrmazd*; *Nērang* recited when putting on new clothes; *Nērang ī pahrēz kardan ī šēdan bazī*; *Nērang ī jādūgīh kuštan*; *Nērang ī tab bastan*; *Nērang* for desiring opulence and ease; *Nērang ī bar nazar-e bad*; *Nērang* for praying for one's wants; *Nērang ī zulm dēwān dūr*; how to count the time of the five *Gāh*; *Nērang ī nāxun cīdan*.

Written 11 lines to the page. Headings and ritual indications in red ink. Presented by Dr. Rustomji Jamšedji Nadaršaw. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 25).

**D33:**

*Non vidi.* Iranian *Xorde Avesta* in New Persian. 212 folios, numbered in New Persian words. Completed in Mumbai in AD 1807 (AY 20.01.1176, AH 1221) by Dastur Bāman Dastur Noširwan for Behdin Xer-andiš Behdin Xodabaxš.

Contents: *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*; *Mihr Niyāyišn*; *Hāwan gāh*; *Rapihwin gāh*; *Uzērin gāh*; *Ēbsrūrim gāh*; *Ušahin gāh*; *Māh Niyāyišn*; *Nām stāyišn*; *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Šnūman ī hamkārān*; names of the *gāh*, *gāhānbār*, *gāḏā-*, zones and fires; *Srōš sar šab Yašt*; *Patit ī ruwānīg*; *Stāyišn ī Ohrmazd*; *be nām-e Ohrmazd*; *Spās ī akanārag*; *Nām ī xwābar*; *Āfrin (ciḡrēm. buiiāt)*; *Hordād Yašt*; *Patit ī pašēmānīh*; *Nērang ī gōspand halāl kardan*; *Stōm* or *Yasna 26*; colophon; praise of the 33 *amahraspandān* in verse and red ink; one *Monājāt*; names of *qadimi* and *jalāli* months; one *Monājāt*.

Written 7 lines to the page. Headings in red ink. Colophon (f. 203–204). Presented by Khān Bahādur Bomanji Behramji Patel. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 25–26).

**D34:**

*Non vidi.* Iranian *Xorde Avesta* in New Persian. 148 unnumbered folios.

Contents: *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*; *Mihr Niyāyišn*; *Māh Niyāyišn*; *Nām stāyišn*; *Hāwan gāh*; *Rapihwin gāh*; *Uzērin gāh*; *Ēbsrūrim gāh*; *Ušahin gāh*; *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt*; *Srōš sar šab Yašt*; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn*; *Ābān Niyāyišn*; *Hordād Yašt*; *Drwāsp Yašt*; *Wahrām Yašt*; *Patit*; *Šnūman ī hamkārān*; *Namāz ī Ohrmazd*.

Written 9 lines to the page. Headings in red ink. No colophon. Name of Dadabhoy Rustomji Patel in the brown leather cover. Presented by Khān Bahādur Bomanji Behramji Patel. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 26).

**D35:**

*Non vidi.* Iranian *Xorde Avesta* in Gujarati script with Gujarati translation, made from New Persian, made in its turn from Pahlavi, according to the scribe. 377 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals. Completed in AD 1805 (AY 10.03.1175, Saṁvat 1862, Śāka 1727, AH 1220) by Mobed Edal Darab Rustom Behram Sanjana for Behdin Framji Pešotanji.

Contents: *yaθā. ahū. vairiō* or *Yasna* 27.13; *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14; *Nērang ī kustīg bastan*; *Du'ā* after tying the *kustīg*; *Srōš bāj*; *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*; *Mihr Niyāyišn*; *Māh Niyāyišn*; *Ābān Niyāyišn*; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn*; *Nām stāyišn*; *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt*; *Srōš sar šab Yašt*; *Hōm Yašt* or *Yašt* 20; *Wanand Yašt*; *Patit ī Īrānī*; *Hāwan gāh*; *Rapihwin gāh*; *Uzērin gāh*; *Ēbsrūrīm gāh*; *Ušahin gāh*; *Vīspa. humata* or FrW 2; *Nērang ī nān xwardan*; *Ōšbām*; *Nērang ī kiz kardan*; *Nērang ī pahrēz kardan ī šēdan bazi*; *Bāj ī 1200 ašəm. vohū*; *Bāj ī 1200 yaθā. ahū. vairiō*; *Namāz ī muktātmā*; *Namaskār* of the sea, of the mountain, of the tree, of the lamp; *Nērang* after *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Nērang ī zulm dēwān dūr*; *Nērang* after *Srōš Yašt*; *Nērang ī atse zadan* (recited after sneezing); *Din-no kalmō*; *Tan dorostī* (f. 2–342); colophon in Gujarati (f. 343–45); *Patit ī pašēmānīh* (f. 347–74); Gujarati index (f. 374–77); colophon in New Persian (f. 377).

Written 11 lines to the page. Avestan text in red ink, and Gujarati translation in black ink. Colophons in Gujarati (f. 343–45) and New Persian (f. 377). Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 26–27).

**D36:**

*Non vidi.* Indian *Xorde Avesta* in Gujarati script with Gujarati translation. 363 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 236–37 and 336–39 are blank. Completed in AD 1816 (AY 08.09.1185) by Ervad Edal Darab Sanjana.

Contents: *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14; *yaθā. ahū. vairiō* or *Yasna* 27.13; Avestan texts extracted from the *Yasna*; *Nērang ī kustīg*

*bastan*; texts about the *šabīg* and the *kustīg*; *Srōš bāj*; *Ōšbām*; *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*; *Mihr Niyāyišn*; *Māh Niyāyišn*; *Ābān Niyāyišn*; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn*; *Vīspa. humata* or *FrW 2*; *Nām stāyišn*; *Hāwan gāh*; *Rapihwin gāh*; *Uzērin gāh*; *Ēbsrūrim gāh*; *Ušahin gāh*; *Patit*; *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt*; *Srōš sar šab Yašt*; *Hordād Yašt*; *Haft amahraspandān yašt*; *Gōš Yašt*; *Wahrām Yašt*; *Aštād Yašt*; *Hōm Yašt* or *Yašt 20*; *Drwāsp Yašt*; *Nērang* after *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Nērang ī nān xwardan*; *Nērang ī kiz kardan*; *Nērang ī zulm dēwān dūr*; *Tan dorostī*.

Written 13 lines to the page. Avestan text in red ink, and Gujarati translation in black ink. European blue paper. Presented by Mr. Jamšedji Bomanji Wadia. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 27).

### D37:

*Non vidi*. Indian *Xorde Avesta* in Gujarati script with Gujarati translation. 319 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 249–64 are missing and 265–76 are numbered as 165–76. Completed in AD 1799 (Saṁvat 1855) by Kamaji Rustomji.

Contents: *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna 27.14*; *yaθā. ahū. vairiio* or *Yasna 27.13*; *Nērang ī kustīg bastan*; *Srōš bāj*; *Ōšbām*; *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*; *Mihr Niyāyišn*; *Māh Niyāyišn*; *Ābān Niyāyišn*; *Ātaxš Niyāyišn*; *Vīspa. humata* or *FrW 2*; *Nām stāyišn*; *Patit*; preface of the *Āfrīnagān*; *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ardwahišt Yašt*; *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt*; *Srōš sar šab Yašt*; *Hōm Yašt* or *Yašt 20*; *Wanand Yašt*; *Āfrīnagān ī gāhānbār*; *Aširwād* (bearing the date AY 1057, AD 1688); *Āfrīn ī Zardušt* (f. 1–248); 16 missing folios (f. 249–64); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* (incomplete at the beginning); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhān*; *Tan dorostī*; *Nērang ī kiz kardan*; *Hāwan gāh*; *Rapihwin gāh*; *Uzērin gāh*; *Ēbsrūrim gāh*; *Ušahin gāh* (f. 265–317); Gujarati index (f. 317–18); colophon (f. 319).

Written 13 lines to the page. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of Mulla Kaus Rustom in some folios. Originally presented by

Mr. Limji Cowasji Banaji to Ervad Aspandiarji Navroji of Baroch; later presented by Mr. Hormasji Sorabji LelINVALA. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 27–28).

**D53:**

*Non vidi.* *Stāyišn ī Sīh-rōzag* and *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi. 32 unnumbered folios, of which f. 28–30 are blank.

Contents: *Stāyišn ī Sīh-rōzag* in Pahlavi (f. 1–26); four Pahlavi words written in red ink and explained in New Persian (f. 27); *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi with interlinear translation in New Persian in red ink (incomplete; f. 31–32); some Pahlavi words written in red ink and explained in New Persian (f. 32).

Written 15 lines to the page. Headings in red ink. No colophon, but old, according to Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 36). Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 36).

**D54:**

*Non vidi.* *Stāyišn ī Sīh-rōzag* in Pāzand (incomplete). 52 unnumbered folios, of which f. 48–52 are blank. Written 13 lines to the page. Iranian writing. Headings in red ink. No colophon, but from the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, according to Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 37). Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 37).

**D81:**

*Non vidi.* Indian *Xorde Avesta*. 235 folios, more than the half of which are numbered in Gujarati numerals. Completed in AD 1812 (AY 22.01.1191) by Ervad Sorab Noširwan Mehernoš Kaus Xoršed Mehernoš Dhampal Chānyā Pahlān Rustom Chāndā Faridun, surnamed Chāndā Faridun Pavdi.

Contents: *Patit ī xwad*; *Patit ī ruwānīg*; *Rašn Yašt*; *Rām Yašt*; *Gōš Yašt*; part of *Ohrmazd Yašt*; *Ābān Yašt*; *Tīr Yašt*; *Hordād Yašt*; *Nērang ī naxūn pahrēz*; *Bāj* for lessening the pains of a woman

at the child birth; *Bāj ī Panth yazd*; *Haft amahraspandān yašt*; *Nērang ī rōz Spandarmad māh Spandarmad*; *Nērang ī rēg yaštan*; the *dasturi* formula in Pāzand; *Dēn Yašt*; colophon in Pāzand, and in Gujarati in Avestan script; *Bāj dharnā* (incomplete); *Nērang ī rōz Spandarmad māh Spandarmad*; *Nērang ī rēg yaštan*; colophon in red ink; *Nērang ī xrafstar zadan*; *Aširwād*; *Āfrīn ī Zardušt*; *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin*; *Āfrīn ī rapihwin*; *Āfrīn ī dahmān*; *Āfrīn ī wuzurgān*; *Āfrīn ī haft amahrspandān*; the ceremony of consecrating the white bull called *varasio*, in Gujarati; list of contents in Gujarati.

Written 11 to 13 lines to the page. Headings in Pāzand and Gujarati in red ink. According to the Gujarati colophon, the manuscript was sold by Darab Framji Pavdi to Navroji Cowasji Pavdi in AD 1840 (AY 05.01.1209). Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 48–49).

**R248** (KRC No. 1169):

Indian *Xorde Avesta* in Avestan with Sanskrit translation upside down. 172 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals in red ink, of which f. 1r, 2r, 92r, 171v and 172 are blank.

Contents: Sanskrit introduction (f. 2v–4r); *Nērang ī kustīg bastan* in Pāzand with Sanskrit translation (f. 4r–13v); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* in Avestan (some parts in Pāzand) with Sanskrit translation (f. 14r–50r); *Māh Niyāyišn* in Avestan with Sanskrit translation (f. 50r–61r); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* in Avestan with Sanskrit translation (f. 61r–80v); *Nām stāyišn* in Pāzand with Sanskrit translation (f. 81r–90v); *Nērang* in Pahlavi in red ink with Pāzand interlinear translation in black ink (f. 91r–v); *Ohrmazd Yašt* in Avestan with Sanskrit translation (f. 93r–119v); *Patit ī ruwānīg* in Pāzand with Sanskrit translation (f. 120r–69v); Gujarati index (f. 170r).

Written 11 lines to the page. Ritual instructions and headings in New Persian in red ink. Indian writing. No colophon, but probably from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century or the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The name of Kawasji Nusserwanji Kauji is written in f. 1v.

**R319:**

Iranian *Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation. 184 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals in black ink, of which f. 31 is blank. Indian copy by Mānek Ruštom Frēdōn of an Iranian manuscript completed in Yazd in AD 1733 (AY 06.05.1102) by Bahmard Dastur Rōstām Dastur Jāmāsp Dastur Bahrāmšāh Dastur Noširwan Bahrāmšāh, who copied it from a manuscript of Wahišt-bahrag Frēdōn Marzabān [written <mlc'n'>] Frēdōn, according to its colophon in Pahlavi.

Contents: *aṣəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 with Pahlavi translation and commentary (f. 1v–5r); *yaθā. ahū. vairiio* or *Yasna* 27.13 with Pahlavi translation and commentary (f. 5r–6r); Avestan texts extracted from the *Yasna* with their Pahlavi translations (f. 6r–9v); *Nērang ī kustīg abzūdan* with Pahlavi translation (f. 9v–17r); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 17r–26v); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* with Pahlavi translation (f. 26v–28r); *Āfrīnagān ī xwadāyān* with Pahlavi translation (f. 28r–40v); *Āfrīnagān ī frawardīgān* with Pahlavi translation (f. 40v–43r); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 43r–49r); *Ohrmazd Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 49r–62v); *Āb zōhr* or *Yasna* 65 with Pahlavi translation (f. 62v–72r); *Āfrīn ī Zardušt* in Avestan with Pahlavi translation (f. 72r–75v); *Srōš sar šab Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 75v–89r); *Drōn Yašt* with Pahlavi translation, including all the Avestan *šnūman* to all deities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated (f. 89r–144r); colophon in Pahlavi (f. 144r–46r); *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 146v–62v); *Ēbsrūsrim gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 162v–70v); *Āfrīn* in Avestan and Pāzand with Pahlavi translation (f. 170v–76v); *Stāyišn ī Sih-rōzag* in Pahlavi (f. 176v–82v); *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi (f. 183r–84r); colophon in Pahlavi (f. 184r); *Yasna* 34.4 with Pahlavi translation (f. 184v).

Written 13 lines to the page. Headings in Pahlavi in red ink. The names of Ohrmazd and Zarduxšt are almost always written in red ink. Big size manuscript. Its writing is clearly Indian, although according to



its first colophon in Pahlavi (f. 144r–46r) it was completed in Yazd, in Iran. Each folio has been plastified in the restoration. Description in Raffaelli (2014: 51).

1<sup>st</sup> colophon in Pahlavi (f. 144r–46r):

plc PWN ŠRM W š'tyh plhwyh l'mšnyh BYN YWM mwb'lk  
 YWM hwrđt' MN BYRH y plhw BYRH 'mrdt' kdyym ŠNT'  
 bl 1000 100 2 AHL MN L BRA yzdkrt' MLKA-'n' MLKA y  
 štr' hdyb'l'n' w'ck' BRA OL y hwsłwb' y MLKA-'n' MLKA  
 y 'whrmzdd'n' L y dyn' bnndk b'hmlt' dstwbl lwst'm dstwbl  
 y'm'sp dstwbl b'hl'n' MLKA dstwbl nwšylwn' b'hl'nm MLKA  
 npšt'm pr'c YHSN-št HWE-m ŽNE dptl znd npyl'm'n' yšt BYN  
 dhšnyh 'hl'dyh nlpsšnyh dlwc W 'pdyh yzd'n' 'p'gwm'nyh  
 PWN gyytyh d't'l 'whrmzd W 'mhrspnnd'n' 'p'ryk-c hmk  
 yzd'n' nd'd'sn' dyn' wyh mzdysn'n' pyt'mblyh y yšt' plwh'l  
 zltwšt spyt'm'n' y<sup>4</sup> hlwb' y plwh'l 'p'gwm'nyh MNW 'whrmzd  
 hm' d'm'n' NPŠE d't' MNW hwbš plm'n' bwtl'l YHWWN-d  
 PWN ŠPYL-yh l's nm'y YHWWN-yt' LNE-c mltwm'n' OL  
 y hm' ŠPYL-'n' nywkyh 'p'yt' BOYHWN-st OD m'n' OL y  
 NPŠE-c YHMTWN-yt PWN yzd'n' k'mk YHWWN-'t' npšt'm  
 ADYN dptl MN b'hlyh NPŠE-yh W dstwbl'n' dstwbl z'td'n'  
 dyn' hmwcd'l'n' drwst n'pst'y'n' KLYTWN-d W hmwcd  
 pcyyn' ptš OBYDWN-d L PWN ptyt' YHWWN-yt' OD BRA  
 hwbš 'plyn' klt'ltl šnwm HYA gytyh tn' hwsłwb' PWN mynwg  
 lw'n' 'hlwb'y glwtm'nyk YHWWN-'t' 'ytwn' YHWWN-'t'  
 'ytwnl-c YHWWN-'t' ADYN-š KLYTWN-yt' W hmwcyt' ŠM  
 y L MNW npšt'l HWE-m AP-š 'wstwlyt' 'ywp w'cyyny't' 'ywp  
 yswdttl OBYDWN-yt AP-š gytyh tn' dwslwb'y PWN mynwg  
 lw'n' dlwwnd OBYDWN-'t' AP-š hmym'l HWE-wm PWN  
 dstwbl y d't'l 'whrmzd PWN hncmn y ysty'stl y zltwšt'n's  
 npšt'm BYN kyšwl y 'yl'n' BYN štr" yzd BYN MTA y 'hlst'n'  
 PWN BYTA dstwbl lwst'm dstwbl y'm'sp ŽNE l's PWN 'hl'dyh  
 'lck' PWN nywkyh hdyb't ywdt 'hl'dyh wlčšnyh MNW-š'n'

<sup>4</sup> Phl. <zltwšt spyt'm'n' y> is written in red ink.

<sup>5</sup> Phl. <zltwšt'n'> is written in red ink.

hm' SGYTWN-yt lcc hm b'hlyh kwnd OD-š'n' hwbš 'pryn'  
 krt'l YHWWN-m hm' AYŠ 'hl'dyh hw'st'l YHWWN-yt' LA  
 twb'nyk hw'st'l ME dstwbl'n' gwpt YKOYMWN-yt AYK whšt  
 PWN krpk' YHBWN-t' LA PWN sym scyt zl y zlt 'ytwn-c  
 PWN BBA whšt krpk' cnd LA twb'nyk hw'stk' MN hm' krpk'  
 MNW LNE-c hm' kwnm ZK-c BYN hpt kyšwl ŠPYL-'n' hm'k  
 nywk' OBYDWN-d 'wlv'hmnyh QDM YBLWN-'t ME dyn'  
 'p'gwm'nyh' hm'y twšyt LWTE LNE hmk'l YHWWN-yt  
 'w 100 hm' OBYDWN-m BRA OL y ZK y NPŠE-yh przd'n'  
 dstwbl'n' mgwpt'n' 'p'ryk mzdysn'n' MNW KRA 'pst'k  
 'ywp znd MNW PWN hwdyynnyh YHSNN-d pcyyn' w'ck'  
 y plm'nyh YHWWN-yt' 'ywp wltšnyk yzd'n' PWN m'tk'  
 W LA BRA bhšyt' whštyk lwb'nyk MNW drwst nm'yt BRA  
 glwtm'nyk 'lc'nyk YHWWN-'t npšt'm MN pcyyn' whštb'hk'  
 plytwn' mlc'n' plytwn' QDM ZNE gytyh wtylšny AYT ywdt MN  
 ŠM y nywk' 'wyh MNDOM-c BRA LA KTLWN-yt dh't ZK  
 tn' MNW-š wlcyt lw'nn'nyh 'ytwn' YHWWN-'t 'ytwnl-c tlc  
 YHWWN-'t PWN yzd'n W 'mhrspnd'n' k'mk YHWWN-'t

*\*frazaft pad drōd ud šādih farroxih rāmišnih andar rōz mobārak  
 rōz hordād az māh ī farrax māh amurdād \*kadimī sāl abar  
 1102 pas az man bē yazdagird šāhān šāh ī šahryārān wāzag  
 bē ō ī husraw ī šāhān šāh ī ohrmazdān man ī dēn bandag  
 bahmard dastwar rōstām dastwar jāmāsp dastwar bahrān-  
 šāh dastwar noširwan bahrām-šāh nibištām frāz dāšt hēm ēn  
 daftar zand ud pērāmōn yašt andar dahišnih ahlāyih nirfsišnih  
 druz ud abdih yazdān abegumānih pad gētīy dādār ohrmazd  
 ud amahraspandān abārīg-iz hamāg yazdān niyāyīšn dēn weh  
 mazdēsnaṇ paygāmbarih ī yašt frawahr zardušt spitāmān ī ahlaw  
 ī frawahr abegumānih kē ohrmazd hamāg dāmān xwēš dād kē  
 xwaš framān burdār bawēnd pad wehīh rāh nimāy bawēd amāh-  
 iz mardōmān ō ī hamāg wehān nekīh abāyēd xwast tā-mān ō ī  
 xwēš-iz rasēd pad yazdān kāmāg bawād nibištām \*ēn daftar az  
 bahlīh xwēših ud dastwarān dastwar-zādān dēn hammōz-dārān  
 drust newestāyān xwānēnd ud hammōzēnd paccēn padīš kunēnd*

*man pad patit bawēd tā bē xwaš āfrīn kardārdar šnūman gyān  
 gētīy tan husraw pad mēnōy ruwān ahlaw ī garōdmānīg bawād  
 ēdōn bawād ēdōntar-iz bawād ēg-iš xwānēd ud hammōzēd nām  
 ī man kē nibištār hēm u-š awestwārēd ayāb wāzēnēd ayāb juttar  
 kunēd u-š gētīy tan dusraw ī pad mēnōy ruwān druwand kunād  
 u-š hamēmāl hom pad dastwar ī dādār ohrmazd pad hanjaman  
 ī isadwāstar ī zarduštān nibištām andar kišwar ī ērān andar šahr  
 yazd andar deh ī ahrestān pad xānag dastwar rōstām dastwar  
 jāmāsp ēn rāh pad ahlāyih arzag pad nēkih ayād jud ahlāyih  
 warzišnīh kē-šān hamāg rawēd man-iz ham bahlīg kunad tā-šān  
 xwaš āfrīn kardār bawam hamāg kas ahlāyih xwāstār bawēd nē  
 tuwānīg xwāstār cē dastwarān guft ēstēd kū wahišt pad kirbag dād  
 nē pad sēm sazēd zarr ī zard ēdōn-iz pad dar wahišt kirbag cand  
 nē tuwānīg xwāstag az hamāg kirbag kē amāh-iz hamāg kunam  
 ān-iz andar haft kišwar wehān hamāg nēk kunēnd urwāhmanih  
 abar barād cē dēn abegumānīhā hamāg tuxšēd abāg amāh  
 hamkār bawēd ō sad hamāg kunam bē ō ī ān ī xwēših frazandān  
 dastwarān mowbedān abārīg mazdēsnañ kē har abastāg ayāb  
 zand kē pad hudēnīh dārēnd paccēn wāzag ī framānīh bawēd  
 ayāb wardišnīg yazdān pad mādag ud nē bē baxšēd wahištīg  
 ruwānīg kē drust nimāyēd bē garōdmānīg arzānīg bawād nibištām  
 az paccēn wahišt-bahlag frēdōn marzabān frēdōn abar ēn gētīy  
 widerišnī ast jud az nām ī nēk ēwīh ciš-iz bē nē mānēd dahād ān  
 tan kē-š warzēd ruwānānīh ēdōn bawād ēdōntar-iz tar-iz bawād  
 pad yazdān ud amahraspandān kāmag bawād*

2<sup>nd</sup> colophon in Pahlavi:

*ZNE šnmn BYN ht y p'hlwyk YKTYBWN-štK BYN bnndk  
 dstwbl YLYDWN-tk m'nnk BRE 'ylpt lwštwm plytw'n npšt  
 ēn šnūman andar had ī pahlawīg nibištāg andar bandag dastwar-  
 zādāg mānek pus hērbēd rōstom frēdōn nibišt*

### R379:

*Non vidi.* Xorde Avesta with Pahlavi and New Persian translations.  
 130 folios. It includes *Sih-rōzag* 1 (f. 97v-106r) and *Sih-rōzag* 2 (f.

106r–116v) in Avestan with Pahlavi translation. Formerly belonging to Mobed Jamšed Dastur Edalji Dastur Bomanji Jamaspji Asaji Fretonji's collection. Description in Raffaelli (2014: 52).

**R405** (KRC No. 386):

Iranian *Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation and some interlinear New Persian translations. 161 unnumbered folios, of which f. 1r, 160v and 161, are blank.

Contents: *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 with Pahlavi translation (f. 1v); *yaθā. ahū. vairiō* or *Yasna* 27.13 with Pahlavi translation (f. 1v–2v); Avestan texts extracted from the *Yasna* with their Pahlavi translations (f. 2v–8v); *Nērang ī kustīg bastan* with Pahlavi translation (f. 8v–10r); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 10r–22v); *Mihr Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 22v–24v); *Māh Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 25r–30v); *Ābān Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 30v–36r); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 36v–45r); *Ohrmazd Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 45v–72v); *Ardwahišt Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 73r–84v); *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 85r–95v); *Srōš sar šab Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 96r–109r); *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi (f. 109r–118r); *Hāwan gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 118r–25r); *Uzērin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 125r–27r); *Ēbsrūsrīm gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 127r–31v); *Ušahin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 131v–33v); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhān* with Pahlavi translation (f. 133v–37v); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhānbār* with Pahlavi translation (f. 137v–60r).

Written 12 lines to the page. Headings in Pahlavi in red ink. New Persian glosses in black ink are frequently found above the text and on the margins. Iranian style, but probably written in India. European paper. No colophon, but probably from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In f. 1r it is written: “Presented in memory of late Mr Jehangir Sorabji Kalpika (solicitor) 22/5/1948”.

**R411:**

Indian *Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation. 221 folios.

Contents: *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 with Pahlavi translation (f. 1r–1v); *yaθā. ahū. vairiio* or *Yasna* 27.13 with Pahlavi translation (f. 1v–3r); *Nērang ī kustīg bastan* with Pahlavi translation (f. 3v–10r); *Srōš bāj* with Pahlavi translation (f. 10v–22v); *Nērang ī nān xwardan* with Pahlavi translation (f. 22v–23r); *Nērang ī kiz kardan* with Pahlavi translation (f. 23r–25v); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 25v–48v); *Mihr Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 49r–53v); *Māh Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 53v–63r); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 63v–81r); *Ābān Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 81v–92v); *Hāwan gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 92v–100r); *Rapihwīn gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 100r–106r); *Uzērīn gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 106r–111r); *Ēbsrūrim gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 111r–17v); *Ušahin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 117v–24r); *Nām stāyišn* in Pāzand with Pahlavi translation (f. 124v–33v); *Namāz ī cahār nēmag* with Pahlavi translation (f. 133v–35r); *Viṣpa. humata* or FrW2 with Pahlavi translation (f. 135r–37r); *Ohrmazd Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 137r–64r); *Ardwahišt Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 164r–85r); *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 185v–206v); *Patit ī pašēmānīh* in Pāzand with Pahlavi translation (f. 206v–221v).

Written 11 to 12 lines to the page, with frequent blanks between lines left for Pahlavi translations. Indian writing. English paper with the water mark “Smith & Meynier”. No colophon, but late. Formerly belonging to Jamšedji M. Unvala’s collection. Facsimile edition by Jamasp Asa and Nawabi (1976d).

**R495** (KRC No. 130):

*Āfrīn* in Pāzand. 91 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals in black and red ink, of which f. 1–3 and 88–91 are blank. Catalogued as K-6 in the back cover. Written 9 lines to the page. Headings in Pāzand

and sometimes in Gujarati in red ink. Small size manuscript. Indian writing. European paper. No colophon, but probably a very late manuscript, from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century or even later. The corrosive ink have deteriorated the folios, which are hardly readable after the restoration.

**R570** (KRC No. 1539):

*Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* and *Āfrīn ī rapihwin*. 29 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 5r and 29v are blank. Completed in AD 1880 (AY 1250, Samvat 1937).

Contents: *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* in Avestan (f. 1r–4v); *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* in Pāzand (f. 5r–27v); colophon in Gujarati (f. 28v–29r).

Written 10 lines to the page. Headings in Pāzand in red ink. Small size manuscript. Indian paper and writing.

**R577** (KRC No. 1472, Part I):

Indian *Xorde Avesta*. 176 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 2v and 3r are blank and 171–76 were written by a different scribe.

Contents: Avestan alphabet (f. 3v); *yaθā. ahū. vairiīō* or *Yasna* 27.13 (f. 3v–4r); *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 (f. 4r); *Nērang ī kustīg bastan* (f. 4r–6v); *Nērang ī dastašō* in Pāzand (f. 6v–10v); *Ōšbām* (f. 10v–14r); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* (f. 14r–23v); *Mihr Niyāyišn* (f. 24r–27r); *Māh Niyāyišn* (f. 27r–31v); *Ābān Niyāyišn* (f. 31v–35v); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* (f. 35v–43r); *Nām stāyišn* in Pāzand (f. 43r–46r); *Patit ī Ādurbād ī Māraspand* in Pāzand (f. 46r–58v); *Patit vadardayqan sē rōz* in Pāzand (f. 59r–67v); *Uzērīn gāh* (f. 67v–69v); *Ēbsrūrīm gāh* (f. 69v–73v); *Ušahin gāh* (f. 73v–75v); *Nērang ī ašoān* in Pāzand (f. 75v–81v); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* (f. 82r–86v); *Āfrīnagān ī gāθā* (f. 86v–90r); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhānbār* (f. 90r–95r); *Āfrīn ī dahmān* in Pāzand (f. 95v–101v); *Āfrīn ī haft amahraspandān* in Pāzand (f. 101v–108r); *Āfrīn ī gāhānbār* in

Pāzand (f. 108r–120r); *Paymān ī pahlawīg* in Pāzand (f. 120r–30v); *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* (f. 131r–34r); *Āfrīn ī rapihwin* in Pāzand (f. 134r–42r); *Ohrmazd Yašt* (f. 142r–55v); *Haft amahraspandān Yašt* (f. 155v–62r); *Ardwahišt Yašt* (f. 162r–69v); *Hordād Yašt* (f. 169v–73r); *Drwāsp Yašt* (interrupted; f. 173r–76v).

14 lines in each page. Headings in Pāzand in red ink. Indian paper and writing. No colophon, but probably from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century or the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Formerly belonging to the Nalladaru collection.

Avestan alphabet: γ ġ g. h k. x η η. y š. r z. s n. d δ t. θ t. ž š. β b. f p. m ṇ. v x<sup>v</sup>. ý j. š c. ū x<sup>v</sup>. ħ n. e ē. a ā. ə ə. o ō. i ī. u ū. q ṇ. l r a uu ii ā ṭ.

### C) *Drōn Yašt* manuscripts

**D6** (KRC No-304):

*Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā*, plus a list of all the Avestan šnūman to all deities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated, and *Sīh-rōzag*, inserted in abbreviated form in f. 108v–109v and complete in f. 111r–19v. 136 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, plus one appended later at the beginning and another at the end. Completed in Nausari in AD 1811 (Samvat 09.06.1868) by Dastur Velāyatī, who copied it from a manuscript belonging to Dastur Dorabji Cowasji Meherjirana.

Avestan text with Gujarati commentaries. Ritual instructions in Gujarati language, but generally written in Pāzand script and seldom in Gujarati script. Gujarati commentaries and ritual instructions written in red ink. At the end of f. 110r it is written in New Persian that this part was written by Dastur Velāyatī. Depiction of the *barəšnūm-gāh* in red and black ink in f. 122r. Colophon in Gujarati (f. 132). Gujarati index of the texts on the last four folios. Indian paper and writing. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Feroze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 120v. Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 5–7), and Raffaelli (2014: 45).

**R14** (KRC No. 1281):

*Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā* in Avestan with Pahlavi translation. 31 folios, partially numbered in New Persian numerals, partially in Gujarati

numerals, and partially unnumbered. The manuscript is incomplete, beginning with *Yasna* 3.5 ('hl'dyh gwptn' ā o *asniiaēibiiō. ašahe. ratubiiō. ...*; f. 1r) and finishing in *Yasna* 8.9 (... OD LOYŠE gwptn' PWN yzd'n W 'mhrspnd'n k'mk YHWWN-'t; f. 31v). Some Pāzand and New Persian interlinear translations in red ink (f. 21r–25v) and in black ink (only in New Persian; f. 26r). Written 17 lines to the page. Indian writing. No colophon. Description in Raffaelli (2014: 49).

### R108:

*Non vidi.* *Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā* in Avestan. Loose folios, of which f. 2–7 are numbered in Gujarati numerals. Written 13 to 15 lines to the page. European paper. Presented to the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute by Ardešir Behramji Kamdin. Description in Dhabhar (1923b: 157). Under preservation.

### R109:

*Non vidi.* *Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā* in Avestan. 176 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 131 and 173 are blank. Begun in AD 1750 (AY 15.09.1119) and completed in AD 1750 (AY 22.10.1119, Saṃvat 1806) by Ervad Frām Ervad Xuršēd Ervad Aspendyār Uštā Bahrām Frāmrōz of Surat.

Written 15 lines to the page. Ritual instructions in Gujarati upside down. First colophon in New Persian in Pāzand script (f. 1r), second colophon in Pāzand (f. 171b), and third colophon in Gujarati (f. 172r), according to which the scribe copied some *bāj* from New Persian Rivāyats (Modi 1922: 9). Presented to the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute by Jamsedji Edalji Saklatwālā. Descriptions in Modi (1922), Dhabhar (1923b: 158), and Raffaelli (2014: 52). Under preservation. First colophon, reproduced in Pāzand script by Modi (1922: 7); second colophon, reproduced in Pāzand script and translated into English by Modi (1922: 1–2). third colophon, reproduced in Gujarati script by Modi (1922: 7).

1<sup>st</sup> colophon in New Persian in Pāzand script:

*rōz. goāt. māh. dae. sna. pāršī. īak. hazar. īak. saṭ. noahuzat.*



*in. kitāba. v. darūn. yastən. tamqam. sūt. ī. navəstəm. mən. dīn.  
baṇṭ.e. kəmtarīn. xeraṇdēš. əravaṭ. frəm. ərvaṭ. xūrašēṭ. əravaṭ.  
aspəndiiār. uštā. baeherqam. frəm.roza. sūratīā.*

2<sup>nd</sup> colophon in Pāzand:

*panqmi. yazdqn. in kitāb. avastāi. darūn. yast. srū. karədən. rōz.  
dapamahir. māh. ādar. šār. ik. hazār. ik. šaṭ. nōhōzdah. sana.  
pāršī.*

### **R110:**

*Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā* in Avestan, plus a list of all the Avestan šnūman to all deities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated. 177 folios, numbered in New Persian numerals. Completed in AD 1757 (AY 01.07.1126) by Mobed Rustam Bahrām Dārāb Sohrāb Mānek Pešotan Sanjāna.

Written 15 lines to the page. Ritual instructions in Gujarati. Indian paper and writing. Gujarati list of the *bāj* contained in the manuscript (f. 174v–77v). Colophon in New Persian (f. 177v). The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of Nosirvanji Kaixosro Dastur of Surat in some folios, like for instance in f. 6r. Presented to the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute by Mr K. G. Nariman. Descriptions in Dhabhar (1923b: 158–59), and Raffaelli (2014: 52–53). Facsimile edition by Jamasp Asa and Nawabi (1976a).

Colophon in New Persian (f. 177r):<sup>6</sup>

*fracad pa-darud šādi o rāmišni andar ruz-e mobārak-e dādār  
hormazd o māh-e mobārak-e mehr dāwar sane-ye 1126 yazdajardi  
yek hezār o sad o bist o šeš neweštam in nosxe-ye wāj yašt andar  
hindustān dar bandar-e mobārak-e surat har ke xwānad du'ā o  
āfrīn bar kāteb rasānad kāteb al-ḥurūf man dīn bande mobed-  
zāde rostan ibn mobed bahrām ibn dārāb ibn sohrāb ibn mānek  
ibn pešotan laqab-e sanjāne az nasl-e mobedān mobed neryosang*

<sup>6</sup> I thank Maria Subtelny for kindly helping me to read some difficult passages of this colophon.

*dhawal har ke xwānad du'ā o āfrīn o anuše-ruwān bar kāteb  
 rasānad  
 tamim be-al-xeir wa al-ẓafar  
 man neweštām tā bar āyad ruzgār  
 man na-mānam in be-mānad yādgār  
 man neweštām ʃarf kardam ruzgār  
 man na-mānam in be-mānad pāydār  
 neweštām man ke tā har kas be-xwānad  
 manam bi-šakk be-mīram in be-mānad  
 tammat tamām šod kār-e man nezām šod*

**R111** (KRC No. 1243):

*Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā* in Avestan, plus a list of all the Avestan šnūman to all deities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated. 151 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals in red ink, of which f. 148v and 151 are blank.

Written 12 lines to the page. Ritual instructions in Gujarati (in Gujarati and Pāzand scripts) in red ink. Indian writing. *Yazišn-gāh* depicted in f. 147r and 148r. European blue paper with water mark; f. 1, 123–126, 129–151 in white paper. No colophon, but late. Description in Raffaelli (2014: 50–51).

**R588** (KRC No. 438):

*Drōn Yašt* or *Bāj dharnā* in Avestan, plus a list of all the Avestan šnūman to all deities, to which the *Drōn Yašt* might be dedicated, and some *Āfrīn* in Pāzand. 183 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 183v is blank. Completed in Surat in AD 1830 (AY 1206, Samvat 1896) by Mobed Fredon Mānek Xorsid Naoroji.

Written 14 lines to the page. Depiction of the *barəšnūm gāh* and the *daxma-* with explanations in red and black ink (f. 128r). Depiction of astral bodies in red and black ink (f. 145v). Depiction of three concentric circles, in the centre of which *sukāi. šīiaoθna.*, framed by a square, is written in Avestan; eight Avestan formulas spread from the circle, as if representing eight directions (f. 162r). Gujarati index (f. 171–76). Colophon in Gujarati (f. 177r). Colophon in New Persian

(f. 177v). Ritual instructions in Gujarati in black ink, sometimes in Pāzand in red ink. Headings in Gujarati in red ink. Indian paper and writing. Formerly belonging to Jamšedji Manekji Unvala's collection (Ms-7). The manuscript bears the impression of the seal with his name in some folios, like for instance in f. 1v and 2r.

#### D) *Yašt* manuscripts

##### D27 (KRC No-654):

*Yašt* and Pāzand *Āfrīn*. 239 folios, of which 225v, 235v and 239 are blank, put together from different manuscripts and wrongly numbered with Gujarati numerals up to 3053. Completed in AD 1669 (AY 21.07.1003, but Sāmvat 1726) by Edalji Novroji Jiji Homji Navroj Kamdin Pešotan Xoršed Godāvra, according to the colophon in Gujarati (f. 236r–v), but perhaps later.

Contents: *Ohrmazd Yašt* (... *haiiārē. vāqn. virašt. ašōnē. ašim. vōhū.*

1; f. 1r–16r); *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt* (*masa. va. vḥ. va. ruurōzər. bāt. miinōi. ādar. ... haiiārē. vāqn. rašt. ašōnē. ašim. vōhuu.* 1; f. 16r–26r); *Srōš sar šab Yašt* (*masa. va. vḥ. firōzgarbāt. miinōi. šruus. yazd. ... haiiārē. vihq. rašt. ašōni. ašim. vōhuu;* f. 26v–39r); *Ardwahišt Yašt* (*masa. va. vahrē. firōzṇrbāt. pēmīnōi. aradii.bāhašta. ... haiiārē. vāqn. rasāt. ašōne. ašim. vōhuu. xasnuuḍr. ahuurhəzmdāi. ašim. vōhuu;* f. 39v–61r); *Wahrām Yašt* (*masa. va. vḥ. firōzər. bāt. mnōi. vahamṇn. ... haiiārē. vihq. rasāt. ašōnē. ašim. vōhu;* f. 61r–75v); *Hordād Yašt* (*masava. va.hē. firōzərabāt. miinōi. xaradāt. ... aārē. viqn. rasāt. ašōnē. ašim. vhuu;* f. 75v–81r); *Tištār Yašt* (*mas. va. vāh. pīrō zərabāt. mīnōi. tištārbāt. ... ahiiārē. vāqn. rašt. ašōnē. ašim. vō.hū;* f. 81r–104v); *Āfrīn in Pāzand* (*nqm. yazad. vāzīm. manasnē. ... raḍḅqm. aiiērənqm.ca. ašəm. vōhū;* f. 105r–110r); *Āfrīn in Pāzand* (*nqm. yazd. vāzīm. manasni. ... nabānazdaštīnqm. fruuašnqm. ašim. vōhū;* f. 110r–14v); *Pāzand Āfrīn* (*nqm. yazaṭ. vāzīm. manasani. ... ašōē. ravqn. bēhēdiin;* f. 114v–15v); *Pāzand Āfrīn* (*nqm. yazda. iāḍāhī. viriū. 2. ... pamanāi. ašim. vōhii. hamāt. ra. hamā. aiṭ. biit;* f. 115v–19v); *Āfrīn in Pāzand* (*pṇziṭ. sarōš. ašō. ... ašim. vōhū. 3. fruūārāni;* f. 119v–20v); *Āfrīn in Pāzand*

(*hapatō. ašuuqn. fruuāšiiō. ... ašōruuqn. bēhādii*; f. 120v–21v); *Āfrīn* in Pāzand (*birasāt. nqm. yazd. ... fruuāšnqm. ašim. vōhū*; f. 121v–24v); *Āfrīn* in Pāzand (*hamāzuur. fruuuhara. ... fruuāšnqm. ašim. vōhū*; f. 124v–29v); *Āfrīn* in Pāzand (*hamāzōr. bāt. hamāzōr. hamā. ...*; f. 129v–37r); *Āfrīn* in Pāzand (*hamājōr. bāt. huraṃzda. ...*; f. 137r–44v); *Āfrīn* in Pāzand (*hamāzōr. biit. hamāzōr. ašō. ...*; f. 145r–53v); *Rām Yašt* (f. 154r–69v); *Mihr Yašt* (f. 170r–225r); *Rašn Yašt* (f. 226r–35r); colophon in Gujarati (f. 236r–v); Gujarati index (f. 236v–38v).

The ink of the eight first folios is blurred, and the text cannot be easily read after the restoration of the manuscript. Introductions in Gujarati in red ink. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 1r and 235v. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 22).

#### D77:

*Non vidi. Yašt.* 139 unnumbered folios.

Contents: *Haft amahraspandān yašt* (f. 1–8); *Ābān yašt* (f. 8–55); *Xwaršēd yašt* (f. 55–57); *Māh yašt* (f. 57–58); *Tīr yašt* (f. 58–82); *Mihr yašt* (f. 83–139).

Written 15 lines to the page. Headings in red ink. Iranian writing. No colophon. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 47).

#### D78:

*Non vidi. Tīr Yašt, Gōš yašt and Hordād yašt.* 51 unnumbered folios.

Contents: *Tīr yašt* (f. 1–32); *Gōš yašt* (f. 33–34); *Hordād yašt* (f. 44–51).

Written 11 to 12 lines to the page. Headings in red ink. European paper. No colophon. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 48). Formerly belonging to Mobed Merwanji Framji Šapurji Nyanha's collection, as indicated in a Gujarati note on f. 40.

**D79:**

*Non vidi.* *Frawardīn Yašt* and *Ābān yašt*. 110 unnumbered folios. Completed in AD 1833 (AY 22.12.1202, Saṁvat 1889) by Mobed Darab Framroj Rustom Darab Framroj Minocher Keršaspji Pavdi.

Contents: *Frawardīn yašt* (f. 1–64); *Ābān yašt* (f. 65–110).

*Frawardīn Yašt*, numbered in Gujarati numerals, with headings in Pahlavi; *Ābān yašt*, unnumbered, with headings in Gujarati. Written 15 lines to the page. Iranian writing. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 48).

**D80:**

*Non vidi.* *Ābān yašt*. 30 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals. Completed in AD 1819 (Saṁvat 08.02.1876) by Šapur Manek Behram Jamasp Manek Dastur Pahlān.

Written 13 lines to the page. Headings in red ink. Colophon in New Persian in red ink. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 48).

**D82** (MFL92; KRC No-1152):

*Frawardīn Yašt*, *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* and New Persian *Monājāt*. 65 folios, of which 64v and 65 are blank, numbered with Gujarati numerals from number 2. Completed in AD 1834 (AY 25.04.1203; Saṁvat 1890, according to the colophon in Gujarati) by Naoroji Xoršedji.

Contents: *Frawardīn Yašt* (f. 1v–58r); colophon in Pāzand in red ink (f. 58r); colophon in Gujarati in black ink (f. 58r); *Āfrīnagān ī rapihwin* (f. 58v–61v); Persian *Monājāt* in Gujarati characters (f. 61v–64r).

Gujarati title in Pāzand script in red ink. Indian paper and writing. Presented to the Mulla Firoze Library by Hormasji Sorabji Leliwalla in June 14<sup>th</sup> 1909. Descriptions in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 49–50), and Dhabhar (1923a: 58).

**1<sup>st</sup> colophon in Pāzand:**

*tamqm. suṭ. frauua.šī. barōzi. arašaēšavaṇ. bamāh. tastar. tīr. sār. āk. hazārō. dō. šadō. sē. āzdajardq.*

**R288:**

*Non vidi. Frawardīn Yašt, Patit ī Īrānī and Āfrīn ī šaš gāhānbār.* Formerly belonging to Bejonjo Rustamji Kanga's collection. Under preservation.

**R289** (KRC No. 1015):

*Frawardīn Yašt* and *Āfrīn ī šaš gāhānbār*. 95 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals in black ink, of which f. 36 is blank.

Contents: *Frawardīn Yašt* in Avestan (f. 1r–79v); *Āfrīn ī šaš gāhānbār* in Pāzand (incomplete at the end, until *ašō. frō.har. rasāt. ka. in*; f. 80r–95v).

Written 9 lines to the page. The first folio is a detached and completely deteriorated fragment of the introductory formula of *Frawardīn Yašt* and the text of *Yašt* 13.1; f. 2r begins with *raoxšnō. frādarəsrō* (*Yašt* 13.2). Ritual instructions and headings in Pāzand in red ink. Small size manuscript. Indian writing. No colophon, but probably from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century or the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

**R292** (KRC No. 1529):

*Frawardīn Yašt*. 71 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals in black ink, of which f. 1r, 9v and 71r are blank. Written by E. S. Meherjirana.

Contents: *Frawardīn Yašt* in Avestan (f. 1r–70v); colophon in Gujarati (f. 71v).

Written 13 lines to the page. Ritual instructions and headings in Pahlavi in red ink, with the exceptions of one heading in Gujarati in red ink and another in New Persian in black ink at the beginning of the manuscript. Narrow manuscript. Indian writing. Colophon in Gujarati without date, but probably from the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century or the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The name of Jamshedji Sorabji Dhalla is written in f. 71v.

**R480** (KRC No. 315):

*Frawardīn Yašt*. 63 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f.

63 is blank. Completed in AD 1867 (AY 1236, Šamvat 1923).

Written 13 lines to the page. Heading in Pahlavi and Pāzand in red ink. Small size manuscript. Indian paper and writing. Colophon in Gujarati (f. 62r-v).

**R481** (KRC No. 143):

*Frawardīn Yašt*. 102 unnumbered folios, of which f. 1v and 2r are blank.

Written 8 lines to the page. Headings in Pāzand in red ink. Small size manuscript. Indian paper and writing in big characters. No colophon, but probably from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In f. 1r it is written: “Aspanderjee Burjorjee Punthak Parsee priest in the Small Causes Court of Bombay.”

**R491** (KRC No. 144):

*Frawardīn Yašt*, plus an *Āfrīn* in Pāzand, although in its Pahlavi introduction it is written *Drōn Frawardīn Yašt* <plw’hl dlnw’ yšt’>. 143 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals in black ink, of which f. 140v, 142v and 143v are blank.

Contents: *Frawardīn Yašt* (f. 1v–140r); Pāzand *Āfrīn* (f. 141r–42r).

Written 9 lines to the page. No colophon, but written by Pešotanji Rustam Nalladharu, according to the text written in pencil in a folio attached later. Small size manuscript. European blue paper. Indian writing in big characters.

**E) Composite manuscripts**

**D28** (KRC No-1608):

*Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation, *Frahang ī pahlawīg* and *Wisperad* with Pahlavi translation. 143 unnumbered folios, of which f. 1v, 2v, 3v, 4v and 143 are blank. Completed in AD 1782 (AY 21.11.1151) by Mobed Kaus Rustom.

Contents: six separate *Āfrīn* in Pahlavi written by another scribe in Iranian writing, the two first in black ink and the other four

in red ink, cut from another manuscript and pasted upside down (f. 1r–4r); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 5v–22v); *Māh Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 22v–28v); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 28v–40r); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* with Pahlavi translation (f. 40r–50r); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhānbār* with Pahlavi translation (f. 50r–62r); *Āfrīnagān ī gāḡā*, including *Yašt* 13.49–52 together with its Pahlavi translation (f. 62r–66r); *Ohrmazd Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 66r–84r); colophon in Pahlavi (f. 84r); *Frahang ī pahlawīg*, beginning with the Avestan and Pahlavi alphabets and followed by their equivalent reading in New Persian (f. 84v–93v); *Wisperad* with Pahlavi translation (f. 94r–142r); beginning of the *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi in black ink with interlinear New Persian translation in red ink, both written by another scribe in smaller characters (f. 142v).

Written 13 lines to the page. Headings and ritual instructions in Pahlavi in red ink and sometimes in black ink. Couplets in New Persian in red ink after some headings. Occasional New Persian translation and glosses in black and red ink. Indian paper and writing. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 5r and 35r. Description in Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 22).

#### Colophon in Pahlavi:

plcpt PWN ŠRM W š'tyh W l'mšn' lwb'n KRA 2 'hw'n wyh  
dyn'n YHWWN-'t bndk OZLN-t ZNE 'wst' y znd BYN YWM  
mynwgl'm BYRH mwb'lk whwmn ŠNT QDM 'ywk 1000 100 50  
'ywk <sup>200 35</sup> MN MLKA-'n MLKA yzdkrt štr'dy'lyh YKTYBWN-  
stndyh L dyn' bndkyy mgwpt k'ws BRE lwstm KRA h'wšt 'ywp  
mgwpt 'ywp dstwbl 'ywp KRA AYŠ MNW BRE KLYTWN-d  
ŠRM W 'pryn' MN L BRA YHMTWN-t W KRA AYŠ MNW  
BRA KRYTWN-d ZK hm ŠRM sl'm 'pl L BRA OBYDWN-d

*frazaft pad drōd ud šādih ud rāmišn ruwān har dō axwān weh*



*dēnān bawād bandag šud ēn awastā ī zand andar rōz mēnōy  
rām māh mobārak wahman sāl abar ēk 1150 ēk 235 az šāhān šāh  
yazdagird šahryārīh newestande man dēn bandage mowbed kāus  
pus rōstam har hāwīšt ayāb mowbed ayāb dastwar ayāb har kas  
kē bē xwānēnd drōd ud āfrīn az man bē rasīd ud har kas kē bē  
xwānēnd ān ham drōd srāyam abar man bē kunēnd*

**D83** (MFL16; KRC No. 662):

*Yasna*, *Drōn Frawardīn Yašt*, *Nām Stāyišn*, *Wisperad*, *Sīh-rōzag* and other texts. 245 folios, numbered with New Persian words, of which f. 1, 2r, 140r, 141v, 148v and 245 are blank; f. 140–41 and 147–48 were written by a different scribe in another paper. Completed in Turkābad in AD 1735 (AY 10.03.1104) by Rustām Guštāsp Erdašīr Guštāsp.

Contents: *Yasna* (f. 2v–151r), including the same Pahlavi introduction as Pt4 (f. 5v), but not the longer one before this folio; colophon in Pahlavi (f. 151r–v); *Drōn Frawahrām* (*Frawardīn*) *Yašt* (dlwn plw'hl'm yšt', Y 3–8 is abbreviated and occupies just two lines; the Avestan *šnūman* to the *frauuaši-* follows; then the *Frawardīn Yašt* is written complete; finally, some Avestan formulas to consecrate the *drōn* in Noruz and other occasions follow; f. 152r–80r); *Nām štāyišn* in Pahlavi (f. 180r–81r); *Stāyišn ī Sīh-rōzag* in Pahlavi (only for *Dēn*, *Māraspand* and *Srōš*; f. 181r–83v); *Nām ī xwābar* in New Persian (f. 183v–84v); *Āfrīn* in New Persian script (*ciθrēm. buiiāt*; f. 184v–85r); *Šnūman* in Avestan and New Persian (f. 185v–87v); *Drōn Yašt* (f. 187v–89v); two ownership letters in New Persian, the former dating from AD 10.06.1816 (AY day Ābān, month Šahrevar, year 1185), and the latter from AD 07.09.1826 (AY day Amurdād, month Ādur, year 1195; f. 190r); *Wisperad* (f. 190v–224v); *Yasna ī rapihwin* (f. 224v–30r); colophon in Pahlavi, bearing the name of Rustām Guštāsp Erdašīr Guštāsp and the date AD 10.03.1735 (AY day Ābān, month Ardwhišt, year 1104; f. 230r); *Sīh-rōzag* 1 (f. 230v–33r); *Āfrīn* in New Persian (f. 233v); *Sīh-rōzag* 2 (incomplete, until *upamanəm. yazatəm*; f. 234r–37v); *Nērang-e*

*yasn-e nozodi* and *Darun-e nonāwar* in Avestan and New Persian (f. 238r–43r); description of the *barəšnūm-gāh* in New Persian (f. 243r–v), with the depiction of five spaces, encircled in three circles with 15 dots inside each, on the left margin of f. 243r; *Wīdēwdād* 2.10–14 in Avestan (f. 244r–v) from another manuscript attached at the end, after which the Avestan gloss of Pahlavi *Wīdēwdād* 2.5, written upside down in bigger Avestan characters by another scribe, was added.

Written 16 to 21 lines to the page. *Yazišn-gāh* depicted in f. 194v. Ritual instructions in Pahlavi in red ink, sometimes with an interlinear translation in New Persian. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the Mulla Firoze Library in some folios, like for instance in f. 32r and 81r. Descriptions in Geldner (1886–1896: Prolegomena xi, xxv), who called it Mfi, Brelvi and Dhabhar (1917: 50–51), Dhabhar (1923a: 14–15), and Raffaelli (2014: 48–49). First colophon, reproduced in Pahlavi script and translated into English by Dhabhar (1923a: 89–90, 113–14).

1<sup>st</sup> colophon in Pahlavi:

plcpt PWN ŠRM W š'tyh W l'mšn' 'pst'k' yšt' LWTE nylng  
 pwl-ycšn' YHWWN-'t' npšt' HWE-m pr'c ŠBKWN-t' HWE-m  
 BYN YWM y z' myzdt W MN BYRA 'p'n' ŠNT' bl 1000 90 AHL  
 MN ŠNT' y L BRA OLE y yzdkrt' MLKA-'n' MLKA štrw'hl'n'  
 npšt' HWE-m L y dyn' bnndk lwst'm y gwšt'sp yltšyl MNW  
 OD KRA MNW KLYTWN-d 'ywp ALPWN-d 'ywp ycšn' ptš  
 OBYDWN-d 'ywp pcyn-1 YKTYBWN-d lwb'n' y w'hlwm y  
 lwst'm LWTE L MNW npšt'l HWE-m PWN 'hl' dyh W nywk  
 ŠM-yh 'byd't OBYDWN-'t' 'hl' dyh wlčšnyh MNW-š'n hm'y  
 SGYTWN-yt' LNE hmb'hl OHDWN-d OD-š'n' 'wbš' pryn  
 krt'ltl YHWWN-ym W BOYHWN-šnyk HWE-m BRA OLE y  
 wyh dyn'n y AMT ZNE dptl KLYTWN-d HT' w'ck' y pl'mwš  
 'ywp wltšnyk YHWWN-yt AP-š drwst OBYDWN-yt' OD-š'n'  
 'mhrspnd'n W 'hlwb'n' plw'hl MN gytig W mynwg BRA tn'  
 W lwb'n' OLE-š'n' hdyb'lyh W hwšnwt' YHWWN-d ME ZNE

gytyg wtylšnyk AYT' ywdt MN ŠM y nywk 'yny' MNDOM-c  
 BRA LA KTLWN-yt' ME PWN g's'n' YMRRWN-yt *uštā.*  
*ahmāi. yahmāi. uštā. kahmāiciṭ.* nywk OLE MNW ZK y OLE  
 nywkyh kt'l-c-HD [AYK kt'l-c-HD ANŠWTA MN nywkyh y  
 OLE nywk']

*frazaft pad drōd ud šādih ud rāmišn abastāg yašt abāg nērang  
 purr-yazišn bawād nibišt hom frāz hišt hom andar rōz ī zāmyād  
 ud az mäh ābān sāl 1090 pas az sāl ī man bē ōy ī yazdagird šāhān  
 šāh šahr-wahrān nibišt hom man ī dēn bandag rustām ī guštāsp  
 erdašir kē tā har kē xwānēnd ayāb hammōzēnd ayāb yazišn  
 padiš kunēnd ayāb paccēn-ē nibēsēnd ruwān ī wahrom ī rōstām  
 abāg man kē nibištār hom pad ahlāyih ud nēk-nāmīg ayād  
 kunād ahlāyih warzišnih kē-šān hamē rawēd amāh hambahr  
 gīrēnd tā-šān awiš āfrīn kardārtar bawēm ud xwahišnīg hom  
 bē ō ī weh-dēnān ī ka ēn daftar xwānēnd agar wāzag ī frāmōš  
 ayāb wardišnīg bawēd u-š drust kunēd tā-šān amahraspandān  
 ud ahlawān frawahr az gētīy ud mēnōy bē tan ud ruwān awēšān  
 ayārīh ud hušnūd bawēnd cē ēn gētīy wardišnīg ast jud az nām  
 ī nēk enyā ciš-iz bē nē mānēd cē pad gāhān gōwēd uštā. ahmāi.  
 yahmāi. uštā. kahmāiciṭ. ōy kē ān ī ōy nēkih kadār-iz-ē [kū kadār-  
 iz-ē mardōm az nēkih ī ōy nēk]*

2<sup>nd</sup> colophon in Pahlavi:

npštwm L y dyn' bnndk lwst' m y gwšt' sp y yltšyl gwšt' sp BYN  
 YWM y 'p'n' BYRH 'rtwhšt' ŠNT' bl 1000 W 100 W 4 yzdkrty  
*nibištom man ī dēn bandag rustām ī guštāsp ī erdašir guštāsp  
 andar rōz ī ābān mäh ardwhišt sāl abar 1104 yazdagirdī*

**R246** (KRC No. 1462):

Indian *Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation and *Wīesperad* with Pahlavi translation. 326 folios, numbered in Gujarati numerals, of which f. 1–8v, 154v–66, 208v–217, 255–57, 263v, 272r and 316v–26r are blank.

Contents: *ašəm. vohū* or *Yasna* 27.14 with Pahlavi translation (f.

8v–9r); *yaθā. ahū. vairiio* or *Yasna* 27.13 with Pahlavi translation and commentary (f. 9r–10v); Avestan texts extracted from the *Yasna* with their Pahlavi translations (f. 11r–44v); *Mihr Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 45r–49r); *Māh Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 49r–59r); *Ātaxš Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 59r–77r); *Ābān Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 77r–86r); *Hāwan gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 86r–93r); *Rapihwin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 93r–96r); *Uzērin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 96v–100r); *Ēbsrūšrim gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 100r–109r); *Ušahin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 109r–112v); *Ohrmazd Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 113r–54r); *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 167r–84v); *Srōš sar šab Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 185r–208r); *Āfrīnagān ī dahmān* with Pahlavi translation (f. 218r–31r); *Āfrīnagān ī gāhānbār* with Pahlavi translation (f. 231r–48r); *Āfrīn ī Zarduxšt* with Pahlavi translation, written by another scribe (f. 248v–54v); *Āfrīn ī frawardīgān* with Pahlavi translation (f. 258–63r); *Nām stāyišn* in Pahlavi (f. 264r–66r); *Āfrīn ī paymān* in Pahlavi (f. 266v–70v); *Tan dorostī* in Pahlavi (f. 270v–71v); *Wīšperad* with Pahlavi translation (f. 272v–316r), written by the same scribe who wrote the *Āfrīn ī Zarduxšt* in this manuscript.

Written 12 lines to the page. Headings in Pahlavi, sometimes in New Persian, in black ink. Indian writing. European blue paper with a water mark bearing the date 1850. No colophon, but late. The manuscript bears the impression of the seal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute in some folios, like for instance in f. 1r and 318v. The name of Kawasji Nusserwanji Kauji is written in f. 326v.

**R284** (KRC No. 537):

Indian *Xorde Avesta* with Pahlavi translation and *Frahang ī pahlawīg*. 114 folios, numbered in New Persian numerals in black ink, of which f. 1, 2r, 82r, 113v and 114 are blank.

Contents: Avestan *nērangs*, extracted from the *Yasna*, with Pahlavi translation (f. 2v–4v); *Srōš bāj* with Pahlavi translation (f. 4v–11v);

*Hāwan gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 12r–15r); *Rapihwin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 15r–16v); *Uzērin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 16v–17v); *Ēbsrūsrīm gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 17v–20r); *Ušahin gāh* with Pahlavi translation (f. 20r–21v); *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation, and partially with interlinear New Persian translation at the beginning (f. 21v–28v); *Mihr Niyāyišn* (f. 28v–30v); *Nām stāyišn* in Pāzand with Pahlavi translation (f. 30v–33r); *Māh Niyāyišn* with PT (f. 33r–35v); *Ābān Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 35v–38r); *Ātāxš Niyāyišn* with Pahlavi translation (f. 38r–43v); *Patit ī pašēmānīh* in Pāzand with Pahlavi translation (f. 44r–55r); *Nērang ī kustīg* in Pāzand with Pahlavi translation (f. 55v–56v); Pāzand text (f. 56v–57r); *Ohrmazd Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 57r–67v); *Ardwahišt Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (abbreviated; f. 67v–68r); *Srōš Yašt Hādōxt* with Pahlavi translation (abbreviated; f. 68r–74v); *Srōš sar šab Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (abbreviated; f. 74v–79v); *Hōm Yašt* or *Yašt 20* with Pahlavi translation (f. 79v–80r); *Wanand Yašt* with Pahlavi translation (f. 80r–81v); *Frahang ī pahlawīg* with interlinear Pāzand (in red ink) and New Persian (in black ink) translations (f. 82v–112r); Avestan and Pahlavi alphabets with their equivalent readings in New Persian, including some Pahlavi ligatures (f. 112v–13r).

Written 15 lines to the page. Big size manuscript. Indian writing. No colophon, but the similarities between this and the manuscript T44 of The First Dastur Meherjirana Library, written by this scribe, indicate that it was most probably written by Mobed Sohrāb Dastur Frāmroz Sohrāb Rustom Meherjirana in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

## Bibliography

- Antiā, E.K. *Pāzend Texts*. Bombay: The Trustees of the Parsee Punchayet Funds and Properties, 1909.
- Brelvi S. A., and B. N. Dhabhar. *Supplementary Catalogue of Arabic, Hindustani, Persian and Turkish Mss. and Descriptive Catalogue of Avestan, Pahlavi, Pazend and Persian Mss. in the Mulla Firoz Library*. Bombay: Mulla Firoz Library, 1917.
- Dhabhar, B.N. *Descriptive Catalogue of Some Manuscripts bearing on Zoroastrianism and pertaining to the Different Collections in the Mulla Feroze Library*. Bombay: The Trustees of the Parsee Punchayet Funds and Properties, 1923a.
- *The K. R. Cama Oriental Research Institute. Catalogue*. Bombay: The K. R. Cama Oriental Research Institute, 1923b.
- Geldner, K.F. *Avesta. The Sacred Books of the Parsis*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1886–1896.
- Jamasp Asa, K. M. *The Avesta Codex F1 (Niyāyišns and Yašts). Facsimile Edition with an Introduction*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991.
- Jamasp Asa Kh. M., and M. Nawabi. *MS. R 110. Bāj & Barsom*. The Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches 30. Shiraz: Asia Institute of Pahlavi University, 1976a.
- *MS. R 115. Afrins, Nirangs, Patēts etc. Part 1*. The Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches 14. Shiraz: Asia Institute of Pahlavi University, 1976b.
- *MS. R 115. Afrins, Nirangs, Patēts etc. Part 2*. The Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches 15. Shiraz: Asia Institute of Pahlavi University, 1976c.

- MS. R 411. *Few Prayers, Nīrangs, Bājs & Yašts*. The Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches 23. Shiraz: Asia Institute of Pahlavi University, 1976d.
- Karanjia, R. P. *The Bāj-dharnā (Drōn Yasht)*. Mumbai: The K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, 2010.
- König, G. “Das Nask *Bayān* und das *Xorde Avesta*.” In *The Transmission of the Avesta*. Iranica 20, ed. A. Cantera. Pp. 355–394. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- “Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der *Yašts*: Reste der exegetischen Tradition. Die Pahlavi-Übersetzungen von Yt 13 in Dk 7.” In *aṭciṭ bā nāmō haomāi. Homenaje a Éric Pirart en su 65° aniversario*. Estudios Iranios y Turanios 2, eds. A. Cantera and J. J. Ferrer. Pp. 131–149. Girona: Sociedad de Estudios Iranios y Turanios, 2015.
- Kotwal F. M., and A. Hintze. *The Khorda Avesta and Yašt Codex E1. Facsimile Edition* (Iranica 16). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.
- Modi, J. J. “An Old Manuscript of the *Kitāb-i Darūn Yasht*.” *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute* 1 (1922): 13–32.
- Raffaelli, E. G. *The Sih-rōzag in Zoroastrianism. A Textual and Historico-Religious Analysis*. London: Routledge, 2015.

## On the Etymology of the Old Iranian Term for “Iron”

David B. Buyaner

A scholar setting out to compile the various terms for “iron” in the Iranian languages with the hope of determining their common etymon faces three main problems:

- a) the apparently irregular oscillation between the forms with [s] and with [h] in Middle Persian (namely, *āsan*, with variants *asēn* and *āsēn*; and *āhan*, with variants *āhēn*, Paz. *āhin* and Man. *āhwan* or *āhun*);
- b) the relation of both forms to Eastern Iranian words (such as Pašto *ōspana* / *ōspīna* “iron”, Oss. *æfsæn* “ploughshare” etc.);
- c) the morphological structure of Av. *haosafnaēna*- “steel” (attr.), claimed by some eminent Iranists to be a cognate of the abovementioned Eastern Iranian terms (Miller 2004: 37; Benveniste 1927: 132-133; Morgenstierne 1927: 107; Charpentier 1928: 182-183; Abaev 1958: 481; Abaev 1963: 203-204; Abaev 1985: 12-13).

Let us first enumerate the forms to be dealt with and then examine these three problems in order to determine whether the common prototype of the Iranian designations for “iron” can be deduced, and if it can, what its morphology and semantics are.

The Eastern Iranian terms are:



### Old Iranian

Av. *haosafnaēna*- “of steel” (?) < \**haṣ-śuān-aīna*- “made of good iron” (Miller 2004: 37; Benveniste 1927: 132-133; Abaev 1958: 481; Abaev 1963: 203-204; Abaev 1985: 12-13);<sup>1</sup>

Scyth. \**οσπιν*- in Ὀσπίνμαζος (the comparison with Pashto *ōspīna* and Oss. *æfsæn* by Miller was rejected in Vasmer 1923: 46, but revived by Benveniste and explained as Ὀσπίνμαζος < \*Ὀσπίνβαζος “au bras de fer”; according to Abaev, \*Ὀσπίνβαζος > \**aspaina-bāzu*- “having iron arms”, Benveniste 1927: 133; Abaev 1979: 282, 313).<sup>2</sup>

### Middle Iranian

Khotanese *hīśśana* “iron” (< \**aśuānīa*-, Bailey 1979: 487; according to Rastorgueva and Édel’man 2000: 247, either from \**aśuāna*- with the prothetic [h] or from \**hu-śuāna*-, cf. Witczak 2005: 286; Klingenschmitt reconstructs a prototype \**aīahasuāna*-, similar to one suggested by Rastorgueva and Édel’man for MP *āsēn*, see below and nn. 5 and 11); Chor. *spny* “ploughshare, iron” (Bailey restores the spelling as *aspanī*, Bailey 1979: 487);

Sogd. *ʾspnʾynʾ* “iron” (attr.) (< \**aśuānaīna-ka*-, Bailey 1979: 487; Rastorgueva and Édel’man 2000: 246-247; Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7).

<sup>1</sup> I disagree with such an analysis of this form; my opinion is enunciated at the end of the paper.

<sup>2</sup> The Scythian proper name Ὀσπίνμαζος is comparable to one occurring in Dan. 1: 3 (Heb. *ʾāšpənaz*, LXX Ἀσφανεζ). The similarity poses a challenge to the conventional treatment of the structurally analogous Heb. *ʾāškənaz* / LXX Ἀσχανάζ (Gen. 10: 3; Paral. I, 1: 6; Jer. 51: 27) as a misreading of the Assyrian *aškuzai* (see, e. g., Szemerényi 1980: 7). Given that the Iranian prototype of Ὀσπίνμαζος / *ʾāšpənaz* / Ἀσφανεζ was \**aspana-bāzu*- “having iron arms”, that of *ʾāškənaz* / Ἀσχανάζ should be reconstructed by analogy as \**axšaiṇa-bāzu*- “having blue arms”, an etymology that is quite acceptable typologically; cf. Σαυρομάται < Oss. \**saw-arm-tæ* “having dark arms” (Abaev 1979: 279).

## New Iranian

Pašto *ōspana* (< \**āšyānā-*) or *ōspīna* (< \**āšyān(i)īā-*, Morgenstierne 1927: 12, 107)<sup>3</sup>;

Yidya *rIspēn*,<sup>4</sup> Munji *yūspən* / *yīspən* (< \**āšyānā-*, Morgenstierne 1927: 12);

Oss. *æfsæn* “ploughshare” (Hübschmann, 1895: 10; Benveniste, 1927: 133; Morgenstierne 1927: 12; Morgenstierne 1938: 244; Abaev 1958: 481; Abaev 1985: 12; Bailey 1979: 487);

various Pamir forms, namely, Šuyni *sipin* “iron”, *sipun* “ploughshare”, Xufi *sipun* “iron, ploughshare”, Sarykoli *s(i)pin*, Yazγulāmi *s(ə)pon*, *s(ə)pūn* “ploughshare”, Iškašmi *špvn* “iron”, Sangleči *špōn* “iron”, Waxi (y) *iš’n* “iron” (Morgenstierne 1927: 12; Abaev 1958: 481; Abaev 1963: 204; Steblin-Kamenskij 1985:156; Steblin-Kamenskij 1999: 427; Rastorgueva and Édel’man 2000: 247).<sup>5</sup>

The Western Iranian forms are:

<sup>3</sup> The old etymology by Geiger (< Av. *ayō spaēnām*, Geiger 1893: 190, n° [not sure what the superscript refers to; if this is a footnote write “n.”] 256) is altogether unacceptable; see Morgenstierne 1927: 12.

<sup>4</sup> The initial [r] of this word is rather problematic; both existent explanations, namely those by Klingenschmitt (< \**rayda-* + *āšyāna-*, cf. Parāčī *rū*, Ōrmurī *rō* “iron” < \**rayda-* Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7) and by Witczak (< \**fra-šyāna-* Witczak 2005: 286) are hardly acceptable: Klingenschmitt himself is quite aware of the difficulties posed by his etymology (“Eine lautliche Herleitung aus \**raydāšyāna-* bereitet Schwierigkeiten (\**raydāšyāna-* > \**rōlāspan*, verkürzt zu \**rāspan*?)” [Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7]), whereas Witczak seems to admit an entirely improbable verbal prefix in order to eliminate the initial [a] or [ā] from the etymon (see below). Both in the just quoted passage and elsewhere, Klingenschmitt marks the Iranian phoneme descending from IE \**[k]* as \**[s]*. Since it is represented as [θ] in Old Persian, I instead adhere to the mode of transcription accepted by Rastorgueva & Édel’man, Steblin-Kamenskij, Witczak et al., according to which IE \**[k]* > OI \**[š]*. See below, n. 16.

<sup>5</sup> According to Steblin-Kamenskij, “... the primary form and meaning [of the Waxi *yīšn*] remain obscure – it is obviously a Kulturwort in which one reconstructs with certainty only the middle \**-sp-* // \**-šv-*, IE \**k’u-*” (Steblin-Kamenskij 1999: 427-428, my translation). Elsewhere, however, he suggests for *yīšn* the etymon \**haušvana-* (Steblin-Kamenskij 1999: 30), probably in view of Av. *haosafnaēna-* (see below). Klingenschmitt derives Waxi *yīšn*, *išn* from the same hypothetic prototype \**aīahasūana-* as Khot. *hiššāna-*, see above and n. 11.

### Middle Iranian

Middle Persian <'s(y)n'>, <'h(y)n'> and Man. <'hwn>;  
Parth. <'swn>.

### New Iranian

Kurd. *hāsin*, *āsin*, *hesin*;<sup>6</sup>

Baluči *āsin*;

Surxei *āsān*;

Lasg. *asān* and Semnāni *ōsūn* (Morgenstierne 1927: 12; Steblin-Kamenskij 1985: 156; Steblin-Kamenskij 1999: 427; Rastorgueva and Edel'man 2000: 147; Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7).

\*\*\*

Now we can proceed with solving the problems raised at the beginning of this paper. First of all, there are three spellings of the word for iron attested in Middle Persian, namely, <'s(y)n'>, <'h(y)n'>, and Man. <'hwn>.<sup>7</sup> As regards the two available dictionaries of Pahlavi, MacKenzie tacitly treats the first of these spellings as a pseudo-historic spelling of *āhan* (MacKenzie 1971: 6). In contrast, Nyberg cites only <'syn'> and reads it as *āsēn* (Nyberg 1974: 32). The existence of two parallel and interchangeable forms, namely, *āsan* (with variants *asēn* and *āsēn*) and *āhan* (with variants *āhēn*, Paz. *Āhin* and Man. *āhwan* or *āhun*), thus remains to be explained.

The first scholar to admit a common origin of the two varieties of the Persian term and of the Eastern Iranian forms with *-sp-* was Müller (1891: 258). Some decades later, this subject was elaborated more thoroughly by Morgenstierne: “*ōspīna*, *ōspana* ‘iron’... cf. Sām[n] *āsin*, Phl. *āsīn*, with Persic *s* < \**św*. Prs. *āhan* with *h* < \**θ* < \**św*, cf.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *ḥasin*, *hasin*, *hāsin* / *āsin* as given by Cabolov with an unintelligible etymology: “... to OI \*(*ā*)*sana-* from \*(*ā*)*spana-*” (Cabolov 2001: 454). Generally speaking, all the Western Iranian forms with *-s-* < *-sp-* seem to have been borrowed from Persian. The initial *-h-* in Kurdish is unetymological (see Mann 1906: xxxviii).

<sup>7</sup> Man. <'hwn> constitutes a counterpart to Parth. <'swn> in exactly the same manner as MP <'h(y)n'> does to <'s(y)n'> (see below).

Anc. Prs. *viθa-*, *visa-* ‘all’, is due to a dialectal variation inside Persic” (Morgenstierne 1927: 12). In *Addenda et Corrigenda* he returns to the subject, allowing that “Anc. Prs. *viθa-* in the sense of ‘all’... is doubtful.” He insists, however, that “... the development \*św > \*θ in some Persic dial[ect] is poss[ible], and I do not think we have to separate *āhan*, *āsīn* etc. from *ōspana* etc. as does Benveniste (MSL. 23, 132).”<sup>8</sup>

This view was criticized by Charpentier: to him, “this word [Pašto *ōspīna*, *ōspana* ‘iron’] and its connexion with Pehl. *āsīn* &c. is extremely difficult. We find Soghd. *špnyn* = \**aspanēn-*, Scyth. *’οσπιν-*, Oss. *āfsān*... But on the other hand I cannot believe, with Dr. Morgenstierne, that Pers. *āhān*, Pehl. *āhīn* and the connected forms is really the same word as the preceding ones... I cannot see that *āhīn*, &c. is anything but \**āsanya-* which would very probably represent \**ākā\**nio- or possibly \**ōkā\**nio-” (Charpentier 1928: 182-183). However, this objection did not discourage Morgenstierne: in his reply to Charpentier’s article in the same issue of *Acta Orientalia*, he sticks to his opinion concerning the etymology of the Persian term for iron: “I still believe that Prs. *āhan* (Phl. *āhīn* I do not know) can be derived from \**āšvana-*. We need only assume that in some Persic dialect the change of \*śu (from \*k’u) > \*ś (and further to s) preceded that of \*ś > θ” (Morgenstierne 1928: 198).<sup>9</sup>

Morgenstierne’s position was shared by Gershevitch (1965: 15, 16), who treated Parth. <”swn> and Man. MP <”hwn> as particular cases of the peculiar spelling of OI -śu-, which regularly gives -s- in “genuine” Old Persian and -sp- in common Iranian. In other words, Gershevitch suggested that OI -ś- behaves in this lexeme as if it would not have been followed by -u-: OI -ś- > Parth. -s-; OI -ś- > OP -θ- > MP

<sup>8</sup> Benveniste, cursorily mentioned here by Morgenstierne, suggests without elaboration dividing the Western Iranian words from the Eastern forms with -sp-: “Au Sud [sic], c’est un autre radical qui a prévalu: phl. litt. *āsīn*, kurde *hāsin*... pers. *āhān*, bal. *āsīn*, attendant encore une explication” (Benveniste 1927: 133). His conjecture of a possible connection of the Western Iranian forms with Av. *asānaēna-* (ibid.) was subsequently rejected by Charpentier: “The Av. *asānaēna-* compared by M. Benveniste, seems far too uncertain and, if a real form, probably means ‘made from stone’” (Charpentier 1928: 183). See also further criticism by Belardi (1961: 7, n. 1).

<sup>9</sup> The same explanation of the Persian forms of both types is given (without reference to Morgenstierne) by Abaev (1985: 12).

-*h*-. Thus, Pahlavi *āhan* might represent the development of OP *-θu-*, analogous to that of *čahār* < OI *čaθuār-* (Gershevitch 1965: 16).<sup>10</sup> The OI form *\*āšūan-*, as reconstructed by Gershevitch, however, remains unexplained.

Such an explanation has recently been offered by D. I. Èdel'man and V. S. Rastorgueva. According to them, MP *āsan* < OI *\*aīah-* + *šūana-*;<sup>11</sup> MP *āhēn* < OI *\*aīah-aīna-* (Rastorgueva and Èdel'man 2000: 147). The second part of the first item (*-san*) is a South-West Iranian ("genuine Persian") form to be compared with the East-Iranian forms such as Pašto *ōspana* etc., whereas the first part of both (*ā-*) proves to be derived from the Iranian general term for metal, *\*aīah-*, attested in Avestan *aiīah-*, *aiīahhaēna-* etc. (Bartholomae 1904: 155, 159). The parallelism of the Persian forms with *-s-* and with *-h-* is thus due to a mere contamination (Rastorgueva and Èdel'man 2000: 146-147, 246-247). In their approach the Russian scholars follow the view of Belardi, who at the same time was the first to point out the main shortcoming of this etymology: OI *\*aīah-* should have given *\*ēh* in Middle Persian (Belardi 1961: 20, n. 2).

Thus, the attempt made by Belardi and elaborated by Èdel'man and Rastorgueva to separate the forms with *-s-* and *-sp-* from those with *-h-* seems to me unacceptable. Klingenschmitt (2000: 193, n. 7) divides the above forms in different Iranian languages into three

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Gāthic Av. *isuuān-* "master, possessor" ~ OInd. *iśvarā-* "master, lord" with a development of the consonant group in Avestan entirely analogous to that of Parth. *\*swn* < OI *\*ašūana-*. Another graphic example, which illustrates the multiplicity of developments of a similar cluster in different Iranian languages, is the fascicle of reflexes of OI *\*hižūā-*: *hižū-* "tongue": Av. *hizuuā-*: *hizū-*, OP acc. sgl. *hizānam*, MP *uzwān* (Man. <'zw'n>), Kurd. *zimān*, *azmān*, Zaza *zuwān*, Gazi *uzūn*, Sogd. [should there be a word here? If not – if the Sogdian and Khwarezmian is the same—then these words should be separated by semicolons, to distinguish the main list from its subsections], Khwar. *zβ'k*, Khot. *bišāa*, Oss. *yvzag* / *ævzag*, Pašto *žāba*, Šuyni *ziv*, Waxi *zik* etc. (see Benveniste 1954: 30-31; Henning 1963: 71; Rastorgueva and Èdel'man 2007: 403-405).

<sup>11</sup> A similar prototype (*\*aīahasyana-*) is suggested by Klingenschmitt for Khotenese *hīšāna-* and Waxi *yīšn*, *išn* (Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7); see above, n. 5. Tremblay (2005: 424, nn. 20, 21) convincingly shows that Klingenschmitt's disjoining of the Sakan (Khotanese and Waxi) lexemes from the other Iranian ones is wrong, in view of the relative regularity of the shift *\*-ašu-* > *-īšš-* for trisyllabic words in Khotanese.

groups according to the intermediate prototypes *\*asūana-*, *\*āsūanā-* and *\*āsuna-*, deriving all of them from the common etymon *\*aś-ūan-* (or *\*aś-ūan-*, according to his mode of transcription). This analysis still conforms with that of Gershevitch (the difference in the length of the initial vowel can easily be accounted for in terms of zero / *vr̥ddhi* alternation or as a result of the sporadic lengthening of the initial [a] in Persian, as described by Bailey 1937: 100), and implies deriving the OI *\*aś-ūan-* from IE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ek-* “scharf sein” (= *\*ak-*, *\*ōk-*, according to Pokorny).<sup>12</sup> In order to account for such forms as *\*aśūana-* etc., Klingenschmitt suggests an incidental misinterpretation of the etymon in accusative: *\*aśūan-am* > *\*aśūana-m* (ibid.), an explanation which is the weakest point of his reasoning: it is an arbitrary solution aiming at the preservation of the old etymology with the root *\*aś-* and the suffix *-ūan-*.

An entirely different etymology was recently proposed by Danka and Witczak, who treated the initial vowel as prothetic and connected the Iranian terms for iron with Gr. *κύαρος* “lapis lazuli; copper sulphate; copperas; dark-blue enamel; blue glass” and Hitt. *kuwanna(n)-* “copper, a precious stone,” on the one hand, and with the Balto-Slavic designations of lead, namely, OChSl. *свинѣцъ*, Russ. *свинец*, Slov. *svínac* (< OSl. *\*svinīci* < *\*\*svinū* “lead”), Lith. *švīnas*, Lett. *svins* “id.,” on the other hand (Danka and Witczak 1997: 361-363; Wytczak 2005: 286). The postulated Indo-European prototype of all these forms is *\*k̑wn̥Hos* (Danka and Witczak 1997: 364; Witczak 2005: 286). Though quite sophisticated, this hypothesis is also highly artificial: there is no way to solve the phonetic problem it poses (i.e., the difference in vocalism between the Balto-Slavic and the other forms compared, see Trubačev 1967: 33-34; Ivanov 1977: 23-24; Danka and Witczak 1997: 362, n.2, 364), while the semantic aspect of the comparison remains quite obscure.

Besides, another difficulty connected with this etymology cannot be adequately solved: deriving the Iranian terms for iron from the same source as OSl. *\*svinīci*, Gr. *κύαρος*, Hitt. *kuwanna(n)-* etc.,

<sup>12</sup> Klingenschmitt (ibid.) also gives an example of a typologically analogous development of the same Indo-European root (IE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ek-*) in Latin: *aciēs* “Schärfe, Schneide” → ital. *acciaio*, fr. *acier* etc. “Stahl” (< *\*aciārium*).

Danka and Witczak are forced to treat the initial vowel occurring in the majority of the Iranian forms (and reconstructed for the others) as prothetic. This premise cannot account for the forms with the long [ā] (such as MP *āsan* and Pašto *ōspana* (< \**āśyanā*-); Witczak's conjecture that these forms could contain the scarcely attested prefix \**ā*- "good"<sup>13</sup> (Witczak 2005: 286) is unconvincing. A similar hypothesis was put forward by Morgenstierne and Charpentier in their attempt to explain Av. *haosafnaēna*- "steel (attr.)": Morgenstierne suggested that "... \**haosafna*- ought to be interpreted as \**hao-spana*-, with a prefix *hao*-, while *ō-spana*, *ā-han* etc. are prefixed with *ā*-" (Morgenstierne 1927: 107). Charpentier admitted a coexistence of "two different formations, viz., \**ā-spana*- and \**hu-spana*-" in Old Iranian (Charpentier 1928: 182). Thus we are now approaching the problem of the structure and etymology of Av. *haosafnaēna*-, an issue that became a stumbling block for scholars who felt obliged to regard the *a*- or *ā*- in all the forms in question as an independent element (a prothetic vowel or a morpheme) – just because it is missing in *haosafnaēna*-. Let us first make a brief survey of attempts by different scholars to analyze *haosafnaēna*- as a part of the series of cognates of Pašto *ōspana* etc.

The first to notice the phonetic closeness of the *haosafnaēna*- to the designations for iron in Ossetic, Pašto and in the Pamir languages was V. F. Miller (2004: 37).<sup>14</sup> This fact was overlooked by Benveniste ("Personne n'a rapproché *ōspana* de av. \**haosafna*- "acier", dont nous avons le dérivé *haosafnaēna*- "d'acier" (trad. phl. *pōlāwatēn*), dans *haosafnaēna saēpa* "dont l'acier est trempé", see Benveniste 1927: 132). Both Morgenstierne and Charpentier accepted the derivation of Pašto

<sup>13</sup> The relevant entry of the *Etymological Dictionary* by Rastorgueva and Èdel'man (2000: 301) is marked with "?", and two examples (NP *ādina* and Khwar. 'dyŋk) are cited with much hesitation.

<sup>14</sup> P. Ognibene, who translated the *Osetinskie étyjudy* by Miller into Italian and edited them with a new apparatus and extensive commentary, observes in a footnote that the question mark occurring by the word *haosafna*- is already present in Miller's text and is not an editor's addendum (see Ognibene apud Miller 2004: 37, n. 80). This question mark indicates Miller's linguistic intuition, which, at least in this particular case, compares favourably with that of the other scholars who dealt with *haosafna(ēna)*-.

*ōspana* from Av. \**haosafna*-, admitting an interchange of prefixes \**hu*- (or, in the vrddhi grade, \**hao*-) and \**ā*- in different attested forms (see above). Thus, it appears that all these scholars shared Andreas’ approach to the Avestan text, disregarding a presumed “vocalisation” of the postulated “Arsacid” text written with a consonant script. Indeed, Charpentier writes: “I had long ago fixed upon Av. *haosafnaina* [sic], and I am quite at one with Dr. Morgenstierne that Av. *hwspnyn* should rather mean *hauspanaina*- (or even *huspanaina*-) than anything else” (Charpentier 1928: 182). Since it has become impossible to ignore the Avestan text in its extant form after Henning’s epoch-making article “The Disintegration of the Avestic Studies”, those who dealt with the etymology of the *haosafnaēna*- from the same viewpoint as Miller, Benveniste et al. were forced to imply a spontaneous metathesis: thus, Abaev claims that the etymology of Av. \**husafna*- “... is very simple, provided one admits here a metathesis from \**hu-spana*-” (Abaev 1985: 12). No ground for such a metathesis is indicated, however, which makes the “simple” etymology very feeble.<sup>15</sup>

If one excludes Av. *haosafnaēna*- from the series of cognates presumably having a common etymon, it becomes much easier to explain the other forms in question. As we have seen above, according to Klingenschmitt, all of them can be divided into three groups with the intermediate prototypes \**aśuana*-, \**āśuānā*- (with the variant \**āśuān(i)ā*-, which yielded the Persian *āsēn* / *āhēn* and the Pashto *ōspīna*) and \**āśuna*- (Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7).<sup>16</sup> The question of the ultimate source of all these varieties of the etymon remains unsolved, however.

While considering this problem, one should bear in mind that the disintegration of the Indo-European community had taken place before iron was introduced into common use. A search for external cognates of a term for this metal found in a branch of the Indo-

<sup>15</sup> In view of the explanation below of OI \**āśuān(i)ā*- “iron” as “the horse metal”, it seems fruitful to connect Av. *haosafnaēna*- with *safa*- “hoof”.

<sup>16</sup> I prefer this mode of transcription ([ś] instead of Klingenschmitt’s [s]), because it seems impossible that the transition [ś] > [s] had taken place before the Persian forms such as *āhan* etc. arose.



European family is thus to be preceded by an examination of the possibility of an inner development. An exact form of the Old Iranian prototype of the lexemes in question is the first to be established. As we have seen, the initial [a], sometimes lengthened to the *vṛddhi* grade, is a part of the root; the final [a] of the varieties *\*aśuana-*, *\*āśuan(i)ā-* and *\*āśuna-* should also be considered as an organic element of the stem, and not as an “Uminterpretation einer Akkusativform *\*aśuan-am* zu *\*aśuana-m*” (Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7, see above). Thus, the Old Iranian prototype is to be reconstructed as *\*aśuana-* with the variants *\*āśuana-*, *\*āśuanā-* and *\*āśuaniā-* (> MP *āsēn*). Instead of adding the suffix *\*-uan-* to the root *\*aś-* (as done by Gershevitch and Klingenschmitt, see above), it seems most natural to separate the element *-na-* / *-nā-* or *-niā-*, thus deriving the above forms from OI *\*aśua-* “horse”. As regards the semantic aspect of this reconstruction, it seems quite sound: it is well known that the essential use of iron by horse-breeding peoples was for making bar bits and (more recently) shoeing the hoofs of horses. This explanation (OI *\*aśuan(i)a-* “iron” = “the horse metal”) is thus self-sufficient and releases one from the need to look for external cognates.

### Addendum

When the main body of this paper was already written, Professor M. Schwartz drew my attention to a hypothesis cursorily outlined by Henning in three footnotes to “A Grain of Mustard” (Henning 1965: 36, n. 1; 43, n. 3; 44, n. 4). According to this ingenious conjecture, a correct etymon for the Iranian designations of iron can be found only if some peculiar nasalized forms are taken into consideration, namely, Toch. B *eñcuwo* “iron” and *eñcwaññe* “of iron,” probably borrowed from the Iranian (Bailey 1957: 55-56; Henning 1965: 36, n. 1). With some hesitation, Henning connects these nasalized loanwords with Av. *haosafnaēna-*, where [o] < [n] before a sibilant (Henning 1965: 44, n. 4), and he suggests a common prototype *\*ansuan(i)-* for both nasalized and non-nasalized forms, which from his viewpoint accounts for the sporadic lengthening of the initial vowel as compensatory (Henning 1965: 36; 43, n. 3).

Though this suggestion seems tempting, since it brings together both the forms with the short [a] and those with the long [ā], as well as the otherwise isolated *haosafnaēna-*, it is not free from some hardly surmountable phonological shortcomings, which becomes clear if Tremblay’s elaboration of the subject be taken into account. In his comprehensive survey of Iranian loanwords in Tocharian, he mentions Toch. B *eñcuwo*, *iñcuwo* (translated as “steel” instead of “iron”; cf. Henning 1965: 36, n. 1) together with Toch. A *añcwāši* “in steel”, thus reconstructing a Proto-Tocharian form *\*ančwān-* and comparing it with Chor. *hnčw* “arrow-head,” *hnjw* “iron tip” (Tremblay 2005: 424). Disregarding Henning’s explanation, Tremblay treats the Proto-Tocharian and Choresmian forms as borrowings from the secondarily nasalized variant *\*ančuan-* of Old Sakan *\*ačuan-* (with the shift *\*k̥u > \*č̥u > \*č̣u*, which Tremblay states to be characteristic of Sakan dialects, see Tremblay 2005: 424, n. 23), tracing back to the same prototype shared by the other Iranian terms for iron (according to Klingenschmitt followed by Tremblay, from OI *\*h<sub>2</sub>ék-*uon-* “cutting edge,” Klingenschmitt 2000: 193, n. 7; Tremblay 2005: 424). An indisputable merit of Tremblay’s elaboration consists in showing that, in view of the vowel correspondence between the two varieties of Tocharian, the source of borrowing should be determined as Old Iranian; his further concretisation (“most probably Old Sakan”) is less convincing, however (Tremblay 2005: 423, see below).*

Notwithstanding the obvious contradiction between Henning and Tremblay, they are at one in postulating the correspondence OI *\*ś* – Toch. B *c* (Henning 1965: 36, n. 1) or OI *\*č̣u* – Proto-Toch. *čw* with a postulated intermediary “Old Sakan” *\*č̣u* (Tremblay 2005: 423, 424, n. 23).<sup>17</sup> This correspondence implies that the items containing the reflexes of the Indo-European palatal should have been borrowed into Proto-Tocharian “...at a very early stage, as the PIE palatals were still affricates in Old Iranian” (Tremblay 2005: 423). This condition seems to be satisfied by Toch. B *tsain* < Proto-Toch. *\*tsainā* < OI *\*jainu-* “weapon”

<sup>17</sup> The designations of the Old Iranian reflex of the Indo-European voiceless palatal *\*k̥* are given here in accordance with the mode of transcription adopted by Henning and Tremblay respectively. Thus, Henning’s *\*ś* is equivalent to Tremblay’s *\*č̣*.

with Toch. *ts* < OI \**j* < IE \**ǵ*, a correspondence that also suggests *ts* < OI \**č* < IE \**ǵ*, in view of the lack of opposition of voiceless vs. voiced in Tocharian (Tremblay 2005: 423, 424). However, the reconstructed Proto-Tocharian form \**ančwān-*, with Proto-Toch. \**č* (Toch. AB *c*) instead of \**c* (Toch. AB *ts*) indicates that an immediate source of borrowing should have undergone a process of the palatalization of \**ś* (or, according to Tremblay's mode of transcription, \**č*; see above, n. 17) before \**u*; indeed, such a shift (\**ǵu* > \**ču* > \**čū*) is postulated by Tremblay for "Old Sakan": "This equivalence points to an immediate preform \**čū*. The Sakan dialects (Khotanese, Tumšugese, Waxī) are the only Iranian languages where prepalatals \**ǵ* > PII \**č* and \**ǵ<sup>(h)</sup>* > PII \**j<sup>(h)</sup>* did not evolve to dentals [ʃ] before waw (\**ǵu* > \**ču* > Khot. *śś*, Tumš. *ś*, Waxī *š*; \**ǵ<sup>(h)</sup>u* > Khot. *ś*). This treatment thus constitutes a shibboleth for the origin of the loan words. ... \**ǵu* > \**ču* > \**čū* (> Khot. *śś*, Waxī *š*)" is typical for Sakan dialects" (Tremblay 2005: 423, 424, n. 23).

This chain of reasoning, however, does not stand up under scrutiny. It is true that a stage of affrication of Indo-European palatals may with certainty be reconstructed for Early Indo-Iranian. During the period after the split-off of Proto-Nuristani, these affricates had weakened the occlusive element; the spirantization should have been accomplished before the division of Indo-Iranian, for no trace of the occlusive focus can be found in the reflexes of Indo-European palatals in any Indo-Aryan or Iranian language. In Early Common Iranian, the continuation of the Indo-European voiceless palatal was probably realized as a post-alveolar \**ś* and participated in the threefold opposition \**š* ~ \**ś* ~ \**s* similar to the Indo-Aryan one. Subsequently, after the phonologization of \**h* and the loss of the initial, intervocalic and partially pre-sonant position by the phoneme \*/s/, the Early Iranian spirant \**ś* took its place in the system and became a pure blade spirant in the vast majority of Iranian dialects, with the exception of the Scythian and South-Western, where it yielded \**ś* and \**θ*, respectively (Édel'man 1986: 40-43). A "recurrent" affricate cannot thus be assumed for any variety of Iranian, including the ancestor of the Saka dialects: all of them have [s] for \**ś*, but [ʃ] for \**śu*, in contrast with [sp] in Common Iranian (Édel'man 1986: 41; Rastorgueva and Édel'man 2000: 14). This development

suggests that in Proto-Saka (“Old Sakan” in Tremblay’s terminology), \*ś yielded a hushing sibilant of š-type, which subsequently turned into [s], except before [ʏ] (Ėdel’man 1986: 41; Rastorgueva and Ėdel’man 2000: 13). There is no reason whatsoever to assume the chain of shifts \*k̥ʏ > \*ćʏ > \*čʏ for this branch of Iranian, as Tremblay does.

These considerations make me refrain from accepting the reconstructions by Henning and Tremblay, notwithstanding the ingenuity of both. As I have proposed elsewhere, neither the Choresmian *hnčw* “arrow-head” and *hnjw* “iron tip” nor the Proto-Tocharian \**ančwān-* are connected with the Iranian terms for iron, and should be considered separately (see Buyaner 2013).

### Abbreviations

AO = Acta Orientalia. Oslo.

AION-L = Annali d'Istituto Orientale di Napoli. Serie Linguistica. Napoli.

AION-N.S. = Annali d'Istituto Orientale di Napoli. Nuova Serie. Napoli.

BSOAS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (after 1940). London.

JIES = Journal of Indo-European Studies. Washington.

MSL = Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. Paris.

TPS = Transactions of the Philological Society. Oxford.

WZKM = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Wien.

ZII = Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik. Leipzig.

## Bibliography

- Abaev, V. I. 1958. *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*, vol. 1. Moskva & Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
- Abaev, V. I. 1963. Ob iranskix nazvanijax stali. In V. I. Abaev (ed.), *Iranskij sbornik: K semidesjatiletiju Prof. I. I. Zarubina*, 203-207. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.
- Abaev, V. I. 1979. Skifo-sarmatskie narečija. In Institut Jazykoznanija, *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija I. Drevneiranskie jazyki*, 272-364. Moskva: Nauka.
- Abaev, V. I. 1985. Avestica. In Hermann M. Ölberg, Gernot Schmidt & Heinz Bothien (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für J. Knobloch Zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 23), 7-19. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Bailey, H. W. 1937. Indo-Iranica. *TPS* 1936. 95-101.
- Bailey, H. W. 1957. Adversaria Indoiranica. *BSOAS* 19. 49-57.
- Bailey, H. W. 1979. *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge, London, New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartholomae, Ch. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Belardi, W. 1961. \*axš-aina-, \*axša-ina- o \*a-xšai-na-?. *AION-L* 3. 1-39.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1927. Afghan *ōspana* “fer”. *MSL*. 23(10). 132-133.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1954. Notes avestiques. In *ASIATICA. Festschrift Friedrich Weller Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, 30-34. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

- Buyaner, David B. 2013. O toxarskom nazvanii železa (On the Tokharian designation of iron). In S. Tokhtasev & P. Luria (eds.), *Commentationes Iranicae. Vladimiro f. Aaron Livschits nonagenario donum natalicium*, 608-613. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija.
- Cabолоv, R. L. 2001. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' kurdsogo jazyka*, vol. 1 (a-m). Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
- Charpentier, J. 1928. Some remarks on Pashto etymology. *AO*. 7. 80-197.
- Danka, I. R. & K. T. Witczak. 1997. Indo-European \**ḱwn̥Hos* and its meanings in the Neolithic and post-Neolithic times. *JIES* 25 (3-4). 361-369.
- Ėdel'man, D. I. 1986. *Sravnitel'naja grammatika vostočnoiranskix jazykov. Fonologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Geiger, Wilhem. 1893. Etymologie and Lautlehre des Afghanischen. In *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie den Wissenschaften* 20, I Cl. München: Verlag der königlichen Akademie.
- Gershevitch, I. 1965. Dialect Variation in Early Persian. *TPS* 1964. 1-29.
- Henning, W. B. 1963. The Kurdish Elm. *Asia Major* 10. . 68-72.
- Henning, W. B. 1965. A Grain of Mustard. *AION-L* 1965. 29-47.
- Hübschmann, H. 1895. *Persische Studien*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Ivanov, V. V. 1977. K istorii drevnix nazvanij metallov v južno-balkanskom, maloazijskom i sredizemnomorskom arealax. In *Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie. Antičnaja balkanistika i sravnitel'naja grammatika*, 3-27. Moskva: Nauka.
- Klingenschmitt, G. 2000. Mittelpersisch. In B. Forssman & R. Plath (eds.), *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen*, 191-229. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag [Reprint: G. Klingenschmitt. 2005. In M. Janda, R. Lühr, J. Matzinger & S. Schaffner (eds.), *Aufsätze zur Indogermanistik*, 465-509. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač].
- MacKenzie, D. N. 1971. *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Mann, O. 1906. *Die Mundart der Mukri-Kurden. Teil I. Grammatische Skizze, Texte in phonetischer und persischer Umschrift*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
- Miller, V. F. 2004. *Studi ossseti*. P. Ognibene (ed.). Milan: Mimesis (Italian translation of: Miller, V. F. 1887. *Osetinskije étjudy* 3. Moskva).
- Morgenstierne, G. 1927. *Etymological vocabulary of Pashto*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1928. Notes on Professor Carpentier's article. AO 7. 198-200.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1938. *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*, vol. 2. Oslo: H. Aschehoug and Co.
- Müller, F. 1891. Bemerkungen über die Zendalphabete und die Zendschrift. – Neupersische, armenische und pahlawi Etymologien. WZKM 5(2). 250-270.
- Nyberg, H. S. 1974. *A Manual of Pahlavi. Part II: Glossary*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rastorgueva, V. S. & D. I. Ėdel'man. 2000. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov*, vol. 1 (a-ā). Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
- Rastorgueva, V. S. & D. I. Ėdel'man. 2007. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov*, vol. 3 (f-h). Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
- Steblin-Kamenskij, I. M. 1985. Nazvanie paxotnogo orudija v pamirskix jazykax. In *Iranskoe Jazykoznanie 1981*, 154-170. Moskva: Nauka.
- Steblin-Kamenskij, I. M. 1999. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' vaxanskogo jazyka*. St.-Petersburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie.
- Tremblay, X. 2005. Irano-Tocharica et Tocharo-Iranica. BSOAS. 68(3). 421-449.
- Trubačev, O. N. 1967. Iz slavjano-iranskix leksičeskix otnošenij. In *Ėtimologija 1965*, 3-81. Moskva: Nauka.
- Vasmer, M. 1923. *Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnsitze der Slaven. I. Die Iranier in Südrussland*. Leipzig: Markert & Petters.
- Witczak, K. T. 2005. Notes on the *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Languages*, Vol. I. *Studia Iranica* 34. 281-288.





## **Avestan Texts in Context: Fragments Westergaard 6 and 7 and the Paragnā**

Alberto Cantera

In his edition of the Avestan texts, N. L. Westergaard included some miscellaneous fragments, known today as Fragments Westergaard (FrW).<sup>1</sup> They are short texts of different origins that do not belong to the standard inventory of the Long Liturgy, the Yašts or the Xorde Avesta. As is well known, K. F. Geldner did not include all the texts from Westergaard's edition in his revised edition of the Avestan texts.<sup>2</sup> Fragments Westergaard are part of the texts left out. According to R. Schmitt (1993: vii), Geldner included only the texts that the Pārsis still used ritually. In fact, Fragments Westergaard contain at least three texts that were used ritually, and two of them (the ones considered in this paper) are still used among the Pārsis.

J. Darmesteter (1892: 3.2) gives FrW 2 the title Yašt to 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 (Freydun), although it is actually dedicated to the *frauuaši* of 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀. This “fragment” is clearly a complete ritual text because of its beginning and ending. The beginning of all ritual texts includes the recitation of three Aṣəm Vohū followed by a Frauuarāne that indicates the *ratu* in which the ceremony is celebrated and its dedicatory, followed by the dialogued recitation of the Ahuna Vairiia. At the end, two Ahuna

---

<sup>1</sup> Bartholomae used the abbreviation *FrW* (Fragments Westergaard).

<sup>2</sup> For the complete list, see S. R. Schmitt (1993: viii).

Vairiia are recited, followed by the formula *yasnəmca vahməmca aōjasca zauuarəca āfrīnāmi* with the same dedicatory of the initial Frauuarāne. The whole is closed by one Aṣəm Vohū, and sometimes by the same texts that we find at the end of the Yasna. FrW 2 follows this pattern exactly (like all the Yašts), and is most definitely a complete ritual that could be celebrated independently. In Westergaard's edition, only the introduction (FrW 2.1) and the very short middle section (FrW 2.2) are included. Unfortunately, we do not know why or when this Yašt was celebrated.<sup>3</sup>

FrW 5 contains a special dedicatory in the two usual variants—in the genitive and the accusative—so that its ritual character is clear. The manuscript 84 that belongs to Kurosh Niknām and is published in the Avestan Digital Archive by D. Martínez-Troya includes, at the end, after the Sīrōzag, one section of the Paragnā and a series of instructions for the celebration of the Drōn at each of the five parts of the day. In the last one we discover that FrW 5 is just the dedicatory recommended for the celebration of a Drōn during the first section of the night, at *aīβisrūθrima*.

Westergaard's incomplete edition of fragments 6 and 7 partially conceals the fact that they, too, are complete rituals that are still celebrated in modern times among the Pārsis. He edits FrW 6 as follows:

*frauuarāne. gāh ānce bid agar gāw yā gospanđ yek bid gēuš.  
tašne. gēuš. urune. tauua. gēuš. huđāñhō. urune. xšnaoθra. y.  
v. x. f. yaθā. ahū. vairiō. agar do bid gēuš. tašne. gēuš. urune.  
yauuākəm. gēuš. huđāñhō. urune. xšnaoθra. y. v. x. f. yaθā.  
ahū. vairiō. agar se bid ayā gale bid gēuš. tašne. gēuš. urune.  
yūšmākəm. gēuš. huđāñhō. urune. xšnaoθra. y. v. x. f. yaθā. ahū.  
vairiō. (Westergaard 1852: 333)*

<sup>3</sup> The Rivāyat of Šāpur Bharuchi (Dhabhar 1932: 278) mentions a Yasna of Hōm with the dedicatory to Freyduin in order to avoid famine. If someone is frightened by a dream, he should celebrate a Yasna of Ardafawahr with the same dedicatory, and the same ceremony is to be celebrated for avoiding sickness.

It consists of a Frauuarāne of a ritual with the usual indication (in Persian in this case) that the corresponding daily *ratu*<sup>4</sup> has to be completed, and then three alternative dedicatories depending on the number of animals being used. As we shall see in due course, this Frauuarāne with an alternating dedicatory depending on the number of animals is the beginning of the ritual for obtaining the milk that is used as consecrated milk in the Long Liturgy and in other rituals (*nirang-e ġām doxtan*).

It is even more difficult to recognize FrW 7 as a ritual from the indications provided by Westergaard. He edits it as follows:

FrW 7.1

*aiβiiō van<sup>u</sup>hibiiō vīspanəmca apəm mazdaδātanəm bərəzatō  
ahurahe nafəδrō apəm apasca mazdaδātaiiā tauua ahurāne  
ahurahe xšnaoθra y. v. x. f. yaθā ahū vairiiō*

FrW 7.2

*frā. te staomaide ahurāne ahurahe vanhūš yasnqasca vahmqasca  
hubərətīšca vaṇta bərətīšca yazatanəm θβā ašaonəm kuxšnīša  
us bī barāmi raθβasca bərəzatō gāθāšca srāuuaiiōi<sup>†</sup> (Westergaard  
1852: 333)*

The final formula (*xšnaoθra y. v. x. f. + yaθā ahū vairiiō*) characterizes the dedicatory as belonging to a Frauuarāne similar to the one in FrW 6 and all the other Frauuarānes with a dedicatory.<sup>5</sup> In fact, the combination of dedicatory with *xšnaoθra yasnāi vahmāi xšnaoθrāi frasastaiiaēca* + Ahuna Vairiia appears only in the Frauuarānes. The dedicatory is governed by *xšnaoθra...* as well in the *āuuāēdaiiamahi*-sections (e.g., Y4.23, 24.28, VrS33.23 in the Long Liturgy), but is never then followed by the Ahuna Vairiia, except in the Frauuarānes. Accordingly, it is very likely that FrW 7.2 is the middle section of a

<sup>4</sup>For this see Cantera 2015: 75 ff.

<sup>5</sup>All but the interior Frauuarānes of the Long Liturgy (Cantera 2015: 82 ff.).

minor ceremony beginning with a Frauuarāne (FrW 7.1 once the missing parts have been added) and ending with the corresponding final section (not edited by Westergaard). This is, indeed, confirmed by the Nērangestān and the manuscripts. FrW 7 is simply an incomplete edition of the ritual for taking the water to be used in the Long Liturgy and in other minor rituals (*nirang-e zur gereftan*).

### 1. FrW 6 and 7 in the Nērangestān

One of the most important contributions to our knowledge of the history and evolution of the Zoroastrian rituals has been the publication of the Nērangestān by F. M. Kotwal and G. Kreyenbroek between 1992 and 2004. This is a treasure trove of information about the Zoroastrian rituals that is now readily accessible for the first time. It contains FrW 6 and 7 in a more complete form than in Westergaard's edition and, even more importantly, in their respective ritual contexts. Both texts are recited during the taking of the two main components of the libation (Av. *zaōθrā*, Phl. *zōhr*): milk and water. Furthermore, they are quoted almost in their entirety: with the initial Frauuarāne and the middle section. The closing section (*yasnəmca ... āfrīnāmī*) is never included in the description of the rituals of the Nērangestān since it is perfectly predictable. The complete Avestan texts of these two rituals appear, however, in the manuscripts (§3&4). In the Nērangestān, both rituals are described within the context of the ritual instructions for the performance of the Āb-zōhr, or libations to the waters, but in different parts of the Nērangestān.

FrW 6 is quoted in the description of the ritual for obtaining the milk called *gqm jīuuiiqm* in Avestan and *ḡwām* or *ḡām* in Middle Persian. It is subsequently used for the *zōhr*, the libation, together with water. Furthermore, it is also used for the preparation of *haōma* during the Hōmāst of the Long Liturgy. The resulting *haōma* is called *\*haōma \*yō gauua*<sup>6</sup> “the *haōma* with milk”. This ritual is described in the Nērangestān (N49.14 [DH 137r.13 ff.; TD 92v.9 ff.]) as follows (Kotwal and Kreyenbroek 2003: 224 f.):

<sup>6</sup> Mss. *haomaiiō gauua* (Hoffmann 1975: 475 ff.).

ka jīw girēd ā-š bē war gōspand sawiṣn u-š abestāg pad war ī gōspand gōwiṣn <i>aṣəm vohu</i> 3 <i>frauuarāne</i> čē gāh dārēd <i>gəuṣ tašne gəuṣ urune</i> ka ēk <i>tauua gəuṣ hudāṇhō urune</i> ka 2 <i>yauuākəm gəuṣ</i> ka-š abēr juttar nēst <i>xšnaōθra</i> u-š wāž frāz gīrišnīh	When one obtains the consecrated milk, one should first go to a cow. Near the cow he should recite the following Avestan text: Aṣəm Vohū three times and the Frauuarāne that contains the section of the part of the day (with the dedicatory) <i>gəuṣ tašne gəuṣ urune</i> ; when there is one cow, <i>tauua gəuṣ hudāṇhō</i> <i>urune</i> , but <i>yauuākəm gəuṣ</i> when there are two. When there are more, it makes no difference. Then (he recites) <i>xšnaōθra</i> ( <i>yasnāi vahmāi</i> <i>xšnaōθrāica frasataiiaēca</i> ) and he should take the wāž.
gōspand] add ud zōhr G42. <i>hudāṇhō</i> . <i>urune</i> ] <i>hudāṇhō urunō</i> HJ, G42	
u-š <i>aša.sara mananḡha</i> bē gōwiṣn u-š hamē gōspand bē āyēd <i>aša.sara</i> <i>vacanḡha aša.sara šīiaōθana</i>	He should recite <i>aša.sara mananḡha</i> , and he goes to the cow (reciting) <i>aša.sara vacanḡha</i> <i>aša.sara šīiaōθana</i> .

There are two important differences regarding Westergaard's edition. First, the Nērangestān explicitly excludes the possibility of a different dedicatory when the milk is taken from more than two animals. This possibility appears, however, in Westergaard's edition (and in the manuscripts themselves). Secondly, it includes the middle section *aša.sara mananḡha aša.sara. vacanḡha. aša.sara. šīiaōθana* "through the thought that puts in connection with Order, through the word that puts in connection with Order and through the action that puts in connection with Order", which is missing in Westergaard's edition. The likely reason for its omission is that the same text appears in Yt 11.4. However, our text is unlikely to be a quotation of Yt 11.4. Both are seemingly independent quotations of the same text, a kind of *mąθra* that accompanies risky actions and ensures they are performed according to Order.

FrW 7 is mentioned in a different section of the Nērangestān, but one that also concerns the Āb-zōhr. According to N30.10, FrW 7 is recited while drawing from a stream or spring the water that is going to be used for preparing the libations (*zaōθrā*) once mixed with the consecrated milk. In the Long Liturgy, the water is used also for preparing the *haōma* (N30.10 [DH 99v.10 ff.; TD68r.8 ff.]) (Kotwal and Kreyenbroek 2003: 133):

<p>ka zōhr stānēd ā-š pad war ī āb  šawišn u-š abastāg pad war &lt;ī&gt;  āb gōwēd  <i>ašəm vohū 3 frawarānē</i>  <i>čē gāh dārēd aiβiiō</i>  <i>vanhubiiō vispanqmca apqm</i>  <i>mazdađātānqm bərəzatō</i>  <i>ahurahe nafōdrō apqm apasca</i>  <i>mazdađātaiiā tauua ahurāne</i>  <i>ahurahe xšnaōθra yasnāica tā</i>  <i>frasastaiiaēca</i>  u-š wāž frāz gīrišnīh  <i>frātē staōmaide ahurāne ahurahe</i>  <i>vanjhēuš yasnqasca vahmqasca</i>  <i>hubərətīšca ušta. bərətīšca vaŋta.</i>  <i>bərətīšca yazatanqm abar āb</i>  <i>θβā andar ward&lt;ēn&gt;nišn</i>  <i>ašaōnqm pādyāb andak-ē andar</i>  <i>kunišn kuxšnūša purr bē kunišn</i>  <i>usbibarāmi az āb ul dārišn</i>  <i>raθβasca bərəzatō andar rāh-ē</i>  <i>gāθāšca srāuuaiiōiθ ān gyāg kē</i>  bē nihēd</p>	<p>“When he takes the <i>zōhr</i>, he should move in the direction of the water and recite these Avestan texts near the water: <i>Ašəm Vohū</i> three times; then the <i>Frauarāne</i> that contains the section of the part of the day (with the dedicatory) <i>aiβiiō</i> <i>vanhubiiō vispanqmca apqm mazdađātānqm bərəzatō ahurahe nafōdrō apqm apasca mazdađātaiiā tauua ahurāne ahurahe xšnaōθra yasnāica</i> until <i>frasastaiiaēca</i>. And he should take the <i>wāž</i> (and recite) above the water: <i>frātē staōmaide ahurāne ahurahe vanjhēuš yasnqasca vahmqasca hubərətīšca ušta. bərətīšca vaŋta. bərətīšca yazatanqm</i>. At <i>θβā</i> he should turn (the <i>Hōm</i> cups) face down. At <i>ašaōnqm</i> he should fill them with a little consecrated water. At <i>kuxšnūša</i> he should fill them completely. At <i>usbibarāmi</i> he should lift them fully out of the water. (He recites) <i>raθβasca bərəzatō</i> on the way and <i>gāθāšca srāuuaiiōiθ</i> at the place where he puts them down.”</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The *Nērangestān* confirms our supposition: FrW 7.1 is the dedicatory to a *Frauarāne*. Furthermore, it gives detailed ritual instructions about the action accompanying the recitation of the middle section.

## 2. The Paragnā

The consecrated water is an essential element for the performance of the Long Liturgy, and so it is the consecrated milk. The latter is, used for the preparation of the *haōma* during the *Hōmāst*. Consequently, these two rituals are always performed during the *Paragnā*, the preliminary rites before the celebration of the Long Liturgy, as already noted by Darmesteter (1892: 3.6-7). The *Paragnā* is an essential component of Zoroastrian ritual life, and contains several specific texts and text combinations that are not recited elsewhere. The oldest description of the *Paragnā* is to be found again in the *Nērangestān* (N28-28.16), although strikingly it does not mention the rituals during which FrW 6 and 7 are recited.

It has never been edited in the West. The only editions available are contained in the complete descriptions of the Long Liturgy published at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Bombay for use by priests. The most famous edition is the *Yasna bā Nirang* published by Tahmuras Dinshaji Anklesaria in Bombay in 1888. Darmesteter's description (1892: 1. lxxiiiff.) is a translation of Anklesaria's instructions in Gujarati. There is also a description in Persian, published in Bombay by Bahman Keyxōsrō Kermani, under the patronage of the famous Dastur Namdar Šahryār (Keyxōsrō Kermani 1893). Although written in Persian, it was composed under the influence of Indian ritual practice, and these influences are readily apparent in the edition. There are also some complete descriptions based mainly on modern practice; worth mentioning are the descriptions by Modi (1922: 251ff.) and, more recently, by Kotwal and Boyd (1977).

The Paragnā does not appear in the manuscripts as profusely as the main variants of the Long Liturgy. Nevertheless, it appears at the beginning of many Indian Yasna liturgical manuscripts.<sup>7</sup> I have found it in the following ones: 100 (B3), 110 (K11), 230 (L17), 231, 234, 235.<sup>8</sup> We may clearly distinguish between two different groups, about one hundred years apart from each other, representing the local traditions of Baroach and Surat. On the one hand, we have manuscript 100 (B3) and its copy 230 (L17). The former was copied in 1556 on the basis of the exegetical ms. 510 (K5) of Mihrābān Kayxōsrō, but converted into a liturgical manuscript through the ritual knowledge of the scribe Ardašīr Zīvā (Cantera 2014: 152). Since the Paragnā does not appear in its original, we can confidently assume that the Paragnā reproduced in these manuscripts represents the liturgical practice of the 16<sup>th</sup> century in Baroach. On the other hand, we have a group of manuscripts that are related to each other, although their exact interdependence is not clear. The oldest seems to be ms. 110 (K11), which has been attributed to Dārāb Hirā Čāndā by Jaime Martínez Porro (2013) on the basis

<sup>7</sup> A shorter Paragnā for the Drōn Yašt appears in some manuscripts including several celebrations of this ceremony, such as manuscripts J4 and R110.

<sup>8</sup> For a short description of the sigla, see Cantera 2014: 403ff. For a longer description of each manuscript, see Hintze 2012.



of palaeographic and orthographic observations. These locate the manuscript in Surat around the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. All these manuscripts reveal an Iranian influence,<sup>9</sup> albeit to varying degrees, but they are also heavily influenced by liturgical practice in India at that time (Cantera 2014: 50). We thus know of the performance of the Paragnā in Baroach in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and in Surat in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. There are few differences between the two.

Unfortunately, the transmission of the Paragnā in Iran is not so clear. The scarce Iranian Yasna manuscripts do not usually include a description of the Paragnā.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, in the late Yasna manuscript belonging to Kurosh Niknām (ms. 84), mentioned above, we find at the end, after the two Sīrōzag that follow the Yasna, a Paragnā or a section of the Paragnā.<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, we know the Iranian version of the Paragnā thanks to the Persian Rivāyats. In 1516 (885 Y.E.), which is to say, probably shortly before ms. 110 (K11) was copied, a group of Iranian priests answered the questions posed by their Indian colleagues concerning, among others, the performance of the Paragnā. This Rivāyat is known as the Rivāyat of Ġāsā, after the name of the Indian messenger who brought the letter.<sup>12</sup> Although the original letter written by the Iranian priests has been lost, we know of it through two different witnesses. Firstly, some

<sup>9</sup> This was already assumed by Geldner for 110 (K11) (Geldner 1886: 1 xxxviff.).

<sup>10</sup> On Iranian manuscripts of the Yasna, see Cantera 2014: 108, 115ff.

<sup>11</sup> The text includes a description of many of the rituals described in the Paragnā, but not all and also not exactly in the typical order of the Indian manuscripts. For the usual succession of rituals in the Paragnā, see Appendix 1 at the end of this paper. In ms. 83, the rituals described are as follows:

1. Taking of the waters (*zur gereftan*)
2. Cutting of the barsom (*barsom čīdan*)
3. Tying of the barsom (*barsom bandid*)
4. Washing of the barsom (*barsom šostan*)
5. Washing of the *hōm* twigs

After a section break, there follows a description of the celebration of the Drōn in the five parts of the day. Therefore, we could suppose that it is a Paragnā for the Drōn. However, the Paragnā of the Drōn usually consists only of the ceremony for cutting the barsom twigs. Therefore, the Paragnā of ms. 84 could be one for the Long Liturgy, but it does not seem to be complete.

<sup>12</sup> On this Rivāyat see Vitalone (1987: 8).

Indian copies of this letter are extant. I have been able to consult one copy that appears as the third part of the famous codex K7 in the Royal Library in Copenhagen (K7c fol. 1ff.). Further copies are to be found in manuscripts T32 and T33 in the Meherjirana Library and in Suppl. Pers. 47 of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, but unfortunately I have not been able to consult them. Furthermore, its section on the Paragnā was included in the compilation of Rivāyats made by Dārāb Hormazdyār at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>13</sup> Dārāb Hormazdyār himself made three copies: one manuscript in the possession of Unvala that is the basis for his lithographed edition (Unvala 1922: 1. 4676ff.) (copied in 1692); a second manuscript that is held by the Bombay University Library (BU 2.372ff.) (copied between 1678 and 1679), and a third belonging to Shapurji Hormusji Hodivala (copied between 1673 and 1674). I have consulted only the lithographed edition of Unvala (quoted under sigla U) and the manuscript in Bombay (BU).

Additionally, FrW 7 is also included in the Rivāyat of Kāmdin Šāpur written in 1559 (928 Y.E.).<sup>14</sup> He describes the performance of a Widewdad ceremony, but indicates that since water cannot be drawn during the night, this section of the Paragnā must be performed at *uzayeirin* the day before, and gives some indication about the performance of this ritual. Hence, it offers a further witness for FrW 7. There are numerous copies of this Rivāyat: T31 and F45 of the Meherjirana Library; Suppl. Pers. 50 of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and M12 of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München. Unfortunately, I have not been able to consult them for this paper. Since this section was also included in Dārāb Hormazdyār's compilation, I have used the same copies of his compilation as for the Rivāyat of Ġāsā (except ms. K7), but in this case I quote them as U<sup>RKS</sup> (Unvala 1922: 1.464ff.) and BU<sup>RKS</sup> (BU 2.369ff.).

In sum, for the Paragnā we have, on the one hand, Indian manuscripts, some of which are influenced by the Iranian tradition that arrived in India in the form of Rivāyats during the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and, on the other hand, a single copy in a late Yasna manuscript and

<sup>13</sup> On this Rivāyat see Vitalone (1987: 20).

<sup>14</sup> On this Rivāyat see Vitalone (1987: 10f.).

Indian copies of the Rivāyats describing the Iranian practice, albeit with some Indian palaeographic and orthographic features (and perhaps also performative features).

The description of the Paragnā in the Rivāyats is slightly more complete than in the Indian manuscripts, but basically similar. Appendix 1 provides an overview of the description of the Paragnā in the different sources. The Indian manuscripts begin at a later point than the Rivāyats—with the milking of the *ḡwām*—and omit the cutting of the *barsom* twigs, for in India already at the time of the production of the oldest manuscripts, the *barsom* was composed of metal wires instead of plant twigs.

The Paragnā consists of two well-defined sections: the first part is the gathering of the different implements, which are taken from different places and brought to the sacrificial area. They are collected in this order: first, the *barsom* twigs are cut, then the pomegranate twigs, the milk for the *ḡwām* is subsequently obtained, the hair for the *waras* is cut, and finally, they draw the water. The second part is celebrated in the *yazišnḡāh*, and consists of the preparation of the *parāhaōma* complemented by the tying of the *barsom*.

Most rituals are accompanied by an Avestan text that presents the structure I mentioned at the beginning of the essay; that is, they open with a Frauuarāne and end with the *yasnəmca ... āfrīnāmi* section. The only exception is the cutting of the pomegranate twigs, which consists simply of the threefold repetition of *xšnaōθra ahurahe mazdā* plus Aṣəm Vohū. Most of the rituals are introduced by a Frauuarāne with the dedicatory to Ahura Mazdā. In such a case, the middle section consists solely of different combinations of recitations of Aṣəm Vohūs and Ahuna Vairias. Thus, the washing of the *haōma*-twigs is made during the recitation of four Aṣəm Vohūs.

Only five rituals in the Paragnā have a specific dedicatory. They usually have a middle section that includes different texts other than combinations of Aṣəm Vohū and Ahuna Vairia. The only exception is the washing of the *haōma* twigs. It is dedicated to *haōma*, but its middle section consists of just four Aṣəm Vohūs. The other four have a specific middle section. The cutting of the *barsom* twigs is done under

the dedicatory to the plant (*uruuarā*). The middle section is very short: *nəmō uruuaire vañhi mazdadāte ašaōni* plus one *Ašəm Vohū*. The antiquity of this ritual for cutting the *barsom* is assured by V19.17-19:

<i>pərəsaṭ zaraθuštrō ahurəm mazdqm dātō vañhən ahura mazda kana yasna yazāne kana yasna frāiiāzāne imaṭ dāma yaṭ ahurahe mazdā</i>	Zaraθuštra asked Ahura Mazda: “Giver of goods, with which sacrifice should I sacrifice, with which sacrifice should I sacrifice solemnly to the creatures of Ahura Mazda?”
<i>āaṭ mraōt ahurō mazdā uruuaraṇqm uruθmiiāṇqm auua jasāhi spitama zaraθuštra srīra urusta amauuaiti imaṭ vacō framrū nəmō uruuaire vañhi mazdadāte *ašaōni ašəm vohū vahištəm astī ...</i>	Ahura Mazda said: “You should go to the burgeoning plants, o Spitama Zaraθuštra, reciting the following: ‘O beautiful (plant) grown and powerful. Homage to you, o good plant, created by Mazda, supporter of Order. <i>ašəm vohū vahištəm astī</i> ...’
<i>barəsma hē uzbāraiiā aēšō.drājō yauuō.fraθō mā.hē barəsma pairi kərətəm pairi.kərəntiš.<sup>15</sup> [narō aṇhən ašauuanō] hāuuōiia zasta niiāsəmnō yazəmnō ahurəm mazdqm ...</i>	He takes out a <i>barəsman</i> of the length of a ploughshare and of the width of a yoke; you should not cut a <i>barəsman</i> that is already cut [thus are men supporters of Order], holding it with the left hand and making a sacrifice to Ahura Mazda ...

After the encounter with Anhra Mainiiu, Zaraθuštra asks Ahura Mazda how he should perform a sacrifice for the creatures of Ahura Mazda. The answer describes exactly the ritual of cutting the *barsom* twigs as it appears in the descriptions of the Paragnā (K7c 3f.) (Unvala 1922b: 1.466 & 1.467):

<sup>15</sup> The form is difficult to interpret. Perhaps a corruption of *pairi.kərəntōiš* (Kellens 1984: 169).

<p>pas har do dast barsom-čîn b-ân âb šostan yek šâh-e barsom be-dast-e râst be-gereftan wa sar-aš be-daste-čab wa barsom-čîn be-gereftan wa se bâr namâz bordan pas</p> <p><i>xšnaōθra ahurahe mazdā ašəm vohū 3 frauuarāne gāh ānče bid uruuaraiiā vañhuiiā mazdaδātaiiā ašaōñiiā xšnaōθra yasnāica ... frasastaiiāēca yaθā ahū vairiio zaōtā... mraōtū</i></p>	<p>Then, he washes both his hands and the <i>barsom-čîn</i> with consecrated water. He takes one twig of the <i>barsom</i> with his right hand and its end and the <i>barsom-čîn</i> with his left hand and he praises three times. Then (he recites) <i>xšnaōθra ahurahe mazdā ašəm vohū 3 frauuarāne</i> with the corresponding section of the part of the day <i>uruuaraiiā vañhuiiā mazdaδātaiiā ašaōñiiā xšnaōθra yasnāica ... frasastaiiāēca yaθā ahū vairiio zaōtā ... mraōtū</i>.</p>
<p><b>do]</b> add pas U. <b>be-gereftan]</b> gereftan RJ. <b>se]</b> om. K7. <b>uruuaraiiā]</b> uruuaraiiā U, U<sup>RKS</sup>. <b>ašaoniiā]</b> vīša nagirand U<sup>RKS</sup>.</p>	
<p><i>nəmō. uruuaire. *vañhi mazdaδāte *ašaōni<sup>16</sup></i>  urwar wa dār wa deraxt tamām be-negarand wa be  <i>ašəm</i> sar-e šâh-e barsom boridan wa meqdâr-e êk dâne-e ġou dur afgandan pas <i>vohū</i> barsom-čîn bar miyân-e barsom nihādan pas <i>vahištəm</i> teke-ye barsom boridan pas <i>astī uštā astī uštā amāi</i>. tā sar xāndan  se šâh-e barsom b-in dastur âwāyad čidan pas har čand ke xāhand cinand hame-rā yek-yek bar âwāyad boridan ...</p>	<p><i>nəmō. uruuaire. *vañhi mazdaδāte *ašaōni</i>  He carefully examines the plant, the wood and the tree.  At <i>ašəm</i> he cuts the end of the <i>barsom</i> twig and he throws it away (as) a corn of barley. Then (at) <i>vohū</i> he puts the <i>barsom-čîn</i> in the middle of the <i>barsom</i>. Then with <i>vahištəm</i> he cuts a piece of the <i>barsom</i> and then recites <i>astī uštā astī uštā amāi</i> up to the end.  He must cut three twigs of the <i>barsom</i> in this way. Then he must cut twig by twig, as many twigs as they want to cut. ...</p>
<p><b>uruuaire]</b> urauuariiāē U. uruuai U<sup>RKS</sup>. <b>vañhi]</b> <i>vañhe</i> K7 (pr.m.), U. <i>auuañhe</i> U<sup>RKS</sup>. <i>avañhe</i> K7 (sec.m.). <b>mazdaδāte]</b> <i>mazdaδatahe</i> U, U<sup>RKS</sup>. <b>ašaōni]</b> <i>ašaone</i> K7, U, U<sup>RKS</sup>. <b>sar-e šâh-e ... afgandan pas]</b> yek ġou-ye barsom bordan U<sup>RKS</sup>.</p>	
<p><i>yaθā ahū vairiio (2)</i>  <i>yasnəmca vahməmca aōjasca zauuarəca āfrināmi uruuaraiiā vañhuiiā mazdaδātaiiā +ašaōñiiā</i></p>	<p><i>yaθā ahū vairiio (2)</i>  <i>yasnəmca vahməmca aōjasca zauuarəca āfrināmi uruuaraiiā vañhuiiā mazdaδātaiiā +ašaōñiiā</i></p>

<sup>16</sup> °e in all manuscripts.

They agree even in the details. The same texts have to be recited and the *barsom* should even be held with same hand, the left one.

The preparation of the Parāhōm, the last and most important procedure of the Paragnā, is introduced by a Frauuarāne with the dedicatory to the *frauuaši* of Zaraθuštra. Its middle section is a variant of the Hōmāst as celebrated in the Long Liturgy that ends with the final *wāž*, again with the dedicatory to the Frauuaši of Zaraθuštra. The other complete rituals that are performed with a dedicatory that is not to Ahura Mazdā and whose middle sections do not consist of Aṣəm Vohū and Ahuna Vairiia are the milking of the *jiwām* (*nirang-e ġām doxtan*) and the drawing of the water (*nirang-e zur gereftan*), that is, the rituals described in FrW 6 and 7.

### 3. FrW 6 (*nirang-e ġām doxtan*) in the Paragnā

This ritual is described in its complete form exclusively in the manuscripts of the Paragnā, whereas the Nērangestān includes only the opening and the middle section and Westergaard includes only the Frauuarāne of the opening. Beside the ritual instructions are more detailed in the Rivāyats than in the Nērangestān. The Rivāyat of Ġāsā describes the ritual as follows:

nirang ġām duxtan (K7c 10 f.; BU 2.373; U 1.470 f.)	Nirang for the milking of the consecrated milk.
<p>naxost gāw yā gusfand āwardan yā be gale-ye išan šodan wa ġāmdān rā se bār b-āb pād̄yāwi šostan wa dast be gāw nahādan</p> <p><i>ašəm vohū</i> se guftan</p> <p><i>frauuarāne</i> gāh ānce bid <i>gəuš tašne</i> <i>gəuš urune tauua gəuš hudāñhō urune xšnaōθra</i> y.v.x.f.</p> <p><i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā mrūtē</i></p> <p><i>aθā ratuš ašātciṭ haca frā ašauua viḏuuā mraōtū</i></p> <p>agar do bid <i>gəuš tašne gəuš urune yauuākəm gəuš hudāñhō urune xšnaōθra</i> y.v.x.f.</p> <p><i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā tā sār mraōtū</i></p> <p>agar se bid <i>gəuš tašne gəuš urune yūšmākəm gəuš hudāñhō urune xšnaōθra</i> y. v. x. f.</p> <p><i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā tā sār mraōtū</i></p>	<p>First he brings a cow or a sheep or he goes to the flock. He washes the container of <i>ġām</i> three times with consecrated water and places his hand on the cow.</p> <p>He recites three <i>Ašəm Vohū</i> and the <i>Frauuarāne</i> with the corresponding section of the day and (with the dedicatory) <i>gəuš tašne gəuš urune tauua gəuš hudāñhō urune xšnaōθra</i>. y.v.x.f. and <i>yaθā ahū vairiiō ... mraōtū</i>.</p> <p>If there are two: <i>gəuš tašne gəuš urune yauuākəm gəuš hudāñhō urune xšnaōθra</i>. y.v.x.f. and <i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā ... mraōtū</i>.</p> <p>If there are three: <i>gəuš tašne gəuš urune yūšmākəm gəuš hudāñhō urune xšnaōθra</i> y. v. x. f. and <i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā ... mraōtū</i></p>
<p><b>nirang...duxtan</b>] nīrang. ĵam. doxtan. yā] wa U. <b>be</b>] om. K7. <b>rā</b>] om. BU. <b>pād̄yāwi</b>] bād̄yāwi K7. <b>se</b>] 3 BU. <b>guftan</b>] om. U. <b>frauuarāne</b>] frw'r'ny BU. <b>mraōtū1</b>] maraōtū U. marotū BU. <b>xšnaōθra1</b>] xšnoθra BU. <b>xšnaōθra2</b>] xšnaoθra BU. <b>mraōtū2</b>] maraōtū U. marotū BU</p>	
<p>awwal se serešk ō zamin duxtan <i>aša.sara manañha</i> miguyad šir ō ġāmdān miduśad digar <i>aša.sara vacañha</i> miguyad šir andar ġāmdān miduśad digar <i>aša.sara šīiaōθəna</i> miguyad ġām andar ġāmdān miduśad</p>	<p>First, he spills three drops on the floor. He recites <i>aša.sara manañha</i> and pours the consecrated milk into its pitcher. He then recites <i>aša.sara vacañha</i> and pours the consecrated milk into its pitcher. Then he recites <i>aša.sara šīiaōθəna</i> and pours the consecrated milk into its pitcher.</p>
<p><b>aša.sara1</b>] ašasara K7, U. asāsara BU. <b>aša.sara2</b>] ašasara U. aša.sara K7. <b>vacañha</b>] vacññha U. <b>ašasara3</b>] ašasara U. <b>šīiaōθəna</b>] šīiaōθna U</p>	

<p>digar dast-e u be gāw nahāde yā gusfand wa  <i>yaθā ahū vairiō</i> guftan          wa <i>yasnəmca</i> tā sar <i>āfrināmi</i> <i>gəuš tašne</i>  <i>gəuš urune taua gəuš huḍāñhō urune</i>          se tā har kodām be-wāg gerefte bāšand ān          wāg beguyad pas andar yazešgāh bord xod          mohkam nahādan pas durtar āyad yek <i>ašəm</i>  <i>vōhū</i> guftan  <i>ahmāi raēšca</i> ...</p>	<p>Then, after he has put his hand on the cow or sheep, he recites the <i>Yaθā ahū vairiō</i> (2x?) and <i>yasnəmca</i>... <i>āfrināmi gəuš tašne gəuš urune tauua gəuš huḍāñhō urune</i>. (one of) the three (decidatories depending on the circumstances): the same one he used when he has taken the <i>wāz</i>, he has to use it now. Later he brings (the milk) to the <i>yazišngāh</i>, lays it there and goes away. He recites one <i>Ašəm Vohu</i> and <i>Ahmāi raēšca</i>. ...</p>
<p><i>yasnəmca</i>] <i>yasnemča</i> K7. <i>nahādan</i>] <i>nahand</i> BU. <i>ašəm vōhū</i>] <i>ašem wahū</i> K7; U. <i>ahmāi</i>] <i>amāi</i> K7. <i>ahmā</i> U. <i>ahmāi raēšca</i>] <i>ahmārasca</i> BU. <i>raēšca</i>] <i>rasca</i> K7. <i>resca</i> U</p>	

The proper ritual action, the milking, takes place during the recitation of the middle section: the priest first spills three drops of milk onto the floor and then pours it into the *ḡāmdān* once at *aša.sara. mananḡha*, once at *aša.sara vacanḡha* and once at *aša.sara šīiaōθana*.

The Indian manuscripts have the same text for the dedicatory, but without mentioning the three alternative dedicatories:

<p><i>ašəm vohū</i> 3  <i>frauuarāne mazdaiiasnō zaraθuštriš vīdaēuuō ahurō.ṭkaēšō hāuuanē ašaōne ašahe</i>  <i>raθpe yasnāica vahmāica xšnaōθrāica frasastaiiaēca sāuuauḡhē vīšiiāica ašaōne</i>  <i>ašahe raθpe yasnāica vahmāica xšnaōθrāica frasastaiiaēca gəuš tašne gəuš urune</i>  <i>tauua gəuš huḍāñhō urune xšnaōθra yasnāica vahmāica xšnaōθrāi frasastaiiaēca</i>  <i>yaθā ahū vairiō zaōtā frā mē mrūtē aθā ratuš ašācīṭ haca frā ašauua vīduuā mraōtū</i>  <i>frauuarāne</i>] <i>frauuarāni</i> 100, 230. <i>frauuarāni</i> 235. <i>mazdaiiasnō</i>] <i>mazdaiiasnōm</i> 100, 230.  <i>hāuuanē</i>] <i>hāuuanē</i> 235.  <i>ašaōne...</i> <i>frasastaiiaēca</i>] abbr. 110, 230, 234, 235. <i>sāuuauḡhē</i>] <i>sāuuauḡhē</i> 110. <i>sāuuauḡhē</i>          235. <i>frasastaiiaēca</i>] <i>frašaštaiiaēca</i> 100. <i>frasastaiiaēca</i> 110, 234, 235. <i>frašaštaiiaēca</i> 230. <i>tašne</i>          234. <i>tasni</i> 100, 110, 230. <i>tasne</i> 235. <i>urune</i>] <i>urani</i> 100, 230. <i>urune</i>] <i>urunō</i> 100, 235. <i>uranō</i> 230.  <i>xšnaōθra</i>] <i>xšnōθra</i> 230. <i>vīduuā</i>] <i>vīduuām</i> 230. In 100 the page is damaged. <i>mraōtū</i>] <i>maraōtū</i>          230, 235. In 100 the page is damaged.</p>
<p><i>aša.sara. mananḡha. aša.sara. vacanḡha. aša.sara. šīiaōθana.</i></p>
<p><i>ašasara</i>1] <i>ašašara</i> 100, 230. <i>aša.sar</i> 110, 234. <i>ašasara</i>2] <i>ašašara</i> 100, 230. <i>aša.sar</i> 110, 234. <i>asa.sara</i> 235. <i>ašasara</i>3] <i>ašašara</i> 100, 230. <i>aša.sar</i> 110, 234. <i>asa.sara</i> 235</p>
<p><i>yaθā ahū vairiō</i> (2x)  <i>yasnəmca vahməmca aōjasca zauuarəca āfrināmi gəuš tašni gəuš urune tauua gəuš huḍāñhō urune</i></p>



<i>yasnəmca</i> ] <i>yasnəm.ca</i> 230. <i>vahməmca</i> ] <i>vahməm.ca</i> 230. <i>āfrīnāmī</i> ] <i>āfrīnāmī</i> 100, 230. <i>tašni</i> ] <i>tasni</i> 100, 110, 230, 235. <i>tašni</i> 234. <i>urune1</i> ] <i>urunai</i> 100. <i>urani</i> 230. <i>urune2</i> ] <i>urunō</i> 100, 230, 235
<i>hazaṇrəm baēšazanqm baēuuarā baēšazanqm</i>
<i>hazaṇrəm</i> ] <i>hazaṇarəm</i> 100. <i>hazaṇharəm</i> 234, 235. <i>baēšazanqm1</i> ] <i>baēšazanqm</i> 100, 110, 234, 235. <i>baēuuarā</i> ] <i>baiuuara</i> 100. <i>baeuuarā</i> 110, 235. <i>baēšazanqm2</i> ] <i>baēšazanqm</i> 100, 110, 234, 235
<i>ašəm. vohū. (1)</i> <i>ahmāi raēšca x'arənasca ahmāi ...</i>

The three alternatives edited by Westergaard appear thus only in the Rivāyat of Ġāsā. Whereas the Indian manuscripts indicate only one (for a single animal), the Nērangestān allows only the dedicatory with the pronoun in the singular and the dual, and explicitly states that there is no alternative dedicatory if the milk is taken from three animals.

#### 4. FrW 7 (*nirang-e zur gereftan*) in the Paragnā

The Rivāyat of Ġāsā and the Rivāyat of Kāmdin Šāpur describe the ritual action for drawing the waters in a very similar way. The ritual is exactly the same as described in the Nērangestān. There are slight differences in the wording chosen for the ritual instructions in the Nērangestān and in each Rivāyat (for the Nērangestān see above):

Rivāyat Ġāsā (K7c fol. 7ff.; BU 2.375ff.; U 1.471f.)	Rivāyat Kāmdin Šāpur (U <sup>RKS</sup> 1. 465ff.; BU <sup>RKS</sup> 2.371)
FrW 7.1 <i>xšnaōθra ahurahe mazdā</i> <i>ašəm vohū (3) se guftan</i> <i>frauuarāne gāh-e hāwan aiβiiō</i> <i>vanhibiiō vīspanqmca apqm</i> <i>mazdađātānqm bərəzatō ahurahe</i> <i>naḫədrō apqm apasca mazdađātaiiā<sup>17</sup></i> <i>xšnaōθra yasnaica vahmāica</i> <i>xšnaōθrai frasastaiiāēca</i> <i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā tā sar mraōtū</i>	<i>ašəm vohū 3</i> <i>frauuarāne tā sar sāuuānḫē tā sār ayā</i> <i>gāhān bid *** ke ḡuddiwdād gāh-e</i> <i>uzayerin zur bāyad gereftan</i> <i>aiviiō vanhibiiō vīspanqmca apqm</i> <i>mazdađātānqm bərəzatō ahurahe</i> <i>naḫədrō apqm apasca mazdađātaiiā</i> <i>tauua ahurāne ahurahe xšnaōθra y.v. x.f.</i> <i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā tā sar</i>

<sup>17</sup> In the Rivāyat of Ġāsā (*tauua ahurāne ahurahe*) is missing, but it appears in the Nērangestān, the Rivāyat of Kāmdin Šāpur and ms. 84.

<p>gāh-e hāwan ] K7. gāh ānče bid RJ.  <b>vaṇhubiiō</b>] vaṇobiiō K7. <b>višpanq̄mca</b>] <i>višpanq̄m.ca</i> K7. <b>mazdaδātaiiā</b>] <i>mazdaδātiiā</i>          BU. <b>ahurahe. naf̄δdrō</b>] <i>ahurunap̄δdrō</i> BU.</p>	
<p>FrW 7.2  <i>frā.tē staōmaiḍe ahurāne ahurahe          vaṇhīš yasn̄q̄sca vahm̄q̄sca hub̄ərətīscā          uštā.b̄ərətīscā vaṇta.b̄ərətīscā          yazatanq̄m ǝβā ašaōnq̄m kuxšniša          āb andar sukure-ye do tā porr kardan          us.mībarāma se bār sukure andar bālā          wa šeib āwardan pas raθ̄basca b̄ərəzatō          gāθ̄āscā srāuuaiiōiṭ sukure andar ruy-e          sang-e urwis nahādan</i></p>	<p><i>frā.tē staōmaiḍe ahurāne ahurahe          vaṇh̄a yasn̄q̄sca vahm̄q̄sca hub̄ərətīscā          uštā.b̄ərətīscā vaṇta.b̄ərətīscā          yazatanq̄m ǝβā u rā wardešn̄ ašaōnq̄m          pādyāb andaki andar konešn̄ kusnišca          porr bekonišn̄ usbī barāma az āw dārešn̄          raθ̄basca b̄ərəzatō andar rāh gāθ̄āscā          srāuuaiiōiṭ be ḡāi nahešn̄<sup>18</sup></i></p>
<p><b>frā.tē</b>] <i>frāte</i> K7. <i>frātē</i> U, BU. <b>staōmaiḍe</b>] <i>staomaiḍe</i> K7, U. <i>staomaede</i> BU. <b>vaṇhīš</b>] om. BU. <b>hub̄ərətīscā</b>] K7. <i>hubaraetīscā</i> BU. <i>hubaretīmca</i> U. <b>uštā.b̄ərətīscā</b>] K7, BU. <i>uštā.b̄ərətīmca</i> U. <b>vaṇta.b̄ərətīscā</b>] K7, BU. <i>vaṇta.b̄ərətīmca</i> U. <b>kuxšnēša</b>] <i>kuxšnēša</i> K7. <i>auuaxsneša</i> U. <i>uuaxsneša</i> BU</p>	
<p>FrW 7.3  <i>pas yaθā ahū vairiō do guftan          yasn̄mca tā āfrināmi &lt;aiβiiō vaṇhibiiō          višpanq̄mca ap̄qm mazdaδātānq̄m&gt; b̄ərəzatō          ahurahe naf̄δdrō ap̄qm          apasca mazdaδātaiiā wa yek sukure-ye zarr          az dast-e čab-e mähruy benahišn̄</i></p>	
<p><b>āfrināmi</b>] <i>āfrinq̄mi</i> U. <b>āfrināme</b> BU. <b>mazdaδātaiiā</b>] <i>mazdaδātiiā</i> U</p>	

<sup>18</sup> The text of this section is almost identical to Nērangestān 30.11.

<p>FrW 7.1  <i>xšnaōθra ahurahe mazdā</i> He should recite three times the <i>Ašəm Vōhū</i> (and then).  <i>frauuarāne mazdaiiasnō</i> with the section of the part of the day of <i>hāwan</i> (and the dedicatory) <i>aiβiiō vanhibiiō vīspanqmca apqm mazdaδātanqm bərəzatō ahurahe nafəδrō apqm apasca mazdaδātaiiā xšnaōθra yasnaīca vahmāica xšnaōθrāi frasastaiiaēca</i> (and then) <i>yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā</i> up to ... <i>mraōtū</i></p> <p>FrW 7.2  <i>frā.tē staōmaiðe ahurāne ahurahe *vanhī yasnqasca vahmqasca hubərətīasca uštā bərətīasca vaṇta.bərətīasca yazatanqm θβā ašaōnqm kuxšnēša</i> He should fill the two saucers with water. At <i>†us</i>. <i>mībarāma</i> he should move the saucers up and down three times and then at <i>raθbasca bərəzatō gāθāasca srāuuaiiōiṭ</i> he should put them on the surface of the stone <i>urwīs</i>.</p>	<p>FrW 7.1  (He should recite) three <i>Ašəm Vohū</i> (and then) <i>frauuarāne</i> up to the end and <i>sāuuauḡhē</i> until the end or the corresponding section of the day. If it is a <i>Widēwdād</i>, then they should take the waters in the <i>gāh uzayeyirin</i>, (reciting) <i>aiβiiō vanhibiiō</i> and <i>yaθā ahū vairiiō</i> up to the end.</p> <p>FrW 7.2  <i>frā.tē staōmaiðe ahurāne ahurahe vanhēu yasnqasca vahmqasca hubərətīasca uštā.bərətīasca vaṇta.bərətīasca yazatanqm</i>. At <i>θβā</i> he should turn up the saucers. At <i>ašaōnqm</i> he should pour a bit of consecrated water in them. At <i>kusnišca</i>. he should fill them. At <i>usbī</i>. <i>barāma</i> he should lift them out of the water. (He recites) <i>raθbasca bərəzatō</i> on the way and at <i>gāθāasca srāuuaiiōiṭ</i> he should put them down (on the <i>urwīs</i>).</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The version in ms. 84 is also similar. It is in some regards closer to the version of Rivāyat Kāmdin Šāpur:

āb pādyāb kardan wa sukure-ye zurdān wa sarsāle-ye āb<sup>19</sup> bar dast-e rāst zurdān be-dast-e čab gereftan wa xšnōtre ahurahe mazdā ašem wohu no *frauuarāne* be-gāh-e hāwan wa uzeyerin šāyad

*aiβiiō vanhibiiō vīspanqmca apqm mazdaδātanqm bərəzatō ahurahe nafəδrō apqm apasca mazdaδātaiiā tauua ahurāne ahurahe xšnaōθra* y. v. x. f.

<sup>19</sup> The meaning of *sarsāle* is obscure.

*yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā tā ḡā-ye*  
*frā.tē staōmaide ahurāne ahurahe vanhiš yasnaṣca vahmaṣca*  
*hubəratīsa uštəbəratīsa van̄ta.bəratīsa yazatanəm awar āb<sup>20</sup>*  
*θβā āb ke dar-in zurdān bāšad rixtan ašaōnəm pādyāb andar*  
*dārišn<sup>21</sup> kuxšnīša zurdān <porr> kardan usbī. barāma ač āb ul*  
*dārišn<sup>22</sup> raθβaēca bərazatō andar rāhi gāθāśca srāuuaiiōiṭ ingā*  
*be nahešn*  
*yaθā ahī vairiiō do bār yasnamca. v. aō. z. āf. aiβiiō. vanhībiiō tā*  
*ahurahe*

He cleans the water and the saucer for the *zur* (*zurdān*). He takes the (saucer) *sarsāle-ye āb* with the right hand and the saucer for the *zur* with the left one. He recites *xšaōθra ahurahe mazdā* and three *Ašəm Vohū*. He might (recite) the Frauuarāne for the morning *gāh* or for the afternoon *gāh*.<sup>23</sup>

(He recites then) *yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā* till the passage:

*frā.tē. staōmaide. ahurāne. ahurahe. vanhiš. yasnaṣca. vahmaṣca.*  
*hubəratīsa. uštəbəratīsa. van̄ta.bəratīsa. yazatanəm.* (with the  
 saucer) over the water. At *θβā* he pours the water that is in the  
 saucer for *zur*. At *ašaōnəm kuxšnīša* he pours consecrated water  
 (*pādyāb*) into the saucer for the *zur*. At *†usbī. barāma* he takes  
 out (the saucer for *zur*) from the water. (He recites) *raθβaēca*  
*bərazatō* on the way and at *gāθāśca srāuuaiiōiṭ* he puts (the saucer)  
 there.<sup>24</sup>

He recites *yaθā ahū vairiiō* twice and *yasnamca. v. aō. z. āf. aiβiiō. vanhībiiō* till *ahurahe*.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. N 30.11 *abar āb*.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. N30.11 *pādyāb andak-ē andar kunišn*.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. N30.11 *az āb ul dārišn*.

<sup>23</sup> The water cannot be taken in complete darkness. Therefore, when celebrating a Widēwdād ceremony, they should take the water in the afternoon *gāh* of the former day.

<sup>24</sup> On the *urwis*.

The ms. 84 and the Rivāyat Kāmdin Šāpur are closer to the version of the Nērangestān (N 30.10), whereas the Rivāyat of Ġāsā uses a different vocabulary and is more independent from the Pahlavi version. The latter omits as well the final section of the dedicatory (*tauuu ahurāne ahurahe*). We cannot decide whether it is a transmission error or a ritual variant. All of them describe, however, a ritual very similar to the modern practice as described by Kotwal & Boyd (1977: 26).

There are some textual differences regarding the Avestan text in the different transmission lines. I reproduce here the Avestan text of the middle section as it appears in each transmission line:

ms. 84	Rivāyat Ĝsā	Rivāyat Kāmdin Šapur	Indian manuscripts
<i>frā.tē. staōmaide. ahurāne. ahurāhe. varjhiš. yasnašca. vahmāšca. hubarāfīšca. uštarabarāfīšca. vanīta. barāfīšca. yazatanāqm. 9βā ašāōnqm kuxšnša usbī. barāma raββašca bərəzatō. gāδāšca srāuuiiōiŋ.</i>	<i>frā.tē. staōmaide. ahurāne. ahurāhe. varjhiš. yasnašca. vahmāšca. hubarāfīšca. uštarabarāfīšca. vanīta. barāfīšca. yazatanāqm. 9βā. ašāōnqm. kuxšnša. usmī. barāma. raββašca. bərəzatō. gāδāšca. srāuuiiōiŋ.</i>	<i>frā.tē. staōmaide. ahurāne. ahurāhe. varjhiš. yasnašca. vahmāšca. hubarāfīšca. uštarabarāfīšca. vanīta. barāfīšca. yazatanāqm. 9βā. ašāōnqm. kuxšnša. usbī. barāma. raββašca. bərəzatō. gāδāšca. srāuuiiōiŋ.</i>	<i>frā.tē. staōmaine. ahurāne. ahurāhe. varjhiš. yasnašca. vahmāšca. vohu. yasnašca vahmāšca hubarāfīšca. uštarabarāfīšca. vanīta. barāfīšca. yazatanāqm. 9βāšāōnqm. kasnišca. us. bī. barāni. raββašca. bərəzatō. gāδāšca. srāuuiiōiŋ.</i>
	<i>frā.tē] frāte K7. frātē U, BU. staōmaide] staōmaide K7, U. staōmaide BU. varjhiš] om. BU. hubarāfīšca] K7. hubarāfīšca BU. hubarāfīšca U. uštarabarāfīšca] K7, BU. uštarabarāfīšca U. vanīta. barāfīšca] K7, BU. vanīta. barāfīšca U. kuxšnša] kuxšnša K7. auuaxšneša U. uuaxšneša BU</i>		<i>frā.tē] frātē 110. 234. frātē 230. frā.tē. staōmaine] staōmaine 100 (v.l. staōma sec. man. supr. l. ienī). staōmaiane 110. 234. staōmaiane 230. staōmaiane 234. staōmaiane 235. ahurāne] ahurāni 100. 230. ahaōrāne 231. ahurāni 235. ahurāhe] ahaōre 231. varjhiš] varjhišca 100. varjhišca 230. varjhišca 231. yasnašca] yasnaqm. šca 100. 230. yasnašca 110. itasnašca 235. vahmāšca] vahmāšca 100. 230. vahmāšca 110. vahmāšca 231. hubarāfīšca] hubarāfīm. ca 100. 230. hubarāfīšca 110. hubarāfīšca 234. haō. biritamca 231. hubarāfīšca 235. uštarabarāfīšca] uštarabarāfīm. ca 100. 230. uštarabarāfīšca 110. uštarabarāfīšca 231. uštarabarāfīšca 235. barāfīšca 110. uštarabarāfīšca 234. uštarabarāfīšca 231. uštarabarāfīšca 235. vanīta. barāfīšca] vanīta. barāfīm. ca 100. 230. vanīta. barāfīšca 110. vanīta. barāfīšca 234. vanīta. biritamca 231. vanīta. barāfīšca 235. 9βāšāōnqm] 9βāšāunqm 100. 9βāšunqm 110. 234. 9βāšāonqm 230. 9βāšāonqm 231. 9βšnqm 235. kasnišca] kasnišca[ca] 100. kasnišca 230. kasnišca 110. 231. 234. kasnišca 235. us. bī. barāni] us bī. barāni 100. ašbuiia. varāni 110. 234. ašbuiia. 9βāni 230. ašhi. baōiie, varāna 231. ašbuiia. varāna 235. raββašca] raββašca 100. 230. raββašca 231. bərəzatō] biriti. zatō 231. gāδāšca] gāδāšca 100. 230. gāδāšca 235. srāuuiiōiŋ] srāuuiiōiŋ 231. srāuuiiōiŋ 235</i>

The main difference concerns the object of *frā staōmaide*. The Iranian versions agree with the Nērangestān: *\*vanhūš/vanhūš yasnqasca vahmqsca hubəratīšca ušta.bəratīšca vaṇta.bəratīšca* “the good sacrifices and praises and the good offerings that begin with *uštā* and end with *vaṇtā*”. By contrast, we find a longer variant in the Indian manuscripts. It appears again in two different versions:

A	B	C
<i>vanhūš yasnqasca vahmqsca hubəratīšca ušta.bəratīšca vaṇta. bəratīšca</i>	<i>vanhūš. yasnqasca. vahmqsca. <b>vohū. yasnəmca vəhməmca hubəratīmca. uštā.bəratīmca vaṇta.bəratīmca.</b></i>	<i>vanhūš. yasnqasca. vahmqsca. <b>vohū. yasnəmca vəhməmca. hubəratīšca ušta.bəratīšca vaṇ ta.bəratīšca</b></i>
Nērangestān, RĠ (K7, BU), RKS (BU <sup>RKS</sup> , U <sup>RKS</sup> ), 84	100 (B3), 230 (L17), 231, 235;	110 (K11), 234

Version A has no parallels. The expression *hubəratī- uštā.bəratī- vaṇtā. bəratī* is fairly frequent in Avestan texts, but always appears in the singular as a designation of the offerings to the fire (Y60.8, 62.1.7, 68.15). For the Indian version B we have, by contrast, a parallel in Y60.8 *o yaθa ahmīia aməṣā spənta sraōšāda ašiiāda paitišqn vanhūš yasnqasca vahmqsca vohū yasnəmca vəhməmca hubəratīmca uštəbəratīmca vaṇtabəratīmca ā.darəyāt xʷā.bairiiāt*. Version C seems to be the result of an amalgamation of versions A and B. Since there is no parallel that could easily justify an innovation in version A, this is most likely the original one and version B would be the result of the influence of Y60.8. There may well have been an innovation in Indian ritual practice through the influence of the well-known Dahmā Āfriti. This change had already taken place in ritual practice before the production of ms. 100 (B3) in the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and has remained the standard version until modern times. Consequently, this is the version reproduced by Anklesaria at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and more recently by Kotwal and Boyd in their description of the Paragnā. The manuscripts ms. 110 (K11) and ms. 234, written almost a hundred years

later and in the region of Surat, produced a new version (C) under the influence of the Rivāyat of Ġāsā or Kāmdin Šāpur, or another Iranian manuscript, used perhaps as the original. They have kept the plural form typical of the Iranian manuscripts, but have introduced *vohū yasnəmca vāhməmca*, as is commonplace in Indian liturgical practice. Westergaard reproduced the Iranian version, but surprisingly and, probably by mistake, omits *uštā.bərətīšca*.

Another example of a change in the Indian transmission is the universal reading *staōmaine* for *staōmaiḍe*, most likely under the influence of *mqm staōmaine stūīdi* in Y9.2. The error is common to all Indian manuscripts, including ms. 100 (B3) 230 (L17). It provides another example of the generalisation of a reading in a branch of the transmission, although all the manuscripts in this branch do not necessarily hark back to the same source<sup>25</sup>.

## 5. FrW 6: text, translation and commentary

In general, FrW 6 does not pose any special difficulties either for its edition or for its translation. The main problems lie in the alternative dedicatories. Only the dedicatory in the singular is grammatically correct, whereas in the other two only the number of the pronoun changes. When the addressee of a dedicatory is mentioned through a second-person pronoun, then the referent of the 2.p. might appear either in the genitive, as in Y68.15 (*āfrīnāmi yūšmākəm dahmanqm narqm ašaōnqm*), or, much more frequently, in the vocative<sup>26</sup>: AZ 1:

<sup>25</sup> On this problem s. Cantera 2012: 304 ff.

<sup>26</sup> The vocative is probably the original form also in the dedicatory to the fire (Y72.8, Ny5.17, etc.): *āfrīnāmi* [*āθrō ahurahe mazdā puθra*] *tauua ātarš puθra ahurahe mazdā*. The attested dedicatory shows two ungrammaticalities:

1. The first *puθra* should be in the genitive, agreeing with *āθrō*. This is probably the result of a crossing of the multiple variants. There are the main formulas (in the expected form): a) *āθrō ahurahe mazdā \*puθrahe* (but attested as *āθrō ahurahe mazdā puθra* Y1.12, 22.26, etc.); b) *tauua ātarš puθra ahurahe mazdā* (but attested as *tauua ātarš puθra ahurahe mazdā* Y4.23, 72.8, etc.); c) *tauua āθrō ahurahe mazdā \*puθrahe* (but attested as *āθrō ahurahe mazdā puθra* Y3.14, 21, etc.). The vocative *puθra* is the only attested form in all the variants. Observe that Geldner corrects *āθrō ahurahe mazdā \*puθrahe* in Yo.2 and o.11, but never again.
2. The nominative singular *ātarš* appears instead of the expected vocative *ātarə*.



*āfrīnāmi tauua nara daḡhu.paiti vohu.jīti us.jīti darəγəm.jīti*; FrW7.1: *aiβiiō vaŋ<sup>u</sup>hibiiō vīspanəmca apqm mazdaδātānqm bərəzātō ahurahe nafədrō apqm apasca mazdaδātaiiā tauua ahurāne ahurahe xšnaōθra*. Despite these difficulties, this dedicatory is noteworthy, as it seems to distinguish between *gəuš uruuan-* and *gəuš hudāḡhō uruuan-*. The latter is used as equivalent for both *gəuš tašan-* and *gəuš uruuan-* in the *Sirōzag*. There, *gəuš hudāḡhō uruuan-* appears as the accusative equivalent of *gəuš tašan-* and *gəuš uruuan-* “genitive” (S2.14 and 1.14 respectively). Accordingly, the dedicatory of the *Nirang-e ḡām doxtan* seems to contain a repetition of the same concept, once with and once without the personal pronoun. It is then comparable with the dedicatory of the fire which appears in the first *Frauarāne* of the Long Liturgy when the liturgy is performed in a fire temple (Yo.3):

*āθrō ahurahe mazdā<sup>27</sup> puθra<sup>27</sup> tauua ātarš puθra ahurahe mazdā<sup>27</sup>*

In a recent paper about the fire in the Long Liturgy, I tried to show that here we witness the splitting of the concept of fire in two different realities: the eternal fire and the ritual fire that is present at the sacrificial space (Cantera 2019). The personal pronoun of the second person has a clear performative function: it introduces a direct reference to an actual element present during the performance. In the case of the *Nirang-e ḡām doxtan*, the *gəuš hudāḡhō uruuan-* seems to make a reference the specific cow or cows from which the milk is taken, while *gəuš tašan-* and *gəuš uruuan-* are *yazatas* with a status similar to the one of the *Aməša Spənta* (see Y1.2 and 70.2).

The fact that the number of cows from which the milk is taken (together with other signs like the use of Phl. *gōšudag* that I am not going to discuss here) points to the possibility that the *gauu- hudāh-* from which the milk is taken might have been originally identical with the cow or cows (or even goat /goats or sheep) that were going to be sacrificed during the ritual. Accordingly, the “living milk”

<sup>27</sup> Observe that Geldner corrects *āθrō ahurahe mazdā<sup>27</sup> xpuθrahe* in Yo.2 and o.11, but never again.

(*gauu- jīuuiā-*) extracted from the victim would ensure its continuity after the slaughtering through its mixing with water and *haōma* and its subsequent libation to the waters. The victim is split through its previous milking in two components: one destined to be sacrificed (the proper animal) and one that will continue to live and bring life (its consecrated milk). This splitting might be reflected in the repetition of the *gauu- hudāh* at the beginning of the *Srōš Drōn*<sup>28</sup> (Y4.1, 3):

*imq haōmq̄sca mīazdq̄sca zaōθrā̄sca barəsmaca ašaiia  
frastarətəm ḡmq̄ca hudā̄ñhəm hauruuata amərətāta ḡmq̄ca  
hudā̄ñhəm haōməmca para.haōməmca*

Interestingly, the parallel passage in the *Hōmāst* transforms the second *gauu- hudāh-* in the *gauu- jīuuiā-* (Y24.1, 3):

*imq haōmq̄sca mīazdq̄sca zaōθrā̄sca barəsmaca ašaiia  
frastarətəm ḡmq̄ca hudā̄ñhəm.imq̄mcā ḡm jīuuiq̄m ašaiia  
uzdātq̄m*

And the *Drōn Yašt*, in which the *haōma* mixed with milk is not used, omits the mention of the second *gauu- hudāh-* (DrYt2.1, 3):

*imq mīazdq̄sca zaōθrā̄sca ḡmq̄ca hudā̄ñhəm hauruuata  
amərətāta apəmca uruuarq̄m*

Another problem of this dedicatory concerns its time of composition. The fact that *gəuš hudā̄ñhō urunō* does not agree in number with the personal pronoun of the second person, but appears in the singular might indicate a late composition. However, since the genitive dual *yauuākəm* is a rare form, attested indeed only in this passage, it is unlikely that the alternative dedicatory for two cows is a

<sup>28</sup> Kellens (2006: 58) thinks that the repetition could be a corruption, but the fact that it appears in two different passages is unlikely. In any case, if one of the mentions should be deleted (what I hardly believe), it would be the second one and not the first one, as the comparison with the *Drōn Yašt* shows (DrYt2.1,3).

a late composition. This possibility cannot, however, be dismissed for the dedicatory in the plural, since *yūšmākəm* is frequent. The absence of this variant in the Nērangestān could point in this direction. However, we should avoid jumping to conclusions. The Nērangestān caters for the possibility that the milk is taken from three or more animals. It simply ignores the existence of a different dedicatory, or rather explicitly denies the possibility of using one. It is not clear, then, why there should be a specific dedicatory for the dual, but not for the plural. The possibility thus cannot be excluded that the Rivāyats have transmitted an old dedicatory that was either unknown to the redactor of the Nērangestān or that he disapproved of using.

The Avestan text of the FrW 6 should be edited and translated as follows:

#### Text

FrW 6.1

*ašəm vohu 3*

*frauuarāne. mazdaiiasnō. zaraθuštriš. vīdāēuuō. ahurō.  
tkaēšō. hāuuanāne. ašaōne. ašahe. raθβe. yasnāica. vahmāica.  
xšnaōθrāica. frasastaiiaēca. sāuuanhāe. vīsiiaica. ašaōne. ašahe.  
raθβe. yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāica. frasastaiiaēca.<sup>29</sup>  
gēuš. tašne. gēuš. urune. tauua. gēuš. hudāñhō. urunō.<sup>30</sup>  
xšnaōθra. yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāi. frasastaiiaēca.  
[agar do bid]<sup>31</sup>*

*gēuš. tašne. gēuš. urune. yauuākəm. gēuš. hudāñhō. xurunō.  
xšnaōθra. yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāi. frasastaiiaēca.  
[agar do bid]<sup>32</sup>*

*gēuš. tašne. gēuš. urune. yūšmākəm. gēuš. hudāñhō. xurunō.  
xšnaōθra. yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāi. frasastaiiaēca.  
yaθā. ahū. vairiō. zaōtā. frā. mē. mrūtē. aθā. ratuš. ašācīcī.  
haca. frā. ašauua. vīduuā. mraōtū.*

<sup>29</sup> *hāuuanāne. ašaōne. ... ašahe. raθβe* might be substituted for the corresponding *ratu*.

<sup>30</sup> Ms. 100 (B3), 230 (117), 235; the rest *urune*.

<sup>31</sup> Mentioned only in the Nērangestān and the manuscripts of the Rivāyats.

<sup>32</sup> Mentioned only in the manuscripts of the Rivāyats.

FrW 6.2

*aša.sara. manajha. aša.sara. vacajha. aša.sara. šīiaōθana.*

FrW 6.3

*yaθā. ahū. vairiiō. (2)*

*yasnəmca. vahməmca. aōjasca. zauuarəca. āfrīnāmi.*

*gəuš. tašne. gəuš. urunō. tauua. gəuš. hudāñhō. urunō.<sup>33</sup>*

*xšnaōθra. yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāi. frasastaiiaēca.*

[agar do bid]

*gəuš. tašne. gəuš. urune. yauuākəm. gəuš. hudāñhō. <sup>x</sup>urunō.*

*xšnaōθra. yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāi. frasastaiiaēca.*

[agar se bid]

*gəuš. tašne. gəuš. urune. yūšmākəm. gəuš. hudāñhō. <sup>x</sup>urunō.*

*xšnaōθra. yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāi. frasastaiiaēca.*

*ašəm. vohu. (1)*

*ahmāi. raēšca. x<sup>v</sup>arənasca. ahmāi. ... (= Y72.9-10)*

*hazañrəm. baēšazanəm. baēuuarə. baēšazanəm. (3)*

### Translation:

FrW 6.1

Ašəm vohu (3x)

For the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation, I make the choice of performing a sacrifice to Ahura Mazdā in the way Zaraθuštra did for repelling the demons and according to the teachings of Ahura Mazdā for the morning articulation of Order that supports Order; for the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation, (I make the choice of performing a sacrifice) for the articulation of the ritual success (*sauuah*) and the *clanic* (articulation) of Order that supports Order;

[*dedicatory if the milk is taken from one animal*]

for the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation, (I make the choice of performing a sacrifice) with the intention of satisfying the fashioner of the cow, the soul of the cow, and you, the soul of the generous cow.

[*if it is taken from two*]

<sup>33</sup> Ms. 100 (B3), 230 (L17), 235. The rest *urune*.

for the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation,  
(I make the choice of performing a sacrifice) with the intention  
of satisfying the fashioner of the cow, the soul of the cow, and  
you two, the soul(s) of the generous cow(s).

[if it is taken from more than two]

for the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation,  
(I make the choice of performing a sacrifice) with the intention  
of satisfying the fashioner of the cow, the soul of the cow, and  
you, the soul(s) of the generous cow(s).

The *zaōtar* is there for reciting *yaθā ahū vairiiō*, he who knows  
should recite *aθā ratuš ašātcit hacā*.

FrW 6.2

With the thought that connects with Order; with the word that  
connects with Order and with the action that connects with  
Order.

FrW 6.3

*yaθā ahū vairiiō* (2)

I make propitious the sacrifice, the adoration, the force and the  
power for the fashioner of the cow, the soul of the cow and you,  
the soul of the generous cow.

/or/ ... and you two, the soul(s) of the generous cow(s).

/or/ ... and you, the soul(s) of the generous cow(s).

Ašəm vohu

+ Y72.9-10

A thousand healings, ten thousand healings.

## 6. FrW 7: text, translation and commentary

In contrast with FrW 6, FrW 7 records major textual variants in the  
different transmission lines, as we have already seen. Furthermore,  
there are some difficulties for its translation, and it attests some  
complex verbal forms unknown elsewhere. The verb *kuxšnūša* is the  
more challenging form. We find different variants in the different  
transmission lines:

- It appears in the Nērangestān as *kuxšnūša*.

- The Rivāyats have two different variants: 1. *kuxšnīša* (ms. 84, BU<sup>RKS</sup>, U<sup>RKS</sup>. *kuxšnēša* K7c) and 2. *auuaxsneša* U. *uuaxsneša* BU. Since *kuxšnīša* is common to ms. 84 and both Rivāyats, while *auuaxsneša*/*uuaxsneša* appear only in part of the transmission of the Rivāyat of Ġāsā (in Hormazdyār's compilation), the form *kuxšnīša*/*kuxšnēša* is to be preferred.
- The Indian manuscripts have different variants that are hardly compatible with the Iranian forms: *kasnišcaš[ca]* 100 (B3). *kasnišca* 230 (L17). *kasnasca* 110 (K11), 231, 234. *kusnasca* 235

The Iranian readings go back to *kuxšnūša*,<sup>34</sup> and the Indian variants seem to be a corruption of the original form. It has usually been taken for a corruption of the 2.p.sg. opt. middle *kuxšnūuīša* of the verb *kuxšnu-* (Kellens 1984: 185). This interpretation is, however, impossible. The meaning of *kuxšnu-* in the middle voice is always “to give satisfaction to someone (in acc.):

Vyt 8.7

*āaṭ. tūm. nišhiδōiš. gāθāšca. srāuuaiiō. apasca. vaṇ"hiš.*  
*yazəmnō. narəmcā. ašauuanəṃ. kuxšnūuānō. asnāaṭca.*  
*jasəntəṃ. dūrāaṭca.*

“Then you start to recite the Songs, to sacrifice to the good waters and to please the man supporter of Order who comes from near and far.”

H2.13

*āaṭ. tūm. nišhiδōiš. gāθāšca. srāuuaiiō. apasca. vaṇ"hiš. yazəmnō.*  
*ātəramcā. ahurahe. mazdā. narəmcā. ašauuanəṃ. kuxšnūuānō.*  
*asnāaṭca. jasəntəṃ. dūrāaṭca.*

“Then you start to recite the Songs, to sacrifice to the good waters and to the fire of Ahura Mazda and to please the man

<sup>34</sup> The readings of the Rivāyats go back to the same form, but with the usual Iranian substitution of *ū* through *ī*.

supporter of Order who comes from near and far”.

Yt13.24

*yō. hīš. yazānō. kuxšnuuqñō. zbaieiti. barō.zaōθrō. ašauua.*

“the supporter of Order who invokes them, bringing libations, sacrificing to them and pleasing them”.

In our passage, the second person refers to the waters. They are the receiver, and not the giver of satisfaction, as the dedicatory clearly indicates. Besides, the pronoun of the 2.p.sg is in the accusative, so the 2.p. cannot be both subject and object at the same time. The assumed correction of the verbal form into a 2.p.sg. is therefore impossible. Accordingly, *kuxšnūšā* can only be a 1.p.sg. like the following *us.bībarāmi*. The present stem *kuxšnuša-* seems to be the result of a crossing between the present stem *kuxšnu-* and the desiderative present stem *cixšnūša-*. It also seems to have a desiderative value (“I want to satisfy you”).

The verb *us.bībarāmi*<sup>35</sup> raises questions too, but of a different order. The meaning seems clear: “to raise, to lift”. Notice that according to the ritual instructions, the priest, while reciting *us.bībarāmi*, moves the two cups up and down and finally takes them out of the water. Thus, the meaning seems to be “I raise (the cups) out (of the water)”. It looks like a thematised form of the reduplicated verb *bi-bar-*. The reduplicated present stem of this root is not attested elsewhere in Avestan, but in Vedic, where it has an iterative meaning “to bear” (Goto 1987: 226). In Avestan, the verb could also be iterative, since the cups are moved up and down until they are finally taken out from the water.

The translation of J. Darmesteter (1892: 3.7) depends on the edition of N. L. Westergaard, towards which he is more confident than towards T. D. Anklesaria’s version of the Avestan text. Accordingly, he does

<sup>35</sup> The transmission error *us. mībarāma* clearly happened under the influence of the Persian *mībaram*. It appears in the copies of the Rivāyat of Ġāsā, but not in the version included in the compilation of Dārāb Hormazdyār, which must have used an older copy preceding the extant ones.

not translate the complete ritual and has the surprising omission of *uštā.bərətīšca*. Furthermore, his translation of the final section is quite problematic from a syntactical point of view. He translates it thus: “Je te soulève, puisses-tu satisfaire les saintes divinités et le Grand Ratu. — Qu’il chante les Gāthas!”

Darmesteter has not been able to recognize the different syntactical units and their close connections to the ritual actions performed simultaneously. At the mention of “you” the priest puts the cups over the water; at “I try to satisfy”, the saucers are filled with water; at *us.bībarāmi*, they are lifted out of the water; and after bringing them to the *yazišngāh*, he exhorts the next officiating priest to recite the texts of the Long Liturgy including the Gāθās.

## Text

### FrW 7.1

*ašəm vōhū 3 frauuarāne. mazdaiiasnō. zaraθuštriš. vīdaēuuō.  
ahurō.ṭkaēšō. hāuuanāe. ašaōne. ašahe. raθβe. yasnāica.  
vahmāica. xšnaōθrāica. frasastaiiaēca. sāuuayhāe. vīsiīāica.  
ašaone. ašahe. raθβe. <sup>36</sup> yasnāica. vahmāica. xšnaōθrāica.  
frasastaiiaēca. aiβiiō <sup>x</sup>van<sup>v</sup>hībiiō.<sup>37</sup> vīspanqmca. apqm.  
mazdadātanqm. bərəzatō. ahurahe. nafədrō. apqm. apasca.  
mazdadātaiiā. tauua. ahurāne. ahurahe.<sup>38</sup> xšnaōθra. yasnāica.  
vahmāica. xšnaoθrāica. frasastaiiaēca  
yaθā ahū vairiiō zaōtā fra.mē. mrūte. aθā. ratuš. ašātciṭ. haca.  
ašauua. vīduuā. mraōtū.*

### FrW 7.2

*frā.te. staōmaide.<sup>39</sup> ahurāne. ahurahe. vanjhūš.<sup>40</sup> yasnqsa.*

<sup>36</sup> *hāuuanāe. ašaōne. ... vīsiīāica. ašaone. ašahe. raθβe*] It can change depending of the ratu.

<sup>37</sup> *+vanhibiiō*] *vanjhāebiiō* HJ, G42. *vanjobiiō* K7. *vanhubiiō* BU, BU<sup>RKS</sup>, UR<sup>RKS</sup>. *vanhibiiō* 100, 230. *vanhuibiiō* 110, 234, 235. *vanhuibaiiō* 231.

<sup>38</sup> *tauua ahurane ahurahe*] Missing in all the manuscripts of the Rivāyat of Ġāsā.

<sup>39</sup> *staōmaide*] *staōmaidi* HJ, G42. *staomaide* K7, U. *staomaede* BU. *staomaine* 100 (v.l. *staoma* sec.man. supr. l. īeni). *staōmiiānei* 110, 234. *štaomaīeni* 230. *staōmīāeni* 234. *staōmīāneni* 235

<sup>40</sup> *vanjhūš*] *vanjhīš* K7, U. *vanjhēuš* U<sup>RKS</sup>, BU<sup>RKS</sup>. *vanjuuašca* 100. *vanjhūšca* 230. *vanhahūš* 231. om. BU



*vahm̥asca. hubəratīšca. uštā.bəratīšca. vañtā.bəratīšca.*<sup>41</sup>  
*yazatanəm. ʔβā. ašaōnəm. kuxšnūša.*<sup>42</sup> <sup>+</sup>*us.bī.barāmi.*<sup>43</sup>  
*raθβasca. bərazatō. gāθāšca. srāuuaiiōiṭ.*

FrW 7.3<sup>44</sup>

*yaθā ahū vairiiō (2)*  
*yasnəmca. vahməmca. aojasca. zauuarəca. āfrīnāmi. <aiβiiō.*  
*vanʰhibiiō. vīspanəmca. apəm. mazdaḍātānəm. tauua.*  
*ahurāne. ahurahe.>*<sup>45</sup>*bərazatō. ahurahe. nafədrō. apəm. apasca.*  
*mazdaḍātaiiā.*

## Translation

FrW 7.1

Ašəm vohu (3x)

For the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation, I make the choice of performing a sacrifice to Ahura Mazdā in the way Zaraθuštra did for repelling the demons and according to the teachings of Ahura Mazdā for the morning articulation of Order that supports Order; for the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation, (I make the choice of performing a sacrifice) for the articulation of the ritual success (*sauuuh*) and the *clanic* articulation of Order which is a supporter of Order; for the sacrifice, the adoration, the satisfaction and the exaltation, (I make the choice of performing a sacrifice) with the intention of satisfying the good waters and all waters created by Mazdā and you, the wife of Ahura.

The *zaōtar* is there for reciting *yaθā ahū vairiiō*; he who knows

<sup>41</sup> *hubəratīšca. uštā.bəratīšca. vañtā.bəratīšca*] TD, Hj, G42, K7, BU, BU<sup>RKS</sup>, U<sup>RKS</sup>.  
*hubaretīmca uštā.bəratīmca vañta.bəratīmca U. vohū. yasnəmca vahməmca*  
*hubəraitīmca. uštā.bəraitīmca vañta.bəraitīmca* 100 (B3), 230 (L17), 231, 235. *vohū.*  
*yasnəmca vahməmca. hubəratīšca uštā.bəratīšca vañta.bəratīšca* 110 (K11), 234.

<sup>42</sup> *kuxšnūša*] TD, Hj, G42. *kuxšneša* K7. *kuxšniša* BU<sup>RKS</sup>, U<sup>RKS</sup>. *auuaxsneša U. uuaxsneša*  
 BU. *kasnišcaš[ca]* 100. *kasnišca* 230. *kasnasca* 110, 231, 234. *kusnasca* 235.

<sup>43</sup> *us.bī.barāmi.*] *us. mī.barāma* TD. *usbībarāmi* G42. *usmī.barāma* K7, BU, U. *usbī.*  
*barāma* BU<sup>RKS</sup>, U<sup>RKS</sup>. *us.bī.barqni* 100. *ašbuiia.varqñ* 110, 234. *asabiia.βrqñi* 230. *ašhi.*  
*baoiie. varāna* 231. *ašbuiia.varqna* 235

<sup>44</sup> Available only in the version of the Rivāyat of Ġāsā.

<sup>45</sup> *aiβiiō ... ahurane. ahurahe.*] Missing in the manuscripts.

should say *aθā ratuš ašātcit hacā*.

FrW 7.2

We praise, O wife of Ahura, your sacrifices and adorations and the good offerings that begin with the word *uštā* and end with *van̄tā*. I try to satisfy you among the adorables who support Order. I lift you out. He (who is going to be the *zaōtar*) should recite (the text) of the Great Ratu and the Songs.<sup>46</sup>

FrW 7.3

*yaθā ahū vairiō (2)*

I make propitious the sacrifice, the adoration, the force and the power for the good waters and all waters created by Mazdā and you, the wife of Ahura.

### Postscript

After reading proofs, I have seen at the Iranian National Library three Yasna manuscripts that contain sections of the Paragnā; ms. 5-39196, ms. 20570 and ms. 114-1689 (the two latter belong indeed to the Tarbiat Modares University). All three were copied in the second half of the 19th century and show a similar textual arrangement. After the Yasna follow following series of short texts, including a description of the Paragnā: šnuman-e nō-nābar, šnuman-e darun-e siruze, nirang-e barsom čidan, nirang-e barsom bastan, nirang-e barsom šostan, nirang-e hum čidan, nerang-e urwarām čidan, nirang-e ġām gereftan, nirang-e zur gereftan, nirang-e farāhum gereftan, nirang-e wars čidan, darun-e wedaregān fe yom (i.e. ruz) čahārom, darun-e rafitwin, darun-e haft amešāsband, darun-e din o mānšar.

<sup>46</sup> This probably refers to the Long Liturgy that includes the Gāθās (Cantera 2015: 79ff.).

## Appendix

The Paragna in the different sources. Comparison table					
Ritual	Action	Intro	dedicatory of the Frauuarāne	Karde	
nirang barsom čidan	1. Cutting of the barsom	[ <i>xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā.</i> + AV] (2)	<i>uruuaraiiā</i>	<i>nəmō. uruuaire. +van̄hi mazdađāte +ašaōni</i> + AV	
	2. Washing of the barsom	AV 3	AM	AV 4	
	3. Tying of the barsom	[ <i>xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā.</i> + AV] (3)	AM	<i>xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā</i> AV YAV 2	
Nirang urawarān	3		—	[ <i>xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā.</i> + AV] (3)	
Nirang ġām duxtan	4		<i>auš tašne...</i>	<i>aša.sara. manar̄ha aša.sara. vacar̄ha aša.sara. šīiaōθəna</i>	
Nirang waras čidan	5		AM	AV 4	
	6		AM	AV 4	
Taking of the waters	7	[ <i>xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā.</i> + AV] (3)	<i>aiβiō van̄hibiō</i>	<i>frā.tē. staōmaiðe. ahurāne. ahurahe. van̄hūš. yasnašca. vahmašca. hubərətīšca. uštā.bərətīšca. van̄ta. bərətīšca. yazatanqm. θβā. ašaōnqm. kuxšnūša. us.bībarāma raθβasca bərəzatō geθāšca srāuuaiiōt</i>	
Washing of the Hōm twigs	8		<i>haōmahe ašauuazar̄hō</i>	AV 4	
Second preparation of the barsom	9		AM	AV 4 <i>xšnaōθra ahurahe mazdā</i> YAV (1)	
Hōmāst of the Parāhōm	10		<i>zaraθušt̄rahe frauuašəē</i>	short Hōmāst	

<sup>47</sup> [*xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā.* + AV] (3).

<sup>48</sup> AV 3 + *Frauuarāne haōmahe ašauuazar̄hō*.

<sup>49</sup> It adds *xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā.* + AV] (3) before the *Frauuarāne* and AV 1 before *aša.sara manar̄ha*.

<sup>50</sup> AV + *frauuarāne urauuaraiiā* /*xšaθrahe* + AV<sub>1</sub> + YAV<sub>1</sub> + closing *wāž* + AV<sub>3</sub> + *frauuarāne ahurahe mazdā* + AV<sub>4</sub> + YAV<sub>2</sub> + closing *wāž*. Partially similar to Par. 9.

RĠ	Indian mss	Nērangestān	Anklesaria	Bahman Kayxōsrō	Par. de drōn (J4, R110)
				nirang-e āb-e pādyāw namudan	
x			x	nirang-e barsom wa aiwanghan čīdan <sup>47</sup>	1. Barsom twigs (urauuarā /xšaθra)
		N28.16			
x		N28.22	<i>xšnaōθra. ahurahe. mazdā. + AV] (3)</i>		AV YAV <sub>2</sub>
x			+	nirang-e urwarān	
				nirang-e hom čīdan <sup>48</sup>	
x	1	[[N49.10]]	+ <sup>49</sup>	nirang-e ġiwām gereftan	
x			----		
x			----		
x	2	[[N30.10]]	+	nirang-e zur gereftan	
				nirang-e barsom basta <sup>50</sup>	
x	3	N28.24	+	nirang hum pādyāb kardan	
x	4	cf. N28.16	+ (before 8)		
x	5	N28.27	+	nirang-e farāhum gereftan	

## Bibliography

- Anklesaria, T. D. 1888. *Yazishnē Bā Nīrang*. Bombay: Trustees of the Parsi Punchayet, Trustees of the M. F. Cama Athornan Institute and M. M. Cama Education Fund.
- Cantera, A. 2012. Building trees: Genealogical Relations Between the Manuscripts of the Widēwdād. In A. Cantera, *The Transmission of the Avesta*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
- Cantera, A. 2013. Los manuscritos de Yasna con traducción pahlaví e instrucciones rituales (abāg zand ud nērang). In A. Agud, A. Cantera, R. Elhour et al. (eds.), *Séptimo Centenario de los Estudios Orientales en Salamanca*, 503-521. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Cantera, A. 2014. *Vers une édition de la liturgie longue zoroastrienne : pensées et travaux préliminaires*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Cantera, A. 2015. The usage of the Frauarāne in the Zoroastrian rituals. *aṭciṭ bā nēmō haōmāi*. In A. Cantera and J. J. Ferrer (eds.), *Homenaje a Éric Pirart en su 65º aniversario*, 71-98. Girona: Sociedad de Estudios Iranios y Turanios.
- Cantera, A. 2019, Fire, the Greatest God (ātarš ... mazišta yazata). The Cult of the “Eternal” Fire in the Rituals in Avestan. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 62. 19-61
- Darmesteter, J. 1892. *Le Zend-Avesta*. Paris.
- Dhabhar, B. N. 1932. *The Persian Rivayats of Hormazyar Framarz and others. Their version with introduction and notes*. Bombay.
- Geldner, K. F. 1886. *Avesta. The sacred books of the Parsis*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

- Goto, T. 1987. *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen*. Viena: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hintze, A. 2012. Manuscripts of the Yasna and Yasna ī Rapithwin. In A. Cantera (ed.) *The transmission of the Avestan texts*, 244-278. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hoffmann, K. 1975. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- Kellens, J. 1984. *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kellens, J. 2006. *Études avestiques et mazdéennes, vol. 1 : le Ratauuu vispe mazista* (Yasna 1.1 à 7.23, avec Visprad 1 et 2). Paris: Collège de France.
- Keyxōsrō Kermani, B. 1893. *Yašt u nirang*. Mumbai.
- Kotwal, F. M. and J. W. Boyd. 1977. The Zoroastrian paragnā ritual. *Journal of Mithraic Studies* 2. 18-52.
- Kotwal, F. M. and G. Kreyenbroek. 2003. *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Volume III: Nērangestān, Fragard 2*. Paris: E. Peeters.
- Martínez Porro, Jaime. 2013. The manuscripts of the school of Surat and the orthographical analysis of the Avesta. University of Salamanca, 28 November.
- Modi, J. M. 1922. *The religious ceremonies and customs of the Parsees*. Bombay: British India Press.
- Schmitt, R. 1993. Niels Ludwig Westergaard und seine Avesta-Ausgabe. In *Zendavesta or the religious books of the Zoroastrians edited by N. L. Westergaard*, v-xiv. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Unvala, E. M. R. 1922. *Dârâb Hormazyâr's Rivâyat*. Mazgaon, Bombay: British India Press.
- Vitalone, M. 1987. *The Persian Revâiyats: a bibliographical reconnaissance*. Nápoles: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici.
- Westergaard, N. L. 1852. *Zendavesta, or The religious books of the Zoroastrians*. Copenhagen: Berling Brothers.
- Williams, A. V. 1990. *The Pahlavi Rivâyat accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg. Part I: Transliteration, transcription and glossary. Part II: Translation, commentary and Pahlavi text*. Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.



## The Serpentine Man in Iranian Myth

Touraj Daryaee

One of the well-studied aspects of the Indo-European tradition is the narrative of the dragon-slaying myth (Lincoln: 1981, 103-121 and Watkins: 1995). The common consensus is that this tradition, which found its fullest manifestation in the Indo-Iranian myth, describes a dragon/serpent/worm that represents the foreign enemy of the Aryans. The Indo-Iranian heroes slay the dragons for various reasons, but primarily for the release of cattle and release of the waters. In the Indo-Iranian tradition, there are a number of these dragons/snakes/worms and each has a specific shape. They include Aži Sruuara, the horned dragon, who was slayed by manly-minded Kərəsāspa (Persian Garshasp); Aži Zairita, the yellow dragon; Aži Raoiḍita, the red dragon; Aži Višāpa, the poisonous dragon; and Gandarəβa, who is yellow-healed and lives in the water (Skjærvø 2011). In the Pahlavi text the *Kārnāmag ī Ardaxšīr ī Pābagān*, the founder of the Sasanian Empire is able to slay the Haftowād ī Kirm, who is referred to specifically as a worm (Grenet: 2003, 81-84).

The most famous of the dragons in the Iranian world is Aži Dahāka (Persian Aždaha, literally, dragon). This dragon is mentioned in the *Avesta* as having three mouths (*θrizafanəm*), three heads (*θrikamarəḍəm*), six eyes (*xšuuuāš.ašīm*), and a thousand viles (*hazaṇrā.yaoxštīm*) (Lincoln: 1981, 123; Watkins: 1995, 314). By late antiquity, it seems that this three-headed dragon (Middle Persian Dahāg) (Daryaee:



2014, 70) had become an evil Arab foe of the Iranians and was to take the Iranian throne in the Peshdadian section of Iranian historiography (Ferdowsi: 1987, 55-62).

By the time of the *Shahnameh* in the tenth century CE, Zaḥḥāk had been clearly transformed into a historicized evil ruler who usurps the Iranian throne (Khaleghi-Motlagh: 2011). At the same time, this usurper is also strangely invited by the Iranian nobility to replace Jamishd, the hubris-struck king (Omidasalar: 2012, 139-140). His father is imagined as a cannibal (Persian Mardās), and he himself is a man with a serpent growing on each shoulder (Omidasalar 1362: 328-339). Not only the *Shahnameh* itself, but the many illustrations of the *Shahnameh* support this apparent “development” in the myth of Zaḥḥāk / Dahāk / Aži Dahaka- (Fig. 1).



Figure 1: Chester Beatty Library, Dublin  
Manuscript: Per 104 , Accession Number: Per 104.003

In honor of Professor Philip G. Kreyenbroek, I would like to discuss this serpentine-man “development” further, in order to see whether this creation is a late antique development, or whether further evidence, both linguistic and from the material culture of the Iranian world, can push the date back. I hope to show that the idea of an evil, foreign king ruling over the Iranians is much older and perhaps not a development at all. In fact, I propose, it is an early tradition that existed in eastern Iran from as early as the end of the second millennium BCE, whence the serpentine-man myth developed and continued to exist up to the first millennium CE.

The linguistic evidence for the name of our serpentine-man is clear, with *aži* / Indian *ahi* standing for snake and secondarily for dragon (Russell: 1987). The best evidence for *Dahāka*- comes from the Eastern Iranian tradition, namely in Khotanese. S. Konow and later H.W. Bailey have already demonstrated that Khotanese *daha*- stands for man, male and corresponding cognates in the Indo-Iranian world (Konow: 1912, 96-97; Bailey: 1958, 109-110; see also de Blois 1993). A. Parpola and M. Schwartz have touched upon this and explained how to go about interpreting Khotanese *daha*- “man, male,” which is cognate with Sanskrit *dasyu*- “enemy, foreigner” (Parpola: 2015, 100-105). That is, we can posit an Indo-Iranian \**dasa*- for “man” in the Saka language group, i.e., in Khotanese, but also in the Wakhi *ḍāi*. Thus, as Schwartz has suggested, we may take *aži dahaka*- as “snake-man” (Schwartz: 1980, 123-124). If the *Dāsas* are the enemies of the Aryans, or, more precisely, hostile to them, then already in remote antiquity the combined *aži- dahāka*- could be understood as the “serpentine-man.” What I would like to contribute to this discussion is pictorial evidence from the relatively recent finds in eastern Iran that were part of the Bactrian World exhibit at the Louvre Museum in Paris. Several years ago at the Louvre, a small cylinder seal with an interesting court scene, possibly from the BMAC area, caught my eye (Fig. 2):



Courtesy of the Louvre Museum

The scene shows a number of attendants and people before a seated figure who is clearly a humanoid with two snakes growing from his shoulders. The location of the find matches closely with the Avestan tradition and more importantly with the Khotanese *daha*- “man, male.” This may suggest that the development of the dragon/serpent in antiquity into a serpentine-man did not take place in late antiquity and in the Middle Persian and Classical Persian literature, but rather was already part of the long-standing eastern Iranian tradition. That is, a sort of *aži- dahāka*- that we know from the Persian epic was already imagined as a serpentine-man in eastern Iran at the end of the second millennium BCE. Was this a BMAC tradition, where the story of a serpentine-man who as a usurper was known? This is difficult but not impossible to ascertain, as we already have the evidence of the story of Yima and of the BMAC tradition as mentioned in the *Widēwdād* (Parpola: 2015, 98). We now have more evidence of pictographic

snake-man from Bactria Margiana to confirm this Eastern tradition (Azarpay 1991: 2 & 4).

The idea conforms with Parpola's contention that the battleground between the Aryans and the Dāsas was located not by the Indus River, but rather closer to the Iranian world, and exactly where we find the linguistic evidence, namely, in BMAC in Dashly-3, in modern-day Afghanistan (Parpola: 2015, 97). These BMAC structures are similar to the description of the *vara-* (fortress) that was Yima's creation (Parpola: 2015, 98). If we consider the Rig Vedic *dāsá-* "enemy people" (classical Sanskrit "slave"), this could account for the Old Persian *Dahā-*, the name of the people who, according to Quintus Curtius Rufus 8.3, lived in Margiana (Parpola: 2015, 100-101 ; contra Witzel 2002-2003, 10). Thus, we may be seeing the visualization of the enemy by the early Iranians at the exact location where conflicts between the Aryans and the Dāsas were taking place in the late Bronze Age. Hence, the Aryans saw the dragon/serpent on what C. Watkins calls the human plane (Watkins 1995, 311), as the Dāsas, and Aži Dahaka represented the king of the Dāsas who may have attempted to take the Aryan throne. In the end, I should note that Aži Dahaka is not the only dragon/serpent/worm-king imagined as such in the Iranian world. As mentioned in the beginning of the essay, in the *Kārnāmag ī Ardašīr ī Pābagān* (Chapter VII) there is Haftowād ī Kirm, whose name also carries the Middle Persian *xwadāy*, i.e., ruler (Grenet: 2003, 80). Hence, we have another figure who, while specifically referred to as a worm, is also a ruler who will be met by Ardaxšīr I and slain on the coast of the Persian Gulf. It appears, then, that Haftowād ī Kirm is in fact the late antique model for the Indo-European / Iranian hero battling the dragon/snake/worm, and not Aži Dahaka, who in remote antiquity was already humanized and imagined as an evil ruler. After Ardaxšīr, however, those Sasanian kings such as Wāhrām Gūr in the fifth century reverted back to the model of the Indo-European hero who battled and slayed non-humanoid dragons.

## Bibliography

- Azarpay, G. 1999. The Snake-Man in the Art of Bronze Age Bactria. *Bulleting of the Asia Institute* 5., 1-10.
- Bailey, H. W. 1958. Iranian *arya-* and *daha-*. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 58, 1. 71-115.
- Blois, F. de. 1993. Dahae i. the name. In E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. VI, Fasc. 6, pp. 581-582 (<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/dahae>).
- Daryaee, T. 2014. Historiography in late antique Iran. In Ali Ansari (ed.), *Perceptions of Iran: History, myths and nationalism from Medieval Persia to the Islamic Republic*. London: IB Tauris.
- Ferdowsi. 1987. *Shahnameh of Ferdowsi*, Dj. Khaleghi-Motlagh (ed.). Persian Heritage Foundation: New York.
- Grenet, F. 2003. *La Geste d'Ardashir fils de Pâbag*, Paris: A Die.
- Khaleghi-Motlagh, Dj. 1989. AŽDAHĀ. ii in Persian literature. In E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. III, Fasc. 2, pp. 191-205 (<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/azdaha-dragon-various-kinds#pt1>).
- Konow, S. 1912. Vedic. 'dasyu,' Toxrī [i.e. Khotanese] "dahä". In *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen*. Leipzig.
- Lincoln, B. 1981. *Priests, warriors, and cattle: A study in the ecology of religions*. UC Press: California.
- Omidasalar, M. 2012. *Iran's epic and America's empire*. Santa Monica. Afshar Publishers.
- Omidasalar, M. 1983. Zahhak pesar-e Mardas. *Iran Nameh* 2: 328-339.
- Parpola, A. 2015. *The roots of Hinduism: The early Aryans and the Indus*

*civilization*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Russell, J.R. 1987. AŽDAHĀ. In E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. III, Fasc. 2, pp. 191-205 (<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/azdaha-dragon-various-kinds>).

Schwartz, M. 1980. Review of M. Mayrhofer, Die avestischen Namen in the *Iranisches Personennamenbuch* I(1). *Orientalia* 49. 123-124.

Skjærvø, P. O. 2011. AŽDAHĀ. In E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. III, Fasc. 2, pp. 191-205 (<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/azdaha-dragon-various-kinds#pt1>).

Watkins, C. 1995. *How to kill a dragon: Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Witzel, M. 2002-2003. The home of the Aryans. *NIB: The International Journal of Ancient Iranian Studies* 2(2). 5-60.



# Zoroastrian Pilgrimage Songs and *Ziyārat-nāmes* (“Visitation Supplications”)

Zoroastrian Literature in New Persian II

Shervin Farridnejad

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The study of Zoroastrianism since the beginning of the “Zoroastrian Studies” in Europe has been, and still is focused mainly on the philological and historical analysis of the Avestan and Middle Persian canonical textual sources, and to a lesser extent more recently on written sources in New Persian or Gujarati.<sup>2</sup> Most of these *canonized*

---

<sup>1</sup> I would especially like to thank my friend and colleague Farzaneh Goshtasp (Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies, Tehran) for her kind advice and especially for her generous permission to use and publish some recorded materials from her private family archive. I also owe a great debt of gratitude to her and Mobad Ramin Shahzadi (Berlin) for their help with Dārī songs, as well as to Mohammad Khodadai (Vienna), who helped me with computer musical notation. My thanks also to Mobad Mehraban Firouzgari (Tehran), Firoza Punthakey Mistree, and Khojaste Mistree (Zoroastrian Studies, Mumbai), who are always willing to answer my endless questions.

<sup>2</sup> This article is dedicated to my teacher and Doktorvater Philip G. Kreyenbroek, from whom I have learned much about different aspects of the living Zoroastrian tradition, which sadly attracts limited attention from contemporary Zoroastrian studies and its academic curricula. In his unique book *Living Zoroastrianism*, Kreyenbroek, together with his interviewer Shehnaz Neville Munshi, has studied the different religious and cultural façades of Zoroastrian beliefs and practices, as performed and lived by the Pārsis of India. In some thirty interviews, mostly with elderly lay Pārsis in Bombay, each of ninety minutes in length, they present a detailed account of Zoroastrians’ current views, including festivals and religious occasions, the Zoroastrian laws of purity, illnesses and cures, death and the afterlife, and beliefs and observances of non-Zoroastrian origin. They also talk of visits to fire temples and pilgrimages; cf. Kreyenbroek 2001.



sources reflect the theological and legal status of the Zoroastrianism of late Sasanian and early Islamic times, up until the ninth or tenth centuries. Compared with the huge amount of publications focusing on philological matters, however, Zoroastrian literature in New Persian and Gujarati, including the non-canonical and “oral” literature as well as the “living” tradition, has attracted less interest from scholars.<sup>3</sup>

The New Persian language has now been the main literary vehicle of Zoroastrian communities in Iran and the diaspora for more than a millennium.<sup>4</sup> Long before Gujarati became the Pārsi language for religious purposes,<sup>5</sup> Persian was the preferred adopted primary language of the Pārsis of India — at least among the learned elite — for a long period of three hundred years from the beginning of the correspondence between the Indian Zoroastrians and their brethren in Iran in 1478 CE, or what is known as the Persian *Revāyat*, “Transmitted Tradition”.<sup>6</sup> This fact bestows on the mostly religious corpus of literature composed in New Persian an outstanding value for the study of the Zoroastrian religion. The relatively impressive amount of literature available is however generally understudied and thus remains an unknown chapter of the history of the faith.<sup>7</sup> This article is dedicated to the study of a

<sup>3</sup> For the scholarly literature, which focuses mainly on living and oral literature, cf. Boyce 1977; Fischer 1973; Kreyenbroek 2001; Phalippou 2003; Bharucha 1906; Fozi 2014; Stewart 2018.

<sup>4</sup> We can safely assume that the lay members of the communities in Iran have mainly spoken, as is still the case today, their regional dialects, most prominent among others the so-called Zoroastrian *darī* (also known as *gabrī*, an exonym), a central dialect which itself has two major dialects spoken by the Zoroastrians of Yazd and Kermān as well as the surrounding towns and villages. For the central Zoroastrian dialects cf. Windfuhr 1989, 105–8; Gholami 2016. For the sociolinguistic situation of the Zoroastrian dialects cf. Farudi/Doustdar Toosarvandani 2004.

<sup>5</sup> The usage of Gujarati (the local language of the Pārsis) for the literary compositions is attested much later from the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries onwards. Only over the course of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Gujarati became the predominant language of the literary activities of the Pārsis; cf. Sheffield 2015a, 543–54.

<sup>6</sup> For a general overview of Persian *Revāyat* cf. Vitalone 1987.

<sup>7</sup> For a recent brief survey of Zoroastrian literature in New Persian cf. Sheffield 2015b. For other and previous scholarship on Zoroastrian Literature in New Persian cf. West 1896, 122–29; Āmuzgār 1349 š [1970]; Šāhmardān 1330 š [1951]; Montazerī 1394 š [2016].

small and unknown portion of Zoroastrian oral literature, namely the pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes* (“Visitation Supplications”).

### ***Ziyārat* “Pilgrimage” in Zoroastrianism**

The Arabic term *ziyāra* (pl. *ziyārāt*), Persified as *ziyārat*, meaning “pious visitation”, refers generally to the well documented religious practice of pilgrimage to visit a major (“cathedral”) fire temple, holy place, the tomb of a venerated figure or the shrine of a saint (*pīr* in the Zoroastrian terminology), generally at any time and without at least a predetermined ritual.<sup>8</sup> It also refers to the special religious literary genre of pilgrimage songs, mostly special personalized salutations recited by a pilgrim when entering a holy shrine or during the residence at the shrine, also known as *ziyārat-nāme* “visitation supplication”. These pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes* can even be recited by one who cannot undertake the journey to a saint’s shrine in person, as a spiritual pilgrimage can be effected by meditation or by reciting texts related to pilgrimage.<sup>9</sup> In this article, I aim to introduce and contextualize some samples of this literary religious genre within Zoroastrian literature.

Pilgrimage visitation of the tombs of saints, and the corresponding cults, have been widespread in the Buddhist, Jewish, Christian and Islamic world societies, and still exist today, including in other religions.<sup>10</sup> In Iran, the first home of Zoroastrianism, several fire temples held the most sacred type of fire, called *ātaš-bahrām* (MP *ādūr ī warahrān* “victorious fire”), a Zoroastrian sacred “cathedral” fire of the highest grade, during the Parthian and Sasanian periods.<sup>11</sup> Visiting and venerating *ātaš-bahrāms* is still today the highest goal of Zoroastrian pilgrims.

<sup>8</sup> On Zoroastrian shrines in general cf. Langer 2004; Langer 2006. For a comprehensive documentation of the Zoroastrian shrines in Iran with an analysis of their different historical aspects, as well as a survey of related textual and material culture sources, cf. Langer 2008.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Meri et al. 2002; Hā’erī 1379 š [2000]).

<sup>10</sup> For an overview and treatment of theoretical issues cf. Coleman/Elsner 1995; Herbers/Lehner 2014).

<sup>11</sup> The three principle categories of temple fires called *ātaš bahrām*, *ādor-e ādorān* and *dādḡāh*, which have given rise to three grades of fire-temples in which they are hosted, namely *ātaš bahrām*, *ātaškade* (in Iran)/*agīārī* (in India), and *dar(b)-e meh(e)r*; cf. Boyce 1968.

Following the marginalization of the Zoroastrians in their homeland after the advent of Islam, and especially for those Zoroastrian communities harassed by Muslim rulers and neighbours, the characteristic role of fire has been partly restricted.<sup>12</sup> As a result the *pīrān* and *ziyāratgāh*, shrines and pilgrimage places, exist on only a modest scale. The independence of the rituals connected with the *pīrān* and *ziyāratgāh* from the cult of fire and its parallels in the dominant Muslim and especially the Shi'ī environment, have nonetheless contributed greatly to the establishment of a new meaning for pilgrimage to the *pīrān*. The long-term but steady conversion of Iranian Zoroastrians from the eighth through the thirteenth centuries caused a harmful diminution of contributions to the Zoroastrian institutions and pious foundations, administered by the priests. As a result, already by the fourteenth century a large number of the Zoroastrian priestly institutions (including fire-temples and *hērbedestāns*, theological colleges or seminaries) had been abandoned, destroyed or converted into Islamic institutions. With the fall of the main Zoroastrian institutions, the sphere of influence of the Zoroastrian priests were also restricted.<sup>13</sup> This allowed non-priestly perspectives and practices to flourish, among others the adoption of *ziyārat* as an important part of pious lay rituals. Pilgrimage to the shrines of saints called *pīr* became popular among Zoroastrians. Since Zoroastrians traditionally do not bury the bodies of dead in the earth, they could not have grave-shrines. Instead the shrines of miraculously disappeared saints, empty shrines known as *pīr*, have enjoyed a huge popularity. Most specifically, from the early modern period onwards we have references to pilgrimages to seek the *pīr*'s blessing. It seems that similar to the Islamic Shi'ī and Ṣūfī traditions, it was believed that the *pīr*'s spirits remain close to the shrines in order to help those pilgrims who visit them. Today therefore,

<sup>12</sup> In struggle against the classical accusation of being “fire worshippers”, Iranian Zoroastrians de-emphasized, and still de-emphasize, the central role of fire within the Zoroastrian rituals; partly due to the abandonment of the inner priestly rituals among Iranian Zoroastrians, this has to some extent been accepted by the community itself.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Kreyenbroek 1987. On the status of the Zoroastrian priestly rituals in contemporary Iran cf. Daruwalla 2016.

the two main types of Zoroastrian pilgrimages are visits to the sacred ‘cathedral’ fires, as well as to the *pīrān* and *ziyāratgāhs*.

### Pilgrimage to “Cathedral” fires

Three sacred “cathedral” fires can be counted among the famous Zoroastrian pilgrim destinations of pre-Islamic Iran. The pilgrimage fire Ādur Burzēn-Mihr (literally, “Exalted is Mihr”), established in Parthia in northeast Iran, most likely on the Nīšāpūr mountains in the district once known as Rēvand in Ḥorāsān, drew pilgrims during the Parthian era (7<sup>th</sup> cent. BCE–3<sup>rd</sup> cent. CE). The other two great sacred fires were Ādur Gošnasp, established somewhere in Media, and Ādur Farrobay/Farnbāg (literally, “Having a Share through Fortune”), installed in Fārs, both presumably in the late Achaemenid or Parthian period.<sup>14</sup> The religious importance of these three great sacred fires of ancient Iran can be seen in the Zoroastrian belief that they were brought into existence at creation “for the protection of the world” by Ohrmazd himself (Bd. 18.8).

The pilgrimage to the great fire temples was practiced by the king and the royal family, as well as the lay Zoroastrians. The main cathedral fires were thought to have different curative powers. The pilgrimage of the Sasanian kings to the Ādur Gušnasp was indeed so prominent that it was remembered in various sources from the early Islamic time onward.<sup>15</sup> Ādur Gušnasp sanctuary (up to the early Islamic time known as Šiz) is the only one of the great fires to have been located and excavated.<sup>16</sup> Both Zoroastrian and medieval literary traditions,<sup>17</sup> as well as clay bullae inscriptions *in situ*, make it possible to identify the site known today as Taht-e Soelymān site as the Sasanian fire temple of Ādur Gošnasp, which was captured and demolished by the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Boyce 1983 a,b,c. For the fire temples in general cf. Schippmann 1971.

<sup>15</sup> Ādur Gušnasp was traditionally categorized by Zoroastrian scholastics as the fire of the warrior estate, to which the kings themselves belonged.

<sup>16</sup> For the structure and layout of Ādur Gušnasp fire temple cf. Huff 2008.

<sup>17</sup> The site is mentioned already by all of the medieval Oriental chroniclers, e.g. Ebn Ḳordādbēh, Ṭabarī, Bel‘ami, Ebn al-Faḳīh, Mas‘ūdī, Ferdōsī, Yāqut, Ḥamd-Allāh Mostawfī et al. For references cf. Huff 2002.

troops of Emperor Heraclius in 623 CE.<sup>18</sup> Located about 30 km north-northeast of Takāb in Āzarbāyġān, this important archaeological site with significant Sasanian and Ilkhanid ruins provides us with remains of a royal complex at the south, as well as pilgrimage facilities at the north part of the site. This is probably the only archaeological evidence to show how a major fire temple might have worked as a pilgrimage site. There is a separate, not very convenient entrance (compared with the easily accessible royal southern way for the king) for the normal pilgrims to the north. Ascending the northern hill, the entering pilgrims had to continue walking forward from the outer gate through the inner gate up to the gatehouse of the courtyard. The south forecourt was the accommodation place with shelters, refuges and lavatories for the visiting pilgrims, in which votive plaques and amulets have been found.<sup>19</sup> Presenting a votive offering or purchasing such objects to take as a souvenir are well-attested pilgrimage practices.

The king's pilgrimage to Ādur Gušnasp seems to have been one of the major ceremonies of accession to the throne. Every newly enthroned king was supposed to make a pilgrimage to Ādur Gošnasp, completely or at least partly on foot after the coronation, as well as before and after important occasions, such as a military campaign,<sup>20</sup> or in general just as a sign of veneration.<sup>21</sup>

Ebn-e Hordādbēh (fl. 9<sup>th</sup> century), the Persian geographer and bureaucrat under the 'Abbāsīd Caliph al-Mu'tamid (r. 869–885 CE), born into a Zoroastrian convert family to Islam, writes in his *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik* ("Book of Roads and Kingdoms"), the earliest

<sup>18</sup> For the administrative importance of Ādurbādġān in general and Šīz in particular during the Sasanian and the post-Sasanian period cf. Ghodrat-Dizaji 2007.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Naumann/Huff/Schnyder 1975, 110–18; Huff 2002.

<sup>20</sup> In the *Šāhnāme* is mentioned that Xosrow I *Anōšīravan* (r. 531–79) paid a visit to Ādur Gušnasp before setting out on a military expedition (Khaleghi-Motlagh 2008, Vol. VII, 522–523), and later he lavished royal gifts and an enormous quantity of treasure taken from tribute received from Byzantium on the fire-temple, for its role as the protector of wayfarers and travelers (Khaleghi-Motlagh 2008, Vol. VII, 2373–2380); cf. Boyce 1983c.

<sup>21</sup> The fire temple Ādur Gošnasp, called also Āzar Ābādāġān in the *Šāhnāme* is frequently mentioned there, cf. Wolff 1965, 6. For classical and Arabic references to Ādur Gušnasp cf. Schippmann 1971, 309–57.

surviving Arabic book of administrative geography:

And Urmia, the city of Zarathuštra and Salmās and Šiz, in which the Ādur Gušnasp fire temple is located and has a high status among Zoroastrians. On his accession to the throne, each king had to go from Madāʿen [i.e. Ctesiphon] on a pilgrimage there by foot.

وأرمية مدينة زردشت وسلماس والشير وبها بيت نار اذرجشنس وهو عظيم القدر عند المجوس كان اذا ملك منهم الملك زاره من المدائن ماشيا.<sup>22</sup>

Elsewhere the Muslim historian and geographer Masʿūdī (c. 896–956) in his *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa-l-išrāf* (“Book of Admonition and Revision”) mentions:

And there [i.e. Šiz] are still today so many wonderful works of architecture and images with fascinating colours from the constellations and stars and of the world, from the drylands, the seas, the abodes and the ruins and mines and plants and animals and many other curiosities. And there is also a fire temple there, which is respected and venerated by all classes of Iranians. It is called *āzarḥoš*, for that *āzar* is the name of the fire in Persian and *hoš* means good, pleasant. Whenever an Iranian king acceded to the throne, he went on a pilgrimage there by foot to show his respect, to make offerings and to present gifts and goods to it [i.e. to the fire].

وفيه الى هذا الوقت آثار عجيبة من البنيان والصور، بأنواع الاصباغ العجيبة من صور الأفلاك والنجوم والعالم وما فيه من بر وبحر وعامر ومعدن وخراب ونبات وحيوان وغير ذلك من العجائب ولهم فيها بيت نار معظم عند سائر طبقات الفرس يقال له «آذرخش» و «آذر» أحد أسماء النار بالفارسية و «الخش» الطيب وكان الملك من ملوك الفرس إذا ملك زاره ماشيا تعظيما له، وتندر له النذور، وتحمل اليه التحف والأموال.<sup>23</sup>

In Ferdōsī’s *Šāhnāme*, which relies on the Sasanian traditions of *Xwadāy-nāmags*, one can find numerous mentions of the Ādur Gušnasp fire-temple, to which the kings and heroes pay reverence,

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Ebn Ḥordāzbeh/ed. de Goeje 1889, 91, 119–20. The translation is mine.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Masʿūdī/ed. de Goeje 1894, 95. The translation is mine.

seek out as a holy place for expression of gratitude, and to which to make endowments. The legendary Kayanian hero-king Kay-Ḥorsro,<sup>24</sup> after coming back from Turān to Iran and reporting his deeds to his grandfather Kay-Kāvus, in despair of catching Afrāsiyāb after his flight from Gang-dež, accompanies his grandfather on a pilgrimage to Ādur Gušnasp fire-temple, and prays that Afrāsiyāb may be delivered into their hands. They bring the temple and the priests gifts and show their respect and humility by crying their souls out. The mention of humble crying as an act of pilgrimage and visiting of a holy shrine is remarkable. Crying (MP *grīstan*) and lamentation (MP *mōyag*) were generally considered within the Zoroastrian tradition to be sinful demon-supported acts, particularly when lamentation was made for the departed.<sup>25</sup> In the Islamic tradition, however, crying was regarded positively as a sign of humbleness and modesty<sup>26</sup> which “illuminate[s] the heart”.<sup>27</sup> If this was not originally genuine Zoroastrian custom, the later association of such piety practises with Zoroastrian pilgrimage is notable.<sup>28</sup> Elsewhere, Kay-Ḥosro went with all the nobles of the royal family to the Ādur Gušnasp fire-temple, and spent forty days there with minstrels, harp, and wine. This kind of pilgrimage praxis still constitutes the main activity of Zoroastrian pilgrims to the empty

<sup>24</sup> Kay-Ḥorsro is considered as the founder of the Ādur Gušnasp fire temple both in Zoroastrian tradition (Bd.17.7; Dk.VIII.39) and by Ferdōsī: | فرزندۀ جوشن و زین و اسب | “Thou dost exalt steed, mail, and saddle, and give to glorious Āzar Gošasb fresh lustre”; lightly altered after Warner/Warner 1909, vol. 4, 274.

<sup>25</sup> According to the Zoroastrian tradition, when Zarathuštra was born, he *laughed* instead of *crying*, which is considered one of his miracles. The juxtaposition of crying and laughing in the Zoroastrian tradition is highlighted in the fact that it is said that before Zarathuštra was born, the demons were rampant and oppressive, attacking humans, assaulting and raping women, as in Yt.19.80: *āat tā snaodəntiš gərəzānā | hazō niuuarəzaiēn daēuua* “and the demons used to subject to violence those crying and screaming (women)”. So the crying and screaming of the humans under suffering came to an end with the birth of Zarathuštra, which was marked by his laughter (WZ VIII.15); among others cf. Gignoux/Tafazzoli 1993, 64–65, 223.

<sup>26</sup> *Qurʾān*, Surat al-Māʾidah 5:83.

<sup>27</sup> In a *ḥadīṣ* from the first Shiʿi Imam it is mentioned: «البكاء من خشية الله ينير القلب ويعصم من» “Crying out of fear of God illuminates the heart and prevents a person from returning to past sins”; cf. Nūrī Ṭabrisī 1408 q [1987] vol. 11, p. 245, *ḥadīṣ* 36.

<sup>28</sup> For further references cf. Daryaee 2009, 96.

shrines of the *pīrs* (see below). The *Šāhnāme* also tells the story of how the Sasanian king Hūšraw II (590–628) made a pilgrimage to the Ādur Gušnasp fire-temple to pray for the support of the gods for his victory before leaving for his campaign against Bahrām VI Čōbīn.

In modern times, the Pārsis seem also to continue the tradition of pilgrimage to the cathedral fire-temples hosting Ātaš Bahrāms, which they took with them in great metal containers to secure places during times of persecution. The most important such pilgrimage is to the fire-temple which houses the Irānšāh Ātaš Bahrām “the Victorious Fire, King of Iran”, the most celebrated holy fire of the Pārsis,<sup>29</sup> now located in Udvaḍa (India), in the western coastal province of Gujarat. It was watched for four hundred years in Navsārī (India), before being transferred in 1741 to Udvaḍa as the result of a jurisdictional dispute between two Zoroastrian factions.<sup>30</sup> Again, the consecration of a second Ātaš Bahrām in Navsari in 1765 made the city an important centre of pilgrimage for the Pārsis.

<sup>29</sup> Other important ‘living’ Ātaš Bahrāms are Desai Ātaš Bahrām (Navsari), Dadiseth Ātaš Bahrām (Mumbai), Modi Ātaš Bahrām (Surat), Vakil Ātaš Bahrām (Surat), Wadia Ātaš Bahrām (Mumbai), Banaji Ātaš Bahrām (Mumbai), Anjuman Ātaš Bahrām (Navsari), all in India; and Yazd Ātaš Bahrām (Yazd), in Iran.

<sup>30</sup> The Irānšāh Ātaš Bahrām was established in 1742 CE in Udvaḍa. According to the Zoroastrian tradition, its fire was brought by a large group of persecuted Zoroastrians who fled to India after the Arab conquest of Iran, and was consecrated in 721 CE (*rōz ādar*, *māh ādar*, 90 AY) at Sanjan, Gujarat. It was moved first to the safety of Surat before being brought to its present resting place in Udvaḍa; cf. Boyce/Kotwal 2006, 531–33. The Sanjan fire-temple, which once housed the Ātaš Bahrām, no longer exists; however, pilgrims usually include a visit to the historic town of Sanjan as part of their pilgrimage to Udvaḍa. The journey of the Ātaš Bahrām before it was brought to Udvaḍa is recounted in the narrative poem *Qeṣṣe-ye Sanjān* “The Story of Sanjān”, composed by Dastur Bahman Kaiqobād Sanjana in 1599; cf. Hinnells 2008. For an edition of the text cf. Williams 2009.



### Pilgrimage to the Empty Shrines of Saints

As briefly delineated, the early Islamic sources as well as the *Šāhnāme* put an emphasis on the making pilgrimage to sacred fires and on the practice of vowing to the fire and presenting gifts to the fire temple.<sup>31</sup> However, the marginalization of the Zoroastrian community during early Islamic times, followed by the destruction and abandonment of the cathedral fire-temples in Iran, put an end to these main pilgrimage sites. In order to protect and preserve the holy fires, the high priests brought these to the small villages, far from the main centres or major cities. The rise in importance of the holy *pīrs* (also *pīrān-šāh* or *pīrān-gāh*), which are empty shrines, was probably the result of a strategic change in the pilgrimage behavior of the Zoroastrians after the fall of the Sasanian Empire, and was gradually established during the early Islamic centuries. The oldest record of a Zoroastrian *pīr* and the notion of doing pilgrimage to it can be found in the Persian *Revāyāt*. In the *Revāyat* of Bahman Esfandiyār Punjia, there is a letter from Torkābād, a Zoroastrian city some 60 km north-west of the city of Yazd. Torkābād, known as one of the “Persian Strongholds of Zoroastrianism”, a small city close to Šarīfābād, another important Zoroastrian village, was for centuries the city of refuge for the Mobadān-Mobads, the High Priests of the Iranian Zoroastrian community, and a shelter for the Ātaš Bahrām, until the last Mobadān-Mobad of Torkābād was compelled to move to Yazd during the reign of the Nāder Shah (1736-1747 CE). The letter is dated to 996 AY (1626 CE), and mentions the name of Hātun Bānū Pārs as a pilgrimage site:

<sup>31</sup> For a complete survey of all attestations of Ādur Gušnasp in classical Persian and Arabic sources cf. Mo‘ in 1326 š [1947], 204–15.

[...] Let it be known to the Dasturs, Mobeds, Herbads and Behdīns of India that Behdīn Bahman ben Esfandiyār honoured us with his visit in Iran at the village of Torkābād and he stayed in [our] service for several days. As he had come with a ship by crossing the sea, he was supposed to undergo an obligatory atonement, and [therefore] we have atoned him according to the Zoroastrian regulation. He accomplished it completely. We performed [also] a Barešnūm (purification ritual) for him, and he carried it for nine nights; and let it be clear that he catered for water and fire and served the Ātaš Bahrām according to the religious principles. Again, let it be acknowledged that he offered his services to Ȥātun Bānū Pārs, which is a pilgrimage site; He [carefully] performed [all the rituals] in every incident according to the [religious] tenets.

[...] و معلوم دستوران و موبدان و هیربدان و بهدینان کشور هندوستان بوده باشند که بهدین بهمن بن اسفندیار در ایران شهر در ولایت ترکاباد تشریف آورده و چند روزی بخدمت بود و چون براه کشتی و تران دریا آمده بود او را توجش لازم بود و آنچه قاعده دین زرتشتی بود او را توجش فرمودیم قبول کرد و تمام بجای رساند و او را برش نوم کردیم و نه شوه داشت و خدمت آب و آتشها و آتش ورهرام آن چه قواعد دین بود کرده تا واضح بوده باشد و دیگر معلوم بوده باشد که خدمت خاتون بانو بارس که زیارتگاهست هم کرد و آن چه که قاعده بود در هر باب کرد [...] <sup>32</sup>.

The letter is an important attestation for the importance of the pilgrimage for both the Irānī and Pārsi communities and clearly shows the twofold relation between the visitation of both cathedral fire and the *pīr* shrine in fulfilment of religious duties.

<sup>32</sup> Unvala 1922, Vol. 2, 158–59. Cf. also Dhabhar 1932, 593.



*Image 1* - The old dome of the shrine of Pīr-e Bānu-Pārs, the earliest historically attested Zoroastrian pilgrimagage empty shrine, 112 km northwest of Yazd near Šarīfābād. The onion-like dome was covered with white and green glazed tiles, representing six cypresses. Photograph: Firoza Punthakey Mistree © Godrej/Punthakey Mistree 2002, 238-239.

The practice of pilgrimage to empty shrines and reflections on their background is also attested in an apologetic treatise called *Mas'ale-ye Dīn* ("Tenets of the Religion"), an Zoroastrian text from the reign of Fath- 'Alī Šāh (1772–1834), composed by Ḥodābaḥš son of Ġāmāsp in approximately 800 couplets during the year 1207 AY/1837 in Yazd.<sup>33</sup> This text relates an encounter with the Qajar governor of Yazd, Prince Moḥammad Valī Mīrzā (r. 1821–1828). The text introduces the Qajar prince as a just and moderate governor, though without any knowledge about the Zoroastrian community under his rule. Receiving complaints and accusations about the alleged impiety and ungodliness of the Zoroastrians, in order to investigate he addresses the Iranian priests with a series of thirty-three questions. Should they not be able to persuade the prince, he will use force either to convert or kill them all. He writes a letter and lists all his questions about the Zoroastrian prophet, *vožū'* (ritual ablution), *qeble* (direction of prayer), *rūze* (fasting), *taḥārat* (rites of purification), *ḥāyež-šodan* (menstruation), *ḥalāl-o ḥarām* (proper slaughter of animals), *ḥoms* (one-fifth tax of acquired wealth), *'ert* (inheritance), *vaqfiyāt* (endowments), as well as *ziyārat* (pilgrimage), etc.<sup>34</sup> The question are brought to the high priest Dastūr Keyḥosro, who in turn initiates a council by inviting two other scholar priests Mobad Ḥodābaḥš Forud and Mobad Ġāmāsb to answer the questions of the prince. As already mentioned, the fifteenth question is about pilgrimage in Zoroastrianism:

باب پانزدهم در باب زیارتگاه و پاسخ دادن آن<sup>35</sup>

سوال پانزده ماندم بعاجب	زیارت‌گه کجا دانید واجب
کسی‌تان جایگاهی گشت <sup>36</sup> غایب	چسان معجز نمود او از عجایب
بپاسخ آنچه خواهی آشکارا	نویسم من چنین بهر شما را
زیارتگاه ما بد سرو کشر	که بود از معجز دین پیمبر
بدان شهری که خوانی بلخ بامی	زیارتگاه شاهان بد مدامی

<sup>33</sup> Ḥāze 'Elāhābādī 1327 š [1948], 133–86.

<sup>34</sup> The text is also introduced by Sheffield 2015b, 535–36.

<sup>35</sup> Ḥāze 'Elāhābādī 1327 š [1948], 161–63.

<sup>36</sup> *ac* کشت

کنون مارا برفتن دسترس نیست  
 ولی بعد از وفات شاه یزدگرد<sup>37</sup>  
 بایران چون خلیفه گشت<sup>39</sup> عمر  
 دو دخترهای یزدگرد<sup>40</sup> شهنشاه  
 دگر خاتون که بد در فارس بانو  
 عمر میخواست بانو را بگیرد  
 چو بانو زین سخن گردید آگاه  
 به پنهانی گریزان شد دل افکار  
 چو تازی زین سخن گردید آگاه  
 سه ماه رویان ابا پای برهنه  
 ز بهر نام و ننگ و دین یزدان  
 همه تشنه لب و گشنه<sup>41</sup> شب و روز  
 دو نرگس خونفشان و آبریزان  
 چو گنجشکی<sup>43</sup> که از فریاد بگریخت<sup>44</sup>  
 ز بخت خویشتن حیران و گریان  
 پس آنکه<sup>46</sup> رخ بدرگاه خداوند  
 گهی<sup>47</sup> بر آسمان و گاه بر خاک  
 توئی رازق بهر جا بی نظیری  
 بگفتند این و زاری ها نمودند  
 به یزدان هریکی بگریست بسیار

زهمکیشان ما الحال کس نیست  
 عمر در پارس با لشکر شدن گرد<sup>38</sup>  
 کیان را اسیری شد بخت و اختر  
 که بودند هریکی بر تخت چون ماه  
 شبستان جملگی روشن بد از او  
 به کیش و دین خود او را پذیرد  
 ابا آن دختران نامور شاه  
 بسوی یزد رو آورد ناچار  
 نمود لشکر پی ایشان روانه  
 ز بیم دشمنان نالان و خسته  
 فراری هریک از کوهی همیدان  
 نه غمخواری بهمره شان نه دلسوز  
 همی رفتند هر سوئی گریزان<sup>42</sup>  
 و یا صیدی که از صیاد بگریخت<sup>45</sup>  
 ز آه و سوزشان شد کوه بریان  
 بخاک اندر بنالیدن نهادند  
 همی گفتند ایا ای داور پاک  
 مر این بیچارگان را دستگیری  
 رخ خویش اندران خاره بسودند  
 بامر حق تعالی کوه بیدار

---

<sup>37</sup> یزدکرد ac

<sup>38</sup> کرد ac

<sup>39</sup> کشت ac

<sup>40</sup> یزدکرد ac

<sup>41</sup> کشنه ac

<sup>42</sup> کریزان ac

<sup>43</sup> کنجشکی ac

<sup>44</sup> بگریخت ac

<sup>45</sup> بگریخت ac

<sup>46</sup> آنکه ac

<sup>47</sup> کهی ac

دهن برهم گشود <sup>48</sup> از هر سه جانب	بصدق هریک بکوهی گشت <sup>49</sup> غایب
چو دم بر حق زدند آن حق شناسان	بر ایشان کار مشکل گشت آسان
برو بر قلب خالص راه یابی	چو کردار و زبان یکسان نمائی
چو آن خالق مر ایشان را چنان دید	همه هر سه بلطف خویش بگزید <sup>50</sup>
که آن آثار سنگش <sup>51</sup> هست ظاهر	به باطن یک بیک بودند ظاهر
بر ایشان دست ظالم گشت <sup>52</sup> کوتاه	عجب سنگ سیه گشتند از راه
زیارتگاه ما باشد هم اکنون	بسی معجز شده ظاهر بخوبون

The fifteenth chapter: [question] on *ziyāratgāh* (pilgrimage shrines) and the response to it.

“The fifth question: I wonder, what do you consider the obligatory pilgrimage site?

Has anybody ever vanished, who in this way brought forth a miracle worthy of admiration?”

“In response I will frankly write for you what you are looking for; Our pilgrimage site is the cypress of Kašmar, which is a miracle of the prophet’s religion;

Located in a city called Balḥ-e Bāmī, it was a perpetual pilgrimage site of the kings;

For the time being, neither have we any chance to reach the place, nor [can one find] a companion among our co-religionists;

But after King Yazdgerd’s passing, ‘Omar came together with his army in Fārs;

As he became the Caliph over Iran, the fortune of the Kings expired and the [the good omen of their] horoscope elapsed;

[There lived still] the two daughters of King Yazdgerd, who were each [beautiful and elegant] like a moon on the throne;

And also the other princess, who was the Lady of Fārs; the

<sup>48</sup> *ac* کشود

<sup>49</sup> *ac* کشت

<sup>50</sup> *ac* بگزید

<sup>51</sup> *ac* سنکش

<sup>52</sup> *ac* کشت

[royal] gynæceum was luminous because of her presence;  
 'Omar wanted to capture the Lady and [force her] to accept his  
 faith and religion;  
 As the Lady heard of this affair, together with other daughters  
 of the king,  
 Wounded and distressed, she fled secretly and headed to Yazd  
 out of necessity;  
 As the *tāzī* [i.e. 'Omar] was informed about this, he sent his  
 army after them;  
 Barefooted, those beautiful three Moon-faced [princesses],  
 terrified of [their] enemies, lamenting, and tired,  
 For the sake of the good name and honour and God's religion,  
 each running away in the direction of a mountain;  
 They were all thirsty and hungry day and night, without any  
 compassionate or benevolent [friend];  
 Shedding blood and weeping bitter tears from their narcissi [i.e.  
 beautiful eyes], they took flight in every direction;  
 Like a sparrow running away from a shout, or prey fleeing the  
 hunter;  
 Perplexed and weeping from their [bad] fortune, the mountain  
 was terrified by their heart-rending sighs;  
 Then they implored to God, lamenting for mercy;  
 Now falling to the earth, now looking to the heavens, they said,  
 'O just Supreme Judge!  
 You are the peerless Giver of the necessities of life, you are the  
 reliever of the helpless poor.'  
 Thus they spoke, weeping and scratching their visages on the  
 mountain rocks;  
 Each of them cried much to God, while by the command of the  
 Most High God, the mountains were wakeful;  
 The mountains opened their mouths in three directions, in truth  
 each of them vanished into one of the mountains;  
 As those grateful ones spoke the truth, what was difficult was  
 made easy for them;  
 You will find your path to him if you have a pure heart and your  
 deed and words are one;



As the Lord the Creator saw them in [that pious] manner, he  
 chose them all out of his grace.  
 The vestiges [of that miracle] are still visible, in the heart they  
 are all revealed;  
 The hand of the cruel tyrant fell short of them, as they  
 miraculously became black stones;  
 These are now our pilgrimage sites, where the good fair people  
 have witnessed many miracles.”

The first pilgrimage site mentioned by the priests is the cypress of Kašmar in Balḥ-e Bāmī,<sup>53</sup> which was not accessible to the Zoroastrians of the time.<sup>54</sup> There are some celebrated cypresses in the Zoroastrian tradition, which are also mentioned in the later Islamic sources, both Persian and Arabic. The first famous cypress is the one from Kašmar (in the district of Taršīz in Ḥorāsān). The cypress tree plays a crucial symbolic role for the foundation of the Zoroastrian religion, remembering Goštāsp (Vištāspa)’s conversion. The *Dāstān-e Goštāsp* (“Tale of Goštāsp”) in the *Šāhnāme*, told by Abū Manšūr Aḥmad Daqīqī (d. c. 976 CE), says that Zarathuštra brought it from paradise. Either Zarathuštra himself or his patron King Goštāsp planted the wonderful cypress-tree at the gate of the fire-temple at Kašmar, upon whose trunk it was carved that the King had accepted the ‘Good Religion.’<sup>55</sup> The tradition of going on foot to make a pilgrimage to the cypress of Kašmar was already alive in the tenth century:<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Zarathuštra’s name in his later days is intimately associated with the city of Balḥ and Bactriana. The name of Balḥ is also mentioned in the list of countries in the first chapter of the *Vendīdād* (Vd. 1.6-7). The Av. Bāxδī/ Bāxtrī-, (Bactria in Greek) has the epitheton *srīra*- “beautiful” in Avesta and is mentioned in Classical Persian poetry of Farroḡī (c. 980 – 1037 or 1038), Asadī-ye Tūsī (ca. 390/999-1000 – 465/1072-73) and Ferdōsī (329-410 or 416/940-1019 or 1025) from the early Islamic periods.

<sup>54</sup> After living for some fourteen and a half centuries, according to the Islamic sources, in 861 AD, the ‘Abbāsīd caliph Mutawakkil (r. 847-861) ordered that the famous cypress of Kašmar be cut down; cf. Beyhaqī (Ebn Fondoq)/ed. Bahmanyār 1308 š [1929], 281-83; Morony 1986, 1111.

<sup>55</sup> To plant a tree to celebrate a significant event is still a usual practice in Iran. Metaphorically, to plant a tree refers to instituting a new convention or tradition.

<sup>56</sup> For evidences and more details cf. Dahlén 2011, 132-33.



یکی سرو آزاده را زردهشت      به پیش در آذر اندر بکشت  
 نبشتش بر آن زاد و سرو سهی      که پذیرفت گشتاسب دین بهی  
 [...]

فرستاد هرسو به کشور پیام      که چون سرو کشر به گیتی کدام  
 زمینو فرستاد زی من خدای      مرا گفت از این جا به مینو گرای  
 کنون جمله این پند من بشنوید      پیاده سوی سرو کشر روید

Zarathuštra then planted him a noble cypress  
 Before the portal of the Fane of Fire,  
 And wrote upon that noble, straight-stemmed tree:  
 "Gushtasp is convert to the good religion";  
 [...]

He sent this message through the realm:  
 "In all the world what equalleth the cypress of Kašmar?  
 God sent it down to me from Paradise,  
 And said: 'Ascend to Paradise therefrom',  
 Now hearken, all of you, this rede of mine:  
 Go to the cypress of Kašmar afoot".<sup>57</sup>

The next three pilgrimage sites mentioned in the poem are the traditional Zoroastrian empty shrines or *pīrs*, belonging to the three daughters of the last Sasanian king Yazdgird III. Only one of them, namely the Pīr-e Bānū Pārs, is referred to directly: دگر خاتون که بد در فارس: "the other one, who was the Lady in Fārs", which clearly refers to the Bānū Pārs. The other two must be the Sasanian Princesses Gohar-Bānū and Ḥayāt-Bānū, to whom the Pīr-e Herišt and the Pīr-e Sabz or Pīr-e Čak-Čak(ū) are dedicated respectively. The mythological narrative is the same, as it is known from all the *pīrs* (see below). The priests indicate that many pious pilgrims have witnessed miracles in those shrines.

Iranian Zoroastrian tradition recommended that each Zoroastrian make at least one pilgrimage to the holy *pīrs* and the cathedral fire of Yazd during his or her lifetime. The *pīrs*, especially those scattered in Yazd province, constantly attract Zoroastrian pilgrims from around the world, who pay a visit to these shrines to request that some petition

<sup>57</sup> Slightly altered after Warner/Warner 1910, Vol. 5, 34–35.



Image 2- The entrance of the shrine of Pir-e Bānu-Pārs. Photograph: Khojaste Mistree  
© Godrej/Punthakey Mistree 2002, 238

be granted, or just on the special annual festival day of the shrines. Either pilgrims are motivated by a specific need, or, more usually, they wait to be “called” to pay a visit to the *pīrs*. The call manifests itself typically in form of a dream.

Over the past several decades, and regularly after the establishment of the Islamic Republic in 1979, a number of Pārsi organizations and agencies have come to organize different annual tours to Iran as part of the “Zoroastrian Pārsi heritage”, with a special accent on religion. This new “religious tourism”<sup>58</sup> offers a novel opportunity to the Pārsi community to become more connected to its cultural heritage and for constructing a religious identity in which the land of their ancestors, Iran, plays an important role. For some, the pilgrimage to Iran is also an occasion to receive revelations.<sup>59</sup> These pilgrimage tours involve visits to ancient Iranian sites and regular visits to Mountain Damāvand, the main fire-temples and the *pīrān*, for which there is generally no equivalent in Pārsi Zoroastrianism.<sup>60</sup>

Nowadays Iranian Zoroastrians undertake pilgrimages on a variety of occasions. These include, among others, commemorating a departed relative, friend or family member; to accompany important life-events, such as marriage, something which is very popular among young engaged couples and is usually undertaken before the official wedding ceremony; in order to seek fulfilment of a wish (e.g. a desire to have children, pass an exam, or recover from a serious illness); or in order to celebrate a *gāšan* or *gāhānbār* festival on diverse occasions.

The evolution of the practice of making *ziyārat* to a saint’s shrine within Zoroastrianism (specifically among the Zoroastrians of Iran) under Islamic rule was most probably due in part to the Judæo-Christian concept of the saints as mediators between God and humans. Intermediary figures between the laity and the omnipotent God arose in order to satisfy the needs which had been served by the gods and

<sup>58</sup> A categorical difference between pilgrims and tourists, pilgrimage and tourism, is for some scholars no longer tenable. According to this view, pilgrimage is considered a form of tourism, or more specifically as “religious tourism”; cf. Stausberg 2011.

<sup>59</sup> For a documentation of revelatory experiences among Pārsis cf. Kreyenbroek 2011, 134–135, 142, 169.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Stausberg 2011, 49ff.

patrons of their old, pre-monotheistic traditions. This idea was also adopted by Muslims, especially in Imamate Shī'ism. Thus in Shī'ī piety, the annual visitation of the martyred Imāms' shrines<sup>61</sup> is believed to be a powerful means to win forgiveness for sins.<sup>62</sup> It was believed that through the visitation and the act of reverence for the saints, prayers recited by the shrine, and votive offerings, the petitioners could gain the help and *ṣafā'at*, intercession, of the saints with God on their behalf. It also guaranteed that the pilgrim would share in the final victory of the messianic Imām at the end of the history. Shrines are also seen as a place where pilgrims are able to share in an Imām's sanctity.<sup>63</sup> A similar attitude to *ziyārat* can be assumed among the Zoroastrians of Iran. Zoroastrians share a number of shrines with their Muslim neighbours, and there is sufficient evidence to trace the Zoroastrian origins of a dozen of what are today Shī'ī shrines. A good example of the former type of shrine is the shrine of Bābā Šarafoddīn in Taft. For the latter, the most prominent example is the shrine of Bibi-Šahr-bānū (lit. "Lady of the Land [of Iran]")<sup>64</sup>, on the top of the hills of the same name, in the ancient city of Rayy, south of Tehran.<sup>65</sup> In Shī'ī tradition, Bibi-Šahr-bānū has a very special place, as she is believed to be the daughter of the last Sasanian king Yazdgerd III. (623-652) and the spouse of the

<sup>61</sup> Beside the Imāms' shrines, there are not only numerous shrines dedicated to the ancient prophets and sages (like Adam, Noah, Daniel, Jesaja, etc), but also to Šūfī saints (like Borğ-e Allāh, the mausoleum of Šeyḥ Šafī-al-Dīn Ardabilī), whose mausoleums and tombs were gradually replaced by *emāmzādes*, descendents of Shī'ī Imāms, in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century in Iran, following the foundation of the Safavid dynasty. The *emāmzādes* have a special place within the *ziyārat* tradition and are a focus of popular devotion up to the present day.

<sup>62</sup> The earliest known Shī'ī pilgrimage guides include the *Kitāb al-Ziyārāt* of the Kūfan jurist al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Faḍḍāl al-Taymī al-Kūfī (d. 224/838-9), Ibn Kūlūya's (d. 368/978-9) *Kāmil al-ziyārat*, his disciple Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Nu'mān al-Ḥarīṭhī (al-Šhayḫ al-Mufid)'s (d. 413/1022) *Kitāb al-Mazār* and Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḳummi's (d. 368/978 or 379/989) *Kitāb al-Mazārāt al-kabīr*; cf. Meri 2002, 526.

<sup>63</sup> For an overview of Muslim pilgrimage in Iran and other Shī'ī countries cf. Sachedina 2002, 533-34; Meri et al. 2002.

<sup>64</sup> The oldest part of the present shrine can be dated back to the tenth century. The building was expanded later during the Safavid and Qajar periods. The fifteenth-century *ẓarīḥ* (the gilded lattice structure that encloses a grave) of the inner sanctuary, which is said to hold her remains, is built in an ordinary *emāmzādeh style*.

<sup>65</sup> For a new survey of Rayy, cf. Rante 2015.

third Imām, al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (martyred at Karbalā’ in 61 AH/680 CE), which makes her the “Mother of the Nine [subsequent] Imams”.<sup>66</sup> This marriage symbolizes the marriage between Iran and Islam in the Iranian mind, uniting its pre-Islamic Zoroastrian heritage with its new religious identity and at the same time legitimizing the Iranian claim that their loyalty to Shī‘ism reaches back to the very advent of Islam. The legend also plays an important role in the transmission of the concept of Light in Imamism, namely the notion of *nūr al-walāya*, the Light of Vicegerency, source of esoteric knowledge and charisma, inherited both from the prophet Muḥammad, via ‘Alī and Fāṭima, and the *xʷarənah*-, “Light of Glory”,<sup>67</sup> from the ancient Iranian kings.<sup>68</sup> The shrine of Bibī-Šāhrbānū, generally devoted only to the female and male descendants of the Prophet (*seyeds*), is regularly visited by both Muslim and Zoroastrian pilgrims. The legend makes also the sharing of the saint possible as for the Zoroastrians pilgrims the Muslim visitors are “their sons-in-law (*dāmād*)”.<sup>69</sup>

The plot of Bibī-Šāhrbānū’s legend is a very Zoroastrian one, already known from other six major Zoroastrian *pīrs*, e.g. Pīr-e Sabz and Pīr-e Bānū Pārs.<sup>70</sup> All of the Zoroastrian empty shrines share the same legendary pattern, in which usually a high-ranking female member of the Sasanian ruling dynasty, generally a queen or a princess, plays a

<sup>66</sup> The Shī‘ī narrative of Bibī-Šāhrbānū goes back to at least the ninth century CE, however it lacks a clear historical base. According to the Shi‘i tradition, Šāhrbānū was taken captive after the Arab invasion of Iran and was taken to Medina where the first Imām ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib decided to marry her to his second son al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. According to some narratives, she died and was buried in Medina after giving birth to ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-‘Ābedīn Saḡād (d. 92/711 or 95/714), the fourth Shi‘i Imām (Mohammad Baqer Maḡlesi 1627–1699 in his *Galā’ al-‘Oyun* “Polishing eyes”), whereas some other narratives say that she was present at the battle of Karbalā’ and fled back to Iran after al-Ḥusayn’s martyrdom (Moḥammad Hāšem Āṣaf in his *Rostam al-Tavārīḡ*). In the early Muslim accounts, up to the ninth century, it is a Sindhi or Ḥorāsānī slave who gave birth to the fourth Shi‘i Imām. For a detailed analysis of the sources cf. Amir-Moezzi 2011, 45–100.

<sup>67</sup> In German “Glücksglanz”. For *xʷarənah*- cf. Gnoli 1992, 312–19.

<sup>68</sup> Amir-Moezzi 2011, 51–52.

<sup>69</sup> Fischer mentions this idea, which I’ve also heard from Zoroastrians in Yazd and Tehran, but inverts it, apparently by mistake; cf. Fischer 1991, 138.

<sup>70</sup> Both shrines are first recorded in texts from the seventeenth century; cf. Langer 2004, 571.



central role. The core of the legend is the escape of the pious royal family member from the Arab Muslim conquerors, who aim to convert him or her, whereupon a miracle happens and Ahura Mazdā rescues them from a forced conversion through a legendary disappearance (*ḡeyb šodan*) into mountain cliffs. The legend of the Zoroastrian sanctuary of Bānū Pārs, “the Lady of Persia”, in the northwestern plain of Yazd is a good example of this generic plot. According to the legend, Hātūn Bānū is a daughter of Yazdgird III who escapes from the Arab army. Just before being caught by her enemies, the princess appeals to God for help. The mountain miraculously opens and offers her refuge. As it closes behind her, a piece of her scarf is caught between the rocks, thus acting as witness to her sanctity.<sup>71</sup>

In the Bībī-Šahrbānū legend, after surviving the battle of Karbalā’ the protagonist flees back to Iran, where she is hunted by her enemies. Her pursuers close behind her, Šahrbānū reaches Rayy, where the cliff-face opens miraculously and she passes behind it and is concealed there. However, a small piece of her garments was caught between the rocks as the mountain closed on her, demonstrating her sainthood; the shrine which was built there, became a pilgrimage place. The creation of Bībī-Šahrbānū’s shrine and her legend seem to have been rather a political act to ensure and legitimize the Iranian elements of the nascent Islamic Iranian identity, in which a local Zoroastrian veneration of a *pīr* was replaced with an Islamic one. The name of the shrine also suggests a strong connection with the pre-Islamic veneration of the ancient Iranian Goddess Anāhīd (Av. Arədvī Sūrā Anāhitā), a popular Zoroastrian *yazata*, celebrated in *Yašt* 5 (*Ābān Yašt*), one of the longest and best preserved Avestan hymns. Interestingly the goddess also bore the Middle Persian title *bānūg*, “the Lady”, at least in the Sasanian period,<sup>72</sup> whereas the shrine’s *ziyārat-nāme* give her titles as *Šāh-Ġahān* “King of the world,” *Šāh-e zanān* “King of women,” and *Ġahān-Bānū* “Lady of the world.”<sup>73</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Sorūšiān 1335 § [1956]), 204; Boyce 1967: 31–32.

<sup>72</sup> E.g. in his inscription at Paikuli, Narseh invokes “in the name of Ohrmazd and all the *gods*, and Anāhīd who is called the Lady” (MP *’nhyt ZY MROTA*); cf. Humbach/Skjærvø 1983, 35.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Boyce 1989, 198; Qomī 1388 § [2010].



*Image 3- General view of the Pir-e Bānu - Pārs shrine complex with the renovated dome in 2006, redecorated with white glazed tiles and the green fravahar symbol. © Photo by JOVIKA (<https://bit.ly/2wovoCp>)*

The six major contemporary Zoroastrian pilgrimage centres in Yazd province, Iran, are as follows:

1. Pīr-e Sabz (“The Green Saint/Shrine”), also known as Pīr-e Čak-Čak(ū)<sup>74</sup>, located near Ardakān, ca. 72 km from Yazd (Images 1-3). It has been the most popular of the Zoroastrian shrines in modern times. The annual pilgrimage to Pīr-e Sabz is today a kind of national event for Iranian Zoroastrians. The major pilgrimage period of Pīr-e Sabz is June 14<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup>, even if the shrine is open to everyone throughout the whole year. Pīr-e Sabz acts nowadays almost as a national Zoroastrian pilgrimage centre, visited by a large number of Zoroastrian (and also non-Zoroastrian) tourists, especially during the specific annual pilgrimage period in summer. The popularity of Pīr-e Sabz among Zoroastrians shows itself in many images of the shrine to be found in different Zoroastrian public and private spaces, on the walls, in wall and desk calendars, or elsewhere. The pilgrims converge on one point to pray in the grotto, where the water drips from the cliff above. Other activities and rites, distribution of *heyrāt*, chanting and playing music, happen later on the platforms outside. The pilgrims spend generally the night in the shelters which are built close by, as part of the shrine complex. The Šarīfābādīs as a rule celebrate a *gāhānbār-e tōgī* on the last day of the pilgrimage here.<sup>75</sup> The pilgrimage core time, as for all other *pīrs*, is a favourable time to celebrate marriages or initiation ceremonies for young children.
2. Pīr-e (Māh) Setī or Setī-Pīr, often visited on the way to Pīr-e Sabz, is located east of Yazd. Its pilgrimage date is June 14<sup>th</sup>.<sup>76</sup>
3. Pīr-e Nārestāne, which is located 31 km east of Yazd in the mountains of the old village of Ḥarānaq. Pīr-e Nārestāne is usually visited after Pīr-e Sabz, from June 23<sup>rd</sup>-27<sup>th</sup>.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>74</sup> For this shrine cf. Boyce 1977, 255–62; Afšār 1374 š [1995-96]), 63-65 (Vol. I); 63-65 (Vol. II); Langer 2008, 328–51.

<sup>75</sup> Goštāsb 1389 š [2010].

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Langer 2008, 473.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Langer 2008, 315-328.



4. Pīr-e Bānu-Pārs<sup>78</sup>, the earliest historically attested Zoroastrian *pīr* (see above) located 112 km northwest of Yazd near Šarīfābād. Its pilgrimage period is from July 4<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup>, for which the pilgrims usually walk twenty-four hours from Šarīfābād or the nearby village Zarġū(‘) to reach the shrine. A sacred rock and a perpetual spring also mark the complex.
5. Pīr-e Nāraki, which is located at the foot of Mount Nāraki, 58 km southeast of Yazd. The dedicated days for annual pilgrimage are August 3-7.<sup>79</sup>
6. Pīr-e Herišt, which is located 110 km northwest of Yazd near Šarīfābād (Image 4). Its pilgrimage period is March 27-31.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> For the shrine cf. Amir-Moezzi 2011; Boyce 1967: 30–44; Boyce 1989; Langer 2008, 352–372.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Langer 2008, 411–425.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Langer 2008, 372–386.

Zoroastrian major pilgrimage shrines in Yazd province			
Shrine	Core pilgrimage date		Site Dedication and heroes of the foundation legend
	Gregorian Calendar	Zoroastrian Calendar	
Pīr-e Herišt	March 27-31	<i>māh farvardīn, rūz amordād-ḥoršīd</i>	Royal Maid Morvārid or Gohar-Bānū, daughter of Yazdgird III
Pīr-e (Māh) Setī or Setī-Pīr	June 14	<i>māh ḥordād, rūz aštād</i>	Mehrbānū, a granddaughter of Yazdgird III, her mother, and a priest, Dastur Kerobād
Pīr-e Sabz or Pīr-e Čak-Čak(ū)	June 14-18	<i>māh ḥordād, rūz aštād-mahraspand</i>	Princess Ḥayāt-Bānū, daughter of Yazdgird III
Pīr-e Nārestāne	June 23-27	<i>māh tīr, rūz aspandmard-ādar</i>	Prince Ardešīr
Pīr-e Bānu-Pārs	July 4-8	<i>māh tīr, rūz meher-bahrām</i>	Princess Bānū Pārs, daughter of Yazdgird III
Pīr-e Nāraki	August 3-7	<i>māh amordād, rūz meher-bahrām</i>	Nāz-Bānū, the wife or daughter-in-law of the governor of Pārs

### Structure of the Zoroastrian Shrines

The majority of the Zoroastrian shrines are built close to or in the mountains. Mountains thus play an essential symbolic role as the place of refuge for the vanished saints connected to the sites. Complexes almost always include a water source, usually a fountain or a well, as well as an old tree, often a plane tree or cypress (see above), which is considered to be sacred. A small, domed, mud-brick building similar to the tombs of the local Muslim saints sheathes each of the shrines. Shrine complexes usually have shelters called *ḥeyle* for the pilgrims to rest in during visiting time. They also share a very similar foundation legend. Commonly the holy *pīrs* are fairly unembellished chambers,

with a simple fire burning on a column or in a metallic bowl, and a pile of logs. The holy fires, which have been threatened with disrespect, desecration, or even extinction at the hands of non-Zoroastrian opponents, are very complicated and costly to maintain, whereas in contrast the empty shrines were much less susceptible to the violence of adversaries, and tend towards extreme simplicity. The *pīrs* were, and indeed are very much uncomplicated in terms of daily maintenance, whereas a fire temple and especially a cathedral fire need trained and costly priests. The fires of the *pīrs* can either burn constantly or be lit afresh by devotees and pilgrims.<sup>81</sup> This way, every village or community could afford to have such shrines, and in fact, this is still the case in Iran. It is only in recent decades, after resettlements of the Iranī community in big cities such as Mumbai, that there has started a new trend of opening such empty shrines, most of them dedicated to the gods Sorūš (MP Srōš), Bahrām (MP Wahrām) and Mehr (MP Mihr). Among others, these include Pīr Šāh-Varahrām-Īzad (called Pīr-e Morteza-‘Alī-Gabrān by Muslims)<sup>82</sup> shrines in the cities of Kerman and Yazd, and their counterpart the Šāhbehramizad shrine, located in the complex of the Seth Dadibhay Noshirwanji Dadyseth Ataš Bahrām at Mumbai, established in 2016.<sup>83</sup> This shrine is the only empty shrine of this kind in India, and was inspired by the Iranian shrines. Belonging to the Kadmi tradition, both the shrine and the fire-temple are regularly visited by Shahanshahi and Fasli Pārsis. Occasionally shrines are dedicated to a saint, such as the already mentioned shrine of Bābā Šarafoddin in Taft (20 kilometers southwest of the city of Yazd), which is incidentally visited and honoured by both Zoroastrian and Shī‘ite pilgrims.<sup>84</sup> The shrines for *yazatas* fit perfectly within a Muslim tradition of dedicating shrines to saints and immortals. It seems that the Muslim adoption of Zoroastrian shrines dedicated to Ḥāḡī Ḥeẓr or

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Boyce 1979, 82–91; Langer 2004, 573–574, 584–587, 590.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Sorūšīān 1335 š [1956], 310.

<sup>83</sup> The *Dadyseth Ataš Bahrām* itself was established in 1783. The shrine was inaugurated on *Bahrām-rūz* by the performance of a *ḡašan*. Many visitors sponsor and donate oil lamps as well as enough oil for keeping the lamps burning consistently through the whole year in the shrine.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Langer 2004, 566.

Elias as living *pīrs* was forgotten at a certain point, and these have now become entirely Muslim shrines.<sup>85</sup>



Image 4- Pir-e Sabz, also known as Pir-e Čak-Čak(ū) near Ardakān, Yazd © Photo by Shervin Mandgaryan

### Rituals connected with *ziyārat*

Similar to the Islamic pattern of pilgrimage to holy shrines and its related rituals, the pilgrimage rituals connected to the Zoroastrian *Pīrs* belong to the *farzīyāt* “obligatory prayers”, the non-priestly pious lay rituals. The importance of the pilgrimage to the *pīrs* as a central act of religious practice can be seen in the description of pilgrimage as *ḥağ*, using Islamic religious vocabulary. Certain rituals, for instance, are described by members of the community as *ḥağ-e pīr-e sabz*, which not only indicates the importance of this pilgrimage, but also suggests how the ritual cycle has become emplotted in a quasi-canonized way.<sup>86</sup> This quasi-canonized cycle provides recommendations for particular forms of behavior that pilgrims should adopt while completing a

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Boyce 1967, 31.

<sup>86</sup> Among others an online short travelogue by Farzaneh Goshtasb; cf. Goštāsb 1389 š [2010].

*ziyarat*. Some of them are outer priestly rituals, such as performance of a *gāhānbār*,<sup>87</sup> as well as those that can be performed by any non-professionals. The main core of the rituals performed comprises recitation of various prayers from the Ḥorde-Avestā, lighting candles and/or oil lamps, burning incense sticks, paying respect to devotional objects if available, and also lighting temporary fires. Greetings of the *pīr* by means of the recitation of the *ziyarat-nāme* is part of the whole traditionally-prescribed ritual behavior. It mostly includes presenting a votive offering (e.g. lighting candles or burning incense sticks), praying, and leaving the shrine moving backwards, while performing all this in the proper state of ritual purity, ensured by performing the ritual ablutions *pādyāb* and *koštī-nō-kardan* (*pādyāb-kostī*) in advance. To perform a *ziyarat* is considered of great benefit to those doing so, while prayers said at the shrine are believed to have a particular effectiveness. The pilgrims are supposed to pay attention to the presence of the *pīrs* and to bear in mind that spiritual presence surrounds the pilgrims. The pilgrims can talk to God, *yazatas*, and even address the *pīrs*. Reciting the *ziyarat-nāmes* or chanting the songs addressing the *pīrs* are also part of the rites, which could be spoken from the depths of the heart to establish a firm connection between the pilgrims and the divine. This can be accompanied by touching the shrine or the devotional objects. In contrast to Shi'i *ziyarat-nāmes*, recitation of which is mostly restricted to particular times,<sup>88</sup> the recitation of most Zoroastrian pilgrimage songs and *ziyarat-nāmes* is not restricted to a specific time, and they may be recited from a distance. However, there are fixed annual pilgrimage periods specified for each *pīr*, during which of course the related *ziyarat-nāmes* are recited intensively (see the table of the major pilgrimage shrines in Yazd). All the Zoroastrian *ziyarat-nāmes* I am familiar with are specific to certain *pīrs* and may be recited

<sup>87</sup> As a general rule a *gāhānbār-e tōgī*, that is to say a communal *gāhānbār* beyond the regular seasonal ones, in which all community members present join together to celebrate and each contribute what they can.

<sup>88</sup> E.g. *ziyarat-al-arba'in*, a visitation supplication of the third Imam, only be recited on 20<sup>th</sup> day of *ṣafar* in the Heḡrī Lunar calendar and the anniversary of the 40<sup>th</sup> day after the Battle of Karbalā, when Imam Ḥusayn and his companions were martyred on the Day of 'Āšūrā, i.e. Muḥarram 10, 61 AH/October 13, 680.

during residence at or while visiting the relevant shrine or mausoleum.

An essential part of pilgrimage rites in all the Zoroastrian shrines is the animal sacrifice, usually of a young sheep or goat,<sup>89</sup> which is addressed by the common Islamic term *qorbānī* “(sacrificed) animal”. The animal, usually decorated with a garland of marjoram, is brought in a ceremony to the shrine and carried seven times around the fire pillar before being slaughtered outside of the shrine. The cooked meat will partly be consumed by the pilgrims present at the shrine and partly shared between the poor people and eventually beggars as well as some shares for the ever-present dogs.

Besides offering devotion and sacrifices, playing musical instruments, singing joyful songs, dancing and drinking wine is a common pilgrims’ activity during their stay at the shrine or in the residential *heyles*.<sup>90</sup> This concept is thematized in many Zoroastrian traditional *ziyārat-nāme* songs in Zoroastrian Darī and Persian, like: *yakī raqsa, yakī hīna, yakī kra seyr-o safū | pīr-e sauvz-e čak-čakū, pīr-e savz-e čakčakū* “One dance, one sing, one amusing himself | O Pīr-e Sabz-e Čak-čakū, o Pīr-e Sabz-e Čak-čakū!” (See below).

### Charitable food distributions

Both *heyrāt*, “the distribution of charitable food”, and *sofre*, “tablecloth feasts”, are pious activities which are also connected to the pilgrimage rites. The *heyrāt* is an essential part of the *gāhānbārs*, “the communal feasts”, the periodic five-day agricultural seasonal banquets held every two mounts.<sup>91</sup> The *heyrāt* may be offered to the neighbouring fire temple, to the neighbourhood, and to relatives and friends. Moreover, *heyrāt* is

<sup>89</sup> Sacrifice of cows still was practiced in the 19<sup>th</sup> century at Pīr-e Bānu-Pārs, when it was abandoned under the influence of Maneckji Limji Hataria (1813–1890), a Zoroastrian scholar and civil rights activist, who was active as the emissary of the Pārsis of India to the Zoroastrians of Iran from 1854 to 1890. Cf. Boyce 1967: 42 and fn. 42.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. also Boyce 1967: 44.

<sup>91</sup> These are 1. *maiḍiiōi.zarəmaia* “midspring; lit: midgreening”, harvest of winter barley and wheat; 2. *maiḍiiōi.šam* “midsummer”; 3. *paitiš.hahia* “corn-bringing”; 4. *aiiāθrima* “homecoming”; 5. *maiḍiiāiria* “midyear”; 6. *hamaspaθmaēḍaia*, for which no generally accepted meaning has been proposed, maybe “equal heat” (?).

an important charitable activity during irregular commemorations such as death memorials, and for the purpose of fulfilment of vows, as well as on occasions of *ziyārat* and *sofre* “tablecloth feasts”,<sup>92</sup> in which there is a parallelism between Zoroastrian and Muslim charity systems, these elements being common to both of them.<sup>93</sup> *Sofre* generally have been regarded as a less elevated women’s folk practice, supposedly borrowed from Muslim folk religion. Shrines, alongside private homes, are a favourite location for performing the *sofre* rituals. As correctly observed by Michael J. Fischer, *heyṛāt*, *sofre* and *ziyārat* are all particular parts of a series of ritual cycles, gathered around the very Zoroastrian ethic of sharing to engender solidarity between the community members.<sup>94</sup> Distribution of fruits and nuts, and cash offerings, are very usual. The main element of the food given in charity is either a mixture of fruits and nuts, or the meat of a *qorbānī* “(sacrificed) animal”.

### The Pilgrimage Songs and the *Ziyāratnāmes*

The pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes* (“Visitation Supplications”) are texts and songs recited or sung when visiting the holy shrine of a saint or prominent religious figure, to show one’s respect and earn spiritual merit. The text takes the form of a petition containing praise of the person to whom the shrine or the mausoleum is dedicated. It includes greetings and complements, extended occasionally by compact hagiographical accounts of the saints concerned. Pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes* are usually recited on the traditionally fixed annual *ziyārat*-days of saints, or at the actual time of visitations to the holy sites. Pilgrimage songs are orally transmitted, whereas *ziyārat-nāmes* are written down and available as printed texts, either as part of Zoroastrian devotional booklets or at least in one case as a monumental inscription, at the entrance of the Pīr-e Pārs-Bānū (image 2). They are thus composed in a standardised colloquial version of the Persian

<sup>92</sup> For *sofre*-feasts, their rituals and costumes in Zoroastrian tradition cf. Phalippou 2003.

<sup>93</sup> On some aspects of this parallelism between Zoroastrian and Muslim feasts cf. Fischer 1991.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Fischer, 139.



language. Extant pilgrimage songs in contrast are all in Zoroastrian dialects and retain their oral character as the spoken language of the community.

We do not know much about the age and chain of transmission of the Zoroastrian pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes*. They have mostly been transmitted orally and only in very recent periods can one find panels on which are inscribed the relevant *ziyārat-nāmes* hanging in *pīrān* and *ziyāratgāhs* to be recited by the pilgrims. Together with the genre of the Zoroastrian *mōnāḡāt* (“intimate conversation”), the genre of pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāme* belongs to the less studied genres of the *devotional works* within Zoroastrian New Persian literature. While an analysis and German translation of a pretty good number of the Zoroastrian *mōnāḡāts*<sup>95</sup> are available for the scholars of the field, nonetheless most of the Zoroastrian *ziyārat-nāmes* remain unstudied.<sup>96</sup> Generally, the reliably datable extant works of Zoroastrian literature in New Persian can hardly be traced back to the period before the Mongol conquest of Iran in the early 13<sup>th</sup> century. The general structure and the outer form of the Zoroastrian pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes* resembles strongly the structure of the Zoroastrian *monāḡāts*, the earliest attestations of which appear in the works of the Persian poet and translator Zartošt Bahrām Paždu, as the *Ardā Virāf-nāme-ye manzum* (“the Versified Book of Ardā Virāf”) and the *Zartošt-nāme* (“Book of Zarathuštra”), which probably date back to the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>97</sup> Zoroastrian Persian *ziyārat-nāmes* are versified according to the rules of classical Persian poetry. They follow in general the forms of the

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Schmermbeck 2008), which contains an edition of 23 Persian *monāḡāt* with German translation.

<sup>96</sup> Šāhbahrām Belivānī’s record of five Zoroastrian *ziyārat-nāmes* is the only published text edition known to me within the secondary literature, cf. Belivānī 1382 § [2003], 32–45. Based on Belivānī’s edition, they are also referred to by Robert Langer in his comprehensive study of Zoroastrian shrines; however only a small portion of the *ziyārat-nāme* of Banū-Pārs together with its translation is provided by him; cf. Langer 2008, 363.

<sup>97</sup> The genre of Persian *monāḡāt* as a literary form in the Muslim contexts became established around the 11<sup>th</sup> century CE, especially through the *monāḡāt-nāme* of the Iranian spiritual master and Šūfī saint Ḥ“āḡe ‘Abdollāh Anšārī (1006–1089).



Zoroastrian *mōnāḡāt*, which in turn copy their Islamic counterparts.<sup>98</sup> They are composed in a multiple rhyme, preferably in the form of *qeṭ'ē*, and most commonly, as a *maṣnavī* (rhyming couplets) and *tarḡī'-band* (lit. “bound to return”) or even *ḡazal*. It should be noted however that even though the literary form shows a close connection to classical literary genres, most of the extant *ziyārat-nāmes* are either orally transmitted poetry or are based on such a template. As a result, they display rather free stylistic tendencies and are not very strict regarding the retention of classical Persian meter and *‘arūḡ* (prosody). The literary form and structure of all extant supplications are closely connected to each other. There are certain verses that they borrow from one other, sometimes word by word, and occasionally with slight alterations. They are not strict when it comes to following prosodic principles. The poets do not really care about meter. This gives the *ziyārat-nāmes* a lower literary elegance in comparison to mainstream classical Persian poetry and even in comparison to the Zoroastrian *monāḡāts*. Nevertheless, they are important witnesses of the lay Zoroastrian faith and the adoption of a literary genre from the Islamicate environment for their own pious purposes.

Following the pattern of Islamic Persian poetry, praise and invocation of Gods and *pīrs* and wishes for forgiveness of sins mark the beginning and ending of some of the Zoroastrian pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes*. Furthermore, similar to all other genres of Zoroastrian religious literature in New Persian, the usage of both Persian and Arabic Islamic influenced terminology is very common. Pilgrimage songs and *ziyārat-nāmes* usually contain formulae declaring regards for and peace upon the persons to whom the shrine is dedicated, and invoke notions such as friendship with them, loyalty, obedience, intercession (*ṣafā’āt*), religious dependency on their support (*tavassol*), surrender, and testimony, as well as sometimes cursing the enemies of the religion. All these notions are well known from the Islamic genre of *ziyārat-nāmes*, which were

<sup>98</sup> The *monāḡāts* were published from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in the *Khorde Avestās*. The *monāḡāt* of Bahrām Rāvari printed for the first time in *avestā bā ma’ni* in 1853 in Calcutta is probably one of the oldest examples. For an edition of 23 Persian *monāḡāts* with German translation cf. Schmermbek 2008.

clearly a source of inspiration for the Zoroastrian ones.

Less is known generally about Zoroastrian music and songs, both religious and folkloric.<sup>99</sup> There have been no scholarly investigations as to what extent this music has retained any ancient elements, and to what extent it has been influenced by mainstream Iranian music and especially by the classical Persian *radīf*. Besides the chanting of Avestan prayers and hymns as the Zoroastrian priests perform them in rituals,<sup>100</sup> little of the folkloric or religious music has been systematically documented or investigated.<sup>101</sup> Those songs sung mostly by the Zoroastrian women in the pilgrimage sites and during the communal feasts generally follow the structure of classical Persian music known as *radīf*. They are usually sung according to the common scales and modes of traditional Iranian music and accompanied by the *‘arbūne*, which is a medium-sized frame drum played by Zoroastrian women on festivals and joyful occasions (Image 5). Two examples related to the special songs chanted for the *pīrs* may serve here as specimens.

<sup>99</sup> For a general overview on music in pre-Islamic era cf. Lawergren 2016. For a very short notice on Zoroastrian religious music cf. Darvishi 1997, 152–62.

<sup>100</sup> For some samples, listen to Darvishi 2015.

<sup>101</sup> A unique exception so far is a set of two cassettes of Zoroastrian folk songs from Yazd, performed by traditional Darī vocalist Dariush Yazeshni (b. 1953), son of Mobad Khodamorad Yazeshni (1916–2007); cf. Yazeshni 1997.

## Two versified *Ziyārat-nāmes* in Zoroastrian Darī dialect

### *Ziyārat-nāme-ye Pīr-ē Nārakī*

The first sample is dedicated to the Pīr-ē Nārakī. The melody has been sung by a Zoroastrian woman, Fīrūze Mehrabānī (d. 2009), in the *šūstarī* major section (*šāh-gūše*) of the scale of *homāyūn* (G Ap B C D Eb(p) F G),<sup>102</sup> recorded in 1996 in Šarīfābād-e Ardakān, Yazd. The melody is a very typical *šūstarī* in G (C D Ep F# G A B C):



The wording of the song is in the Zoroastrian dialect of Yazd, known as Zoroastrian Darī or *behdīnān* dialect and has the form of a *tarǧī-band*:

<i>dārd-e del vevā be pīr-e nārakī</i>	<i>morād-e del āgā be pīr yakī yakī</i>
<i>ege kyōmī dust dāre, bā in-o min</i>	<i>ege qalb-ot pāk-one, az tohmat-e</i>
<i>čomī ma-pārs</i>	<i>kyōmī ma-tārs</i>

*dārd-e del vevā be pīr-e nārakī*  
*morād-e del āgā be pīr yakī yakī*

<i>to ke pāk-o sāda vo bī kīna vo</i>	<i>eči bad de sar-e tā varzeš(?) veko</i>
<i>qall-o qaše</i>	<i>birā naše</i>

*dārd-e del vevā be pīr-e nārakī*  
*morād-e del āgā be pīr yakī yakī*

<i>ege del-ot lipon o boqz e māza de</i>	<i>xišun-ot yāoga mehr o mahebat</i>
<i>ri sina</i>	<i>tu qalb-šo kīna ha</i>

<sup>102</sup> The letter 'b' indicates the flat and 'p' the *koron* "semiflat"; the tonic is underlined. For the scale of *homāyūn* cf. Caron/Safvate 1966), 85–88; Farhat 1990, 65–75; Miller 1999, 69–70.

*dārd-e del vevā be pīr-e nārakī*  
*morād-e del āgā be pīr yakī yakī*  
*zyuna dāvā mira dāvā vača dāvā     hār či dāu šo pīr-e nā[rakī] kem*  
*kem yā rasen*  
*dārd-e del vevā be pīr-e nārakī*  
*morād-e del āgā be pīr yakī yakī*  
*ege prāq dāre, bā hezvun mavā     montazer unig bar e vā but, az bar*  
*e tu āt*  
*dārd-e del vevā be pīr-e nārakī*  
*morād-e del āgā be pīr yakī yakī*

The song begins with a couplet which serves as a refrain after each subsequent verse:

Translation:

Unburden your heart to Pīr-e Nārakī,	(and) take your heart's wish from the Pīr.
If you love someone, don't ask for this and that,	If your heart is pure, do not fear any accusation.
Unburden your heart to Pīr-e Nārakī, (and) take your heart's wish from the Pīr.	
You are pure and sincere and forgiving and without deceit,	No matter how you are unlucky, [...] take care that you don't go the wrong way.
Unburden your heart to Pīr-e Nārakī, (and) take your heart's wish from the Pīr.	
If your heart is full (of sorrow) and filled with hatred,	(if) the heart of your relatives are filled with hatred instead of love,
Unburden your heart to Pīr-e Nārakī, (and) take your heart's wish from the Pīr.	

Are you seeking a wife, a husband or a child,	All things you seek, go to the Pīr [...], [all you want] will gradually be fulfilled.
-----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Unburden your heart to Pīr-e Nārakī,  
(and) take your heart's wish from the Pīr.

If you are separated (from your beloved), do not tell it with your tongue <sup>103</sup> ,	Keep waiting, the door will open and he/she will enter.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

Unburden your heart to Pīr-e Nārakī,  
(and) take your heart's wish from the Pīr.

These poems, sung somewhat joyfully to musical accompaniments, are a necessary part of the pilgrimage rites to the *pīr* shrines and can be found in popular recorded collections of Zoroastrian music. Here is another example of these pilgrimage songs and *Ziyārat-nāmes* dedicated to the Pīr-e Čak-čakū:<sup>104</sup>

***Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz***

<i>pīr-e sauvz-e čakčakū, omahe tā dāmen-e kūh</i>	I have come to the foot of the mountain;
<i>če qa pella meme tey ka, tā ne rasūhe depū</i>	I have climbed many steps to reach your feet.
<i>hvūy-e pīr-e sabz-e mū, droḥša mesl-e qors-e mū</i>	O Pīr-e Sabz, you are shining like the full moon,
<i>ūve čaka tūy-e hovz, čak-o čak-e az sin-e kūh</i>	The water drips into the pond, dripping from the summit of the mountain,
<i>ğemīyat moğ-e kūza tū heyła hū</i>	The crowd [of the pilgrims] swells in the pavillions;

<sup>103</sup> I.e. 'do not complain publicly'.

<sup>104</sup> A version of this song is recorded as No. 10 in Yazeshni 1997.

<i>yakī raqsa, yakī hīna, yakī kra seyr-o safū</i>	One dances, one sings, one amuses himself,
<i>pīr-e sauvz-e čak-čakū, pīr-e savz-e čakčakū</i>	O Pīr-e Sabz-e Čak-čakū, o Pīr-e Sabz-e Čak-čakū!
<i>šem-o čūb-e sendaloš, kalak-e meyn-e piroš</i>	People light candles and offer sandalwood, the candlesticks in the middle of the Pīr,
<i>mardomūn čarḡ-e kūzen dāvr-o varoš, hūgat-e tlaben az oš</i>	as they walk round the shrine, asking for their wishes to be granted.
<i>yakī kena rešte goše čūrqadoš, grege ta rī milay-e šemdūn hū</i>	One takes the corner of her headscarf to bind it into the shaft of the candlesticks.
<i>vāḡa pīr-e čak-čakū, āden mrūd-e del-e mū</i>	They say, 'O Pīr-e Čak-čakū, accomplish our heart's wish.'
<i>pīr-e sauvz-e čak-čakū, pīr-e savz-e čakčakū</i>	O Pīr-e Sabz-e Čak-čakū, o Pīr-e Sabz-e Čak-čakū!
<i>siyošūn-e sīne kūh, če qadar dūra safū,</i>	Sīyāvašān <sup>105</sup> has been grown on the slope of the mountain, how joyful is it!
<i>vaqtī ūv az še čaka, vāllā meme vīre tū.</i>	The water drops off from the summit of the mountain, I remember my mother.
<i>šašeka me pīš-e pū, yūr-e nūz-o delrobū,</i>	My charming and graceful beloved can [reach] her audience,
<i>še vā vaqtī tā rasūhe še pū, vevā pīr-e čak-čakū,</i>	When you reach the feet of the Pīr, tell her, O Pīr-e Čak-čakū,

<sup>105</sup> Par-e Sīyāvašān or Sīyāvūšān (Lat. *adiantum capillus-veneris*) is a species of fern which plays an important role in Iranian mythology and mythical history.

<i>tā veras be del-e mū, nabīm az</i>	Grant the desire of my heart and
<i>hem mū ġzū,</i>	never separate us.
<i>pīr-e sauvz-e čak-čakū, pīr-e</i>	O Pīr-e Sabz-e Čak-čakū, o Pīr-e
<i>savz-e čakčakū</i>	Sabz-e Čak-čakū!

### Five versified *Ziyārat-nāmes* in New Persian

As already mentioned, the second group of pilgrimage songs and *Ziyārat-nāmes* are those which are rendered in a rather standard colloquial Persian, without a specific dialectal colouring. A series of five *ziyārat-nāmes* was published by Mobadyār Shah-Bahram Belivānī initially in 1986-87.<sup>106</sup> He stated that he heard these *ziyārat-nāmes* from his father Rostam Nushrivan Belivānī (1918-1998), the late mayor and head of the Zoroastrian Council of Šarīfābād-e Ardakān, Yazd, who served also as the custodian of Pīr-e Čak-čakū for over thirty years.<sup>107</sup> The *ziyārat-nāmes* must be based on orally transmitted songs, probably composed between the late 17<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz III* however there are indications of literary origins, among them verses that are composed in the style of the *Mas'āle-ye Dīn* of Ḥodābahš son of Ġāmāsp (see above), or literally taken from it. Three pieces (at least their last redaction) are definitely datable to 1354 AY / 1985, as mentioned in the supplications themselves. The last one in this series carries the name of Rostam Nushrivan Belivānī as its composer.

<sup>106</sup> Belivānī 1382 š [2003], 32-45.

<sup>107</sup> He was also Mary Boyce's host on her research trip to Iran during 1963-64. Interestingly, though Boyce has published several works regarding the Zoroastrian customs and holy shrines of Yazdi community, she never mentioned any of these *ziyārat-nāmes*. Unfortunately, I had no access to Boyce's Nachlaß, her notes and audio records, which may well contain the same or similar materials.



Image 5- The ‘arbūne is a medium-sized frame drum played by Zoroastrian women on festivals and joyful occasions. Fire festival Hirombā in Pīr-e Herīšt © Photo courtesy of Behrad Nafissi Mistry.

### *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz I*

The first of these series is dedicated to the Pīr-e Sabz in fifty-three verses and in *hazaġ* meter and bears the composition date of 1354 AY / 1985. The supplication has a repetitive distich in every second verse: “Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: O Truthful Pīr!” A similar repetitive distich to this can be found in the *Ziyārat-nāme pīr-e pārs-bānū I* (see below).

Thematized here also is the connection between the *pīrs* and the Amšāspands, the Bounteous/Life-giving Immortals,<sup>108</sup> which is elaborated at greater length in the *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz III* (see below).

The shrine of Pīr-e Sabz is addressed here with the term *qadamgāh* “[holy] place of the footprints”, an expression which also designates a series of Shi‘i pilgrimage and holy places. *Qadamgāh* refers generally

<sup>108</sup> NP Amšāspand (Av. *Amāša Spənta*, MP Amešāspand, [A]mahraspand).



to a natural and rarely to an artificial mark in the rocks, understood as a special trace of divine nature. There are many such holy sites from Anatolia to India, and they are common all over Iran, Afghanistan, and Central Asia, such as the *qadamgāh*, an ancient site at the southeastern tip of the Kuh-e Raḥmat (some 40 km south of the Persepolis terrace), which is said to be the stepping place of the horse of the first Shi‘i Imam ‘Alī.<sup>109</sup> The most striking coincidence of Islamic and Zoroastrian tradition occurs in connection with the Islamic prophet and ‘immortal’ saint Ḥeẓr (Ar. al-Ḥiḍr), to whom a series of Islamic *qadamgāhs* and caves are dedicated.<sup>110</sup> The literal meaning of his name is traditionally been taken to be “the green, the verdant (man)”, which meaning overlaps with that of the Pīr-e Sabz, “the Green *pīr*”. It is associated with cultivation cults and thus belongs to the group of so-called “agricultural shrines”.<sup>111</sup> The connection to water is further evidence; the fountain in the grotto and the dripping water of Pīr-e Sabz give the shrine its nickname “Pīr-e Čak-čakū”, “the dripping *pīr*”. This is derived from the sound of the drops of water that fall down from the rock and which are now collected in a storage tank. The *ziyārat-nāme* mystifies this as part of the miraculous legend of the disappearance of the saint into the mountain and the mountain’s weeping for her submissive modesty and innocence. Whereas weeping for the innocence and submissiveness of the martyred saint in the Islamic tradition belongs to the main rituals of a pilgrimage, crying is proscribed as a sin in Zoroastrianism, one which makes crossing of the soul of the departed over the bridge to the hereafter very difficult. Here we have an interesting mixture of the two traditions. The Zoroastrian *pīrs*, in contrast to the Shi‘i martyrs, were not killed; nor indeed are they dead, but immortals. While the supplication makes a reference to the saint’s death, some verses later it is said that she vanished and continued to existence in secret, a fate

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Boucharlat 2014.

<sup>110</sup> Among others, the *kūh-e Ḥeẓr-w nabī* “Mountain of the Prophet Ḥeẓr”, located six kilometers from the center of Qom. It is believed that there was a three-thousand-year-old cave above this mountain in which Ḥeẓr prayed. The shrine serves as a pilgrimage destination for Shi‘i Muslims.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Langer 2004, 587.

attributed to the other *pīrs* as well. Moreover, Ḥeẓr also has a wider association with Zoroastrian deities; many shrines of Srōš, especially in Yazd province, are regularly dedicated to Ḥāḡe Ḥeẓr, and at least one, in the city of Yazd,<sup>112</sup> to the Biblical prophet Elijah, the Jewish figure associated with Ḥeẓr by Islamic authors; they are reconsidered to be *riḡal al-ḡayb* (“people of the unseen”) within the Islamic tradition.<sup>113</sup> Both figures are thus very appropriate for adoption as living Zoroastrian *pīrs*.<sup>114</sup>

A further overlap of the legend of Pīr-e Sabz with that of Ḥeẓr occurs in connection with Moses, who is closely connected to Ḥeẓr in the Islamic tradition. The staff of Pīr-e Sabz recalls the miraculous rod of Moses (Ar. *ʾaṣā Mūsā*), as mentioned in the biblical and Qurʾānic legends.<sup>115</sup> As there is no reference to any miraculous rod in the legends of Ḥeẓr or Pīr-e Sabz herself, it is not too far-fetched to assume further borrowing of legendary elements from Islamic narratives.

#### زیارت‌نامه پیر سبز (۱)

دهان که بخشش آرد گفت یا حق	قلم هر وقت به کاغذ داد رونق
به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق	اگر خواهی به حق باشی تو مطلق
گل از گل آفرید و آدم از خاک	به نام آنکه نامش ایزد پاک
به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق	به حکم او معلق چرخ افلاک
پیر سبز است پیر بر حق ای پسر	حق به گیتی داد رونق ای پسر
به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق	کس شک آرد باشد احمق ای پسر
که دارد گوهر پاک و بلند است	کسی در نزد یزدان او پسند است
به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق	یکی پیران یکی امشاسپند است
پذیرفته ز لطف کردگار است	ز نسل یزدگرد شهریار است

<sup>112</sup> Boyce 1967, 31. Intriguingly Boyce states that she got the idea of this association from the above-mentioned Rostam Nushrivan Belivānī, confirmed by Dastur Khodādād Naryōsangī, the priest of Šarīfābād. That these supplications were transmitted by Rostam Nushrivan Belivānī shows that this was at least common accepted knowledge among priests and educated laymen. Cf. also Fischer 1991, 141.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Franke 2000; Wensinck 1997, 902–5; Wensinck/Vajda 1986, 1156.

<sup>114</sup> For his associations and legends in the Zoroastrian and broader Iranian tradition cf. Krasnowolska 2009.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Saritoprak 2005, 508–9.

ز دین به، یقین او استوار است  
 از آن کوهی درود و بیحد و مر  
 درود و آفرین گویند سراسر  
 به دستش بود عصای رستگاری  
 به خصم او بودند لشگر هزاری  
 به کوهی چون رسید نالید به یزدان  
 بکن ما را به چشم خصم پنهان  
 به گفتا ای خدایا من زنانم  
 بگیری دست من، من ناتوانم  
 خجسته نام اویست نیک بانو  
 بسر بر زد همی گفتا که یا هو  
 به صدق پاک نالیدی به یزدان  
 عجایب قدرتی دیدی ز یزدان  
 بشد گنجینه را از خود هویدا  
 به معجز قبه نور است پیدا  
 ز جا برجست سر از سوی خدا کرد  
 هماندم جان شیرینش فدا کرد  
 عصا زد بر زمین و خود روان شد  
 در گنجینه آندم بی‌نشان شد  
 بنا کرد کوه خاران اشک بارید  
 سر از فرمان حق کوهم بنالید  
 به چشم اشک همان آب روان شد  
 گل سرخ و سفید و ارغوان شد  
 عصای او بشد سبز و هوا رفت  
 خوش و خرم شده او با صفا رفت  
 از آن تاریخ الا اوقات چند است  
 بدیدی قدرت پروردگار هست  
 ندا آمد به خصمان زمین عبارت

به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 که باشد او قدمگاهش منور  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 رضایش با رضای کردگاری  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 که دست دشمنان کوتاه گردان  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 سبب‌سازی به غیر از تو ندانم  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 بنالید از خدا بنشست به زانو  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 به کوهی یک جائی گشت پنهان  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 تمام کوه شد پر نور و شیدا  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 سپاس و حمد حق گفت و وداع<sup>116</sup> کرد  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 سجودآور به سوئی حق نهان شد  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 به چشمه اشک سر از حق بنالید  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 تمام کوه همان آب روان شد  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 سر از بالا به فرمان خدا رفت  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 هزار و سه صد پنجاه و چهار است  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 چرا همراهتان اسباب غارت

---

ودا ac<sup>116</sup>

به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 به تندی یکدیگر آواز کردند  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 دو دست بر هم بیفشردند و رفتند  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 که از بهر چکیدن آب کوه شد  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 به معجز سبز کرده بشن کوهش  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 شفاعت خواه خلقان پیر سبز است  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 شفیق دردمندان پیر سبز است  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 وصف او ناید درست اندر قلم  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق  
 حق به زودی می‌گشاید مشکلات  
 به صدق دل بگو یا پیر بر حق

به امر حق در این کوهست زیارت  
 شدند مخبر و اسباب بار کردند  
 سجود از پای کوه آغاز کردند  
 زیارت‌نامه را خواندند و رفتند  
 تعجب امر حق گفتند و رفتند  
 به شهره نام آنکوه چکچکو شد  
 ملایک با فرشته همگروه شد  
 به پیر سبز، آن نام نکویش  
 هزاران آفرین بر خلق خویش  
 زیارتگاه خلقان پیر سبز است  
 پسند پاک یزدان پیر سبز است  
 دلیلاً شاه مردان پیر سبز است  
 مراد مستمندان پیر سبز است  
 سنگ کوهش به ز در و گوهر است  
 در دو گیتی ترک عالم شد علم  
 مهر او بیحد زیاد اندر دلم  
 گر به پیر سبز می‌بندی دلت  
 تا به جنت می‌رساند منزلت

“Ever since the pen brought grace and splendour to paper, the merciful mouth kept repeating ‘O Truthful Pīr!’

If you want to be completely on the righteous side; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: ‘O Truthful Pīr!’

In the name of the just and pure Lord, who creates flowers from mud and man from dust;<sup>117</sup>

It is his commandment which holds the hanging heavenly sphere; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: ‘O Truthful Pīr!’

The Lord gave grace and splendour to the world, O son; the righteous Pīr is Pīr-e Sabz, O son!

<sup>117</sup> This verse is identical with the first verse of *Ziyārat-nāme pīr-e pārs-bānū I*.

Awkward is the one who has doubts, O Son; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

Those who have virtue of pure extraction are the approved and admired by God;

One group is the Pīrs and the other the Amšāspands [the Bounteous/Life-giving Immortals]; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

She is from the lineage of the king Yazdgerd, she is graced by the blessing of the Lord;

Her conviction in the good religion is firm; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

Countless and boundless salutations [come] from the mountain, that her footprint-place be splendid and bright;

She held in her hand the staff of salvation, submitted to the will of Lord;

Her adversary was a thousand-man army; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

As she reached the mountain, she cried to God to curtail her enemies' power;

'Hide me from the eye of the enemies', Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

She said, 'O Lord, I am a woman and do not know any provider of sustenance, other than you!

Give relief and support me, as I am powerless'; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

Her blessed name is Nik-Bānū ("the fair Lady"); she cried out to God and went down on her knees;

She pleaded, and struck her head, and called out, 'O Lord!', Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

As she supplicated from the depth of her heart to God, the Lord hid her in the mountain;

Have you seen this miraculous power from God? Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

Thus, the treasure became visible and the whole mountain was illuminated, frenzied with love;

The dome of light is in view as the sign of this miracle; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

She stood up and turned herself to God, praised and thanked God and bade farewell;

She sacrificed her sweet life at this moment; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

She threw her stuff on the ground and departed, bowing down to pray to the Lord, she got disappeared;

The treasure has lost at the moment, Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: O Truthful Pīr!

The rocky mountain showered tears, pleaded to the Lord with a spring of tears;

[See, even] the mountain pleaded to the Lord, accepting his command; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

This flowing water is the tears pouring from the mountain's eyes, the whole mountain became full of this flowing water;

Red and white and purple flowers have grown; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

Her stuff made everything green and she has ascended to the heaven by the favor of the Lord;

Here is now pleasant and green and cultivated; she went peaceful and purified; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

Since this happened, it is now the year one thousand three hundred and fifty-four;

You have seen the power of the Lord, Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

There came a call from heaven to the adversaries [the Arab army]: why do you all bear motives of plunder and pillage?

By the command of the Lord, this mountain is a place of

pilgrimage,; Call from the depth of your heart and with  
 utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

As [the people everywhere] received the news, all packed their  
 stuff, informing and convoking each other;

They bowed down to pray in all reverence, starting from the foot  
 of the mountain; Call from the depth of your heart and with  
 utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

They all recited this supplication and went, they pressed their  
 hands together<sup>118</sup> and went;

They wondered at the will of the Lord and went; Call from the  
 depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful  
 Pīr!'

That is why the mountain is known as Čak-čakū (lit. "drip-  
 drip"), as the water drips from the cliff;

The celestial beings and angels joined together; Call from the  
 depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful  
 Pīr!'

I swore by Pīr-e Sabz, by her pious name, whose mountain  
 flourishes and is green by a miracle;

Thousands of praises to her good spirit and nature; Call from the  
 depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful  
 Pīr!'

Now the Pīr-e Sabz is a pilgrimage destination for all the people;  
 she is intercessor for all creatures,

Pīr-e Sabz is the blessed and chosen one of the Lord; Call  
 from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O  
 Truthful Pīr!'

Pīr-e Sabz is proof of the King of Heroes; Pīr-e Sabz is the  
 benevolent friend of all the wretched in pain;

Pīr-e Sabz is sought by the needy; Call from the depth of your  
 heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'

The cliffs of her mountain are more precious than gems and

<sup>118</sup> This is the gesture of respect by addressing the gods while praying. The Avestan term for this gesture is called *ustanazasta*- "with outstretched hands", in which the palms pressed to each other.

jewels; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!'  
 In both worlds, renouncing the world becomes illustrious; it is impossible to describe her (divine) attributes by (writing) with a pen;  
 If you trust in Pīr-e Sabz, the Lord will swiftly solve your problems,  
 And will lodge you in paradise; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Truthful Pīr!' ”

### *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz II*

This piece is in a quasi *mosammat-e moḥammadas* “refrained tail-rhymed” form and *ramal* meter.

#### زیارت‌نامه پیر سبز (۲)

ای از عزیزان دارم از دل آرزوی چکچکو	دایم آید بر زبانم گفتگوی چکچکو
بر دماغم هر دم آید عطر و بوی چکچکو	می‌کنم این جامه‌را از دشت سوی چکچکو
تا ببوسم بار دیگر خاک کوی چکچکو	
جمله به‌دینان همه در آرزوی پیر سبز	هر غریبان وطن در آرزوی پیر سبز
طوطی شکرشکن در آرزوی پیر سبز	هر کسی هر جا بود در آرزوی پیر سبز
سالها باشم همی در جستجوی چکچکو	
جمله به‌دینان زرتشتی غیاث <sup>119</sup>	جمله دستوران و رادان عام و خاص
کدخدایان که خدایان الغیاث <sup>120</sup>	در مکان پیر سبز <sup>121</sup> منزلگه هر عام و خاص <sup>122</sup>
دردمندان اشکبارند همچو کوی چکچکو	
آنکه از پیران بود از بهر پیران جان دهند	آنکه از ایران بود از بهر ایران جان دهد
جمله پیران و جوان از بهر پیران جان دهند	مردوزن با کودکان از بهر پیران جان دهند
گر رسد روزی کسی در روبروی چکچکو	
سالها چندان به غربت در غریبی گشته‌ام	راه را گم کرده‌ام از راه خود برگشته‌ام

<sup>119</sup> قیاس ac

<sup>120</sup> القیاس ac

<sup>121</sup> ac سبیز ; The form *sabiz* (sic!), for the correct *sabz*, is probably adopted in order to squeeze the word into the meter.

<sup>122</sup> ac عام خاص



ای رفیقا سرکجا سامان کجا سرگشته‌ام      گر روم رود در وطن ما همچنان سرگشته‌ام  
 آمدم بر سر کنم من خاک کوی چکچکو  
 ای عزیزان گر رسم روزی به یاران در وطن      دست یاران را ببوسم پیر سبز ماوای من

“O my dears, I have a great desire most heartily (to visit) Čak-čakū, Constantly I speak about Čak-čakū, I smell at every moment the good scent and sweet odor of Čak-čakū, I take this garment from the desert to Čak-čakū, so that I may kiss again the ground of Čak-čakū;

All the adherents of the good religion are yearning for Pīr-e Sabz, all the strangers in the homeland are yearning for Pīr-e Sabz, all the sugar chewing<sup>123</sup> parrots are yearning for Pīr-e Sabz; everybody, everywhere is yearning for Pīr-e Sabz; for years I have been yearning for Pīr-e Sabz;

O all the Zoroastrian adherents of good religion, I take refuge in God; O all the Dastūrs and munificent ones, nobles and plebeians, O Elders and Lords, I take refuge in God. The shrine of Pīr-e Sabz is a home for nobles and plebeians, the compassionate ones weep tears like Čak-čakū;

Those who love the *pīrs* would gave up their lives for their sake; those who belong to Iran would gave up their lives for their sake; all the elders and youngers would gave up their lives for the sake of the *pīrs*, the very moment they come into the presence of Čak-čakū;

For years I have been wandering as a stranger in exile, have often lost my way and come back on myself;

O my friends, where is my home and where is my family? I am perplexed; even going to my home, I am still wandering; thus I am here desperate to beg for help from Čak-čakū;

O my dears, if I reach someday my beloved in the homeland, I will kiss their hands and take my abode in the (shrine of) Pīr-e Sabz”.

<sup>123</sup> A “sugar chewing” parrot is one of the favorite imageries within classical Persian poetry. It generally allegorizes a wise teacher who focuses on the proper behavior of humankind; cf. Schimmel 1992, 182–84.

*Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz III*

In fifty-seven verses in the *mašnavī* form, with variable meter, mostly fitting *hazağ*. The supplication connects the shrine of Pīr-e Sabz with a reference to the Zoroastrian concept of *aša* “(Cosmic) Order, Righteousness”, therefore to paradise, in order to establish the importance of the pilgrimage site. The poet states that “its refreshing breeze comes from the garden of paradise, and its lights are [the sign of] the ‘Best Righteousness’ of Zarathuštra”. The New Persian term used here, *ordibehešt* (Av. Aša Vahištā, MP Ardvahišt “Best Righteousness”) refers to one of the six great Aməša Spəntas that with Ahura Mazdā or his Holy Spirit, make up the Zoroastrian Heptad. He is Ahura Mazdā’s counselor (Y. 46.17) and accompanies the soul of the righteous man (Y. 34.2), who receives the best reward (Y. 49.9). Fire in many visible forms, and as the source of warmth and light, is his manifestation in physical creation. This imagery is well presented here. Moreover, the description of the site presents an allusion to the garden of paradise as well.

Like the *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz* in the Darī dialect (see above), the motif of the (*par-e*) *Siyāvašan* plant is also present here, consistent with a clear pattern of symbolizing natural elements in connection with this specific shrine. The poet takes it as an allegorical motif, connecting the fate of the last Sasanian king Yazdegerd III (reigned 632–651), his relatives, and especially his daughters, who are the focus of devotion of the Zoroastrian empty shrines, to the sad and unjust fate of the beloved mythological prince and vegetation deity Siyāvaš. The myth is well known in both Zoroastrian tradition and in the Iranian epic tradition, as rendered in Ferdōsī’s *Šāhnāme*.<sup>124</sup>

A noteworthy aspect of this piece is the reference to the first three of the four Islamic Rashidun Caliphs, namely Abū Bakr (r. 632–634), ‘Umar bin al-Ḥaṭṭāb (r. 634–644) and ‘Uṭmān ibn ‘Affān (r. 644–656).

<sup>124</sup> Siyāvaš (Av. Siiāuaršan; MP Siyāwaxš) is mentioned in the Avesta (Yt. 13.132, Yt. 5.49–50), whereas a rough sketch of his story is mentioned in the *Bundahišn* (Bd 33.10). The earliest rendering of the full story is given by Abu Maṣsur Ṭa‘ālebi, cf. Ṭa‘ālebi/ed. Zotenberg 1900, 171–213 and Ferdōsī, cf. Khaleghi-Motlagh 2008), Vol. II, 202–376.

The fourth Caliph and the first Shi‘i Imam, ‘Alī ibn ‘Abī Ṭālib (r. 656–661) is excluded from the list, most probably due to the context. The poet encourages his audience to make a comparison between the kings, heroes and elders from the past, in order to recognize those among them who were righteous. The caliphs here are presented as counter-examples, those who lost their good fortune and therefore their thrones. Sensitivity around naming the first Shi‘i Imam, particularly the fear of accusations of blasphemy, is most likely the reason for not mentioning him here, suggesting that these *Ziyārat-nāmes* were accessible to Zoroastrians’ Muslim neighbors.

Notable also is the use of special titles at the end of the piece, where the saints are invoked, a standard section of Islamic *ziyārat-nāmes*. The first in the series is the *šāh-e mardān*, the “King of Men” or “King of Heroes”. In either this or its reverse form, *Mardānšāh*, this is a common name among Zoroastrians, and is attested as such in Islamicate authors.<sup>125</sup> It generally referred, however, to the first Shi‘i Imam ‘Alī ibn ‘Abī Ṭālib, who as we have seen was excluded from the list of the accused caliphs. The title *bānū-ye kobrā* “the Greatest Lady”, appearing some verses later, is of great interest, as this title clearly refers to Fāṭimah bint Moḥammad (606–632), the youngest daughter of Moḥammad and his first wife Ḥadiḡa, and wife of ‘Alī ibn ‘Abī Ṭālib. She is the mother of second and third Shi‘i Imams Ḥasan and Ḥusain. Her younger son Ḥusain again plays an important role in the mythical genealogy of the rest of the Shi‘i Imams, as according to the legend, he was married to the daughter of the last Sasanian king Yazdegerd III (see above). Thus, both ‘Alī ibn ‘Abī Ṭālib and Fāṭimah are brought into a marriage alliance with the last Zoroastrian king and are thus close relatives of the members of the Zoroastrian royal family who are the subject of these supplications. Especially among the Twelver Shi‘is and Isma‘īlīs, she is considered a miracle-working female figure, corresponding remarkably well therefore with the miracle-working figures among the Zoroastrian *pīrs*.

<sup>125</sup> Already the late Abbāsid historian and geographer (1179–1229) Yāqut Ḥamawī mentions it as the name of the son of Xusraw II (590/91–628), the last great king of the Sasanian dynasty; cf. Ḥamawī Baġdādī 1399 q [1979], 148.

Furthermore, the second reference of the title *šāh-e mardān* appearing some verses later appears to be Jam (Av. Yima), the mythical king of Iran and the king par excellence.<sup>126</sup> Mentions of the thirty-three Amšāspands, “the Bounteous/Life-giving Immortals”, in the same verse, and Zarathuštra in the following verse, are the key to decoding the hidden name behind the title *šāh-e mardān* as Yima. There are several instances in the Pahlavi literature where Jam and Zarathuštra are linked; they are the first and last of the four heroes of origins, brought into the world as a gift of their fathers’ *haoma* sacrifices.<sup>127</sup> In the *Dēnkard* (Dk. 7.2.21), for example, Zarathuštra is believed to be of human lineage through Jam, and of the lineage of the Amšāspands through Nēryōsang, which is also illustrated here in the triad of *šāh-e mardān* (i.e. Jam), the Amšāspands and Zarathuštra.

Other righteous figures mentiond here are primarily Ardā Wīrāz, Wīrāz the Just, key character of the Zoroastrian Middle Persian text *Ardā Wīrāz-nāmag* (“The Book of Ardā Wīrāz”), a report of his extra-terrestrial soul journey, including a description of heaven and hell.<sup>128</sup> Others are Šāpūr and the son of Dārāb. Šāpūr is the name of three Sasanian kings of kings, as well as of a number of personages of the Sasanian and later periods, whereas *pūr-e Dārāb* “son of Dārāb” clerally refers to Dārā ī Dārāyān, the last Achaemenid king of kings, Darius III (r. 336–330 BCE).<sup>129</sup> Assuming the names on this list are not put randomly together, “Šāpūr” must refer to the Sasanian king Šāpūr II (309–79), in whose reign we meet Ādurbād ī Mahraspandān, the renowned Zoroastrian *mowbedān* *mowbed* or “high priest”. According to the Zoroastrian tradition, widely reported within the Pahlavi literature, Ādurbād successfully underwent the *war* “ordeal” of molten bronze, in which the metal was poured onto his chest and he was seen to arise unhurt in order to prove the validity

<sup>126</sup> For an detailed overview cf. Skjærvø 2012, 501–22.

<sup>127</sup> *Yasna* 9.1–13 (‘the hymn to Haoma’) tells us the name of the four heroes, who were born as the result of their fathers *haoma-sacrifice*, namely Viuuanvhant, fathered upon Yima; Āθβiia upon Ōraētaona; Ōrita of the Sāmas upon Kərəsāspa and Pouruśaspa upon Zarathuštra; cf. Kellens 2001, 316–22.

<sup>128</sup> For text and translation cf. Vahman 1986.

<sup>129</sup> Oktor Prods Skjærvø suggests that *Dārā ī Dārāyān* is an amalgamation of the memory of last Achaemenid king of kings with Dārāyān, the name of a series of kings of the region of Persis; cf. Skjærvø 1997, 102–3.

of his interpretation of religious tradition. His role as the miraculous proof of the validity of the faith is in accord with the purpose of Wīrāz's soul journey. Wīrāz was chosen to be sent to the other world on account of his righteousness in order to verify Zoroastrian beliefs and the efficacy of Zoroastrian rituals. Both Ādurbād and Wīrāz are heroes of the time of religious uncertainty, who provide confidence and reinforce the distressed community. These scenes of piety aimed at strengthening the believers had to be repeated several times after the fall of the Achaemenid empire, whose last king was Darius III. In addition, some other important names among the Sasanian kings, including Xusrō I Anōšīrvān (r. 531-579), Artaxšahr ī Pābagān (r. 224-241), the founder of the Sasanian dynasty, and Bahrām V Gōr (r. 420 to 438), are invoked, outwith their chronological order.

#### زیارت‌نامه پیر سبز (۳)

قبول پاک یزدان پیر سبز است	زیارت‌گاه مردان پیر سبز است
که نور اردیبهشت زردْهشت است	نسیمش روضه مینو بهشت است
ز اعجاز خداوند تعالی	بیا در پیر سبز و کن تماشا
درختان سبز و خرم گشته انبوه	ز پایین تا به بالا قله کوه
مشام عالمی پر مشک و عنبر	ز عطر و بوی آویشن معطر
چو باغ سبز گلزار و گلستان	ز روس سنگ روییده درختان
ز اشک چشم پیر سبز کاری است	همان آبی که از کوه است جاری
که شیرین‌تر ز هر قند و نبات است	نیک‌بانو که آبش چون حیات است
به زیبایی و سرسبزی بود فخر	سیاوشان بدور کوه و استخر
ز هر دردی و علت‌ها شفاست	دوای بس مفید دردهاست
به ناحق کشته شد زو یادگاری	چو شاه یزدگرد این شهریاری
به کوه غایب شدند از بیقاری	ز فرزندان او هریک فراری
نهادندی سر از کوه و بیابان	ز ظلم ظالمان یکسر گریزان
فرار هریک به کوهی اشک‌ریزان <sup>130</sup>	ز بهر نام، ننگ و دین یزدان

<sup>130</sup> This verse is very similar to the sixteenth verse of the fifteenth chapter, "[question] on *ziyāratgāh* (pilgrimage shrines) and the response to it" (see above). The aforementioned text must serve as the *Vorlage* here.

به ایشان کار مشکل گشت آسان<sup>131</sup>  
 بشد غایب که بودش هوش و ادراک  
 که هر سالی به پابوش صفا آورد  
 مراد سر به سر پیوسته گردید  
 روا گردد به امر پاک یزدان  
 دهد آرام دل‌های پریشان  
 ز معجزهای کوه پایین و بالا  
 زهر دردی کزو باشد علاجش  
 که باشد بهتر از کار تجارت  
 که از خوبی با فر و شکوه است  
 گذارش<sup>132</sup> سخت و دور از هر گروه است  
 نه جای مردم بدنام باشد  
 که هستی نیک‌نام و نیک‌پیوند  
 که باشد بر خداوندان خداوند  
 کزین آمدشدن مقصود از چیست  
 گهی مانند گل گاهی چه خاریم  
 ز هدینان هر دور و زمانی  
 ز احوال بزرگان و سترگان  
 ز بوبکر و ز عثمان وز عمر  
 که بیرون رفته بد زان خاندان بخت  
 به هر کوهی همه پنهان گشتند  
 به مین، سرور شاهنشاهانند  
 به خود آسان سراسر مرگ کردند  
 که گوی نیک‌نامی را ربودند  
 زیارتگاه مردان مصفا  
 که ما را از بدی‌ها پاک گردان

چو دم بر حق زدند آن حق‌شناسان  
 به سمت کوه عقدا بانوی پاک  
 زیارتگاه فاضل از زن و مرد  
 صف مرد و زنان چون بسته گردید  
 مراد و مطلب و حاجات ایشان  
 هریشت پیر از خاصان ایشان  
 به نارستانه آی و کن تماشا  
 ز آب و مورد سبز و سبز کاجش  
 زیارت کن در آنجا کن عبادت  
 یکی هم نارکی تیجنگ کوه است  
 چنان خورشید نورانی ز کوه است  
 زیارتگاه خاص و عام باشد  
 الا ای مرد بهدین و خردمند  
 به قلب صاف دل را با خدا بند  
 به سر<sup>133</sup> حکمتش کس را خبر نیست  
 همه در تحت امر کردگاریم  
 ز شاهان پهلوانان کیانی  
 قیاسی گیر از نیکان و پاکان  
 ز دور و عهد شاه<sup>134</sup> یزدگرد بنگر  
 گذشتندی همه از تاج و از تخت  
 ز جان و مال و زر یکسر گذشتند  
 بنام نیک مشهور جهانند  
 جهان بی‌وفا را ترک کردند  
 سرای آخرت منزل نمودند  
 همه آثارشان پاک و هویدا  
 خداوندا به حق شاه مردان

<sup>131</sup> This verse is taken from *Mas'ale-ye Dīn* of Ḥodābahš son of Gāmāsp (see above).

<sup>132</sup> *ac* گذار

<sup>133</sup> *ac* بسرو

<sup>134</sup> *ac* شا

ز شأن و شوکت و فر و شکوهش  
 به آن نور روان تابناکش  
 دل پر درد مسکینان دوا کن  
 که بوده از همه عیبی مبرا  
 چو از نزدیک از دوری وطن‌ها  
 چو ماه نو ز نور خورشیدست  
 به حق شاه شاهان شاه مردان  
 کنی چشم و دل ما را پر از نور  
 همه را باحیا و بیا کن  
 صفا بخش و بده بذل و سخاوت  
 چنان شاپور شاه و پور داراب  
 که ایران و همه آفاق آباد  
 شهنشاه سریر لامکانی  
 که بودندی سرافراز و نکونام  
 به امر و حکم و فرمان خدا شد  
 بخواند هرکه از همیار ما است  
 جهانش سربه‌سر زیر نگین باد

به حق پیر سبز و اوج کوهش  
 ز سوز دل به آب چشم پاکش  
 مراد جمله بهدینان روا کن  
 به حق عصمت بانوی کبری  
 مراد و حاجت مردان و زنها  
 منور کن و دل و جانسان ز شیدت  
 به حق سی و سه امشاسپندان  
 به حق حضرت زرتشت و خشور  
 درون سربسر را با صفا کن  
 ز حرص و بغض و از کین و عداوت  
 به خوبی همچنان اردای ویراب  
 چو شه نوشیروان با عدل و با داد  
 و یا چون اردشیر بابکانی  
 چنان بهرام گور از عهد و ایام  
 نمودم ختم و حاجاتم روا شد  
 زیارت‌نامه پیران سبز است  
 به خواننده درود و آفرین باد

“Pir-e Sabz is the pilgrimage shrine of all people, [all prayers to]  
 Pir-e Sabz are accepted by the pure Lord;  
 Its refreshing breeze comes from the garden of paradise,  
 and its lights are [the sign of] the “Best Righteousness” of  
 Zarathuštra;  
 Come here, enjoy the Pir-e Sabz and look at the miracles of the  
 Almighty Lord;  
 See how from its bottom to its top, the mountain is crowded  
 with luxuriant and thick forest;  
 Look, how perfumed and well-smelling it is here [i.e. the Pīr]  
 from the fragrance of thymes and marjorams, so that the  
 whole universe fills with an agreeable odor of musk and  
 ambergris;  
 The trees are growing out of the stones, like a green garden full  
 of flowers;

And the water flowing down from the mountain is so efficacious,  
 because the tears of Pīr-e Sabz;  
 It is a remedy for many pains and heals any complaint and  
 disease;  
 The water of [the shrine of] Nīk-Bānū is life-giving<sup>135</sup> and sweeter  
 than any sweetmeat and candy;  
 The Sīyāvašān plants grow all over the mountain and the lake,  
 splendid in their beauty and greenery;  
 Like King Yazdgerd, he was a king killed unjustly, and these are  
 here as a remembrance [of him];  
 All his [Yazdgerd's] children have been put to flight and have  
 vanished in the mountains out of anxiety;  
 They all escaped from the cruelty of the tyrants to the mountains  
 and deserts;  
 For the sake of the good name and honour and God's religion,  
 each ran away tearful;  
 The pure Lady vanished in the mountains of 'Aqdā,<sup>136</sup> intelligent  
 and perspicacious, she disappeared;  
 Here is the pilgrimage destination of all virtuous women and  
 men, who bring purity by coming each year into her presence;  
 As soon as they have gathered and lined up, they have become  
 joined with what they desired;  
 All their wishes, issues and demands will be fulfilled by the  
 command of the pure Lord;  
 Pīr-e Haršt, one of those saints of rank, pacifies the distressed ones;  
 Come to [Pīr-e] Narestāne and observe the many miracles of the  
 mountain;  
 [Come and observe] the water and green myrtles and pine-trees,  
 which are remedies for any pains;  
 Fulfil your pilgrimage there and pray; this will be much better  
 than any commercial business;

<sup>135</sup> An allusion to the namesake of the shrine of Pīr-e Sabz, who is known in the tradition as Ḥayāt-Bānū, "the Lady of Life" or "the Life-giving Lady" (see above).

<sup>136</sup> 'Aqdā is a rural district of Ardakān county, Yazd, Iran. The district is indirectly referred to in the *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e pārs-bānū II* by naming the village of Arġenān.



The other [pilgrimage site] is Nārakī in the Tiḡang [mountains],<sup>137</sup>  
 which is magnificent and elegant;  
 It is like a shining sun on the mountains; the way to it is hard  
 and far from any community;  
 It is the pilgrimage shrine of both noble and common people,  
 and not a place for infamous disgraced ones;  
 O you adherent of the good religion and the wise, behold! O  
 you, who you are honored and respected and of a noble  
 family, beware!  
 Put confidence in the Lord with a pure heart, he who is Lord of  
 Lords;<sup>138</sup>  
 For none will guess the riddle of his mystery, that of why we  
 came into this world and why we will pass away;  
 We are all under the Creator's commands, now like the flowers  
 and now like the thorn;  
 From all the Kīyanid kings and heroes, from all the adherents of  
 the good religion of all the ages  
 Take your example; from the pious and righteous ones, from the  
 elders and grantees;  
 Look at the age and fortune of King Yazdgerd, and those of Abū-  
 Bakr, 'Oṣmān and 'Omar;<sup>139</sup>  
 They all have relinquished crown and throne, as good fortune  
 abandoned their dynasty;  
 Whereas they [the *pīrs*] have renounced life and wealth and  
 luxury and each has disappeared into a mountain;  
 They are thus now in good odour in this world and are the lords  
 of all the kings of the kings in paradise;  
 They have left behind the unfaithful world and made their own  
 death easy for themselves;

<sup>137</sup> The Tiḡang mountains are ca. 30 kilometer east of Yazd, Iran.

<sup>138</sup> This could either simply mean God, who is the Lord of all the kings and nobles, but it might also refer to the henotheistic structure of the Zoroastrian pantheon, in which Ahura Mazdā presides over all other deities.

<sup>139</sup> Putting 'Oṣmān before 'Omar in ahistorical order is necessary to preserve the rhyme.

They have chosen the hereafter as their eternal residence and  
 in this manner, they have borne away the ball of good  
 reputation<sup>140</sup>;  
 Their traces are pure and clear; they serve as pilgrimage sites for  
 their purified adherents;  
 O Lord, by the righteousness of the Kings of the Heroes, purify  
 us from evils;  
 By the righteousness of Pīr-e Sabz and the height of her mountain,  
 [By the righteousness] of her dignity, glory, splendour, and  
 magnificence;  
 [By the righteousness] of her compassion and her purified tears,  
 [By the righteousness] of the bright light of her soul;  
 Accomplish all the wishes of the adherents of the good religion  
 and remedy the painful heart of the wretched;  
 By the righteousness of the chastity of the Greatest Lady, who is  
 innocent of any fault,  
 [Accomplish] all the wishes and needs of men and women, may  
 they be from near or far;  
 Illuminate their heart and soul by your radiance, like the new  
 moon, which shines because of the sun's light;  
 By the righteousness of the thirty-three Bounteous Immortals;  
 by the righteousness of the Kings of the Kings and Kings of  
 the Heroes;  
 By the righteousness of his holiness Zarathuštra, the bearers of  
 the [divine] words,<sup>141</sup> illuminate our eyes and hearts;  
 Purify our hearts completely, make us all modest and true-  
 hearted;  
 [Save] us from greed, grudges, rancour and hostility, purify and  
 endow us with generosity and munificence;  
 Make us as justified and blessed as Ardā-ye Vīrāb was, as King  
 Šāpūr and the son of Dārāb;

<sup>140</sup> "Bearing away the ball of good reputation", in the sense of "being successful", is a well-known allegorical expression in Persian literature, drawn from polo playing.

<sup>141</sup> NP *vaḥšūr*, from MP *vaxšvar* "Prophet, lit. carrier of the words", a known title for Zarathuštra in Pahlavi literature. E.g. *yazdān waxšwar* "the prophet of the divine" (DD 38.22).

[And] as King Nušīravān [ Xusrō I. Anōšīrvān], [furnish us]  
 with justice in perfect equilibrium;  
 Or [as valiant and righteous] as Artaxšahr son of Pābag, the  
 king of the throne of with no abode;<sup>142</sup>  
 [And] like Bahrām-e Gūr [Bahrām V] from the previous ages,  
 where all were exalted, glorious and with good reputation;  
 I have concluded this and my wishes have been fulfilled by the  
 favor and order of the Lord;  
 This is the supplication of the Pīr-e Sabz, may it be read by all  
 who are our companions;  
 May the reciter be praised and blessed, may the whole world be  
 under his authority.”

### *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e pārs-bānū I*

In twenty-five verses in the *maṣnavī* form in the *motaqāreb* meter. It has a similar repetitive distich to the *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz I*: “Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: O Pīr-Bānū!”, which has probably served as the template for other *ziyārat-nāmes* like this one. The fact that Islamic supplications wield a remarkable influence on the composition of the Zoroastrian *ziyārat-nāmes* can be seen in the special uses of phrases that are popular in the Iranian-Islamic tradition. The expression قربان سرت “May I be sacrificed to thy head”, used here in the first distich of the second verse, is a common form of address used by inferiors to superiors, widely attested in Islamic supplications. In addition, the expression به پایوس آمدن “kiss one’s feet”, i.e. to pay reverence in someone’s presence, is also another common phrase, widely used in Islamic *ziyārat-nāmes*, and thus shows the influence of the vocabulary of the Iranian-Islamic *Ziyārat-nāmes*. This supplication mentions the date 1354 AY, most probably in the style of *Ziyārat-nāme pīr-e pārs-bānū III* by Rostam Belivānī (see below), which corresponds to 1985. It is unclear if the composer is the same Rostam Belivānī or not, though the style and imagery suggest his authorship.

<sup>142</sup> The term *lā-makān* “lit. with no abode” refers to the heavenly status of a righteous man or a deity.

Beside the general outline of the saint's story, the poet here also deploys significant Zoroastrian imagery in the closing verses, by praising the Bānū Pārs as having a "pure soul", fine in odor and with a "fragrance imbued with ambergris". This recalls both the imagery of the Zoroastrian goddess *Daēnā* and the personal anthropomorphic embodiment of the sum of human actions, views, inner consciousness as well as spiritual visions, as in, *inter alia*, Y. 31.11; Y. 46.6; Y. 37.5; Y. 51.21 etc., where she appears as the maiden of the Činwad bridge in the afterlife.<sup>143</sup> She is described as a noblewoman from the east, notable for her fine scent, who takes care of the souls of the righteous going to paradise.<sup>144</sup> This is why she is called "the fragrant/well-scented one" (Av. *hubaoiδitāma*-, MP *hubōy*). Her presence is associated with a pleasant smelling wind, which blows gently and is considered the harbinger of her appearance.<sup>145</sup> This association recurs frequently in other Zoroastrian literature.<sup>146</sup> The poet plays with this image, so that the person referred to in the distich *روان پاک او عنبر سرشت است* can be both the Pīr-Bānū and the poet.

#### زیارت نامه پیر پارس بانو (۱)

به نام آنکه نامش ایزد پاک	گل از گل آفرید و آدم از خاک
به قربان سرت یا پیر بانو	به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو
دم خواهد به پابوست بیایم	مرادم ده که من زودی بیایم
به پابوست بیایم زانو زانو	به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو
الهی نور بارد بشن آن کوه	دهان سنگ داده جای بانو
از این کوه بلند بالاسر او	به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو
که بانو قبله گاه دین ما بود	نماز و سجده و عذرش به جا بود
که دایم پای این کوه منزل او	به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو
زیارتگاه گشته آن دل او	دهان سنگ گشته جای بانو

<sup>143</sup> For *Daēnā*, her theological concept and imagery cf. Farridnejad 2018, 201–9; 384–400.

<sup>144</sup> KSM 35, cf. Back 1978, 452.

<sup>145</sup> E.g. in cf. H.2.8, cf. Piras 2000, 60, 65, 70.

<sup>146</sup> E.g. in *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag*, Cf. Gignoux 1984, 48, 157; Vahman 1986, 194–95.

به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	ز نسل شاه بود اصل بانو
تمام سنگ جایش کیمیا است	مکان و جای بانو لاله‌زار است
به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	تمام خاک کویش طوطیا است
تمام دوستانش حق پذیرند	الهی مردمان بد بمیرند
به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	زیارت بر دل بانو بدارند
و رحمی بر دل بانو نکردند	که این بانو دلش آزرده کردند
به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	که فکری بهر آن مینو نکردند
که نام او بود بانوی پارسی	نشانت می‌دهم گر می‌شناسی
به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	ز گوهر یزدگرد شاه پرسی
فراغش می‌خورم با اشک دیده	دگر بانو به نزد حق گزیده
مرا از دریای موج غم بر آور	توئی شهزاده شاه دلاور
به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	ثنایت می‌شود مقبول دارو <sup>147</sup>
که بانوی شهر غربت استوار است	هزار و سیصد و پنجاه و چهار است
به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	زیارتگاه بانو برقرار است
در آن دنیا مکانش در بهشت است	هرآنکس نامه بانو نوشته است
به صدق دل بگو یا پیربانو	روان پاک او عنبر سرشت است

“In the name of the just and pure Lord, who creates flowers from mud and man from the soil,<sup>148</sup>  
 May I be sacrificed to thy head, O Pīr-Bānū! Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: ‘O Pīr-Bānū!’  
 My heart demands to come to you and to kiss your feet; fulfil my demand, so that I might come to you quickly;  
 So that I might come to your presence kneeling on the floor to kiss your feet; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: ‘O Pīr-Bānū!’  
 May God rain pure light on the mountain [i.e. may god bless the

<sup>147</sup> *ac* دارو, which makes no sense. This could be either an orthographical mistake or an alteration of داور. In the first case, then the rhyme would be corrupt. I could not find any other attestations of the alteration of this word, nor similar records in any Zoroastrian dialect. Considering this alteration as a matter of simple *poetic* licence seems to me unjustifiable.

<sup>148</sup> This verse is identical to the third verse of *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e sabz I*.

mountain] that opened its lips and gave refuge to the Lady;  
 From this high mountain which stands above her, Call from the  
 depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

The Lady was the focus of our religion, her prayer and prostration  
 and virginity were all in their proper place;  
 She, whose residence is now at the foot of this mountain; Call  
 from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O  
 Pīr-Bānū!'

Her heart here is now [our] pilgrimage shrine, where the mouth  
 of the mountain has become her residence;  
 She was of royal descent; Call from the depth of your heart and  
 with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

Her residence and her place is now a tulip-garden, all the stones  
 are alchemy;  
 The soil of her quarter [i.e. the soil of her shrine] is like ointment  
 for our eyes; Call from the depth of your heart and with  
 utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

May God cause the evil people to perish, but her friends, those  
 who are followers of the truth,  
 May they perform the pilgrimage to her heart; Call from the  
 depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

The Lady who was hurt and to whom nobody showed mercy;  
 That paradise for whom nobody cared; Call from the depth of  
 your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

I will show you her, should you recognize her, she whose name  
 was the Lady of Pārs;  
 She was of noble birth, from king Yazdgerd; Call from the depth  
 of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

The Lady who chose to reside with the Lord, I mourn her  
 absence with tearful eyes;  
 O you, born of the valiant king, rescue me from the stormy sea  
 of grief;  
 Your praise will be accepted by [?]; Call from the depth of your  
 heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

It is now [the year] one thousand and three hundred and fifty-

four, in which the [shrine] of the Lady having been in exile holds firmly;

The pilgrimage shrine of the Lady continues to exist; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'

May the one who composed the visiting supplication of the Lady have a place in the paradise of the other world;

Her pure soul is fragrant as if imbued with ambergris; Call from the depth of your heart and with utmost sincerity: 'O Pīr-Bānū!'"

### *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e pārs-bānū II*

These thirty-three verses are also in the *maṣnavī* form in the *motaqāreb* meter. Again, like the previous supplication, here the expression "kiss someone's feet" به پابوس آمدن is used.

#### زیارت‌نامه پیر پارس‌بانو (۲)

کزین برتر اندیشه برنگذرد <sup>149</sup>	به نام خداوند جان و خرد
از این دشمنان ربایند کیش	بگفتند یارب به اکرام خویش
تو می‌پذیر ما را از ایمان زیان	به پرهیز ما را ازین بد گمان
به نام بلند و به آئین و کیش	نگهدار ما را به آیین خویش
برآمد بر آن چشمه حاجاتشان	به پذیرفت یارب مناجاتشان
از ایدر بیا اندرین بامداد	ندا آمد از کوه و آواز داد
در آن خانه سنگ اندر نهان	دگر نوجوانی شد اندر دمان
که بانو روان شو بزودی چو باد	فرو بست لب کوه و آواز داد
نتانست تابش رود در گریز	روان گشت بانوی و با وی کنیز
بدرگاه آن داور ذوالمنن	بنالید بانوی آن پیرزن
تو ما را ز دشمن به فریادرس	همی گفت ای داور دادرس
دریغا، فغانا، صد افسوس ما	نگهدار ناموس و آیین ما
همان به که کامه به دشمن دهیم	اگر جان شیرین همی بسپریم
رهانم به تن جان، ایدر مکن	مرا شرمساری به داور مکن

<sup>149</sup> The couplet is taken from the opening verse of Ferdōsi's *Šāhnāme*.

بنالید بانو رخی اشکبار  
 ره ارجنان گیر و بگذار جای  
 پس اندر پر از لشکر دشمنان  
 یکی مرزبانى بدیدش چو باد  
 به من ده که گشته دلم چون کباب  
 بدوشید شیرش پی ماه نو  
 همی ریخت در پای آن پیر را  
 برون شد از آن مرز و آن مرزبان  
 دلش روشن و چهره شد آب جوی  
 رسید او به نزدیک یک مرغزار  
 گریزان و نالان در آن پهن دشت  
 یکی گلستان پر گل و ارغوان  
 در این گلشن آباد تا جاودان  
 به پابوس آیند همه دوستان  
 بدانست کامد ز یزدان کلید  
 چراغ دل و دیده دوستان  
 پر از شادمانی و با فرهی  
 عرب در پس آمد که گشته دژم  
 به فرجام آن بانوی باآفرین

به عجز و به لابه بر کردگار  
 خبر گشت بانو که ایدر مپای  
 همی تاخت بانو سوی ارجنان  
 از آن سو گذر یافت بانو چو باد  
 بدو گفت بانو یکی جام آب  
 شتایید آن مرزبان نزد گاو  
 لگد زد همان گاو آن شیر را  
 چو بانو چنین دید زینسان از آن  
 سوی کوه خارا همی کرد روی  
 همی رفت بر کوه نخجیروار  
 به زر جان و از باغشان درگذشت  
 یکی قصر پیدا شدش در نهان  
 ندا آمد از جانب غیب دان  
 بیاید همانند در این بوستان  
 بشد شاد بانو چو آن را بدید  
 همی تاخت در گلشن و بوستان  
 درون شد خرامان چو سرو سهی  
 فرو بست لب سنگ خارا بدم  
 به مینو روان شد به خلد برین

“In the name of the Lord of both wisdom and mind, to nothing  
 sublimer can thought be applied;<sup>150</sup>

They said, O Lord, [vowing] to your honour, [save us] from  
 these enemies, the thieves of faith,

Save us from these suspect ones, and do not accept that our faith  
 be lost;

Save us to keep our faith and our highly renowned fame and  
 religion;

The Lord has accepted their prayers and their requests have  
 been fulfilled from that fountain [of life];

<sup>150</sup> The opening verse in translation Warner/Warner 1905, Vol. I, 100.



A proclamation came from the mountains and convoked them:  
 'come here, behold by the first light of morning;  
 Youth has gone in haste and is hidden in the stony house'.  
 The mountain become silent, but then called her: 'O Lady, run  
 fast like the wind'.  
 The lady ran and together with her, her maid-servant, but she  
 could not endure the [difficult] escape;  
 That old lady groaned with pain to the heavenly court [of the  
 Lord], the bestower of endowments;  
 She kept saying, 'O you the Judge [of the world], the renderer of  
 justice, redress us of our grievances toward the enemy;  
 Save our chastity and religion! Alas, [hear] our lamentation and  
 hundreds of complaints and sorrows;  
 If we are supposed to resign our breath, this is much better than  
 that our enemy should attain his purpose;  
 Don't let me be ashamed in front of the Judge, liberate my soul  
 from my body, behold!'  
 Imploring and confessing her weakness in presence of the Lord,  
 she complained in vain with a tearful face;  
 Then she received the message, 'behold, do not remain here!  
 Leave here and go toward Arġenān'.<sup>151</sup>  
 The Lady kept rushing toward Arġenān, pursued by a great  
 army of the enemy;  
 The Lady fled from that side like the wind, while a military  
 commander [marzbān] saw her running like the wind;  
 The Lady said to him: 'give me a bowl of water, as I am dying of  
 thirst'.  
 The commander rushed to a cow and milked it for the New  
 Moon [i.e. the Lady];  
 But the cow kicked the the milk and spilt it in front of the *pīr*'s  
 feet;  
 As the Lady saw what had happened, she left the commander  
 and that land;

<sup>151</sup> Arġenān is a village in 'Aqdā rural district, Ardakān county, Yazd, Iran.

She turned again toward the flinty mountain with a bright heart  
 and a tearful face;  
 She approached the mountain like a hunter and reached close  
 to a meadow;  
 She passed the garden [...] and the vast field, taking flight and  
 lamenting;  
 [Suddenly] appeared secretly a palace to her, a flower-garden  
 full of roses and cherries;  
 Then came a heavenly call from the omniscient Lord: 'may this  
 flower-garden flourish eternally;  
 You should come to this garden and rest, and all the friends will  
 come to kiss your feet [i.e. to pay reverence at her presence]'.  
 The Lady grew happy as she saw this and knew that all these  
 came from the Lord;  
 She ran into the flower-garden, she the favorite beloved one  
 among the friends;  
 Elegantly she entered [the garden] with a graceful gait, full of joy  
 and honour and glory;  
 The mountain then closed his lips, while the Arabs reached the  
 place and grew angry;  
 The praiseworthy Lady finally went to eternal paradise."

***Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e pārs-bānū III* by Rostam Belivānī**

In eight verses composed by Rostam Nushrivan Belivānī, this piece is the only supplication of this genre about both whose composer and date we can be sure. Like the *Ziyārat-nāme-ye pīr-e pārs-bānū I*, the composition date of 1354 AY / 1985 is mentioned in the last verse.

زیارت نامه پیر پارس بانو (۳)

بود پارس بانو ز ساسانیان	پدر یزدگرد سوم از شهان
نژاد از شهنشاه پیشینیان	زیارتگه جمع زرتشتیان
ز بیداد تازی گریزان ز یزد	به کوه و بیابان و بی خواب و خورد
رسیدی بدین جای دور از گروه	به فرمان یزدان پناه داد کوه

گواهی دهد بر همه بی‌درنگ	نشان از شکافی که بینی به سنگ
ببینند آیین پیشینیان	همان جاودان تا که بینندگان
به فرمان یزدان که گشتی نهان	چنان پاک دامن بدی در جهان
هزار و سه صد بود و پنجاه و چهار	سنة یزدگرد جهان شهریار

“Pārs-Bānū was of Sasanian descent, her father [was] Yazdegerd III, of the kings;

Born of a distinguished race of the former King of Kings, [whose shrine is] the pilgrimage site for the Zoroastrian community;

Taking flight from Yazd from the oppression of the Arabs [*tāzī*] to the mountains and deserts, sleepless and hungry

She has arrived here, far from the people, where the mountain gave her sanctuary at God’s command;

The mark of the fissure that you see on the cliff provides evidence to everyone, without any doubt;

May you retain eternally, so that visitors might witness the [truth of] the religion of their forebears;

As she lived chastely in the world, on God’s command she went into hiding;

The year [of this composition] is One thousand and three hundred and fifty-four after Yazdegerd, the king of the world.”

### Conclusion

The extant Zoroastrian *ziyārat-nāmes* and pilgrimage songs represent a young and popular literary genre among the Zoroastrian literature composed in New Persian. As orally transmitted poetry, they display a fairly free stylistic tendency to the structure of both folklore songs as well as the classical Persian prosody. Being remarkably influenced by the Shi‘i supplications, the composition of the Zoroastrian *ziyārat-nāmes* in combination with the cult of pilgrimage to the empty shrines are good examples of a functioning acculturation, in which the Zoroastrian community has adopted this popular literary genre into their own pilgrimage rites. The *ziyārat-nāmes* and pilgrimage songs are important witnesses of the lay Zoroastrian faith for preservation and passing down the identity-establishing legends.

### Abbreviations

<i>ac</i>	reading before correction
Av.	Avestan
Bd	<i>Bundahišn</i>
DD	<i>Dadestān ī dēnīg</i>
Dk	<i>Dēnkard</i>
KSM	Kirdir's inscription at Sar Mašhad
MP	Middle Persian
NP	New Persian
Vd.	<i>Vidēvdād</i>
WZ	<i>Wizīdagihā ī Zādspram</i>
Yt	<i>Yāšt</i>

## Bibliography

- Afšār, Īrağ. *yādegārḥā-ye yazd. moʿarefi-ye abniye-ye tāriḥi-o āšār-e bāstānī* [Yazd Memorials. Historical Monuments and Ancient Relics]. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Selsele entešārāt-e anğoman-e āšār-o mafāḥer-e farhangī. Tehran; Yazd: Anğoman-e āšār-o mafāḥer-e farhangī, 1374 š [1995-96].
- Amir-Moezzi, Mohammad Ali. 'Shahrbānū, Lady of the Land of Iran and Mother of the Imams: Between Pre-Islamic Iran and Imami Shi'ism'. In *The Spirituality of Shi'i Islam: Beliefs and Practices*, 45–100. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.
- Āmuzgār, Žāle. 'adabiyāt-e zartošti be zabān-e fārsi [Zoroastrian Literature in New Persian]'. *Mağalle-ye dāneškade-ye adabiyāt-o ʾolūm-e ensānī* 171–199, no. 2 (1349 š [1970]).
- Back, Michael. *Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften*. Acta Iranica 18. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Šāhbahrām Belivāni, *mağmūʿe-ī az ziyārat-nāme-o čegūnegī-ye bargozārī-ye marāsem-e dinī-ye zartoštiyān* [A collection of "Visitation Supplications" and the customs of the Zoroastrian religious ceremonies], 2nd ed. [1st ed. 1365 š /1986-87] (Yazd: Vešāl, 1382 š [2003]).
- Beyhaqī (Ebn Fondoq), Abol-Ḥasan ʿAlī B. Zeyd. *Tāriḥ-e beyhaq* [The History of Beyhaq]. Ed. by Aḥmad Bahmanyār. 2nd ed. Tehran: Forūqī, 1308 š [1929].
- Bharucha, Sheriarji Dadabhai. *Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Pārsis: Consisting of Old Translations of Avestā and Pahlavi-Pāzend Books as Well as Other Original Compositions; with Various Readings and*

- Notes. 6 vols. Bombay: Trustees of the Parsee Punchayet Funds and Properties, 1906.
- Boucharlat, Rémy. 'S. v. Qadamgāh'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica, Online Edition*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, 2014. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/qadamgah>.
- Boyce, Mary. *A Persian Stronghold of Zoroastrianism. Based on the Ratanbai Katrak Lectures*, 1975. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- . 'Bībī Shahr-bānū and the Lady of Pārs'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30, no. 1 (1967): 30–44.
- . 'On the Sacred Fires of the Zoroastrians'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 31, no. 1 (1968): 52–68.
- . 'S. v. Ādur Burzēn-Mihr'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, Vol. I, Fasc. 5:472–73. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983a.
- . 'S. v. Ādur Farnbāg'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, Vol. I, Fasc. 5:473–75. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983b.
- . 'S. v. Ādur Gošnasp'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, Vol. I, Fasc. 5:475–76. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983c.
- . 'S. v. Bībī Šahr-bānū'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, Vol. IV, Fasc. 2:198. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1989.
- Boyce, Mary, and Firoze M. Kotwal. 'S. v. Irānšāh'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, Vol. XIII, Fasc. 5:531–33. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2006.
- Caron, Nelly, and Dariouche Safvate. *Iran: Les traditions musicales*. Collection de l'Institut International d'Etudes Comparatives de la Musique 2. Paris: Buchet, 1966.
- Coleman, Simon, and John Elsner. *Pilgrimage: Past and Present in the World Religions*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Dahlén, Ashk P. 'He Addressed the Kayānian King: "I Am a Prophet!" – The Image of Zoroaster in the Dāstān-e Goshtāsp (Tale of Goshtāsp)'. *Orientalia Suecana* LX (2011): 117–39.
- Daruwalla, Kerman. 'Evolution of the Zoroastrian Priestly Rituals in

- Iran'. *SOAS Journal of Postgraduate Research* 10 (2016): 100–110.
- Darvishi, Mohammad Reza, ed. *Musiqī-ye āyīnī-ye zartoštiyān-e īrān: avetsā- ḥānī-o gātā-ḥānī dar yazd [Iranian Zoroastrian Ritual Religious Music: Chanting Avesta and Gāthās in Yazd]*. Regional Music of Iran 60. Tehran: Mahoor Institute of Culture and Arts, 2015.
- . 'Ritual and Religious Music in Iran'. *Honar Periodical* 34 (1997): 152–62.
- Daryaei, Touraj. *Sasanian Persia: The Rise and Fall of an Empire*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.
- Dhabhar, Bamanji Nasarvanji, ed. *The Persian Rivayats of Hormazyar Framarz and Others: Their Version with Introduction and Notes*. Bombay: K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, 1932.
- Ebn Ḥordāzbeh, Abo' l-Qāsem 'Obayd-Allāh. *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik (Liber Viarum et Regnorum) Auctore Abu'l-Kāsim Obaidallah Ibn Abdallah Ibn Khordādhbeh et Excerpta e Kitāb al-Kharādj Auctore Kodāma Ibn Dja'far*. Ed. by Michael Jan de Goeje. Lugduni Batavorum: Brill, 1889.
- Farhat, Hormoz. *The Dastgāh Concept in Persian Music*. Cambridge Studies in Ethnomusicology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Farridnejad, Shervin. *Die Sprache der Bilder: Eine Studie zur ikonographischen Exegese der anthropomorphen Götterbilder im Zoroastrismus*. Iranica 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2018.
- Farudi, Annahita, and M. Doustdar Toosarvandani. 'The Dari Language Project – 2004 Fieldwork Endeavour: Summary of Findings', 2004. [http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~dari/2004\\_summary\\_of\\_findings.pdf](http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~dari/2004_summary_of_findings.pdf).
- Fischer, Michael M. J. 'Sacred Circles: Iranian (Zoroastrian and Shi'ite Muslim) Feasting and Pilgrimage Circuits'. In *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographies of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. by Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley, 131–144. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing, 1991.
- . 'Zoroastrian Iran between Myth and Praxis'. PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973.

- Fozi, Navid. *Reclaiming the Faravahar: Zoroastrian Survival in Contemporary Tehran*. Iranian Studies Series. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2014.
- Franke, Patrick. *Begegnung Mit Khidr: Quellenstudien zum Imaginären im traditionellen Islam*. Beirut: Texte und Studien 79. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2000.
- Ghodrat-Dizaji, Mehrdad. 'Administrative Geography of the Early Sasanian Period: The Case of Ādurbādagān'. *Iran* 45, no. 1 (2007): 87–93.
- Gholami, Saloumeh. 'S.v. Zoroastrians of Iran. vi. Linguistic Documentation'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica, Online Edition*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2016. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/zoroastrians-in-iran-o6>.
- Gignoux, Philippe. *Le Livre d'Ardā Virāz: Translittération, Transcription et Traduction du Texte Pehlevi*. Bibliothèque Iranienne 30. Paris: Édition Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1984.
- Gignoux, Philippe, and Ahmad Tafazzoli. *Anthologie de Zādspram*. Studia Iranica 13. Paris: Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes, 1993.
- Gnoli, Gherardo. 'S. v. Farr(Ah)'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, IX:312–19. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1992.
- Godrej, Pheroza, and Firoza Punthakey Mistree, eds. *A Zoroastrian Tapestry. Art, Religion & Culture*. Middletown, NJ: Grantha, 2002.
- Goštāsb, Farzāne. 'Ḥaḡ-e pīr-e sabz: safari be 48 sāl-e pīš [The Pilgrimage to Pīr-e Sabz: A Journey to 48 Years Ago]'. *Berasad*, 1389 š [2010]. <http://fa.berasad.com/content/view/4121/48/>.
- Ḥamawī Baḡdādī, Yāqut. *Mo'jam al-boldān*. Vol. 5. Beirut: Dar Beyrut, 1399 q [1979].
- Ḥā'eri, Seyed-Mehdī. 's.v. Ziyārat'. In *dāyerat-ol-ma'āref-e taṣayo' [Encyclopedia of Shi'a]*, ed. by Aḥmad Ṣadr-Ḥaḡ-Seyed-Ġavādī, VIII:564–66. Teheran: Moḥebī, 1379 š [2000].
- Herbers, Klaus, and Hans Christian Lehner, eds. *Unterwegs im Namen der Religion: Pilgern als Form von Kontingenzbewältigung und Zukunftssicherung in den Weltreligionen / On the road in the name of religion: pilgrimage as a means of coping with contingency and fixing*



- the future in the world's major religions*. Beiträge zur Hagiographie 15. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014.
- Hinnells, John R. 'S. v. Pārsi Communities i. Early History'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica, Online Edition*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater. New York, 2008. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/Pārsi-communities-i-early-history>.
- Ḥodābaḥš Ġāmāsp. 'mas'ale-ye dīn [Tenets of the Religion]. In *pandnāme-ye mollā firūz [The Book of Advice of Mollā Firūz]*, ed. by Ardešīr Ḥāze 'Elāhābādī, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 133–86. Bombay: Čāpḥāne-ye Solṭānī, 1327 š [1948].
- Huff, Dietrich. 'S. v. Takht-e Solaymān'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica, Online Edition*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/takt-e-solayman> (Letzter Zugriff am 20.11.2012), 2002.
- . 'The Functional Layout of the Fire Sanctuary of Takht-i Sulaimān'. In *Current Research in Sasanian Archaeology, Art and History. Proceedings of a Conference Held at Durham University, November 3rd and 4th, 2001, Organized by the Centre for Iranian Studies, IMEIS, and the Department of Archaeology of Durham University*, ed. by Derek Kennet and Paul Luft, 1–14. BAR International Series. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2008.
- Humbach, Helmut, and Prods Oktor Skjærvø. *The Sassanian Inscription of Paikuli*. Vol. 3. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1983.
- Kellens, Jean. 'Fils du soleil, fils du sacrifice'. In *Philologica et Linguistica: Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Dezember 2001*, ed. by Maria Gabriela Schmidt and Walter Bisang, 316–22. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2001.
- Khaleghi-Motlagh, Djalal, ed. *Shāhnāmāh (The Book of Kings)*. 8 vols. Bibliotheca Persica. Persian Text Series, New Series (PTSNS) 1–8. New York: Persian Heritage Foundation, 2008.
- Krasnowolska, Anna. 'S. v. Kezr'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica, Online Edition*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater. New York, 2009. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/kezr-prophet>.
- Kreyenbroek, Philip G. *Living Zoroastrianism: Urban Pārsis Speak about Their Religion*. Richmond: Curzon, 2001.

- . ‘The Zoroastrian Priesthood after the Fall of the Sasanian Empire.’ In *Transition Periods in Iranian History*, edited by Philippe Gignoux, 151–166. Cahiers de Studia Iranica 5. Ozoir-la-Ferrière: Assoc. pour l’Avancement des Études Iraniennes, 1987.
- Langer, Robert. ‘From Private Shrine to Pilgrimage Centre: The Spectrum of Zoroastrian Shrines in Iran.’ In *Zoroastrian Rituals in Context*, ed. by Michael Stausberg, 563–592, Tab. XII/1–XVI/16. Numen Book Series: Studies in the History of Religions 102. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . ‘Schreine und Wallfahrtsstätten der Zarathustrier: Zur “sakralisierten Topographie” Irans.’ In *Heilige Orte in Asien: Räume göttlicher Macht und menschlicher Verehrung*, ed. by Angelika C. Messner and Konrad Hirschler, 219–256. Asien und Afrika: Beiträge des Zentrums für Asiatische und Afrikanische Studien (ZAAS) der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel 11. Hamburg: EB-Verlag (ebv) Dr. Brandt, 2006.
- . *Pirān und Zeyāratgāh: Schreine und Wallfahrtsstätten der Zarathustrier im neuzeitlichen Iran*. Acta Iranica 48. Leuven: Peeters Press, 2008.
- Lawergren, Bo. ‘S. v. Music History i. Pre-Islamic Iran.’ In *Encyclopædia Iranica, Online Edition*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater. New York, 2016. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/music-history-i-pre-islamic-iran>.
- Mas‘ūdī, Abu-’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī Ibn-al-Ḥusain al-. *Kitāb at-tanbīh wa-’l-išrāf [Book of Admonition and Revision]*. Ed. by Michael Jan de Goeje. Laidan: Brill, 1894.
- Meri, J.W. ‘S.v. Ziyāra. 1. In the Central and Eastern Arab Lands during the Pre-Modern Period.’ In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs, 2nd ed., XI:524–29. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Meri, J.W., W. Ende, Nelly van Dooren-Harder, Houari Touati, Abdulaziz Sachedina, Th. Zarcone, M. Gaborieau, R. Seesemann, and S. Reese. ‘S.v. Ziyāra.’ In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs, 2nd ed., XI:524–39. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

- Miller, Lloyd. *Music and Song in Persia: The Art of Avaz*. London: Curzon Press, 1999.
- Montazerī, Seyed-Sā'id-Rezā. 'barresi-o mo'arefi-ye adabiyāt-e fārsī-ye zartoštī [A Survey on Zoroastrian Literature in New Persian]'. *Āyene-ye pažūheš* 156 (1394 š [2016]): 29–37.
- Morony, Michael G. 'S.v. Madjus'. In *Encyclopaedia of Islam. New Edition (EI2)*, ed. by Bernard Lewis, Victor Louis Ménage, Charles Pellat, and Joseph Schacht, 2nd ed., V:1110–1118. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Mo' in, Moḥammad. *mazdayasnā ava adab-e fārsī [Zoroastrianism and its Influence on Persian Literature]*. Tehran: Tehran University Press, 1326 š [1947].
- Naumann, Rudolf, Dietrich Huff, and Rudolf Schnyder. 'Takht-i Suleiman: Bericht über die Ausgrabungen 1965–1973'. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 90 (1975): 109–204.
- Nūrī Tabrisī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn. *Mustadrak al-wasā'il wa mustanbat al-masā'il*. 18 vols. Qom: Mu'assisa Al al-Bayt li Ihya' al-Turath, 1408 q [1987].
- Phalippou, Éric. *Aux sources de Shéhérazade: Contes et coutumes des femmes zoroastriennes*. Acta Iranica 38. Louvain: Peeters, 2003.
- Piras, Andrea. *Hādōxt Nask 2: Il racconto zoroastriano della sorte dell'anima*. Serie Orientale Roma 88. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2000.
- Qomī, 'Abbās, ed. *Ziyārat-nāme-o šāḡare-nāme-ye hazrat-e ḡ-anūm Bibī-Šahrbānū [Visitation Supplication and Geneology of Her Holiness the Lady Bibī-Šahrbānū]*. Tehran: Revāyat, 1388 š [2010].
- Rante, Rocco. *Rayy: From its Origins to the Mongol Invasion. An Archaeological and Historiographical Study*. Arts and Archaeology of the Islamic World 4. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz, W. Ende, Nelly van Dooren-Harder, Houari Touati, Abdulaziz Sachedina, R. Seesemann, and S. Reese. 'S.v. Ziyāra. 5. In Persia and Other Šhī'ī Lands'. In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs, 2nd ed., XI:533–34. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Šahmardān, Rašīd. *Farzānegān-e zartoštī [Learned Zoroastrians]*. Tehran: Sāzmān-e Ġavānān-e Zartoštī-ye Bamba'ī, 1330 š [1951].

- Saritoprak, Zeki. 'S.v. Rod'. In *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, ed. by Jane Dammen McAuliffe, IV:508–9. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Schimmel, Annemarie. *A Two-Colored Brocade: The Imagery of Persian Poetry*. The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Schippmann, Klaus. *Die iranischen Feuerheiligtümer*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 31. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.
- Schmermbeck, Beate. *Persische zarathustrische monāḡāt: Edition, Übersetzung, Tradition und Analyse*. Göttinger Orientforschungen III. Reihe, Iranica, NF 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.
- Sheffield, Daniel J. 'Primary Sources: Gujarati'. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Zoroastrianism*, ed. by Michael Stausberg and Yuhan Sohrab-Dinshaw Vevaina, 543–54. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc, 2015a.
- . 'Primary Sources: New Persian'. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Zoroastrianism*, ed. by Michael Stausberg and Yuhan Sohrab-Dinshaw Vevaina, 529–42. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc, 2015b.
- Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. 'S.v. Jamšid. i. Myth of Jamšid'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, XIV, Fasc. 5:501–22. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2012.
- Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. 'The Joy of the Cup: A Pre-Sasanian Middle Persian Inscription on a Silver Bowl'. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 11 (1997): 93–104.
- Sorūšiān, Ġamšid Sorūš. *Farhang-e behdīnān [Beddīnān (=Zoroastrian's) Dictionary]*. Ed. by Manūčehr Sotūde. Tehran: Farhang-e Īrān-zamīn, 1335 š [1956].
- Stausberg, Michael. *Religion and Tourism: Crossroads, Destinations, and Encounters*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.
- Stewart, Sarah. *Voices from Zoroastrian Iran: Oral Texts and Testimony (Part 1: Urban Contexts: Kerman, Tehran, Ahwaz, Esfahan, Shiraz)*. Iranica, GOF III/NF 17. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2018.
- Taʿ ālibī, Abū-Manšūr aṭ-. *Ġorar aḥbār moluk al-forss wa-siyaruhum: Histoire des Rois des Perses*. Ed. by Hermann Zotenberg. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1900.

- Unvala, Manockji Rustamji, ed. *Dârâb Hormazyâr's Rivâyat: Vol. 2*. Bombay: British India Press, 1922.
- Vahman, Fereydun. *Ardâ Wirâz Nâmag: The Iranian 'Divina Commedia'*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies 53. London: Curzon Press, 1986.
- Vitalone, Mario. *The Persian Revâyats: A Bibliographic Reconnaissance*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, 1987.
- Warner, Arthur George, and Edmond Warner. *The Shâhnâma of Firdausî*. 9 vols. London: Kegan Paul Trench, 1905-25.
- Wensinck, Arent Jan. 'S.v. al-Ḳhaḍir (al-Ḳḥiḍr)'. In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs, 2nd ed., IV:902-5. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Wensinck, Arent Jan, and Georges Vajda. 'S.v. Ilyās'. In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs, 2nd ed., III:1156. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- West, Edward William. 'Pahlavi Literature. Appendix. VIII. The Modern-Persian Zoroastrian Literature of the Pārsis'. In *Grundriss Der Iranischen Philologie*, ed. by Wilhelm Geiger and Ernst Kuhn, II:122-29. Strassburg: Trübner, 1896.
- Williams, Alan. *The Zoroastrian myth of migration from Iran and settlement in the Indian diaspora: text, translation and analysis of the 16th century Qeşse-ye Sanjān 'The story of Sanjan'*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Windfuhr, Gernot. 'S.v. Behdinān Dialect'. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, ed. by Ehsan Yarshater, IV, Fasc. 1:105-8. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1989.
- Wolff, Fritz. *Glossar zu Firdosis Schahname*. Reprografischer Nachdr. der Ausg. Berlin 1935. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965.
- Yazeshni, Dariush. *Zoroastrian Folk Songs: Melodies from the Deserts of Yazd*. A set of 2 cassettes. Mumbai: Zoroastrian Studies, 1997.

## **Religious and Community Issues Addressed in the Early Twentieth Century by the Athornan Mandal, a Trust for Priests**

Ramiyar P. Karanjia

### **Establishment**

In the early twentieth century, there was a general sentiment among some of the Zoroastrian religious elders that some priests and community members were performing an increasing number of irreligious acts, either ignorantly or blatantly.

At this time two gentlemen, Mr. Jehangir J. Vimadalal and Mr. Faredun K. Dadachanji, decided to form a trust for priests, made up of responsible priests and community elders, to maintain the economic and social interests of the priests and to guide the community (AMII: 23). The priests put aside their personal prejudices, as well as their diocesan and sectarian differences, and came together under one umbrella by establishing the Athornan Mandal on 9 May 1915, mainly for the purpose of securing their own interests and to act as their own spokespeople on religious, moral and social issues (*Parsi* 1936: 284). The Mandal safeguarded the traditional aspects of the Zoroastrian religion by maintaining an orthodox stance and taking up cudgels for the priests and the community (AMII: 8, 15). Within the twenty years of its existence, the Athornan Mandal established itself as a representative not only of Mumbai priests, but also of priests from dioceses all over India and even outside India. It considered itself the custodian of the

rights of the priests, rising above diocesan divisions and even trying to unite them (AMI: 63). The Mandal was, furthermore, represented not only by priests throughout India, but also by priests from overseas, for example, from Karachi, Hong Kong and Shanghai. It enjoyed the privilege of being patronized by almost all the head priests (Dasturs) of India.

### **Community issues**

As the highest body of priests, the Athornan Mandal was asked questions about religion and rituals by priests, associations and individuals from bastions of the Zoroastrian religion like Navsari, Surat, Bharuch, Baroda, Devlali, Panchgani and Matheran, as well as far-off places like Queta, Rajkot, Calcutta and Bhavnagar. Though the Athornan Mandal answered almost all types of questions, when the questions seemed awkward and inappropriate, no replies were given. When religious questions had a legal bent, the Mandal refrained from offering an opinion (MC3: 217, 282, 305, 306). Some of the issues about which the Athornan Mandal was consulted and gave its opinion in the first twenty years of its existence are as follows:

#### **1. The Sindh Navjotes**

In December 1918, the Athornan Mandal took up the case of the Juddin-navjotes<sup>1</sup> of two children from a Parsi father and a non-Parsi (Afghan) mother performed at Jekobabad in Sindh by Ervad Hormusji Jamshedji Panthaki (Khalera)<sup>2</sup> from Surat. The priest concerned apologized and sought forgiveness for his actions by writing a letter to Dastur Darab Peshotan Sanjana, citing his ignorance of the resolution passed after the Rangoon Navjotes. He further assured that he would not perform such rituals again. The letter was placed before the committee and it was agreed that no action would be taken against the priest considering

<sup>1</sup> Juddin-navjote is the term used for the Navjote in which one of the parents of the child undergoing Navjote is a non-Zoroastrian.

<sup>2</sup> Priests were often known by their nicknames, especially in their professional circles. Though the surname of this priest was Panthaki, he was better known by his nickname Khalera.

his ignorance, apology and assurance. However they also decided to publicize the priest's letter and take appropriate steps to ensure that in the future priests would not cite ignorance as a reason for performing such actions (MC1: 57).

## **2. The Queta Navjotes**

A question was asked from Queta about a man named Edalji who had converted to Islam and then married three Muslim women according to Islamic practice, and yet had the Navjote performed on their children. The Mandal opined that the children could not be considered Zoroastrian and their Navjote was to be considered null and void. Since the priest who had performed the Navjote apologized, he was not penalized and no steps were taken against him (MC1: 63-64).

## **3. The Navjotes of Ratan Tata's children**

In the Anjuman Committee meeting of 26 January 1921, a letter received from Mr. Pestonji Dhanjibhoy Mahalaxmiwala along with an attached letter from Mr. Ratan Tata were read aloud by Mr. Jehangir Jamshedji Vimadalal. In his letter, Mr. Tata mentions the Navjotes of his two children, which were to be performed shortly, and asked that his children be considered as exceptions and be exempted from the resolutions of the Anjuman. Both letters were discussed at length in the meeting and a resolution was passed that was proposed by Mr. Jehangir Vimadalal and seconded by Er. Kaekhushru Kutar. The resolution stated that the committee had noted the circumstances of Mr. Tata's marriage. It also noted that the resolutions of the Parsi Anjuman and resolutions passed in the open meetings of the Athornans regarding intermarriages and children born of such intermarriages were passed after Mr. Tata's marriage, and that the Navjotes of two of Mr. Tata's other children had already taken place. Taking this into consideration, it was resolved that the case of the two forthcoming Navjotes of Mr. Tata's two remaining children be considered exceptional cases, and that no action should be taken, either against the Navjotes to be performed or against the priests who were to perform them, as per the resolutions of the meeting of the priests on 10 May 1914.



The resolution also emphasized that the case of the Navjotes of Mr. Ratan Tata's children was an exception, and that the committee would make every effort to implement the resolutions of the May 1914 meeting of the priests. The committee expressed hope that there would continue to be good relations between Mr. Ratan Tata and the priests, whom the resolution referred to as his "brothers", since this would benefit the community. It was also decided to publish the resolution in the newspapers so that the community would be informed (AACI: 57-62).

#### **4. The Vandsa Navjotes**

In June 1942, some Athornans performed seventy-seven Navjotes of Parsis of "mixed" parentage at Vandsa, a village in Gujarat. Almost the entire community was shaken by this event. In July, the Athornan Mandal's Managing Committee called a meeting under the chairmanship of Dasturji Noshirwanji Dinshaji Garda to discuss these Navjotes. After long deliberation a resolution was passed to oppose them. An additional resolution with the signatures and support of all the Dasturjis of Mumbai was passed to call a Samast Athornan meeting. Accordingly this meeting was convened on 2 August 1942 at Albless Baug under the chairmanship of Dasturji Noshirwanji Dinshaji Garda. The meeting passed resolutions against the Navjotes as well as the Athornans who performed the Navjotes. Copies of the main resolutions with Dasturji Garda's signature were sent to the concerned persons of all Agyaris and Atash Behrams in Mumbai as well as all to out-of-town Anjumans and other important religious institutions. The arrangement and expenses of the Samast Athornan meeting were borne by the Athornan Mandal.

#### **5. The Navjote of children from intermarriages**

##### **a. Children of a Parsi father and a non-Parsi mother**

In January 1931, Mr. Jamshedji Rustamji Saklatwala approached the Athornan Mandal with the questions listed below. The replies were drafted by Jehangirji Vimadalal, Fardunji Dadachanji, and Gustadji Antia and approved by the committee. Previously Mr. Saklatwala had also sent these questions to the Bombay Parsee Punchayat, the

Zoroastrian Association, and the Bombay Jashan Committee. Hence the replies were also sent to them. It was suggested that the answers be published in the newspapers. Apparently Mr. Saklatwala was not happy with the replies (MC2: 287-89, 305):

- a. **Question:** Can a child born of a Parsi father and Juddin (non-Zoroastrian) mother be considered a Parsi? **Answer:** It is not obligatory to consider Zarthoshti the child born of a Parsi father and Juddin (non-Zoroastrian) mother. From a legal point of view, and on the basis of the resolutions passed by the Parsi Panchayat on 16 April 1905 and by the Athornan Anjuman on 21 March 1918, if priests make the child wear Sadra Kasti he becomes a Zarthoshti; if they do not make him wear Sadra Kasti he cannot be called a Zarthoshti.
- b. **Question:** If such a child's Navjote is performed by a priest in a fire temple, is the child entitled to all the rights of a Zoroastrian? **Answer:** If the Navjote of such a child is performed, then he will receive rights only from the trust funds of the Bombay Parsi Panchayat, according to its deed and customs. He is not entitled to rights from other institutions just by wearing the Sadra Kasti. For this matter, it is necessary to study the deed and customs of all trust funds. In the future, if all new trusts in their deeds were to start the practice of disentitling such a child from all rights, this issue would not arise.
- c. **Question:** On the basis of the following paragraph occurring in the Judgment of Justice Davar and Beamon, it is clear that such children should get all the rights of a Zoroastrian and that the trustees are duty-bound to grant those rights. Even in the case of Ratanji Tata and Soonabai Tata, the trustees have agreed that "[the] Parsi Community consists of children born of [a] Parsi father and [an] alien mother, and such children are entitled to all [the] benefits of [the] trust funds and properties." (This quote is incomplete in the original). **Answer:** The judgement of Justice Davar has been given only on the basis of the declaration made by the trustees of the Bombay Parsee Panchayat. It applies only to the trusts belonging

to them. It should be noted that this judgement has not been given for other Parsi trusts.

- d. **Question:** If a Parsi gentleman has married according to Christian customs and tradition, but still wears the Sadra Kasti and is a righteous person, may he be allowed to go to the fire temple and attend the Geh Saran ritual? Can he be the beneficiary of Agyaris and Dokhmas? **Answer:** If a person has forsaken his religion and then married according to Christian customs and traditions, he may not be considered a Zoroastrian. If he has not forsaken the religion and married as per the Christian act, then he is considered a Zoroastrian. However the priests have the right to reject him and to refuse to perform rituals for him. But trusts whose deeds make no mention of denying rights to such individuals must consider him a Zoroastrian and give him the benefit of Agyaris and Dokhmas.
- e. **Question:** A Parsi marries according to Christian tradition, his wife dies, and then he engages in a civil marriage with a lady from another religion. He wears the Sadra Kasti and is righteous. If he wants his wife to wear the Sadra Kasti, may she be accepted into the religion, and will the Parsi gentleman get the benefits of Agyaris and Dokhmas? **Answer:** The person who has entered into a civil marriage with a non-Zoroastrian lady has already made the prior declaration that "I do not practice the Zoroastrian religion." This person is considered a non-Zoroastrian and he may not be a beneficiary of Agyaris till he is given a Bareshnum and reconverted into the religion. Wearing Sadra Kasti does not grant a non-Zoroastrian lady rights to Parsi Zoroastrian institutions, about which Davar and Beamon have provided a clear judgement.

**b. Children of a Parsi mother and non-Parsi father:**

In the year 1964-65 a Navjote was performed for a child born of a black American father and a Parsi lady. The Athornan Mandal carried out an investigation to determine who had performed the Navjote. In spite of their best efforts, they were not able to identify the priest. Thereafter the Athornan Mandal wrote to the Bomaby Parsi Panchayat informing them that the child could not be considered a Zoroastrian even though

the Navjote had been performed, and hence the child should not be allowed to avail himself of the benefits granted to a Parsi Zoroastrian. The Panchayat took cognizance of this letter and consequently issued a manifesto declaring that the above-mentioned child could not be considered a Parsi Zarthoshti and would not be entitled to any rights of a Zarthoshti (AMII: 54).

#### **6. The move to register Navjotes**

The Athornan Mandal made a move to get Navjotes registered, and drafted an official form for that purpose, the "Form of Certification of the Navjote Ceremony for Parsi Zoroastrians under Section V of the Bill of 1934." The form contained the following columns: the name of the boy or girl admitted; the name of his or her father and grandfather; the name of his or her mother and grandmother; the age of the boy or girl; the name of the street or locality of residence; the name of city, town or village of residence; the name of the place where the Navjote was performed, and the date; the signature of the father or guardian; the signature of the priest administering Nahan; the signature of the Dastur or priest performing the Navjote (MC3: 213, 214).

#### **7. The Samast Anjuman meeting condemning intermarriage**

In 1932 some leading Zoroastrians sent a requisition to the Bombay Parsee Panchayat to hold a Samast Anjuman meeting condemning intermarriages. The trustees were not in favour of the fourth resolution mentioned in the requisition and hence postponed the Samast Anjuman meeting. This resolution declared that a Zoroastrian lady who married a non-Zoroastrian should be considered a non-Zoroastrian for life and should not be allowed to return back to the fold under any circumstances.

The Athornan Mandal, however, supported this resolution and hence passed its own resolution to be sent to the BPP declaring that the Samast Anjuman meeting should be called without changing the fourth resolution and that, if the BPP did not call the meeting then the community leaders should themselves call such a Samast Anjuman meeting (AMI: 23).

### **8. The Civil Marriage Bill**

Dr. Gower and the chief of the Viceroy's legislative assembly wanted to pass a Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill passed through Parliament. The Athornan Mandal protested this bill, perceiving it to be harmful to the interests of the Parsi Zoroastrian community and of the Mazdayasni Zarthoshti religion. The Mandal believed that the only valid and legal form of marriage was the one performed through the sacred Ashirwad ritual. They argued as follows: Any marriage performed without the Ashirwad ritual was contrary to the teachings of the religion and hence should be considered null and void. This practise had been followed for thousands of years and was necessary for the survival of the Zoroastrians. The only valid marriage is that of a Zoroastrian to another Zoroastrian performed through the Ashirwad ritual. The Zoroastrian community considers the encouragement of civil marriage to be deplorable. Children born from a marriage solemnised without the Ashirwad ritual could not be considered Zoroastrians. Hence anybody wishing to undergo civil marriage will first have to declare that he is not a member of the Zoroastrian community. The Mandal also pointed out to the Honourable Queen Victoria that such a bill would contradict her Declaration that all Indian citizens had the right to practise their religion and religious traditions. The Civil Marriage Act would suspend the religious rights of Zoroastrians and offend their priestly class (MC1: 111, 112; MC2: 186).

The Mandal also sought to amend the Parsi Marriage and Divorce Bill of 1865. They wanted it to state that priests with the power of Bareshnum should give Nahan (the ritual bath) to the bride and groom, and that a Dastur or priest with the power of Bareshnum should perform the "Special Ashirwad (Benediction) Ritual." Mr. F. K. Dadachanji was asked to draft the words to be added to the bill, with the help of a subcommittee. The Mandal also selected four of its members as representatives to attend all meetings that the Parsi Panchayat convened for that purpose under the guidance of the Honourable Sir Firoz Khurshedji Sethna. Later a draft for modification of the bill was prepared by Mr. Dadachanji in which there were several amendments including the inclusion on the marriage certificate of the signature of

the persons giving Nahan to the bride and groom (excepting a groom who had undergone the Navar ritual). To lodge a protest against the bill, five hundred signatures were collected and sent to the government (MC1: 111, 112; MC2: 186).

Later the government legislators asked the entire case to be submitted together and so Mr. Dadachanji compiled a thirty-one-page booklet and sent it to them. Included with it were a list of the other fifty-four leading Association members, along with some of the resolutions passed by the Athornan Anjuman and the Bombay Parsi Panchayat (MC3: 241, 242).

In October 1935, when the Joint Select Committee brought out the bill, the Athornan Mandal was not happy with its definition of "Parsi." The Mandal stated that the definition provided in the bill was preferred only by a minority of Parsis and that the Committee should take a referendum of the community and find out what the majority preferred. Then the Mandal defined the word Parsi as naming "a Parsi Zoroastrian or children born to a Parsi or Irani mother and father who have been duly admitted into the Zoroastrian fold." It also suggested two other changes to the bill – specifying (1) that the only valid Parsi marriage is one accomplished through the ritual of Ashirwad, and (2) that both parties have to be Parsis and have to produce their valid Navjote certificates, the registration of which should be proposed in this Act. Later in November 1935 a modified bill was sent to the Mandal, who accepted it (MC3: 271-275, 279).

## **9. Cremation**

In 1922 there was disturbance in the community about the use of cremation amongst Zoroastrians. The Athornan Mandal took it upon itself to do something about it. To that end it appointed a subcommittee to call a Samast Anjuman meeting to address the matter (WCI: 60, 61). On this basis a Samast Anjuman meeting of all Dasturji, Panthakis and priests was organized under the banner of the Athornan Mandal to discuss the issue of cremation (WCI: 62).

### **10. The movement against cremation**

In the year 1964-65, the Athornan Mandal actively participated in the meeting at the Wadiaji Atash Behram called by all the Dasturjis of India to prohibit priests from performing rituals for community members availing of cremation as a mode of disposal of the dead in places where there was a Dokhma (AMII: 54).

The movement in favour of cremation was gaining ground, and hence the Athornan Mandal once again passed a resolution, at its annual meeting on 3 August 1968, in favour of Dokhmenashini and against cremation. It also expressed solidarity and a desire to work with associations, like the Bombay Parsee Association, that were taking up cudgels in regard to this issue (AMII: 56-57).

### **11. Burials of community members**

From time to time, information about instances of burials of Zoroastrians in India were brought to the notice of the Athornan Mandal, who condemned them in no uncertain terms. In June 1925 it condemned the burial of a Parsi girl, the daughter of Mr. Jehangirji Khurshedji Mistry in the Varnaai village in Malad, and called a meeting of Dasturjis to discuss the issue. Later it resolved that wherever there was a Dokhma, the non-Zoroastrian practice of burial should not be performed. It condemned the act of the Panthaki who supervised and the two priests who performed the Geh-sarna ritual, and applauded the action of Mr. Cawasji Jalbhai Seth of Manekji Seth Agyari, who barred the two priests from performing rituals in his own Agyari where they were serving. The Mandal also appealed to the trustees and Panthakis of other Agyaris and Atash Behram to bar these two priests from performing rituals in their places of worship (MC2: 33, 37-39, 41).

In 1925, a Parsi lady was buried in Malad, which the Mandal protested and about which it passed protest resolutions. In 1931, Mrs. F. E. Dinshaw was buried in Poona in spite of there being two Dokhmas. Dasturji Sardar Noshirwan Kekobad Dastur himself was present when this happened, along with the other priests Ardeshtar Kotwal, Hormasji D. Dastur, and Jal B. Bharda. The services of official Khandias were employed to bury the corpse in the house compound after the Geh-

sarna. Dasturji Noshirwan Dastur defended this act, saying that he was respecting the lady's last wishes. The Mandal sent a set of questions asking the priests to clarify their position; however they got no response. Later the Mandal appointed a subcommittee to look into the matter. When approached personally, Dasturji Noshirwan did not cooperate and did not even assure that such a step would not be repeated. The Mandal passed a resolution expressing their displeasure. In another incident a lady's corpse was brought from Poona to be buried in Panchgani. A letter was sent to the president and secretaries of the Panchgani Parsi Zarthosti Anjuman, asking them to explain their positions.

Another such incident occurred in December 1933, when a three-year-old child was buried in a coffin as per Christian customs, while the Geh-sarna ritual was performed irreligiously by two priests holding the power of Bareshnum. The Mandal took notice of this incident and passed a resolution condemning it along with the priests who participated. The resolution was sent to all Parsi newspapers but none published it, so the Mandal decided to send a representative to meet Mr. Savaksha Marazban to get his opinion (MC3: 27-29, 36-37, 57-58, 140-143, 147).

## **12. The use of iron stands for the corpse**

A new practice was being introduced at the Doongerwadi of placing the corpse on six iron stands after the Sachkar, instead of on stones. This practice was initiated after the death of Dr. Nanabhai Moos. The Athornan Mandal objected to the introduction of this new trend, and reprimanded the Nasesalars as well as the Panchayat trustees. It also suggested that whenever a new trend seems to be introduced, the Nasesalars should not do Sachkar or carry the corpse but should inform the manager or the trustees (MC3: 303, 304).

## **13. The Bareshnum of priests following different calendars**

In a resolution, the Mandal had opined that since the prayers and roj-mah of the Shahenshahi and Kadimi sects differ, a difference in their rituals is understandable. Later in response to questions about



the Bareshnum of priests following different calendars that was posed by the noted scholar Irach Jehangir Taraporewala in June 1931, the Athornan Mandal emphatically replied: Priests who have taken Bareshnum as per the Shahenshahi or Kadimi system may not perform higher rituals according to the other calendar system or change their original roj and mah. They may only perform rituals on the basis of the calendar according to which they have taken the Bareshnum; otherwise the ritual is invalid. They also may not pray the Ashem vohu and Ashem vohi (symbolic of reciting prayers in the two calendar systems) under one Bareshnum (MC2: 80-81; MC3: 25-26).

#### 14. Boe, Bareshnum-gāh and priests:

A prominent priest from Bharuch, Er. Hoshangji Mancherji Vimadalal, asked the following five questions, which were very clearly answered by the committee (MC2: 233-235):

- a. **Question:** May a priest who is just a Navar offer boe in an adaran?  
May such a priest offer boe in a adaran where there is a tradition of giving boe without performance of moti khub (Yasna) and without a Bareshnum? If it may not be done, where in the religion is this mentioned?  
**Answer:** A priest who is just a Navar may offer boe in an adaran. There is no tradition that a boe may only be offered by a Mobed who is observing the higher ritual power (moti khub).
- b. **Question:** If the door of an adaran is facing towards the north, is it okay to keep the wood on the afarganyu in the north-south direction?  
**Answer:** The door of the sanctum of the adaran and the wood on the afarganyu may be in any direction.
- c. **Question:** Is it necessary to have the higher ritual power (moti khub) with the performance of a Yasna before giving boe in an adaran?  
**Answer:** Not at all.
- d. **Question:** Traditionally the place of a Bareshnum-gah (the place where a Bareshnum is administered) is mentioned as nine vām (nine hands long and wide). Is it okay to have a place that is smaller

or larger than this? What should be the minimum dimension in feet of a Bareshnum-gah?

**Answer:** Our ancestors did mention the dimension of a Bareshnum-gah to be nine vām. However there are smaller Bareshnum-gāh in and outside Mumbai and there is no problem in that.

In reply to a letter from Agra dated October 1935 asking whether a priest with dentures may take a Bareshnum and perform rituals like the Yasna, Vendidad and Baj, the Mandal opined that it is not permissible to perform even a prayer while anything is in the mouth, not to mention higher rituals like the Yasna and Vendidad. Hence it is not permissible to take a Bareshnum with dentures, and as long as the power of Bareshnum is to be maintained, one may not wear the dentures (MC3: 269, 270).

### 15. Parsi ladies acting in movies and plays

On 4 September 1935, an Anjuman meeting was convened to launch a massive protest against Parsi ladies working in movies and plays. In this meeting a subcommittee was constituted that formulated ten questions and sent them to the Mandal for their opinion (MC3: 262-265, 271):

- a. **Question:** Do you accept that there has been no tradition of Parsi ladies working in the public arena of the cinema and the theatre in the twelve centuries that they have been in India”

**Answer:** Yes, it is true.

- b. **Question:** Does this practice have the approval of the teachings of the Zoroastrian religion?

**Answer:** Yes, it has.

- c. **Question:** Is there a teaching in Zoroastrian religion of giving as much importance to old traditions and practices as to religious teachings?

**Answer:** Yes.

- d. **Question:** Does the Zoroastrian religion hold the ideal that a Parsi lady should be like Spenta Armaiti? Is it necessary that the religion and community accept whatever is written in the Aiwisruthrem

geh about the same?

**Answer:** It is the duty of every lady to follow the lofty status of ladies as shown in the Zoroastrian religion. In this religion, since ancient times, the status of woman is as high as that of men. And hence it is necessary that they carefully maintain their status with dignity.

- e. **Question:** Considering the small numbers of the Parsi community, it is necessary that Parsi girls and ladies should remain in the community. While performing plays, ladies may have to come into close contact with men and enact love scenes, which creates opportunities to start relationships with such people, which is dangerous. This may lead to taking steps against the religion. Isn't it the religious duty of community members to prevent this?

**Answer:** Considering the small numbers of community members, it is advisable that our ladies remain in the community. This is a major burden of the community. There is the fear that ladies participating in films and plays will have an adverse effect on the religion and its traditions and practices. It is indeed the religious duty of every Zoroastrian to prevent this from happening.

- f. **Question:** Do Parsis, compared to those from other communities, need to take greater care about their behaviour? Is there a possibility of about five hundred to one thousand Parsi women participating in plays over a certain period of time? And if this is so, isn't it the social and religious responsibility of the community to stop them from adopting careers in films and plays, for its self-preservation?

**Answer:** Compared to other communities, we should be more careful. If this is ignored, then surely numerous ladies will give in to temptation and be attracted to careers in film or the theatre, and this would undoubtedly have adverse effects on the future of the community. Hence it is necessary to keep ladies away from these professions.

- g. **Question:** If "pāki-e-tan" (purity of the body) and "ashoi-e-ravān" (righteousness of the soul) are the chief teachings of the Zoroastrian religion, is work in films and plays proper for Zoroastrian ladies?

**Answer:** From that perspective, these professions are not meant for Parsi ladies.

- h. **Question:** In the present circumstances, the trustees of the Bombay Parsi Panchayat have deplored these professions. Is this stand substantiated by the basic teachings of the Zoroastrian religion and ancient Parsi practices and does it have the support of the majority of the community?

**Answer:** Of course it has.

- i. **Question:** Whenever Parsi or non-Parsi directors of actresses ask them to change costumes as per the times and requirements, then it would require the Parsi ladies to abandon their religious vestments of Sadra Kasti, and would this not be an insult to the Zoroastrian community and a very painful blow to the Parsi community?

**Answer:** Directors of films and plays change things when they want, and this may include the actors' costumes, which is in fact very likely; in this case Parsi actresses may stop wearing the Sadra Kasti that is the insignia of our religion. If this happens it would be a sad day for the religion and bring grievous harm to the community.

When the 29 September 1935 issue of the newspaper "Kaisare-Hind" ridiculed a Dasturji for taking a stand on the above topic, the Mandal castigated its publisher and editor and warned them against publishing such cartoons of any priests.

## 16. Priests portrayed in Parsi plays

In 1915 the Athornan Mandal became aware of the play "Parsi Harishchandra," which contained scenes mocking Parsi priests. The Mandal instructed its two joint secretaries to first go and watch the play and then report to the Mandal (MC1: 11, 12). In the meeting following their report about the play, it was resolved that a subcommittee be formed that would draft a letter to Dr. Wadia, the playwright, expressing the Mandal's displeasure about the words and scenes insulting the priestly class (MC1: 14). In the following meeting the drafted letter was read aloud and approved, and it was unanimously decided that the letter be sent to Dr. Wadia (MC1a: 18).

In the early 1920s, the Parsi play "Juddin Zaghdoo" was staged by Dr. Mehllasa Pavri. In it, a character by the name of Bahmandaru portrayed

a Parsi priest in a mocking fashion, which offended the priestly class. The Athornan Mandal, represented by Mr. Jehangir Vimadalal and Mr. Faredun Dadachanji, took up the issue with the play's producers, who responded positively and deleted the objectionable portions (AMI: 22-23; MCI: 74).

In April 1935 two Parsi plays, "Uthaavgir" (directed by Mr. Hermes) and "Gotaalaa maa gosh" (directed by Dr. Jehangir Pavri), portrayed priests in a negative light. Letters were written to both requesting them to delete the objectionable parts. Both directors were warned that if the objectionable parts were not taken care of, the Mandal would approach the police commissioner. Mr. Hermes assured the Mandal that in his future plays he would make changes and take care not to offend the priests (MC3: 221, 222, 233).

### **17. Division among priests**

As far back as 1939, priests were unnecessarily divided about differences based on their panths. The Athornan Mandal had taken upon itself to unite the different panths and sought cooperation from all priests to help it fulfil this aim (AMI: 64). Dasturji Noshirwan Garda invited priests of any panth to perform rituals in the Dadyseth Atash Behram under him, provided they were willing to do it as per the Kadimi way (AMI: 66).

### **18. About Dasturjis**

The Parsi Federal Council asked the Athornan Mandal whether it was advisable to appoint a single Dastur for the whole community. The Mandal, after due deliberation, opined that at the present time it was almost impossible to have one Dastur across all panths, especially since there were even different Dasturs at different Atash Behrams. However, it recommended that the practice of appointing hereditary Dasturs be changed and that a well-educated and learned person with a suitable temperament should be appointed a Dastur (MC2: 221-222). In the mid-1920s, the Athornan Mandal urged all Dasturjis to join one platform and work with the Athornan Mandal to voice a united opinion and to pass unanimous resolutions on important religious

issues. It argued that it would be easier to implement such resolutions and that the community would be more willing to accept resolutions presented unanimously (MC2: 40).

### **19. Houses for practising priests**

The Athornan Mandal felt that priests performing higher rituals (yozdathregar priests) needed proper houses where they could live according to proper religious observance (G. tarikats). It lamented that money for this purpose was not forthcoming and suggested that wealthy Zoroastrians buy houses near Zoroastrian religious places and rent them at low cost to these priests (MC3: 144).

### **20. The presence of non-Zoroastrians at rituals**

There was a practice among a certain section of the community of allowing non-Zoroastrians to sit on a mat where Zoroastrian rituals were being performed. The Athornan Mandal took up the case, had handbills published and distributed, educated the laity and brought a halt to such practice (AMI: 23).

A similar complaint was made regarding non-Zoroastrians touching the huge mats that were used during Navjotes and weddings and on which Zoroastrian priests performed the rituals and on which the wedding and Navjote candidates stood. The Mandal took up the issue and wrote letters to the Dasturjis asking their opinions on this matter. The Dasturjis replied that the objection was valid and that steps needed to be taken to stop the practice. The Athornan Mandal passed a resolution to this effect and distributed its copies to Panthakis and got it published in the newspapers (MC1a: 53, 54, 56).

### **21. Sezda by non-Zoroastrians**

The community was confused by articles in the local press about the Sezda. In order to clarify the issue, the Mandal issued guidelines. It stated that after the death of a Parsi Zoroastrian, the body should be cleaned with Nirang and water, then dressed, then the Kasti is tied, after which the Nasesalars take charge of the body and bring it to the appointed place where the Sagdid is then performed. Only Zoroastrians are allowed to see this procedure and do the Sezda thereafter. Non-

Zoroastrians were not before and should not be allowed to do so. Nobody has the right to make any changes to these customs, and if anybody tries to, the entire Parsi Zoroastrian community will rise up to defend them (MC3: 190,191).

## **22. The proper Parsi New Year**

In 1926, the Parsi Federal Council asked for the Mandal's opinion about having 21 March as the Parsi New Year. The Mandal appointed a subcommittee of Dasturjis, prominent Ervads and religious scholars from among its members to review this question. However, no reply is found in later records (MC2: 76-77).

## **23. The Fasali calendar**

In principle, the Athornan Mandal was opposed to the Fasali movement and the Fasali calendar. In the triannual meeting of the Mandal on 12 December 1926, the president of the meeting, Dasturji Jivanji Garda, pronounced the Fasali movement to be false. Mr. Faredun Dadachanji supported him and reported that Mr. Dinshah J. Irani of the Irani Anjuman, along with some other people, supported the Fasali movement, but not on the basis of a thorough study and merely on account of their own whims and fancies (AMI: 33-34).

## **24. The protest against prohibition**

In 1938, the Athornan Mandal led a protest against the government's proposal to prohibit liquor completely in Mumbai. A huge meeting was called at the Wadiaji Atash Behram in Mumbai that was supported by all the Dasturjis in the city. The meeting was presided over by Dasturji Kekobad Darabji Meherjirana of Navsari and was attended by ten Dasturjis and priests from all panths. The meeting protested total prohibition of alcohol in Mumbai on two grounds. First, such a step would result in massive unemployment among the Parsis since lot of Parsis were employed in or traded in liquor. Secondly, liquor was required in certain rituals and total prohibition might disrupt their performance. Thus the Athornan Mandal served the cause of the priestly class as well as that of the community at large (AMI6II: 10).

### 25. The escalating cost of rituals

The Athornan Mandal was approached by the Zoroastrian Association to look into the matter of the rising costs of rituals, on account of which the community was staying away from and losing faith in their performance. The Mandal was asked to take necessary steps to address this problem, and in response they appointed a subcommittee of about twenty people comprising priests and laymen to look into the matter. They suggested that the secretaries publish a write-up of their findings and thereafter publish the subcommittee's resolution in the newspapers. After meeting several times, the subcommittee decided not to produce any opinion on the cost of rituals, but did make some suggestions about changes in some rituals and sent the report to the secretary of the Jashan Committee (MC1: 88-89, 92, 105).

### 26. The Varasyaji

When the President of the Parsi Anjuman of Queta asked questions about the Varasyaji in 1932, a committee of six people comprising Dasturji Garda, Ervads M. N. Kutar, G. P. Antia, F. N. Panthaki, K. F. Panthaki and Mr. F. K. Dadachanji gave the following replies. The last question was asked a few months later by the Agyari Panthaki (MC3: 89-90, 109, 122):

- a. **Question:** May the Nirang taken from a Varasyaji when he is alive be used after his demise?

**Answer:** The Nirang may be used but the varas (hair) has to be discarded.

- b. **Question:** If a Mobed has taken Bareshnum using the Nirang of a Varasyaji and if that Varasyaji dies, is the Bareshnum and rituals performed under its power still valid according to the religion?

**Answer:** If the Bareshnum is completed then it is valid. However, if the Bareshnum is still ongoing, the priest has to discontinue it.

- c. **Question:** In our Agyari we have a Varasyaji who when bought was completely white. However now, after consecration, a tuft of black hair has grown at the lower part of his tail. May a Nirang-din be performed with such a Varasyaji?



**Answer:** No. Such a Varasyaji may not be used for Nirang-din.

- d. **Question:** If white hair is taken from a Varasyaji with some black hair, may it be used for Yasna and other religious rituals?

**Answer:** No, it may not be used.

- e. **Question:** When the Varasyaji was consecrated he was flawless, and the varas taken at that time is with us. Afterwards black hair was seen in the Varasyaji. May the previously taken white hair be used for Nirang-din or Hama Yasht?

**Answer:** The varas and Nirang taken previously may be used. Rituals may be performed with this varas (even if the Varasyaji dies, the Nirang may be used for a long time.) However in the future, it is not permissible to take varas from this Varasyaji, nor may Nirang-din kriya be performed with him.

### **Abbreviations**

AACI = Athornan Anjuman Committee.

AMI = Athornan Mandal, 1940.

AMII = Athornan Mandal, 968

MC<sub>1</sub> = Athornan Mandal's Managing Committee, 1924.

MC<sub>2</sub> = Athornan Mandal's Managing Committee, 1931.

MC<sub>3</sub> = Athornan Mandal's Managing Committee, 1936.

WCI = Athornan Mandal Working Committee.

## Bibliography

- Athornan Anjuman Committee. 1937. *Minute book of monthly meetings from 12 July 1918 to 9 April 1937*.
- Athornan Mandal. 1940. *Minute book of annual meetings from May 1915 to September 1940* (sixty-eight written pages, numbered on one side only).
- Athornan Mandal. 1968. *Minute book of annual meetings from September 1941 to August 1968* (fifty-seven written pages, numbered on one side only).
- Athornan Mandal's Managing Committee (Karobari Mandli). 1924. *Minute book 1 of meetings from 10 July 1915 to 30 June 1924* (Notebook size, 144 two-sided, handwritten pages).
- Athornan Mandal's Managing Committee (Karobari Mandli). 1931. *Minute book 2 of meetings from 28 August 1924 to 29 July 1931* (Long-book size, 312 handwritten pages).
- Athornan Mandal's Managing Committee (Karobari Mandli). 1936. *Minute book 3 of meetings from 5 August 1931 to 9 September 1936* (Long-book size, 316 handwritten pages).
- Athornan Mandal Working Committee. 1937. *Minute book of monthly meetings from March 1916 to July 1937* (111 two-sided, handwritten pages).
- Parsi Prakash*. 1936. Vol. V (1911-1920), Part III (1914-1915), prepared by the Rustam Barjorji Paymaster. Bombay.

## What is a *ratu sarəda*?

Jean Kellens<sup>1</sup>

1. The facts: The first chapters of Yasna (Y 1-7) list five ritual divisions of time (*ratu*-), either in the genitive (Y 1.17, etc. *aiiaranamca asniianqmca māhiianqmca yāirīianqmca sarədanqmca*) or in the accusative (Y 2.17, etc. *aiiara asniia māhiia yāiriia sarəda*).<sup>2</sup> The first two refer to the day with two different words (*aiiar*:- *aiiara*- and *azan*:- *asniia*-), the third to a month (*māh*:- *māhiia*-), and the last two to the year, also with two different words (*yār*:- *yāiriia*- and *sarəd*:- *sarəda*-). The text summarized by this list only provides the composition for the *ratus asniias*, *māhiias* and *yāiriias*, which reflect time of day (Y 1.3-7), lunar phases (Y 1.8), and seasonal agricultural celebrations (Y 1.9), respectively. The *ratus aiiaras* do not appear at all, and the *ratus sarədas* are mentioned without any analysis (Y 1.9).
2. A remark: It would be reasonable to think that the *ratus aiiaras* are the days of the month listed by the Siroza and approximately reproduced in the succession of Yašts. The *ratus sarədas*, however, are enigmatic.

---

<sup>1</sup>Translated into English by Rebecca Stengel.

<sup>2</sup>For a complete list see Raffaelli 2014: 185 n. 28 and 29.

3. According to the Yasna: In the Yasna the *ratus yāiriiias* and the *ratus sarədas* appear in the same paragraph (Y 1.9). The former introduce the list of seasonal celebrations, whereas the latter conclude it. This arrangement leads one to think that *sarəda-*, like *yāiriiia-*, could in fact be a secondary adjective derived from a name of the year. However, given that both words are distinctly listed in Y 1.17, it is clear they are not synonyms.<sup>3</sup> Therefore the specific meaning of *ratu sarəda* remains to be determined.
4. According to the Visprad: The list of Visprad 1 and 2 is structurally more complex, and at first sight, more nebulous than the Yasna.

Vr. 1.1: Not in the Yasna, an enumeration of the *ratus* of living creatures.

Vr. 1.2: A list of the *ratus yāiriiias* that is similar to Y 1.9 but contains more epithets.

Vr. 1.3: A composite passage mentioning the reproduction of living creatures and the corpus (*haṇdāta-*) of the Staotas Yesniias.

Vr. 1.4-Vr. 1.9: the mention of the *ratus sarədas* is followed by the enumeration of the texts that make up the Staotas Yesniias, with intercalations and prolongations (see Cantera 2009: 17-26).

The structure of Vr. 2 is identical except that the appellation “Staotas Yesniias” is replaced with the paraphrase *vispe tē ratauuō... yōi aoxta ahurō mazdā zaraθuštrāi yasniiāca vahmiiāca ašāt haca yaṭ vahištāt* “all the *ratus* of which Ahura Mazdā tells Zaraθuštra they are suitable for sacrifice and worship-chants (because they were) adapted to very good Order” (Vr. 2.3), followed by a development of two paragraphs (Vr. 2.4-5) before the beginning of the parallel passage at Vr. 1.4-9 (Vr. 2.6-11). The insertion of the Staotas Yesniias throws doubt on the conceptual affinity of the *ratus sarədas* both with living creatures as well as with

<sup>3</sup> It is difficult to understand Bielmeier’s hypothesis (1992: 29) of *yār-* as the year in its subdivisions and *sarəd-* as the year as a whole, since *sarəda-* intrinsically depicts a division in *ratu-*.

the *ratus yāiriias*.<sup>4</sup> There seems to be no solution in sight.

5. An attempt at interpretation: Darmesteter noted the difficulty and sought to resolve it philologically, annotating the *ratus sarədas* in Vr. 1.4 thus: “There appears to have been a shift in the text: this formula would be better placed after the invocation of the Gāhānbārs [= the *ratus yāiriias*], and the Staota would therefore come right before the prayers” (1892: 446 n. 26). Rather than rearrange the formulas, perhaps it would be better to question the homogeneity of the paragraphs. Vr. 1.3 is clearly a composite. Its mention of reproduction refers to the animals of Vr. 1.1 beyond the list of *ratus yāiriias*, but without logical contradiction because the biological cycle is related to the seasons. Inserted at the beginning of Vr. 1.4, between mention of the Staotas Yesniias and the enumeration of texts that make them up, *ratu sarəda* functions precisely as if it were a categorical designation of the texts as *ratus*. Similarly, the *ratus sarədas* in Vr. 1.9, coming logically in the absence of animals, after the *ratus yāiriias*, could be seen as the texts that Y 1.10 qualifies as *nazdišta pairiš.hāuuanañiō* and are listed in Y 1.11-17.<sup>5</sup>

In both the Yasna and the Visprad, *sarəda-* could plausibly be seen as a designation for ritual time represented in the texts requiring their recitation.<sup>6</sup> This interpretation does not imply that their corpus is identical (it is not), nor does it inhibit their common correspondence with a time of year, both inherent in their names and accounting for their order in the list.

<sup>4</sup> Kellen’s hypothesis (1996: 78-79), which proposes that *sarəda-* is derived from *sarəda-* “living creature”, is to be refuted for this reason.

<sup>5</sup> Contrary to the explicit *staotanəm yesniianəm* in Vr. 1.3, the formulation in Vr. 2.3 does not clearly imply an allusion to the texts, but the terminological agreement with Y 1.10 *vīspaēibiō... yōi hənti aṣahe yaṭ vahištahe mazdō.frasāsta zaraṭuštrō.fraoxta* should be observed.

<sup>6</sup> Regardless of what I have written (1996: 103-104 and 2006: 9-10), *ratu-* always refers to a “period of ritual time” (Alberto Cantera would say “articulation of time”), but by extension can designate those they represent (the gods), those who observe them (the sacrificers, the living in their biological cycle) or the texts they imply.

## Bibliography

- Bielmeier, Roland. 'Zur Konzeption Des Avestischen Kalendars'. *Münchener Studien Zur Sprachwissenschaft* 53 (1992 [1994]): 15–74.
- Cantera, Alberto. 'Die Staota Yesniia der textuellen ratu des Visparad'. In *Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran. Études indo-iraniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire*, edited by Éric Pirart and Xavier Tremblay, 17–26. Beiträge zur Iranistik 30. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2009.
- Darmesteter, James. *Le Zend-Avesta: Traduction Nouvelle avec Commentaire historique et philologique. Vol. I. La Liturgie (Yasna et Vispered)*. Annales du Musée Guimet 21. Paris: Leroux, 1892.
- Kellens, Jean. 'Commentaire sur les premiers chapitres du Yasna'. *Journal Asiatique* 284, no. 1 (1996): 37–108.
- Raffaelli, Enrico G. *The Sīh-Rōzag in Zoroastrianism: A Textual and Historico-Religious Analysis*. Iranian Studies 20. London: Routledge, 2014.

# Studies on the History of Rationality in Ancient Iran III: Philosophy of Nature Götz König

## 1.

About twenty years ago Professor Kreyenbroek pointed out an anomaly in the thirteenth Yašt (Kreyenbroek 1992: 61-63; 1993; 1994: 177f.), from which he convincingly concluded “that parts of *Yt.13* reflect an intermediary stage in the transition from the postulated Indo-Iranian myth to that of the *Bundahišn*” (1993: 98) and “probably go back to a remote, pre-Zoroastrian past” (1994: 177). This anomaly relates to the cosmogonic account of *Yt 13*, which is composed of two narratives: a) that of the support (*vī.δāraīia-* “auseinander-halten”) of the realms and processes of nature by Ahura Mazdā and by means of the *Frauuāšis*; and b) that of the revitalization of these processes after a period of stasis caused by the Evil.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the narratives distinguish two stages of the creation of the world: a stage of creating and supporting, and a stage of revitalisation after stasis (differently Kellens 2016, S. 35, 93, 158-161). It is the conception of this “second stage” of the creation (Kreyenbroek

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Dk 3.203, “the Good” is defined by its active and “the Evil” by its passive movement. According to GrBd 3.22 (a passage that is also included in the IndBd) there was an eternal midday before the advent of the Evil. This cosmogonic midday is mirrored by a standstill of the sun in the eschatological process of the world (see ZWY).



1992: 57, 62; 1994: 177) that differs radically from the cosmogonic teachings in the Pahlavi books (the Bd, WZ < *Dāmdād*<sup>2</sup>). And it is this difference out of which Kreyenbroek was able to reconstruct some pre-Zoroastrian strata in the Avestan texts (esp. Miθra's cosmogonic/sacrificial function<sup>3</sup>; the cosmogonic function of Spənta Mainiiu).

If Yt 13 preserved an older conception of the cosmogonic stages than the Pahlavi books, a conception that resembles the Indo-Iranian cosmogonic point of view,<sup>4</sup> then traces of other deviating worldviews are to be expected. And indeed, not only the conception of the second but also that of the first stage of the creation in Yt 13 points to such a deviation.

In the following I try to show that Yt 13 is the oldest Iranian record of an analytic, rational perspective on and thereby a theoretical model of nature. Its analysis comprehends two elements: a) the division of the world (= a generalization of the things in the world) into six or seven irreducible elements (or fields of nature); b) a sequencing of these elements according to a rational principle. Moreover I'd like to claim that this analysis of the world contributed significantly to the constitution of the group of the Aməša Spəntas.

## 2.1

To this day, the genesis of the Aməša Spəntas is disputed within Old Iranian studies. Key problems are: a possible parallel in India (the Āditya question); the inner Iranian development (abstract concepts > deities; their existence in the *Gāθās*; the formation of a stable group and its sequence); and finally, the question of age and the origin or basis of the correspondence between the Aməša Spəntas and the elements or realms of nature.<sup>5</sup> Studies on this last question belong largely to the German

<sup>2</sup> "The main difference between the two accounts lies in their explanation and understanding of this course of events: the Pahlavi Books regard the beginning of the 'second stage' as the result of the assault of the Evil Spirit, the older myth saw it as a deliverance" (Kreyenbroek 1992: 62; cf. 1994: 178).

<sup>3</sup> Kreyenbroek 1992: 63ff; 1993: 98, 100; 1994: 179-181.

<sup>4</sup> For the differences see the table in Kreyenbroek 1993: 102.

<sup>5</sup> Concerning the use of the term "element", see the remarks in Lommel 1959 [1970]: 259; Widengren 1965: 79 n. 97.

and French research traditions. Despite different results, methods and presuppositions, these studies, especially the monographs of Geiger and Narten, agree in their criticism of a *naturmythologische* answer to the question. Twentieth-century studies emphasize the priority of the conceptual elements within the processes that lead to the stable group of the Aməša Spəntas and their correspondences in nature. Not only is the *naturmythologische* conception of the (later) Aməša Spəntas denied in this context. It is also assumed that only after the emergence of the group of the Aməša Spəntas were the divinized concepts connected in post-Avestan times<sup>6</sup> with natural entities.<sup>7</sup> The traces of correspondences that can be found in the Old and Young Avestan texts do not justify the claim that the correspondences have already a systematic character.<sup>8</sup> Thus, after Narten's book, two questions remain unanswered: In which way was a system of correspondences elaborated, and what was the basis for the systematization of the Aməša Spəntas?

<sup>6</sup> See especially Narten 1982: 103-148 ("Die Aməša Spəntas und die „Elemente“"), 106-119, 120-148.

<sup>7</sup> Geiger 1916: 245, summarizes this position as follows:

"Es ist wohl klar geworden, daß der Stifter der gāthischen Religion nicht ein so seltsames Gemisch von Gottheiten des Viehes, des Feuers, der Metalle, der Erde, des Wassers und der Pflanzen ausgesucht haben kann, um sie dem Prozeß der Vergeistigung zu unterziehen.\* Es ist vielmehr augenscheinlich, daß eine Reihe bedeutsamer abstrakter Begriffe und Personifikationen der indo-iranschen Zeit in der vorgāthischen Religion, und zwar im Kult einer Gruppe von Ahuras, sich lebendig erhalten hat, daß dann in dem System der Gāthās (ähnlich wie im Ādityakult) der eine oder der andere alte Begriff personifiziert und vergöttlicht, die eine oder die andere alte Personifikation durch eine neue ersetzt worden ist, und daß später gelehrte Spekulation in Anknüpfung an uralte oder durch die Reformation entstandene oder (wie bei Xšaθra) ausgeklügelte Beziehungen der personifizierten Begriffe zu den drei Naturreichen Tierwelt, Pflanzen, Metalle und zu den drei Elementen Feuer, Erde, Wasser diesen Personifikationen bestimmte Verwaltungsgebiete zugewiesen hat.\*\*"

\*Cf. Geiger 1916: 122.

\*\*Cf. Geiger 1916: 120ff., following Tiele (*Gesch. d. Rel.* II, 202ff.). On the inherited relation of *aša-* and fire, see Geiger 1916: 202f.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Thieme 1970: 410f.: "Der spätere Zoroastrismus macht 6 Aməša Spəntas zu den Schutzgeistern der 6 Lebenselemente: Feuer (*aša*), Metall (*xšaθra*), Erde (*ārmaiti*), Wasser (*hauruuatāt*), Pflanzen (*amərətātāt*) und Vieh (*vohu manō*). Dies ist schon in den zarathustrischen Gāthās – zwar nicht als System voraussetzbar, aber doch – als Summe von Assoziationen nachzuweisen".

In contrast to Geiger and Narten, the French tradition is based on a structuralist approach. For Dumézil the Aməša Spəntas were substitutes for the old functional deities. His thesis is built on two presuppositions: a) the originality of the group of the six Aməša Spəntas; b) the originality of the correspondences.<sup>9</sup> Concerning the first point, Kellens (2014) was able to show that the contours of the (later) group of the Aməša Spəntas can be detected in the five *Gāθās*, and that the formation of their group is deeply rooted in a structural and ritualistic conception.<sup>10</sup> Dumézil's second presupposition remains nothing more than an allegation. The weak point in his theory of a tripartite scheme is that this scheme behaves non-dialectically with respect to its own ontological and epistemological status and also with respect to the relation between structure and history. For this reason, the historical explanatory value of Dumézil's approach remains unsatisfying.

## 2.2

H. Lommel's articles on the Aməša Spəntas can be read as attempts to reconstruct a primary system of correspondences. Unfortunately Lommel's approach – still prominent in Schlerath's *Zarathustra* (1970) – has been forgotten for the last forty years. My own attempt to solve the problem of the correspondences is based on a reformulation of Lommel's approach.

Lommel has dealt repeatedly with the question of the Aməša Spəntas. Already in his 1926 review of Geiger's book (1916), he criticized Geiger's methodology as "intellectualist," and questioned his categorical distinction between a conceptual and a natural character

<sup>9</sup> Dumézil's position is summarized in Narten 1982: 104f., n. 12, with literature.

<sup>10</sup> Kellens 2014 has shown: a) there is a "noyau dur" of the first four Aməša Spəntas (see esp. 166); b) Hauruatāt and Amərətātāt form a group; c) in the course of the *Gāθās* both groups unite three times, and the members of the later Aməša Spənta-group unite once in each polyhatic *Gāθā* (p. 166 : Y 34.11, 45.10, 47.1); d) the unification of the Aməša Spəntas has a liturgical value.

of the Aməša Spəntas in order to derive the latter from the former.<sup>11</sup> In two later studies (1959, 1964 [both again in Schlerath 1970]) Lommel reconstructs a net of spiritual-material correspondences. For instance, he asserts that water and plants are causally related to “wholeness” and “survival” (Lommel 1959<sup>[1970]</sup>: 260). Symbolic relations exist that have a double direction (concreta signify abstracta in this world, abstracta signify concreta in the world beyond). Furthermore Lommel considers that the (group of the) Aməša Spəntas is based on a preexisting order. On the one hand, he tries to reconstruct a certain internal coherence of the five “gottgegebenen Kräften” (Lommel 1959<sup>[1970]</sup>: 257-259; cf. Lommel 1964<sup>[1970]</sup>: 385).<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, he considers the number five to be rooted in the Chinese theory of the elements. Thus, the assumed preexisting order has a historical point of reference:

Das altiranische Weltbild ist also eine Zusammenfügung von uralten asiatischen Lehren über die fünf Elemente mit fünf aus arischer Urzeit stammenden Ideen; diese beiden Fünferreihen, die aus sehr alten Bestandteilen gebildet sind, wurden dann um je ein Glied, um das quasi-Element Rind und um Vohumanah vermehrt. (Lommel 1964<sup>[1970]</sup>: 387)

Lommel also touches on the questions of whether the sequence of

---

<sup>11</sup> “G.s Versuche, aus dem abstrakten Wesen der Am.Sp. ihre Geltung als Schutzgötter der Natur herzuleiten, überzeugen zumeist wenig. Das soll hier nicht im einzelnen kritisiert werden. Die umgekehrte Ansicht lehnt er mit Recht ab. Aber ich zweifle, ob überhaupt die alternative Fragestellung, wonach entweder die abstrakte oder die Naturgeltung dieser Götterbegriffe primär sein müßte, berechtigt ist. Für uns Intellektualisten sind freilich Gute Gesinnung und Viehzucht durchaus zweierlei. Muß es denn immer so gewesen sein. Können nicht Abstraktum und Konkretum in einer gewissen Epoche dem menschlichen Geist als einerlei Wesens, das Abstraktum als die innere Wesenheit des Konkretums erschienen sein? So daß etwa Fromm Gemüt und Erde die geistige und stoffliche Seite einer und derselben Sache wären...”. (Lommel 1926: 31f.)

According to Boyce 1989, Lommel’s interpretation points to “an ancient, mystical way of looking at reality”.

<sup>12</sup> According to Lommel, except for Vohu Manah (cf. Colpe 1975: 6f.) the Aməša Spəntas have Indian parallels. In 1964, Lommel relates the number five to the Chinese elements. The number five is accepted by Colpe 1975.

the five (preceeding) elements has an effect on the sequence of the *Aməša Spəntas* (Lommel 1964 [1970]: 384f.), and of whether the *Aməša Spəntas* are a kind of analysis of the (especially immaterial) world (Lommel 1964 [1970]: 385). Lommel's reference to the Chinese theory of the elements stresses the importance of the material components in his reconstruction of the development of the *Aməša Spəntas*. Moreover, the focus shifts from the analysis of single elements<sup>13</sup> and their correspondences towards their systemic context:

Die Glieder dieses Systems, die aus urarischer Zeit stammen, sind gründlich erforscht, nicht ebensowenig das System als solches, weil die diachronische Untersuchung, die man den Entsprechungen: *aša-ṛta*; *xšathra-ksatra* usw. gewidmet hat, immer nur Einzelteile behandeln kann. Außerdem kann das System gar nicht voll in Erscheinung treten, wenn man die Elemente, die zusammen mit den Geisteswesenheiten das System bilden, als nebensächlich behandelt.<sup>14</sup>

The material side in particular has to be analyzed always as a systematic whole: "Die andere Seite des Systems sind die Elemente. Diese sind meines Wissens nicht diachronisch erforscht, wir müssen sie in ihrer Fünzfzahl als gegebenes Ganzes nehmen."<sup>15</sup>

A modification of Lommel's theory is Colpe's assumption (1975) that the entities that will become the *Aməša Spəntas* are not all on the same level of abstraction.<sup>16</sup> Colpe thinks that already in Vedic times

<sup>13</sup> On the abstraction "cow" = all animals, "metal" = all metallic things, see Lommel 1964 [1970]: 395.

<sup>14</sup> Lommel 1964 [1970]: 387.

<sup>15</sup> Lommel 1964 [1970]: 388.

<sup>16</sup> "They probably were not developed from the same principles of abstraction from Aryan to later times. Rather abstraction has been the case just with the first two ones, the social-cosmic "Truth, Right, Order" and "Sovereign Power"; whereas there must have been a real numinous earth-goddess behind the third one; and finally, behind the fourth and the fifth one, a hypostatization of drinkable water and edible plants, rendering possible wholeness (or soundness) and absence of death (which is another thing than bodily or spiritual immortality)". (5)

the three aspects “abstraction, divine personality and materiality” were “equalized” (5). This process was an “oscillation between being attributes and autonomous entities, between divine and human, between abstractions, persons, and elements, between mediating between God and Man ...” (6). After the equalization of the conceptual and material aspects, a transfer into the ritual field took place: “The relation to a basic element still shines through some of the Zarathustrian A.Sp.s, but on the whole they are now more or less abstract[ion]s. But beyond this fact, they become *symbols of that what is used or intended in the worship*: Aša of the sacrificial fire ...” (7, emphasis added).

Lommel's/Colpe's theory balances *entwicklungslogische* and structuralist elements. While, as I have said above, the formation of a group and a sequence of the Aməša Spəntas and of their correspondences cannot be explained only on the basis of an *Entwicklungsdenken*, a purely structuralist postulate remains historically unrooted. On the one hand, Lommel/Colpe supply the necessary structure with historical concreteness; on the other hand, they are able to deal with heterogeneities that can be explained only with recourse to historical particularities.

### 2.3

In previous research on the emergence/structure of the group of the Aməša Spəntas and of their correspondences there was often no awareness of the two following points:

- a) Systematic correspondences between deities and material elements are found (in the Pahlavi literature) only for the deities of the first week of the month. They are missing in the case of those deities that are loosely attached to this group (e.g., Ātar, Sraoša, Vərəθrəyana).
- b) The limitation of the conceptual analysis of the world to only six deities remains unexplained. The limitation is remarkable because of the great number of existing concepts that are not deified, or that are deified but not included in the group of the six Aməša Spəntas.

Point b) seems to indicate a structuring of the “concept-deities” according to an independent model. Lommel’s suggestion that this model is the Chinese teaching of the five elements was not arbitrary. Like other authors before him, Lommel pointed out the problem that Vohu Manah neither has Indo-Iranian roots, apparently, nor is there any inner connection between Good Thinking and the cow or bull;<sup>17</sup> i.e., Vohu Manah was a later addition to an older group of five entities. According to this theory, not only is the emergence of the Aməša Spənta group based on a certain meaningful number; it also implies that there is a very old connection between this figure (five) and an analysis of the (material) world.

I’d like to borrow two of Lommel’s ideas:

- 1) The emergence of the group of the Aməša Spəntas is related to one or more prior structures;
- 2) the group of the Aməša Spəntas can be read as an analysis of the world. However, I believe that this analysis is first an analysis of the material world. This hypothesis has the advantage of accounting for the size of the group by the number of “elements” (which is [one to] four in Greece, five in China, and six or seven in Iran).<sup>18</sup> We will see that the Iranian model combines causal and teleological ways of thinking.

<sup>17</sup> Lommel’s suggestion is worth considering, because the position of Vohu Manah is unstable. Within the *Gāθās aša* has closer ties with Ahura Mazdā; within the YH *aša* (*vahišta*) seems to have a constitutive value for the emergence of the term Aməša Spənta (see Humbach/Ichaporria 2013); But in YH 37.1 the cow, and in the YAv lists Vohu Manah, is placed before Aša Vahišta. This is also Wahman’s obligate position in the Pahlavi literature.

<sup>18</sup> The determination of these elements always indicates a particular human worldview (for example, metal is missing among the Greek elements) and a theoretical purpose (Aristotle’s four elements are necessary because his theory of a combinatorial qualitative change would not work with three or five elements).

But an analysis of all Avestan passages in which two or more “elements” are mentioned shows that often only segments of the above-mentioned structure of six (or even seven or eight) elements appear. While in some cases these segments seem to be older than the overarching structure, in other cases they are only fragments of this structure.



X	fire	heaven	water	earth	plant	animal	man	X	Passages	Remarks
	b	a							N 47	
	b					a			Y 58.4 <sup>19</sup>	Cf. Y 37.1
		a		b					Y 8.5; Y 16.6; Y 42.3; Y 61.1; Y 68.15; Y 72.1; Yt 8.8; Yt 10.95; Yt 13.13, Yt 13.43, 44	in Y 68.15 the sequence is a metaphor for the world
	b		a						V 7.25; H 2.13	
	a		b					<i>barəsman</i> + believers	V 16.3, 4	
			a	b					V 6.29, 31	
			a		b <sup>20</sup>				FrW 1.2; G 4.5; Ny 4.0; V 6.46; V 8.104-106; V 15.9, 10; V 18.63; Vr 21.1; Yt 8.7, 23, 29; Yt 13.153; Yt 17.57, 60; Yt 19.43	Yt 19 myth.- cosm.; V 15 medical
			a		b			sphere of light	Yt 13.53-58	
			a		b			Frauuāšis of the Ašauuans	Yt 1.9; Yt 10.100; Yt 13.78, 79, 147;	
			a		b			<i>zaodras</i>	N 53.11; Y 8.3	
				a		b			Y 9.29	
						a	b		Y 68.22; V 2.8 (+ dog, bird)	
						b	a		Y 48.5; V 5.20	

<sup>19</sup> In 58.7 fire + Hauruuatāt + Amərətātāt.

<sup>20</sup> Yt 8.29 pasture + grain; V 8.104-106 tree.

					a <sup>21</sup>	b <sup>22</sup>		Vr 21.2; Yt 5.89; Yt 8.5	cf. Vr 21.2 with Vr 21.1
			a		b	c <sup>23</sup>		Y 16.9; Yt 13.93	
	a		b		c			Y 1.12; Y 2.12; Y 22.14	
			b	a		c <sup>24</sup>			
			a	b	c			G 2.6; V 1.3; V 6.3; V 21.3	V 21 remedies
			b	a	c <sup>25</sup>			V 19.26	farming
			a	b	c		AmSp + other gods (also Ātar)	Y 65.12	
home			a	b	c			Vr 16.3	
			b		c	a		Y 51.7	
			a		c	b		Y 52.2	
	a		b		c <sup>26</sup>		d	V 3.16, 17; V 16.4; V 17.4	
		a	b	c	d			Yt 13.28	
			c		d	a	b	Y 9.4; Yt 19.32	myth
			a		b	c	d	Y 12.7	
		d <sup>27</sup>	a	c	b			Y 44.4	
	b		a			c	d	V 5.37	
	(a) <sup>28</sup>	a	b	c	d	e <sup>29</sup>		Vr 7.4; Yt 13.2-10; Yt 13.86	
		a	b	c		d	e <sup>30</sup>	Y 23.1	cf. Yt 13

<sup>21</sup> Yt 5, 8 *pasu staora*.

<sup>22</sup> Vr 21.2 *gaiia*.

<sup>23</sup> Yt 13 creations.

<sup>24</sup> urine of the cow.

<sup>25</sup> grain.

<sup>26</sup> *barəsmān*.

<sup>27</sup> clouds.

<sup>28</sup> Yt 13.2.

<sup>29</sup> Yt 13.2 pets.

<sup>30</sup> sons in the womb.

		d	c <sup>31</sup>	a	b			e (sphere of light)	V 19.35	model of ascent
			a	b	c		e <sup>32</sup>	d (wind)	Yt 13.14f.	plants from earth
			a	b	d	c		All Good	H 1.3	
		e	b, d	a	c			f (sphere of light)	V 19.35	eschatological conception
	a		b	c	e	d	f		V 9.33, 42	
house	a		b	c	e	d	f		V 11.4-9	cf. also V 12.2
house	a		b	c	e	d	f	sphere of light	V 11.1, 2, 10, 13	
		a	b	c	d	e	f	g (sun)	Y 19.8	
		a	b	c	e	d	f <sup>33</sup>		Yt 13.22, 28	
	b <sup>34</sup>	e <sup>35</sup>	c	f	d	a		g (All Good)	Y 37.1	one-on-one order
		d	a	c	b	f		e (sphere of light)	Y 71.9	one-on-one order
living places		f <sup>36</sup>	a	b <sup>37</sup> , d <sup>38</sup>	e			g + (wind + sphere of light)	Y 1.16; Y 2.16; Y 4.21	heaven-earth
	f	a	b	c	e	d	g	h (robbers, Daēuuas, material world)	Y 19.2, 4 <sup>39</sup>	
X	fire	heaven	water	earth	plant	animal	man	X		

<sup>31</sup> sea.<sup>32</sup> children.<sup>33</sup> sons in the womb.<sup>34</sup> Aša.<sup>35</sup> light.<sup>36</sup> heaven *there*.<sup>37</sup> countries.<sup>38</sup> earth *here*.<sup>39</sup> Cf. Narten 1982: 115.

### Observations

- a) Often only pairs of elements appear. Among them the pairs heaven/earth and water/plants dominate.
- b) Triplets are most often based on the pair water/plants. The most common extension is water/earth/plants.
- c) Quartets connect the dominating pairs (Yt 13.28) or add animals and men to the pair water/plants.
- d) Quintets show a sequence heaven/water/earth/plants/animals (see Vr 7.4; Yt 13.86 [cf. Yt 13.2ff.]); in Yt 13.22/V 11 the sequence plant/animal is reversed.
- e) There is a remarkable deviation from the sequence in d) in Y 37.1, Y 71.9; their sequences are made of pairs.

### Interpretation

Two phenomena are especially remarkable:

- 1) The pairings:
  - 1.1) The pair heaven/earth is also well known in the OPI (AM haya imām būmim adā haya avam asmānam adā, etc.). The extension in the OPI (mankind; happiness of mankind; king) (mankind is in the center of heaven and earth) is unknown in the Avesta.
  - 1.2) The pair water/plant (correspondences of Hauruuatāt/Amərətātāt) is not only very often used, but it is also probably the most important kernel for the construction of longer sequences. It is probably based on a simple observation of nature: water makes the plants grow. Sometimes the plants appear as grain, and the combination earth/water/plants (or grain) points to farming (i.e., a natural context appears as an economical context).
- 2) Long sequences insert the observation water → plant in a more complex context of nature. The sequence heaven/water/earth/plant probably means: heaven dispenses water, which makes plants grow out of the earth (see Yt 13.14). Animals and men therefore prosper (see esp. Yt 13).
- 3) Only a minority of the sequences do not point to a natural chain of the “elements.” Y 37.1 is exceptional because it combines three pairs: cow/fire (*aša*) (cf. Y 58.4), water/plants, and light (or

heaven)/earth, and it has some resemblance to the later ritual order cow/fire/heaven/earth/water/plants.

Especially in the *Vīdēvdād* we find sequences that are not an analysis or synthesis of nature, but are based on ritual considerations. I assume that natural and ritual orders were of mutual influence, but this difficult subject needs further examination. Further research should also focus on: a) the position of fire within the set of elements (it seems that the later exceptional position of the fire is anticipated in the Avesta); b) the elements within the *Gāθās*.

As a central result of our examination it may be stated: In the Younger Avesta the six or seven elements that are known from the Pahlavi texts occur in sequences that amount to an analysis of the material world. An ideal form is the sequence heaven → water → earth → plant → animal/men.<sup>40</sup> The kernel of the analysis is the sequence water/plant (≈ *Hauruuatāt* / *Amərətātāt*). Yt 13 in particular is a reservoir of this simple theory of nature. It is likely that the chain of elements was a key impetus for the formation of the group of the *Aməša Spəntas*. Other speculations (see, e.g., Kellens 2014) have been added.

Prof. Kreyenbroek has shown that with respect to the “first stage” of the world, Yt 13 records a model that differs (probably also in age) from the model that is transmitted in the *Bundahišn*. Looking more closely at the sequence of elements in this “first stage” in Yt 13, we see that the sequence deviates from that of the *Aməša Spəntas*. We take Yt 13.28 as an example:

*tā. mazdā. zbaiaī. auuaṇhe. auuaṇheca. ašnō. vīdiḍāra. apasca. zəmasca. uruuaraiiāscā. yaī. spəntō. mainiiuš. vīḍārāiaī. asmanəm. yaī. āpəm. yaī. qəm. yaī. gəm. yaī. uruuarqm. yaī. barəθrišuua. puθrē. vīḍārāiaī.*

Mazdā called upon them [i.e., the Fravašis] for help, for the support (?) of yon heaven and of the water(s) and of the earth

<sup>40</sup> In Yt 13.44f., the relation between animal and man is not defined teleologically. However, Dk 3.123 says: "The plant grows through the earth, the animal through the plant, the man gets help from the animal."

and of the plants so that Spənta Mainiiu might support the heaven; the water(s), the earth, the animals, the plants, so that he might maintain the sons conceived in the mothers ... .  
(Kreyenbroek 1993: 98)

It is clear that in no other Avestan text are the “elements” so often and in such long sequences (four to six members) mentioned as they are in Yt 13. The order of the elements is more or less fixed:

Yt 13.28	heaven – water – earth – plants
Yt 13.14f.	water – earth – plants – sons
Y 23.1 (< Yt 13)	heaven – water – earth – animals – sons
Yt 13.22, 13.28	heaven – water – earth – animals – plants – sons
Yt 13.2-10, 13.86	(fiery <sup>41</sup> ) heaven – water – earth – animals – plants – sons (cf. Vr 7.4; Y 19.2)
cf. Y 19.8	heaven – water – earth – plants – animals – men – sun

Thus, two, related concepts of nature can be found in Yt 13: 1) first, the history of nature is based on two principles – stasis (the bad principle) and dynamis (the good principle) – that are historically rhythmicized; 2) second, nature is divided into six (or seven) “elements”: (fiery) heaven, (heavenly) water(s), earth or mountain(s), plant(s), animal(s), and mankind (including children). It is remarkable that there are no clear references to fire (see Kreyenbroek 1993: 304).<sup>42</sup>

In contrast to the historical conception of the first and second stage, the sequence of elements in Yt 13 (and in Y 19.8) was passed on in the Pahlavi books. It appears in the cosmological Pahlavi literature,

<sup>41</sup> Compared with *aiiaṇhō. kəhrpa. xʷaēnahe*. “fiery metal” (cf. Y 32.7 *xʷaēnā. aiiaṇhā*. > GrBd 6a3; GrBd 3.16). As in the Greek theory of elements, metal has no original place among the areas of nature.

<sup>42</sup> According to Boyce 1970: 27, fire is missing from the cosmogony of Yt 13 (cf. Y 23.1) because of the (postulated) “reform” of Zaratustra. However, in Yt 13.77-78 (the target point of the first part of Yt 13 and therefore related to Yt 13.2), fire has a cosmogonic-cosmologic value.

especially in the *Bundahišn*:<sup>43</sup>

GrBd <sup>44</sup>	heaven	water	earth	plant	animal	man	
GrBd <sup>45</sup>							fire (< endless light <sup>46</sup> )
GrBd 6a-j							fire + heavenly sphere

This sequence deviates significantly from the ritual sequences of the elements (cow – fire – heaven/metal – earth – water – plants). Its underlying principle can be seen in Yt 13.43-44.<sup>47</sup> According to this passage, the sequence of elements has both causal aspects (star > heaven/earth > rain > plant growth) – a causality provoked by the Frauuašis<sup>48</sup> – and teleological aspects (“for the protection of”).

<sup>43</sup> WZ 1.4 has the same sequence. The conformity between WZ and Bd indicates that this teaching was transmitted by the *Zand*.  
<sup>44</sup> GrBd 1.54; 1a6-13, 1a16-21.  
<sup>45</sup> GrBd 1a4; GrBd 3.7-9; GrBd 6/WZ 3; WZ 1.25.  
<sup>46</sup> Cf. GrBd 7.9 (TD2 73.3-11; TD1 59.15ff.; DH 38.5ff.). Cf. V 11.  
<sup>47</sup> Cf. S 1.13 and 2.13. With respect to the Frauuašis, cf. Yt 13.10.  
<sup>48</sup> According to Dk 3.123 (B 94), the Frawahrs are responsible for the movement of the heavenly lights; cf. Yt 13.57.

<p><i>tā. hərəzənti. satauuāēsəm.  aṇtarə. zqm. asmanəmca.  taṭ. āpəm. zauuanō.srūtəm.  taṭ. āpəm. uxšiiat.uruuarəm.  θrāθrāi. pasuuā. vīraiiā.  θrāθrāi. airiiānqm. daxiiunqm.  θrāθrāi. gəuš. pañcō.hiiiaiiā.  auuanḡhe. narqm. aṣaonqm.</i></p>	<p>They (the Frauuašis) send forth the &lt;star&gt; Satauuāēsa<sup>49</sup> between the earth and the sky, who drops the water, listens to the appeal, who drops the water, that makes the plants grow,<sup>50</sup> for the protection of animals and men, for the protection of the Aryan countries, for the protection of the five kinds of animals,<sup>51</sup> for the help of the faithful men.</p>
<p><i>vī. aṇtarə. zqm. asmanəmca.  satauuāēsō. vī.jasāiti.  taṭ. āpō. zauuanō.srūtō.  taṭ. āpō. uxšiiat.uruuarō.  srīrō. bānuuā. raoxšnəmā.  θrāθrāi. pasuuā. vīraiiā.  θrāθrāi. airiiānqm. daxiiunqm.  θrāθrāi. gəuš. pañcō.hiiiaiiā.  auuanḡhe. narqm. aṣaonqm.</i></p>	<p>Between the earth and the sky passes the &lt;star&gt; Satauuāēsa, who drops the water, listens to the appeal, who drops the water, that makes the plants grow, the beautiful, bright, full of light, for the protection of animals and men, for the protection of the Aryan countries, for the protection of the five kinds of animals, for the help of the faithful men.</p>

While in the Avesta and the *Bundahišn*, the sequence of the six or seven elements is presented without any explanation, a scientific explanation can be found in the texts of Ādurfarrbay (Dk 3.123):

<sup>49</sup> For Satauuāēsa cf. Yt 8.9, 8.32.

<sup>50</sup> With respect to Miθra Yt 10.61, cf. the verse line *fraṭ. āpəm. zauuanō.srūtəm. taṭ. āpəm. uxšiiat.uruuarəm.*

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Yt 13.10, Yt 19.69.



B 93.7-15		
<p>W gytyy dhšn'n hngltykyh HWHnd dhšn' &lt;y&gt; 'sm'n' &lt;W&gt; MYA W zmyk W 'wlwl W gwspnd W mltwm W 'sm'n' ptš YHBWNt pyt'k' TNB MYA pt' s'c'k hmd' lšnyh y w't' nylwkyh MDM w'y &lt;y&gt; mynwd 'sm'n' gwhl TNB zmyk W TNB 'wlwl W TNB gwspnd W 'pdwm mltwm APš'n' pnc<sup>52</sup> 'ndlwn' sym'n' bytwm ZYš'n wsp' 'L (w) hm'k MDM 'hmbwnyhstn'<sup>53</sup> pyt'k MYA twšn' wstlšn' 'ndl hm'k w'y y 'cdl y stl p'dk W 'yl W MDM xW hm'<sup>54</sup> pylwmwn' zmyk MDMc MYH nylwk' &lt;y&gt; 'HDWNtkyh/ 'BYDWNtkyh W wynltyh 'wlwl MDM zmyk lwstkyh gwspnd pt' ' ' W ANŠWTA ptč gwspnd hdyb'lyh W gytyydhšn'n' p'hlwm ANŠWTA BYN ANŠWTA'n' 'LH y hwhwt'y dhywpt'</p>	<p><i>ud gēti dahišnān hangirdigih hēnd dahišn &lt;i&gt; āsmān &lt;ud&gt; āb ud zamīg ud urwar ud gōspand ud mardōm ud āsmān padiš dād paydāg did āb pad sāsāg hamdārišnīh ī wād nērōgih abar way &lt;i&gt; mēnōy āsmān gōhr did zamīg ud did urwar ud did gōspand ud abdom mardōm. u-šān panj andarōn āsemān bēdom ī-šān wisp ō hamāg abar <sup>x</sup>hambondīhistan paydāg. āb-tošn wistarišn andar hamāg wāy<sup>55</sup> ī azēr ī star- pāyag ud ēr ud abar <sup>x</sup>ud ham<sup>x</sup> pēremōn. zamīg abar-iz āb nērōg griftagih/kardagih ud winnirdih urwar abar zamīg rustagih gōspand pad urwar ud mardōm pad-iz gōspand ayārīh ud gēti-dahišnān pahlom mardōm andar mardōmān ōy ī huxwadāy-dahibed</i></p>	<p>Und die &lt;in Kontinuität stehende&gt; Gesamtheit der materiellen Schöpfungen sind: die Schöpfungen des Himmels<sup>56</sup> und der Wasser und Erde und Pflanzen und Tiere und Menschen.<sup>57</sup> Wodurch der Himmel erschaffen wurde, ist &lt;in der <i>dēn</i>&gt; manifest; das Wasser sodann dient (?<sup>58</sup>) dem Erhalt der Kraft des Windes (gegenüber Way, der als ein Geistiges die Substanz (<i>gōhr</i>) des Himmels ist), der Erde sodann, der Pflanze sodann, dem Tier sodann und schließlich dem Menschen. Und die fünf &lt;Elemente&gt; sind innerhalb &lt;des Himmels&gt;, der Himmel ist die äußerste &lt;Schöpfung&gt;, der sie alle zu einem Ganzen offenbar zusammenfaßt. Bei einem Bedürfnis nach Wasser (?) geschieht die Verbreitung des Wassers in der gesamten unterhalb der Sternensphäre gelegenen Atmosphäre &lt;in einer Bewegung&gt; drunter und drüber und rings herum; der Erde aber &lt;vermittelt sich&gt; über das Wasser die Fähigkeit zur Aufnahme (von Samen?)/ Tätigkeit und Disposition;<sup>59</sup> der Pflanze &lt;vermittelt sich&gt; über die Erde Wachstum, dem Tier durch die Pflanze und dem Menschen ist durch das Tier Hilfe. Und von den materiellen Schöpfungen ist der Mensch die beste, unter den Menschen &lt;wiederum&gt; der gutherrschende Fürst.</p>

<sup>52</sup> Bailey *pat-ic*.

<sup>53</sup> hmbwn dysytn'.

<sup>54</sup> B h'm.

<sup>55</sup> With *andar hamāg way* cf. *andarwāy* "atmosphere".

<sup>56</sup> On heaven as the first creation, see Dk 3.74/107.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Dk 3.193; Dk 3.335

<sup>58</sup> Or: *pad sāsāg*?

<sup>59</sup> Cf. the last sentence of the heading of the chapter Dk 3.123: *ud abar nērōg kē gēhān padiš winnirdagih ud gēhān*.

## Bibliography

- Boyce, M. 1970. Zoroaster the Priest. *BSOAS* 33, 22-38.
- Boyce, M. 1989. AMĒŠA SPĒNTA an Avestan term for beneficent divinity, meaning literally 'Holy/Bounteous Immortal' (Pahl. Amešāspand, [A]mahraspand). *EIr* I, 933-936.
- Colpe, C. 1975. Reflections on the history of the Ameša-Spenta-Conception. In *Iran Ancien. Actes du XXIXe Congrès International des Orientalistes. Paris, juillet 1973. Section organisée par Philippe Gignoux*, 4-8. Paris.
- Darmesteter, J. 1877. (1971). *Ormazd et Ahriman*. Paris. (Includes: *Haurvatât et Amermetât*. Paris).
- Geiger, B. 1916. *Die Ameša Spəntas. Ihr Wesen und ihre ursprüngliche Bedeutung*. Wien.
- Humbach, H. and P. Ichaporia 2013. Aməšā Spəntas and Aša Vahišta. In Choksy, J. K. and J. Dubeansky (eds.), *Gifts to a Magus. Indo-Iranian studies honoring Firoze Kotwal*. NY.
- Kellens, J. 2014. Sur l'origine des Aməšas Spəntas. *Studia Iranica* 433. 163-175.
- Kellens, J. 2016. *Cinq Cours sur les Yašts de l'Avesta*. Paris.
- Kreyenbroek, Philip 1992. Mithra and Ahreman, Binyānīn and Malak Tāwūs: Traces of an ancient myth in the cosmogonies of two modern sects. In Gignoux, Ph. (ed.), *Recurrent patterns in Iranian religions: from Mazdaism to Sufism*, 57-59. Paris.
- Kreyenbroek, Philip. 1993. On Spenta Mainyu's role in the Zoroastrian cosmogony. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 7. 97-103.
- Kreyenbroek, Philip. 1994. Mithra and Ahreman in Iranian

- cosmogonies. In J. R. Hinnells (ed.), *Studies in Mithraism. Papers associated with the Mithraic Panel organized on the occasion of the XVIth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions. Rome 1990*, 173-182. Rome.
- Lommel, H. 1926. Rezension von: B. Geiger, die Aməša Spəntas, ihr Wesen und ihre ursprüngliche Bedeutung. In *Anzeiger für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde, Beiblatt zu den Indogermanischen Forschungen*, Bd. 43. 29-36. (Quoted from its reprint in Schlerath 1970: 20-32).
- Lommel, H. 1930. *Die Religion Zarathustras nach dem Avesta dargestellt*, 30-73. Tübingen.
- Lommel, H. 1959. Symbolik der Elemente in der Zoroastrischen Religion. *Symbolon. Jahrbuch für Symbolforschung* 2. 108-120. (Quoted from its reprint in Schlerath 1970: 253-269).
- Lommel, H. 1964. Die Elemente im Verhältnis zu den Aməša Spəntas. In *Festschrift für Ad. E. Jensen*, Bd. I. 365-377. (Quoted from its reprint in Schlerath 1970: 377-396).
- Narten, J. 1982. *Die Aməša Spəntas im Avesta*. Wiesbaden.
- Schlerath, B. (ed.). 1970. *Zarathustra*. Darmstadt.
- Thieme, P. 1970. Die vedischen Āditya und die zarathustrischen Aməša Spənta. In Schlerath 1970, 397-412.
- Widengren, G. 1965: *Die Religionen Irans*. Stuttgart.

## ***Gāthū Bhārvā nī Kriyā* – The Ritual of Preserving a Burning Knotted Billet Beneath the Fire-Ash**

Firoze M. Kotwal

The *gāthū<sup>1</sup> bhārvānī<sup>2</sup> kriyā* is an ancient ritual performed on a regular basis by the Sanjānā priests, the traditional guardian-servitors of the sacred Irānshāh fire installed in the village of Udvada in Gujarat. This little-known ritual is supposed to safeguard the fire and ensure that if it is ever in danger of going out, a hidden fire smoldering beneath the layers of ash can be restored and used for worship. Thereby, the *silsila* or continuity of this fire, which was consecrated sometime after the Parsi arrival in Sanjan, is maintained. The ritual is performed only by the Sanjānā Mobeds of Udvada and has never been revealed to priests of other *panths*. Dastur Edalji Navroji Dastur Meherjirana,<sup>3</sup> the scribe of Ms. E49 who has written about this ritual, received his information

---

<sup>1</sup> The word *gāthū* means a billet of knotted-wood and is derived from Guj. *Gāth*, meaning “a knot”.

<sup>2</sup> The Guj. word *bhārvū* means “to keep live fire smoldering and burning below the ashes to preserve the fire”. See Belsare 1895: 571.

<sup>3</sup> Descended from an illustrious line of learned priests, Dastur Edalji Navroji Dastur Meherjirana was the Deputy High Priest (Nā’ib Dastur) of the Bhagarsāth Anjuman in Navsari. He was the nephew of the famous scholar-priest and scribe Dastur Erachji Sohrabji Dastur Meherjirana, and he donated his personal library to the First Dastoor Meherji Rana Library in Navsari. He died in 1278 AY (1908 CE) at age seventy-five.

from an anonymous priest of Udvađa who did not want his name to be revealed to the public. Manuscript E49 describes in detail the ritual of placing a large knot of wood under the layers of ash on the *sarpōsh*<sup>4</sup> of the fire-vase holding the sacred Ātash Bahrām fire.<sup>5</sup> It is of historical importance that the ancient priestly tradition of preserving the sacred Irānshāh fire is maintained in its original form and specifically by the priestly class. This priestly *kriyā* should be treated as a holy literary piece linked to the *Gathic* verse *Yasna* 34.4, which is worthy of study by serious students of Zoroastrian rituals.

#### Verse 34.4 (Transliteration)

aṭ tōi ātarəm ahurā aojōṇhuuaṇtəm ašā usōmahī  
asištəm ēmauuāṇtəm stōi rapaṇte citθrā-auuaṇhəm  
aṭ mazdā daibišiiāṇtəm zastā ištāiš dərəštā aēnaṇhəm.

#### Verse 34.4 (Translation)

Then through Aša, O Ahurā, do we long for Thy mighty Fire,  
swiftest, courageous, giver of abiding joy, giver of manifest help,  
but unto malicious person, O Mazdā, he detects the sinner through  
the pointing of the hand.

The *Gathic* verse extols the miraculous power of the Fire to give abundant help and joy to a righteous devotee who protects and preserves it. On the other hand, the Fire detects a sinner at the time of the Last Judgement by pointing at him. The passage exhorts the Zoroastrians to preserve the Fire till the time of the Renovation.

The priest from Udvađa who allowed Dastur Edalji Navroji Dastur Meherjirana to write down this otherwise secret ritual (*kriyā*) has in many ways contributed to learning, and by allowing the ritual to be documented, the priest has ensured the perpetuity of other fires in the future. A meticulous description of the *kriyā* is important, as it details

<sup>4</sup> *Sarpōsh* means “a slightly concave lid resting on the top of the fire-vase and spread with a layer of fine grey ash”.

<sup>5</sup> See Ms. No. E49 presented to the First Dastoor Meherji Rana Library, Navsari, by Edalji N. Meherjirana, pp. 34-35. [replace the preceding with the in-text parenthetical citation (Dhabhar 1992: 34-35)?].

the ritual process, and although it has been conveyed by a priest who remains anonymous, the details given suggest that the information was recounted by a practicing priest who participated in and performed this ritual.

### **The Traditional Practice of the *Kriyā* of *Gāthū Bhārvū* by the Sanjānā Priests**

The Bhagariā priest Dastur Jāmāsp Āsā, who died in 1753 CE before the enthronement of the Anjuman Ātash Bahrām of Navsari in 1765 CE, provided details on how to remove fire-ash (*bhasam*) from an Ātash Bahrām fire, a practice followed by the Bhagariā priests as per the agreement signed between them and the Sanjānā priests, preceding the latter's arrival in Navsari. At that time there was only one Ātash Bahrām in India, viz., the Irānshāh, which was housed in Navsari, and so the description for this ritual refers specifically to the Irānshāh fire. Dastur Jāmāsp Āsā records that the priest, after removing the *bhasam* or fire-ash in the third Ātaš Niyāyeš, must complete the Bōy ceremony of the *Ushahin Gāh* only after the conclusion of the ninth Ātaš Niyāyeš. This also indicates that previously only nine Ātaš Niyāyeš were recited in the *Ushahin Gāh* during the Bōy ceremony offered to the Irānshāh fire. However, there seems to be another explanation worth considering. It appears that the Sanjānā priests, while performing the ritual of preserving a burning knotted billet under a layer of ash (*Gāthū Bhārvānī Kriyā*) for the hidden inner fire, might be reciting eleven Ātaš Niyāyeš only on that special occasion of the Bōy ceremony performed in the *Ushahin Gāh*. In order to show the importance of the Irānshāh fire, they might have applied the same principle of reciting eleven Ātaš Niyāyeš during the Bōy ceremony of the *Ushahin Gāh* on all days throughout the year. This seems to be a plausible explanation of why the Sanjānā priests recite eleven Ātaš Niyāyeš in the *Ushahin Gāh*. The relevant *kriyā* of taking out *bhasam* from the Irānshāh Ātash Bahrām, as detailed by Dastur Jāmāsp Āsā, was copied by Nā'ib Dastur Edalji Navroji Dastur Meherjirana in Ms. E49, p. 37. The proposed explanation here for the change in the additional number of Ātaš Niyāyeš made in the *Ushahin Gāh* is based on the authority of this manuscript.

### The Ritual as Described in Ms. E49

The procedure for this special ritual begins with obtaining a small log of knotted wood that is kept dry and has been cleaned by scraping the bark away. On the first day during *Hāwan Gāh*, the billet is placed by the priest in the East, under the layer of ash on the *sarpōsh*. When the tenth *Ātaš Niyāyeš*<sup>6</sup> is recited, and the *Bōywārā*—i.e., the priest whose turn (Guj. *wārā/wārī/wārō*) it is to offer frankincense (*bōy*) to the fire—comes to the seventeenth verse, he recites two *Yathā Ahū Vairyō*. While reciting the first *Yathā Ahū Vairyō*, he draws one furrow (Phl. *kiš*)<sup>7</sup> or circle on the layer of ash around the holy fire on the *sarpōsh*. Likewise, while reciting the second *Yathā Ahū Vairyō*, he draws another furrow just outside the first circle, forming two concentric circles. Then, when the eighteenth verse beginning with *aṭ tōi ātarəm ahurā* (which corresponds to *Yasna* 34.4 of the *Ahunavaiti Gāthā*) is recited, one billet of wood is buried under the ash within the area bounded by the two concentric furrows and is covered with the remaining ash.<sup>8</sup> It is an honour to be ready to offer the burning log of wood to the fire for its preservation while reciting the *Gathic* verse of Zarathushtra beginning with the words *aṭ tōi ātarəm ahurā*. The verse extols the miraculous power of the sacred fire, which is said to help a righteous

<sup>6</sup> The *Ātaš Niyāyeš* (Ny. 5), which is recited by Zoroastrians as given in the Khorda Avesta, is taken from *Yasna* Ch. 62. There is a variation in the number of *Ātaš Niyāyeš* recited in different *Gāhs* while performing the *Bōy* ceremony in an *Ātash Bahrām*. In the *Hāwan Gāh*, eleven *Ātaš Niyāyeš* are recited; in the *Rapithwin* or Second *Hāwan Gāh*, nine; in the *Uzairin Gāh*, seven; in the *Aiwisrūthrem Gāh*, seven; and in the *Ushahin Gāh*, nine; but eleven are recited at the *Irānshāh Ātash Bahrām*.

<sup>7</sup> In the *Bōy* ceremony performed in the *Ātash Bahrām*, the furrows (*kiš*) are normally drawn in the first *Ātaš Niyāyeš* at the recital of two *Yathā Ahū Vairyō*, and they are effaced while reciting two *Yathā Ahū Vairyō* in the third *Ātaš Niyāyeš*. It is to be noted that in the ritual of preserving a burning log of fire (*Gāthū Bhārvānī Kriyā*), two furrows are drawn at the recital of two *Yathā Ahū Vairyō* in the tenth *Ātaš Niyāyeš* in the *Hāwan Gāh*, and are not effaced in the following, eleventh *Ātaš Niyāyeš*. This is specially done in this ritual.

<sup>8</sup> In the most conservative village of Sharifābād in Iran, there is a practice of sustaining the fire of *Ātaš Bahrām* while performing the *Bōy* ceremony. The *Bōywārā*, who is termed *Ātašband* in Iran, puts a billet directly upon the glowing embers of the previous day's billet and draws the warm ash around it so that it is almost buried beneath the ash. (Cf. Boyce 1977: 75).

person in various ways. According to the Pahlavi version of verse 7 of the *Ātaš Niyāyeš*, the fire expects the devotees to intercede with dry fuel and sweet-scented wood. While this fresh billet of wood is buried, no sparks should fall within the arc created by the two furrows.

On the second day, the same ritual is performed and the billet of wood is buried in the South within the area marked by the furrows. On the third day, a billet is similarly buried in the West. On the fourth day, the billet of wood that was buried earlier in the East on day one, and which has remained under the ash for three days and nights, is removed during the recitation of the phrase *dāitiīō upasaiiene<sup>9</sup> buiīā* from verse 2 of the tenth *Ātaš Niyāyeš*. This billet is then immediately offered to the sacred fire. While continuing to recite the tenth *Ātaš Niyāyeš*, the Bōywārā buries a new billet of wood in the same way as he did before when reciting the eighteenth verse beginning with *aṭ tōi ātarəm ahurā*. In this way, on each day a new billet is buried and the burning billet that has been kept under the ash for three days and nights is then offered to the fire. In the tenth *Ātaš Niyāyeš*, before removing the billet from the ash, the Bōywārā recites the words *dāitiīō upasaiiene buiīā* from verse 2 of the *Ātaš Niyāyeš*, and thereafter removes the smoldering billet from beneath the ash, ritually offering it to the fire.

On the fifth day, the billet buried in the South is taken out while the priest recites the words *dāitiīō upasaiiene buiīā* from verse 2 of the tenth *Ātaš Niyāyeš*; in the same tenth *Ātaš Niyāyeš*, while reciting two *Yathā Ahū Vairyō* the priest draws two furrows in the ash and then buries a fresh billet while reciting the passage beginning with *aṭ tōi ātarəm ahurā*. On the sixth day, the billet that was buried on the west side is removed and offered to the fire while the priest recites the words

<sup>9</sup> The Avestan word *upasaiiana* –, meaning “log of wood,” is translated in Pahlavi by the word *pasišn*, meaning “nourishment”. It seems that this ritual evolved in ancient Iran for sustaining and preserving the holy fire in the bitter winter months. As Dēnkard states, especially in winter, proper food and nourishment must be offered to the sacred fire. This ritual ensures that the fire is ever-burning (See Dhabhar 1963: 72, n. 2). It is worth noting that Av. *upasaiiana* – translates philologically as “a resting place, couch, bed” (see Bartholomae 1904: 366). The traditional meaning “knot of wood” is close to the philological meaning, since faggots are needed to maintain the sacred fire that is kept ablaze on its bed of fire-ash.



dāitiō upasaiene buiā from verse 2 of the tenth Ātaš Niyāyeš. When reciting two *Yathā Ahū Vairyō* in the tenth Ātaš Niyāyeš, the priest redraws two furrows and buries a billet within them in the same way as he did before. On the seventh day, the billet that was buried on the east side is removed and offered to the fire while verse 2 of the tenth Ātaš Niyāyeš is recited at the words dāitiō upasaiene buiā. When reciting two *Yathā Ahū Vairyō* in the tenth Ātaš Niyāyeš, the priest redraws two furrows and buries a billet within them in the same way as before. The burying and unburying process of this ritual is sometimes compared with that of nature, wherein a seed is planted in fertile soil and results in a ripened (Guj. *pākēlō*) fruit.

It is worth noting here that the ritual of burying the knotted wood in the fire-ash in the *Hāwan Gāh*, as performed *externally* by the Sanjānā priests in difficult times, seems to have been abandoned by them in later prosperous times.

### **The Ancient Inner Ritual as Performed by the Bōywārās of the Irānshāh Fire<sup>10</sup>**

It appears that there used to be two rituals for burying a knotted billet offered to the sacred fires – one that is visible outwardly on the large fire-vase and another that is performed inwardly and hidden with due ritual prescription within the fire-vase in a large bowl-shaped copper vessel (*kundī*). There are three specifically named fires that are kept burning in the copper bowl secured in the inner concave portion of the large fire-vase. In order to preserve and maintain these fires and keep them permanently burning, the ritual of offering the *gāthū* has

<sup>10</sup> On my visit to Udvada on 20 December 2015 to pay homage to the Irānshāh Fire, Dasturji Khurshed Kekobad Dastoor, the High Priest of Udvada, gave me a detailed description of the inner ritual, which has been passed down for a millennium, of burying a knotted billet of the bāval (babul) tree under the fire-ash. This splendid ritual is known only to the Sanjānā priests who perform the Bōy ceremony of the Irānshāh Fire. I am highly indebted to Dasturji Khurshed for giving me this detailed description, provided to him by Mobed Nadirshah Fardunji Mogal, an illustrious and pious priest who performed all the high liturgies of Zoroastrianism and was very much attached to the Irānshah Fire. Mobed Nadirshah Mogal was the grandfather of Khurshed Dastoor's wife, Havovi.

been in vogue since the inception of the holy Irānshāh fire. The copper vessel within the fire-vase has four strong circular handles on four sides. The upper part of the copper vessel is hidden below the concave lip of the large silver fire-vase, so that the copper vessel cannot be seen from outside by the devotees who come there to offer obeisance to the Irānshāh fire. Within the copper vessel there are three separate fires. In order to preserve them permanently, the ritual of *gāthū* has been performed by the Sanjānā priests, who rightly proclaim themselves as the *parastār* or *khidmatgār*, i.e., the servitors of the Irānshāh Ātash Bahrām.

It is important that each of the three fires should be kept in their own specific place within the *kundī*. It is believed that if their individual places are not carefully preserved, their sacred mechanism (Ar. *tilism*) will likely be disturbed. In order to make the individual positions of the three fires secure, a copper netted ring is entwined over one of the solid handles of the *kundī* as an indicator of the northeast direction. On account of this placement, there is no danger of the three fires changing position. One fire is placed in the centre, one in the Northeast, and one in the Southwest. The three fires have different names. One is referred to as the fire of *chēchēstē*, one is called the fire of *gōfēstē*, and one is called the fire of *līlēstē*. Though we cannot be certain which name is associated with which fire, these names have been mentioned by the priestly ancestors of the Sanjānās for centuries, and hence have been noted here.

For the ritual of offering the *gāthū* to these hidden fires, the knotted babul log should be totally dry. This log is thoroughly cleaned and the bark is scraped away, and the knot of wood is shaped like a small coconut (See figure 1).



Figure 1. The knotted babul log, thoroughly cleaned and scraped like a small coconut. Image courtesy of F.M. Kotwal

The ritual of offering the *gāthū* is performed only in the *Ushahīn Gāh* before performing the Bōy ceremony. It cannot be performed in any other *Gāh*. The Bōywārā should take note of this specially. There is a certain system and mode for offering the *gāthū* to the fires, which is described as follows:

1. The ritual of offering the *gāthū* to the fire in the Northeast may be performed only on alternate days (*Rōz*) of the Zoroastrian calendar starting from *Rōz Bahman*, *Shahrēwar*, *Khōrdād*, *Day-pa-ādar*, *Ābān*, *Māh*, *Gōsh*, *Mihr*, *Rashn*, *Bahrām*, *Gōwād* (*Wād*), *Dēn*, *Āštād*, *Zamyād* and *Anagrān*.
2. The ritual of offering the *gāthū* to the fire in the centre can be done on any day of the Zoroastrian calendar.
3. The ritual of offering the *gāthū* to the fire located in the Southwest can be performed only on the remaining alternated days (*Rōz*) of the Zoroastrian calendar starting from *Rōz Ohrmazd*, *Ardibehesht*, *Spandārmad*, *Amurdād*, *Ādur*, *Khwarshēd*, *Tīr*, *Day-pa-mihr*, *Srōsh*, *Frawardīn*, *Rām*, *Day-pa-dīn*, *Ashishwāngh*(*Ard*), *Asmān* and *Mahraspand*.

### Performing the *Gāthū* Ritual for the Inner Fire of the Northeast

The Bōywārā, having obtained the ṣamal of *khūb* and dressed in a *jāmā-pīchhōrī* (priestly robe and sash), wears white gloves and enters the *gumbad* (*sanctum sanctorum*) on any relevant day in the *Ushahīn Gāh*. He holds two ladles in his hands and faces the southwest direction in readiness for the start of the ritual. Thereafter, he reverently shifts the outer fire burning on the surface of the bed of ash in the fire vase to the side, keeping the northeast direction clear and empty. This enables him to fully open the northeast corner. The fire-ash is carefully removed from the northeast direction little by little, until the priest is able to see the edge of the *kundī* buried in the fire-vase. As soon as the edge of the *kundī* is visible, the priest removes the fire-ash from the inner part of the ash layer in the *kundī* from the northeast direction. Once he reaches into the *kundī* up to about five finger-breadths, he is able to see the inner fire. This is the fire preserved in the Northeast. After shifting the fire-ash that covers the fire, the priest lifts the inner fire very carefully with the two ladles, and reverently keeps the burning embers of wood in the large fire-vase separate from the visible fire. While removing the inner fire and also while putting a new piece of knotted wood back in the inner *kundī*, the priest is careful not to mix any spark of the inner fire with the outer fire. In this manner, after removing the inner fire he takes the knotted babul log, which has been prepared beforehand, and places it reverently on the two ladles, carefully setting it in the little pit that has been formed while removing the inner fire. Thereafter, the priest holds the inner fire and rearranges it on and around the *gāthū*. After arranging the fire, he places pure sandalwood or if possible *agar* (a kind of fragrant sandalwood) on the ladles and reverently holds this offering over the fire, reciting in an undertone *nəmasə-tə ātarš mazdā ahurahe hudā mazišta yazata* (Homage unto you, O Fire of Ahura Mazda, bestowing good, the greatest Yazata, created by Ahura Mazda). While reciting this prayer, the priest waves the ladle over the fire three times and then offers sandalwood to the fire by reciting in an undertone the word *ašəm* (righteousness). Thereafter, he places both ladles on the fire-vase itself and comes out of the *gumbad* to stand in the outer *pāwī*, loudly reciting the *ašəm vohū* prayer beginning with

the word *vohū*. In this way he leaves the *bāj* and enters again into the *gumbad*. He holds the ladles and shifts all the fire-ash again over the inner fire, covering it completely. After spreading the fire-ash, he shifts the outer fire that earlier was shifted to the side back to its proper place. Afterwards, he puts the logs of wood on the outer fire and offers the *māchi*, performing the Bōy ceremony of the *Ushahīn Gāh*.

The same procedure is carried out for the inner fire of the Southwest on one of its relevant days. The inner fire that is in the Centre may be offered *gāthū* on any one of the thirty days of the Zoroastrian calendar. As per the format laid down by the Sanjānā priests, certain principles must be observed by the Bōywārā who performs the *Gāthū Bhārvānī Kriyā*:

1. The *gāthū* ritual can be performed in respect of two fires on a single day. When the *gāthū* is performed for any one of the fires placed in any of the two directions, simultaneously the *gāthū* for the central fire can also be performed thereafter.
2. The *gāthū* ceremony should be performed at an interval of at least every eight days.
3. On the day when *gāthū* is to be done, a few logs of wood should be placed in the *Aiwisruthrem Gāh* so as to facilitate the Bōywārā's performance of the *gāthū* in the *Ushahīn Gāh* with a reasonable quantity of fire burning.
4. It is the solemn responsibility of every Bōywārā to perform this duty with diligence, just as it is his duty to take care of and preserve the outer fire.
5. The outgoing Bōywārā should inform the incoming Bōywārā when he has performed the ritual of *gāthū*.
6. The ritual of *gāthū* is an esoteric mystery known only to the Sanjānā priests of Udvaḍa serving the Irānshāh Fire. Hence, as per the Sanjānā priestly code, the secrets of this ritual should not be divulged to any other priest except the servitors of the Holy Irānshāh Fire.

### On the Observation of the Three Inner Fires

The three inner fires seem to be mentioned indirectly by the learned Sanjānā priest Bahman Kaikōbad in the *Qissa-ye Sanjān* written in 1599 CE. Bahman Kaikōbad mentions that the Irānshāh Fire was consecrated with the *ʿālāt* brought from Khōrāsān by high-souled priests, among whom were “several alchemists” (*chandīn kimiyyāgar*). It is very likely that these alchemists brought into existence the three inner fires kept secretly burning below the visible Irānshāh fire burning from the outside.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, in Samvat 1821 (1764 CE), the Anjuman of Udvada wrote a long letter to the Anjuman of Surat in which they mention that the priests of Navsari want to consecrate the new Ātash Bahrām in Navsari: “Let it be known that this is not the time of great ones who were masters of righteousness and astrology. They were devout and they cared for the King of Religion. They installed the Great Ātash Bahrām in accordance with the rites of religion. There should be one King of Religion in our country and so the work of religion could continue. The priests of Navsari want to consecrate another Ātash Bahrām out of pride which they cannot do in accordance with the practice of religion. If a new Ātash Bahrām is to be consecrated, the sages of old would have done it, since they were peerless; yet they did not consecrate another Ātash Bahrām as they knew well that there could be only one King of the Religion”. This seems to be an indirect reference to the wisdom of priests in ancient times, and this spiritual wisdom regarding the consecration of a new Ātash Bahrām seems to have been lost, according to the Sanjānā priests of Udvada.<sup>12</sup>

### Conjectural Identification of the Three Hidden Fires

The high-souled Mobeds (*kimiyyāgar*) of Iran, who came with the *ʿālāt* of Khōrāsān in Iran, together with the Mobeds of Sanjan seem to have brought into existence the three hidden fires of the Irānshāh Ātash Bahrām. It is tempting to connect the three fires, viz., *Līlēstē*,

<sup>11</sup> On the high-souled [“saintly”?] alchemists mentioned in the *Qissa-ye Sanjān*, see Williams 2009: 96-97.

<sup>12</sup> See Ms. No. F97, p.192, housed in the First Dastoor Meherji Rana Library, Navsari, copied by Dastur Erachji Sohrabji Meherjirana. [Cite Dhabhar 1922 for this?]

*Chēchēstē* and *Gōfēstē*, with the ancient spiritual fires *Ādur Farnbag*, *Ādur Gušnasp* and *Ādur Burzīn-Mihr* created by Ahura Mazda for the protection and preservation of the world.

The *Gāthū Bhārvānī Kriyā* seems to be an ancient Iranian practice that may have emerged during times of conflict and the periods of intense persecution suffered by the Zoroastrians, when many sacred fires were doused in Iran and the fire temples were either destroyed or converted into mosques. In India the *Gāthū Bhārvānī Kriyā* has been practiced for more than a millennium and is done in an effort to save and safeguard a part of the original fire in case the sacred fire is ever doused. This ritual is faithfully followed today by the venerable Mobed Sahebs of the Udvada Irānshāh Fire, since it is from the great Udvada fire that all Agiaries and Ātash Bahrāms in India have their unbroken link (*silsila*) with the Irānshāh and their early ritual connection with the sacred fires of Iran through the 'ālāt of Khorāsān.

The Sanjānā priests of Udvada should be praised for keeping alive this unbroken tradition that has come down to succeeding generations of the Parsi community. May the Irānshāh Ātash Bahrām fire burn continually in its Abode up to the time of the Renovation (*Frašegird*). So may it be as I bless (*aḍa jamiiāt yaḍa āfrīnāmī*).

\*\*\*

It is a matter of great joy and satisfaction that a *Festschrift* will be dedicated to Prof. Philip Kreyenbroek. I have had the pleasure of collaborating with him on the monumental work of *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān* for a long and fruitful period of time. It is my sincere prayer to Ahura Mazda to bestow on him health, happiness and joyful mind as long as he lives. Thus may it be as I bless.

## Bibliography

- Bartholomae, Christian. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1904.
- Belsare, Malhar Bhikaji. *An Etymological Gujarati English Dictionary*. Ahmedabad: H.K. Pathak, 1895.
- Boyce, Mary. *A Persian Stronghold of Zoroastrianism. Based on the Ratanbai Katrak Lectures, 1975*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Dhabhar, Bamanji Nasarvanji. *Descriptive Catalogue of All Manuscripts in the First Dastur Meherji Rani Library, Navsari*. Bombay: Commercial Printing Press, 1923.
- Dhabhar, Bamanji Nasarvanji, ed. *Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad: With an Introduction and Glossary of Select Terms*. Vol. 8. Pahlavi Text Series 8. Bombay: The Bombay Parsi Punchayet (BPP), 1949.
- Dhabhar, Bamanji Nasarvanji. *Translation of Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk*. Bombay: K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, 1963.
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. *Vispered and Khorda Avesta*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1889.
- Kanga, Kavasji Edulji. *Gāthā-Bā-Ma'nī. Translated from the Gujarati Original into English with Grammatical and Explanatory Notes*. Translated by Maneck Fardunji Kanga. Bombay: Trustees of the Parsi Panchayat Funds and Properties, 1997.
- Williams, Alan. *The Zoroastrian myth of migration from Iran and settlement in the Indian diaspora: text, translation and analysis of the 16th century Qeṣṣe-ye Sanjān 'The story of Sanjan'*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.





## **Descent in Frēdōn's Line: An Epic Narrative in the Light of Zoroastrian Law**

Maria Macuch

A central theme of the Iranian national epic, alluded to repeatedly in Pahlavi epic narrations and recounted with artistic finesse in Ferdausi's famous Šāhnāmeḥ, is the story of the genesis of the age-old enmity between Iran and Turan. It is one of the many fascinating tales from the Iranian cultural heritage that can be traced back in its essentials to Middle and Old Iranian sources, illustrating not only how myths, legends, names and figures were transmitted in the course of many centuries, but also how they were re-adjusted to changing times and incorporated into existing cultural and social patterns. In its final form in the Šāhnāmeḥ the Iranian epic consists of numerous intertwined strata, reflecting the diverse narrative traditions of many centuries, albeit with several altered connotations, remodelling ancient myths and legends to conform to the political and social realities of tenth century Muslim Iran in Ferdausi's age.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the ancient epic material in Pahlavi texts (in their late 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> century redactions) reflects the religious and cultural mores of a Mazdean society, reaching back to the Sasanian period and revealing specific features, which only make

---

<sup>1</sup>On the dispute regarding the oral or written *Vorlage* of Ferdausi's epic, see now the survey in Vevaina 2015 with further references.

sense within the framework of a Zoroastrian worldview. Despite the persistence of many story patterns and even mental representations<sup>2</sup> throughout the centuries, it seems that many epic tales contain unconscious adjustments to the social realities of the audiences they were recounted to, not only in order to make the tales credible to the auditors, but since the narrators adapted their recitations to the only conceivable social background they could imagine. I contend that in this respect there is a kernel of historical truth in epic narratives alluding *en passant* to important social and legal institutions, which there was no need to describe in detail, since they were perfectly understood by the original recipients of these tales, but have to be put into context in order to be comprehended with their vast implications today.<sup>3</sup> In this short contribution dedicated to our esteemed colleague Philip Kreyenbroek as an homage to his inspiring work in the field of Iranian Studies I would like to show how one of the most important Zoroastrian legal norms of the Sasanian period was incorporated into the account of the genealogy of Iranian kings (and that of Zarathustra) in the saga of the origin of the ancient strife between Iran and Turan.

The bitter feud between Iranians and Turanians is set into motion when King Ferīdūn (MP Frēdōn; Av. Θraētaona-)<sup>4</sup>, a sovereign of the first dynasty of epic kings<sup>5</sup>, divides his vast realm between his three sons. According to Ferdausi's famous account Ferīdūn bestows to Salm, his eldest son, the land of *Rūm* (Rome, Byzantium) and all the Western regions, to his second eldest son Tūr the region of *Tūrān* (the land of the Turks, Central Asia) and Čīn (China), to his youngest and favourite son Īraǰ the most precious part of his realm, Īrān. Out of jealousy of

<sup>2</sup> On this important aspect of epic literature in the context of the Achaemenid and Sasanian epigraphical material see Shayegan 2012 (especially pp. 157-159).

<sup>3</sup> The same kernel of historical truth in the field of family law may be found in the diverse narrations referring to Ardašīr's genealogy, see Macuch 2014.

<sup>4</sup> Mayrhofer 1979, nr. 312 (I/81) with further references.

<sup>5</sup> The Pēšdādians in the Šāhnāmeḥ; in Pahlavi literature Frēdōn seems to have been already associated closely with the Kayanians, see Bd. 35 (*abar tōhmaḡ ud paywand ī Kayān* "On the seed and offspring of the Kayanians") and *Abdīh ud sahiḡih ī Sīstān* "Wonders and Magnificence of Sīstān", cited below. For an overview of the Iranian national epic see Yarshater 1983 (on Frēdōn pp. 372-373, 428-429).

the youngest son, the oldest one Salm kills his brother Īraǰ with the help of Tūr and sends his severed head to his father, hereby initiating the vicious circle of vengeance and enmity between Iran and Turan. Ferīdūn, having himself lost his eyesight after Īraǰ's murder, wishes that his son be avenged by one of his descendants. He finds a pregnant woman in Īraǰ's harem called Māhāfarīd, one of Tūr's daughters, who was loved dearly by his murdered son and would hopefully bear him a male successor and avenger. To Ferīdūn's disappointment Māhāfarīd only gives birth to a daughter, who is, however, brought up with the proper education and betrothed to one of her grandfather's nephews (a son of Ferīdūn's brother), called Pašang. This alliance between Īraǰ's daughter (Ferīdūn's granddaughter) and the latter's nephew finally produces the desired male offspring, Manūčehr, who avenges Īraǰ by killing Salm and Tūr and becomes the king of Iran.<sup>6</sup>

This is the core of the story recounted by Ferdausi, in which the main ingredients of the ancient tale, the names of the protagonists and the story line, have been retained. In comparison with the Iranian and Middle Persian material, however, there are significant changes in the account of Manūčehr's descent from Īraǰ, to which we will turn presently. The tale certainly belongs to an older strata of the Iranian epic, since it is well known that the origin of the names of Ferīdūn's three sons can be reconstructed as (1) Īraǰ < MP *Ērēj/Ērēz/Ērēč* < Av. \**Airiiaēča*–; (2) Tūr < (MP *Tūz* < *Tūč* < \**Tūr(a)ča*) < Av. *Tūra-/Tura*–; (3) Salm < MP *Sarm/Salm* < Av. *Sairima*–, and traced back to an ancient tribal division of the Iranians, mentioned in the Avesta.<sup>7</sup> In the *Frawardīn*

<sup>6</sup> Šāhnāmeḥ 6/460–489; see Khaleghi Motlagh 2012, p. 25, who cites these passages according to the system adopted by Wolff 1935 (/1965). Khaleghi Motlagh 2012 is a recent English translation of his original German dissertation of 1971 (*Die Frauen im Schahname*, Freiburg) and is in the chapters referring to legal matters by now completely outdated and even misleading.

<sup>7</sup> See also Boyce 1975, 104–105, and Yarshater 1983, 409, with further references. Ferdausi has a fantastical explanation of these names, corresponding to the story line: *Salm* is “flight”, because this son is timid; *Tūr* is “warrior”, since this son has an aggressive disposition; Īraǰ is “the highly praised one”, since he combines calmness and courage in an ideal manner.

*Yašt* (13.143-144),<sup>8</sup> dedicated to the worship of the *fravašis*, five ethnic names of tribes confessing Zoroastrianism are mentioned: (1) *Airiia*-,<sup>9</sup> (2) *Tūiriia*- (*Tūra*-/*Tura*-)<sup>10</sup>, (3) *Sairima*-<sup>11</sup>, (4) *Sāinu*-<sup>12</sup> and (5) *Dāha*-<sup>13</sup>. These ancient tribal appellations obviously became an important part of the cultural heritage of the Iranians and are still referred to in Pahlavi literature, albeit with completely different connotations. In the chapter on “the composition of mankind” (*abar čiyōnih ī mardōmān*) of the *Bundahišn* (14.37-38)<sup>14</sup> the following ethnic groups are listed among the earliest descendants of the first human pair, the siblings Mašē und Mašānē, and their offspring Frawāg, son of Siyāmag: these are the peoples of (1) *Ērān dehān* (“lands of the Iranians”) and those of the “non-Iranian lands” (*an-ērān deh*), consisting of the inhabitants of the (2) “land of *Tūr*” (*Tūr deh*); (3) “the land of *Salm*” (*Salm deh*); (4) “the land of *Sēn*” (*Sēn deh*); (5) “the land of *Dahī*” (*Dahī deh*).<sup>15</sup> Although the ethnic names in this passage correspond exactly (even in their sequence!) to those in Yt. 13, 143-144, they are – apart from the name of the Iranians – connoted differently, corresponding to the changed historical environment and political situation in late Sasanian and early Muslim times: in the cited *Bundahišn* passage (and elsewhere) the inhabitants of the land of *Tūr* are identified with the Turks, those of the land of *Salm* with the Romans and the people of the land of *Sēn*

<sup>8</sup> Translations in Wolff 1910 (/1960), pp. 255-256; Lommel 1927, pp. 128-129.

<sup>9</sup> Bartholomae 1904, col. 198, with further references.

<sup>10</sup> Bartholomae 1904, col. 656; Mayrhofer 1979, nr. 309 (I/81); on *Tura*-/*Tūra*- see also Hintze 1994, p. 60, fn. 162; MP *Tūr* “Turanian”, originally presumably the designation of an Iranian tribe (Marquart 1901, p. 157, identified them with the Massagetes, a Scythian tribe), but connoted in MP and NP literature with the Turks. On the Massagetes see Herodot I. 215-216; Parzinger 2004, p. 27.

<sup>11</sup> Bartholomae 1904, col. 1566; MP *Salm*, originally the designation for the Sarmatians of South Russia, connoted in the epic tradition with Rome/Byzantium (*Grōm*). On the Sauromats und Sarmatians see Parzinger 2004, pp. 64-67; Herodot IV.110.

<sup>12</sup> Bartholomae 1904, col. 1570; MP *Sēn* of unknown ethnic provenance, associated with the Chinese in Pahlavi texts.

<sup>13</sup> MP *Dahī* are the Dahae of classical authors, a Scythian tribe, which is also mentioned in the *Daiva* inscription of Xerxes (Persepolis H, 26).

<sup>14</sup> According to Anklesaria 1956, pp. 134-135 (corresponding to Bd. 14.35-36 in Pakzad 2005, pp. 191-193). I have cited and discussed the whole passage in Macuch 2016.

<sup>15</sup> On these (and the other names in the Bd. list) see Macuch 2016, pp. 310-311.

with the Chinese.

All this has already been elucidated before,<sup>16</sup> but apart from the divergent ethnic connotations there is another alteration of the epic tale regarding the parentage of Iraǰ's male heir, Manučēhr (MP Manuščihr, Av. Manuš.ciθra-<sup>17</sup>) in the transition from the Avestan material to the Pahlavi and New Persian versions, which has not yet been explained adequately. Although the allusion to Manuš.ciθra- in the Avesta (Yt. 13.131) is only very short, it is significant that he is mentioned – in contrast to the Pahlavi and Persian versions – as the *direct* son (and successor) of Airiiāuuā-<sup>18</sup>. In Pahlavi literature the elaborate story told by Ferdausi is reduced to its essentials<sup>19</sup>, but these texts are most intriguing with respect to our topic, since they depict a specific form of legal descent, which corresponds perfectly with the Sasanian law of succession and other Zoroastrian norms of this period.

In the short Pahlavi treatise “The Sixth Day of the Month of *Frawardīn*” the question of descent does not yet appear, but the text was probably associated with the Avestan *Frawardīn Yašt* (Yt. 13) referred to above, in which both Manuš.čiθra- and the appellations of the Iranian tribes (leading to the names of Frēdōn's sons) are mentioned, since it contains a concise version of the epic tale. The treatise seeks to combine all the remarkable events occurring on the sixth day of the first Zoroastrian month *Frawardīn* from the beginning of creation up to the day of resurrection, counting among these the calamity that befell Frēdōn:

*Māh ī Frawardīn rōz ī Hordād* (Pahlavi Texts) 103.12-16<sup>20</sup>:

<sup>16</sup> Lommel 1927, p. 128, fn. 5; Christensen 1928, p. 23; Yarshater 1983, p. 409; Utas 1983, p. 265, on the ethnic names. On Bd. 14.37-38 see also Macuch 2016, pp. 310-311.

<sup>17</sup> Mayrhofer 1979, nr. 219 (I/61).

<sup>18</sup> Mayrhofer 1979, nr. 11 (I/18); Bartholomae 1904, col. 199; Wolff 1910 (/1960), p.253, Lommel 1927, p. 127, Justi 1895 (1963), pp. 191-192 (under Manuščiθra).

<sup>19</sup> There is a longer version in the *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg* (4.27-51), now easily available in the new edition of Agostini 2013, pp. 50-54; 97-99, which is, however, in this section based on a manuscript in the Arabic script and does not give an exact account of Frēdōn's succession.

<sup>20</sup> Jamasp-Asana 1897-1913, p. 103, 12-16 (Pahlavi text).

*Māh frawardīn rōz ī hordād Frēdōn baxšišn ī gehān kard. Hrōm ō Salm dād ud Turkestān ō Tūz dād. Ērānšahr ō Ērēj dād ud se duxtar (ī) Bōxt-husrō Tāzīgān šāh be xwāst ud pad zanīh ō pusrān dād. Salm ud Tūz andar pidar a-burd-framān šud hēnd ud Ērēj ī brad ī xwēš rāy be ōzad hēnd.*

“On the sixth day of the month of Frawardīn Frēdōn undertook the division of the world. He gave Rome to Salm and Turkestān to Tūz. He gave Ērānšahr to Ērēj and asked for the hand of the three daughters of Bōxt-husrō, King of the Arabs, and gave them in marriage to his sons. Salm and Tūz became disobedient towards the father and killed their own brother Ērēj.”

The eschatological significance of these events is taken up in “Wonders and Magnificence of Sistān”, the region associated with Zoroaster’s teaching and the geographical setting for the emergence of the three eschatological saviours:

*Abdīh ud sahiḡīh ī Sistān* (Pahlavi Texts) 25. 4-6<sup>21</sup>:

*ēk ēd kū paywand ud tohmag ī Kayān dahibedān ī pad ēn kišwar wizend awiš mad az frazandān ī Frēdōn Salm kē kišwar ī Hrōm ud Tūz kē Turkestān pad xwadāyīh dāšt Ērēj Ērān dahibed būd u-š be ōzad. ud az frazandān (ī) Ērēj bē kanīg-ē(w) kas nē mānd. ud pas Frēdōn ō war (ī) Frazdān nīd ud pad nihān dāšt tā +(da) hom paywand ka az ān kanīg pus zād.*

“And this: the offspring and seed of the Kayanian rulers are in this region (Sistān). Disaster befell them (=the Kayanians) through the children of Frēdōn, Salm, who (ruled) the land of Rome, and Tūz, who held rulership of Turkestān, (while) Ērēj

<sup>21</sup> Jamasp-Asana 1897-1913, p. 25, 4-6 (Pahlavi text); the edition of Utas 1983, pp. 262-263, 4-6, has a divergent translation of the relevant passage.

was sovereign of the Iranians. And they killed him. And of the children of Ērēj none survived except a girl. Afterwards Frēdōn brought her to Lake Frazdān and held her in hiding up to the <sup>+</sup>tenth<sup>22</sup> generation, when from the (offspring) of that daughter a son was born.”

Both cited texts describe concisely the division of the world between Frēdōn's sons Salm, Tūz and Ērēj and the latter's murder by his brothers, but only the second one refers to the problem of Ērēj's succession after having left only a daughter, but no son. A more detailed version is given in the *Bundahišn* in a chapter on the “Seed and Offspring of the Kayanians” (*apar tōhmag ud paywand ī kayān*):

*Bundahišn* 35.11-16<sup>23</sup>:

(11) *az Frēdōn zād sē pus Salm ud Tūz ud Ērēj ud az Ērēj dō pus ud duxt-ēw zād.* (12) *pus ī dōgānag Wānīdār<sup>24</sup> ud Anastob (/Anastox)<sup>25</sup> nām bud hēnd ud duxt Gūzag (/Ganʿag)<sup>26</sup> nām būd.* (13) *Salm ud Tūz-iz Ērēj ud frazandān āwādagān hamāg ōzad ud ān duxt Frēdōn pad nihānīh dāšt az ān duxt duxt-ēw zād awešān āgāgīh būd u-šān mādar ōzad ud ān duxt<sup>27</sup> hamē Frēdōn pad*

<sup>22</sup> The text only has an incomplete <hwm> *hom*, which according to Jamasp-Asana 1897-1913, p. 25, fn. 10, should be completed to <(d)hwm> *dahom*. If we follow the genealogy given in other texts (see below) it would also be possible to read <(n)hwm> *nohom* “ninth”. The parallel passage, however, Bd. 35.13, has <dhw> *dahom* “tenth” (see below; also Utas 1983, p. 261, fn. 11) Anklesaria 1956, p. 295; Pakzad 2005, p. 393.

<sup>23</sup> Anklesaria 1956, 294-295; Pakzad 2005, 392-394 (with MSS variants, which will be referred to below).

<sup>24</sup> For variant spellings of the name see (in the original Pahlavi and Pāzand) Pakzad 2005, p. 392, fn. 94: TD1, DH <w'nyt'l>; TD2 <'nyt'l>; K2ob <w'nyt'l>. Justi 1895 (1963), p. 348.

<sup>25</sup> Variants see Pakzad 2005, p. 392, fn. 95: TD1, TD2, DH <'nstb'/'wstb'>; K2o, K2ob *Astox*. Justi 1895 (1963), pp. 16, 47.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* 393, fn. 98: TD1, TD2, DH <gwck/gnck>; K2o *ganja*; K2ob *gəja*. Justi 1895 (1963), p. 123.

<sup>27</sup> I am following the version in TD1, fol. 98r. line 16, where <W ZK BRTH> *ud ān duxt* is placed after <ZKTLWNt'> *ōzad*. In other MSS (TD2 and DH) it is placed before *ōzad* (see Pakzad 2005, 393, fn. 107).



*nihān be kard tā dah paywand ka Manuṣ<sup>28</sup> ī xwaršēd-pad-wēnīg (/xwaršēd-wēnīg)<sup>29</sup> az mād zād čē čiyōn be zād rōšnīh ī xwaršēd pad wēnīg ōbast. (14) az Manuṣ<sup>30</sup> ud xwahar Manuṣxwarnar<sup>31</sup> az Manuṣxwarnar<sup>32</sup> ud xwahar Manuščīhr<sup>33</sup> zād kē-š Salm ud Tūz ōzad ud kēn ī Ērēj xwāst. (15) az Manuščīhr zād Friy<sup>34</sup> Nōdar<sup>35</sup> ud Dūrāsrāw<sup>36</sup>. (16) čiyōn Manuščīhr ī Manuṣxwarnar (ī) Manuṣxwarnāg<sup>37</sup> kē mād Gūzag<sup>38</sup> ī Ērag<sup>39</sup> ī Sridag<sup>40</sup> ī Bīdag<sup>41</sup> ī Frazuṣag<sup>42</sup> ī Zuṣag<sup>43</sup> ī Fragūzag<sup>44</sup> ī Gūzag<sup>45</sup> ī Ērēj ī Frēdōn.*

“(11) Of Frēdōn three sons, Salm and Tūz and Ērēj, and from Ērēj two sons and a daughter were born. (12) The names of the twins were Wānidār and Anastob and the name of the daughter was Gūzag. (13) Salm and Tūz killed Ērēj and all his children and descendants. And Frēdōn kept that daughter in hiding and from that daughter a daughter was born (*az duxt duxt-ēw zād*). They (=Salm and Tūz) were informed of her and killed the mother. And Frēdōn kept that daughter in concealment

<sup>28</sup> Variants see Pakzad 2005, 393, fn. 109: TD1 <m'nwš>; TD2, DH <m'nws>; K2o <mnwš>; K2ob <mnwyš>. Justi 1895 (1963), pp. 193-194.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* 393, fn. 109: TD1, TD2, DH <wynyk>; K2o <wynyy>; K2ob *vini*.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* 393, fn. 116: TD1, TD2, DH <m'nwš>; K2o *manōš.x<sup>v</sup>aršed vini*; K2ob *manōš*.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.* 393, fn. 118: TD1, DH <m'nwšhwlnl/m'nwšhwlw>; TD2 <m'nwyšhwlnl>; K2o *manōš.x<sup>v</sup>arnar*. Justi 1895 (1963), 194.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 119: TD1, TD 2, DH <m'nwšhwlnl>; K2o *manōš.x<sup>v</sup>arnar*; K2ob *manōš x<sup>v</sup>arnar*.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.* 393, fn. 121: TD1, TD2, DH <m'nwšcyhl>; K2o *manocāhr*; K2ob *manō<cyhl>*. Justi 1895 (1963), 191-193.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 126: TD2, DH <plyh>; K2o *fraš*; K2ob *fraš*. Justi 1895 (1963), 106.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 127: TD2, DH <nwtl>; K2o, K2ob *nōdar*.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 128: TD2, DH <dwł'slwb>; K2o, K2ob *durāsrō*. Justi 1895 (1963), 87.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 130-133.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 135: TD1, TD2, DH <gwck/gnck>; K2o, K2ob *gōzak*.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 137: TD1, DH <'ylk>; TD2 <'klk>; K2o *erak*.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 138: all mss. *Θritak*.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 139: TD1, TD2, DH <byt'k>; K2o *bitag*.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 140: TD1 <plwzws>; TD2, DH <plzws>; K2o *fraduṣag*.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 142: TD1, TD2, DH <zwš>; K2o *zuṣak*; K2ob *guzak*.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 143: TD1 <plgwzk>; TD2, DH <plgwwzk>; K2o *fraguzag*; K2ob *fraguzaka*.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.* 394, fn. 144: TD1, TD2, DH <gwzk>; K2o *guzak*; K2ob *guḍak*.

up to ten generations (*tā dah paywand*) until Manuš (with the epithet) '(with) the sun on his nose' (*xwaršēd-pad-wēnīg*) was born from his mother (*az mād zād*), since when he was born the light of the sun fell on his nose. (14) From Manuš and (his) sister was born Manušxwarnar; from Manušxwarnar and (his) sister was born Manuščihr, who killed Salm and Tūz and sought vengeance for Ērēj. (15) From Manuščihr Friy and Nōdar and Dūrāsraw were born. (16) Just as Manuščihr, son of Manušxwarnar, son of Manušxwarnāg (was born), whose mother was Gūzag, (daughter) of Ērag, (daughter) of Sridag, (daughter) of Bīdag, (daughter) of Frazūšag, (daughter) of Zūšag, (daughter) of Fragūzag, (daughter) of Gūzag, (daughter) of Ērēj, (son of) Frēdōn."

The information to be gained on the Pahlavi version of the narrative from the two latter texts may be summarized as follows: Ērēj has two sons (Wānidār and Anastob) and a daughter (Gūzag). Both sons and all other descendents of Ērēj are killed by Salm and Tūr with the exception of his daughter Gūzag (<\*Gūzā- 'the hidden one', see below), who is kept in concealment by her grandfather Frēdōn, but is also murdered by her two uncles after having given birth to a daughter. Frēdōn keeps this great-granddaughter (called Fragūzag <\*Fra-gūzā- 'the concealed one', see the list below) and her offspring, consisting of six more daughters, all named in the text, in concealment until a son called Manuš is born, in whose line of descent (after Manuš/Manušxwarnāg and Manušxwarnar) finally Manuščihr appears, the avenger of Ērēj and king of Iran.

The line of descent leading after eight daughters from the first male successor Manuš to Manuščihr is also transmitted (in different variations) in Pahlavi sources in another context, which does not recount the story of Frēdōn's descendants, but includes them in a constructed 'genealogy of Zarathustra' (*tohmag-ōšmurišnīh ī Zarduxšt*).<sup>46</sup> This genealogy, in which only the names of Zarathustra's

<sup>46</sup> WiZ 7 (Gignoux/Tafazzoli 1993, p. 62).

ancestors are listed, leading from the first man (*gayōmard*) to Zarduxšt, is a recurring topic in several texts (notably in *Dēnkard* 7.2.70, *Wizdahihā ī Zadspram* 7.1 and *Wizīrgard ī dēnīg* 21.4). In these lists, besides the cited *Bundahišn* passage, the *male* successors of Frēdōn and Ērēj are all named Manuš (Manu-) and distinguished by additions or epithets (*-xwarnāg*, *-xwarnar*, and *-čīhr*), forming three (or together with Manuš with no epithet) four individuals.<sup>47</sup> These male heirs are transmitted in two sequences (after a long line of female intermediary successors):

1. a sequence of three male successors in two variants: (a) Manuš > Manušxwarnar > Manuščīhr (Bd. 35.14, see above; Dk 5.4.3);<sup>48</sup> or: (b) Manušxwarnāg > Manušxwarnar > Manuščīhr (Dk 7.2.70).<sup>49</sup>
2. a sequence of four male successors: Manuš > Manušxwarnāg > Manušxwarnar > Manuščīhr (Bd. 35.16, see above; also WiZ 7.1).<sup>50</sup>

These variations in the sequence of male successors after eight females and the large number of generations kept in concealment (ten!) by Frēdōn were probably the result of different priestly calculations regarding the Zoroastrian world cycle, in which Frēdōn was placed at the very beginning of the third millennium of the “mixed state” (*gumēzišn*), to which the preceding and following genealogies had to be adjusted correspondingly.<sup>51</sup> As no difference was made between epic and history, the ancient saga had to be somehow incorporated into these calculations, assigning a very long period of 500 years (!) to the reign of Frēdōn before Manuščīhr takes over.<sup>52</sup> This would explain

<sup>47</sup> The epithet *-xwarnar* (Manušxwarnar) is derived, according to Éric Pirart (see fn. 55 below), from \**xʷarənarā*- “avec des hommes de bonne couleur” <proto-Indo-Iranian \**suuṛarna+nara-*; the form *-xwarnāg* (Manušxwarnāg) from Av. *xʷarənanʰhant-* (‘brilliant, splendid, illustrious’, Yt. 19.67, see Hintze 1994, p. 424, “glanzvoll, hoheitsvoll, herrlich”); *-čīhr* (Manuščīhr) from \**čiθra-* ‘seed, origin, nature, essence’ (Bartholomae 1904, col. 587, ‘Same, Ursprung, Herkunft, Abstammung’); on Manuš. *čiθra-* see also Mayrhofer 1979, nr. 219 (I/61).

<sup>48</sup> Amouzgar/Tafazzoli 2000, pp. 34-35.

<sup>49</sup> Molé 1967, pp. 26-27.

<sup>50</sup> Gignoux/Tafazzoli 1993, pp. 62-63.

<sup>51</sup> On the chronology of the early kings see Yarshater 1983, pp. 383-386.

<sup>52</sup> Bd. 33.3-4 and 36.7 (Pakzad 2005, pp. 362-363; 412).

the need to include a row of female intermediary successors into the scheme.

As to the line of eight daughters leading in the lineage of Frēdōn to the first male successor, called Manuš, these agree in number to the females connecting Ērēj with his male successor in the constructed genealogy of Zarathustra in several Pahlavi texts (Dk. 7.2.70; WiZ 7.1; WiD 21.4 with small variations in the transmitted names). In these sources we find the following names of the eight females between Ērēj and his male successor Manuš:

Sequence of female successors	<i>Bundahišn</i> 35.16	<i>Wizidaghihā ī Zadspram</i> 7.1	<i>Dēnkard</i> 7.2.70 (DkM 613.14-15; DkD 345.18-20)	<i>Wizīrkard ī dēnīg</i> 21.4	Reconstructed Avestan forms <sup>53</sup>
1	Gūzag	Gūzag	Īzak	Izak	*Gūzā-
2	Fragūzag	Fragūzag	Frasīzak	Frasīzak	*Fragūzā-
3	Zušag	Zušag	Zišak	Zišak	*Zūšā-
4	Fražūšag	Fražūšag	Frazišak	Frazišak	*Fražūšā-
5	Bīdag	Bīdag	Bitak	Bitak	*Bitā-
6	Sridag	Sridag	Θritak	[Ai]Θritak	*Θritā-
7	Ērag	Arīg	Airiiak	Airiiak	*Airiiā-
8	Gūzag	Wizag	Vīzak	Vīzak	*Gūzā-

The most remarkable feature of this narrative, which distinguishes it both from the short Avestan allusion to Manuš.ciθra-, son of Airiiāuua-,

<sup>53</sup> This reconstruction follows Éric Pirart, who generously distributed his paper titled "Pour de nouveaux fragments avestiques" (presented on March 23, 2017, at the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Corpus Avesticum in Berlin ("Editing Avestan Texts in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Problems and Perspectives") among the participants. Discussing the provenance of these names, he assumes that the first vowels are long (due to the confusion of long ī and ū in the Avestan script) in (numbers 1, 2 and 8) \*gūzā- and \*fragūzā- (from the root *guz* 'to hide'; Kellens 1995, p. 20; + preverb *fra*-; Bartholomae 1904, col. 485 [*gaoz*, OP *gaud*] 'verbergen'; Ir. \**gauz* 'to hide, conceal'; Cheung 2007, p. 177) and (numbers 3 and 4) \*zūšā- and \*frazūšā- (from the root *zuš* 'to approve', Kellens 1995, p. 69; + preverb *fra*-; Bartholomae 1904, col. 1656 [*zaoš*, OP *dauš*] 'Geschmack finden an'). In (numbers 5, 6, 7) \*bitā- ('second'); \*Θritā- ('third') and \*airiiā- ('Arian') the Pahlavi ending in 'k reflects the Avestan feminine ending 'ā-, especially in two syllabic words, such as 'ylk (*ērag*), for \*airiiā-.

and Ferdausi's version (with Manučēhr, son of Īraǰ's daughter), is the long line of daughters who all give birth to girls until the longed for male successor is generated (the eight fictional names cited above might have been taken, however, from lost passages or a lost passage of the Avesta). Although this genealogy is presumably a convenient construction seeking to fit into the calculation of the Zoroastrian world cycle mentioned above, the important point in an epic narrative is that even fabricated family ties would have to conform with Zoroastrian cultural, social and legal norms in order to be credible and convincing to both the narrators and the auditors of the tale. It would not have even occurred to the narrators, who strove to find a credible link between the generations, to construct an implausible genealogy based on a form of descent not known and practised in their own society. Descent based on the female line, as in the Frēdōn saga and in the genealogy of the revered Zarathustra, would be completely impossible in a purely agnatic society in which succession is the exclusive right of the males of a lineage. In this respect there is a significant hidden truth in the story of Frēdōn and his heirs (up to Zarathustra) in the Pahlavi sources that agrees fully with the concept of the descent group and legal practice in the Sasanian period, to which we will turn now.

As I have argued in another context dealing with Ardašīr's genealogy, the main feature of most of the divergent accounts of his descent, especially in his relationship to Sāsān, is the central role conveyed to Ardašīr's mother (who in Bd. 35.36 is Sāsān's daughter, providing the important blood link to the dynasty of Kayanian kings from whom Sāsān originates in the epic tale).<sup>54</sup> The significant role of the women in the Frēdōn saga fits in well with this material and can be explained perfectly within the framework of Sasanian family law and succession. In order to understand the connection it will however be necessary to repeat a few essentials of this branch of law, without going too far into details, since I have already described its characteristic features extensively in other contributions.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Macuch 2014.

<sup>55</sup> For an overview see Macuch 2005 and 2009, pp. 181-196; on different aspects of family law see the literature in the following footnotes.

The most prominent traits of the system are – besides allowing incestuous and temporary marriages<sup>56</sup> – its obsession with problems of descent and lineage on the one hand and the abundance of fictive family ties on the other. The law of succession and inheritance was formed in correspondence with the needs of the most influential entities of society, powerful descent groups belonging to the aristocracy and the Zoroastrian clergy, seeking to keep their vast property, accumulated across many generations, intact and to transfer it with a minimum of partition to the next generation.<sup>57</sup> It became incumbent on every affluent descent group with a certain amount of property at its disposal to secure its continuity even in the complete absence of a male heir. In the “ideal” case a *paterfamilias* or head of a household (*kadag-xwadāy*) would himself procreate sons and successors in a marriage concluded to this purpose ‘with full matrimonial rights’ (*pādxšāy-zanīh*)<sup>58</sup> and guardianship (*sālārīh*) over the wife (or wives). These were obliged to bear him legitimate children (*dādestān-pus* ‘son according to the law’ and *dādestān-duxt* ‘daughter according to the law’). Both legitimate sons and daughters were regarded as “successors” (*yōhē pasčāēta*) of the *paterfamilias* and were entitled to inheritance, but with an important difference: only the sons were direct successors of the *paterfamilias*, inheriting all his rights and duties as heir (*xwāstagdār*) and replacing him totally by assuming all his rights and duties in the descent group. In this respect Sasanian succession was definitely patrilineal, allowing only a male to become a man's final legal successor. However, if the head of a household did not leave a son on his demise, one of the women in the family of the deceased man took over as an ‘intermediary successor’ (called *ayōgēn*) with the obligation to procreate a son for the deceased man. The technical term *ayōgēn* ‘intermediary successor’ is used exclusively of women and designates either a man's *pādxšāy*-wife or his unmarried daughter or sister, who puts her reproductive capacities in the service of the deceased husband, father or brother. In order to procreate children the *ayōgēn* entered an ‘auxiliary marriage’

<sup>56</sup> On these two characteristic traits of Sasanian family law see Macuch 2006 and 2010.

<sup>57</sup> On the political and social implications of family law see Macuch 1995.

<sup>58</sup> On the marriage contract of this type of matrimony see Macuch 2007.

(called *čagar*) with either a relative or another Zoroastrian fellow-citizen. The wife remained legally the spouse of her first husband in *padixšāy*-wedlock despite the second *čagar*-marriage, which was concluded without guardianship of the husband and without any title to inheritance. The children from this second marriage, sons and daughters alike, were counted as the legitimate offspring of the first (*pādixšāy*)-husband. In the case of the daughter (or sister) acting as ‘intermediary successor’ a *fictive* incestuous (*xwēdōdah*)<sup>59</sup> marriage of the *pādixšāy* type was construed between daughter and father (or sister and brother) with the same obligation to enter an ‘auxiliary marriage’ (*čagar*) and procreate legitimate heirs for the deceased father or brother.<sup>60</sup> If the *ayōgēn*-daughter (or sister) gave birth to a son, he became the direct successor and heir of the deceased *paterfamilias*, his grandfather, entitled to inherit his estate, to replace him in the descent group and to carry out all the duties of the heir (*xwāstagdār*), such as family guardianship (*dūdag-sālārīh*) and ceremonies for the soul of the deceased (*nāmagānīh*). If she only bore a daughter, this daughter was in turn obliged to act as ‘intermediary successor’ of her grandfather with the same duty to procreate a son. The same applied to the next daughter who was born within this framework, who would have the duty to be ‘intermediary successor’ of her great-grandfather, and so on until a male successor was born. Theoretically the final successor and heir, who was always a male, could be separated by several generations of *ayōgēn*-daughters from his legal father, although in legal practice this would have been rather the exception than the rule.

Thus succession in Sasanian law was clearly patrilineal or agnatic, allowing only a legitimate son to replace the male head of a family or descent group, but it was combined with many cognatic elements, defining kinship by both male and female links. The *ayōgēn* women were crucial to the system, since they established a genetic or “blood” link between a man and his legal male successor despite the fact that the successor’s natural father would be another person (only in the absence

<sup>59</sup> For incestuous marriages in the context of family law see Macuch 2010.

<sup>60</sup> On the different types and the legal status of children see Macuch 2003.

of an *ayōgēn*-wife/daughter/sister would one of the other Sasanian strategies of secondary succession come into force<sup>61</sup>). This is not only the background of the list of females conveyed in the Frēdōn saga (and in Zarathustra's genealogy), but also one of the important ingredients of Ardašīr's constructed genealogy.<sup>62</sup> Not being a juridical text, we cannot expect legal terminology to be used in the context of an epic narrative, but even though the corresponding terms are not employed, the whole construction only makes sense within this framework. Without having to be explicitly explained, the text implicitly suggests the following: Ērēj's daughter (Frēdōn's granddaughter, who was kept in hiding and appropriately called Gūzag, 'the hidden one') has the duty to generate a male heir for her deceased father, who has left no son. As an *ayōgēn*-daughter she counts legally as the (*pādixšāy*) spouse of her father under his guardianship (only in this case would the children be regarded as the legitimate offspring of the father) and concludes a marriage of the auxiliary type (*čagar*) in order to conceive. As she only gives birth to a daughter (Fragūzag), the obligation to continue Ērēj's line is transferred to this daughter and to all other daughters born in sequence until a legal son is born (Manuš in the saga), Ērēj's male heir and legal successor, who continues the lineage up to Manuščihr, the king of Iran.

To conclude, the variations in the different versions of the Frēdōn saga in the course of its transmission as part of the Iranian epical tradition presumably reflect changed social and legal conditions. In the short Avestan entry (Yt. 13.131) Manuš.ciθra- is the immediate son (and successor) of Airiiāuua- and there is no mention of any intermediate successors or heirs, be it male or female. The Pahlavi tale, on the other hand, construes a long line of *ayōgēn* daughters, an element of the tale, which is not only completely acceptable from a legal and cultural point of view, but could well have even been a necessary ingredient of the story from a Zoroastrian perspective. According to the scheme worked out by Zoroastrian priests the third millennium of the "mixed state"

<sup>61</sup> On these strategies see overview in Macuch 2005 and 2009 with further references.

<sup>62</sup> Macuch 2014.



(*gumēzišn*) after the attack of Ahriman began with the rule of Frēdōn, which they calculated to have lasted for 500 years.<sup>63</sup> This long period up to the reign of Manuščihr had to be filled somehow and although finally a sequence of two (or three) male successors preceding him was included in the genealogy, only the long line of eight daughters would account for the immense transition period between the first two kings of this millennium (Frēdōn and Manuščihr) and also explain why Ērēš's murder was not avenged sooner. This construction makes perfect sense in a Zoroastrian context with the legal implications described above, but could hardly have been understood under conditions prevailing in the Muslim period, besides the fact that there was absolutely no need to keep to the millennium scheme (which was not understood by later Islamic historians anyway).<sup>64</sup> Hence the tale underwent another important change, in which the *ayōgēn*-daughters (and the other male heirs) were eliminated. In Ferdausi's version Manučēhr is Īraj's grandson by his daughter, which complies perfectly with the law of succession in Shi'ite law, giving precedence to a man's lineal descendants, be it male or female (in sharp contrast to Sunnite law, which gives priority to a man's male agnates).<sup>65</sup> But although the long line of daughters has disappeared in the Šāhnāme, there is also some continuity in this version, albeit adapted to changed conditions. The underlying idea that a daughter can and must continue the lineal issue of a man in absence of a son has remained an important ingredient of the narrative and agrees with the underlying concept of the family and descent group in both Sasanian and Shi'ite law.

<sup>63</sup> Bd. 33.3-4 and 36.7 (Pakzad 2005, pp. 362-363; 412); according to Yarshater 1983, pp. 383-385, the basic chronological scheme can be reconstructed as follows: the first millennium of the "mixed state" comprised the reign of the first kings from Gayōmard to Jamšēd; the second millennium the rule of Dahāk; the third began with Frēdōn (lasting 500 years) and ended with the conversion of Guštāsp.

<sup>64</sup> On the variations in the Islamic sources see Yarshater 1983, pp. 383-384.

<sup>65</sup> On the correspondences between the Sasanian and Shi'ite law of succession see Macuch 2017.

## Bibliography

- Agostini, Domenico. 2013. *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg. Un texte eschatologique zoroastrien*. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press.
- Amouzgar, Jaleh und Tafazzoli, Ahmad. 2000. *Le cinquième livre du Dēnkard*. Paris: Association pour l'avancement des études Iraniennes [Studia Iranica. Cahier 23].
- Anklesaria, Behramgore Tehmuras 1956. *Zand-ākāsīh. Iranian or Greater Bundahišn. Transliteration and Translation in English*. Bombay.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1904 (reprint 1961). *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Boyce, Mary. 1975. *A History of Zoroastrianism. Vol. I*. Leiden: E.J. Brill [Handbuch der Orientalistik. Achter Band Religion, erster Abschnitt].
- Cheung, Johnny 2007. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Christensen, Arthur. 1928. *Etudes sur le zoroastrisme de la Perse antique*. Copenhagen.
- Gignoux, Ph. and Tafazzoli, A. 1993. *Anthologie de Zādspram. Édition critique du texte pehlevi traduit et commenté*. Paris: Association pour l'avancement des études iraniennes [Studia Iranica. Cahier 13].
- Herodot 1984. *Neun Bücher der Geschichte. Nach der Übersetzung von Heinrich Stein*. Essen: Phaidon Verlag.
- Hintze, Almut. 1994. *Der Zamyād-Yašt*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag [Beiträge zur Iranistik 15].

- Jamasp-Asana, Jamaspji. 1897-1913. *The Pahlavi Texts. Vols. I and II*. Bombay: Fort Printing Press.
- Justi, Ferdinand. 1895 (/1963). *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Marburg: Druckerei Lokay (reprint Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung 1963).
- Kellens, Jean. 1995. *Liste du verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Khaleghi Motlagh, Djalal. 2012. *Women in the Shāhnāmah*. Ed. Nahid Pirnazar; translated by Brigitte Neuenschwander. Costa Mesa California: Mazda Publishers (German original title: *Die Frauen im Schahname*. Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag 1971).
- Lommel, Herman. 1927. *Die Yäšt's des Awesta*. Göttingen: Vandenhöeck & Ruprecht [Quellen der Religionsgeschichte 15].
- Macuch, Maria. 1995. "Herrschaftskonsolidierung und sasanidisches Familienrecht: zum Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat unter den Sasaniden". In Chr. Reck/P. Zieme (eds.) *Iran und Turfan: Beiträge Berliner Wissenschaftler, Werner Sundermann zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Iranica 2), 149–167.
- 2003. "Zoroastrian Principles and the Structure of Kinship in Sasanian Iran". In: C.G. Cereti/M. Maggi/E. Provasi (eds.) *Religious Themes and Texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli on the occasion of his 65th birthday on 6 December 2002*. Wiesbaden: Reichert 2003 (Beiträge zur Iranistik 24), 231–246.
- 2005. "Inheritance. i. Sasanian Period". In *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. XIII. New York, 125–131.
- 2006. "The Function of Temporary Marriage in the Context of Sasanian Family Law". In: A. Panaino, A. Piras (eds.) *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europaea held in Ravenna, October 6–11, 2003*. Vol. I: Ancient and Middle Iranian Studies. Milano: Edizioni Mimesis, 585–597.
- 2007. "The Pahlavi Marriage Contract in the Light of Sasanian Family Law". In: M. Macuch, M. Maggi, W. Sundermann (eds.) *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Iranica

- 13), 183–204.
- 2009. “Judicial and Legal System. iii. Sasanian Legal System”. In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* XV, New York, 181–196.
  - 2010. “Incestuous Marriage in the Context of Sasanian Family Law”. In: M. Macuch, D. Weber, D. Durkin-Meisterernst (eds.) *Ancient and Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the Sixth Europæan Conference of Iranian Studies of the Societas Iranologica Europæa* in Vienna, Sept. 19–22, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2010 (IRANICA 19), 133–148.
  - 2014. “Ardashir's Genealogy Revisited”. In: Parvaneh Pourshariati, Mohamad Tavakoli (eds.) *Iran Nameh. A Special Issue Honoring Jaleh Amouzgar*, vol. 29, 80–94.
  - 2014. “Türken in der zoroastrischen Literatur”. In: Ingeborg Hauenschild, Matthias Kappler, Barbara Kellner-Heinkele (eds.) *Eine hundertblättrige Tulpe – Bir šadbarg lāla. Festgabe für Claus Schönig*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 308–331.
  - 2017. “Descent and Inheritance in Zoroastrian and Shiite Law”. In: *Der Islam* 94 (2), pp. 322–335.
- Marquart, J. 1901. *Ērānšāhr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1979. *Iranisches Personennamenbuch. Band I. Die altranischen Namen*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Molé, Marijan. 1967. *La légende de Zoroastre selon les textes pehlevi*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Pakzad, Fazlollah. 2005. *Bundahišn. Zoroastriische Kosmogonie und Kosmologie. Band I. Kritische Edition*. Tehran [Ancient Iranian Studies Series 2].
- Parzinger, Hermann. 2004. *Die Skythen*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Pirart, Éric. (2017). “Pour de nouveaux fragments avestiques” (paper presented on March 23, 2017, at the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Corpus Avesticum in Berlin (“Editing Avestan Texts in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Problems and Perspectives”).
- Shayegan, M. Rahim. 2012. *Aspects of History and Epic in Ancient Iran. From Gaumāta to Wahnām* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London,

- England: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University.
- Utas, Bo 1983. "The Pahlavi Treatise *Avdēh u sahiḳēh ī Sakistān* or 'Wonders and Magnificence of Sistan'." In *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae XXVIII*, 259-267.
- Vevaina, Yuhan. 2015. "'The Ground Well Trodden But the Shah Not Found...': Orality and Textuality in the 'Book of Kings' and the Zoroastrian Mythoepic Tradition." In *Orality and Textuality in the Iranian World. Patterns of Interaction across the Centuries*. Ed. Julia Rubanovich, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 169-190.
- Wolff, Fritz. 1910 (/1960). *Avesta. Die heiligen Bücher der Parsen*. Strassburg: Verlag Karl J. Trübner. (reprint Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1960).
- 1935 (/1965). *Glossar zu Firdosis Schahname*. Berlin (reprint: Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1965).
- Yarshater, Ehsan. 1983. "Iranian National History". In *The Cambridge History of Iran. Volume 3(1). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*. Ed. Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 359-477.

## The Corpus of the Yašts and their Pahlavi Translations: Considering a Textual Lacuna

Antonio Panaino

It is well known that only very few of the Avestan *Yašts* still possess a corresponding Pahlavi version<sup>1</sup>, which in many cases is neither very ancient nor very good.<sup>2</sup> The Pahlavi version is, in fact, attested for the following texts:

the *Ohrmazd Yašt* (Yt. 1).<sup>3</sup>

the *Arwdahišt Yašt* (Yt. 3).

the two *Srōš Yašts*: the first, Yt. 11, i.e., the *Srōš Yašt Hāδōxt*,<sup>4</sup> comprising twenty-three stanzas in five *kardag*, is explicitly marked<sup>5</sup> (in the ms **F1** as taken from the *Hāδōxt Nask* (*māhe yasta srōš az naska hāδōxta bun*),<sup>6</sup> and was also referred to as *Srōš Yašt ī Mēh*, “the Greater *Srōš*

---

<sup>1</sup> Panaino 1992. Cf. also Hintze 2009: 46-62.

<sup>2</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Dr. E. Raffaelli (Toronto) and Prof. Dr. G. König (Berlin/Bochum) for their kind comments. I had the opportunity of reading König's last article (2015) on a closely related subject when my article was already in press, so that I have taken this contribution into consideration only in a very late phase of my work.

<sup>3</sup> In this case we possess not only the Pahlavi and Pāzand translations (see, e.g., the ms Dolgoruky [Salemman 1876: 520-541], which includes not only a Persian paraphrase but also a Sanskrit one: see Bharucha 1906: 19-23).

<sup>4</sup> Kreyenbroek 1985: 59-75. Cf. Dhabhar 1927: 23-24.

<sup>5</sup> Hintze 2014.

<sup>6</sup> See JamaspAsa 1991: 157. Cf. also König 2014a: 359a, n. 21.

*Yašt*”, at the time of ms E1<sup>7</sup> because it belongs to this prestigious *Nask* and *not* because of its length; formally, it embeds also the text of *Yasna* 56.<sup>8</sup> It is recited at all watches of the day.<sup>9</sup> The second hymn to Sraoša, the *Srōš Yašt ī Keh*, the “Lesser Hymn to Srōš” (*Yt.* 11a),<sup>10</sup> with its thirty-four stanzas is divided into thirteen *kardag* (plus, in the *recensio* of the *Yašts* and of the *Xwardag Abestāg* mss, the introductory and concluding formulas typical of the *Yašts*); it practically constitutes ch. 57, 0-34 of the *Yasna*,<sup>11</sup> and because of its importance in the *Yasna*-Liturgy is also called *Srōš Yašt ī yazišn*.<sup>12</sup> It is recited in the first night watch, the *Aiβisrūθrām Gāh*, and for this reason it was also denominated *Srōš Yašt ī sar ī šab* “*Srōš Yašt* of the beginning of the night”.<sup>13</sup>

the *Wahrām Yašt* (*Yt.* 14).

the minor *Hōm Yašt* (*Yt.* 20)<sup>14</sup>; but we must consider, although its transmission belongs to the line of the *Yasna*, also the great *Hōm Yašt* appearing as *Y.* 9-11.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 22.

<sup>8</sup> Kreyenbroek 1985: 70-75; see Kellens 2011: 63-73. Cf. Dhabhar 1927: 24-26. This hymn was also translated into Sanskrit (see Spiegel 1861: 239-249; Barucha 1906: 51-53 and 1910: 127-132; Dehghan 1982), although this version was written not by Nēryōsang, but by one of his probably not very skilled pupils. (see again Spiegel 1861: 12; Dehghan 1982: 22-23). It should also be remarked that the Sanskrit translation of *Yasna* 57, corresponding to *Yašt* 11, (cf. Dehghan 1982: 24-54, who follows Bharucha 1910: 127-132), certainly does not belong to Nēryōsangh, as already suggested by Spiegel (1861: 12), and now confirmed by Goldman (2019: 54). Very fittingly Goldman (2018: 51, n. 2) has also remarked that no extant manuscript has preserved a complete Sanskrit translation of the *Yasna*, while some codices stop just around the chapters dedicated to *Srōš*. In particular, **J3** extends to *Y.* 56, 5; **K6** to 56, 29; **K7** to 57, 34. Cf. already Spiegel 1861: 249). See also Bharucha 1910: ii-iv; Hintze 2012: 258-260, 271-272. In reality, as rightly remarked by Cantera (in the press), “Y56 is not a *Yašt*, but rather a collection of *sraōšō iḍa astu*-formulas”.

<sup>9</sup> Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 3, 22.

<sup>10</sup> Kreyenbroek 1985: 34-59. König (2012a: 357) offers some pertinent remarks about the ritual use of these texts; see Kellens 2011: 73-99.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also Dehghan 1982.

<sup>12</sup> Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 22.

<sup>13</sup> Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 3, 22.

<sup>14</sup> This text has also been translated into Sanskrit; see Bharucha 1906: 26.

<sup>15</sup> See, in particular, Josephson 1998; cf. Cantera Glera 1999.

the *Wanand Yašt* (Yt. 21).

With regard to the *Xwaršēd* and *Māh Yašts*, the texts edited under the classification of “Pahlavi versions” by Darmesteter<sup>16</sup> are, contrariwise,<sup>17</sup> only translations of the corresponding *Niyāyišns*, as I have shown<sup>18</sup> in other works.<sup>19</sup> In any case, the textual material preserved was produced very late and is probably the result of a back-translation from Persian as in the case of some similar texts discussed below.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Darmesteter 1883, II: 275-303.

<sup>17</sup> According to West (1892: 471), in *Sns* 12, 17 there might have formerly appeared a Pahlavi commentary of Yt. 6, 1, also attested in Yt. 1, 17 (cf. note 19 below).

<sup>18</sup> Panaino 1990b; 2012b. See also the independent remarks made by Skjærvø 2008: 4, n. 10.

<sup>19</sup> It is most probable, as also assumed by E. Raffaelli, that already in the collection of the *Yašts* included in the *Bayān Nask*, texts of other origin, i.e., texts presenting a style and a composition not strictly identical to that of the standard hymns (i.e., without the *aoxtō.namana yasna*-formula) were present. This would account for the statement repeated in many Persian *Rivāyats* concerning the presence in this *Nask* of only seventeen texts, of which presumably (see below) sixteen should be the *Yašts*. On the possibility that the last text was an appendix containing the five *Niyāyišns* and other minor texts, see note 73 below.

<sup>20</sup> Cantera 2004: 192-194. Cf. Skjærvø 2008: 4.



Our discussion presupposes basic knowledge of certain evidence convincingly put forth by Geldner already more than one century ago, when, describing the *Yašts* and the *Xwardag Abestāg*, he remarked:<sup>21</sup>

The Dīnkard (8, 15) gives the following short description of the Baḳān Yašt Nask (*i.e.*, the Nask of the Yashts addressed to the

<sup>21</sup> Geldner 1904b: 29-30, §17. Cf. Geldner 1904: 19-20, §17:

Der Dinkard (8, 15) gibt von dem *Baḳān-yašt-Nask* (d. h. dem Nask der Yashts an die *baya* oder Gottheiten) folgende kurze Beschreibung: »Der Baḳān Yasht enthält das Nähere, erstlich über die Verehrung des Ahuramazda, des höchsten unter den Baghas und zweitens über die Verehrung der Engel und anderer unsichtbarer und sichtbarer irdischer Wesen, von welchen auch die Namen der Tage kommen; auch über ihren Ruhm, ihre Macht, Triumph und ihre Wunder. Ausserdem über viele Engel, welche mit Namen bei ihrer Verehrung angerufen werden, und die ihnen schuldige Achtung und Unterwürfigkeit«. Schon WEST hat daraus den einleuchtenden Schluss gezogen, dass mit dieser Beschreibung die Yashts des Awesta gemeint seien und dass diese einen Teil des Baḳān Yasht bildeten, eine Vermutung, welche DARMESTER näher ausgeführt hat. Eine Bestätigung seiner Ansicht fand WEST in einem persischen Rivayet, wonach den *Baḳān Yašt* 16 besonders namhaft gemachte Yashts unserer Sammlung bildeten. Und mit Recht legt DARMESTER grosses Gewicht darauf, dass das älteste Yasht-Ms. F<sub>1</sub> noch eine Reminiscenz an die Zugehörigkeit zu diesem Nask bewahrt hat, sofern es nämlich vom 14. Yasht unserer Sammlung (dem Bahirām Yasht) bis zum 19. oder Zamyād Yasht mit jedem Yasht einen neuen Fargard beginnt. Die Zahl der Fargard stimmt aber nicht mit unserer Yashtzählung, sondern differiert stets um 3. In der Aufzählung des Rivayet fehlen von Yasht 1 — 19 die Yasht 2 — 4; die Reihenfolge ist dort die gewöhnliche, nur der Khurshēd Yasht steht am Ende. Setzt man denselben an seine richtige Stelle, so ergibt sich völlige Concordanz zwischen der Fargardzählung in F<sub>1</sub> und der Yashtzahl und es lässt sich die Anordnung des alten Baḳān Yasht genau reconstruieren (die in F<sub>1</sub> fehlende Fargardzählung in Klammern):

Jetzige Ordnung: 1 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19

Ordnung im Baḳān Yasht: (1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10) 11 23 13 14 15 16

Die im Baḳān-Yasht fehlenden Yasht 3-4 sind stellenweise in stark degenerierter Sprache verfasst, nicht minder aber auch der vorhandene erste Yasht. Der Hōm-Yasht (ausführlich in Yasna 9-11, ein Extract daraus in Yasht 20) würde danach im Baḳān-Yasht keine Stelle gehabt haben. Zu bemerken ist allerdings, dass die Angaben über die Fargardzahl desselben schwanken. Die Rivayets des Kāmāh Bahrah, des Narēmān Hōshang und des Barzū Qiyāmu-d-dīn geben dieselbe auf 17 an, ebenso der Pahlavi-Rivayet Dīn-Vidshirgārd. Aus dem *Hātōkht* Nask sind ferner entnommen der kleine Srōsh Yasht (Nr. 11), die angeblichen Yashts 21 und 22 bei Westergaard und der Āfringān Gahanbār, aus dem Vishtāsp-sāsto der Vishtāsp Yasht und der Afrīn Paighambar Zartusht (Yt. 23 bei Westergaard).

*baya* or divinities): — “The Bagān Yasht contains particulars, first, about the worship of Aūharmazd (sic!), the highest of the *Baghas*; and, secondly, of the worship of the angels and other invisible and visible worldly beings, out of whom are likewise the names of the days; also about their glory, power, triumph and marvelousness. Besides, also, many angels who are invoked by name at (the time of) their worship and the attention and obeisance due to them.” Already West has drawn from this the evident conclusion that in this description the Yashts of the Avesta are intended, and that these formed one part of the Baḵān Yasht, a conjecture which Darmesteter has worked out in greater detail. West found a confirmation of this view in a Persian Rivāyet, according to which 16 specially named Yashts of our collection composed the Baḵān Yašt. And Darmesteter rightly lays great stress on the fact that the oldest Yasht MS. F<sub>1</sub> has preserved a reminiscence of its having formerly belonged to this Nask in beginning with every Yasht a new fargard from the 14th Yasht of our collection (the *Bahirām Yasht*) to the 19th or *Zamyād Yasht*. The number of the fargards does not, however, agree with one reckoning, but differs continually by 3. In the numbering given to the Yashts in the Rivāyet, the hymns 2-4 are wanting in the Yashts 1-19; the order is there the usual one; only the Khurshēd Yasht stands at the end. When it is put in its proper place, the result is a complete agreement between the number of the fargards in F<sub>1</sub> and the number of the Yashts, and it becomes possible to reconstruct the arrangement of the Baḵān Yasht with exactness (the numbering of the fargard is wanting in F<sub>1</sub> being given in brackets). The present arrangement is: 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. The arrangement in the Baḵān Yasht: (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10), 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.

The Yashts 2-4, which are wanting in the Baḵān Yasht, are written in part in a very degenerate language; not less so, however, the extant first Yasht. The Hōm-Yasht (contained in full in Yasna 9-11, an extract of it in Yasht 20) could accordingly have had no place in the Baḵān Yasht. It is, however, to be remarked that

the statements regarding its fargard-number vary. The Rivāyets of Kāmāh Bahrah, Narēmān Hoshang and Barzū Qiyāmu-d-dīn give it as 17; so also the Pahlavi Rivāyet Dīn-Vijirgārd.

Further, from the Hātōkht Nask have been taken the small Srōsh Yasht (Nr. 11), the supposed Yashts 21 and 22 as given by Westergaard and the Āfrīngān Gahanbār; from the Vishtāsp-Sāsto, the Vishtāsp Yasht, and the Āfrīn Paighambar Zartusht (Yt. 23 in Westergaard).

Of all these texts in the Pahlavi version, only the *Srōš Yašt*—a text that has been thoroughly studied by Prof. Kreyenbroek, to whom this article is dedicated—can be considered as properly belonging to the group of the so-called “Great” *Yašts*, although the first of the two *Srōš* hymns (Yt. 11) properly derives from the *Hādōxt Nask*, while the second one belongs to the tradition of the *Yasna*.<sup>22</sup> In their turn, we must note that already the *Wahrām Yašt* (Yt. 14) presents some compositional problems (which are not without interest and pertinence),<sup>23</sup> while also the little *Hōm Yašt* (Yt. 20)<sup>24</sup> and the *Wanand Yašt* (Yt. 21)<sup>25</sup> probably did not appear at all in the original *Bagān Yašt Nask*,<sup>26</sup> where most of the Avestan hymnal literature was presumably preserved. In

<sup>22</sup> According to Josephson (1997: 163) the *Srōš Yašt* (= Y. 57), like the *Hōm Yašt* (Y. 9-11), should belong to the textual tradition of the *Bagān Yašt*, and only in later times would both texts have been inserted into the *Yasna*. This statement, which considers the history of the liturgy as dependent on the written Great Sasanian *Avesta*, is now completely untenable. The oral liturgies were much older than any written *recensio*, and their organization was not the fruit of a textual compilation, although in some cases, and only in later periods, the mss might have been used to enforce the correct organization of the ritual, its maintenance and the relative preservation of its contents. But this was a very late phenomenon that occurred after centuries of political decay in Zoroastrian tradition.

<sup>23</sup> See the fitting remarks advanced by König 2014b: 514-517. König (2015: 134-140) has recently discussed a very interesting *Transmissionsfehler* in the mss tradition of Yt. 14, 39, which turns out to be remarkably helpful in the reconstruction of the Indian line of textual transmission.

<sup>24</sup> See Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 26.

<sup>25</sup> See König 2012a: 384-385. Cf. Panaino 1987.

<sup>26</sup> A new approach to the study of the *Bagān Yašt Nask*, apart from the article by Skjærvø (1988), can be found in König 2012a; 2012b; 2014.

fact, the description of this *Nask* as given in the eighth book of the *Dēnkard* does not confirm their presence there.<sup>27</sup> Again, we can remark after the systematic study offered by Kanga,<sup>28</sup> but enormously developed and increased by Cantera,<sup>29</sup> that among all these translations, only those of the *Ohrmazd Yašt* (plus those of the two *Srōš Yašts*) can be considered *relatively* good and old, while the rest appear to be very late and present many grammatical and linguistic problems.<sup>30</sup> But we must also note that already in its Avestan version the present *Ohrmazd Yašt* is just a late and grammatically disturbed source,<sup>31</sup> and presents all the problems of a (post)-later Avestan text;<sup>32</sup> its Pahlavi version, at least until par. 23,<sup>33</sup> was edited in a reasonably good Pahlavi, although not of the same level and age of the older translation of texts like the Pahlavi *Yasna* and the *Widēwdād*. In this respect we absolutely share Cantera's concern<sup>34</sup> about Dhabhar's overly optimistic evaluation of its

<sup>27</sup> West 1892: 7. 34-35; *Dk.* VIII, 14, 1-5, according to Sanjana 1916, XV: 33 (text), 36 (translation). Cf. Darmesteter 1892, II: xxvii; Panaino 1989: 179; König 2012a: 359-364.

<sup>28</sup> 1941: iii-viii, *passim*. See in general also the contributions given by Klingenschmitt 1969 and 1978.

<sup>29</sup> Cantera 2004: 188-194, *passim*.

<sup>30</sup> Cantera (2004: 192) rightly insists on the pertinence of the glosses attested in the *Ohrmazd Yašt*, as in the case of Av. *sāstār*-, in order to establish a relative chronology; these glosses seem to depend on older sources preserved in the *Dēnkard* and the Pahlavi *Widēwdād*, so that it is reasonable to suppose that the material contained in the Pahlavi version of this *Yašt* is later than that of the *Widēwdād*. Cantera's idea is that the presence of large and detailed glosses and comments reflects an older attitude and tradition, while the introduction of wrong, unfitting or very brief glosses is testament to a later composition. See also Skjærvø 2008: 4, with some prudent comments.

<sup>31</sup> Panaino 2002, *passim*. We must note that according to West (1892: 470-471, n. 2), it is possible that a commentary to *Yt.* 1, 17 was contained in the Av.-Pahl. passage embedded in the *Wizirgerd ī Dēnīg* (ed. Peshotan 1848: 160, 161; better *Dēn ī Wizarkard*). Other remarks concerning a special commentary containing a passage belonging to one of the five following *Yašts*, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 18, may occur in the *Wizirgerd ī Dēnīg* 157-158. On the debate about the authenticity of this Pahlavi source, see Sheffield 2005.

<sup>32</sup> For the case of the *namāstotras* in *Yt.* 1 and 15, see Panaino 2002: 89-103.

<sup>33</sup> Cantera 2004: 188; see already Dhabhar 1927: 23.

<sup>34</sup> Cantera 2004: 188-194.

composition.<sup>35</sup>

We must also note that the Pahlavi *Arwdahišt Yašt* seems to be attested only in Indian mss,<sup>36</sup> and its present version is a late *Ruckübersetzung* from Persian (less probably from Pāzand),<sup>37</sup> while the linguistic value of the Pahlavi *Wahrām Yašt* seems even inferior. Again Cantera<sup>38</sup> has given a few examples of the bold accidents occurring in this text.<sup>39</sup> In this case too, the possibility that the present Pahlavi text<sup>40</sup> is nothing but a translation from a Persian or Pāzand version is more than reasonable,<sup>41</sup> while the Pahlavi translations of the *Hōm* and the *Wanand Yašts*, given their brevity, do not currently permit in-depth evaluation.

<sup>35</sup> Dhabhar 1924: 22.

<sup>36</sup> This is the impression I had after an examination of the extant mss of which I am aware, and based on the description given by Geldner in his *Prolegomena* to the *Avesta-Aufgabe*. Dhabhar (1927: 23) was the first to observe this fact. The mss he used (1927: 341) were **MR2**, **U2**, **3**, and **D**. The Indian scholar suggested that this Pahlavi translation would have been done after a Persian version (see 1927: 23-24).

<sup>37</sup> Kanga 1941: 30. For the pseudo-archaising re-translations in Pahlavi from Pāzand or New Persian texts, see de Jong 2003, Lazard 2003; very important is the balanced evaluation of the problems offered by Azarnouche 2014.

<sup>38</sup> 2004: 192-193.

<sup>39</sup> But see again the more detailed discussion by König 2012b.

<sup>40</sup> I thank Dr. Götz König for the following critical remarks concerning this subject: "I am unsure about the character of the PTr. of the *Yts* of the *XA*. Nēryōsang shows that a PTr of *Yt.* 1 + 11 existed at least in the early 1<sup>st</sup> millennium. Whether the 4 other PTrs of *Yts* are Re-Translations, as you assume, this is a hard question. I have edited *Yt.* 14 + *Yt.* 3 with its PTrs and NpTrs, and the results are ambiguous. Skjærvø's idea that these translations are old, but (orally) updated, is - at least as a general explanation - implausible: Why then [do] the translations of the *Niyāyišns* [seem to have] another and better preservation (especially for them we would expect terrible processes of updating)". (oral communication)

<sup>41</sup> Kanga 1941: 88.

Furthermore, the origin of these two brief texts already in their Avestan version is very obscure, and we can presume, as previously noted, that they were not at all attested in the original *Bagān Yašt Nask*.<sup>42</sup> In the case of the *Wanand Yašt*, we could also suppose that it was part of a longer text dedicated to the stars, and that it perhaps should have been appended to the *Tištar Yašt*, or to a larger composition concerning astral matters,<sup>43</sup> but these are only hypotheses.

The Pahlavi translations of the hymns previously mentioned all appear in the redaction of the *Zand ī Xwardag Abestāg*, or, for the particular cases of the *Srōš* and *Hōm Yašts*, also in the framework of the Pahlavi *Yasna*, although some of them, such as the *Ohrmazd Yašt*, could have also been transmitted in special mss centred on their texts (like the Avesta-Pāzand-Pahlavi ms ed. by Salemann),<sup>44</sup> but in this case they seem to represent the expression of a particular form of devotion (to the highest divinity, for example). Already West<sup>45</sup> assumed that an earlier Pahlavi version of this hymn should have existed in Nēryōsang's time, because he translated it into Sanskrit in his *Perāma-iasti-nāmakān*.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>42</sup> It is worth mentioning West's note (1892: 470, n. 1) about some additional and scattered references to this Nask:

The account of this Nask in Dk. VIII, though very short, is a fair description of the extant Yašts I-XX and their general character is also indicated by the name of the Nask, which means "the worship of the divinities". The extent of these Yašts may be estimated at about 22,000 words of Avesta text, and, from the Pahlavi versions of the few Yašts that still possess one, it may be calculated that about 44,000 words of Pahlavi version would have been required for the whole collection .

<sup>43</sup> See Kellens 1998: 508.

<sup>44</sup> Salemann 1876.

<sup>45</sup> West 1904, II: 87.

<sup>46</sup> See Bharucha 1906: v, vi. It should be also emphasized that the *Yašts* are not a literary type of text that knew particular favour in Zoroastrian Sanskrit; in the extant mss we find many times the *Ohrmazd Yašt* (also in Gujarati), the *Srōš Hāδōxt Yašt* (on this text in particular, see note 7 above), and the *Hōm Yašt*, while very doubtful are the references to the *Xwaršēd* and *Māh Yašts* (those attested being in general simply mutilated or abridged versions of the corresponding *Niyāyišns*; see Panaino 2012b). For the rest a more detailed analysis is required, and I am presently not in the position to state if other *Yašts* have been translated into Sanskrit. Certainly, the limited presence of these kinds of texts further supports the view that already in Nēryōsang's time the collection of the Pahlavi *Yašts* would have been very limited. Cf. also Baghbidi 2012.

It should also be noted that some *Yašts* that are preserved in the collection of the *Xwardag Abestāg* do not possess a Pahlavi translation: this is the case for *Yašts* 2, 4, 9 and 16,<sup>47</sup> which shows the importance and relative antiquity of this textual loss. And from the status of the sources we can affirm that no entire Avestan-Pahlavi collection of the *Bagān Yašt Nask*, in its bilingual edition, whatever may have been its actual and definitive composition, has been transmitted to modern times. In fact, the Pahlavi translations we possess, apart those transmitted through the Avesta-Pahlavi mss of the *Yasna*, just correspond to a collection of texts prepared for the *Zand ī Xwardag Abestāg* and are frequently of secondary derivation; some are simply re-translated from a Pāzand or a New Persian *Vorlage*. The fact that in the colophon of the ms **E1** (folia 487v-488v),<sup>48</sup> *Yašts* and *Bayān Yašts* are carefully distinguished, surely means that the texts belonging to the proper *Bayān Nask* collection are at least those six hymns (*Yašts* 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19) whose original *fargard*-numeration (as appearing in the *Nask* of derivation) can still be read in their headings not only in ms **E1**, but also in **F1**.<sup>49</sup> It is also very probable that apart from *Yašts* 2-4 and 20-21, the rest of the present collection was originally in the *Bayān Nask*, while the other five *Yašts*, i.e., 2-4 and 20-21—or six, if we include also the *Srōš Yašt Hāδōxt*—did not belong to it, but were extracted from other *Nasks* or, at least in their Avestan version, as we can prudently suspect, from other liturgies. This suggests that the original number of the *Yašts* was sixteen, although another tradition<sup>50</sup> states that there should have been seventeen. This could perhaps indicate that some scribes included both the *Srōš Yašts* in their computation, or that the last text of the collection was of another genre.<sup>51</sup>

Presently, there is no reason to doubt that all the surviving *Yašts*, whichever hymns were really included in the *Bagān Nask*, were edited

<sup>47</sup> König 2012a: 378-380, 382.

<sup>48</sup> See Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 1-2, 40-42.

<sup>49</sup> See Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 2.

<sup>50</sup> See again Kotwal & Hintze (2008: 2, and footnotes), who give a detailed description of the problem and of the data.

<sup>51</sup> See the further discussion here, in note 86.

in a double (Avesta-Pahlavi) version.<sup>52</sup> This should have been the standard procedure in the framework of the edition of the official Mazdean *Canon*, whose purpose was not specifically ritual or strictly liturgical, but mainly exegetical and theological. If a study of the contents of these texts was possible, as it surely was,<sup>53</sup> this activity would have been developed with respect to the bilingual version by those few scholars really interested in doctrinal researches. For the rest, the Avestan text, used as a memory aid in the daily, monthly or seasonal occasions, was learnt by heart<sup>54</sup> and recited in the course of its proper liturgies. We can also imagine that some priests were specialized in the recitation of these texts, whose insertion in the ritual can be partly reconstructed thanks to the introductory and closing formulas, which represented a juncture with the *Yasna*,<sup>55</sup> but this procedure needs to be better studied and investigated in order to be understood. For instance, Cantera has remarked that certain rituals might involve the intercalation of the *Yašts* as well, but the information at our disposal does not permit (at least currently)<sup>56</sup> a more precise reconstruction of this specific liturgy,<sup>57</sup> beyond what can be deduced from the frequent mention of the *Bayān Yašt*<sup>58</sup> liturgy in the *Nērangestān*.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore, we must observe that the data concerning the ritual performance of the hymns is really very minimal to the point of being embarrassing. The present debate, still open, about the controversial relation between the

---

<sup>52</sup> See Cantera 2004: 20; König 2012b: 496.

<sup>53</sup> Panaino 2012.

<sup>54</sup> Originally the Mazdean priests did not read during the ritual, because this procedure would have compromised the efficacy of the ceremony, although such a strict rule turned out to be unsustainable and the usage of mss for reading texts became current; see below.

<sup>55</sup> Darmesteter 1892, II: 332; Lommel 1927: 8-12.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. König 2015: 138-139.

<sup>57</sup> See also Kreyenbroek 2004; 2008: 254-56; Cantera 2009; König 2012a; Kellens 2012: 475.

<sup>58</sup> See Cantera 2013a: 104-105 with a proposal (in note 33) of reconstruction of a lost ceremony with eight intercalations of two *Yašts* in each division.

<sup>59</sup> Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 2003: 98-99 (N. 28, 41), 112-113 (N. 29, 5), 114-115 (N. 29, 10). Cf. again Kreyenbroek 2004; 2008. See also König 2012a: 356-358, *passim*.



Mazdean hemeronimy<sup>60</sup> and the list of the *Yašts* would be much more easily approached were we to have at our disposal a more complete conspectus of the liturgical calendar and its corresponding daily, monthly, and yearly performances (both solemn and normal).

Returning to the relation between the Avestan *Vorlage* and the Pahlavi versions of the hymns, it is possible to deduce, following a remark already put forth by B. N. Dhabhar,<sup>61</sup> that a Pahlavi version of *Yt.* 13, 106-107<sup>62</sup> as well as another quotation from stanza 97<sup>63</sup> of the same hymn have been preserved in the *Dēnkard*.<sup>64</sup> More precisely, we can observe:

- 1) that *Dk.* VII, 7, 12-13<sup>65</sup> embeds a quotation from the description of the Avestan hero Karsna (*Yt.* 13, 106-107)<sup>66</sup>;
- 2) that *Dk.* VII, 7, 6<sup>67</sup> echoes the contents of *Yt.* 13, 97 concerning the high priest Saēna;
- 3) and also that *Yt.* 19, 78-81,<sup>68</sup> 92-93<sup>69</sup> and stanza 11<sup>70</sup> more than resonate with *Dk.* VII, 4, 42-46,<sup>71</sup> VII, 11, 3<sup>72</sup> and VII, 8, 50,<sup>73</sup> respectively.

<sup>60</sup> See the discussion of the problem, already presented though not really resolved, by Belardi 1977.

<sup>61</sup> 1963: V.

<sup>62</sup> Malandra 1971: 92, 136, 214-215.

<sup>63</sup> Malandra 1971: 88, 132.

<sup>64</sup> See *Dk.* VII, 6, 11-12, according to the edition Sanjana 1915, XIV: 51-52 (text), 50 (translation) and note 8.

<sup>65</sup> See Molé 1967: 72, 73, 197 (where the Avestan passage is discussed in the light of the Pahlavi version).

<sup>66</sup> See now the detailed analysis offered by König 2012a: 388-391. König (2015: 142-143) offers a new detailed discussion of this passage.

<sup>67</sup> See Molé 1967: 70, 71; *Dk.* VII, 6, 5, according to the edition Sanjana 1915, XIV: 48-49 (text), 47 (translation) and note 10. See again König 2015: 140-141.

<sup>68</sup> Hintze 1994a: 337-345; 1994b: 35-36; Humbach & Ichaporia 1998: 54-55; 155-158.

<sup>69</sup> Hintze 1994a: 370-380; 1994b: 39; Humbach & Ichaporia 1998: 59-69, 165-169.

<sup>70</sup> Hintze 1994a: 109-117; 1994b: 15; Humbach & Ichaporia 1998: 30, 86-88.

<sup>71</sup> Molé 1967: 36, 37; *Dk.* VII, 3, 42-46, according to the edition Sanjana 1915, XIV: 15-16 (text), 13-14 (translation).

<sup>72</sup> Molé 1967: 36, 37; *Dk.* VII, 10, 2, according to the edition Sanjana 1915, XIV: 98 (text), 94 (translation).

<sup>73</sup> Molé 1967: 88, 89; *Dk.* VII, 7, 50, according to the edition Sanjana 1915, XIV: 80 (text), 48-49 (translation).

Recently, König<sup>74</sup> has discussed the textual relations between *Dk.* VII, 10, 15-16 and *Yt.* 132, 142 and between *Dk.* VII, 7, 7.8 and *Yt.* 13, 115. The general result of his careful investigation convincingly shows that it is highly possible<sup>75</sup> that “Dk 7 nicht direkt aus einer alten PÜ *Yt* 13 zitiert, sondern vielmehr aus einem auf *Yt* 13 sich beziehenden Kommentartext stammt, der sich zu *Yt* 13 in etwa verhält wie die *Gāthā*-Kommentare in *Dk* 9 zu den *Gāthās*”.<sup>76</sup>

Dhabhar has noted again that we could deduce from the *Zand ī Wahman Yasn* (ch. 7, 24) a direct reference to the existence of a *Zand* of *Hordād* and *Aštād Yašts*,<sup>77</sup> apart, of course, from that of *Wahman*. Various scattered Pahlavi references to the myth of *Tištār* in the *Bundahišn*<sup>78</sup> and in other Pahlavi texts show that the mythological cycle of this god, as well as those of other Mazdean *yazadān*, were well known also in a literary form, presumably based on a “resonance” of an earlier Pahlavi version of their Avestan *Vorlage*.

From all these facts we can reasonably figure the following conclusions. In spite of the existence of a standard official or canonical bilingual edition of the *Bagān Yašt Nask*, the liturgical importance of these texts was preserved by a limited group of ritual priests who still exercised their current memory of these hymns and who probably possessed ritual manuscripts in a *sāde* form as a support and/or help for the textual memorization. The scholarly interest of these priests<sup>79</sup> was limited, and this might explain the definitive loss of the earlier Pahlavi versions of the single *Yašts* as it was attested in the original *Bagān Yašt Nask*. In fact, if we just presume that at the time of the redaction of the *Dēnkard* (the full edition of) the *Bagān Yašt Nask* had already disappeared, it would be impossible to explain the origin of the Avestan text of the *Yašts* not preserved into the line of the *Xwardag*

<sup>74</sup> 2015: 143-146.

<sup>75</sup> König prudently writes “möglich”.

<sup>76</sup> König 2015: 147.

<sup>77</sup> 1963: V. Cf. Cereti 1995: 145, 164, 211.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. König 2015: 139.

<sup>79</sup> See the reference to the role of the *hērbeds* emphasized by König 2012a: 364-365.

*Abestāg*. More probably, it was only a *sāde recensio* of this text that was preserved,<sup>80</sup> reflecting the ceremonial care of some priests less involved (or just less interested) in scholarly activities. This could also justify the scarcity of details concerning the *Bagān Yašt Nask* in the *Dēnkard* VIII, although we must wonder why the compiler of the *Dēnkard* was so ignorant about a collection of texts that should have had importance. How was it possible that the main contents of hymns such as the *Mihr*, *Tištār*, *Frawardīn*, *Xwarrah*, etc. had been forgotten? In this respect I think that our “romantic” evaluation of the “literary taste” of ancient sources should be strongly reduced and we should take into consideration the presence of a very different sensibility among ancient people who certainly had another set of values. At the moment I limit my observation to the evidence of the facts without proposing any particularly strong inference from them. Perhaps competence regarding these texts was restricted to certain priests, and their contents, which appear so interesting to us, became less significant for the post-Sasanian clergy, for whom they maintained only a liturgical pertinence. We must also consider that at a certain moment, as happened for the *Widēwdād* in the Long Liturgy,<sup>81</sup> the whole ritual *corpus* was no longer recited entirely by heart; contrariwise, it may have become possible (and necessary), against tradition, to read large parts of the liturgies with the help of the manuscripts.

A few of the hymns had particular popularity as devotional texts, as in the case of the *Ohrmazd Yašt*; the two *Srōš Yašts* (here the presence of a psychopompous divinity, essential in funeral ceremonies [for example, the three nights ritual after death], may explain its particular interest and preservation); and some hymns used in magical incantations against demons,<sup>82</sup> like the *Arwdahišt Yašt* (but we should also recall the *Wanand Yašt* that was adopted against the *xrafstars*).<sup>83</sup> The prestige of Wahrām, as warrior divinity, once particularly close to the military and aristocratic framework but later strongly connected

<sup>80</sup> See also König 2012a: 361.

<sup>81</sup> Cantera 2014, *passim*.

<sup>82</sup> See also Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 2; König 2014a: 386.

<sup>83</sup> Panaino 1987.

with the ritual of the fire-enthronement and understood as a warlike anti-demoniac divinity, might explain the endurance of the *Wahrām Yašt* and the interest in the re-creation of its Pahlavi version.<sup>84</sup> Very fittingly König<sup>85</sup> has emphasized the importance of a remark made by Jackson,<sup>86</sup> who, during a visit to the Fire Temple of Yazd, heard by chance the recitation of the *Wahrām Yašt*. In any case, the absence of complete Pahlavi translations of hymns of the importance of the *Frawahrān*, *Mihr*, *Tištar*, *Ābān*, etc. compels us to deduce that the surviving translations did not reflect the work of theologians only interested in a scholarly exegetical dimension, but that the choice of the texts satisfied many expectations including those of a lower sacerdotal level, in which devotional interests were more significant than high theological and exegetical ones.

Probably the Avestan text of most of the *Yašts* more or less still reflects the *Vorlage* attested in the *Bagān Yašt Nask* (obviously for the texts that presumably derive from this line), whereas it does not derive necessarily and exclusively from this tradition. In fact, the survival of the *Yašts* is due to the ritual endurance on behalf of the few priests who preserved them in rituals, even if at a certain point this preservation suffered a severe decadence, albeit one not so bad as to result in the definitive loss of the *Yašts*. The need to preserve these texts should have produced the composition of later mss collections, like F<sub>1</sub> (CE 1591),<sup>87</sup> which, in spite of its high quality, encapsulated different traditions, among which we can recognize at least two lines: hymns deriving from the *Bagān Yašt Nask*, which were copied in their *sāde* version, and texts assimilated to the “genre” of the *Yašts*, which had other origins, as partly already suggested by Geldner and other scholars, but whose choice reflected the sensibility of post-Sasanian priests and scribes.<sup>88</sup> In any case, the Zoroastrian priests who copied the hymns in the so-

<sup>84</sup> On this translation see now König 2012b.

<sup>85</sup> 2012a: 357-358, n. 14.

<sup>86</sup> 1906: 366-368.

<sup>87</sup> See the introduction by Hintze (1991: xi-xii) to the facsimile edition of this manuscript (JamaspAsa 1991).

<sup>88</sup> Cf. now also König 2012a: 370-372.

called *Yašt*-mss had a liturgical interest, and their sacerdotal target was that of preserving texts considered of particular relevance, whether or not they had a good comprehension of their contents. In the case of the line of the *Xwardag Abestāg* codices, where only three *Yašts* with a Pahlavi translation (1, 11, 14) belong to the tradition of the *Bayān Nask*, while the origin of the other three ones accompanied by a Pahlavi translation (*Yašts* 3, 20, 21) is unclear,<sup>89</sup> we have to do with texts chosen according to different patterns and reasons, as I tried to explain above. In this case the presence of a translation, sometimes very late and incorrect, reflects the desire to offer an interpretation whose authority remains circumspect, since the long passage of time was (re)-founded on the archaizing redaction of a Pseudo-original Pahlavi version, which was in reality based on an already sloppy translation in Persian. The role played by the Zoroastrian calendar in the process of the self-recognition and self-distinction of the various Mazdean communities, in particular during the diaspora, can provide one of the main reasons for the creation of combined mss like **Pt1** (CE 1625), where the text of the *Xwardag Abestāg* included also all the *Yašts*, taking those hymns missing in the tradition of the *Xwardag Abestāg* from good, pure *Yašt*-mss such as **F1**. In any case, it is evident that when a Pahlavi translation of reasonably good quality accompanied the Avestan text of a *Yašt*, as in the case of *Yašt* 1 and *Yašts* 11 and 11a, we have to do with a genuine and relatively old tradition, confirmed by the date of the manuscripts. This is the case of **T12** (= **AK**), the oldest codex (CE 1552) that, as noted by König,<sup>90</sup> contains the Pahlavi translations of *Yašt* 1 and *Yašt* 11a (while **T15**, in spite of the fact that it presents an *Āšīrwād*-dating 1398, might be much later). Thus, we can share the conclusions proposed by Cantera,<sup>91</sup> who assumes with reference to the history of the Pahlavi

<sup>89</sup> See König 2012a: 382.

<sup>90</sup> 2012a: 382, n. 160.

<sup>91</sup> See Cantera 2015. Cantera, *ibid.*, prudently distinguishes three chronological levels for the stratigraphy of the Pahlavi translations of the Avestan sources. The one that is most interesting for the present discussion is the second: “(2) new translations of texts partially integrated in the great Avesta, but with a definitive writing around the 9th century, probably in order to adapt the translation of the ritual Avesta to the Avestan text (such as the *Yasna*, *Ohrmazd Yašt*, *Sirōzag*, and *Āfrīnagān*)”.

*Avesta* that:

The situation is more complicated for the *Xwardag Abestāg* and the *Yašts*. The different translations were added to the Avestan texts probably between the 12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century. Some translations were taken from the “great” *Avesta* (*Ohrmazd Yašt*, *Sīrōzag*, *Āfrīnagān*) or from later translations (*Hušbām*, *Niyāyišn*), while others had to be newly composed at this very late date.

To this sound reconstruction I would just like to add as a sort of warning an important remark already advanced by Skjærvø<sup>92</sup> about the role of orality, not only in the transmission of the Avestan text, something strongly emphasized as never before by Cantera himself in his book of 2014,<sup>93</sup> but also in the composition of the Pahlavi translations. In fact, the translators’ activity was based not exclusively on written sources, but also, and at least in part, on the continuity of an oral tradition that should have accompanied the Avestan *Vorlage* and sometimes its Pahlavi version too. The hypothesis suggested by Skjærvø,<sup>94</sup> that the presence of late forms “may simply mean that the translations of these particular texts were more updated by the time of the version we have was written down”, deserves to be discussed shortly. In my opinion, this conclusion is supported by what Josephson observed in the Pahlavi version of the great *Hōm Yašt*,<sup>95</sup> where she noted not only that the Pahlavi translation showed a sort of dualism, in which a correct interpretation alternated with mistranslations, etc., but also that Nēryōsang’s Sanskrit version “shows examples of correct translations which appear mistranslated in the extant MSS containing the Phl. version”. This is not only and/or exclusively evidence of the existence of another Pahlavi version still at Nēryōsang’s disposal, because the translator’s insight might also be due to his strong competence, textual and oral, with respect to the text and

---

<sup>92</sup> 2008: 16–17.

<sup>93</sup> 2014: 273–360.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> 1997: 164.

its liturgy. For these reasons Skjærvø is probably right when he states: “In the case of the *Xorde Avesta* this makes sense, since it contains what may have been more ‘popular’ texts, different from the *Videvdad* and *Yasna*”.<sup>96</sup> These arguments are certainly persuasive, although their relevance in the special case of the *Yašts* remains uncertain, because of the state of preservation of the original *recensio* of the Sasanian *Bayān Nask*. In fact, it is not impossible that a good priest and scribe well trained and with a strong oral background also in the “hymnological” tradition, both Avestan and Pahlavi, was able to interfere with the *textus traditus* – a phenomenon I can admit in the case of the great *Hōm Yašt* or in some parts of the *Ohrmazd* of the two *Srōš Yašts*. But with regard to the other extant Pahlavi versions of the *Yašts*, we should suppose a remarkably pertinent endurance of the oral competence despite the complete loss of the earlier Pahlavi written *Vorlage*, a solution not so easily postulated after the evaluation of the poor state of these texts, whose current use was partly magic and whose liturgical adoption less important. When the written tradition of the Pahlavi text maintained its consistence and authority, a continuous evolution of the texts due to sometimes pejorative, sometimes ameliorative additions and changes was possible, in a continuous dialectical process, but when the tradition and the transmission were interrupted or seriously damaged, the oral competence, although always active, could not work miracles.

---

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

It is a pity that the earlier and complete version of the *Bayān Nask* with its full apparatus of translations and glosses did not survive, and that only fragments of its *Zand* have left their mark<sup>97</sup> in the surviving Pahlavi material.<sup>98</sup>

This evidence shows that the hymnological literature in the period of the Mazdean decadence sparked very limited interest in its interpretation, and that its exegesis was considered less important than a material preservation of the *sāde* texts, evidence that in any case confirms the relevance of the *Yašts* in the rituals, although we are not in a position to reconstruct their precise and systematic liturgical distribution.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>97</sup> Cf. also König 2012a: 386-387.

<sup>98</sup> I take the opportunity to quote a long remark on this subject sent to me by my colleague in Berlin, Prof. Dr. Götz König:

The loss of an exegetical *Bayān* transmission could be due to the fact that exegetical Mss. were always a minority. When the *Bayān*-Service has died out is unclear, but for the *Nērangestān* it is still a central ceremony, in the lists of the *Riwāyats* on the existing Av. materials it has disappeared. I assume that after the surprising ritual disappearance of the *Bayān* there was also no interest anymore to save the exegetical transmission. Already Mihraban writes for Chahil that no exegetical *Bayān* was at hand. The liturgical transmission – probably once better attested – was not completely lost. I would agree: **F1** and then all the Tamam XA are successors of a liturgical tradition. It is surprising that **E1** or **Pt1** do not start as copies of **F1** (*Yt.* 1-3, 1-4) – should it be by accident that all the *Amaša Spəntas Yašts* are copied from another source (see: the content of **Jm4**)? –; and it is also surprising that **F1** begins with the *Bayān* tradition just at the point of *Yt.* 14 (why not before?). (At the moment there is no good explanation for that).

<sup>99</sup> See again König 2012a: 364-368, *passim*.



The materials contained in the *Bayān Nask*, i.e., not only the *Yašts*, as has been shown,<sup>100</sup> but probably also the *Niyāyišns* (which partly derive from the hymns for their textual composition),<sup>101</sup> plus other minor texts (such as, perhaps, the *Sih-rōzags*),<sup>102</sup> have been partly saved thanks to codices such as **F1** or **E1** and **J10** (which seems to have

<sup>100</sup> König 2014a: 372-387.

<sup>101</sup> There is a certain hesitation about the actual presence of the *Niyāyišns* in this *Nask*. In my opinion, it is not impossible at all that they were probably considered as a single collection of texts, and not just as five separate invocations, although in the ritual they were performed separately at different moments and on different days. If this was so, they might correspond to the unclear seventeenth text of the *Bayān Nask* (West 1892: 426, 431, 436: Persian *Rivāyats* of Kāmā Bōhrā [AY 896], par. 15, of Narīmān Hōšang [AY 855], par. 16, and of Dastūr Barzū Qiyām-ud-Dīn [AY 1019], par. 16; see also West 1892: 444-445, par. 15; cf. Kotwal & Hintze 2008: 2). The same tradition is also attested in the later Pahlavi text known as *Dēn ī Wizarkard* (West 426, 431, 436, 444-445; Dhabhar 1963: iv-v). In any case, the invocation to the divinities worshipped in the *Niyāyišns* was a very old custom, and the organisation of this collection of prayers might satisfy a number of ritual needs, in particular at a lower religious level. In fact, they are clearly mentioned in the *Yasna* 1.16 (cf. de Jong 1997: 96-103, in particular 102), but their importance was already emphasized in the list of Persian divinities offered by Herodotus (cf. Boyce 1996: 18). The same sequence of worshipped divinities becomes very remarkable in the framework of the late antique Iranian and Mazdean iconology, where these gods appear in many artistic representations, as recently emphasized by Grenet (2015: 214-215). It is also interesting to note that in post-Sasanian times, according to the *Saddar Bundahišn* 98, 1 (West 1885: 359-360), it was necessary for all the members of the Good Religion to learn Avestan characters and to read them in the presence of their masters and priests, so that no error should appear in the *Niyāyišns* and the *Yašts*. The mention of these two collections seems to support the hypothesis that both of them were transmitted together. It is also probable that with the inclusion of the *Niyāyišns* in the *Bayān Nask*, the practical creation of a prayer book like the *Xwardag Abestāg* became much more advantageous; in fact, the presence of texts of the genre of the *Niyāyišns* alongside ritual texts like *Gāh*, *Āfrīnagān* and the two *Sih-Rōzags*, was very useful and pertinent for liturgical reasons. Thus, the attraction of some *Yašts* into this kind of material might also find a simple explanation. Furthermore, we must note, as Prof. E. Raffaelli reminds me, that in a Pahlavi *Rewāyat* quoted by West (1892: xlv) and referred to as **B29** (ms. of Bombay University), the *Bayān Yašt Nask* not only had sixteen hymns, but also the last of them was the *Xwaršēd* one. This strange disposition, instead of the common one at the sixth place, can perhaps imply that the collection presented at the end a sort of juncture, in which the final *Yašt* to the Sun was followed by the five *Niyāyišns*, whose first one was exactly that one dedicated again to the Sun.

<sup>102</sup> See now Raffaelli 2013.

preserved an earlier and independent *Vorlage* of the hymnological sources) that derive from a ritual *recensio* of the texts, and certainly not from the *Avesta Ausgabe*, as König also establishes in the conclusions of a study dedicated to the same subject.<sup>103</sup> This demonstrates also that as beautiful and good a ms as F1 continues a tradition connected with the liturgical dimension, and confirms that this line of transmission had its own dignity, based on a *sāde* version of the main *Ausgabe*, which should have been full or ritual directions.<sup>104</sup> In this framework, the *Xwardag Abestāg* cannot be the mythical text composed by a fourth-century priest named Adurbad Māraspandān<sup>105</sup> for the secular, laic Mazdeans, but it seems to work as a *Breviarium*, containing a number of daily or monthly prayers of particular force, and of which different variants probably circulated. In any case, its links with the earlier edition of the *Bayān Nask* of the *Avesta Ausgabe* are very far, and in the case of the Pahlavi versions of the *Yašts* very intricate, because the *Yašts*, which did not belong to the *Bayān*, were probably of different provenance, in the sense that they were extracted from different *Nasks*.

Finally, it would be useful to remark that the rarity of Sanskrit translations of the *Yašts*, presently limited to three cases, the *Ohrmazd*, *Srōš Hāδōxt* and *Hōm Yašt*, inevitably confirms the absence of a more or less living Pahlavi tradition of the so-called hymnological literature.<sup>106</sup> Sanskrit translations were essentially based on Pahlavi versions, and it is not by chance that two out of three of the extant Sanskrit *Yašts* belong just to the line of transmission of the *Yasna* and of the *Hāδōxt Nask*, while only one, the *Ohrmazd Yašt*, can be attributed to that of the *Bayān Nask*.<sup>107</sup> Thus, also thanks to this additional observation,

<sup>103</sup> 2012a: 387

<sup>104</sup> See also Panaino 2012, *passim*.

<sup>105</sup> See König 2012a: 373.

<sup>106</sup> This is a literary category that probably needs a theoretical revision.

<sup>107</sup> In particular König (2015: 131-132) writes: "[...] wir annehmen dürfen, daß Sanskrit-Übersetzungen (= SÜ) von Avestatexten auf der Vorlage von PÜs angefertigt wurden, ist zu schließen, daß um Indien des frühen 2. Jt. nur PÜs derjenigen *Yašts* bekannt waren, von denen wir auch eine SÜ kennen. Zwar glaubte Bharucha daß Nériosangh einmal all jene Texte des Xorde Avesta (= XA), welche in PÜ bekannt sind, in seinem *Perāma Iasti* ins Sanskrit übersetzt hatte; [...]"

it is practically self-evident to conclude that very few *Yāšts* had still survived with their “original” *Zand* and the relative translation, at least among the Parsis, although the present conspectus of the mss does not seem to offer promising material from the Iranian side, at least until new discoveries are made, for which we can now hope given the significant amount of new Avestan mss of the Long Liturgy<sup>108</sup> that have finally entered the scholarly debate of the twenty-first century.

---

<sup>108</sup> See now Cantera 2015, *passim*.

## Bibliography

- Azarnouche, S. 2014. Deux modes de transmission dans la tradition scripturaire zoroastrienne: interdépendance du pehlevi et du pāzand. *Eurasian Studies* 12 (*Lecteurs et copistes dans les traditions manuscrites iraniennes, indiennes et centrasiatiques. Scribes and readers in Iranian, Indian and Central Asian manuscript traditions*). Textes réunis par/ed. by N. Balbir – M. Szuppe). 81-99.
- Baghbidi, R. H. 2012. Parsi Sanskrit. In J. S. Klein & K. Yoshida (eds.), *Indic across the millennia: From the Rigveda to Modern Indo-Aryan. 14<sup>th</sup> World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, Japan, September 1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>, 2009, Proceedings of the Linguistic Section*, 1-8. Bremen.
- Belardi, W. 1977. *Studi Mithraici e Mazdei* (BRLF 6). Roma, Istituto di Glottologia.
- Bharucha, Sh. D. 1906. *Collected Sanskrit writings of the Parsis. Old translations of Avestâ and Pahlavi-Pâzend books as well as other original compositions with various readings and notes, collated, corrected and edited. Part I. Khorda-Avestâ-Arthah*. Bombay.
- Bharucha, Sh. D. 1910. *Collected Sanskrit writings of the Parsis. Old translations of Avestâ and Pahlavi-Pâzend books as well as other original compositions with various readings and notes, collated, corrected and edited. Part II. Ijisi (Yasna)*. Bombay.
- Boyce, M. 1996. On the orthodoxy of Sasanian Zoroastrianism. *BSOAS* 59. 11-28.
- Cantera Glera, A. 1999. Rev. of *The Pahlavi translation technique as illustrated by Hōm Yašt* by Judith Josephson. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 62(2). 364-366.

- Cantera, A. 2004. *Studien zur Pahlavi-Übersetzung des Avesta*. (Iranica 7). Wiesbaden.
- Cantera, A. 2009. Die Staota Yesniia der textuellen ratu des Visparad. In E. Pirart & X. Tremblay (eds.), *Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran. Études indo-iraniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'occasion de son 65<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*, 17-26. Wiesbaden: Carl Winter Verlag.
- Cantera, A. 2014. *Vers une édition de la liturgie longue zoroastrienne : pensées et travaux préliminaires* (Studia Iranica – Cahier 51). Paris: Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes.
- Cantera, A. 2015. Avesta ii. Middle Persian translations. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/avesta-02-middle-persian-translations> (9 March, 2015).
- Cantera, A. (in the press) The Long Liturgy: its structure and position within the Avestan ritual system. In *Aux sources des liturgies indo-iraniennes. Liège 9-10 juin 2016*. Ed. by Ph. Swennen. Liège.
- Cereti, C. G. 1995. *The Zand ī Wahman Yasn: a Zoroastrian apocalypse* (Serie Orientale Roma 75). Rome.
- Darmesteter, J. 1883. *Études iraniennes*. 2 Tomes. Paris.
- Dehghan, K. 1982. *Der Awesta-Text Srōš Yašt (Yasna 57) mit Pahlavi- und Sanskritübersetzung* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 11, N.F.). München.
- Dhabhar, B. N. 1927. *Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk* (Pahlavi Text Series 3). Bombay.
- Dhabhar, B. N. 1933). *The Persian Rivayats of Hormazyar Framarz and others*. Bombay.
- Dhabhar, B. N. 1963. *Translation of Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk*. Bombay.
- Dehghan, K. 1982. *Der Awesta-Text Srōš Yašt (Yasna 57) mit Pahlavi- und Sanskritübersetzung* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft. Beihefte, Neue Folge 10). München.
- Geldner, K. F. 1904a. Awestalitteratur. In A. Kuhn & W. Geiger (eds.), *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*. Zweiter Band, 1-74. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner (Nachdruck: Berlin & New York: 1974).
- Geldner, K. F. 1904b. Avesta Literature. In *Avesta, Pahlavi, and Ancient Persian studies in honour of the late Shams-ul-Ulama Dastur Peshotani Behramji Sanjana*, 1-82. Strassburg.

- Goldman, L. (2018) *The Sanskrit Yasna Manuscript S1*. Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section two, South Asia. Corpus Avesticum 32/1. Leiden – Boston.
- Grenet, Fr. 2015. Zoroastrianism among the Kushans. In H. Falk (ed.), *Kushan histories. Literary sources and selected papers from a symposium held at Berlin, December 5th to 7th, 2013*. 203-229. Bremen.
- Hintze, A. 1991. Remarks on the spelling conventions in F1. In K. M. JamaspAsa (ed.), *The Avesta codex F1 (Niyāyišns and Yašts)*. Facsimile edition, xv-xx. Wiesbaden.
- Hintze, A. 1994a. *Der Zamyād-Yašt. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Beiträge zur Iranistik 15). Wiesbaden.
- Hintze, A. 1994b. *Zamyād-Yašt. Text, translation, glossary* (Iranische Texte 7). Wiesbaden.
- Hintze, A. 2009. Avestan literature. In R. E. Emmerick & M. Macuch (eds.), *The literature of pre-Islamic Iran. Companion volume i to a history of Persian literature* (A History of Persian Literature), 1-71. London.
- Hintze, A. 2012 Manuscripts of the Yasna and Yasna ī Rapithwin. In A. Cantera (ed.), *The Transmission of the Avesta*. (Iranica 20), 244-278.
- Hintze, A. 2014. Yašts. In E. Yarhater (ed.), *Encyclopædia Iranica*. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/yashts>. (23 September, 2014).
- Humbach, H. & P. R. Ichaporia. 1998. *Zamyād-Yašt. Yasht 19 of the Younger Avesta. Text, translation, commentary*. Wiesbaden.
- JamaspAsa, K. M. 1991. *The Avesta codex F1 (Niyāyišns and Yašts)*. Facsimile edition. Wiesbaden.
- Jackson, A. V. W. 1906. *Persia, past and present: A book of travel and research, with more than two hundred illustrations and a map*. New York.
- Jong, A. de. 1997. *Traditions of the Magi. Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin literature*. Leiden, New York & Cologne.
- Jong, A. de. 2003. Pāzand and “retranscribed” Pahlavi: On the philology and history of late Zoroastrian literature. In L. Paul (ed.), *Persian origins – Early Judæo-Persian and the emergence of New Persian. Collected papers of the symposium, Göttingen 1999* (Iranica 6), 67-77. Wiesbaden.

- Josephson, J. 1998. *The Pahlavi translation technique as illustrated by Hōm Yašt* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Iranica Upsaliensia 2). Uppsala.
- Kanga, M. F. 1941. *Pahlavi version of the Yašts translated for the first time into English with copious notes and an introduction*. Bombay.
- Kellens, J. 2011. *Études avestiques et mazdéennes*, vol. 4 (Persika 16). Paris.
- Kellens, J. 2012. Le panthéon mazdéen: dieux qui survivent et dieux qui naissent. In *Cours et travaux du Collège de France. Résumés 2010-2011. Annuaire 111<sup>e</sup> année*, 471-488. Paris: Collège de France.
- Klingenschmitt, G. 1969. Die Pahlavi-Version des Avesta. In Wolfgang Voigt (ed.), *XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 27. Juli 1968 in Würzburg. Vorträge* (ZDMG, Supplement 1, 3), 993-997. Wiesbaden.
- Klingenschmitt, G. 1978. Der Beitrag der Pahlavi-Literatur zur Interpretation des Avesta. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 37. 93-107.
- König, G. 2012a. Das Nask *Bayān* und das *Xorde Avesta*. In A. Cantera (ed.), *The transmission of the Avesta* (Iranica 20), 355-394. Wiesbaden.
- König, G. 2012b. The Pahlavi translation of *Yašt* 14. In A. Cantera (ed.) *The transmission of the Avesta* (Iranica 20), 495-518. Wiesbaden.
- König, G. 2013. Das Herabsingen der Götter. Zur Struktur der Sammlung der avestischen *Yašts* (ZDMG) 153. 505-510.
- König, G. 2015. Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der *Yašts*: Reste der exegetischen Traditionen. Die Pahlavi-Übersetzungen von Yt 13 in Dk 7. In A. Cantera & J. Ferrer-Losilla (eds.), *aṭciṭ bā nāmō haōmāi. Homenaje a Éric Pirart en su 65<sup>o</sup> aniversario* (Estudios Iranios y Turanios 2). 131-149. Girona.
- Kotwal, F. M. & Hintze, A. 2008. *The Khorda Avesta and Yašt Codex E 1. Facsimile Edition*. (Iranica 16). Wiesbaden.
- Kotwal, F. M. & Kreyenbroek, Ph. G. 2003. *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān*. Volume II: *Nērangestān, Fragard 2* (Studia Iranica. Cahier 30). Paris.
- Kreyenbroek, Ph. G. 1985. *Sraoša in the Zoroastrian Tradition*. Leiden.

- Kreyenbroek, Ph. G. 2004. Ritual and rituals in the *Nērangestān*. In M. Stausberg (ed.), *Zoroastrian ritual in context*, 317-31. Leiden.
- Kreyenbroek, Ph. G. 2008. The term *Bagān Yasn* and the function of the *Yašts* in the Zoroastrian ritual. In M. Jaafari-Dehaghi (ed.), *One for the Earth: Prof. Dr. Mahyar Nawabi, Memorial Volume*, 81-94. Tehran: Centre for the Great Islamic Encyclopaedia. (Repr. in Kreyenbroek 2013: 251-259).
- Kreyenbroek, Ph. G. 2013. *Teachers and teachings in the Good Religion: Opera Minora on Zoroastrianism*. (K. Rezanian [ed.], *Studies in Oriental Religions* 68). Wiesbaden.
- Lazard, G. 2013. Du pehlvi au persan: diachronie ou diatopie? In L. Paul (ed.), *Persian origins – Early Judaeo-Persian and the emergence of New Persian. Collected papers of the symposium, Göttingen 1999* (*Iranica* 6), 95-102. Wiesbaden.
- Lommel, H. 1927. *Die Yäšt's des Avesta übersetzt und eingeleitet* (Quellen der Religionsgeschichte 15.6). Göttingen.
- Malandra, W. W. 1971. *The Fravaši Yašt. Introduction, text, translation and commentary*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- Molé, M. 1967. *La légende de Zoroastre selon les textes pehlevi* (Travaux de l'Institut d'Études Iraniques de l'Université de Paris III, 3). Paris.
- Peshotan, M. S. 1848. *Daftar-ī vicirkart dēnīg (Vazarkard dīnī)*. Bombay.
- Panaino, A. 1987. L'inno avestico a Vanant. *ATTI DEL SODALIZIO GLOTTOLOGICO MILANESE* 28 (1989). 21-30.
- Panaino, A. 1989. Gli *Yašt* dell'Avesta: metodi e prospettive. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* 30 [1992]. 159-184.
- Panaino, A. 1993. L'innologia avestica. In *L'inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico. Atti di un colloquio, Napoli 21 – 24 ottobre 1991* (*AION, Sezione Filologico-Letteraria* XIII, 1991), 107-123. Rome.
- Panaino, A. 2012a. The age of the Avestan canon and the origins of the ritual written texts. In A. Cantera (ed.), *The transmission of the Avesta* (*Iranica* 20), 70-97. Wiesbaden.
- Panaino, A. 2012b. The *Niyāyišns* corpus and its relationship with the *Yašts*: the case of *Yašt* 6 and 7. *Iranian Studies* 45(2). 261-273.
- Raffaelli, E. 2013. *The Sīh-Rōzag in Zoroastrianism: A textual and*



- historico-religious analysis* (Iranian Studies 20). London & New York.
- Salemann, C. 1876. Über eine Parsenhandschrift der Kaiserlichen Oeffentlichen Bibliothek zu St. Petersburg. In *Travaux de la troisième session du Congrès international des orientalistes* vol. ii, 491-587. St. Petersburg & Leiden.
- Sanjana, D. P. 1915. *The Dīnkard. The original Pahlavi text of the latter part of Book VII. The same transliterated in Roman characters, translations of the Pahlavi text into the English and Gujarati languages with full annotations, and a glossary of select words*. Vol. XIV, *Containing the Pahlavi Zarathushtra-Nāmag. Part II*.
- Sanjana, D. P. 1916. *The Dīnkard. The original Pahlavi text of the first part of Book VIII, with its transliteration in roman characters, translations into the English and Gujarati with annotations, and a glossary of select words*, vol. xv, book viii (Contents of the Avesta Nasks. Part I).
- Skjærvø, P. O. 1988. Bagān Nask. In E. Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. iii, fasc. 4, 406.
- Skjærvø, P. O. 2008. Review of A. Cantera, *Studien zur Pahlavi-Übersetzung des Avesta*. (Iranica, vol. 7), Wiesbaden 2004. *Kratylos. Kritisches Berichts- und Rezensionsorgan für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* (Jahrgang 53). 1-20.
- Spiegel, Fr. 1861. *Neriosenghs Sanskrit-Uebersetzung des Yaçna herausgegeben und erläutert*. Leipzig.
- West, W. E. 1885. *Pahlavi Texts III: Dīnâ-î Maīnôg-î Khirad, Šikand-Gūmānīk Vigār, Sad Dar*. (SBE 24). Oxford (repr. Delhi, 1965).
- West, W. E. 1892. *Pahlavi Texts IV: Contents of the Nasks*. (SBE 37). Oxford (reprint: Delhi, 1965).
- West, W. E. 1904. *Pahlavi Literature. Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, Zweiter Band, 75-129. Herausgegeben von A. Kuhn & W. Geiger. Strassburg (Nachdruck: Berlin & New York 1974).

## **Caspian Calendar Names and their Etymologies**

Ludwig Paul & Jonas Elbers

In the Caspian region of northern Iran, as in many other regions of Iran, a rich variety of local cultures exists that reveal themselves in customs, social practices, agriculture, dialect(s), etc. Of great historical importance are the local Caspian calendars that can be traced back to the Young Avestan calendar system of pre-Islamic Iran. These Caspian calendars have remained widespread up to the present time, even if since the twentieth century (or starting even earlier) their usage has gradually declined, and they have been increasingly assimilated to the official Iranian calendar. The various Caspian calendars are closely related to each other and are bound to their local dialects through their calendar terminology, especially their month names. They are now endangered not only because their former agricultural, social, and other related functions have decreased, but also because the Caspian dialects that provide their terminology are on the decline.

The historical roots and evolution of the Caspian calendars, their subdivisions and structural properties, will be dealt with in a separate article.<sup>1</sup> The aim of the present article, which is based on an MA thesis by Jonas Elbers, is to present the linguistic material of the Caspian month names, and to give a first analysis of their etymologies. The linguistic material for the present article is drawn from a large

---

<sup>1</sup> Elbers, in preparation; for Iranian calendar systems in general, see Elbers 2017.

number of sources, mostly in Persian, and often from ethnographic descriptions of single villages' local calendars. The reliability of some of these descriptions is doubtful, and they have to be interpreted as primary sources. For the month names as such, given the sheer number of identical or similar month names from different sources, there is no problem of veracity.<sup>2</sup> The oldest sources for Caspian month names go back only to the nineteenth century<sup>3</sup>; there is accordingly a relative lack of historical depth in the sources. Works in "Western" languages that have dealt with Caspian calendars so far are scarce, and only two recent works shall be mentioned here, Cristoforetti 2000 and Borjani 2013.<sup>4</sup>

The following overview should give an impression of the variety of month names that occur in Caspian calendars, and of a selection of phonetic sub-varieties (some of which are possibly due to unattentive notation by non-linguists). Nouns in (parentheses) indicate varieties that occur seldom. The division into six (or possibly five) Caspian sub-areas will be explained in Elbers (in prep.) Each name is given here without the word *mā* (or *mo*) "month" that usually follows it (e.g., usually, the first Māzandarānī month is called *Fardīne mā*, etc.). Each name is also quoted without the vowel -e (or -ə) that often connects the month name to the word *mā*, and that is not part of the month name, although in some sources, or by some speakers, it may be understood as such.

<sup>2</sup> Representing the many Persian sources, and also the difficulties inherent in them, only Hūmand 1996 shall be mentioned here. A more comprehensive list of the sources, and their critique and interpretation, will be given in Elbers (in prep.).

<sup>3</sup> The oldest source known to me is the *Neṣāb-e Ṭabarī* by Amīr Timūr Qāğār (1848 C. E.)."

<sup>4</sup> The *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. iv, has a long, multi-authored article on Iranian calendars, including modern calendars (658-677), but it provides only a very brief account of Caspian ones (677) (Panaino 1990b).

	Young Av.	(official)	Māzandarānī	Gāleši	Gīlakī	Ṭāleqānī	Sangesarī	Aftarī
1	frauuāšīnaṃ	farvardīn	fardīn (siyā, nōrz)	tan šūr	nourūz (tanšūre)	nūrūj qasar	siyou, siyā	siyā
2	ašahe vahištahe	ordībehešt	korč, kerč	korč	kūrč, korč	korč	kūrč, naron	korča
3	hauruuatātō	xordād	hare (xare)	xor	ar(y)e	herā, xorā	ouriyā	hare
4	tištriiehe	tūr	tūr	tūr	tūr	tūr	tūr	tūr
5	amərətātō	mordād	melār (mordāl)	mərdāl	mərdāl, mordāl	mərdāl	mərdāl, mordāl	mərdāl
6	xšaθrahe vairiehe	šahrivar	šerrīn (šarīr)	šarar, šervīn	šerīr	šərə, šərar	šarvar, šarrar	šarivar
7	miθrahe	mehr	mihr	(a)mūr	amūr	(a)mūr	miron	mūr
8	āpam	ābān	ūn (aw, oul)	avval, ūn	āval, avəl	avəl, on	āvən	oun
9	āθrō	āzar	ark (siyā)	seəə, ark	siyā (sowā)	siyā	mas	harek
10	daθušō	dey	de(y)	də	dey(ā), diyā	deyā	de	dey
11	varjəuš mananḥō	bahman	vahman (varfan)	varfən, vahman (vahn)	varfan(a)	varpen, vahman	gujū	vamen
12	spəntaiā ārmatōiš	esfand	nūr, nourūz (fardīn, ‘eyd, espandār)	nourūz	espindār, esfandār (nourūz)	espandār, norj, nourūz	nousāl	pītek

It is important to note that this schedule serves to compare the Caspian month names, but does not represent the position of the months in the year. To the contrary, most Caspian year cycles have moved forward during the last centuries as compared with the Iranian civic calendars. The official Iranian *Nourūz* (1 Farvardīn) occurs in the second half of the eighth month (*Ūne mā*, etc.), during the epagominae (which follow the eighth month in the Caspian calendars!), or at the beginning of the ninth month (*Arke mā*, etc.) in the Caspian calendars (for more detail, see Elbers in prep.).

The first thing to note about the month names is that etymological equivalents of almost all Young Avestan month names that have been preserved in the Iranian official civic calendar are still found in the Caspian calendars. The only name to have been fully dropped out of the system, and replaced with another, non-Avestan one in all available sources is *Ordibehešt* (through *Korč*, etc.). Some names have been replaced in many but not all regions (e.g., *Āzar*, whose etymological equivalent [*Ark*, *Harək*] is found in Māzandarān, and in Aftar), some have been dispersed over more than one month (e.g., equivalents of *Farvardīn* are found not only in the first, but also in the last line), and others seem to have remained very stable (e.g., *Tīr*). Most names, however, show at least some phonetic variation.

The non-Avestan month names, which likely represent later additions to the system, are either widespread (e.g., *sīyā*, occurring in many regions; see the first and ninth lines above) or restricted to certain areas (e.g., *nəron*, *mas*, *guḡū* and *nousāl* in Sangesarī). Because of these four names, Sangesarī takes a special position among the Caspian calendar systems.

In the following, some interesting etymological features of the Caspian month names are highlighted.

### Among the Avestan names

- *Fardīn*: the syllable -var- has been elided, like -va- in forms like *Šarīr*. It is interesting to note that shortened *Šarīr* occurs also in the *Šāhnāme* (besides *Šahrīvar*), as does *Farvadīn* (without -r-),

besides *Farvardīn*.

- *Hare/Xare*, etc. are the shortened outcomes of *Hauruuatātō*. The anlaut variation of h-/x-/ø- seems to be widespread, and unpredictable, in Caspian dialects. *Arye* and *Ouriyā* show a reflex of the first intervocalic -t- (> -d- > -y-) of *Hauruuatātō*.
- *Mordāl*: The basic form, with vocalic variations like *Merdāl*, etc., has been dissimilated from *\*Mordād*. Māzandarānī *Melāre* is a metathesis from *\*Merāl* < *\*Merdāl*.
- *Mīr* shows the development of *\*θr* > *\*hr* > *r* that is typical for NW-Iranian languages; see also *Šarīr* (above) and *Arke* (below). The A- of *Amīr* seems to be a popular etymological adaptation to Np.-Arab. *amīr* “prince”.
- Forms like *Āvən*, *Ūn* (< *\*Āwn*), etc. are regular developments from *\*āpām*; *av(v)əl* and seems to be a popular etymological adaptation (from *\*āvən* > *\*avən*) to Np.-Arab. *avval* “first”, given that the New Year's Eve sometimes fell within this month.
- *Ark/Harek* is the regular development from *\*āθra-kā(na)-*, with *\*θr* > *r* as in *Mīr* and *Šarīr* (v.s.), and whence also the Old Armenian month name *Ahekani* (Schmitt 1985: 95). The h- of Aftarī *harek* seems to be secondary. The Np. form *Āzar* derives regularly from *\*ādar* < *\*ātara-* (cf. Parthian/MP *Ādur*), i.e., from the same etymon (*ātara-* ~ *āθra-*).
- *De(y)* has the variations *Deyā* and *Dīyā* (in Gilakī, Ṭāleqānī) that are probably emulating phonetically the immediately preceding month name *Sīyā*.
- The variations *Varfan* (etc.) have been explained, also in local sources, as a popular etymology meaning “month in which no snow came” (*varf-na-mā*, see Cristoforetti 2007: 43f.); this seems neither phonetically nor semantically very plausible. An alternative explanation could be that it comes from the name of the twentieth day of the Zoroastrian month, Av. *vərəθrayna-* (MP *Vahrām*, Np. *Bahrām*) through a NW form *\*varθrān* > *\*varfrān*.

#### Among the non-Avestan names:

- *Sīyā*: “Black month” is not likely to be the original meaning of this

month name. The etymology remains unclear; a connection with the Bactrian month name *sīwan* (of Semitic origin, Sims-Williams & de Blois 1996: 156f.) is improbable. Was the name perhaps derived from the mythological *Sīyāh*<sup>5</sup> *Gāleš*, patron of the shepherds (Asatryan 2002: 83)?

- *Nōrz*, *Nūrūj*, *Norj*, etc.: These various forms of the New Year's Eve festivity's name have been transferred to a month name of various positions in various Caspian regions. The *Ṭāleqānī* forms with -j represent the expected NW-Iranian outcome of \*-č̌; the forms with -z must be Persian loans, probably of a later date.
- *Korče* (etc.) is the most enigmatic of all Caspian month names. Possible lexical meanings of the word, like "healthy" (*Ṭāleqānī*) or "short" (*Sangesarī*), don't help for understanding the naming of this month, nor does the similar Old Armenian month name (of unknown etymology) *k'aloc'*.
- *Sangesarī Nəron* corresponds to MP *anagrān*, the name of the thirtieth day of the month<sup>6</sup>; the months' last day has obviously been transferred to the month's name.
- Sang. *Mas (mo)* = "big (month)".
- Sang. *Gujū*: unknown meaning and etymology, a connection to the old toponym *Kojū* of the *Kojūr* region, to where the *Sangesarī*'s pastures extended is improbable.
- Sang. *Nousāl* corresponds to the name of the first Old Armenian month *Nawasardi*, and to that of the first Sogdian month *Nausarδič̌*. The change of -l < \*-rd makes it look like a Persian loanword, but *Nousāl* does not seem to be a calendar term in any known form of Middle or New Persian.
- *Pītek* is the *Aftarī* term for the epagominae, i.e., the five (monthless) days (Np. *panjak*) to be added to the 12 x 30 = 360 days of the year, which has been transferred to denote the last *Aftarī* month.

<sup>5</sup> *Sīyā* occurs also in other Iranian calendar contexts, e.g. *sīyāh bahār* for the period of 16-26 Esfand in *Lālezār/Kermān* (Krasnowolska 1998: 52).

<sup>6</sup> MP *anagrān* (from *anagr* "infinite") also denotes the Zoroastrian "Infinite Light".

<sup>7</sup> For this name in another calendar system, see also de Blois/Sims-Williams 1996: 159.

To summarize, the etymological study of the Caspian month names shows that the calendar system of North Iran must have been quite homogeneous over a long time, probably since Sasanian until pre-modern periods. The region of Semnan belongs to the Caspian calendar system although its dialects differ considerably from Caspian dialects like Gilaki or Mazandarani. The Sangesari month names show peculiarities as compared to other Caspian regions, but remain clearly within the range of the Caspian calendar system. From the city of Semnan itself, whose dialect is different from those of the region (Sangesar, Aftar, etc.), no local calendar data have been documented so far.

Expectedly, the Caspian month names show typical NW-Iranian phonetic developments like \*θr > (\*hr >) r. The Caspian month names are therefore similar to the Parthian ones (Panaino 1990a: 666), but not derived directly from them; see the Pth. month name *p'xwn* (~ Ābān). Persian has exerted a major influence on the Caspian dialects, and thus also on their calendar terminologies; cf. forms like *nūr*z, *nourū*z.

The occurrence of the Caspian month name *Fardīn* in the Šāhnāme is remarkable. The Iranian national epic abounds in NW-Iranian loanwords (see Lentz 1926), because it was largely based on epic traditions that originated in NW-Iran. The NW-Iranian language or dialect that exerted the greatest influence on Persian was likely not Parthian itself, however, but rather a group of NW-Iranian dialects that may be called “Parthoid”.



## Bibliography

- Asatrian, Garnik. 2002. The lord of cattle in Gilan. *Iran and the Caucasus* 6(1-2). 75-85.
- Borjian, Habib. 2013. The Caspian dialect of Kujur in the central Alborz. *Iran* 51. 235-246.
- Cristoforetti, Simone. 2000. *Forme "neopersiane" del calendario "zoroastriano" tra Iran e Transoxiana*. S. l.: Grafiche Biesse.
- Cristoforetti, Simone. 2007. The "Hall of the Ambassadors" painting in the frame of the calendrical systems of the Iranian world. In Matteo Compareti & Simone Cristoforetti (eds.), *The Chinese scene at Afrāsyāb and the Iranian calendar*, 33-71. Venezia: Cafoscarina.
- Elbers, Jonas. The Caspian calendars. (in preparation).
- Elbers, Jonas. 2017. Iranische Kalendersysteme. In Ludwig Paul (ed.), *Handbuch der Iranistik*, Bd. 2, Wiesbaden: Reichert. 109-115.
- Hūmand, Naşrollāh. 1375. *Gāhşomāri-ye bāstāni-ye mardomān-e Māzandarān va Gilān*. S. l. [1996].
- Krasnowolska, Anna. 1998. *Some key figures of Iranian calendar mythology (winter and spring)*. Kraków.
- Lentz, Wolfgang. 1926. Die nordiranischen Elemente in der neupersischen Literatursprache bei Firdosi. *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 4. 251-316.
- Panaino, Antonio. 1990a. Calendars. i. Pre-Islamic calendars. *Encyclopaedia Iranica* IV. 658-668.
- Panaino, Antonio. 1990b. Calendars. iv. Other modern calendars. *Encyclopaedia Iranica* IV. 675-677.

- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1985. Zu den alten armenischen Monatsnamen. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 6. 91-100.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas & François de Blois. 1996. The Bactrian calendar. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 10. 149-165.



## Mithra and Mercurius: Two Pictures of Divine Agency in the Death of Julian<sup>1</sup>

Jenny Rose

This brief note compares two bas-relief depictions, which this author encountered in radically different contexts in the summer of 2015. The two reliefs present the same historic event - the death of the Roman Emperor Julian (r. 361-363), which occurred during the battle of Samarra against the Sasanian king, Shapur II (r. 309-379). A well-preserved investiture relief at Tāq-e Bostān in Iran's Kermanshah province shows the emperor under the feet of both a Sasanian king (usually identified as Ardashir II, r. 379-383) and Ahura Mazda.<sup>2</sup> On the left of the relief, a radiate-haloed Mithra holds the *barsom* in both hands and stands on an open lotus flower (Fig.1). Julian's demise is also illustrated in a stone roof boss in the medieval cloister of Norwich Cathedral. The scene is the last in a series of four bosses, which provide a narrative of the event, attributing the death of Julian to the intercession of St. Basil of Caesarea, the intervention of the Virgin Mary, and the posthumous action of the warrior saint Mercurius.

---

<sup>1</sup> This topic was partly stimulated through personal discussions with Philip Kreyenbroek concerning Mithraic elements at the site of Char Situn, near Duhok in Iraqi Kurdistan.

<sup>2</sup> Some scholars identify the figure on the right as Shapur II; see Shahbazi 1985: 184-85. Soudavar accepts this identification, but maintains that the central figure is Ahura Mazda (Soudavar 2003: 52).

In later “pagan” and Christian written accounts of the death of Julian, the armed horseman who fatally wounded Julian is not positively identified. This mystery allows for the death to have occurred at the hands of a Persian aided by Ahura Mazda and the *yazatas*, or, as in Syriac and Byzantine accounts, through the action of an avenging Christian saint.



Fig. 1. Investiture Relief, Tāq-e Bostān, Iran © Jenny Rose

The Sasanian rock relief at Tāq-e Bostān displays an obvious correlation with earlier reliefs at Bishapur illustrating the defeat and death of the Roman emperor Gordian III (r. 238-244) during the rule of Shapur I (r. c. 240-270), under whose horse's hooves the emperor lies. Shapur's *res gestae* states that Gordian was killed in battle against Sasanian troops at Misikhe<sup>3</sup> and that the Roman army was destroyed, but Roman accounts vary as to the place and circumstances of Gordian's death. Julian was the only other Roman emperor after Gordian to perish as a result of warfare with the Sasanians: this, and the fact that the deceased figure underfoot in the Tāq-e Bostān scene bears Julian's

<sup>3</sup> Frye 1984: 398.

distinctive beard and physique, along with the diadem, indicates that it can only be Julian.<sup>4</sup> Although there is no Sasanian narrative of the death of Julian apart from this scene, the implication of the relief is that he was utterly humiliated and defeated during his campaign against the Persians, due to the superiority of both the Sasanian king and army, whose victories were aided by Ahura Mazda. The fact that both Ahura Mazda and the king trample the emperor underfoot recalls the early Sasanian relief of the investiture of Ardashir I at Naqsh-e Rostam, where the hooves of Ahura Mazda's horse crush the snake-headed Ahriman, while Ardashir's horse tramples the last Parthian king. In a similar vein, the Tāq-e Bostān depiction celebrates the triumph, not only of Persia over Rome, but of a wider cosmic victory over an evil adversary who had brought chaos to the region.<sup>5</sup>

### *Mithra*

The relief at Tāq-e Bostān presents the only extant image of Mithra on a Sasanian monument, and is the only representation in which the *yazata* is attested holding the *barsom* (Fig. 2). It also marks the first time that another divine being appears in a Sasanian investiture scene along with Ahura Mazda. This inclusion of Mithra in the context of a royal investiture evokes the *yazata*'s identification as one who protects the *xʷarənah*, the “divine fortune or glory” bestowed on a ruler – and, by extension, on Eranshahr—by Ahura Mazda (Yt. 19. 35). It has been suggested that the lotus upon which Mithra stands could symbolize the *xʷarənah* protected by the waters.<sup>6</sup> The appearance of Mithra as “assistant” *yazata* to Ahura Mazda at the moment of the bestowal of *xʷarənah* through the diadem of rule suggests the superiority of Persian polity and religion over all others, particularly the Romans. A persuasive theory in support of this reading is that the incorporation of Mithra, an Iranian *yazata* intimately connected with the sun, comprises a deliberate counterpoint to the defeated Roman emperor's

<sup>4</sup> Hollard 2010: 157; Nicholson 1983: 177.

<sup>5</sup> Hollard: Ibid. [page number?]

<sup>6</sup> Soudavar 2013: 54–5. Cf. Yt. 19.51.





Fig. 2. Mithra, Investiture Relief, Tāq-e Bostān, Iran © Jenny Rose

reverence for and reliance on Sol-Mithra.<sup>7</sup> Julian's promotion of *Sol invictus* as patron of the Roman army under his command would have appeared to the Persians as a challenge to the supremacy of their own solar divinity, Mithra.<sup>8</sup> Julian's defeat and death would, therefore, have been considered a victory for the Iranian Mithra.

In his writings as emperor, specifically in the *Caesars* and the hymn *To King Helios*, Julian referred to Mithra (as Mithras) by name only a couple of times. The context of these references is evidence of Julian's personal interest in the god, but scholarly opinion is divided as to the extent of his involvement with Roman Mithraic cult.<sup>9</sup>

Another possible reading of the scene at Tāq-e Bostān is that Mithra, as *yazata* of the contract, is recognized as presiding over the peace treaty made between Shapur II and Julian's immediate successor, Jovian (r. 363-364), which resulted in embarrassing territorial losses for the Romans.<sup>10</sup> The treaty involved Roman withdrawal from their five provinces to the east of the Tigris, and from claims to Armenia, in exchange for the safe passage of the Roman army out of Iranian territory. From this perspective, the relief may be understood to constitute not only a commemoration of Sasanian victory but also a warning against future incursions by the Romans.

Although later Iranians were unaware of the import of the iconography of the bearded figure with rayed nimbus and *barsom*, the imposing image was seized on as a model for nineteenth-century depictions of Zarathushtra, who has a radiate halo of light and holds a staff or scepter.

---

<sup>7</sup> Hollard 2010: 148.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.: 150.

<sup>9</sup> Smith 1995: 124-132; Hollard 2010: 149.

<sup>10</sup> Azarpay 1982: 186. In the few months of his rule, Jovian reversed his predecessor's edicts against Christians and persecuted those who continued to worship "pagan" gods.



### *Mercurius*

Roman sources, both non-Christian and Christian, describe how Julian was wounded during a skirmish and died a few hours later. Some of these sources state that the perpetrator was a Persian soldier, or a mercenary fighting on the Sasanian side,<sup>11</sup> or even a Saracen from Julian's own army<sup>12</sup>; others claim that it was a Christian member of Julian's army, who took issue with the emperor's devotion to the many gods of Athens and Rome, and with his discrimination against the religion espoused and imposed by his predecessor (and uncle), Constantine. From a contemporary fourth-century Christian perspective, Julian was an apostate; Byzantine texts and later iconography present Julian's death as divine punishment for this apostasy. A legend that developed in relation to Basil, the Greek Bishop of Caesarea from 365-379, who had been a fellow student of Julian in Athens, revolves around the former's agency in the death of the latter.

The Syriac *Julian Romance*, dating to the early sixth century, introduces St. Mercurius as the divine executioner who, at the behest of Basil of Caesarea, brings an end to Julian's anti-Christian, polytheist activity.<sup>13</sup> According to Christian hagiography, Mercurius was a Roman soldier stationed at Caesarea under the emperor Decius (r. 249-251). After refusing to worship pagan gods, Mercurius was tortured and then beheaded at Caesarea in late 250 CE. Legend has his given name as Philopater, and identifies his birth father as a Scythian officer in the Roman army.

The later sixth-century Greek *Chronographia* by the Byzantine historian John Malalas names St. Mercurius as the slayer of Julian, as witnessed by St. Basil in a vision on the night of Julian's death.<sup>14</sup> In Malalas' account, in which Julian also has a premonitory dream of his death, St. Mercurius acts on Christ's command; but the late eighth

<sup>11</sup> Eutropius, who accompanied Julian on the expedition against the Persians, states that "he was killed by the hand of an enemy, on the 26th of June, in the seventh year of his reign, and the thirty-second of his age, and was enrolled among the gods" (1853).

<sup>12</sup> See De Barros Dias 2013: 108 n. 28.

<sup>13</sup> Baynes 1937: 26.

<sup>14</sup> Halliday 1914: 102.

or early ninth century *Life of St. Basil*, pseudonymously attributed to Basil's friend Amphilocius, the Bishop of Iconium (modern Konya), attributes the divine mandate to the Virgin Mary.<sup>15</sup> According to this biography, translated into Latin in at least three independent versions in the later part of the ninth century,<sup>16</sup> Basil went to pray on a mountain with all the clergy and people of Caesarea in order to avert Julian's destruction of the city after his return from Persia. After three days of prayer and fasting, Basil had a vision of "a glorious throne" on which sat "a woman clad in feminine attire" surrounded by a heavenly conclave. In the vision, the woman called St. Mercurius from among the military saints in attendance, and bade him dispatch the emperor. A variation of this narrative became generally accepted in Western Europe, where the woman is identified as the Queen of Heaven, the Virgin Mary.

The death of Julian became a constant element in the cycle of stories about the Virgin Mary. One medieval example is found in Cantiga fifteen of the thirteenth-century Galician-Portuguese *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, where Basil falls asleep in front of the altar of the Virgin, who assures him in his dream-vision that she will be avenged on the Emperor Julian for his offences. In this account, the Virgin calls St. Mercurius, who shoots an arrow through Julian's stomach.<sup>17</sup> A version of the story close to that in the *Cantigas* is replicated on the mid-fourteenth- to early fifteenth-century roof bosses carved above the west walk of Norwich Cathedral cloisters. The central bosses of this part of the cloister depict chapters twelve to twenty-one of the biblical book of Revelation, alongside which are incorporated four consecutive roof bosses showing the legend of St. Basil and the defeat of Julian.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.: 91.

<sup>16</sup> De Barros Dias 2013: 104.

<sup>17</sup> De Barros Dias 2013: 96.



Fig. 3. Basil's Vision of the Virgin Mary, Norwich Cathedral, England © Bruce Benedict

The second roof boss in this quadripartite series shows St. Basil's vision of the Virgin Mary (Fig. 3). In this scene, Mary is seated with the Christ child on her lap and is enclosed within an aureole of flames. There are two angels on each side of her, and St. Basil is asleep at her feet in a recumbent position (reminiscent of the prone figure of Julian under the feet of the Persian king and Ahura Mazda at Tāq-e Bostān). The motif of the fiery mandorla is attached to imagery of the Virgin Mary at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Within the Christian context this emblem is attributed to the identification of the Mother of God as the "woman clothed in the sun" in the vision of St. John (Rev. 12.1). The iconography itself may have evolved from an original numismatic depiction of flames on the right shoulder of Kushan kings beginning with Vima Kadphises (r. c. 105-127 CE). In the Kushan context, the flames are thought to be a stylized representation of the *farr* (*xʿarənah*), which, according to Iranian ideology, resided with the rightly appointed ruler and was said to shine (Yt. 19.53-4). Flaming shoulders then became a feature of images of the Buddha Shakyamuni produced near the Kushan capital of Kapisa.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Rosenfield 1967: 200.

Later Gandharan statuary encircled the standing Buddha with a spiked radiate nimbus, and cave temple murals along the silk roads into China depicted the seated or standing Buddha surrounded by a flaming mandorla.<sup>19</sup>

In the third roof boss, her Virgin Mary, surrounded by angels (three to her right and two to her left) calls on St. Mercurius to champion St. Basil's cause (Fig.4). On the lower right hand side, one of the angels leads in a saddled and harnessed riderless white horse, which seems to have a form of the Chi-Rho christogram on its hindquarter. In the context of medieval Christianity, the *topos* of the white horse would have called to mind that ridden by the Word of God (Christ) at the front of the heavenly armies about to engage in the final battle (Rev. 19.11-16). It was also the vehicle for St. George and other equestrian saints, including St. Mercurius.<sup>20</sup> The horse here is riderless because it is awaiting the arrival of Mercurius, whose vacant tomb lies along the lower frame of the scene.



Fig. 4. The Virgin Mary summons St. Mercurius, Norwich Cathedral, England  
© Bruce Benedict

<sup>19</sup> For instance, in murals at Kara Tepe, Kizil, Kumtura and Dunhuang.

<sup>20</sup> Coptic portrayals of St. Mercurius usually place him on a black horse.

The riderless horse recalls the numerous examples of similar Central Asian iconography, in which these mounts, it is thought, are consecrated to Mithra.<sup>21</sup> The image features in reliefs on recently discovered sixth-century house tombs and funerary couches for Sogdian community leaders (*sabao*) found in North-Central China<sup>22</sup>; on seventh-century Sogdian ossuaries from near Shakhri-Sabz, Uzbekistan; and on the southern wall of the “hall of Ambassadors” at Afrasiyab, also in Uzbekistan, where it forms part of a royal procession to the ancestral mausoleum. Since these depictions all occur within the context of Central Asian Zoroastrian funerary monuments, the connection seems to be with the Iranian *yazata* Mithra in his role as judge of the dead.<sup>23</sup>



Fig. 5. St. Mercurius kills Julian the Apostate, Norwich Cathedral, England

© Bruce Benedict

<sup>21</sup> Marshak 2004: 280.

<sup>22</sup> These are the sarcophagi of Yu Hong and Shi Jun (Wirkak), and the An Qie (Anyang) and Shumei funerary beds. On the first tomb, Mithra seems to welcome the horse, and on the second, the riderless horse is winged.

<sup>23</sup> Grenet 2013: 23.

The fourth and last roof boss in the Norwich series portrays St. Mercurius killing Julian in battle (Fig. 5). The sense that this is a fight between good and evil, which prefigures the final battle of the Apocalypse (Rev. 20.7-10), is reinforced through the appearance of a devil above the (now headless) emperor, and an angel above the helmeted saint, whose horse charges over that of his adversary. This vertical pairing of a devil above Julian and an angel above St. Mercurius on the Norwich Cathedral roof boss recalls the similar, but horizontal and inverted alignment on the investiture relief of Ardashir I at Naqsh-e Rostam. Unfortunately, this roof boss is the least well preserved of the four, whether through the natural degradation of age, or the iconoclasm of Cromwell's troops in 1643. St. Mercurius, now astride his horse, seems to clutch an elaborate cuirass to his chest - perhaps the "breastplate of faith" referred to in accounts of his martyrdom<sup>24</sup> - and to strike Julian's shield with a flail, rather than a spear, but since the crucial section of the boss is missing, the means of the emperor's death remains a mystery even here.

From both Sasanian Zoroastrian and Byzantine Christian perspectives, Julian's demise represented a spiritual as well as a material victory for the forces of good against the imposition of governance by one who worships "false gods".

---

<sup>24</sup> For instance, the Greek martyrology *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* 1274.

## Bibliography

- Azarpay Guitty. 1982. The Role of Mithra in the Investiture and Triumph of Šāpūr II. *Iranica Antiqua* 17. 181-87.
- De Barros Dias, I. 2013. The Emperor, the Archbishop and the Saint: One Event Told in Different Textual Forms. In E. Kooper, and S. Levelt (eds.), *The Medieval Chronicle viii*, 93-133. S. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi..
- Baynes, N. H. 1937. The death of Julian the Apostate in a Christian legend." *JRS* 27. 22-29.
- Eutropius. 1853. *Abridgement of Roman history*. Trans. by the Rev. John Selby Watson. <http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/eutropius/trans10.html> (October 2015).
- Frye, R. N. 1984. *The History of Ancient Iran*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Grenet, F. 2013. Zoroastrian funerary practices in Sogdiana and Choresmia and among expatriate Sogdian communities in China. In Stewart, S. (ed.), *The Everlasting Flame: Zoroastrianism in History and Imagination*, 17-27. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Halliday, W. R. 1914-16. St. Basil and Julian the Apostate: A fragment of legendary history. *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* VII. 89-106.
- Hollard, D. 2010. Julien et Mithrā sur le relief de Tāq-e Bostān. *Res Orientales* XIX: 147-163.
- Marshak, B. 2004. Central Asian Metalwork in China. In Watt, J. C. Y. et al. (eds.), *China: Dawn of a Golden Age, 200-750 AD*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Nicholson, O. 1983. Taq-i Bostan. Mithras and Julian the Apostate: an

- irony." *Iranica Antiqua* 18. 177-178.
- Rosenfield, J. M. 1967. *Dynastic Art of the Kushans*. Berkeley: U. California Press.
- Shahbazi, A. S. 1985. Studies in Sasanian Prosopography: II. The relief of Ardašer II at Tâq-i Bustân. *AMIT* 18. 181-85.
- Shenkar, M. 2014. *Intangible Spirits and Graven Images: The Iconography of Deities in the pre-Islamic Iranian World*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Smith, R. 1995. *Julian's Gods: Religion and philosophy in the thought and action of Julian the Apostate*. London and New York: Routledge.



