IRANICA

Herausgegeben von Maria Macuch

Band 17

2009

Exegisti monumenta
Festschrift in Honour of
Nicholas Sims-Williams

Edited by Werner Sundermann,
Almut Hintze and François de Blois

2009

Contents

Contents IX

Nicholas Sims-Williams

Nicholas John Sims-Williams was born on 11 April 1949 in Chatham, the son of Rev. Michael V. S. Sims-Williams and Kathleen née Wenborn, one of a pair of twins and the youngest of five children. After developing an interest in ancient languages and cultures while at Borden Grammar School in Sittingbourne, he was admitted to Trinity Hall, Cambridge to read Oriental Studies. His first interest was in Sanskrit, which was taught by Professor John Brough, but students were expected to take a second option and he chose Iranian, which was taught by Dr Ilya Gershevitch. So inspiring was the latter's teaching that he soon found that Iranian had become his main concern. The only other student in Gershevitch's class was Ursula Seton-Watson, and Nicholas and Ursula got married in 1972, at the end of their course together. After graduating with first class honours, he was awarded a research studentship at Trinity Hall from 1972 to 1975, followed by a Research Fellowship at Gonville and Caius College in 1975. However, he resigned the latter in 1976 to take up a position as lecturer in Iranian Languages at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. He became Reader in 1989, Professor of Iranian and Central Asian Languages in 1994 and, after taking early retirement, Research Professor in 2004.

As a student of Walter B. Henning, Ilya Gershevitch had been profoundly moulded by the study of the Iranian Turfan texts. It was he who enthused Nicholas for this wide, diverse and largely unexplored field. While reading Olaf Hansen's 1954 edition of the Christian Sogdian manuscript C2 with his teacher, Nicholas noticed many inaccuracies, misreadings and unsolved problems. So much so, that the need for a new and, in contrast to Hansen's, complete edition became evident, together with a fresh collation of all its extant fragments. Between 1972 and 1976 Nicholas carried out most of the work on this new edition, for which he was awarded not only a Ph.D. by the University of Cambridge in 1978 but also the Prix Ghirshman of the Institut de France in 1988.

At the time, the surviving fragments of the MS C2 were in the custody of archives located in what were East and West Berlin: the then Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR and the Museum für Indische Kunst of the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz in West Berlin (Dahlem). Thus Dr Gershevitch's young, boyish-looking PhD-student became involved in the problems of a city that was divided between the "free" and the "socialist" worlds. He lived in West Berlin, but in order to carry out his work in East Berlin, had to cross the border daily and endure the security checks and interrogations of the DDR border

control officers at Berlin Friedrichstraße. In addition, his archival work also met with obstacles. The West Berlin fragments were secreted in the Museum für Indische Kunst, but were discovered by chance by WERNER SUNDERMANN. When he told Nicholas, the Museum was upset that their secret was out. After the reunification of Germany, however, these fragments were returned to the Academy. The East Berlin texts had been reserved, after the death of W. B. HENNING, to be published by the Academy's own specialist, WERNER SUNDERMANN. The latter, however, quickly recognized that the young iranist was a truly remarkable scholar. Even if he did not always speak them fluently, his understanding of foreign languages was striking. Moreover, in linguistic discussions he combined sound common sense with deep insight into the essence of a problem, and unpretentious modesty with ingenuity. Consequently the Academy made an exception to its rule that unpublished texts are reserved for publication by in-house specialists by giving permission for unpublished fragments associated with published ones (and for already published texts) to be put at the disposal of its visiting scholar. They were even more ready to do this since SIMS-WILLIAMS agreed to publish his text edition in the Academy's own series of *Berliner Turfantexte*. It became vol. XII and appeared in 1985 as *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2*. His text edition is unsurpassed and has completely replaced that of HANSEN. Not only that, but SIMS-WILLIAMS included a "Morphological analysis of C2", and this represents a significant step towards the Grammar of Christian Sogdian that still remains to be written.

By the time his edition of C2 appeared, SIMS-WILLIAMS had already published more than forty articles and reviews. They include editions of smaller Sogdian texts, in particular those in the British Library (see below, fn. 20), and, moreover, numerous important articles on Sogdian palaeography, grammar, and lexicon. One would not detract from SIMS-WILLIAMS' other excellent achievements during this early phase of his scholarship by stating that his contributions to Sogdian palaeography and grammar were perhaps the most important ones. They significantly correct and enrich our understanding of the Sogdian language.

Sogdian palaeography and grammar

In his very first publication in 1972, SIMS-WILLIAMS argued that the Buddhist Sogdian preposition which previously had been read *rm* should instead be read ʿM. The latter renders Aramaic *ʾam* 'with' and is thus heterographic for Sogdian *δn(n)* 'with'.[1] In other articles he pointed out misleading and unjustifiable inaccuracies that had become customary in the transliteration of Sogdian texts written in Sogdian script. Once put forward, his corrections were so obvious

1   "A Sogdian ideogram." In: BSOAS 35.3 (1972), pp. 614–615.

that one can only be astonished that no one else had suggested them before. For instance, he demonstrated that in word-final position the letter *gimel* (γ) is almost always distinct from *cheth* (x) in the Mug documents and Buddhist manuscripts,[2] and that in addition initial and medial γ and x are also systematically distinguished in a Manichaean Sogdian manuscript.[3] This seemingly trifling observation entirely changed the transliteration system of Sogdian by putting an end to the indiscriminate use of either γ or x for both γ and x. Spellings like γw for xw or mz'yγ for mz'yx are no longer acceptable.

In a sophisticated sketch of the representation of the Sogdian sound-system by means of the Sogdian script, he showed that the voiced plosives [b, d, g] are represented by the same letters *pe*, *tau* and *caph* as their voiceless counterparts [p, t, k], but that they normally only occur either in foreign words or as allophones of [p, t, k] after the vocalic nasal [ṁ]. By contrast, the letters *beth*, *lamed* and *gimel* are reserved for the voiced fricatives [β, δ, γ], which had developed from the OIr. voiced stops, while use of the letter *daleth* is confined to the ideogram 'D 'to'. Furthermore, he deduced the phonemic status of vowel quantity from the effects of the Rhythmic Law.[4]

In one of his most important contributions to Sogdian grammar, Sims-Williams established the phonological basis of the Sogdian Rhythmic Law,[5] that determining and all-pervading principle of Sogdian phonology and morphology discovered by P. Tedesco and further elaborated by W. B. Henning and I. Gershevitch. Tedesco had noted the morphological effects of the Rhythmic Law, whereby light stems retain a vocalic ending which is lost in heavy stems, while Gershevitch had observed that the position of the stress determines whether word-final syllables are kept or drop off. However, it was not clear as to what made a stem light or heavy. Sims-Williams argued against Gershevitch's claim that all light stems were monosyllabic and that there were heavy stems consisting of two short syllables. Moreover, he showed in detail and conclusively (p. 213):

> that those heavy syllables previously regarded as containing a short vowel "in positione" before a consonant cluster *(xw, rC, mb, nC)* in fact contain a long vowel or diphthong. A heavy syllable may therefore be defined very simply as a syllable which contains a long vowel or diphthong.

2   "Notes on Sogdian palaeography." In: BSOAS 38.1 (1975), pp. 132–139.
3   "Remarks on the Sogdian letters γ and x (with special reference to the orthography of the Sogdian version of the Manichean church-history)." In: W. Sundermann: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts.* Berlin 1981 (BTT XI), pp. 194–198.
4   "The Sogdian Sound-System and the Origins of the Uighur Script." In: JA 219 (1981), pp. 347–360.
5   "The Sogdian 'Rhythmic Law'." In: W. Skalmowski/A. van Tongerloo (eds.): *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982.* Leuven 1984 (OLA 16), pp. 203–215.

He thus significantly simplified GERSHEVITCH's complicated and inconsistent description of a heavy syllable by including sequences of short vowel plus *ə^r* or *ṁ* into his own definition of long vowels and diphthongs. Having established the phonological basis for the origins of the morphological categories of 'light' (stems which have no long vowel) and 'heavy' stems (those which do have a long vowel or diphthong), he introduced the consequent use of a final hyphen to distinguish light stems (e.g. wn- 'to do') from heavy ones (e.g. wyn 'to see').[6]

In other articles he examined the far-reaching effects of the Rhythmic Law in the history of Sogdian syntax and inflectional and derivational morphology. For instance, in an investigation of the processes which led to the double system of light and heavy stems in nominal morphology, he argued against the likelihood of TEDESCO and GERSHEVITCH's explanation, according to which the oblique suffix -*ī* was borrowed from the gen.sg. of light stems, because in some Christian Sogdian manuscripts the pointing indicates the vowel-quality -*ĭ* for the oblique suffix, but -*ě* for the gen.sg. He proposed instead that the oblique marker results from the regular phonetic development of unstressed -*ya* in the loc.sg.m. (< *-*ayā*), loc.sg.f. (< *-*āyā*) and gen./abl.sg.f. (< *-*āyāh*), and supported his explanation with an analysis of the syntactic function of the relevant forms in folios 30–120 of the MS C2,

> a source which is not to be regarded as typical but rather as outstanding for the exceptional clarity and internal consistency of its grammatical system.

His study demonstrates that the oblique suffix -*ī* (< *-*ya*) is "well entrenched" in all those syntactic functions where the equivalent light stem ending is -*ya* (< *-*yá*.), i.e. in the loc.sg. of masc. nouns, the gen.-loc.-abl.sg. of fem. nouns and the gen.-loc.-abl. pl. of masc. and fem. nouns.[7] Moreover, he surveyed the development of OIr. -*a*-, -*aka*- and -*ā*-, -*ăkā*-stems in both Khotanese and Sogdian. Accepting TEDESCO's theory of the loss of intervocalic -*k*-, he proposed a convincing explanation of the origins of the inflection of Sogdian contracted stems.[8] He noticed that old dual forms had come to be used not only after 'two' but also after higher numbers, and he therefore adopted the term "numerative" for this grammatical category, which exists alongside the singular and plural. In the same article he also put forward an explanation for the plur. suffix -*yšt* which is attached to certain masculine light-stem nouns denoting animals or persons. According to him, the plur. suffix -*yšt* was already formed in OIr. times and is made up of the nom.sg. in *-*īš* to which the collective-abstract suffix *-*tā*- was attached. Moreover, by comparing Sogd. wyrqyšt 'wolves' < *wr̥kīš-tā- directly

---

6   CLI, p. 181f.
7   "The double system of nominal inflexion in Sogdian." In: TPS 1982, pp. 67–76.
8   "Chotano-Sogdica II: aspects of the development of nominal morphology in Khotanese and Sogdian." In: GH. GNOLI/A. PANAINO (eds.): *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Turin, September 7ᵗʰ–11ᵗʰ, 1987 by the Societas Iranologica Europaea.* Vol. I. Rome 1990 [1991], pp. 275–296.

with Ved. *vŕkī́ḥ*, he retrieved an equivalent for the sigmatic nom.sg. of the Ved. *vŕkī́-* declension not certainly attested elsewhere in Iranian.[9] In an investigation of some suffixes in the light of the Rhythmic Law, he established the phonological basis for the distribution both of the abstract nominal suffixes *ᵒyāk* and *ᵒyā* (< *ᵒyā́kā* after light and *ᵒyākā* after heavy stems respectively) and of *ᵒyā* and *ᵒī* (both < *ᵒyā*).[10]

In the Sogdian pronominal system, Sims-Williams identified a suppletive system of the 'second person' demonstrative pronoun *š-/t-* 'iste', which he derives from OIr. *aiša-/ta-*. This system is in addition to that of the 'first person' *y-/m-* 'hic', *š-/t-* 'iste', and 'third person' *x-/w-* 'ille'. He thus demonstrated that Sogdian expresses a three-way deictic contrast involving pronominal stems inherited from Old Iranian and continued in modern East Iranian languages.[11]

Sims-Williams surveyed new formations in the Sogdian verbal system (forms in *-āz,* the middle of the imperfect, the precative, and the irreal) in the abstract of a congress paper.[12] In one of his more recent studies he presented a new theory of the origin of the Sogdian potentialis in three separate constructions and of its use to express anteriority. Moreover, he proposed a new and convincing etymology for the ending *-ta* in the intransitive and passive potential (both formed with suffix *-ta* and the auxiliary *βw-* 'to become') by deriving it from the nom.sg. of the agent noun in *-tar-*, an explanation he strongly supports with evidence for the same construction in Vedic and Avestan, where agent nouns with suffix *-tar-* are likewise combined with the copula *bhū* and often express or imply potentiality.[13] His contributions to Sogdian syntax include the discovery that the imperfect tense is not negated, except in late texts. He established the rule, previously observed only in Choresmian, that in negative clauses the present indicative or injunctive is used, with or without the enclitic particle -β(y), instead of the imperfect.[14]

His chapter "Sogdian" in CLI offers the most up-to-date and comprehensive account of Sogdian grammar.[15] Moreover, he has significantly contributed to the corpus of Sogdian electronic texts on Jost Gippert's TITUS homepage (Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien). In all his articles , only some of which are summarized above, Sims-Williams has made important

---

9 "On the Plural and Dual in Sogdian." In: BSOAS 42 (1979), pp. 337–346.
10 "Some Sogdian denominal abstract suffixes." In: AcOr 42 (1981 [1982]), pp. 11–19.
11 "The triple system of deixis in Sogdian." In: TPS 92/1 (1994), pp. 41–53.
12 "The development of the Sogdian verbal system." In: A. Wezler/E. Hammerschmidt (eds.): *Proceedings of the XXXII International Congress for Asian and North African Studies, Hamburg, 25th–30th August 1986.* Stuttgart 1992, p. 205.
13 "The Sogdian potentialis." In: M. Macuch/M. Maggi/W. Sundermann (eds.): *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume.* Wiesbaden 2007 (Iranica 13), pp. 377–386.
14 "On the Historic Present and Injunctive in Sogdian and Choresmian." In: MSS 56 (1996), pp. 173–189.
15 "Sogdian." In: CLI, pp. 173–192.

contributions to a general Sogdian grammar which is yet to be written. For this and other reasons it would be valuable to republish his *opera minora* in a thematic order.

Works on other Iranian languages

Alongside these studies of Sogdian, Nicholas Sims-Williams has contributed to the investigation of other Middle Iranian idioms (especially Khotanese), Old Persian, Avestan and non-Iranian Near-Eastern languages. For instance, he clarified a well-known but corrupt passage in the Avestan Yima-story in Vīdēvdād, chapter 2, by restoring the verb *ˣaiβisuua-* as a thematic aorist, and linking it to the nasal-infixed present **sumb(a)-* which is continued in Sogd. swmb/swβt- 'to pierce, bore'.[16] Other examples are his explanations both of the fossilized Manichaean Middle Persian inflectional endings of relationship nouns and of the linking vowels that occur when enclitic pronouns and adverbs are attached to their hosts.[17] Shortly afterwards, Skjærvø's article "Case in inscriptional Middle Persian, inscriptional Parthian and in the Pahlavi Psalter"[18] showed that the two scholars' independent researches complemented and confirmed one another in numerous ways.

Many of Nicholas Sims-Williams' linguistic discoveries are relevant not only to Iranian but also to Indo-Iranian, indeed Indo-European philology. Examples include the Iranian evidence he retrieved for the sigmatic nom.sg. of the IE *vr̥kī́ḥ*-declension, see above, and his suggestion that the 2sg. imperative form *trš* (alongside the 3pl. *trš'nt*) in the Rustam fragment points to a heavy stem (< **tarša-*) rather than the light one of the inchoative present (IE **tr̥s-ské/ó-*), which is unattested in Sogdian.[19] The meaning 'to flee', which he posits on the basis of the context of P 13.1–2, agrees not only with the evidence of other Iranian languages but also with Greek τρέω 'to flee from fear, flee away', e.g. Iliad 11.745 ἔτρεσαν ἄλλυδις ἄλλος 'they fled one hither, another thither'.

Other Text editions

An outstanding example of his smaller Sogdian text editions is the *editio princeps* of eighteen Sogdian fragments in the British Library.[20] This heterogeneous

16 "Avestan suβrā-, Turkish süvre." In: L. Bazin/P. Zieme (eds.): *De Dunhuang a Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton.* Turnhout 2001 (Silk Road Studies 5), pp. 329–338.
17 "Notes on Manichaean Middle Persian Morphology." In: StIr 10 (1981 [1982]), pp. 165–176.
18 StIr 12 (1983), pp. 47–62 and 151–181.
19 IIJ 18 (1976), p. 58.
20 IIJ 18 (1976), pp. 43–83.

collection includes both the famous epic Rustam fragment (no. 13) and the Zarathustra fragment (no. 4) containing two lines of the Avestan *Ašǝm vohū* prayer in early Sogdian language. His long-standing work on the Sogdian Ancient Letters led to the translation or complete edition of letters 1, 2, 3, and 5.[21] Of particular historical importance is letter 2, which became the subject of a detailed study by Sims-Williams and Frantz Grenet, confirming Henning's dating of the letters to shortly after AD 311.[22]

Sims-Williams produced the complete and definitive decipherment of the Middle Iranian (mainly Sogdian) inscriptions of the upper Indus valley,[23] contributed decisively to the understanding of the Sogdian fragments from Leningrad (St. Petersburg),[24] edited the Middle Iranian fragments in Helsinki[25] and, jointly with James Hamilton, eight Sogdian documents from Dunhuang.[26] He also provided reliable and illuminating help to Sundermann and many other colleagues in their editions of various Turfan texts and other works. More could be said, but special prominence should be given to his collaboration with Frantz Grenet on the very old Sogdian inscriptions from Kultobe.[27]

21 "The Sogdian Ancient Letters", internet publication under: http://depts.washington. edu//silkroad/texts/sogdlet.html. Cf. N. Sims-Williams: "Towards a new edition of the Sogdian Ancient Letters: Ancient Letter 1." In: É. de la Vaissière/É. Trombert (eds.): *Les Sogdiens en Chine.* Paris 2005, pp. 181–193; "The Sogdian Ancient Letter II." In: M. G. Schmidt/W. Bisang (eds.): *Philologica et Linguistica. Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Dezember 2001.* Trier 2001, pp. 267–280; "Sogdian Ancient Letter II." In: A. L. Juliano/J. A. Lerner: *Monks and Merchants: Silk Road Treasures from Northwest China: Gansu and Ningxia, 4th-7th century.* New York 2001, pp. 47–49; (with F. Grenet and É. de la Vaissière): "The Sogdian Ancient Letter V." In: *Alexander's Legacy in the East: Studies in honor of Paul Bernard.* Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, 1998 [2001] (BAI n.s. 12), pp. 91–104.

22 F. Grenet/N. Sims-Williams: "The Historical Context of the Sogdian Ancient Letters." In: *Transition Periods in Iranian Ancient History. Actes du symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau (22–24 mai 1985).* Leuven 1987, pp. 101–122.

23 *Sogdian and other Iranian Inscriptions of the Upper Indus.* I and II. London 1989 and 1992 (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, Vol. III Sogdian).

24 "The Sogdian fragments of Leningrad." In: BSOAS 44 (1981), pp. 231–240; "The Sogdian fragments of Leningrad II: Mani at the court of the Shahanshah." In: BAI n.s. 4 (1990), pp. 281–288; "The Sogdian fragments of Leningrad III: fragments of the Xwāstwānīft." In: A. van Tongerloo/S. Giversen (eds.): *Manichaica Selecta. Studies presented to Professor Julian Ries on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.* Louvain 1991, pp. 323–328.

25 N. Sims-Williams/H. Halén: *The Middle Iranian fragments in Sogdian script from the Mannerheim collection.* Helsinki 1980 (StOr 51.13).

26 N. Sims-Williams/J. Hanilton: *Documents turco-sogdiens du IXᵉ–Xᵉ siècle de Touenhouang.* London 1990.

27 N. Sims-Williams/F. Grenet: "The Sogdian inscriptions of Kultobe." In: *Shygys* 1 (2006), pp. 95–111; and (with F. Grenet and A. Podushkin): "Les plus anciens monuments de la langue sogdienne: les inscriptions de Kultobe au Kazakhstan." In: CRAI 2007 [2009].

Bactrian

The most exciting development in Iranian studies during the last two decades was doubtless the rediscovery of the language and literature of ancient Bactria, a fortunate bye-product of the tragic events in Afghanistan. During the 1990s a number of leather documents with Bactrian writing began to appear in smugglers' markets in Pakistan and soon the trickle became a stream. The largest portion of these were acquired by the London art collector DAVID KHALILI and it was at the suggestion of Professor DAVID BIVAR that the owner showed them to NICHOLAS SIMS-WILLIAMS and eventually entrusted him with their publication.

Prior to the new discoveries, the only really substantial Bactrian texts known to scholars were the inscription from Surkh Khotal, discovered in the 1960s, and the unique Bactrian text in Manichaean script from Turfan. The latter has to this day still not been published (an edition and translation by SIMS-WILLIAMS is forthcoming in the festschrift for WERNER SUNDERMANN), but it had been studied by ILYA GERSHEVITCH, with whom SIMS-WILLIAMS read it while a student. Already in 1989 SIMS-WILLIAMS published a brief sketch of Bactrian in the *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, largely on the basis of the Manichaean text, but also taking into account all the other then available texts, meagre though they were. The new documents from Afghanistan brought with them an enormous increase in the materials for the study of the language and history of Bactria, but at the same time they threw up a huge number of new problems. To begin with, they are written in a Greek-based cursive script that was, to be sure, already partially known from a handful of documents, but which had still not been entirely deciphered. Having first unlocked the secret of the script, SIMS-WILLIAMS set out to unravel the language. A preliminary report on the new documents was published in 1997 in his inaugural lecture at SOAS.[28] At about the same time as the leather documents, the important Bactrian inscription of Rabatak from the reign of Kanishka came to light. Jointly with his colleague JOE CRIBB of the British Museum he was awarded the Hirayama prize in 1997 for their work on the decipherment and interpretation of this inscription.[29] A first volume of the leather documents was published in 2001[30] and a second volume

---

28 *New light on ancient Afghanistan: the decipherment of Bactrian.* London 1997.
29 N. SIMS-WILLIAMS/J.CRIBB: "A new Bactrian inscription of Kanishka the Great." In: SRAA 4 (1996), pp. 75–142; N. SIMS-WILLIAMS: "Further notes on the Bactrian inscription of Rabatak, with an Appendix on the names of Kujula Kadphises and Vima Taktu in Chinese." In: N. SIMS-WILLIAMS (ed.): *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies.* Part 1: *Old and Middle Iranian Studies.* Wiesbaden 1998 (Beiträge zur Iranistik 17), pp. 79–92.
30 *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents.* Oxford 2000 [2001] (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. III).

in 2007.[31] Both volumes contain a detailed grammatical sketch of Bactrian and a complete glossary of all the then published documents (in the narrower sense of the word, that is: without the inscriptions and coin legends), with etymologies and comparative material. The grammar and vocabulary in the second (2007) volume incorporate and expand upon those in the first (2001) volume and give thus an up-to-date overview of the language. In February 2009 the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran awarded Nicholas Sims-Williams the International Book of the Year Prize for his *Bactrian Documents*. As a result of his work Bactrian has now become not only one of the most important Middle Iranian languages, but also one of the best studied and most expertly described of all the pre-modern Iranian languages. Students of Iranian linguistics will henceforth ignore it at their peril.

The significance of the new documents for the history and geography of ancient and early mediaeval Afghanistan has only just begun to be studied, but Sims-Williams has already made ground-breaking observations on these matters as well. A study of the month-names and the day-names in the Bactrian documents by Sims-Williams, in conjunction with that of the month-names of 'the people of *Tukharistan' in one of the tables added to al-Biruni's *Chronology* by de Blois, has made possible the reconstruction of the Bactrian calendar[32], while an examination of the Bactrian documents edited by Sims-Williams gave the impetus to a solution of the problem of the Bactrian era by de Blois[33] and thus to a reliable chronological framework for the Bactrian documents and inscriptions. But this is just the beginning of a new epoch in the study of the history of ancient Afghanistan.

Nicholas Sims-Williams as a teacher

Although Nicholas Sims Williams' teaching activities at SOAS officially ended in 2004, there are numerous students and colleagues who have been and, metaphorically speaking, still are sitting at his feet in London, Cambridge and many other places throughout the world in order to learn from his immense knowledge of and deep insight into things Iranian and Central Asian, and to benefit from his clear and precise presentation of their subject matter. We could

---

31 *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan II: Letters and Buddhist Texts.* London 2007 (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. III).

32 N. Sims-Williams/F. de Blois: "The Bactrian calendar." In: BAI X (1996 [1998]), pp. 149–165; *eidem*: "The Bactrian calendar: new material and new suggestions." In: D. Weber (ed.): *Languages of Iran: Past and Present. Iranian studies in memoriam David Neil MacKenzie.* Wiesbaden 2005 (Iranica 8), pp. 185–196.

33 F. de Blois: "Du nouveau sur la chronologie bactrienne post-hellénistique: l'ère de 223/224 ap. J.-C." In: CRAI 2006 [2008], fasc. II, pp. 991–997.

do no better than quote the words of his distinguished pupil, Professor YUTAKA YOSHIDA of Kyoto, who expresses the indebtedness and gratitude he owes to his teacher in the following words:

> The oldest letter I have from Nicholas is dated 26th July 1979, when he sent me his comments on my master's thesis, which I had posted on 20th July, just one week before. The type-written letter (these were the good old days!) comprises five full pages containing his comments on every detail of my not very long paper on the Sogdian infinitives. At that time he was 30 and I was 25. In my letter accompanying the thesis I asked him about the possibility of studying Sogdian at SOAS and his letter ended with "It would give me great pleasure if you were able to come to study in London". It took me two years to finally find a scholarship to study with him.
>
> I learned Sogdian, Khotanese, Old Persian, and Western Middle Iranian from him within no more than two terms during 1981–82. I still remember very well how in the SOAS library he first gave me the photographs of Sogdian manuscripts, subsequently published by Werner Sundermann in his "Kirchengeschichte", and told me to prepare the text and translation. The Sogdian lesson, which lasted a whole afternoon, was given in the library of his house on 38 Parolles Road. As a foreigner I found then and still find it difficult to follow English spoken by mother-tongue speakers, but I could understand his English without difficulty. When I indicated that to him, he was very pleased and told me that he tried very hard to speak English in such a way that I could follow him.
>
> Among the Sogdian texts I read with him were old photographs of two relatively large fragments, which were suspected to belong to the same manuscript. I had discovered them in one of the store houses of Kyoto University and brought them to England so that I might read the difficult text with Nicholas. The provenance of the photographs and the location of the original fragments were unknown. Just before I left England I spent a week in Germany to see more photographs of Sogdian manuscripts preserved in Hamburg. I was also hoping to find out whether the originals of the photographs from Kyoto University were preserved in the Berlin collection. When I shared my plan with Nicholas, he insisted that I should not only search for them but should also pay careful attention to discovering whether there were any additional fragments which could be joined to them.
>
> A few days later I was most excited to find out that the manuscript of the so-called "Job Story" once published by Henning precedes the Kyoto fragments without a gap. I had always suspected that Nicholas, who had also examined the Hamburg photographs, had pretended not to know the fact so that I might be the first to discover it. When reading fragments Nicholas always required me to infer what was lost in the missing part; otherwise one would not be able to piece them together to make larger texts and eventually discover many interesting facts. His edition of C2 is full of such insights and is a masterpiece of Sogdian philology, which no one else could have produced. I also admired him when I found out that all his joinings of the Leningrad fragments published by Ragoza were borne out by the Chinese texts on their reverse which I had a chance to examine; he was not even misled by Ragoza's wrong measurements of the fragments.

It is not possible to fully explain how much I owe him. Even today I send him e-mails from time to time always asking him for help in matters of Sogdian philology. His answers are something like a learned article which I can only cite in my paper. One recent instance is my question about the contents of an unpublished Sogdian fragment belonging to the Otani collection and currently housed in the Lushun Museum. It is a wonderful piece containing the names of Rustam, Senmurgh, Godarz, etc. who are mentioned in sentences like "May you be a brave rider just like brave Rustam!". On the very same day I received his answer in which he drew my attention to the Vishtasp Yasht. I am very lucky to be of similar age, because I can learn from my teacher even when I become very old!

It is perhaps not out of place to mention here the generous help that Nicholas has often given to so many of his students and colleagues, whether by devising creative schemes to get them employment, or by reading and advising on drafts of their articles and books. His work, for example, in editing the volumes of the Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, far exceeded what is normally required.

General appraisal

Scholarly activity of this intensity is uncommon, and more so since it has gone along with other academic obligations in universities, academies and other scholarly bodies as well as with various private and social engagements. To contribute to the progress of the humanities with such a wealth of publications is due to more than exceptional intellectual capacity. It is also the result of a critical restriction of effort to the essentials and of the patient acquisition of the latter by studying, learning and reflecting.

Nicholas Sims-Williams was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 1988, Corresponding Member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in 1990 and Associé Étranger of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in 2002. He was Visiting Professor at the Collège de France in 1998–1999, at the University of Rome 'La Sapienza' in 2001 and, in 1998–2000, at Macquarie University, Sydney, where he was also Adjunct Professor in 2004–2006. He gave the Ehsan Yarshater Distinguished Lectures on Iranian Studies, in which he surveyed the newly discovered Bactrian documents, at Harvard University in 2000. He raised ca. £ 900,000 in total of Government funding for two major research pojects (Manichaean Dictionary and Bactrian Chronology) both of which he directed between 2000 and 2007. He is Member of the Kommission "Turfanforschung" of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, vice-president of the Philological Society of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (president 2003–2007), for many years Secretary and from 2002 Chairman of the Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Chairman of the Linguistics and Philology section of the British Academy (from 2004), British Academy representative to the

Union Académique Internationale (from 2004), Treasurer of the Ancient India and Iran Trust, Cambridge, editor of *Beiträge zur Iranistik* (Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden) and associate editor of the *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, to which he has contributed numerous articles. He has also been or is serving on the editorial board of several Journals, including the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, *Studia Iranica* and the *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*.

On December 14, 2001 a group of iranists from several countries benefited from another of Sims-Williams' many talents. It was the day of a commemoration ceremony in honour of the late Ronald E. Emmerick in Hamburg. The musical part of the ceremony was written by Nicholas Sims-Williams as a composition for violin, viola and cello, the three instruments representing the three eminent iranists that we had lost in that particular year: Ronald E. Emmerick, D. Neil MacKenzie and Ilya Gershevitch. The work was later published in *East and West*.[34] Those who know Nick well will be aware that music is his favourite leisure time occupation. He enjoys listening to it and his knowledge is immense. He plays the piano and performs in concerts on the French horn, often with Ursula, herself an accomplished oboist, and has written many compositions himself. In addition to "In Memoriam", his published works include a Partita for oboe, cor anglais and bassoon (1993) and a Serenade for ten wind instruments (1997).

It is not the rule that scholars meriting a festschrift receive one at the still youthful age of sixty. We trust, however, that many more colleagues than those who have contributed to this volume agree that it is more than justified to offer these articles to Nicholas Sims-Williams, the sexagenarian. We regard the fact that so many of Nicholas' colleagues and ex-students consider him worthy of a festschrift at such a young age to be a promising sign that he will continue to enrich our knowledge of philological, linguistic and religious matters in and beyond Iran in numerous ways and for many years to come.

Werner Sundermann, Almut Hintze and François de Blois

---

34 "In Memoriam." In: EW 51 (2001), pp. 423–425.

Disseminating the Mazdayasnian Religion

An Edition of the Avestan Hērbedestān Chapter 5[*]

ALMUT HINTZE, London

Introduction

The twenty chapters of the Hērbedestān (Hēr.),[1] as well as the ninety-one of the Nērangestān, have come down to the present in two manuscript traditions: the Indian line of HJ and the Iranian line represented by TD. HJ derives its name from that of its scribe and previous owner, Hoshang Jamasp of Poona, who in 1727 CE copied it from a ms. that was brought from Iran to India in 1722 by Jāmāsp Velāyatī.[2] However, as far as chapter 5 is concerned, the manuscript HJ is incomplete because on fol. 6r l.11 in Hēr. 3.5 the text breaks off after the words *harw tis* but continues in Hēr. 6 with the words *ka ham-xānag*. All mss. descending from HJ share this deficiency.[3] As a result, for chapter 5 we are entirely dependent on the single manuscript TD.[4]

The latter, which is now held in the Cama Oriental Institute Library, Mumbai, was brought to India by the Iranian mobed Khodābaxš Farōd Ābadān. In 1876 he passed it on to mobed Tehmuras Dinshaw ANKLESARIA (1842–1903), after whom the ms. is named. TD was written by Gōbedšāh Rūstām Bōndār

---

[*]   The Pahlavi text has been edited by MARIA MACUCH in this volume.

1   While DARMESTETER, *ZA* III, pp. 78–91 divides the Hērbedestān into eighteen chapters, both H/E and K/K distinguish twenty.

2   A facsimile edition of HJ was published by SANJANA in 1894. On the impact of Dastur Velāyatī's visit on the Parsis and especially on the transmission of the Vīdēvdād, see A. CANTERA/M. A. ANDRÉS-TOLEDO: "The transmission of the Pahlavi Videvdad in India after 1700 (I): Jāmāsp's visit from Iran and the rise of a new exegetical movement in Surat." In: JCOI 2008, pp. 81–142.

3   One of the mss. decending from HJ is J55, which belongs to the collection of Dastur K M JAMASPASA. We are grateful to him for giving us access to it.

4   KOTWAL/BOYD 1980 (pp. 3, 5) mention three copies of TD: F21 in the Meherji Rana Library, Navsari, and D46 in the Cama Oriental Institute Libray, Mumbai, both made by Dastur Erachji in 1882, and one apparently made by mobed Tehmuras for E. W. WEST. SANJANA 1894 (p. 5) refers to a copy made in 1881 and held in the Mulla Firuz Library (at the Cama Oriental Institue). This is probably D46, since the dates may differ slightly when they are converted from one era date to another.

around 1530 CE. The first 103 folios, which have now been separated from the rest of the ms., contain the Iranian Būndahišn and were followed by 112 folios of the Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. That the text of the latter two originally belonged to a separate, independent volume emerges not only from the fact that it is written in a different hand but also, as noted by KOTWAL/BOYD 1980, p. 1f., from the numbering in the corner of the upper left margin, where the folios are counted in Persian from 1 *(yek)* to 112 *(sad-o-duwāzdah)*. The Hērbedestān occupies fols. 1r5 to 20r3 and is immediately followed by the Nērangestān on fol. 20r.3.[5]

While chapters 12 to 20 of the Hērbedestān concern various aspects of the study of sacred texts under the guidance of a teacher *(aēϑrapaiti-)*, the first eleven deal with the conditions under which family members (men, women or children) may leave home *(para-i)* for the purpose of an activity described as *aϑauruna-*. In the case of married women or minors, they need to be accompanied *(para-hac)* by a male escort, the relevant circumstances being discussed in chapter 6 with regard to a woman and in chapters 7–11 with respect to a child.

The question as to which member of a household should leave home for *aϑauruna-* is raised in the first chapter of the Hērbedestān. The answer is that, regardless of age, the one with the highest esteem for truth should go:

1.1   ×*katāmō*[1] *nmānahe*[2] *aϑaurunəm pāraiiāt̰*[3]
1.2   *yō ašāi bərəjii̯ąstəmō*[4]
1.3   *huu̯ōištō*[5] *vā yōištō*[6] ×*vā*[7]
1.4   *yim vā ainim* ×*haδō.gaēϑa*[8]
1.5   *hazaōšiiā*[9] ×*sā̊ŋha*[10] *caiiąn*[11]

1	*knmō* TD	6	*ẏōištō* TD HJ J55 T58
	deest HJ J55 T58	7	deest TD HJ J55 T58
2	*nmānahe* TD	8	*hapō.gaēϑa* TD
	…*hē* HJ J55 T58		… *gaēϑa* HJ (gap of 4 cm) J55 (gap of
3	*pāraiiāt̰* TD		3 cm) T58 (gap of 4.5 cm)
	paraiiāt̰ HJ T58 J55	9	*hazaōšiiā* TD
4	*bərəjii̯ąstəmō* TD		*azaōšiiā* HJ J55 T58 *(ao)*
	bərəijii̯ą̊stəmāō HJ J55 T58 (ą̊.s)	10	*paå̊ŋha* TD HJ J55 T58
5	*huu̯ōištō* TD	11	*caiiąn* TD HJ T58 *(ą)*
	huu … HJ T58 J55		*caii. ą́ń* J55

5   The ms. is described as TD1 by B.T. ANKLESARIA in T.D. ANKLESARIA 1908, pp. vii–ix and by KOTWAL/BOYD 1980, pp. 1–12, who also offer a facsimile edition of the Hērbedestān and Nērangestān.

1.1   Which one[6] of a household should go away for priestly service?
1.2   The one who has the greatest esteem[7] for truth
1.3   – be it the eldest[8] or the youngest –,
1.4   or any other person whom the co-owners[9]
1.5   shall select by unanimous vote[10].

Chapter 5 discusses the question as to whether the lord or the lady of the house should leave home for *aϑauruna-*. The unexpected answer is that either may do so, but that the one who is more capable of looking after their domestic affairs and property *(gaēϑā-)* should remain behind. The view that looking after one's possessions takes priority over leaving home for *aϑauruna-* is also expressed both in Vd 13.22, where *aϑauruuan-* 'priest' ranks third below the masters of large (Vd 13.20) and medium-sized households (Vd 13.21) and in chapter 3 of the Hērbedestān, quoted below, p. 183.

---

6   BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 433 emends the reading *knmō* to *ˣkatāmō*, while K/K 26 edit *kō*. The latter is also the form preferred by H/E 16, although they consider *katāmō* as an alternative.

7   On *bərəjiiạstəma-* and the root noun *bərəj-* see HINTZE 2007, pp. 50–53.

8   On *huuōišta-* 'oldest, eldest, most important', see N. SIMS-WILLIAMS/E. TUCKER: "Avestan *huuōišta-* and its cognates." In: G. SCHWEIGER (ed.): *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag.* Taimering 2005, pp. 587–604, esp. pp. 594–596.

9   BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 1759 convincingly emends the ms. TD *hapō.gaēϑa* to *ˣhaδō.gaēϑa*. The compound is also attested in Yt 10.116, where it denotes two persons bound by a contract *(miϑra-)*. GERSHEVITCH 1959, p. 267 notes that *haδō.gaēϑa-* is "of almost identical formation" with Choresmian *angēϑ*, Parth. *hʾmgyẖ* and Aram. *hngyt* (A. COWLEY: *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.,* Oxford 1951, no. 43, l. 9 and E. BENVENISTE: "Éléments perses en araméen d'Égypte", in: JA 1954, pp. 297–310, esp. p. 298 fn. 3), all from the possessive adj. *ˣhan-gai̯ϑa-* 'having property in common; partner'. A derivative of the adj. is the fem. abstract substantive *ˣhan-gai̯ϑi̯ākā-* which is found in ʾγγϑγʾ in a Chr.Sogd. fragment (N. SIMS-WILLIAMS: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2,* Berlin 1985, pp. 187, 204) and in Sogd. ʾnγγδγʾ 'association, partnership' (N. SIMS-WILLIAMS/J. HAMILTON: *Documents turco-sogdiens du IXᵉ –Xᵉ siècle de Touen-houang,* London 1990, p. 70).

10 BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 1796, followed by K/K 28, 29 fn. 8 (but differently H/E 18) emends the ms. TD reading *hazaōšiiā paā̊ŋha* to *huua zaoša uta så̊ŋha* after the Pahlavi translation. This could be supported by Yt 13.33 *hauuāi kāmāica zaošāica* 'according to their (i.e. the Fravashis') own wish and will'. Alternatively, one could read *hazaōšiiā* and consider it to be either the instr.sg. (agreeing with *ˣså̊ŋha*) or the nom.pl. of an adj. *ˣhazaošiia-* 'unanimous', cf. *hazaoša-* 'of one will'. The thematic verb *caiiąn*, which BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 441 interprets as a 3ʳᵈ pl. subj.pres., belongs in fact to the root aor. subj. stem *caiia-* (= Ved. *caya-*) of *ci* 'to pile; select', see KELLENS 1984, p. 353. P. HORN: "Nīrangistān Aw. fragm. 1", in: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 34 (1897), pp. 582–584, esp. p. 583f. reads *hazaōšiiāpå̊ŋha* and suggests the nom.pl. of a compound consisting of *hazaošiia-* and *apah-* 'working together' ("gemeinsam zu werke gehend").

Edition of the Avestan Hēr. 5 and commentary[11]

5.1   *katārō aϑaurunəm* ×*pāraiiāṯ*[1] *nāirika vā nmānō.paitiš vā*
5.2   *yezica* ×*uua*[2] *gaēϑå vīmā* ×*katarasciṯ*[3] ×*pāraiiāṯ*[1]
5.3   *nmānō.paitiš gaēϑå nāirika* ×*pāraiiāṯ*[1]
5.4   ×*nāirikā*[4] ×*gaēϑå.vīš*[5] *nmānō.paitiš* ×*pāraiiāṯ*[1]
5.5   *nōiṯ* ×*aēuuō*[6] ×*cina*[6] *dāitīm* ×*vīnāϑaiiāṯ*[7]

Av. quotation in the Pahl. commentary:
×*nōiṯ*[8] ×*aēuuō cina*[9] *dāitīm* ×*vīnāϑaiiāṯ*[10]

1	*paraiiāṯ* TD	4	*nāirikāi* TD	7	*vīnāṯ* TD	10	*vinānϑaṯ* TD
2	*vā* TD	5	*gaēϑå. viš* TD	8	deest TD		
3	*katār* TD	6	*auuacinō* TD	9	*aēuuācina* TD		

5.1   Which one of the two should go away[1] for priestly service[2], the wife or the master of the house?
5.2   If both administer[3] the possessions, either should go away[1].
5.3   (If) the master of the house (administers) the possessions, the wife should go away[1].
5.4   (If) the wife looks after the possessions[3], the master of the house should go away[1].
5.5   Not even one[4] will infringe[5] the law.

1 ×*pāraiiāṯ* 'he/she should go away'

The ms. TD transmits the form *paraiiāṯ* four times. Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 65, 152 adopts this reading, but marks it as an emendation, presumably in order to distinguish it from the form *parāiiāṯ* emended by Darmesteter, *ZA* III, p. 81 in its first and second occurrences in Hēr. 5. By contrast, K/K read *paraiiāṯ* the first and third times, but *pāraiiāṯ* the second and fourth, while H/E 40 suggest *pāraiiāṯ* throughout the chapter.

    Since the syntactic function is consistently that of a voluntative subjunctive,[12] it is clear that the form should be the same in all four occurrences. Morphologically a thematic 3sg. subj.pres. of the verb *para-i* 'to go away', one would expect **parāiiāṯ* (< **para-aia-a-t*). According to Bartholomae, *GIrPh* I 1 § 268.3b, the first contracted *-ā-* of **parāiiāṯ* was shortened, thus producing *paraiiāṯ*, while Kellens 1984, p. 99 n. 2 suggests that **parāiiāṯ* became *pāraiiāṯ* by a secondary

---

11   The numbers following words in the Av. text refer to the manuscript readings, those following words in the translation refer to the commentary. The sign + before a word indicates a reading with manuscript support, the sign × an emendation without manuscript support.

12   In the deliberative interrogative clause of the first occurrence the voluntative subjunctive entails a shift of volition from the speaker to the addressee, see E. Tichy: *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien. Studien zum indogermanischen Verbum, ausgehend von der älteren vedischen Prosa.* Bremen 2006, p. 268f. with fn. 194.

redistribution of the long vowel. The latter form is in fact attested in Hēr. 1.1 by the ms. TD, and without variants in Vd 9.39 and 15.9. On the basis of this and other forms, DE VAAN proposes a rule according to which *a in an open initial syllable in front of two or more syllables containing a or $ə$ became $ā$.[13]

2 *aϑaurunəm* 'priestly service'

With the exception of chapter 2, each of the first seven chapters of the Hērbedestān contains one of the six attestations of *aϑauruna-*. BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 64 posits its meaning as 'priestly function, priestly service' ("priesterliche Funktion, Priesterdienst"). In the Pahlavi version it is translated as *āsrōīh*. The way in which the Middle Persian commentators understood the term emerges from Hēr. 1.1 and 3.1 in the gloss *hērbedestān kardan*. That this expression refers specifically to the study of the Avesta and the Zand is stated in Dk 6.C27 (SHAKED 1979, p. 154f.), where *hērbedestān ī pad abastāg ud zand* 'religious education in the Avesta and the Zand' contrasts with *abārīg-iz frahang ī pad pēšag pēšag* 'the other instruction in each profession'. K/K 16–18 convincingly conclude that *hērbedestān kardan* implies attendance at schools that provide religious education for all Mazdayasnians, including the laity.

Presumably in the light of this gloss, K/K 27 etc., 87, 88 render the Av. phrase *aϑaurunəm para-i* as 'to go forth (to pursue) religious studies', but its Middle Persian version *pad āsrōīh raftan* 'to go for priestly work', while H/E 17 etc. translate the Av. expression as 'to go forth for Āϑrauuanship', leaving *aϑauruna-* untranslated, and the MP 'to go forth to the (religious) centre for Āsrōship'. The underlying assumption seems to be that family members leave home for a certain period of time in order to study the Mazdayasnian religion at a particular place. The Av. term for the latter activity, however, is *aiβišti-*, the *ti*-abstract derived from the well-attested verb *aiβi-ah* 'to study' (*AirWb.* 95, 277f.) and rendered in Pahlavi as *ōšmārišnīh* 'study'. It is distinct from and contrasts with *aϑauruna-* in Hēr. 4:

4.1   *cuuaṯ nā āϑrauua aϑaurunəm haca* ×*gaēϑābiš*[1] ×*pāraiiāṯ*[2]
4.2   *yaṯ hiš ϑriš* ×*yā̊*[3] ×*ahmāṯ*[4] ×*aiβiiāiti*[5]
4.3   *cuuaṯ* ×*aiβištīm*[6] ×*pāraiiaṯ*[7]
4.4   *ϑrixšaparəm haϑrākəm* ×*xšuuaš*[8] *xšafnō āca paraca*
4.5   *ϑrišūm*[9] *āsnąm xšafnąmca*
4.6   *yō baoiiō*[10] *aētahmāṯ parāiti*
4.7   *nōiṯ* ×*pascaēta*[11] ×*anaiβištīm*[12] *āstriiaṇti*

---

13   DE VAAN 2003, pp. 63, 106, 609. While *pāraiiāṯ* clearly belongs to *para-i* in Vd 9.39, KELLENS 1984, p. 276 n. 4 considers the possibility that it is from ³*par* 'to pass through, cross', pres. *pār-aiia-* in Vd 15.9. However, in both contexts the verb is followed by the pres. ind. *parāiti*, which is from *para-i*: Vd. 15.9 *mā … daxštəm pāraiiāṯ*, Vd. 15.10 *yezica … daxštəm parāiti*. Since *para-i* is intransitive, the acc. it governs in Hēr. 5.1 denotes not the object but the goal or purpose, as indicated by BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 152 (bottom).

1	*gāϑābiš* TD	4	*hmā* TD	7	*paraiiaṯ* TD	10	*baōiiō* TD
2	*paraiiāṯ* TD	5	*aiβiš. iti* TD	8	*xšauuaš* TD	11	*pascaita* TD
3	*yā* TD	6	*aiβištəm* TD	9	*ϑrišūm* TD	12	*anaiβnštīm* TD

4.1.   How far shall a priest[14] depart from his possessions[15] for priestly service?

4.2.   So (far) that he can return[16] to them from it[17] three times a year[18].

4.3.   How far away shall he go for studying[19]?

4.4.   Three nights, altogether six nights there and back.

4.5.   (One should travel) during a third of the days and nights.

4.6.   If one goes farther away than that

4.7.   then[20] they do not commit the offence of not studying.

14   The nom.sg. *nā* 'man, person' occurs here in an enclitic position, as noted by Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1049, and functions as an attributive substantive like Ved. *nárō víprāḥ* 'the singers' (B. Delbrück: *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Strassburg 1893 [repr. Berlin 1967], vol. I, p. 421). As in the Pahlavi version, it may be left untranslated.

15   Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 477, 479 n. 8 rightly corrects the TD form *gāϑābiš* to ˣ*gaēϑābiš*.

16   Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 95 emends the TD form *aiβiš. iti* to ˣ*aiβišūiti* which he regards as an inf. from the verb *šauu*: 'coming towards' ("herzukommen, heimzukehren"). Benveniste 1935, p. 30 accepts Bartholomae's restoration, but considers the passage to be too corrupt for the form to be of any use ("un passage bien trop incertain pour rien valoir"). K/K 36f. also accept Bartholomae's reading. H/E 34, by contrast, restore ˣ*aiβi.šūite* and translate 'he can visit' (p. 35). Unfortunately they offer no commentary, but one assumes that they consider the form to be the 3sg.ind.mid. of the root present of the verb *aiβi.šauu-*, which is found only here, although there is a verb *auui-frā-šauu-* 'to depart for' ("fortgehen zu", *AirWb.* 1714f.). While *šauu-* normally forms a thematic present *šauua-*, Kellens 1984, pp. 92, 93 n. 3 considers there to be a root present in Y 29.3 *šauuaitē* – assuming it is a 3pl. rather than a 3sg. However, even if the root present is admitted, there is the problem that the root is expected to have a full grade middle instead of the zero grade in H/E's ˣ*aiβi.šūite*. One may therefore consider the alternative possibility that *aiβiš. iti* is a corruption of ˣ*aiβiiāiti*, the 3sg.ind.pres. of *aiβi-i*, also attested elsewhere (*AirWb.* 149).

17   H/E 34 and K/K 36 emend the ms. reading *hmā* to *aētahmāṯ* 'from there'. Although the demonstrative pronoun of the second person is semantically more satisfactory, the near-deictic ˣ*ahmāṯ* is closer to the transmitted form. The dem. pronoun would then be used as a substantive (*AirWb.* 4–6) and refer back to *aϑaurunəm*. Darmesteter, *ZA* III, p. 80, who disregards the preceding *yā*, interprets *hmā* as 'par été', a suggestion rightly rejected by Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1842, who notes that the word *hmā* is not translated in the Pahl. version.

18   On the basis of the Pahlavi translation *sāl*, Bartholomae connects the form *yā* of the ms. TD with *yār-* 'year'. His emendation of a nom./acc. *yārə* (*AirWb.* 95, 1842) is accepted by K/K 36f. In *AirWb.* 1287 with n. 3, however, he cautiously interprets *yā* as the gen.sg. of the same stem but queries the reading. Humbach 1961b, p. 110f. identifies *yā* as a corruption of *yā̊*, the expected gen.sg. (< IIr. **yān-s*) of the heteroclitic noun *yār-* 'year', and H/E 34 consequently emend *yā̊* , cf. Hintze 2007, p. 125 fn. 41 (where 1971 is to be corrected to 1961).

19   H/E 36 followed by K/K 36 emend the transmitted form *aiβištəm* toˣ*aiβištōe*, the dat.sg. of *aiβišti-* f. 'studies', esp. of the sacred texts of the Mazdayasnian religion, also attested in Y 9.24 quoted below, p. 178. To be preferred, however, is Bartholomae's, *AirWb.* 95 emendation of the acc.sg. ˣ*aiβištīm*, since it is not only closer to the ms. but also syntactically parallel to *aϑaurunəm* in Hēr. 4.1 and supported by the form ˣ*anaiβištīm* 'nonstudying' in Hēr. 4.7.

Hēr. 4 indicates that going away for *aϑauruna-* entails both a greater distance and a longer time away from home than doing the same for *aiβišti-* 'studying'. This explains the emphasis found in Hēr. 5.2–4 on proper estate management during the period of absence and its priority over leaving home for *aϑauruna-*. Since the latter, which corresponds to Ved. *ātharvaṇá-*,[21] is a thematic derivative denoting that which is carried out by an *aϑauruuan-*, more insight into that activity can be gleaned from an investigation of that well-attested noun.

In the Avesta, and as noted by Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 65, *aϑauruuan-* is a general term for 'priest'. It thus differs semantically from the eight priestly titles listed, for instance, in Gāh 3.5, which describes a number of distinct ritual functions, such as *zaotar-* (literally: 'pourer'). The *aϑauruuan-* knows the sacred texts and is on hand in a variety of daily-life situations that require a priest. For instance, Vd 8.14–22 discuss the question whether Mazdayasnians may walk on a path along which the dead body of a person or a dog has been carried. The rule is that they are not allowed to do so until a 'four-eyed' dog has been sent down the path, three times if the dog goes willingly, but six or nine times depending on the force applied to make it go. Failing that, an *aϑauruuan-* is required to purify the path by walking on it while reciting the Avestan prayers quoted in Vd 8.19–21. Afterwards the Mazdayasnians are free to use it.

That *aϑauruuan-* is a general term for 'priest' also emerges from the fact that it denotes one of the three social classes alongside that of the 'warrior' *(raϑaēštar-)* and 'cattle-breeding herdsman' *(vāstriia- fšuiiaṇt-)*.[22] Zarathustra is praised as the prototype of all three (Yt 13.89):

yō paoiriiō āϑrauua	(Zarathustra,) who (was) the first priest,
yō paoiriiō raϑaēštā̊	the first warrior,
yō paoiriiō vāstriiō fšuiiąs	the first cattle-breeding herdsman.

The role of Zarathustra as the first *aϑauruuan-* is linked to the spreading of the Mazdayasnian religion, as stated in Yt 13.94:

ušta nō zātō āϑrauua	Hail to us, (for) the priest
yō spitāmō zaraϑuštrō	Spitama Zarathustra has been born!
frā nō yazāite zaoϑrābiiō	Zarathustra will worship[23] for us with libations,
stərətō.barəsma zaraϑuštrō	with strewn sacrificial straw.
iδa apąm vījasāiti	From here then
vaŋʰhi daēna māzdaiiasniš	the good, Mazdā-worshipping religion
vīspāiš auui karšuuąn yāiš hapta	will spread over all seven regions.

20 Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 884 notes that the diphthong *-aē-* of the adv. *pascaēta* is frequently written *-ai-* in the mss. of the Hērbedestān and Nērangestān.

21 Ved. *ātharvaṇá-*, fem. *ātharvaṇī́-* (which characterizes the plants in AV 11.4.16), is a thematic vṛddhi-derivative with zero grade suffix from IIr. **átharu̯an-* (*AiGr.* II 2, 125).

22 On the three social classes see M. Boyce: *A History of Zoroastrianism.* Vol. I. Leiden 1975 [repr. 1989], p. 5f.

23 On the translation of the *yaz* as 'to worship' see Hintze 2007, pp. 156–162.

That it was the *aϑauruuan's* task to travel the country and spread the religion is indicated in Y 9.24:

haomō təmciṯ yim kərəsānīm	Haoma ousted that Kərəsāni
apa.xšaϑrəm nišāδaiiaṯ	from the position of power,
yō raosta xšaϑrō.kāmiia	him who wailed in his desire for power
yō dauuata nōiṯ mē apąm	and sobbed: "Henceforth
āϑrauua aiβištiš +vərəδaiie	the priest will not go about in my land
daŋhauua carāt	to promote[24] the studies[25] (of the religion)."

The *aϑauruuan-* is characterized by the adj. *dūraēfrakāta-* 'desired, welcome far away' in Yt 16.17:

yąm yazata	(Insight), whom the priest, desired far away,
āϑrauua dūraēfrakātō	worshipped,
marəmnəm isəmnō daēnaiiāi	seeking the memorising for the religion,
aməm isəmnō tanuiie	seeking strength for the body.

Y 42.6 both explicitly states that the *aϑauruuan-* go abroad to teach the religion to the 'truth-seekers' and celebrates their return home:

apąmcā fəraxšaostrəm yazamaidē	We worship the cascading of the waters,
vaiiąmcā fərafraoϑrəm yazamaidē	we worship the gliding forwards of the birds,
aϑaurunąmcā paitī.ajaϑrəm yazamaidē	we worship the return of the priests
yōi ˟iieiiən dūrāṯ ašō.īšō dax́iiunąm	who will have gone[26] far away to the truth-seekers of the countries.

These passages suggest that *aϑauruuan-* represents a trained priest who goes far away from his own home (*dūrāṯ* Y 42.6, *dūraēfrakātō* 'desired far away' Yt 16.17),

24 While Geldner, *Avesta* I, p. 45 edits *vərəiδiiē*, Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1420 follows the mss. K5 Mf2 etc. in reading *vərəiδiie*, which he interprets as an inf. of the verb *vard* 'to increase, enlarge, augment'. He translates *aiβištiš vərəδiie* as 'studia (sacra) ut augeat'. Benveniste 1935, p. 38, who questions Bartholomae's grammatical analysis, points out the nominal function of +*vərəiδiie* and rightly connects the form with the gen.pl. *vərəiδinąm* at the end of Y 9.24. However, he then considers +*vərəiδiie* to be a gloss that should be deleted from the text for the sake of an octosyllabic verse line, although he is aware that such an excision renders the acc.pl. *aiβištiš* syntactically isolated. The stem *vərəiδi-* is an action noun derived with suffix *-i-* from the zero-grade root *vard*. Vedic offers numerous examples of such *i*-stems. They form datives in *-áye* that function as infinitives, see *AiGr* II 2, 297ff. The expected Av. form with full grade suffix is in fact attested in the readings *vərəiδaiie* J2 and *vərəδaiie* K6, cf. *vərəziδaiie* in the Sanskrit Yasna ms. J3.

25 Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 95, followed by de Vaan 2003, p. 277, identifies the form *aiβištiš* as the acc.pl. (instead of *aiβištīš*) of *aiβišti-* 'study', of which the acc.sg. ˟*aiβištīm* (corrected from *aiβištəm*) occurs in Hēr. 4.3 (see above, fn. 19) and its antonym *anaiβištīm* in Hēr. 4.7.

26 There is a great variety of readings of this form in the mss. On the basis of the Iranian Vendidad Sāde (*iieiiŋ* Mf2, *iieiiŋn* K4), K. Hoffmann (in Kellens 1974, p. 13 fn. 1. and in Hoffmann/Narten 1989, p. 45f.) emends ˟*iieiiən*, the 3pl.subj.perf.act. (Proto-Aryan *iạiạn*) of the root *i-* 'to go', cf. Kellens 1984, pp. 400, 402 n. 10 and Kümmel 2000, p. 613f.

travels throughout the land (*daṅhauua car* Y 9.24) and promotes the study of the religion (*aiβištiš vard* Y 9.24). The model for all *aϑauruuans* is Zarathustra, whose priestly office results in the Mazdayasnian religion being spread over all seven regions (Yt 13.94). The terms *daṅhāuruuaēsa-* 'moving inside the country' and *pairijaϑan-* 'itinerant', both of which are praised as qualities of a young person *(yuuan-)* together with *x͏ᵛaētuuadaϑa-* 'next-of-kin marriage' in Vr 3.3 and Vyt 17, probably also belong in this context, although they do not occur as epithets of *aϑauruuan-*.

The term *aϑauruna-* then refers to the activity of an *aϑauruuan-* who leaves home for a certain period of time for the dual purpose of instructing others in the Mazdayasnian religion and carrying out various religious and ritual services, as described, for instance, in Vd 8.14–22 summarized above, p. 177. The texts thus support Boyce's suggestion that *aϑauruuans* act as Zoroastrian missionaries.[27] Such a meaning would fit in well with K. Hoffmann's explanation of IIr. **athar-u̯an-* as 'itinerant priest', though unfortunately the formation of **athar-* remains unclear.[28]

27 M. Boyce, "āϑravan." In: EIr III (1989), pp. 16–17. Misson may also be implied in Y 40.4 *aϑā ⁺haxə̄mą̆m x̌iiāt̰ yāiš hiščamaidē* 'may thus be the fellowships with which we shall associate ourselves', if the passage refers to the situation in which Zarathustra's followers approach other communities in order to convert them to their religion, see Hintze 2007, p. 303 with references.

28 While it is obvious that both Av. *aϑauruuan-* and Ved. *átharvan-* continue IIr. **athar-u̯an-* 'provided with *athar-*', the identity of **athar-* is subject to debate, see Mayrhofer, *EWAia* I, p. 60. K. Hoffmann *apud* Mayrhofer, *EWAia* I, p. 805 derives *athar-* as 'walk, trail, footpath' ("Wanderweg") with suffix **-h₂ar-* from the root *at* 'to go constantly, walk' (IIr. **h₂at-*); according to him *athar-* also constitutes the first term of the compound *athar-ví-* 'pursuing the path', see Scarlata 1999, p. 497. By contrast, A. Lubotsky ("The Indo-Iranian Substratum", in: Chr. Carpelan/A. Parpola/P. Koskikallio [eds.]: *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations. Papers presented at an international symposium (Tvärminne, 8–10 January, 1999)*, Helsinki 2001, pp. 301–317, esp. pp. 303, 310) suggests that IIr. **athar-u̯an-* was borrowed by Indo-Iranians from the non-Indo-European substratum of the Central Asian urban oasis cultures. Similarly, G.-J. Pinault ("Une nouvelle connexion entre le substrat indo-iranien et le tocharien commun", in: *Historische Sprachforschung* 116 [2003], pp. 175–189, esp. p. 183 and [with less detail] "Further links between the Indo-Iranian substratum and the BMAC language", in: H. Hettrich/B. Tikkanen [eds.]: *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics*, Delhi 2006, pp. 167–196, esp. pp. 171–175) argues that IIr. **athar-*, which according to him means 'force supérieure', and Common Tocharian **ætræ* (Tochk. A *etre*, A *atär* 'hero') were borrowed independently from the non-Indo-European language of the Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex (BMAC). According to Lubotsky, non-Indo-European origin is indicated by the variation *-ar-/ra-* in Ved. *átharvan-* vs. Av. *āϑrauuan-*. However, the latter, which is confined to the strong cases, could equally be explained by inner-Avestan processes and attributed either to an analogical influence of the gen.sg. *āϑrō* 'of fire' (Hoffmann/Forssman 2004, pp. 56, 145 and Hoffmann/Narten 1989, p. 90 fn. 14) or to a phonetic lengthening of the initial *ā-* in the longer forms (de Vaan 2003, p. 65).

3 *vīmā* 'administering', ×*gaēϑā̊.vīš* 'pursuing the possessions'

The question posed in Hēr. 5.1 as to whether the lord or the lady of the house should go away for *aϑauruna-* is answered in Hēr. 5.2–4 in three ways, each of which refers to a different scenario: if both (×*uua*)[29] are equally suited to looking after the property *(gaēϑā-)*, either may go (5.2), if the husband *(nmānō.paiti-)* is more capable, then the wife *(nāirikā-)* should go (5.3), but if the wife is more qualified, then the husband should go (5.4):

5.2   *yezica* ×*uua gaēϑā̊ vīmā* ×*katarasciṯ*[30] ×*pāraiiāṯ*
5.3   *nmānō.paitiš gaēϑā̊ nāirika* ×*pāraiiāṯ*
5.4   ×*nāirika* ×*gaēϑā̊.vīš nmānō.paitiš* ×*pāraiiāṯ*

In each of the scenarios the crucial expression is what the Pahlavi version renders as *ō gēhān bandagīh* '(suited) for service of the possessions'. In Avestan, however, the wording differs slightly in each of the three phrases:

5.2   *gaēϑā̊ vīmā*
5.3   *gaēϑā̊*
5.4   ×*gaēϑā̊.vīš*

Darmesteter, *ZA* III, p. 81 fn. 22 suggests that *vīmā* is the dual of an adj. *vīma-* that belongs with the verb *mā* 'to measure'. Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1450 with n. 1 also considers the form to be a dual, and tentatively suggests that it is the possibly truncated nom.dual of a root noun **vī-mā(y)-* 'taking care of' ("ausrichtend, besorgend"), attested only here. Kellens 1974, p. 242, who quotes the entire Av. chapter with its Pahl. version but does not translate, refers favourably to Bartholomae's view of *vima-* but notes that the word is missing in Hēr. 5.3 and that the transmitted form is *viš* in Hēr. 5.4. He considers Bartholomae's meaning 'besorgend' to be unjustified, the Pahlavi translation incomprehensible, and therefore that both *vīmā* and *viš* are desperately corrupt.

    Nevertheless, however, it is worth exploring the possible connection of *vīmā* with the verb *vī-mā* further. For while *mā* 'to measure' in combination with *vĭ* is not found elsewhere in Avestan, in Vedic the verb *ví-mā* is well documented. The latter means not only 'to measure, mete out, pass over, traverse' but also 'to ordain, fix, set right, arrange, make ready, prepare', as, for instance, in RV 10.110.11 *vy àmimīta yajñám* 'he arranged the sacrifice'. The latter group of meanings fits the context of Hēr. 5 well, since *vīmā-* clearly describes the activity of managing the domestic affairs on the part of the lord or lady of the house.

29   The form *vā* transmitted by TD is a common corruption for ×*uua* (see Hintze 1994, p. 295) and rightly emended by H/E 40 and K/K 38. The Pahl. translation renders it as *har dōnīn*, on which see Macuch in this volume, pp. 256–259.

30   Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 433, 1450 rightly corrects transmitted *katār* to ×*katarasciṯ*. The restoration is virtually certain as the indefinite pronoun answers to the interrogative nom.sg. *katārō* in Hēr. 5.1. The shortening of the long -*ā*- is regular in the open antepenultimate syllable of a form with enclitic -*că* or -*cĭṯ*, see de Vaan 2003, pp. 109, 155.

The objection could be raised that while root nouns in composition with pre-verbs usually function as action nouns, *vīmā* is obviously of the agent variety.[31] The inherited IIr. way of turning root nouns with preverbs into agent nouns is by means of the suffix *-tar-*.[32] However, there are instances of the combination that functions as an agent noun in both Vedic[33] and Avestan. The latter includes *vī-mad-* 'doctor' (literally: 'measuring carefully') in Vd 7.38 and 40,[34] *aiβi.zū-* 'who presses on, hurries towards' and *vī.zū-* 'who presses on in different directions', both referring to dogs in Vd 5.32,[35] the priestly title *ābərət-* 'bringing',[36] *fra-spā-* 'throwing forth' and *ni-spā-* 'throwing down', both in Yt 15.45,[37] and *upa-uuāz-* 'adducing, providing' in A 3.4.[38] The fact that all these instances come from later texts may imply that the use of prepositional root noun com-pounds as agent nouns became productive during the Younger Avestan period. It therefore appears justified to assume that Hēr. 5.2 *vīmā* functions as an agent noun. It would then be the nom.dual of the root noun *vī-mā-*, as suggested by Bartholomae, while in Hēr. 5.3 the expression is elliptical.

In view of the parallel construction of the three scenarios in Hēr. 5.2–4, one would also anticipate the same wording in Hēr. 5.4. Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1450 n. 2 therefore regards the transmitted *viš* as a corruption of the nom.sg. of *vī-mā-*. However, instead of the **vī.miš* which he suggests, **vīmā̊* (< **vī̆-mā-h*) is to be expected, and it is difficult to explain how the latter could have changed to *viš*, es-pecially as **vīmā̊* would have had the same word ending as the preceding *gaēᵛā̊*.

If one operates with the ms. reading *gaēᵛā̊ viš*, one could adduce the Ved. root *viṣ* 'to work for, serve, be active', but Iranian cognates of IIr. **u̯ai̯š* are uncertain.[39] More promising perhaps is the possibility that it represents the root noun of the

---

31   See *AiGr* II 2, pp. 15–19; Scarlata 1999, pp. 734–736. The compound's function as an agent noun could have been the reason why Bartholomae, *AirWb.*1450 n. 1 re-garded the form as possibly truncated. Duchesne-Guillemin 1936, p. 61 translates it as 'organisateur'.

32   *AiGr.* II 2, p. 5 and II 1, p. 189.

33   See Scarlata 1999, pp. 739–740.

34   On Av. *vī-mad-* see A. Hintze: "Die avestische Wurzel *mad* 'zumessen'." In: B. Forss-man/R. Plath (eds.): *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen.* Wiesbaden 2000, pp. 163–175, esp. pp. 163–168.

35   Kellens 1974, pp. 106, 326 shows that *zū-*, the second member of the compound, corre-sponds to Ved. *jū* 'to hasten, press on'. The latter occurs in composition with the preverb *ápi* in *apíjū́-*, which likewise functions as an agent noun, see Scarlata 1999, p. 168f.

36   Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 329 derives *ābərət-* from **āp-bərət-* 'bringing water', but Kel-lens 1974, p. 136f. suggests that it is a prepositional compound **ā-bərət-*, which is func-tionally parallel to another priestly role, *frabərətar-*, an agent noun with suffix *-tar-*.

37   *AirWb.* 1086, 1003, Kellens 1974, p. 236. A further agent noun could be *fra-spāt-*, the name of a plant that induces abortion in Vd 15.14, see Kellens 1974, p. 265.

38   Kellens 1974, p. 279.

39   Mayrhofer, *EWAia* II, p. 586; R.E. Emmerick/P.O. Skjærvø: *Studies in the vocabu-lary of Khotanese.* Vol. 2. Wien 1987, p. 109f.

verb *vī* 'to pursue'. In Vedic the root noun forms the second part of compounds, e.g. *deva-vī́-* 'turned towards, gratifying the gods', *athar-vī́-* 'pursuing the path' (meaning uncertain, see above, fn. 28) and *padma-vī́-* 'pursuing the track'. R. Schmitt has identified the same compositional type in the OP adj. *manauvĭš* 'impetuous' < **manah-u̯ī-š* (literally: 'turned towards, pursuing passion').[40]

The uncompounded root noun *vī́-* occurs in RV 1.143.6. As in the compounds listed above, it is of the agent variety and governs a genitive denoting the object[41] (RV 1.143.6):

> *kuvín no agnír ucáthasya vī́r ásad*   Will Agni be fond of our hymn?

G. Klingenschmitt has retrieved an example of the Avestan cognate of Ved. *vī́-* in Vd 13.8 *yaϑa vəhrkō ˣviiōi tūite* 'as a wolf is able to pursue'.[42] In contrast to the Vedic simplex, *vī-* functions here as an action noun 'pursuing'. If Hēr. 5.4 offers a further attestation, then *viš* (i.e. *vīš*) is the nom.sg. and, since it governs the acc.pl. *gaēϑå̊*, has verbal force. As in Vd 13.8 it would be an action noun. The transmitted words could then be left virtually unaltered (Hēr. 5.4):

> *nāirikāi gaēϑå̊ ˣvīš nmānō.paitiš ˣpāraiiāṯ*
> If looking after the possessions (is) for the women, the master of the house
>   should go away.

However, the nominatives *ˣuua* and *nmānō.paitiš* of the two preceding sentences in Hēr. 5.2 and 3 rather suggest that *nāirikāi* is corrupted from the nom. *ˣnāirika*, an emendation already proposed by Bartholomae.[43] The nom.sg. *ˣnāirika* would then be the subject of *ˣgaēϑå̊.vīš* 'looking after the possessions', and the latter the nom.sg. of a root noun compound functioning as an agent noun and governing the first, inflected term in the acc.pl. of the fem. substantive *gaēϑā-* 'living being; possessions', cf. Y 46.12 ⁺*gaēϑå̊.frādō* '(of Right-mindedness) who promotes the living beings'.[44]

40 Mayrhofer, *EWAia* II, pp. 307, 510; R. Schmitt: "Altpersisch *m-n-u-vi-i-š = manauvĭš.*" In: G. Cardona/N. H. Zide (eds.): *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Tübingen 1987, pp. 363–366.

41 On the Vedic compounds and their attestations see Scarlata 1999, pp. 496–501; on the simplex see Schindler 1972, p. 45.

42 G. Klingenschmitt: "Die Pahlavi-Version des Avesta." In: W. Voigt (ed.): *XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag. Teil 3*. Wiesbaden 1969 (ZDMG, Supplementa I), pp. 993–997, esp. p. 996, cf. Kellens 1974, p. 96f.

43 Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1066 with n. 4 and 1450.

44 See Kellens 1974, p. 192f. and J. Kellens/E. Pirart: *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Vol. II. Wiesbaden 1990, p. 236. Other Av. root noun compounds with the first term in the accusative include *šiiaoϑnəm.vərəz-* 'who performs an action' in Vd 13.23 (Kellens 1974, p. 69), *ašəm.stut-* 'who praises truth' in Hēr. 1.1, the proper name *ahūm.stut-* 'who praises life' in Yt 13.97 (Kellens 1974, p. 124f.), *daēum.jan-* 'who slays the demon' in Vd 19.40 (Kellens 1974, p. 154, *AirWb.* 662) and *rauuazdā-* 'providing freedom' in Vd 18.6 (Kellens 1974, p. 218). On Vedic root noun compounds with the first term in the accusative, see Scarlata 1999, p. 743.

The compound $^{×}ga\bar{e}\vartheta\mathring{a}.v\bar{\imath}$- 'looking after the possessions' is then semantically equivalent to the expression $ga\bar{e}\vartheta an\ae m\ asp\partial r\partial n\bar{o}\ auu$- 'to take care for the integrity of the possessions' in Hēr. 3.1 and 3.2, translated in Pahlavi as *gēhānīgān uspurrīgānīh (uspurrīgīh) ayārēnēd* and glossed as *kū xwāstag-sālārīh kunād* (on which see MACUCH in this volume, pp. 259ff.):

> 3.1 *katārǝm $^{×}\bar{a}\vartheta rauua\ a\vartheta aurunǝm\ v\bar{a}\ ^{×}p\bar{a}raii\bar{a}ṭ$*
> *gaēϑanąm vā aspǝrǝnō $^{×}auuāṭ$*
> 3.2 *gaēϑanąm aspǝrǝnō auuōiṭ*

> Which of the two (applies): Should a priest go away for priestly service
> or should he take care for[45] the integrity[46] of the possessions?
> He may care for the integrity of the possessions.

The verb $v\bar{\imath}$ is also syntactically parallel to *av* 'to help' in the two consecutive Vedic stanzas[47]

> RV 5.46.7a
> *devánām pátnīr uśatī́r avantu naḥ právantu nas tujáye vā́jasātaye |*
> Let the wives of the gods assist us willingly, let them help us to procreate, for
>   the winning of the prize!

> RV 5.46.8a
> *utá gnā́ vyantu devápatnīr indrāṇy àgnā́yy aśvínī rā́ṭ |*
> *ā́ ródasī varuṇānī́ śṛṇotu vyántu devī́r yá ṛtúr jánīnām ||*

> And let the noblewomen, the wives of the gods, approach: the wife of Indra, of
>   Agni, of the Aśvin, the queen!
> Let Rodasī listen, (and) the wife of Varuṇa! Let the goddesses approach at the
>   time of the women!

<p align="center">4 <i>nōiṭ $^{×}a\bar{e}uuō\ ^{×}cina$</i> 'not even one'</p>

The ms. TD has the reading *auuacinō* in Hēr. 5.5, but *aēuuacina* in the Av. quotation that forms part of the Pahlavi commentary on that line. BARTHOLOMAE,

---

45   BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 162 queries the reading *auuaṭ* of the ms. and KELLENS 1984, 102 rightly emends it to a subjunctive $^{×}auuāṭ$. The form is syntactically parallel to $^{×}p\bar{a}raii\bar{a}ṭ$. Emendation of the latter form from transmitted *pāraiiaṭ* TD, *paraiiaṭ* HJ is supported by the subjunctive mood in the deliberative questions of Hēr. 4 and 5 $^{×}p\bar{a}raii\bar{a}ṭ$ (TD *paraiiāṭ*), see above, fn. 12.

46   The translation of *aspǝrǝnō* is after BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 218. SZEMERÉNYI 1959, p. 73 fn. 1, suggests that the "late Avestan word is the Middle Iranian (Sogdian?) form of **uspr̥na-* 'full, complete'" and BAILEY 1979, p. 43, explains Av. *aspǝrǝnō* as 'completeness' with *as-* < **us-*. By contrast, KLINGENSCHMITT 2000, p. 193f. fn.7, analyses the noun as IIr. **ać-u̯r̥-na-s-*, derived with suffix *-nas-* (an *s*-extension of the suffix *-na-*) from a heteroclitic stem meaning 'provided with a point' and denoting a brooch or, more generally, a small object made of iron.

47   Cf. W. P. SCHMID: "Die Wurzel *vī-* im R̥gveda." In: *Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*. Paris 1968, pp. 613–624, esp. p. 622. On RV 5.46.7–8 see also HINTZE 2007, p. 206.

AirWb. 169, 24 offers no analysis of either form apart from noting that there is no Pahlavi translation of Hēr. 5.5. H/E 52f. emend both occurrences to *auuacinō.mazō* 'of inferior size',[48] which is a hapax legomenon in Vd 5.60, but render it as 'to the slightest extent'. K/K 40f. with fn. 66 likewise read *auuacinō* in both passages but postulate a compound *auuacinō.dāitīm*, which would mean 'less than legal'. According to Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 170, the first term of the compound *auuacinō. mazō* is the adj. **au̯acína-* 'inferior', a cognate of Ved. *avācína-* 'turned downwards'. Both have the suffix *-īna-* and are derivatives from an IIr. stem continued in Ved. *ávañc-* 'turned downwards'.[49] However, apart from the fact that H/E's assumption that *auuacinō* is shortened from *auuacinō.mazō* has no manuscript support, it is difficult to accommodate the meaning 'inferior' in the context of Hēr. 5.5. For, if *auuacinō.dāitīm* is a compound, as K/K propose, its meaning as a possessive adj. is 'whose law is inferior'. It would then be an acc. object governed by the verb *˟vīnāϑaiiāt̰* and Hēr. 5.5 *nōit̰ auuacinō.dāitīm ˟vīnāϑaiiāt̰* would mean 'one does not hurt the one whose law is inferior' or 'what has an inferior law'. If, on the other hand, *auuacinō dāitīm* are two independent words, the resulting translation 'as an inferior one does not infringe the law' makes no better sense.

Since none of these proposals lead to a satisfactory meaning, it is worth exploring the reading *aēuuacina* in the Av. quotation found in the Pahlavi commentary since, apart from the missing *nōit̰*, it appears to be more correct (cf. also *˟vīnāϑaiiāt̰* below). The first part of the word could be either the adverb *aēuua* 'thus' (Ved. *evá*) or a form of the numeral *aēuua-* 'one'; *-cina* would then be the emphasizing postpositive particle which, like its Ved. cognate *caná*, occurs preferentially in negative clauses, and means 'not even, indeed', emphasizing the preceding word.[50]

If *aēuua* is the adverb 'thus' and negated by the preceding *nōit̰* then the translation of the sentence would be 'not even in this way does one infringe the law'. Such a translation suggests that it is considered extraordinary ('not even') for a

48   Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 169f. posits the meaning of *auuacinō.mazah-* as 'of inferior pledge value' ("was (noch) geringeren Pfandwert hat"). In so doing, he follows K. F. Geldner (*Studien zum Avesta*, Strassburg 1882, I, p. 95f.), who interprets the second term as ²*mazah-* 'pledge' ("Draufgeld, Pfand; Pfandwert", *AirWb.* 1157), an alleged cognate of the Ved. verb *máṁhate* 'to give, bestow'. Duchesne-Guillemin 1936, p. 157 accepts this explanation by translating the compound as 'qui a une plus petite valeur de gage'. However, Bartholomae's stem ²*mazah-* is scarcely probable as it should be **mązah-*, cf. *mązā. raiii-* 'bestowing richess' (*EWAia* II, p. 286). Rather, the second term of *auuacinō.mazah-* should probably be ¹*mazah-* 'size', cf. the comments by JamaspAsa/Humbach 1971, I, p. 29f. note a on *tanu.mazah-* 'having the size of the body' in Purs. 17 (18).

49   Wackernagel (/Debrunner), *AiGr.* II 2, pp. 430, 435; Mayrhofer, *EWAia* I, p. 133. E. Schwyzer (in: IF 49 [1931], p. 4 fn. 1 [= *KlSchr.*, p. 375 fn. 1]) proposes analysing the Av. word as **a-u̯acina-* 'having no word', but this is unlikely.

50   Mayrhofer, *EWAia* I, p. 528; Wackernagel (/Debrunner), *AiGr.* III, pp. 562, 570f.; B. Delbrück: *Altindische Syntax*, Halle an der Saale 1888 [repr. Darmstadt 1976], p. 544. On the use of Ved. *caná*, which also functions as an indefinite particle after the interrogative pronoun, see especially J. S. Klein: *Toward a discourse grammar of the Rigveda*. Heidelberg 1985, I, pp. 285–292.

houselord or wife to leave home for *aϑauruna-*, but that as long as they do so under the circumstances outlined in Hēr. 5 neither of them are breaking the law. However, the function of 'not even' is unclear. Moreover, elsewhere *aēuua* 'thus' is not found in combination with *cina*.

It is therefore more likely that *aēuua* is a form of the numeral *aēuua-* 'one'. There is a precedent for its occurrence with the negation and the adverb *cina* (*AirWb.* 23 bottom) not only in Ved. *ná … ekáś cana* (RV 7.104.3, see below) but also in Avestan, Hēr. 16.1:

> *nōiṯ ōim ˣcina vācim ˣaiβiiās*   He studied[51] not even[52] one word.

In contrast to Hēr. 16.1, however, in Hēr. 5.5 a substantive has to be assumed if *aēuua-* 'one' is to function as an adjective. One possibility is that *aēuua* is the nom.sg.f. and refers to an implied *nāirikā-* (Hēr. 5.5):

> *nōiṯ ⁺aēuua ⁺cina dāitīm ˣvīnāϑaiiāṯ*   Not even one (woman) will infringe the law.

The sentence would then mean that no woman would break the law if she left home under the circumstances described in Hēr. 5. The implication is that generally women were not allowed to leave home for longer periods of time. However, the omission of the substantive characterized by the numeral is unusual in view of the fact that it is neither omitted in Hēr. 16.1 , quoted above, nor in Purs. 22 (23) *nōiṯ … ϑraiiąm.cina gāmanąm* 'not … even three steps'.[53]

Another possibility is that the form *aēuua* is a corruption of the nom.sg.m. *ˣaēuuō* and is used as a substantive. Such a use is found in Vedic, e.g. in RV 7.104.3:

> *índrāsomā duṣkŕ̥to vavré antár anārambhaṇé támasi prá vidhyatam |*
> *yáthā nā́taḥ púnar ékaś canódáyat tád vām astu sáhase manyumác chávaḥ ||*
>
> Indra and Soma, pierce the evil-doers and hurl them into the pit, the bottomless darkness, so that not a single one will come up from there again. Let this furious rage of yours overpower them.[54]

While in RV 7.104.3 *ná … ékaś cana* pertains to the 'evildoers' *(duṣkŕ̥taḥ)* of pāda a, in Hēr. 5.5 *ˣaēuuō* could refer back to both *nāirika* and *nmānō.paitiš* in

---

51 Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 278 corrects transmitted *aiβiiāiš* TD, *aiβiiāš* HJ to *ˣaiβiiās*. The form is the 3sg.ipf. of *aiβi-ah* 'to study'. On the ipf. of *ah* 'to be', see Hintze 1994, p. 340 with references.

52 Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 595 n. 2 rightly notes that the transmitted form *cinəm* is probably due to influence from the surrounding words and corrects *ˣcina*. He interprets *ˣcina* in Hēr. 16.1 as the indefinite pronoun. The only other occurrence mentioned by him in this entry is *cina-* in Yt 10.84 *duuācina*, which, however, Gershevitch 1959, p. 230f. interprets as 'who longs for the milk'. According to him, *-cina* (i.e.*-cinā*) is the nom.sg.f. of the thematic derivative of *cinah-* 'desire'. If such was the case one would have to assume that *-cina* is shortened from *-cinaŋha*, cf. the thematic adj. *təmaŋha-* 'dark' (= Ved. *tamasá-*) and the neuter substantives *haosrauuaŋha-* 'good reputation' and *haomanaŋha-* 'well-mindedness', cf. Hintze 1994, p. 290.

53 JamaspAsa/Humbach 1971, I, p. 36f.

54 W. Doniger O'Flaherty: *The Rig Veda. An Anthology.* London 1981, p. 293.

Hēr. 5.1–4 in the same way that the nom.sg.m. interrogative adj. *katārō* 'which of the two' in Hēr. 5.1 refers to either:

Hēr. 5.5
nōiṯ ×*aēuuō* ×*cina dāitīm* ×*vīnāϑaiiāṯ*　　Not even one will infringe the law.[55]

5 ×*vīnāϑaiiāṯ* 'he will infringe'

The ms. TD transmits *vīnāṯ* in Hēr. 5.5 and *vīnāϑaṯ* in the Av. quotation in the Pahlavi gloss. While Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1448 records both forms as inexplicable, H/E 42, followed by K/K 40f. with fn. 65, emend it to ×*vīnāϑaiiāṯ* and translate 'detracts'. This form, which appears to be the most likely restoration of the text, is the 3sg. subj. of the present stem *vīnāϑaiia-* which is also attested in the phrase *pąstō.fraϑaŋhəm hē kamərəδəm vīnāϑaiiən* in Vd 3.20 and 9.49:

Vd 3.20
āaṯ yaṯ hanō vā zaururō vā
pairištā.xšudrō vā bauuāṯ
aojištəmca dim pascaēta mazdaiiasna
taṇcištəmca vaēδiiōtəməmca
upa maitīm ×*barəzaŋhən*
pąstō.fraϑaŋhəm hē kamərəδəm vīnāϑaiiən
aš.xᵛarətəmaēibiiō spəṇtō.mainiiauuanąm dāmanąm kərəfš.xᵛārąm
kərəfš paiti nisrinuiiāṯ
vaiiąm kahrkāsąm

And when he (i.e. a man who has carried a dead body on his own) becomes old
　　　or frail
or his seed has dried up,
then the Mazda-worshippers may forcefully,
in the most energetic and knowledgeable way,
hit him over the head[56] with a bat,[57]

55　Alternatively, as M. de Vaan suggests to me, one might consider a conditional construction with ellipsis of the verb ×*pāraiiāṯ*: '(If) not even one (goes away), (then) one breaks the law'.

56　Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 950 interprets *barəzaŋhąm*, edited by Geldner, *Avesta* III, p. 18, as the gen.pl. of *barəzah-* 'height, mountain'. K. Hoffmann apud Humbach 1961a, p. 103 fn. 1 identifies the form as the 3pl. (with -*ąm* instead of -*ąn* before *p*-) of the verb *barəzaŋha-* (cf. Ved. *barhaya-*), a denominative present from *barəzah-* (Kellens 1984, p. 131). Kellens, 1984, p. 259 interprets *barəzaŋhən* as a subjunctive, but in *Liste du verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden 1995, p. 38 with fn. 1, he emends it to ×*barəzaŋhən*, the 3pl. opt. of the same present stem. Cf. Hoffmann/Forssman 2004, p. 193 for 3pl. opt.pres. forms from other verbs.

57　Geldner, *Avesta* III, p. 18 edits a compound *upa.maitīm*, which is attested in Vd 5.53–56 (*AirWb.* 391: absol.: "es ist zu warten") while Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 391, 1112f. reads two words *upa maitīm* in Vd 3.20 and interprets the latter as the acc.sg. of a masculine stem *maiti-* 'promontory'. More convincing, however, is the suggestion of K. Hoffmann apud Humbach 1961a, p. 103 fn. 1, that *maitīm* corresponds to Ved. *matyà-*,

they shall crush his head to the size of dust.[58]
One may consign his body
to the most voracious of the carrion scavenging creatures of the Bounteous Spirit,
the vultures.

A variant of the sentence occurs in Vd 18.10 *yaϑa yaṯ hē pąstō.fraϑaŋhəm kamərəδəm kərənuiiāṯ*, where the verb *kərənu-* is substituted for *vīnāϑaiia-*.[59] In both varieties of the formula the verb is combined with the direct accusative object *kamərəδəm* '(daēvic) head' and a predicative acc. denoting the result of the action: 'to make/crush the head into having the size of dust'.

Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 1038 interprets *vīnāϑaiiən* in Vd 3.20 and 9.49 as the iterative present *vīnāϑaiia-* of a verb of unknown etymology *vī-nāϑ* 'to maltreat' ("schinden"). Kellens compares Av. *vīnāϑaiia-* with OP *vināϑaiia-*.[60] He suggests that both continue an Iranian root **nāth*, but notes that such a root has no cognates outside Iranian. Alternatively, he considers the possibility that Vd 3.20 contains a Persism for **vīnāsaiiən*, but in later publications favours a phonetic explanation of *-ϑ-* instead of *-s-*. According to Jamison, Av. *vīnāϑaiia-* could be a Western dialect form transferred into Eastern Iranian and corresponding both formally and semantically to Ved. *nāśáya-* 'to make disappear, destroy', and Lat. *nocēre* 'to harm'.[61] Since the meaning fits the contexts of both the Vīdēvdād and the Hērbedestān passages and in view of the lack of a viable alternative explanation, it appears that *vīnāϑaiia-* is best taken as the Av. equivalent of Ved. *nāśáya-*. Hēr. 5.5 could thus indicate that Av. *-ϑ-* instead of *-s-* is not confined to a single from of the Vīdēvdād (*vīnāϑaiiən* in Vd 3.20 and 9.49), but constitutes a phonetic feature of the causative stem *vīnāϑaiia-*.[62]

---

matíya-, which denotes a tool that was used to break up and flatten a clod or lump of earth, a 'club' ("Schollenknüppel"); cf. Mayrhofer, *EWAia* II, p. 297 with references.

58 K. Hoffmann apud Humbach 1961a, p. 103 fn. 1 recognizes that *pąsta-* is not 'the scalp' that Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 904 suggests, but a noun related to *pąsnu-* 'dust' (*AirWb.* 904), Ved. *pāṁsú-* m. 'dust', see Mayrhofer, *EWAia* II, p. 114f.

59 The form *kərənuiiāṯ*, which Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 452 erroneously attributes to *kart* 'to cut', is 3sg.opt.pres. of *kar* 'to do', see Kellens 1984, pp. 170, 171 n. 7.

60 On OP *vināϑaiia-* see R. Schmitt: *Epigraphisch-exegetische Noten zu Dareios' Bīsutūn-Inschriften.* Wien 1990, p. 47.

61 J. Kellens: "Un prétendu présent radical." In: MSS 34 (1976), pp. 59–71, esp. p. 66f. The form *vīnāϑaiiən* is 3pl.opt. of the causative present; see Kellens 1984, pp. 143, 146 n. 20, where he considers a phonetic explanation for *ϑ* instead of *s;* S. Jamison: *Function and Form in the -áya-Formations of the Rigveda and Atharva Veda.* Göttingen 1983, p. 141f. with fn. 76.

62 Alternation between *-ϑ-* and *-s-* occasionally occurs in the manuscripts. For instance, in Yt 13.93 and 17.18 the mss. F1 E1 etc. have the form *uruuāϑən*, but J10 and others *uruuāsən* (the form edited by Geldner, *Avesta* II, pp. 188 and 234), see on this form Kellens, *Verbe av.*, p. 112f. with n. 4 and on Av. *-ϑ-* instead of *-s-* Hintze 1994, p. 96 with fn. 9 and p. 124 fn. 169 with references.

Conclusion

The use of *aϑauruuan-* in the Avesta suggests that the activity of *aϑauruna-*, for which Mazdā-worshippers (male and female, young and old) leave home, is connected with the dissemination of their religion, although those involved in *aϑauruna-* were perhaps not necessarily also *aϑauruuans*. People who leave home for *aϑauruna-* are likely to have been educated in the Mazdayasnian religion (*aiβišti-* Hēr. 4.3), its sacred texts and certain rituals. That both men and women experienced such education is stated repeatedly in the Avesta, e.g. in Y 26.7[63]:

> Y 26.7
> *iδa iristanąm uruuąnō yazamaide*
> *yā̊ ašaonąm frauuašaiiō vīspanąm*
> *ahmiia nmāne nabānazdištanąm para.iristanąm*
> *aēϑrapaitinąm aēϑriianąm narąm nāirinąm*
> *iδa ašaonąm ašaoninąm frauuašaiiō yazamaide*

> Here we worship the souls of the departed,
> the choices[64] of all truthful persons;
> in this house (we worship the choices) of the closest relatives who have passed
>   away,
> of the teachers, of male and female students;
> here we worship the choices of truthful men and women.

What is clear from the Hērbedestān is that any member of a household *(nmāna-)* could engage in the activity of *aϑauruna-*. Possibly every household was obliged to send away at least one member for that purpose within a given period of time. The person chosen was the one 'who had the greatest esteem for truth' (*yō ašāi bərəjiiąstəmō* Hēr. 1.2, above, p. 172f.), on the one hand, and was less needed for running the household, on the other. The *aϑauruuans* went only so far away that they could return home three times a year (Hēr 4.2, above, p. 175f.). There, while away from home, they would teach the religion and its texts 'to the truth-seekers' (*ašō.īšō*, Y 42.6, above, p. 178f.) and perform rituals. They thus contributed towards the growth of new communities, who in turn would then have been obliged to send out some of their own members for *aϑauruna-*. The resulting domino-effect could provide a model that would account for the spread of the Mazdayasnian religion throughout the lands inhabited by Iranians.

---

63   Other passages include Y 26.8, 68.12.
64   On the translation of *frauuaši-* and its use in Younger Avestan, see Hintze 2007, pp. 173–175.

Abbreviated References

AiGr. see Wackernagel (/Debrunner).

AirWb. see Bartholomae 1904.

Anklesaria, T.D. 1908: *The Bûndahishn. Being a Facsimile of the TD Manuscript no. 2 brought from Persia by Dastur Tîrandâz and now preserved in the late Ervad Tahmuras' Library*. With an introduction by B.T. Anklesaria. Bombay.

Bailey, H.W. 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka.* Cambridge.

Benveniste, É. 1935: *Les infinitifs avestiques*. Paris.

Darmesteter, *ZA* = J. Darmesteter: *Le Zend-Avesta*. 3 vols. Paris 1892–1893 [repr. 1960].

Duchesne-Guillemin, J. 1936: *Les composés de l'Avesta*. Paris.

EWAia see Mayrhofer 1992–2001.

Geldner, *Avesta = Avesta. The sacred books of the Parsis.* Ed. by K.F. Geldner. 3 vols. Stuttgart 1896. 1889. 1896.

Gershevitch, I. 1959: *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*. Cambridge [repr. 1967].

H/E = H. Humbach/J. Elfenbein: *Ērbedestān. An Avesta-Pahlavi Text.* München 1990 (MSS, Beiheft 15 n. F.).

Hintze, A. 1994: *Der Zamyād-Yašt. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik 15).

— 2007: *A Zoroastrian Liturgy. The Worship in Seven Chapters (*Yasna *35–41).* Wiesbaden (Iranica 12).

HJ see Sanjana, D.P. 1894.

Hoffmann, K./B. Forssman 2004: *Avestische Laut- und Formenlehre*. 2nd edition, Innsbruck.

Hoffmann, K./J. Narten 1989: *Der Sasanidische Archetypus. Untersuchungen zu Schreibung und Lautgestalt des Avestischen.* Wiesbaden.

Humbach, H. 1961a: "Bestattungsformen im Vidēvdāt." In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 77, pp. 99–105.

— 1961b. "Textkritische und sprachliche Bemerkungen zum Nirangistān." In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 77, 106–111.

— 1991: *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the Other Old Avestan Texts.* In collaboration with J. Elfenbein and P.O. Skjærvø. 2 vols. Heidelberg (Indogermanische Bibliothek: Reihe 1, Lehr- und Handbücher).

JamaspAsa, K.M./H. Humbach 1971: *Pursišnīhā. A Zoroastrian Catechism.* 2 parts. Wiesbaden.

Kellens, J. 1974: *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*. Wiesbaden.

— 1984: *Le verbe avestique.* Wiesbaden.

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.* Wiesbaden, pp. 191–229

K/K = F.M. Kotwal/Ph.G. Kreyenbroek 1992: *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān.* Vol. I: *Hērbedestān*. Paris (StIr, cahier 10).

Kotwal, F.M./J.W. Boyd (eds.) 1980: *Ērbadistān ud Nīrangistān.* Facsimile Edition of the Manuscript TD. Cambridge, Mass./London (Harvard Iranian Series III).

KÜMMEL, M. J. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen.* Wiesbaden.

LIV² = M. KÜMMEL/H. RIX: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen.* Wiesbaden ²2001.

MAYRHOFER, M. 1992–2001: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* 3 vols. Heidelberg.

SANJANA, D. P. 1894: *Nirangistan: a Photozincographed Facsimile.* Bombay.

SCARLATA, S. 1999: *Die Wurzelkomposita im R̥gveda.* Wiesbaden.

SCHINDLER, J. 1972: *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen.* Unpubl. diss. Würzburg.

SHAKED, SH. 1979: *The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages (Dēnkard VI).* Boulder, Colorado (Persian Heritage Series 34).

SZEMERÉNYI, O. 1959: "Iranian Studies I." In: KZ 76, pp. 60–77.

DE VAAN, M. 2003: *The Avestan Vowels.* Amsterdam/New York (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 12).

WACKERNAGEL(/DEBRUNNER), *AiGr.* = J. WACKERNAGEL(/A. DEBRUNNER): *Altindische Grammatik.* Göttingen I ²1957, II 1 ²1957, II 2 1954, III 1930.