INTRODUCTION

At the center of the liturgical text known as the Yasna is the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti surrounded by the Gāthās of Zarathustra. Both collections are in the Gāthic or Old Avestan dialect. Also in the same dialect are the sacred prayers (Y 27.13-15 and Y 54.1). A glimpse into the commentary tradition of these older texts in the ecclesiastical dialect of Standard or Young Avestan is found in Y 19-21, providing a word for word exegesis of the sacred prayers. The content of the 9th book of the Pahlavi text, the *Dēnkard*, gives further evidence of a sizable body of commentary on the Gāthās, though, in this case, it is difficult to establish what of the quoted Zand had an underlying Aβestāg. Transmitted in full, moreover, is the Pahlavi Yasna (PhlY). And it is with this text that our introduction primarily deals.

There are two parts to the PhlY that are interwoven throughout the text. One is a near word for word gloss (Gloss, PhlGl) of the Avestan; the other consists of fairly brief comments (Comment). Clearly the gloss is the basic text, to which comments were appended. These comments have every appearance of being marginal or interlinear notes which the owner of a manuscript may have scribbled as he read the Gloss. Here terminology is significant. With a few exceptions, the running gloss cannot be regarded as a translation, as was supposed by Chr. Bartholomae[1] in his use of the term Pahlaviübersetzung (Pü) for the Gloss. More accurate was his "Erläuterung" to designate the Comment.

Why is the basic text not a translation? Although there are passages here and there which must be recognized as genuine translations, most of the text follows a program where each word of the Avestan is glossed by a Pahlavi word (or occasionally phrase) in the word order of the Avestan. Often this creates strings of words in Pahlavi that make little sense in terms of normal Pahlavi syntax. The problem is compounded by the fact that the author or authors of the Gloss had a very weak grasp of the basics of Avestan grammar. It is safe to say that a native speaker of Middle Persian would have had great difficulty in understanding the PhlGl had it been presented to him apart from the Avesta. And even then it would have remained opaque.

It follows, then, that it would be fruitless in most cases to attempt to translate the PhlGl, for what would result would be usually a string of words with slight syntactic cohesion. In contrast, the commentary material (Comment) is of a very different nature. As stated above it represents the various notes a reader of the PhlGl might make. Some of the comments are quite brief, often consisting of a single word. For example, one finds the frequent insertion of *mizd* 'reward, priestly stipend,' apparently reflecting the monetary concerns of the priest. Another common insertion is *kār ud kirbag*, a hendiadys meaning 'pious deeds.' Sometimes the insertion will be a simple name, such as *Wištāsp*, to identify a person not mentioned by name. As often as not, though, the comment will consist of a more or less coherent sentence. In some cases this will elucidate directly the PhlGl, but in others, the PhlGl seems to have suggested an association with some wider issue such as education or moral behavior or the world to come. In this context, we can identify clear examples of *andarz* 'proverbs.'

---

[1]   *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Berlin, 1961 (reprint of 1904 edition).

In accordance with these general remarks about the nature of the PhlY, the transcribed text which follows this Introduction is not accompanied by a translation. As regards the PhlGl and the Comment one should turn to the *Glossary,* where all Pahlavi words are cited by strophe and line. And where the Pahlavi glosses an Avestan word, the Avestan is given in parentheses.

The Gloss

It is obvious that the basic and older stratum of the text is the Gloss, to which the Comment has been appended. Equally obvious is that, since the text is in Pahlavi, it could not have come into existence until some time during the Sassanid period at the earliest. To achieve any greater precision we must first digress into a discussion of the Avestan text of the Gāthās and Yasna Haptaŋhāiti upon which the Gloss was based, as the history of the Gāthic text offers the key to establishing a relative chronology of the PhlGl.

Leaving aside the thorny problem of the authorship of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti, we may focus on the Gāthās composed by Iran's foremost pre-Islamic poet, the prophet Zarathustra. These hieratic poems were memorized by Zarathustra's followers, who then passed them down through generations in an unbroken oral tradition, for in a non-literate society any break in the tradition means a total loss, since no archive can be turned to to have preserved a backup copy. In spite of the many vicissitudes experienced by the Iranian peoples in general and Zoroastrians in particular over history, the received text of the Gāthās shows a remarkable fidelity to what must have been Zarathustra's original words, a fidelity that can only be explained through the oral tradition of priestly memorization and recitation.

Having stated this, however, we must quickly qualify what we may have implied. Anyone who has worked in a scientific manner on the Gāthās understands that these have not been transmitted directly from the Prophet's mouth to our ears and eyes. There have been intervening stages of transmission that have altered the original poems in various ways. The Gāthās, as we possess them today, are themselves the product of tradition, and further, in order to understand them we must learn how tradition has altered the originals.

The Gāthās were composed in a particular dialect of Old Iranian, known either as Gāthā-Avestan or as some now prefer "Old Avestan," as if the other related dialect generally known as "Young-Avestan" or as we prefer with Ilya Gershevitch "Standard Avestan," is not old enough.[1] Whatever nomenclature one follows, it is clear that Standard Avestan, the language of the Yasna, Yašts, Vendidad etc., became the dominant religious language in Achaemenid Iran, the Gāthic dialect being retained only in the recitation of the Gāthās, Yasna Haptaŋhāiti and the sacred prayers. Linguistically we can see certain intrusions of the dominant dialect on the Gāthās themselves. Here is one example of the verbal root *zbā-*

---

[1] For a discussion of the pitfalls of nomenclature see I. Gershevitch, "Approaches to Zoroaster's Gathas," *Iran,* 33, 1995, pp. 2-3.

'to call, invoke.' Observe that the deficient syllable in each line is made good when we restore the reconstructed form.[1]

33.5a

yastē wīspə̄.mazištəm   səraošəm zbayā awaŋhānē (7 + 8)

yas-tai wispa-mazištam sraušam zuᵓayā awahānai

46.14e

tə̄ŋg zbayā   waŋhə̄uš uxδāiš manaŋhō (3 + 7)

tą̄h zuᵓayā   wahauš uxδāiš manahō

49.12a

kaṯ tōi ašā   zbayaṇtē awaŋhō (4 + 6)

kat tai r̥tā   zuᵓayantai awahō

As such linguistic data show, the priests who were reciting the Gāthās at the end of the Achaemenid period, shall we say, were not native speakers of Gāthic Avestan. In fact, as the locus of temporal power moved to the west, it is equally certain that the sacred compositions in StAv were also in a language foreign to the priests, who were probably speaking forms of early Middle Western Iranian. It is worth noting that the nature of the received text would be very different had it come to us from the Sogdian linguistic area.[2] Be that as it may, the evolution of the Gāthic texts we have received took place in W. Iran.

Despite the pious fiction repeated in the Pahlavi Books about the entire Avesta having been set to writing on ox-hides and stored in the treasury at Istaxr, later to be lost to Alexander, at some point in time attempts to transcribe the spoken word into written text must have taken place. When this began is impossible to say with any precision. In my opinion this could not have been possible until after the Imperial Aramaic script began to be modified and employed in the writing of Iranian languages. Evidence for this places the process well into the Arsacid period. When we follow the sketchy history of the Dēn contained in the 4th book of the *Dēnkard*, we might suppose that an impetus for making written versions of the sacred Avestan compositions came during the first systematic attempt to collect the scattered compositions held in the memories of the priests. According to the *Dēnkard* that took place sometime in the middle of the first century CE during the reign of Vologases I. Unfortunately there is no direct evidence for this. So all we have is a vague *terminus post quem*. There was another major codification at the beginning of the Sassanid period under the direction of Tōsar/Tansar, the minister of Ardašīr; that is, the first half of the 3rd century CE. And yet another codification was organized by Ādurbād Māraspandān a century later during the long rule of Shapur II. Some scholars hold that the magnificent Avestan alphabetic script was invented at this time, while others believe that the invention of the

---

[1] These matters were treated thoroughly by M. C. Monna *The Gathas of Zarathustra a Reconstruction of the Text*, Amsterdam, 1978.

[2] Compare the received text of the *ašəm wohū* prayer and that of the Sogdian version:

ašəm wohū wahištəm astī   *ərtam wahū wahištam ištī*

uštā astī uštā ahmāi   *uštā ištī uštā ahmāi*

hyaṯ ašāi wahištāi ašəm   *yat ərtāi wahištāi ərtam*

See I. Gershevitch *art. cit.*, p. 4.

script belongs to the reign of Xusro Anōšruwān in the mid to late 6th century.[1] If the later date were, indeed, the case, that would not preclude there having been an earlier written text or texts in the simpler Pahlavi script. Irrespective of what script may have been available, it seems to me that campaigns to establish an orthodox text would have required the promulgation of a written canon as a bulwark against innovation and heresy.

I have brought up this digression from the Gāthās into the questions of the organization and writing of the Dēn, in order to place a context for what we will next propose. The Gāthās, as well as the Avesta generally, such as we have received them both in written manuscript form and in the oral performance of the priests, are based on a written text. We shall explain.

Let us imagine an *hērbedistān*, a priestly school, post-Ādurbād. What would have been its curriculum? What would the scholar/priests who staffed the hērbedistān have been interested in? Absolutely essential would have been that the *hāwištān*, the students, both learn the correct performance of the rituals and commit the sacred canon to memory. In addition to these basics, there were various intellectual matters abundantly documented in the Pahlavi Books. Among them was linguistics. As with the early Prātiśākhyas and the establishment of the Padapāṭha text of the Indian Vedic tradition, the overriding concern of the Zoroastrian scholars was phonetics, whose grand testament was the script itself, which was able to produce all the subtleties of the priestly diction. However, there was also an interest in the structure of words, especially the parsing of compounds.

The monument of such linguistic analysis is the text itself! A half century ago, the great German scholar, Karl Hoffmann, observed that, "We have before us an edited school text."[2] What did he mean? By way of example, here are two types of scholastic changes made in the text.

1)   The Five Gāthās or major sections of Zarathustra's hymns are arranged according to the metrical patters of the poems. Unlike the transmission of the Yašts, where the tradition had ceased to recognize that the poetry is in meter, the transmission of the Gāthās shows an awareness of the metrical structure. Nevertheless, when we scrutinize the metrics of individual verses of the Gāthās we find many anomalies, deviations from what we would expect the correct syllable count to be. There are various explanations for these deviations. We have already suggested one in the example given of the verb *zbā-*. Another type of deviation from the expected meter occurs regularly where a preposition/preverb is separated in a verse line from the verb, a phenomenon called *tmesis*. Here is an example from Y 33.8a of the received text with its Pahlavi gloss.

   frō̄ mōi frawōizdūm   *arəθā tā*   *yā wohū šyawāi manaŋhā*

    frāz ō man pad frāz-niwēyišnīh dahēd pad harw dō dādestān kū-m   rawād wahman

In Zarathustra's diction this was approximately

   fra mai [fra]waizdwam arθā tā   yā wahū šyawa'ai manahā (7 + 9)

---

[1] See K. Hoffmann / J. Narten, *Der Sasanidische Archetypus*, Wiesbaden, 1989, p. 34. More recently, Kellens (*JA* 286, 482-3) at "le fin du règne de Xosrō II (590-629)."

[2] *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1.4.1, Leiden/Köln r1958, p. 8.

2)   Like so many languages, Avestan has the ability to combine independent words in compounds that form a new grammatical and semantic unit. Avestan has scores of compounds, all composed in accordance with a number of fixed grammatical rules. As in Vedic, Avestan compounds normally consist of two words in such a way that the prior or first member, with a few exceptions, is not declined. Only the final member is declined, since the compound is regarded as a unit. According to this rule one expects the many nouns and adjectives ending in a short-*a* stem form to be combined with the following word of the compound as a stem without inflection. Looking at the cognate Old Persian and Vedic languages, we find this to be the case. However, in Avestan, more often than not, the prior member, when an *a*-stem, receives the -*ō* ending of the nominative singular. While compounds abound in StAv, Zarathustra avoided using compounds to a great extent. An example, though, is *rānyō.skərəiti*- an epithet of the Cow, "who gives much felicity." Of note is the fact that the word was erroneously divided, the original in Zarathustra's diction being *rānyas-kṛti-.

In Avestan manuscripts the scribes marked word divisions with a dot, and this device was adopted for transliteration in Roman script. In the example just cited observe the dot separating the members of the compound. It was also extended to certain suffixes, for example the superlative –*tama*-, appearing regularly as °*ō.təma*-. For example, *huxšaθrō.təma*- for *huxšaθratama-. This convention was observed in other sorts of compounds as well, for example, *haēcaṯ.aspa*- "son of Hicadaspa," Also, certain verb and noun inflectional endings are sporadically separated by the dot.[1] The dat./abl. pl. of *drugwant-, originally *drugwadbyō, became *drəgwō.dəbyō*. The 2nd pers. pl. imperative *gūšadwam became *gūšō.dūm*

I have attempted to show thus far, that there was, in late Sassanid times, a scholastic edition of the Gāthās which deviated from what would have been transmitted in the oral tradition. In my opinion this was a *written* text that was used in the hērbedistān for instructional rather than liturgical purposes. We now turn to the Pahlavi Yasna of the Gāthās (and Haptaŋhāiti). Here again is Y33.8a

> *frāz ō man pad frāz-niwēyišnīh [ka tan be ō ašmā niwēyom] dahēd pad harw dō*
> *dādestān [abestāg ud zand] kū-m rawād wahman [kū-m pad tan mehmān bawād].*

The preverb *fra*-, which, as already noted, is repeated in the Avestan text in such a way that the meter is distorted with the addition of a superfluous syllable, is also repeated in the Pahlavi. What this, along with other examples, shows, is that the basic text for the Gloss was the Avestan school-text. Why is this significant? Its significance is that for the scholar or scholars who composed the Gloss the school-text was already *the* official text. One might suppose that it is still just another artifact of the instructional curriculum. But if that were so, why would they have chosen to gloss the artificial school-text and not the original upon which it was based?

At this point we can assume as fact that our received text of the Gāthās does not represent precisely the original diction of Zarathustra. We have expressed the opinion that the

---

[1]   It is interesting to observe that these are mostly what in Sanskrit are called *pada*- or word-endings. Is this evidence for a tradition that treated such endings as obeying the rules of external sandhi?

received text was at its inception a written text. However, one can appeal to the Vedic evidence where a sophisticated reworking of the hymns, the Padapāṭha, was the product of an exclusively oral tradition. Why would not the learned Sassanid priest-scholars have been capable of such feats of orality? A strong argument, though not absolutely decisive, is that literacy was an integral part of Sassanid culture and education.[1] Further, we learn from written Pahlavi literature that Zoroastrians wished to portray their religion as a religion of the book, probably as a polemic response to Christians, Jews and Manichaeans, and later to Muslims. In contrast the culture of the Vedic period which produced the Padapāṭha (ca. 9th century BCE?) was entirely non-literate. Moreover, there is one decisive piece of evidence internal to the Yasna and the Pahlavi Gloss that there existed a text *written in Avestan script* that was regarded as authoritative.

In what appears to be an appendix to the Hōm Yašt (Y 11.9), there is a very clever numerological play on words. Y 11.9 The redactor has deftly strung together a sequence of Gāthic quotations, citied, according to custom, by the opening word(s), in such a way that one counts from one to ten. The citations, given in Standard Avestan rather than Gāthic, suggest: 'one' (*yō nō aēwō* Y 29.8 for *yə̄ nə̄ aēwō*), 'both' (*aṯ tē uye* Y. 34.11 for *aṯ tōi ubē*), 'three' (*θrāyōidyāi* Y. 34.5), 'fourth' (*tūrahe* Y. 36.12 for *tūrahyā*), *'five' (*məṇdāidyāi* Y.44.8 for *məṇdaidyāi*), 'sixth' (*xšwīdəm* Y 29.7), 'seven-eight' (*haptāždyāi* Y. 31.22 *haptī* + Y. 51.17 *āždyāi*), 'nine tenth' (*nawa dasme* Y 41.2 *nə̄ wā* + Y. 28.9 *dasəmē*), to which is added the fuller citation of Y. 28.9 *yōi wə̄ waēθma* (for *yōi wə̄ wōiθmā dasəmē*). The only real problem the redactor faced was 'five', as there is no word in the Gāthās even approximating the anticipated *paṇca* or *puxδa-*. If this strophe were the creation of a late Sassanid redactor familiar with the Avestan script, then a graphic explanation will clarify the enigmatic *məṇdāidyāi*. That is, if one writes a ᴖ *p* upside down and rotates it, the result is something resembling a ᴅ *m*; further, if one substitutes a ᴕ *δ* for ᴖ *d*, the result is the same letter in the Pahlavi script for *c* (ᴕ). In this way, the visual pun achieved *pəṇcaidyāi*.

Now, one might expect the PhlGl of *məṇdaidyāi* to contain an interpretation of *məṇdai°* as deriving from perhaps either *menīdan* 'to think' or *māndan* 'to dwell' + the usual gloss of infinitives in °*dyāi* with some form of *dādan* 'to give; place.' Astonishingly, the gloss reads *ān ī panj dahišn*. What could have prompted *panj* to stand for *məndai°*? Obviously the gloss is relying upon the graphic pun of Y 11.9. None of this would make sense if the we were not dealing with a written tradition.

In terms of relative chronology, therefore, the PhlGl presupposes not only the school-text but also that text as *written* in the Avestan script. If we allow a certain passage of time between the creation of the Avestan script and the composition of Y 11.9, and between that and the composition of the PhlGl, we must conclude that, at the earliest, the PhlGl was composed in the 5th century. More likely, it seems to me, would be the late 6th or 7th, which does not preclude it being a post-Sassanid composition.

---

[1] Note for example the references to writing as part of the school curriculum of Ardašīr in the late Sassanid romance, the Kārnāmag ī Ardašīr.

The Pahlavi *Dēnkard* Bk IX draws extensively on the content of the Nasks of the Sassanid Avesta. More particularly, as an example, it refers to the PhlGl of Y53.9d (DkM 875.14-18) in the following manner. "And this too: rulership will be given to Ohrmazd by him who makes that manifest from (the verse) *taṯ tawa xšaθrəm (That, o Mazdā, is thy dominion* etc.). And its *zand* is: *ōy ohrmazd ēd ī tō xwadāyīh ī kē ōy ī rāst-zīwišn driyōš* اسیا *dād.*" This is nearly identical to PhlGl of 53.9d, given here in parallel with the Avestan.

> *taṯ mazdā   tawā   xšaθrəm yā ərəžəjyōi   dāhī drəgaowē wahyō*
> *ān ohrmazd ēd ī tō xwadāyīh kē ōy ī rāst-zīwišn driyōš* اسیکا *dahēd*

Another nearly identical quote of this *zand* is DkM 872.12-14,

> *ān ohrmazd ēd ī tō xwadāyīh kē ōy ī rāst-zīwišn driyōš dahēd* اسدیا

and also DkM 936.6-8 of only the second part of the line

> *kē ō ōy ī rāst-zīwišn driyōš* اسدیا *dahēd.*

Apart from a few text-critical problems,[1] the quotations are explicitly from the Zand and that *zand* is the gloss of our PhlY. The dating of the *Dēnkard* is complicated by the fact that the final compilation of Ādurbād Ēmēdān in the 10th century incorporated older materials compiled early in the 9th century by Ādurfarnbag ī Farroxzādān.[2] Nevertheless, by citing the passage as *zand* the *Dēnkard* recognized it as venerable scripture, ensuring that the PhlGl of the Yasna is much earlier than the 9th century.[3]

An additional matter relevant to relative chronology involves the Avestan letter ﻼ / *ṣ̌* /. Whatever its original phonetic value,[4] it had to have had a different pronunciation from ﻼ / *š* /. In the Gloss, Av. *aṣ̌a-* as appellative is *ahlāyīh*, but as nom. pr. *ašwahišt*. Thus, the date of the gloss is after the shift of *ṣ̌* to *š* in pronunciation, a shift that must have occurred at some time removed from the original creation of the script. So, again, we must be looking at a late, if not post Sassanid time frame.

We have already noted the phenomenon of repeated preverb in tmesis. The PhlGl offers further cases which bear on the state of the Avestan text upon which it was based. For example, at 46.18a *ascīṯ* is glossed with *tan* 'body' as if the Av. were the word for bone, when in fact it is an error, probably scribal, for ⁺*hascīṯ.*[5] There are two cases of dittography of *m* in final position of a word carrying over to the initial of the following: 40.1 *mīždəm [m]awaēθəm = mizd ō manīgān* and 44.20e *hīm [m]īzōn = mizd*. As first observed by Lommel[6] there are cases where the received text of the Avesta shows the dative °*āi* when on the basis of syntax and meter one anticipates rather the genitive °*ahyā* (StAv °*ahe*). At 28.5b (see also 30.1b) the received text has:

> *gātūmcā ahurāi   səwištāi səraošəm mazdāi* (6 + 7)

---

[1] On the variously spelled word see Glossary under *wāsān.

[2] On the dating of the Dk see de Menasce *Une encyclopédie Mazdéenn, le Dēnkart* (Paris, 1958), pp. 8-12.

[3] For further discussion of the relationship between the Gloss and the *Dēnkard* see below.

[4] Probably an unvoiced lateral; *cf.* K. Hoffmann / B. Forsmann *Avestisches Laut- und Flexionslehre*, Innsbruck, 1996, p. 46.

[5] Following Humbach's emendation.

[6] *Festschrift fürF. C. Andreas*, Leipzig, 1916, pp. 96-108.

Since the meter requires the metrical pattern 7 + 9, one needs to restore *ahurahya sawištahya ... mazdaʾah*.[1] For this the PhlGl has the genitive correctly as *gāh-iz ī ohrmazd ī sūd-xwāstār srōš*. Is this evidence that the text used by the Gloss had *ahurahyā*? If so, it would mean that this category of error in the received text is more recent than the writing of the PhlGl.

Where the received text has significant variant readings, the PhlGl may be helpful in sorting out the problem. A well-known example is found at Y 48.10b where the MSS offer both *ahyā magahyā* (adopted by Gld.) and *ahyā madahyā* (as adopted by Bartholomae). Since the PhlGl has *pad ān mayīh*, it is clear, at least, that *magahyā* was the reading of the text upon which it was based. The identical phrase *ahyā magahyā* occurs at Y 53.7a without variant readings and is glossed also by *pad ān mayīh*. How then might we explain the *madahyā* variant? One explanation might be that *madahyā* (the lectio difficilior[2]) was original, but had been corrected in the recension of the text used by the PhlGl with the phrase from 53.7. Certainly a graphic confusion of ⲏ and ⲏ makes no sense, that is, unless there were MSS which had StAv spellings. In such a case *maδahyā* would have been spelled with ⲏ and *mayahyā* with ⲏ. In fact, Gld.'s apparatus shows ⲏⲏⲏⲏⲏⲏ (Pt4) and ⲏⲏⲏⲏⲏⲏ (of several other lesser MSS). This would have facilitated the correction, even if it went against the oral tradition.

Evidence from the Dēnkard

At the beginning of the 9th century the leader of the dwindling Zoroastrian population (*hudēnān pēšōbāy*), Ādurfarnbag ī Farroxzādān, compiled a large encyclopaedic work that was to preserve a great deal of the knowledge of the Good Religion that survived to his day. According to the account given at the end of Dk III, Ādurfarnbag's manuscript (*paccēn*) was bequeathed to his son, Zardušt, also the *hudēnān pēšōbāy*. However, some grave event in Zardušt's life caused the MS to be dispersed. Subsequently the new *hudēnān pēšōbāy* Ādurbād Ēmēdān collected what he could of Ādurfarnbag's copy and apparently collated the rescued leaves. Ādurbād would have lived at the end of the 9th, beginning of the 10th century.

The 9th Book (*nahom dar*) of the *Dēnkard* contains a descriptive summary of the contents of three of the Gāhānīg Nasks of the Avesta, *Sūdgar*, *Warštmānsar* and *Bag*. Each Nask was structured in such a way that its chapters (*fragard*) follow the order of the Gāthic composition of the Yasna, each chapter being named after a particular *hā*. Accordingly, they begin with the three sacred prayers (Y 27.13-15 of the Geldner edition), followed by the canonical sequence of the Gāthās and Yasna Haptaŋhāiti, concluding with Y 54 (*ērman*) and excluding the intrusive *hā*'s Y 41 and 52. However, one should not imagine that these chapters contained renderings into Pahlavi of the Gāthic texts. The content summaries show that there was, at best, only a tenuous connection with the Gāthic text. Here and there key

---

[1] As Monna p. 7, except that *mazdāi* shows a common scribal mistake of *āi* (ⲏ) for *å* (ⲏ) reinforced by the preceding mistaken datives.

[2] Contrary to M. Schwartz *FS Boyce* p. 476.

words and phrases are found, which are quotes in Pahlavi from the Gāthic text and whose inclusion seems to have been that they suggested in some general way the topic of discussion. The importance of these quotes in relation to the PhlY is that they are sources outside the PhlY bearing on the method of glossing the Yasna text. Of particular relevance is the question of whether the quotes are taken from the PhlY. Were such the case, it would provide evidence that the PhlY pre-dates of final redaction of the Nasks.

Before attempting to address this question, we give below an example of how the *Dēnkard* proceeds, here in a case that is closely related thematically to the Gāthā it represents. The text is Dk IX, 29 from the summary of the Warštmānsar Nask (DkM 825.15-828.14).[1] The related words from the PhlY gloss are indicated in *italics* and placed below the Dk.

šašom fragard *xšmaib<y>a.* (1) abar garzišn ī gōšurun ka ō dādan *ni<ša>st[2] andar

gōšurun garzēd[3]

amahraspandān-hanjaman ō ohrmazd az was xīndagīh <ud> anāgīh ī-š mēnōgīhā dīd kū-š pad tanōmandīh abar-rasēd pad zadan ud ōzadan ud rēšēnīdan ud duzīdan ud āzurdan dādan[4] ī ān ī abārōn-kunišn-kāmag ... [there follow some 25 lines of text without direct reference to the gāthā] ... (6) ēn-iz ō gōšurun guft kū "gōwom ō tō wišōbišn-wizārišnīh kū anāgīh az gannāg

wišōbišn wizārišn[5]

mēnōg cārag ast +cē[6]-m nē dām frāz-brīhēnīd hē man kē ohrmazd hom ka-m anāgīh ī az ōy cārag nē dānist-ē." (7) ēn-iz kū-š ēdōn-kāmag būd gannāg menōg kū "ma hagriz dām frāz-brīhēnīd hē ohrmazd ud ma ēdar axwīh hē ma radīh ud ma kāmag <ī> ahlāyīh ī pahlom abāyistan ī ō kār ud kirbag." (8) pursišn ī gōšurun kū "ō kē az brīhēnīd <ud> tāšīd hēm." passox awiš kū "ō ōy ī tuxšāg

ō kē man brīhēnīd hom ō kē man tāšīd hom[7]   *ō ōy fšōnīdār*

ud paymānīg."   (9) ud xwāstan ī gōšurun gōspand rāy ayār ud srāyišn dād

ud warzīdār brēhēnīd hē ud tāšīd hē[8]

ī ohrmazd ō ayārīh ī gōspand <ud> mard ī ahlaw ud srāyišn ī gōspand rāy šīrēnīh andar āb ud urwar kū xwardan <ud> dāštan ī gōspand ōy pādixšāy kē-š ast dahēd wāstar

pādixšāyīh kē-š ast dahēd wāstar

ud ān-iz ī gōspandān-dahišn tuxšāg kū-š wāstar dahēd u-š pasušhurw az ān paydāgēnēd kē gōspand

ān-iz ī gōspandān-dahišn tuxšāg[9]

---

[1] Translated by West *SBE* 37, pp. 237-241; Lommel *ZII*, 10, 1935, pp. 99-102; text and translation Molé *Culte, mythe et cosmologie dans Iran ancien*, Paris, 1963, pp. 196-198.

[2] Molé *ēstāt.

[3] 29.1a.

[4] This list of afflictions is reminiscent of the enumeration at Y 29.1b, yet there is no correspondence of vocabulary between the two texts. However, the Comment seems to be referring either to the Warštmānsar or a common source when to *zadan* it has *pad xešm zanēd*, to *āzurdan* it has *kū-m be āzārēd* and to *duzīdan* it has *kū-m be duzēd.*

[5] 29.6a

[6] Emending 𐭰𐭰𐭰 for 𐭰𐭰.

[7] 29.1a.

[8] 29.6c.

[9] 29.2b. This is an exact quotation.

be abzāyēnēd ud ōy-iz kē ān ī druwand ī xešm anēr wānišn dahēd [kū stō kunēd]. (10) abzāyēnīdan

kē ōy druwand xešmen wānišn dahēd[1]

ī ohrmazd gōspand handarz ī ō mardōmān pad paymān-xwarišnīh ud garān puhl ī ōy ī adādīhā gōspand bēš dād ī gōšurun pad mēnōg hamkirb ī amahraspandān hamkirb ī ān ī xwaršēd rōšnīh ud kāmag-dōisar hucašm kū astān ōzōmanddar ōy kē ō yazdān paywāzēd u-š yazdān paywāzēnd. (11)

az astān ān ōzōmanddar kē ō[2]

abar gōwišn ī ohrmazd ēn-iz kū "az ān saxwan-āmārēnīdār hom kē az-iš ast ī gētīgān ān ī harw dō

ohrmazd saxwan āmārēnīdār[3]

axwān rāy gōwēnd ud āgāh kunišn hom kē-šān warzīd andar astōmand-axwān dēw ud mardōm kē-

kē-šān warzīd pēš-iz   dēw ud mardōm ud kē-

z warzēnd az hom wizīdār-xwadāy ud ēdōn ast ciyōn man kāmag be pad-iz ān   abdom-axwān

warzēnd   pas ān be-wizīdār xwadāy ēdōn amā hēm ciyōn ōy kāmag[4]   *ān ī abdom-axwān*

wardišn. harwisp ān abar-wēnom pad ān ī man xrad ud frazānagīh kē būd kē ast kē-z hagriz

wardišn[5]

bawēd." (12) ud tāšīdan ī ohrmazd mizd ō gētīgān pad mānsarspand kē būd estēd pēš-raftār ī

ān ī abzōnīgīh pad mānsᵃr ohrmazd ō ōy tāšīdār[6]

sūdōmandān kū-šān dastwar kē abzōnīgīh ud āgāhīh ī harwisp sūdōmand ast ān mānsᵃr. (13) abar ēwagīh ud ahamtāgīh ī zardušt andar mardōmān pad kāmag ī ahlāyīh ud cārag-šnāsīh ī abar-wānīdan ī ēwgad ud hammōxtārih ī dāmān. (14) ahlāyīh ast pahlom ābādīh.

One can see in this that the text has a much broader agenda than a rendering of the gāthā.[7] The *fragard* commences with an elaboration of the basic Gāthic theme of the Cow's complaint in a manner somewhat similar to the rabbinic literary genre of the *midrash*. The material quoted or paraphrased must draw upon sources which provided a narrative framework for understanding the situation of Zardušt's gāthā. Once past the initial narrative *mis en scène*, the next wanders off into a variety of more or less related concerns, where the quotations function to punctuate the meanderings of the text by creating associations with the gāthā in the reader's (or listener's) mind.

One can also observe that while a few quotations correspond exactly, or nearly so, to the PhlY, most deviate to a greater or lesser extent from it. For example, in §11, the Dk has created a first person pronouncement by Ohrmazd in place of the third person of the gāthā:

az ān saxwan-āmārēnīdār hom   I am the reckoner of speech
ohrmazd saxwan-āmārēnīdār   Ohrmazd is the reckoner of speech

In §8 there is a significant grammatical difference between the PhlY and the Dk.

ō kē az brēhēnīd <ud> tāšīd hēm   For whom was I fashioned and created?

---

[1] 29.2c

[2] 29.3c.

[3] 29.4a.

[4] 29.4a b c.

[5] 51.6c.

[6] 29.7a.

[7] We leave the text untranslated since it is given simply for illustrative purposes.

ō kē man brēhēnīd hom ō kē man tāšīd hom For whom was I fashioned, for whom
                                                was I created?

Both sources have not understood the grammar of the Avestan, yet have grasped the general meaning, as the original says, "For whom did you shape me? Who fashioned me?" The significance of the two renderings, however, lies in the gloss of *mā* 'me' in the PhlY with *man* and in the Dk with *az*. While in older Phl *az* (Av *azəm*; in the inscriptions always *az* / ᵓ*NH*) is properly the casus rectus, in later texts *man* serves as the general 1ˢᵗ sg. pron. for all cases.[1] This suggests that the Dk is citing a different tradition and one older than that of the PhlY. Further, the response to Gōšurun's question differs widely not only in terseness, but also vocabulary.

ō ōy ī tuxšāg ud paymānīg   For him who is diligent and moderate.
ō ōy fšōnīdār ud warzīdār brēhēnīd hē ud tāšīd hē   For the rancher and the farmer wast thou
                                                        fashioned and created.

Here the Comment quotes either the Dk or its source: *ō ōy ī tuxšāg ī paymānīg dād hē*. Why is this? One can imagine several scenarios.

The starting point for Ādurfarnbag had to have been that he had the full text of the Nask before him and upon which he based his summary. It stands to reason that this full text of the Nask, we know not how extensive, must have contained quotations in Pahlavi from the Gāthās. Were these originally taken from the PhlY?[2] If this were the case, we would have to suppose that discrepancies were the result of modifications somewhere along the line. That is, the authors of the Nask could have changed wording to fit their purposes, or Ādurfarnbag himself made the alterations to accommodate his synopsis.One assumes that Ādurbād only added glosses to the text he received from Ādurfarnbag.

However, matters may be more complex. In an important article,[3] J. Kellens demonstrated that the received Yasna does not derive from the canonical collection of the Nasks. Rather, it stems from a liturgical tradition independent of the Nasks. The implication in respect to the PhlY is that it is based on this independent tradition. The situation, then, of the Pahlavi quotations of the Gāthās in the Warštmānsar might seem to come down to two possibilities: either the Nask borrowed from the PhlY, as opined above, or the Nask exhibits an independent tradition of its own. Were the latter the case, we can suppose that the discrepancies are original to the Nask. Where the two texts have the same wording, we might attribute that to the common understanding of the original, that is, two translators hitting upon the same translation; or, we might posit a situation where the Nask borrowed

---

[1] Note DkM 852.4-6 paraphrasing 44.6: *az widārom zamīg ud āsmān ... man āb ud urwar dād*, literally, 'I support earth and sky ... by me water and plants were created.'

[2] The position taken here is at odds with that taken by A. Cantera ("Avesta: Middle Persian Translations" in <iranica.com>) who assumes that a ritual text would not have had a PhlGl. This is because Pahlavi is not used in the ritual itself, as evidenced by the Sāde MSS which have no PhlGl, as opposed to the Pahlavi-Yasna MSS which do. The logical conclusion he draws is that the PhlGl of the Yasna must necessarily have been taken from a Nask text which contained *aβestāg ud zand*. However, our window on the Nask is the *Dēnkard* text which, to my mind, does not support the claim.

[3] *JA* 282, 1996, pp. 37-108.

from the PhlY, as in the case of 53.9d discussed above as *zand*. Not to exclude such a possibility, we might further suppose that Ādurfarnbag, who, as an active priest, was certainly familiar with the PhlY, "corrected" the Nask text at times by substituting a quote from the PhlY. To further complicate matters, we find in §8 above, not a Gloss of the Avestan, but rather the exact wording of the Comment of the PhlY *kū ō ōy ī tuxšāg ud paymānīg dād hē* "*i.e.,* thou wast created for him who is diligent and moderate." Who is quoting whom? Apparently it is the Comment quoting the Nask.

The root cause of the problems facing us in sorting out all of this, is the intertextuality of the traditions. It is my opinion that the Gloss of the PhlY is an original text which, despite scribal errors in its transmission, was not modified after its creation with the substitution of glosses from whatever was contained in the Nasks. However, the Comment is another matter, as it appears to draw on various sources beyond the lights of its authors. In the *Dēnkard* we have to deal with the layers of editorial work that separate it from the original content of the Nasks. That is, when we read the often muddled prose of the text, to what extent can we be sure that what is given is derived directly from the Nask? When we find at the head of a section the common *ēn-iz kū* "And this too: ....." is what follows a quotation or epitome of the Nask or the import from some other source of material deemed relevant by either Ādurfarnbag or Ādurbād?

The Comment

We have already established that the text of the Gloss is at least late Sassanid, and from this it follows that the Comment is even later. It seems impossible to recover the genesis of the Comment. Does it represent the annotated manuscript of a singular scholar-priest? Or is it analogous to a Talmudic manuscript, preserving layers of marginalia? Wherever the truth may lie the Comment has every appearance of belonging to the scholastic tradition of the 9th century or later.

As an examination of the Comment and its parallels in the Dk will show, the Comment often cites either the Dēnkard itself or else the older Nask material on which the Dk is based. Owing to the situation that most of these citations are inexact to varying degrees, one might suppose that both are drawing on common sources. Of course, this remains an open question, since the hypothetical common sources are now irretrievably lost.

Among the interesting features of the Comment is the inclusion of *andarz* 'proverbs' a genre richly attested in Pahlavi literature.[1] Proverbs can be identified by a couple of criteria. They occur in a context that is not directly a further gloss or explanation of the PhlGl and the content is gnomic in its generality. Also they exhibit a certain literary structure, as a few examples will show.

> *ān ī mad estād   ā-m be kard*
> *ud ān ī nē mad estād rāy   ā-m be nigerīd* (47.1a)

---

[1] See S. Shaked "Andarz" in the *Encyclopedia Iranica* (<iranica.com>).

"That which has come, I do, but in respect to what has not come, I consider." The meaning is that I act upon something that is actual, yet consider matters which are not actual (since they might actualize).

   ō ōy dahēnd kē   kār ud kirbag kunēd (29.7a)

"They give to him who performs good deeds." This particular one is introduced as a quotation from the Holy Word (*ān mizd az mānsᵃr payd*āg "this reward is revealed from the Mānsar.").

   nēkīh ī ēdar   ān-iz ī ānōh (27.2b)

"The goodness that is here, that too is there." The point of reference is the two existences, worldly and spiritual.

The texts of the Pahlavi Yasna of the Gāthās and the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti

The present revised edition is based on the critical edition of B. N. Dhabhar *Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad*, Bombay, 1949, which presents the text in the Book Pahlavi script, accompanied by a glossary. Rather than reproduce the text in the original script we have chosen to present it in transcription, except in a few cases where the reading of a word is too uncertain. The transcription follows the principles established by D. N. MacKenzie.[1]
Occasionally words are found in the Avestan script, mostly Avestan words, but also Pahlavi (Pāzand). In the transcription such words are in *italics*. A * immediately preceding a word indicates an uncertain reading. When there is a sequence of uncertain words, * is place at the beginning of the series and * at the end. In most cases there will be an explanatory note. The Comment is set in square brackets [ ] in order to distinguish it from the Gloss. Words not found in the MSS are set within <   >; while words to be deleted are indicated by ~~strikethrough~~. Raised ⁺ indicates an emendation.
There is a number of problems one encounters in reading Pahlavi manuscripts generally, problems also present in the Pahlavi Yasna. Most frequently encountered is the promiscuity of the scribes in writing or omitting the izafe ᵞ (*ī*) and the conjunction ı (*ud*). Closely connected with the problem of *ī* are the many occasions when properly a word ends in °*īh* followed by *ī*. Because aurally both were heard as *ī* the scribes frequently write only °*īh* or *ī* when both are required, or even write both when only one is required. There are other mistaken homophones in the diction of the scribes. For example, *ō* 'to' written usually ıℽ / ᵓ*w*ˈ / and occasionally ꝑı / ᶜ*l* / is confused with *ōh* 'thus, so' properly written ıℒ / *KN* /, and further there is a confusion with ⧬ı / ᶜ*LH* / pronounced properly as *ōy*, but in the diction of the scribes as *ō*. And there are confused homographs; for example, ıℽ / ᵓ*w*ˈ / or / ᵓ*n*ˈ /, the latter properly ⳅ / *ZK* /, also ᴗꝑᴗ which can be read as either ᵓ*Pš* / *u-š* / or ᵓ*cš* / *az-iš* /.
A daunting problem facing an editor is identifying compounds. The basic question is whether in the Gloss we have merely a sequence of glossed words without particular syntactic relationship or genuine compounds. Owing to the fact that we are dealing with a programmatic word-for-word gloss, in the majority of cases genitive relationship between words of a compound are dependent on word-order; thus, Av *saxʷārō mairištō* (29.4a) is

---

[1] *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*, London, 1971.

saxwan-āmārēnīdār. However, the Gloss does frequently avail itself of the two types of izafe constructions, namely, the simple *X ī Y* (*e.g.*, *gāw ī az* 29.5b) or the complex *ān* (*ōy*, ēd, ēn) *ī Y X* (*e.g.*, *ān ī gōspand tāšīdār* 29.2a). Because it is a gloss there seem to be many cases of *ad hoc* compounds that may not be found elsewhere in Phl literature. For example, Av *tušnā.maitiš* (43.15c) is glossed as *ōy tušt mard menišnīg*. Did the glossist intend a three-word compound? Or was he merely presenting an etymological parsing? Where a word ends in °*išnīh*, it always forms a compound with the preceding word; for example, *bowandag-menišnīh*.

Perplexing is the manner in which verbal endings, especially of the 3rd persons singular and plural, are given in the Gloss. One would think that Av. °*aitī* would mechanically be glossed with °*ēd*, and °*aintī* with °*ēnd*. However, a glance at the verb entries in our Glossary will reveal a chaotic situation where singular and plural freely exchange without apparent reason. Is this the fault of our manuscripts? Or does it reveal a basic indifference to these endings? Related to the problem of 3rd person endings, is the bewildering habit of the scribes in using the signs ꭱ and ꭱ as substitutes for the phonetic ꭱ° and ꭱ °. Owing to the general carelessness in regard to these endings, one can only guess by context what was originally intended by ꭱ or ꭱ when transcribing the text. The verb endings of the first persons singular and plural are usually written with an *m* (ꭱ), sometimes *ym* (ꭱ), reflecting, perhaps, historical pronunciations of °*om* and °*ēm* respectively. Although it is probable that °*m* is merely short-hand for °*ēm*, we have retained the difference in transcription.

Owing to the many parallels found in the *Dēnkard*, these have been given in the footnotes, as an aid to those who might wish to study them further. Since its publication in 1911 the edition of D. M. Madan (DkM)[1] has been the standard for citation in the scholarly literature. We follow this tradition, citing the facsimile edition of M. J. Dresden (B)[2] only when there is a problem in the reading of a word.

The Parallel Avestan/Pahlavi Texts

The production of the texts in parallel (Appendix I) is designed to facilitate study of the relationship between the Avestan text of the Gāthās and the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti and that of the Pahlavi gloss, exclusive of the comments which were later incorporated into the manuscripts of the Pahlavi Yasna. One can see immediately that, with occasional deviations, the Pahlavi forms a word by word gloss of the Avestan, often paying little attention to Middle Persian grammar and syntax.

---

[1]   *The Complete Text of the Pahlavi Dinkard*, Pt. II, Bombay, 1911.

[2]   *Dēnkart, A Pahlavi Text*, Wiebaden, 1966.