Sitzungsberichte

der

philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Classe

der

k. b. Akademie der Wissenschaften

zu München.

Jahrgang 1888.

Erster Band.

München
Verlag der k. Akademie
1888.

In Commission bei G. Franz.

Digitized by Google

Herr West übergab eine Abhandlung:

„The extent, language, and age of Pahlavi literature".[1])

During the last twelve years a good deal of information has been accumulating, about the extent and age of the Pahlavi literature still preserved by the Parsis, which it seems desirable to collect and state in a connected form, as a basis for future investigation.

Already in 1871 Dastûr Peshotanji Behramji Sanjânâ, the high-priest of the predominant sect of the Parsis in Bombay, had published, in the introduction to his Pahlavi Grammar, a list of fifty-two Pahlavi writings preserved in his library. But it was not until the publication of the second edition of Haug's Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsis, in 1878, that any attempt was made to ascertain the actual extent of Pahlavi works, by estimating the number of words in each text. During the last ten years a few additional texts have been discovered, although the Parsis have not yet thoroughly examined all their libraries, and more correct information has been gradually obtained regarding the texts already known; all which additions to our knowledge will be included in the following statements and remarks.

1) Die Classe beschloss, ausnahmsweise die Veröffentlichung in nicht-deutscher Sprache zu gestatten.

Digitized by Google

Pahlavi texts may be conveniently divided into three classes. First, Pahlavi translations of Avesta texts, in which Avesta sentences alternate with a word-for-word Pahlavi translation, more or less interspersed with explanatory glosses, and sometimes interrupted by Pahlavi commentaries of considerable extent. Second, purely Pahlavi texts on religious subjects, or matters closely connected with religion. Third, Pahlavi texts on miscellaneous subjects, not intimately connected with religion, such as social law, legendary history, tales, and forms of letters and documents. Many of the texts in each class are very short, as may be seen from the following lists, in which the number of words in each text has been estimated either from actual inspection, or from the best information otherwise obtainable.[1])

I. Pahlavi translations of Avesta texts.

1. Vendîdâ*d* (400 being Avesta quoted)	48,000	words.
2. Yasna	39,000	»
3. Nîrangistân (besides 3200 in Av. text)	28,000	»
4. Vishtâsp yasht	5,200	»
5. Visparad	3,300	»
6. Farhâng-î Oîm-aêvak (besides 1000 Av.)	2,250	»
7. Aûharmazd yasht	2,000	»
8. Bahrâm yasht, perhaps	2,000	»
9. Hâdôkht nask (so-called)	1,530	»
10. Aogemadaêcâ (besides 280 in Av. text)	1,450	»
11. Cîdak avistâk-î gâsân, 1100 + 400 Av., (in Yasna)	—	»
12. Âtash nyâyish	1,000	»
13. Part of Vijirkard-i Dînîk (besides 630 in Av. text)	900	»
14. Âfrînagân gahanbâr, perhaps	800	»
15. Haptân yasht, perhaps	700	»
16. Srôsh yasht Hâdôkht	700	»
17. Sîrôzah II.	650	»
18. Sîrôzah I.	530	»

1) In these estimates the conjunction »va« and relative particle »î« are not counted as separate words, because they are not written separately in the original texts.

Digitized by Google

19. Khurshêd nyâyish (without yasht)	500	words.
20. Âbân nyâyish	450	»
21. Âfrînagân dâhmân, 450 words (in Yasna) . . .	—	»
22. Âfrînagân gâtha, perhaps	400	»
23. Khurshêd yasht	400	»
24. Mâh yasht	400	»
Total in Class I.	140,160	words.

II. Pahlavi texts on religious subjects.

25. Dînkard, books III—IX.	170,000	words.
26. Bundahish (Irânian version)	30,000	»
27. Dâdistân-î Dînîk	28,600	»
28. Rivâyat accompanying No. 27	26,000	»
29. Rivâyat of Hêmêd-î Ashavahishtân	22,000	»
30. Rest of Vijirkard-i Dînîk (260 being Av.) . . .	17,500	»
31. Selections of Zâd-sparam, in three parts	17,000	»
32. Shikand-gûmânîk Vijâr	16,700	»
33. Shâyast-lâ-shâyast, with App. of 3100	13,700	»
34. Dînâ-î Maînôg-î Khirad	11,000	»
35. Epistles of Mânûshcîhar	9,000	»
36. Ardâ-Vîrâf nâmak	8,800	»
37. Jâmâsp nâmak	5,000	»
38. Bahman yasht	4,200	»
39. Mâdîgân-î Yôsht-î Fryânô	3,000	»
40. Andar's-î Âtûr-pâd-î Mâraspendân, with Hakîkat-î Rôjhâ, (originally 2800 or 3000)	2,200	»
41. Pandnâmak-î Vajôrg-Mitrô-î Bûkhtakân	1,760	»
42. Patît-î Âtûr-pâd-î Mâraspendân	1,490	»
43. Pandnâmak-î Zaratûsht	1,430	»
44. Andar'z-î Hûdâvar-î dânâk (besides 320 lost) . .	1,420	»
45. Âfrîn-î shash gahanbâr	1,280	»
46. Vâcak aêcand-î Âtûr-pâd-î Mâraspendân	1,270	»
47. Mâdîgân-î gujastak Abâlish	1,200	»
48. Mâdîgân-î sî rôj, 1150 words in No. 30	—	»
49. Patît-î khûd	1,000	»
50. Mâdîgân-î haft ameshâspend, 1000 in No. 33 . .	—	»
51. Admonitions to Mazdayasnians	940	»
52. Injunctions to Behdîns	800	»
53. Mâdîgân-î mâh Fravardîn rôj Khûrdâd	760	»
54. Advice of a certain man	740	»

Digitized by Google

55. *Âfrîn-î dâhmân*, or *haft ameshâspend*	720	words.
56. Stâyishn-î drôn	560	»
57. *Âfrîn-î ardâ fravash*	530	»
58. Andar'*z*-î dânâk mar*d*	520	»
59. Âshirvâd	460	»
60. *Âfrîn-î myazd*	450	»
61. Andar'*z*-î Khûsrô-î Kavâ*d*ân	380	»
62. *Av*ar *c*îm-î drôn	380	»
63. Sayings of Âtûr-farnbag and Bakht-*âfrîd*	320	»
64. *Âfrînagân nîrang*	290	»
65. Nâm-stâyishnîh	260	»
66. Five dispositions of priests and ten admonitions, 250 words in No. 30	—	»
67. *Âfrîn-î vajôrgân*	200	»
68. *Âfrîn-î gahanbâr câshnî*	200	»
69. Anecdote of Vâhrâm-î Var'javand	190	»
70. Dârûk-î khûrsandîh	120	»
71. Mâ*d*igân-î sî ya*z*dân, 80 words in No. 33	—	»
Total in Class II.	404,370	words.

III. Pahlavi texts on other subjects.

72. Social Code of the Parsis in Sasanian times, more than 42,000, of which survive probably	26,000	words.
73. Kârnâmak-î Artakhshîr-î Pâpakân	5,600	»
74. Yâ*d*kâr-î Zarîrân	3,000	»
75. Khûsrô-î Kavâ*d*ân and his page	1,770	»
76. Farhâng-î Pahlavîk	1,300	»
77. Forms of epistles, 990 words in No. 30	—	»
78. Cities of the land of Irân	880	»
79. *C*atrang nâmak	820	»
80. Dirakht-î Asûrîk	800	»
81. Form of marriage contract	400	»
82. Wonders of the land of Sîstân	290	»
Total in Class III.	40,860	words.

According to this estimate the total extent of Pahlavi literature known to exist amounts to about 585,390 words, or very nearly the same extent as the scriptures of the Old Testament. Whether much more remains to be discovered

Digitized by Google

is very doubtful, the Parsis themselves being by no means sanguine on the subject. The original Pahlavi of the Shikand-gûmânîk Vijâr has not been discovered, but the style of the Pâzand text removes all doubt as to its transcription from a Pahlavi work. Nos. 55, 57, 60, 64, and 67 have also been only found in a Pâzand version, but the other *Âfrîns* exist in Pahlavi characters, though their language may not be very old. There are likewise a few other Pâzand texts of small extent, which have not been included in the lists, because their Pahlavi origin is more or less uncertain.

Of the Pahlavi texts above detailed about 222,000 words have been already printed and published, and about 198,000 words translated. Of these translations several exist in more than one language; thus, about 187,000 words have been translated into English, 66,000 into Gujarâti, 34,000 into German, and 19,000 into French. The publication and translation of the Dînkar*d* is still in progress, the text of the Social Code of the Parsis in Sasanian times is nearly ready for publication, and the Parsis are making arrangements for publishing the texts of the complete Irânian Bundahish, the Yâ*d*kâr-î Zarîrân, and some other writings of which only one or two manuscripts are known to exist.

Before proceeding to further details (in the course of which it may be necessary to quote several Pahlavi passages) it is necessary to describe the mode of transliterating that will be here adopted. The difficulty of transcribing Pahlavi in an intelligible manner arises not only from the deficiencies of the Pahlavi alphabet, but also from the superfluity of its compound forms which cannot be simplified without entirely destroying the characteristics of Pahlavi manuscript. The transliterator of Pahlavi has, therefore, to indicate not only the various approximate sounds of each letter, but also the particular mode in which the letter happens to be written,

Digitized by Google

and to do so in such a manner that any Pahlavi scholar may readily understand the system adopted, and be able to restore the words to their original form. The simplest way of indicating different letters, or combinations, that have practically the same sound, appears to be the use of italics for those forms that are least normal; and, on this principle, with the occasional use of an apostrophe or hyphen, it has been found possible to express all the variations of the Pahlavi characters with practical success.

The various sounds of the fourteen simple letters of the Pahlavi alphabet will be seen from the following statement of the equivalents used for transliterating each of them: —

1. a (*initial*), â, h, kh, *zd*.
2. b.
3. p, f, *v*.
4. t, *d*.
5. *c*,[1]) j,[2]) *z*.
6. r, l.
7. z.
8. s, or two of No. 14.
9. sh, or Nos. 14 + 1.
10. gh.
11. k.
12. m.
13. n, v,[3]) û, ô, *o*, *r*, *l*.
14. y, î, ê, d, g, *j*.[2])

There is also a fifteenth letter, which is merely an old form of No. 6, used as a final *r* or *l* in a few Semitic words, and shaped like an Avesta o; it occurs only in akha*r*, a*l*, zeka*r*, mekhâ*r*, and va*l*, and remains unaltered when any suffix is added to these words. The Avesta letter ã is likewise found in Pahlavi, but is transcribed âñ; it is only used in the suffixes -âñ of the present participle and -âñd (often -ând) of the conjunctive third person plural. Another peculiar compound is shaped like the second Avesta ê, but with a horizontal stroke across the lower part of the letter; it is used either for the Semitic preposition dên, »among,

1) Like ch in »church«.

2) As in »judge«.

3) Like English w before a, â, ô, û, and English v before î, ê, y.

Digitized by Google

within«, (originally bên,[1]) the horizontal stroke being apparently a remnant of that of the original b), or for the suffix -yên of the optative third person plural, or singular, used with some Semitic verbal stems in Pahlavi. With regard to the *short* vowels, a, e, i, o, u, it should be observed that only the initial »a« and the final italic *o* are expressed in Pahlavi characters.

Besides the simpler forms there are several abbreviated compounds that frequently occur, in which one loop of the complete compound is omitted. This kind of abbreviation occurs in compounds of the first, sixth, eighth, ninth, or fourteenth letter with the third, fifth, or some compound. And the abbreviation is indicated either by italicizing the letter which is abbreviated, or any short vowel occurring between the two letters, or by introducing an apostrophe between the two letters when no short vowel intervenes. Thus, an abbreviated compound of the first with the third or fifth letter of the alphabet may be indicated by *a*p, *a*f, *a*v, *a*c, *a*j, *a*ž, or *a*ĉ,[2]) if initial; or by â*p*, â*f*, â*v*, â*c*, â*j*, â*ž*, *h*ap, *h*af, *h*ac, *h*až, or *khž*, in any position. An abbreviated compound of the sixth with the fifth letter may be indicated by r*a*j, r*a*ž, r'j, or r'ž. One of the eighth with the third or fifth letter by s*p*, d*p*, s*f*, s*a*c, s*a*j, or s*ij*. One of the ninth with the third or fifth letter by y*â*f, y*â*v, or sh'*c*. And one of the fourteenth with the third or fifth letter by y*a*ž, y*e*ž, ê*c*, ê*j*, ê*ž*, *t*v, *t*c, *t*ž, d*a*j, g*a*c, g*a*j, or g*uj*.

It may be here noted that the identity of form between the ninth letter (sh) and any compound of the fourteenth

1) In the long Sasanian inscription of Naksh-i Rustam, ll. 27, 34, 52, 64 (see *Indian Antiquary* for 1881, pp. 29—34). This original form is also given as bakhin (properly bâên) in the Farhang-i Pahlavîk, ed. Hoshangji and Haug, pp. 18, 93.

2) This is a doubly abbreviated compound of the first, fourteenth, and fifth letters, which is sometimes written like *a*p.

Digitized by Google

and first (such as yâ, yah, dâ, dah, gâ) appears to have arisen in very recent times. Old manuscripts, especially those written in Persia, distinguish sh from the compound by omitting the initial dot in the former. Unfortunately, this distinction has not been preserved in the printed texts.

The reasons for using *d* instead of t in certain cases are, first, that the Persians used d in such cases as soon as they adopted their modern alphabet, thus indicating that the sound had become that of d before that time; secondly, we know that the distinction between d and t was not very strongly marked even as early as the third century, for while the earlier Sasanian inscriptions have yaztân for »the sacred beings«, those engraved thirty or forty years later always have yazdân; thirdly, on Indo-Scythic coins of the first century we find the name of the angel of wind written OAΔO in Greek uncials, indicating that this name was pronounced Vâ*do* even in those early times. The final O, in this and other names on the Indo-Scythic coins, is also an interesting confirmation of the reading that was adopted in 1872[1]) for the puzzling final vowel which can be optionally used after the third, fourth, fifth, eleventh, and thirteenth letters of the Pahlavi alphabet.

The explanation of the singular multiplicity of sounds represented by the first, thirteenth, and fourteenth letters is simple enough. Each of these letters represents several separate Sasanian characters which, in the course of time, have approximated in form, and are now written alike. Thus, the first letter is an amalgamation of the Sasanian characters for â, h, and zd; the thirteenth letter is an amalgamation of the Sasanian n and v, the latter of which was also used for r and l, indicating an earlier amalgamation of original characters for v and r; and the fourteenth letter is an amalgamation of the Sasanian y, d, and g.

1) In the text of the book of Ar*d*â-Vîrâf.

Digitized by Google

The thirteenth letter stands for *r* or *l* in several words, both Semitic and Irânian. Thus, we have the Semitic ba*r*â, she*dr*un, gha*l*, ko*l*â, ka*r*ĭtun, mi*l*ayâ, gab*r*â, yema*lel*ûn, etc., and the Irânian *áfr*în, *avâr*îk, âtû*r*, khû*r*sand, pû*rsîd*, *frâs*, sa*r*dâr, ki*r*fak, ka*rd*, mitrô, dû*r*êst, etc. A few of these words are also written occasionally with the sixth letter, such as karĭtun and yemalelûn.

In some Pahlavi words an original b has become d through being joined to the following letter in hasty writing, and this change has gradually become permanent. In such words the permanence of the change has to be admitted, and the letter is represented by d, although it might perhaps be reasonably indicated by italic *b*. In many cases the original form of the word is still extant, though rarely used when the word is of Semitic origin; thus, we find both bâr and dâr, junbînî*d* and jundînî*d*, shebkûn (Ch. שְׁבַק) and shedkûn, mekablûn (Ch. קַבֵּל) and mekadlûn, vabîdûn[1]) (Ch. עֲבַד) and vadîdûn, yensebûn (Ch. נְסַב) and yensedûn, debrûn (Ch. דְּבַר) and dedrûn, bên (Ch. בֵּין) and dên (as mentioned above). Sometimes, however, we find only the altered form, as in *c*edrûn (Ch. עֲבַד), zednun (Ch. זְבַן), mezadnun (Ch. זַבֵּן), neked[2]) (Heb. נְקֵבָה), and yûdân (for yûbân, Av. *yavan*).

Where the thirteenth letter represents an original Semitic ע, or initial א, some scholars object to its transliteration by v, and prefer ô as a closer approximation to the Semitic sound. If, however, we consider that the sound of the Pahlavi syllable va was more like English wa than va, the difference between ע and va is not really so great as it

1) Read bahûn in the Farhâng-î Pahlavîk, where the first letter is omitted. It occurs correctly in the long inscription of Na*k*sh-i Rustam, ll. 2, 6.

2) A final Pahlavi d often differs from b only in size.

Digitized by Google

appears to be. It must also be remembered that the sound of ע is decidedly consonantal, and this fact is strongly indicated in Pahlavi itself by the coexistence of the two forms, va*l* and gha*l*, for the Semitic לע. Further evidence of the consonantal character of v = ע is given by its occurrence at the beginning of words without having the vowel »a« prefixed as *mater lectionis*; which prefix is almost indispensable in Pahlavi when the thirteenth or fourteenth letter is a vowel and would otherwise be initial, as in aûpâr*d*, aûftâ*d*, aûrvar, aûzmû*d*, aûzûsht, aûzdês, aûstôfrî*d*, aôsh, a*z*ishn, Airân, etc. It is doubtful if there be any exceptions to this general rule, except û*z*dahishn, îstâ*d*, and their cognate forms.

The ordinary use of a hyphen is to connect the components of compound words, which are often written separately in the Pahlavi character, or to render them more intelligible by partial separation, as in ham-dâ*d*istânîh, Aûha*r*ma*z*d-dâ*d*, 4-pêtishtân, bîm-hômand, pê*d*âkî-aî*t*o, mar*d*-1, va-zak-1, vad-i*c*, etc. But in some cases the hyphen is used to prevent ambiguity, or to indicate the mode of writing; thus margar'jân and marg-ar'jân indicate two different modes of writing the same word, in which ga represents the fourteenth letter, and g-a the ninth. Again, when the negative particle an- is prefixed to an initial »a«, a hyphen is used to show that the initial is expressed in writing, as in an-ar'jânîk, an-ana*sp*ôrîk, etc.; when the initial is â there can be no ambiguity, and the hyphen is not used, as in anâsâyak. Sometimes the negative prefix a- is written separate from the word, like the Pahlavi cipher for 2; in which case a hyphen is used, as in a-*a*fzârîh, a-khûkîh, a-bâr, a-bûkhtîkîh, etc. Sometimes the negative prefix a- is used irregularly, instead of an-, before an initial â; in which case, being defective, it is italicized, and a hyphen is also used, as in *a*-ârâme*d*, *a*-âmûkht, etc.

Digitized by Google

There are about fifty Semitic words in Pahlavi that terminate with a compound whose traditional reading, -man, is still retained, because its correct reading is not quite certain. Haug endeavoured to explain this termination as a suffix -man, in accordance with the traditional reading, but, as he was compelled to use three different explanations to account for its use in different words, and had to make some assumptions that might be disputed, it cannot be said that his explanation was very convincing.

The actual facts connected with this termination, so far as they have been ascertained down to the present time, appear to be as follows: — Of the fifty Semitic words in Pahlavi, containing the so-called -man, twelve occur also in the Sasanian inscriptions, where the compound -man corresponds to a single letter whose exact sound has not been satisfactorily ascertained, but which is always a final letter. In Pahlavi, also, this compound -man is final, so far as the Semitic portion of the word is concerned, though it may have Irânian suffixes annexed to it; but in the case of certain verbs, hereafter detailed, this finality may be questioned. In forty of these Semitic words whose etymology has been ascertained, the termination -man may be explained as corresponding to an original final -â in 31 cases, either to -â or -âh in three cases, to -âh in three cases, either to -âh or -mân in two cases, and to 𐭩 in one. Rejecting the two optional cases of -mân, as mere possibilities, it is evident that an Irânian might very well pronounce this termination as -â in every case. The difficulties that remain to be explained are how the Sasanian letter became the Pahlavi compound -man, and why the Sasanians had two letters of the same sound (â) in their alphabet. The first of these difficulties has been satisfactorily overcome by the decipherment of a Pahlavi inscription of the seventh century[1]) on a

1) See *Indian Antiquary* for 1882, pp. 223—226.

Digitized by Google

stone amulet which was offered for sale at Baghdâd in 1875. In this inscription the termination -man occurs six times (in the words barman, denman, and nafshman) in various forms intermediate between the Sasanian letter and the modern Pahlavi termination, proving that the latter has descended from the former by a gradual change in its written shape; and, as the Sasanian original has no resemblance to a Sasanian -man, the identity of its modern Pahlavi descendant with a Pahlavi -man can be only an accident. The second difficulty remains to be solved by some scholar who shall possess a thorough knowledge of all the Semitic dialects, existing shortly before and after the Christian era, as well as an intimate acquaintance with the peculiarities of the Pahlavi writings. It has been proposed to read the uncertain Sasanian letter as a Semitic ח which has no separate representative in the Sasanian alphabet; but this is merely solving one difficulty by creating another of a similar nature. It is quite certain that the Semitic ה is often represented by the same Sasanian letter as that which represents ח, as in the words hatîmûn, hankhetûn, havîtun, yehamtûn, and yehvûn; and, if the uncertain final letter also stood for ה, the question why the Sasanians used two letters to represent ה would become a new difficulty. In the great majority of cases the Pahlavi final -man seems to represent the emphatic suffix א֫, but it also represents other instances of final א֫, and the emphatic suffix is likewise represented, more frequently, by the first Pahlavi letter -â. The two words in which the final -man might optionally represent a Semitic -mân are tamman and latamman (cf. Ch. תַּמָּן and תַּמָּה). Three of the verbal stems that contain the compound -man are medammûn (Ch. רַמָּה), vashammûn (Ch. שְׁמַע), and yezbemûn (Ch. עְזָבָה), in which the compound represents the final radical letter; but, if the suffix -ûn or -un be Semitic

Digitized by Google

(as is usually supposed) the compound is not the final of the Semitic stem. On consideration of all these facts it appears almost certain that this Pahlavi final compound in Semitic words cannot stand for an original -man, but very probably represents some such sound as -â or -âh, though it may still be desirable to adhere to the traditional reading, -man, until the correct sound is ascertained with greater certainty.

By attending to the general principles of transliteration above detailed, and extending them so as to include all special peculiarities of the manuscripts, it is possible to transcribe the texts so as to make the actual form of each word perfectly intelligible to any Pahlavi scholar who will take the matter into consideration. There is really very little variation in Pahlavi orthography beyond a few duplicate forms of well-known words, some little uncertainty in the use of long and short vowels, of z and d, and of abbreviated or redundant compounds. And, with regard to etymology, there is hardly any language that contains so few uncertainties as Pahlavi; this is fortunate, because the ambiguity of the writing often makes the reading of a word very uncertain till its etymology is known.

Returning to the consideration of the Pahlavi texts, it should be distinctly understood that no one should turn to the translations of the Avesta for specimens of pure idiomatical Pahlavi. The object of the Pahlavi translator of an Avesta text was to produce, as nearly as possible, a word-for-word translation, so that the separate meaning of each word of the original Avesta might be ascertained without reference to any lexicon, while the general sense of each sentence was not too much obscured by the unusual arrangement of the words. Such translations, therefore, consist of Pahlavi words arranged according to the rules of Avesta syntax, so far as the necessity of making the sentences

Digitized by Google

intelligible to Pahlavi readers will permit. Just in the same way as Nêryôsang's Sanskrit translations consist of Sanskrit words arranged according to the rules of Pahlavi syntax, when he has translated from a purely Pahlavi text; or according to the rules of Avesta syntax diluted by Pahlavi modifications, when he has translated from a Pahlavi version of the Avesta. And as we do not expect classical Sanskrit from Nêryôsang, so we must not expect classical Pahlavi in the Pahlavi translations of the Avesta.

The word-for-word translation is interspersed with a running commentary of glosses, either by the same or a later hand, inserted as parenthetical clauses, as in the following passage from Pahl. Yasna, XLV, 5a (Sp.):[1]) — Pavan zak-î lekûm shalîtâîh (dên denman gêhân aêgh lekûm shalîtâîh) ayehabûnishn*o* aît*o* (aêghash mindavam lâ yehabûnishn*o*) zak-î dari*d*âr yâtûnê*do* (mûn pavan rêsh kar*d*an*o* yâtûnê*d*): — »In that dominion of yours (in this world, where your dominion is,) there is no giving (that is, nothing is to be given) *to* him who comes *as* a tearer (who comes with infliction of a wound).«

The parenthetical clauses, when merely glosses, are usually introduced by the particle aêgh, »that is«, though this is often omitted, as may be seen in the passage just quoted. They are frequently, however, not mere glosses, but explanatory additions to the sentence, that are also often introduced by the same particle which is apt to mislead the unwary, but is then to be understood as meaning »that, so that, or thus«. Instances of such explanatory additions occur in the following passage from Pahl. Yas. XIX, 6, 7: —

1) In this and all other quotations the words in parentheses are explanatory additions by the Pahlavi translator, having no equivalents in the Avesta text; and the English words in italics are not expressed in the Pahlavi version. The Pahlavi text itself is corrected according to the best manuscripts available.

Digitized by Google

Mûn zak bakhtârîh min Ahunaver, Spîtâmân Zaratûshto! pavan aba*r*â-gôbishnîh (aêghash *av*istâk tang dên mîyân*o* ba*r*â lâ yemalelûnê*do*) aba*r*â-sû*d*akîh (aêgh ba*r*â khelmûnê*do*) srâye*d*, pavan 100 madam valmanshân*o* hân*o*-1[1]) radîh-î gâsân*o* amat*o* pavan aba*r*â-gôbishnîh aba*r*â-sû*d*akîh srâye*do*; (aê*d*ûn*o* ya*z*ishn*o* gha*l* yehevûnê*do*): — »Whoever chants that allotment of the Ahunavair, O Zaratûsht the Spîtâmân! without talking (that is, he strictly does not speak out in the middle of his Avesta) *and* not without anxiety (that he may slumber), *it is* like a hundred, as regards any other authority of those of the Gâthas, when *one* chants *them* without talking, *or* not without anxiety; (thus it becomes *fit* for the ceremonial).«

In many places the Pahlavi translators introduce an optional version of some particular phrase, or an optional opinion, with the words: a*i*t*o* mûn aê*d*ûn*o* . yemalelûnê*d*-a*ê*, »there is *some one* who would say thus«, as in Pahl. Yas. X, 42: — *A*fat ba*r*â shedkûnam pavan zanishn*o* (aêghat ba*r*â parâyêm) khû*r*sand marân*o* grestak-î sa*r*îtarân*o*; (a*i*t*o* mûn aê*d*ûn*o* yemalelûnê*d*-a*ê*: Hômant ba*r*â shedkûnêsh): — »I dismiss from thee by beating (that is, I lop off thee) the satisfied deadly *ones*, the burrows of the evil *ones*; (there is *some one* who would say thus: It is 'mayest thou dismiss').« Many of the parenthetical clauses and optional versions have the appearance of being interpolations by after revisers of the translations, but any attempt to distinguish such interpolations would be mere guesswork.

The Pahlavi translations are also interspersed with commentaries, in which the opinions of various old commentators are quoted. In some cases, and generally at the close of some particular subject in the text, these commentaries are of considerable length, and often contain quotations from

1) Or akha*r*an-1.

Digitized by Google

Avesta texts, many of which are not now extant elsewhere. These commentaries, as might be expected, contain purer Pahlavi than the translated text, but, as they are often written in a very abbreviated manner, they do not afford good exemples of Pahlavi style. The extent of commentary, accompanying the translated text, varies very much in different texts; thus, while the Pahlavi Yasna, Visparad, and Yashts contain very little commentary, fully one-fourth of the Pahlavi Vendîdâd, two-thirds of the Aogemadaêcâ, and three-fourths of the Nîrangistân consist of commentary.

It is unfortunate that the European editors of such texts as the Vendîdâd should have separated the Pahlavi from the Avesta, as they have thereby placed an additional difficulty in the way of the successful study of both texts. It is true that the Parsis, in former times, extracted the Avesta from the combined texts for liturgical purposes; but they have never separated the Pahlavi version from the Avesta text. In their combined form the two texts are mutually explanatory; and, when separated, it is advisable to recombine them mentally on meeting with any serious difficulty. It is sometimes by no means easy to determine whether one of the Avesta sentences be a portion of the original text, or merely a quotation inserted by the Pahlavi translator, as there is nothing in the manuscripts to distinguish them, beyond the general connection of their meaning with the context, either Avesta or Pahlavi, and neither the Parsi extractors of the Vendîdâd Sâdah, nor the European editors of the separated texts, are infallible. The general rule, that an Avesta sentence which is not translated must be a quotation, may probably be relied on, though it should be carefully tested by reference to the contexts in all cases. But the converse rule, that an Avesta sentence which is translated must belong to the Avesta text, is liable to exception; thus, in Pahl. Vend. II, 16, the sentence *Yimahê*

Digitized by Google

Vîvanhanahê ashaonô fravashîm yazamaidê is translated, although it is evidently a quotation. This raises the question whether such passages as Vend. I, 15 (W.) may not consist of mere quotations, although translated; at any rate, several undoubted quotations in the Pahlavi translation have been admitted into the Avesta text, even though not translated, such as those in Vend. I, 2 and *khshayamna* . . . to the end of Vend. XVIII, 55 (W.); also *hapta* . . . to . . . *ashkare* and *adha zimahê* . . . to . . . *zaredhaêm* in Vend. I, 4 (W.), and other such quotations which are likely to perplex scholars who do not ascertain their immediate context in the manuscripts. The Avesta which is merely quoted by the Pahlavi translators in their commentaries amounts to about 400 words in the Vendîdâd, and 1700 in the Nîrangistân, of which latter number about 1400 are from the Yasna or Visparad.

By comparing the contents of the Nîrangistân (so far as they can be understood without long-continued study) with the account of the Nasks given in the eighth book of the Dînkard, it has been ascertained that one-eighth of the work is a portion of the Aêrpatistân section of the Hûspâram Nask, and the remaining seven-eighths are a large portion of the Nîrangistân section of the same Nask. All the Bombay manuscripts of the Nîrangistân (so far as they have been examined), including Haug's in the Staatsbibliothek in München and Westergaard's in the University Library at Kopenhagen, are descendants of one original which was brought from Irân to India in 1720. This manuscript has disappeared, but a copy of it, written in 1727, still exists in Poona and is the best authority for what may be called the Bombay text of the work. Another independent authority, more complete at the beginning, but less so at the end, is an old manuscript which was brought from Irân to Bombay some fifteen years ago, and is now in the possession of Môbad Tehmuras Dinshawji Ankalesaria. It appears probable that

Digitized by Google

both these authorities are descended from some very old fragment of the Hûspâram Nask, defective at both ends, and with many of its intermediate folios either lost, or misplaced. This old fragment has been copied, just as it stood, without any notice being taken of the lacunæ, or dislocations, so that the task of editing the Pahlavi text is likely to be one of no small difficulty and uncertainty, whenever it is undertaken.

Whether the Aogemadaêcâ (so called from its initial Avesta word) can be identified as a small fragment of one of the Nasks is as yet uncertain. It has much of the appearance of an Avesta text with Pahlavi translation and extensive commentary, as may be seen from the Avesta-Pâzand-Sanskrit version edited and translated by Geiger in 1878. Two Avesta-Pahlavi manuscripts of the same text have been examined in Bombay, both comparatively modern; one of them, written in 1820, prefixes the first 190 words of some *Âfrîn* to this text, and the last 50 words of Geiger's edition (§§ 106—111) are evidently the conclusion of the *Âfrîn-i* Dâhmân.

The Vijirkard-i Dînîk is a kind of Pahlavi Rivâyat, or miscellany of decisions on religious subjects, and was published in 1848 by the high-priest of the Parsis in Bombay from a copy of an Irânian manuscript of the thirteenth century which had been brought in former times to Surat. It professes to have been compiled by Mêdyômâh, first-cousin of Zaratûsht, but, if the text has been correctly edited, it can have no pretensions to be as much as a thousand years old, and there have been several priests and commentators of the name of Mêdyômâh. The portions of the Vijirkard-i Dînîk that consist of translations from the Avesta contain passages from the Ashem-staota and the Hâdôkht, Nihâdûm, and Bagân-yasht Nasks, which are not extant elsewhere and refer to inheritance, carriers of the dead, preparation of the vars or sacred hair, sacred cakes for new-year's day, clothes

Digitized by Google

for the dead, how the names of the dead are to be mentioned, the sacred thread-girdle, the purification of women after miscarriage, etc.

Regarding the purely Pahlavi texts it is unnecessary to mention more than a few particulars. The longer texts afford the best specimens of Pahlavi idiom and style; the former is nearly the same in all the works, but the latter is much more variable. Of the simple narrative style the Bundahish, Maînôg-î Khirad, and Kârnâmak are good examples, in which the translator finds little difficulty in the construction of the sentences. The more philosophical works, of course, are more difficult, but the amount of difficulty depends more upon the writer than upon the subject; thus, the language of the Shikand-gûmânîk Vijâr is comparatively simple and clear, while that of the Dâdistân-î Dînîk, the Epistles of Mânûshcîhar, the Selections of Zâd-sparam, and of some parts of the third book of the Dînkard is often extremely difficult and obscure, owing to the involved style of the writers.

English translations of Nos. 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, part of 31, and the Indian version of No. 26 (with extracts from the Irânian version) have been published in the *Sacred Books of the East*, vols. V, XVIII, XXIV; also of Nos. 6, 36, 39, and 76 published separately by Hoshangji and Haug in 1867—72; and of Nos. 40, 41, 43, 61, and part of 51 by Peshotan in his *Ganje Shâyagân*[1]) in 1885. German translations of Nos. 42, 45, 49, 55, 59, 64, 65, and fragments of others have been published by Spiegel; of the Indian version of No. 26 by Justi; and of No. 73 by Nöldeke. And a French translation of No. 47 has been published by Barthelemy in 1887. Not to mention several older, partial, and duplicate translations.

1) See *Le Muséon*, tome VI, pp. 263—272, for some further information regarding Peshotan's texts.

Digitized by Google

All Indian copies of the Dînkard, including Haug's incomplete copy in the Staatsbibliothek in München, are descended from a single manuscript brought from Irân to Surat in 1783, and still existing in Bombay; it appears, from its colophons, to have been written in 1659, attested in 1669, and to be descended, through intermediate copies written about 1365[1]) and in 1516, from a manuscript which was copied in 1020[2]) from an original of the latter portion of the Dînkard which had been preserved in Asûristân. Before the copy of 1659 was recopied in India about 71 folios were abstracted by persons to whom it had been lent, so that all its copies are defective in many places; and it was not till 1875 that copies of 64 of these folios could be collected, leaving seven folios still missing. It would appear from this information (which has been obtained from the colophons, Mullâ Fîrûz's *Avîjeh-dîn*, and other sources) that the earlier portion of the Dînkard, consisting of the first two books, had become separated from the rest of the work nine hundred years ago, and has long since been lost. Also, that the copy of 1659 is the only real authority for the text in India. The only other authority, known to exist, is to be found in the Pahlavi codex No. 43 in the University Library at Kopenhagen, which contains fully one-fifth of the text in detached portions. Some of these portions were copied in 1594, and are descended from the same manuscript of 1020 as the Bombay copy. The text of the Dînkard has been in course of publication and translation by Peshotan since 1874, but his progress is slow, as with his fifth volume he hardly completes the first quarter of the text. The eighth

1) Four generations after the Rustam Mihrbân mentioned in Yôsht-î Fryânô, VI, 1.

2) The dates 1020, 1516, and 1659, as well as 1594 below, are all given in the corresponding numbers of years after the 20th of Yazdakard.

Digitized by Google

and ninth books, which contain a long summary of the contents of the Nasks, are being translated for the *Sacred Books of the East.*

The Indian version of the Bundahish, the only one hitherto accessible to Europeans, is merely a series of extracts from the Irânian version, of which latter version two manuscripts have been obtained from Persia by Tehmuras Dinshawji of Bombay, within the last fifteen years. It is the collated text of these two manuscripts that the Parsis now propose to publish; and, in the mean time, a few passages from one of them have been included in the English translation of the Bundahish in the fifth volume of the *Sacred Books of the East.* The last folio of a third manuscript of the Irânian version is also preserved in Westergaard's codex, now No. 43 in the University Library at Kopenhagen, and a facsimile of this folio has been published by Andreas in his facsimile edition of the Pahlavi text of the Mainôg-î Khirad.

The Rivâyat of Hêmêd-i Ashavahishtân is a collection of about 270 questions and answers on religious subjects, some of which contain the opinions of various commentators. It is appended to one of the two complete copies of the Irânian Bundahish mentioned above, and is followed by a Pahlavi version and commentary of Vendîdâd, V—VIII, which appear to be considerably longer than those hitherto known, to which are added some 55 pages of particulars regarding the Yasna ceremony, with several Avesta quotations. These latter texts have not been included in the list of Pahlavi texts, because the information supplied by the owner of the manuscript is not sufficient to determine their nature.

Of the Pahlavi Jâmâsp nâmak only some fragments have been found, amounting to rather more than one-fourth of the extent of the Pâzand version which is also incomplete.

Digitized by Google

The Andar'*z*-î Hûdâvar-î[1]) dânâk consists of Hûdâvar's answers to a disciple on various subjects. The only copy found is contained in the very old Pahlavi codex No. 20 in the University Library at Kopenhagen, among its folios 143—148 which were formerly very much misplaced. About one-fifth of the text is certainly lost, but its original length is very uncertain. In the same old codex is a copy of the Mâ*d*îgân-î gujastak Abâlish, which would suggest several improvements in the text recently edited by Barthelemy who was unable to consult it.

The Social Code of the Parsis in Sasanian times is only known from two fragments of considerable extent; one consists of 20 old folios obtained from Persia by Tehmuras Dinshawji who has prepared a facsimile edition of them for publication; the other is a modern copy of 55 similar folios which are still in Persia. This copy is in the library of Dastûr Jamaspji Minociharji in Bombay, and its text overlaps that of the other fragment, but indicates the loss of many folios in its original. Tehmuras intends to print the text of this copy, if he cannot obtain the original, for publication with the facsimile of his own fragment. The work, so far as it has been examined, appears to be a treatise on the laws of property, in which the opinions of many commentators are quoted, and the names of some of the Sasanian kings, such as Vâhrâm-î Ya*z*dakar*d*ân, Ya*z*dakar*d*-î Vâhrâmân, Pîrû*z*, and Khûsrô-î Kavâ*d*ân, are mentioned.

The original of all known copies of the Kârnâmak-î Artakhshîr-î Pâpakân appears to be in a very old codex belonging to Dastûr Jamaspji, that also contains some other interesting texts, such as Nos. 74, 75, 78, 82. All these texts the Parsis propose to publish shortly.

---

1) Or Khûshvar-î.

Digitized by Google

When the Parsis have published the contents of this old codex, as well as the Irânian Bundahish, and have completed the edition of the Dînkard, while Tehmuras publishes the fragments of the Social Code, Pahlavi scholars will have no further reason to complain of the inaccessibility of materials for prosecuting their studies. Whether they have any such reason at present may fairly be doubted, when we consider that nearly two-fifths of the extant Pahlavi literature has already been published.

Regarding the origin of the Pahlavi language our knowledge has practically made no advance beyond the point attained by Haug in his *Introductory Essay on the Pahlavi language*, pp. 128—148, published in 1870. We have the statement of the Kitâbu-l-fihrist, quoted from Ibn Mukaffa of the latter end of the eighth century, that the Persians were in the habit of using many Semitic words in their Pahlavi writings, for which they substituted Irânian equivalents when reading what they had written. We also know that the Parsi priests still read Irânian equivalents for the Semitic words written in their Pahlavi manuscripts, although Parsi students are now being taught the correct pronunciation of the Semitic words as ascertained by European scholars. And we further learn from Ammianus Marcellinus, XIX, 2, 11, that the Persians (as early as A. D. 350) called their king shahân shâh, »the king of kings«, an Irânian title which is always expressed by the Semitic equivalents (malkân malkâ) of its components, when written in Pahlavi.

These facts prove that the Semitic words in Pahlavi have, for the last 1100 (or, possibly, 1500) years, been used merely as ideograms to represent their Irânian equivalents. It has therefore been justifiable to assume that when the Persians adopted the Pahlavi alphabet from their Semitic neighbours, or predecessors, they also transferred a certain number of complete Semitic words to their writings, as

Digitized by Google

representatives of the corresponding words in their own language. This hypothesis is, however, only intended to explain the facts as we find them in Sasanian and later times, and applies only to the Sasanian alphabet and its descendants in later Pahlavi. So long as the Pahlavi alphabet continued in general use, this clumsy ideographic system was maintained through force of habit, but the Semitic words disappeared immediately the Persians adopted their modern alphabet; which is an additional proof that they had long ceased to be read as they were written.

With regard to the actual origin of Pahlavi we have so few facts to guide us that all attempts to explain it are very hazardous, and lead to much difference of opinion. Last year, in the *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, vol. I, pp. 49—54, 69—76, 93—95, 104—108, de Harlez objected very strongly to the ideographic theory as an explanation of the origin of Pahlavi. Admitting that the Semitic words did finally become mere ideograms, representing their Irânian equivalents, he maintains that they must have been originally spoken as they were written, and, adopting Mordtmann's suggestion, he seems to think that Pahlavi was a mere literary language, adopted by writers and the upper classes not only for writing, but also for conversation, in which they borrowed Semitic words, or used Persian ones, according to their fancy which was only limited by the necessity of being intelligible to their learned readers, or audience. This practice, he thinks, continued till the time of king Bahrâm Gôr who forbade the use of Syriac, and then the reading of the Semitic words gradually ceased, but they were still written because they had been adopted in the sacred scriptures. In confirmation of his view he has noticed about a dozen facts in Pahlavi texts which tend to show that the Semitic words were often read as they were written; it is doubtful, however, whether any of these facts

Digitized by Google

will bear strict examination, and many of them are based upon peculiarities, or misreadings, of some particular manuscript, which are not to be found in other manuscripts of equal, or superior, authority; in other words, they merely indicate the peculiarities, or blunders, of some modern copyist.

It is very probable that we should find that Pahlavi was originally read as it was written, if we could trace it back to its source. This was the view taken by Haug (Essay on Pahlavi, pp. 140, 141), but he traced it to a Semitic dialect imperfectly acquired by an Irânian people, so that both vocabulary and grammatical construction became mixed; and this is certainly more consonant with the facts we have to explain than the literary-dialect theory proposed by de Harlez. If we want to know what kind of change learned men are likely to make in a language, when they borrow words from foreigners, we have only to compare modern Persian with the Persian of Firdausi, and to notice the general character of the Arabic words with which the modern Persian abounds. If we then compare the Persian of Firdausi with the Pahlavi writings, and notice the general character of the Semitic words which the latter contain, we are immediately struck by the totally different nature of this old Semitic admixture from that of the Arabic borrowings of modern Persian writers. We shall notice that the Arabic in modern Persian includes most words connected with religion, science, and literature, together with some metaphorical and professional terms and phrases; while the Semitic portion of the Pahlavi is practically confined to the commonest and most indispensable words in the language, excepting those connected with religion. In other words, the Arabic in modern Persian is the literary and ornamental part of the language, set in a framework of pure Persian; while the Semitic portion of the Pahlavi is the indispensable framework in which pure Persian is set. This is so much

Digitized by Google

the case, that scarcely any of the Arabic words, commonly used in modern Persian, correspond to any Semitic word in Pahlavi; and, though some uncommon and scientific words may be found among the Semitic words in the Farhang-i Pahlavîk, they can very rarely be discovered in the texts. This essential difference in the nature of the Semitic admixture in Pahlavi from that in modern Persian indicates a total difference of origin, and seems to be an insuperable objection to the literary-dialect theory.

In the present state of our knowledge it is far safer to point out the few facts we have to guide us, than to come to any definite conclusion as to the actual origin of Pahlavi. The possibility that the Semitic words in Pahlavi were used ideographically even as early as A. D. 350 has been already mentioned, but before that date there is no information to guide us on that subject. With regard, however, to the existence of Pahlavi, the earliest distinct specimen of such a language, yet discovered, is probably the legend on a coin of Abd Zoharâû, satrap of Cilicia about 700 years earlier. This legend is »mozdî zî 'al Abd Zoharâû Khalk«, which is good Sasanian Pahlavi for »payment which is for Abd Zoharâû of Cilicia«. Here we see the Irânian mozdî used with the Semitic zî 'al just as in Sasanian times. Haug even ventured (Essay on Pahlavi, pp. 136—138) to find Pahlavi characteristics in a short inscription on a tablet from Niniveh, so as to carry the origin of Pahlavi back to the seventh century B. C., and to connect it with some dialect spoken in the Assyrian empire, at a period when foreign conquests and troublous times were likely to produce mixed languages. But numerous instances of such characteristics are necessary before arguments can be safely based upon them, and there was no want of troublous times during the 550 years preceding the reign of Artakhshatar-i Pâpakân.

Digitized by Google

What we have to account for is the origin of a mixed language (either shortly before, or shortly after, the Christian era) whose most essential words are all Semitic, though showing very few signs of Semitic inflection, while most of the construction of the sentences, several of the less indispensable words, and some of the few inflections that occur are Irânian. This is a fairly correct description of the text of the Hâjtâbâd inscription, in which two-thirds of the words are Semitic, and only one-third Irânian. Under ordinary circumstances such a mixture could hardly arise from the borrowing of Irânian words by a Semitic language, because of the loss of the Semitic inflections, and the prevailing Irânian construction of the sentences; still less could it arise from the borrowing of Semitic words by an Irânian language, because no language borrows its commonest and most indispensable words from a foreign source. The facts we have to account for indicate a more complicated process than mere borrowing. We might perhaps suppose that the Sasanian Pahlavi was originally a Semitic language, worn down by use among a mixed population in which the Semites were numerically predominant; much in the same way as Anglo-Saxon was worn down into early English. And we might further suppose that, after a time, this worn and simplified Semitic language came gradually into contact with a comparatively illiterate people, among whom the Irânians were predominant, who adopted it as their written language, with such modifications as the degenerate Persian dialect of the predominant Irânians absolutely demanded. This might account for all the peculiarities of the Sasanian inscriptions, if we supposed that the educated classes had no purely Irânian literature to use; and the increasing education of the Irânians would account for a gradual acceptance of the Semitic words as ideograms, which the highly conservative nature of writing, especially when confined to a small class of literary men,

Digitized by Google

compelled them to preserve. Such an hypothesis might perhaps account for the actual facts, but it is based upon a series of hazardous assumptions which whould be better avoided.

There are also some peculiarities in the construction of Pahlavi sentences, which have not passed into modern Persian, that any theory regarding the origin of Pahlavi ought to explain. The most peculiar and important of these is the prevailing passive construction of most narratives, in which a past participle is generally used at the end of each clause, and a pronominal suffix annexed to some particle at the beginning, as in the following examples: —

*A*fash akha*r* min zamâno vadîdûntô, »also after the period *was* appointed by him«. *A*fash pavan aîyyârîh-î spihâr Zôrvân dâm frâ*z*o brêhînî*d*o, »also, in aid of the *celestial* sphere, the creature Time *was* produced by him«. *C*igûnash dâmâno âhûkînî*d*o, »as the creatures *were* disfigured by him«. Adînash nafshman rabâ gadmanîh numû*d*o, »then his own great gloriousness *was* exhibited by him«. Amatash yashtô yehevûnê*d*, »when it is solemnized by him«. Zyash dûjî*d*o, »which *was* stolen by him«. Mamanash khavîtûnast, »because *it was* known by him«. Aêghash saryâ aûzmâyishno râî yehabûnt, »that evil *was* created by him for the sake of experiment«. Hatash lâ ye*z*bemûnast, »if not wished by him«. *A*fam vakhdûntô pavan drupûshtîh, »also taken by me as a stronghold«. Mûnam hakeri*c* dên stih la khadîtûnt, »which *was* never seen by me in the worldly existence«. *A*fat shapîr gabrâ minî*d*, »also the good man *was* cared for by thee«.

This peculiarity can be traced back to the Sasanian inscriptions, in the later of which the forms *a*fam and *a*fash already occur, while in the earlier inscription at Hâjîâbâd we find the following passive phrases: —

Digitized by Google

Afan[1]) amat zenman khitayâ shadîtun, adînan levînî shatradarân va-barbêtân va-vacarkân va-âzâtan shadîtun, afan rigelman pavan zenman dîkî hankhetûn, afan khitayâ lecad va-zak cîtâk barâ ramîtun, »also when these arrows *were* shot by us, then *they were* shot by us in the presence of the satraps, grandees, magnates, and nobles; also our feet *were* set in this cave, and the arrows *were* shot by us towards and beyond that target«.

In these phrases afan and adînan appear to contain a Semitic pronominal suffix, instead of an Irânian one, thus pointing to some Semitic dialect, already influenced by the ancient Persian habit of suffixing pronouns to particles, as the origin of the peculiarity. The total disappearance of this peculiarity, as soon as Pahlavi writing was completely Irânianized into modern Persian, seems to point also in the same direction.

In ancient Persian we find pronominal suffixes attached quite as often to nouns, pronouns, and adjectives as to particles. In Pahlavi they are practically confined to particles, though occasionally used independently, and very rarely attached to nouns and pronouns; when, however, they are so attached, it is generally in translations from some foreign language. In modern Persian they are, on the other hand, confined to nouns and verbs, or used independently.

The peculiar mode in which a Pahlavi relative particle is governed by some preposition understood in connection with a pronominal suffix attached to it, or by a preposition with a pronominal suffix in the after part of the clause, also deserves attention, although something analogous survives in modern Persian.

Further, we must not forget that the Semitic portion of the Sasanian inscriptions was not confined to the strictly

1) That afan contains a pronominal suffix is shown by the Chald.-Pahl. equivalent va amat lan for the Sas.-Pahl. afan amat.

Digitized by Google

limited number of words we find in Pahlavi manuscripts. The early Sasanians must either have preserved a larger number of ideograms than their successors, or they must have been accustomed to draw extra words from some Semitic dialect with which they were well acquainted.

In the latest Sasanian times the number of ideograms was increased from quite another source; this was the gradual change of the Sasanian letters into their modern Pahlavi forms, which, being incorrectly effected in many cases, gave rise to a number of strange forms of Irânian words in common use. Finally, about one hundred of these Irânian and four hundred Semitic ideograms were collected in a glossary for the use of literary men, and were called Zvârish, a term which was sometimes modified into Uzvârish (whence modern Pahl. Aûzvârishn, misread Hûzvârish). The word zvârish is evidently an abstract noun connected with the Persian verb zvârîdan, »to grow old or thread-bare«, and its meaning must be something like »antiquity or decrepitude«, a fitting term for the last remnants of an old form of writing.

With regard to another term applied to Parsi writings it may be desirable to explain that Pâzand is not the name of any language, or dialect; but it is merely a transliteration of Pahlavi, in which all the Semitic words are replaced by their Irânian equivalents, and it may be written either in Avesta, or modern Persian, characters. A true Pâzand text, therefore, must have had a Pahlavi original, to which it ought to correspond word for word. But, as all Pâzand texts, hitherto examined, have been written by Parsi priests whose vernacular is Gujarâti, their orthography represents merely the Gujarâti pronunciation of Persian, and should not be quoted as an authority for the true Persian pronunciation of any period. As a general rule the orthography of recent Pâzand manuscripts is excessively irregular; every

Digitized by Google

copyist having his own notions of spelling, and often varying it more than once on a single page. Excepting a few detached words and sentences, contained in Pahlavi manuscripts, no specimen of Pâzand written in Persia has yet been seen.

Besides the true Pâzand texts there are some few false ones in existence, which are merely transliterations of modern Persian in Avesta characters. Any text that contains Arabic words, or that has k i and b a, instead of k u and p a, must have sprung from a Persian original. And any text that attaches pronominal suffixes to conjunctions, adverbs, prepositions, or relatives, must have been originally Pahlavi. But between these limits there is room for several gradations of style, between true Pahlavi and true Persian, which may occasion doubts as to the nature of any apparently Pâzand version. Even the existence of the same text in Pahlavi characters is no certain proof that it was originally written in Pahlavi, because Persian texts, when practically free from Arabic, can be written in Pahlavi characters.

Regarding the a g e of the Pahlavi texts, now extant, there has always been much diversity of opinion. The Parsis themselves were formerly inclined to attribute the Pahlavi translations of the Avesta to Zarathushtra himself, which must be an idea of considerable antiquity, as it is mentioned by Mas'aûdî, writing about A. D. 945; but they are now quite ready to accept any suggestions that European scholars may offer on the subject. It is, of course, quite possible that this old idea of the Parsis may be right so far as the mere name is concerned, for there may have been a priest named Zaratûsht assisting in the translation of the Avesta in Sasanian times.

It has often been noticed that a gloss in Pahl. Vend. IV, 141 refers to Mazdak, son of Bâmdâ*d*, the arch-heretic who was put to death by prince Khûsrô, son of Kavâ*d*, at

Digitized by Google

the latter end of his father's reign, about A. D. 529.[1]) This passage is preceded by another, containing a gloss referring to a certain Zarhûndâ*d*, or Zarvândâ*d*, who may perhaps be identified with the eldest son of Mihr-Narsih, who was appointed Herbadân-herbad by king Bahrâm Gôr[2]) (A. D. 420—439). His father, Mihr-Narsih, was prime minister of the three successive kings Yazdakard, Bahrâm Gôr, and Yazdakard, and commanded an army as late as 441.[3])

These passages in Pahl. Vend. IV, 140, 141 are as follows, according to the best authorities available: — Hanâ-*c* mûn, va*l* anshûtâ, darvand sâstâr kamâr[4]) za*d*âr (*c*îgûn Zarhûndâ*d*. *A*jash patkâr levatman Ast-vîdâ*d*). Hanâ-*c* mûn va*l* aharmôk-î an-aharûb*o* akhûrishn*o* (-î sâstâr) patkârê*d* (*c*îgûn Mazdak-î Bâmdâ*d*ân mûnash nafshman sêr vashtamûnt, *a*fash aîshân*o* pavan sûd va-marg dâ*d*. *A*jash patkâr levatman Ast-vîdâ*d*). — »Even he who is a smiter of a wicked tyrant's head, for mankind, (like Zarhûndâ*d*. Owing to him is a contest with Ast-vîdâ*d*, *the demon of death*). Even he who contends with an unrighteous, starvation-causing apostate (who is an oppressor like Mazdak, son of Bâmdâ*d*, who himself ate his fill, while others *were* delivered by him to hunger and death. Owing to him is a contest with Ast-vîdâ*d*).«

It is evident that the names of Mazdak and Zarvândâ*d* could not have been introduced into the Pahlavi version until near the middle of the sixth century, as the two glosses in which they occur have every appearance of being contem-

1) See Nöldeke's *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, p. 465.

2) Ibid. p. 110.

3) Ibid. pp. 75, 106, 108, 113, 116.

4) As kamâr can mean only the head of an evil being, it must refer to that of the sâstâr, and not to those of mankind in general.

Digitized by Google

poraneous. They also look like interpolations inserted between the translation of each sentence of the text and its original explanatory addition: (*a*jash patkâr levatman Astvidâ*d*). If so, their existence seems to prove that this Pahlavi version is older than the time of Mazdak. And, indeed, no one can read the Pahlavi versions attentively without finding traces of at least two generations of glosses, indicating some thorough revision long after the first translation.

Some of the glosses must be very late, as they try to explain the language of the Pahlavi version itself. Thus, the final gloss in Pahl. Vend. I, 4: — Aîto mûn aîto-hômand-i*c* rû*d* yemalelûnê*d*, »there is *some one* who says Aîtohômand (= Hêtûmand) is also a river«, evidently refers to the Pahlavi word ast-hômand at the beginning of the section, and not to its Avesta original astvâo.

Again, it may be argued that the gloss *a*vistâk va-zand (referring to the two sayings, or benedictions, mentioned in Pahl. Yas. XXX, 1; XXXI, 1, as revealed by Aûhar*m*a*z*d, or recited by Zaratûsht) could not have been inserted until the origin of the Zand (which always seems to mean the Pahlavi version) had become obscured by lapse of time. If this be not admitted, we have to fall back upon Haug's theory (*Essays*, p. 120) that the Pahlavi writer is referring to an older Zand, or commentary, in the Avesta language, which, in this particular instance, is rather improbable.

It will be seen from these remarks that the Pahlavi translations of the Avesta contain much internal evidence of revision and alterations from time to time. And, therefore, though we may be able to ascertain the age of certain passages and commentaries which they contain, we cannot safely conclude that the whole translation is subsequent to that period.

It is a relief to turn from such uncertainties to more palpable facts. About twelve years ago a Pahlavi text was

Digitized by Google

first noticed as bearing its original date. This was the third Epistle of Mânûshcîhar, chief priest (rad) of Pârs and Kirmân, and director (farmâdâr) of the profession of priests; the director of the priestly profession being also the leader (pêshûpâî) of the religion. This Epistle is a general notification to all Zoroastrians in Irân, condemning certain heterodox modes of performing the purification ceremony, and dated in the third month A. Y. 250 (June-July 881). This date is found not only in manuscripts in India, but also in one brought from Persia by Westergaard in 1843, and now No. 35 in the University Library at Kopenhagen.

Mânûshcîhar wrote two other longer Epistles, on the same subject, copies of which have also been preserved; one addressed to »the good people of Sîrkân« who had sent him a complaint of the heterodox practices, and dated on the fifth day of the twelfth month (no doubt in A. Y. 249, that is, 15th March 881); the other, to his brother Zâdsparam (who appears to have been high-priest of Sirkân and the south) reproving him for the heterodox practices, seems to have been written about the same time as the general notification first mentioned. From several allusions in these Epistles it appears that Mânûshcîhar was an old man when they were written in 881, but not too old to travel; while his brother was no doubt younger. Their father had been Yûdân-Yim,[1]) son of Shahpûhar, a former leader of the religion. From these three Epistles of Mânûshcîhar we have thus learnt not only their dates, within a few days, but also some other facts that will be useful in further enquiries.

The same Mânûshcîhar, some years earlier, wrote the Dâdistân-î Dînîk, a modern title for a work containing

1) The reading of this name is merely provisional till something more probable can be suggested.

Digitized by Google

his replies to 92 questions sent to him for solution by certain Zoroastrians. His brother, Zâd-sparam, in his later years, was also a copious writer, from whose works Selections have been preserved, regarding the meeting of the good and evil spirit, and their continued struggle till the coming of Zaratûsht; the construction of man out of body, life, and soul; and the production of the renovation of the universe.

Regarding the author of the Bundahish we may perhaps learn something definite when the collated text of the two manuscripts of the Irânian version is published. Judging from some extracts from one of these manuscripts, the penultimate chapter contains not only the name and genealogy of the author, or last editor, but also the names of several of his contemporaries. Owing, however, to the patronymical suffix being generally omitted, and other imperfections in this single available copy, it is difficult to arrange all the names with certainty. But there is no doubt that Zâd-sparham, son of Yûdân-Yim, and Âtûr-pâd, son of Hâmêd, are mentioned as contemporaries of the author. The occurrence of the former name indicates that the Irânian Bundahish was finally edited in the latter part of the ninth century; and that of the latter name leads to the same conclusion with regard to the Dînkard, as will be presently seen. The name Bundahish is comparatively modern, as the bulk of the work seems to have been originally called Zand-âkâsîh, »the knowledge of tradition«, and may have been somewhat older than the ninth century; while the last chapter, »on the computation of the years by the Arabs«, is certainly later, as the present manuscripts of the Irânian version end with the phrases: »as far as the year 447 of the Persians; now *it is* the Persian year 507 (or 527)«.[1])

1) All the manuscripts, including that at Kopenhagen, have 5 and 7 with part of another cipher between them, which may be the beginning of either 100 or 20.

Digitized by Google

The Persian era, here mentioned, is probably the twentieth year of Yazdakard, which is much used in the colophons of Irânian manuscripts; if so, these dates would correspond to A. D. 1098 and 1158 (or 1178).

At the end of the third book of the Dînkard we find a detailed statement, »from the Exposition of the Good Religion«,[1]) professing to give the history of the Dînkard from the earliest times. This statement was published by Haug in 1867, from an imperfect copy, in his introduction to the Farhang-î Oîm-aêvak; but the earlier part of the statement, including the proceedings of the chief priest Tôsar, evidently refers to the Parsi scriptures generally, considered as the source from which the Dînkard was compiled. The historical facts, connected with the Dînkard itself, are contained in the following sentences of the statement, corrected in accordance with the two standard manuscripts, preserved in Bombay and Kopenhagen, respectively: —

Va-akhar min vazand vishôpishno-î min Tâstkân val-ic dîvân va-ganjo-î kêshvar mado, hû-fravardo Âtûr-farnbag-î Farukhû-zâdân-î hû-dênân pêshûpâî yehevûntô, zak pacîno-î kûstakoîhâ pargandako yehevûntô, navak afzâr, min pargandakîh lakhvâr val hamîh-i dîvân zyash babâ yehêtyûntô; dên nikîrishno va-andâsishno-î val shapîr dênô avistâk vazand, pôryôdkêshân gôbishno ângunî-aîtako fîrôko-î min zak barîsh lakhvâr kard. Pavan shikafto khilm (*or* kharam) va-vazand-î val Zaratûhashto-î Âtûr-farnbagân-î hû-dênôân pêshûpâî yehevûntô, jasto, zak-ic dîvân val vishôpishno, vazak nipîk val visastakîh pargandakîh, vâcîh val-ic kahôbanîh vastakîh va-pûdakîh mado. Va-min zak akhar, anmano,

1) This Nikêzo-î Vêh Dênô, from which nearly all the information contained in the third book of the Dînkard seems to have been taken, appears to have been the name of some work; but, owing to the loss of the first folio of the third book, we have no certain knowledge about it.

Digitized by Google

Âtûr-pâd*o*-î Hêmêd*â*n-î hû-dênân pêshûpâî, minshân*o* sûbâragân*o*, dênô-i Mazd*a*yastô aîyyâr-dahishnîh navak *a*fzâr, pavan khvahîshn*o* va-vajôîshn*o* va-ranj*o*-î vêsh, ham nipisht*o*. — »And after the ruin and devastation that came from the Arabs even to the archives and treasures of the realm, the saintly Âtûr-farnbag, son of Farukhû-zâd, who became the leader of those of the good religion, brought those copies, which were scattered on *all* sides, *and* new resources back from dispersion into union with the archives of his residence; *and* through observance and consideration for the Avesta and Zand of the good religion, he made the sayings of those of the primitive faith again a similitude *of* the illumination (Pers. *furôgh*) from that splendour. Through the awful displeasure (*or* defect) and ruin (*or* injury) that happened to Zaratûsht, son of Âtûr-farnbag, who became the leader of those of the good religion, even those archives came to devastation, that manuscript to dilapidation *and* dispersion, *and* the statements also to obsoleteness, perversion, and corruption. And after that, I, Âtûr-pâd, son of Hêmêd *and* leader of those of the good religion, *have* likewise written, from their fragments (cf. Pers. *sivârâ*, *suvârah*), a new means of giving assistance to the Mazda-worshipping religion, with much prayer, investigation, and trouble.«

From this we learn that the final editor of the latter part of the Dînkard, the portion we still possess, was Âtûr-pâd, son of Hêmêd, whom we may safely identify with the Âtûr-pâd, son of Hâmêd, mentioned in the Bundahish (ch. XXXIII, 11) as a contemporary of Zâd-sparham who flourished at the latter end of the ninth century; and it is quite possible that the copy written in A. D. 1020 (see p. 418) was made direct from Âtûr-pâd's original manuscript.

Regarding Âtûr-farnbag, son of Farukhû-zâd, the first compiler of the Dînkard, we have further information. His work is mentioned in the third book, chapter CXLII of

Digitized by Google

Peshotan's edition (p. 200); it is also stated at the beginning of both the fourth and fifth books that they are taken from his statements. In the Shikand-gûmânik Vijâr (ch. IV, 107; IX, 3; X, 55) he is mentioned as the compiler of the Dînkard, but the information there quoted must be from the first two books which have not yet been discovered. Further, we learn, from the Mâdîgân-i gujastak Abâlish, that Âtûr-farnbag, son of Farukhû-zâd, had a religious disputation with Abâlish in the presence of the Khalîfah Al-Mâmûn, that is, some time during A. D. 813—833.

We may, therefore, safely conclude that the Dînkard was first compiled early in the ninth century, that a large portion of this first compilation has been lost, and that the remainder was re-edited and enlarged about the end of the same century. With regard to the misfortunes that happened to Zaratûsht, the son and successor of Âtûr-farnbag, it may be noticed that Mânûshcîhar, when writing to his brother Zâd-sparam, mentions (Epistle II, I, 13) a certain Zaratûsht the club-footed who, by concealing his deformity, had induced many to submit to him for a time; but it is doubtful whether he is not referring to a contemporary, rather than to a predecessor. Mânûshcîhar also mentions (Ep. II, V, 14; IX, 11) a certain Âtûr-pâd as if he were a rival claimant for authority; but it would be rash to identify him with Âtûr-pâd, son of Hêmêd, as Âtûr-pâd was a common name among the priesthood. We may, however, assume, with tolerable certainty, that the succession of the supreme priests, who were leaders of the religion in the ninth century, was as follows: — Âtûr-farnbag, his son Zaratûsht, Yûdân-Yim, his son Mânûshcîhar, and Âtûr-pâd, son of Hêmêd.

The Shikand-gûmânik Vijâr was probably written about the same time as Âtûr-pâd's revision of the Dînkard, as the author has made frequent use of Âtûr-farnbag's compilation, but does not mention Âtûr-pâd's revision. He

Digitized by Google

does, however, mention a certain Âtûr-pâd, son of Yâvand[1]) (or some name that can be so read), a holy man whose teachings he found in the Dînkard of Âtûr-farnbag; but this name has not been discovered elsewhere.

The introductory portion of the Ardâ-Vîrâf Nâmak (forming the first three chapters of the edition of 1872) also refers to the Dînkard, in ch. I, 16, as follows: — »Until the *time* when the saintly *and* immortal-soulled Âtûr-pâd, son of Mâraspend, *was* born, by whom, through the achievement which is in the Dînkard, melted metal *was* poured on *his* breast.« It is doubtful whether this passage refers to the original Dînkard, or to the revised text; but, however this may be, it shows that this introductory portion of the Ardâ-Vîrâf Nâmak could not have been written before the latter end of the ninth century. Whether the remainder of the text existed previously is uncertain. As to Ardâ-Vîrâf himself we are told (ch. I, 35) that »there are *some* who say *his* name *was* Nekhshahpûr«, which statement appears to identify him with a commentator often quoted as Nekhshahpûhar, or Nêshahpûhar, in the Pahlavi Vendîdâd and Nîrangistân. And Mânûshcîhar tells us (Ep. I, IV, 17) that Nêshahpûhar was the magôpat of magôpats in the council of Khûsrô Anôshirvân; possibly the assembly summoned by Anôshirvân to consult about the heresy of Mazdak,[2]) and which, according to the Bahman Yasht (ch. I, 7), included Neshahpûr and Dâd-Aûharmazd.

Whether the Rivâyat of Hêmêd-î Ashavahishtân can be ascribed to Hêmêd, the father of that Âtûr-pâd who revised the Dînkard, or to a son of his contemporary, Ashôvahisht-î Freh-Srôsh (Bund. XXXIII, 11), is quite uncertain. But, without taking these mere possibilities into

1) Or, possibly, Khâvand.

2) About A. D. 529, see p. 430.

Digitized by Google

consideration, it has been already shown that nearly half the Pahlavi literature extant must have been compiled during the ninth century; much of it, no doubt, from older materials.

Of the texts which are popularly ascribed by their titles, introductions, or conclusions, to particular individuals, the Pandnâmak-i Vajôrg-Mitrô, son of Bûkhtak, has probably the best claim to authenticity. It professes to be a memorandum prepared by Vajôrg-Mitrô, prime minister of king Khûsrô Anôshirvân (A. D. 531—579), and placed in the royal treasury, or Ganj-î Shahîkân, which name has also been often applied to the text itself. We have, however, no corroboration of this statement from other sources. Still less can we be sure that the texts ascribed to Âtûr-pâd, son of Mâraspend, (Nos. 40, 42, 46) were really composed by that prime minister of king Shahpûhar II (A. D. 309—379). The Pandnâmak-î Zaratûsht[1]) is merely a traditional name for an anonymous text beginning with the following statement: — »It is proclaimed in a declaration from the religion of those of the primitive faith, who *were* those first in knowledge, that it is necessary for every person, when he arrives at the age of fifteen years, to understand then such things as these, etc.« It is possible that the traditional name means to attribute the text to Zaratûsht, son of Âtûr-pâd, son of Mâraspend, who is mentioned at the beginning of Âtûr-pâd's Andar'z. The Andar'z-î Khûsrô, son of Kavâd, professes to be only a tradition regarding that monarch (Anôshirvân), just as the Ardâ-Virâf Nâmak probably embodies a tradition regarding one of the chief priests of his council. The Kârnâmak-î Artakhshîr-î Pâpakân professes merely to state particulars originally written in that Kârnâmak. The sayings of Âtûr-farnbag and

1) Constituting §§ 121—159 of Peshotan's edition of the Ganjeshâyagân (Bombay: 1885).

Digitized by Google

Bakht-*âfrîd* are given merely as traditional; this Âtûr-farnbag was the son of Farukhû-zâd, already described as the first compiler of the Dînkard early in the ninth century, not his namesake the councillor of Khûsrô Anôshirvân mentioned in the Bahman Yasht (ch. I, 7); but Bakht-*âfrîd* appears to have been the councillor of that name therein mentioned. Finally, the texts which bear the names of ancient personages, such as Jâmâsp, Yôsht-î Fryânô, and Zarîr, make no claim to be anything but legendary.

In the names of the commentators, some forty or fifty in number, whose opinions are quoted in the Pahlavi translations and texts, we should have an additional means of determining the age of certain parts of the text, if we were able to ascertain the times in which several of these commentators wrote. Unfortunately this information can be obtained, as yet, in only a few cases. We have already seen that the commentators Nêshahpûhar (or Nekhshahpûhar) and Bakht-*âfrîd* (or Vakht-*âfrîd*) were councillors of Khûsrô Anôshirvân (A. D. 531—579); and Dâd-Aûharmazd, another of his councillors, may also have been the commentator of that name. Mard-bûd is said (in the Social Code, fol. 91a 16) to have been the magôpat of magôpats in the time of king Pîrûz (A. D. 457—483), and may perhaps be identified with the commentator of the same name. Regarding Rôshan we are told, in the Shikand-gûmânîk Vijâr (ch. X, 53, 54), that he was a son of Âtûr-farnbag and wrote a work called Rôshan; but, as he is mentioned before Âtûr-farnbag, son of Farukhû-zâd, the first compiler of the Dînkard, he was probably the son of some previous Âtur-farnbag, such as he who was summoned to the council of Khûsrô Anôshirvân, as mentioned in the Bahman Yasht (ch. I, 7). As to the other commentators, nothing has yet been discovered to connect them with any definite dates.

Digitized by Google

The relative age of a few other commentators and writers can, however, be determined from various statements in the texts. Three commentators whose opinions are very frequently quoted in the Pahlavi Vendîdâd are Afarg, Sôshâns, and Mêdôk-mâh, each of whom wrote a câshtak, or »teaching«, of the law, as stated in Mânûshcîhar's Epistle I, v, 1, 6; ix, 1, 4, and in Shâyast-lâ-shâyast, I, 3; the passages from the third and fifth fargards of the Vendîdâd of Mêdôk-mâh, quoted in Sls. II, 1, 12, are also, no doubt taken from his câshtak on those fargards. Now, with reference to these three commentators, Mânûshcîhar appears to assert (Ep. I, vi, 1) that a statement of Afarg is quoted in the câshtak of Sôshâns, thereby showing that Afarg was an older commentator than Sôshâns. Mânûshcîhar also asserts (Ep. I, vi, 9; II, ii, 6, 8) that Afarg was prior to Mêdôk-mâh. Again, the fifth book of the Dînkard informs us (in a passage quoted in Haug's translation of the Ardâ-Vîrâf Nâmak, p. 144) that Âtûr-pâd, son of Mâraspend, lived in the reign of king Shahpûhar, son of Aûharmazd, (A. D. 309—379) of whom he is said to have been prime minister. We also learn from his Andar'z (No. 40) that his son's name was Zaratûsht. And the third book of the Dînkard (ch. CXXXVII, 2 of Peshotan) mentions a high-priest named Âtûr-pâd, son of Zaratûsht, who lived in the reign of king Yazdakard, son of Shahpûhar, (A. D. 399—420). It is pretty evident, from these statements, that Mâraspend, Âtûr-pâd, Zaratûsht, and Âtûr-pâd form a pedigree in lineal descent, as Peshotan has assumed in his translation.

So far as our present information extends it seems unlikely that any of the commentators, quoted in the Pahlavi translations of the Avesta, could have written later than the sixth century; and we are quite justified in assuming that the latest complete revision of those translations took place in that century. Regarding the Pahlavi version of

Digitized by Google

the Yasna that existed at the end of the ninth century, we have the positive evidence of a passage (Pahl. Yas. XXX, 4), quoted in the Selections of Zâd-sparam (ch. V, 4), which is practically identical with the text still in use.

Considering the bitter complaints of Parsi tradition about the devastation of ancient literature by the Arabs shortly after their conquest of Persia, it is surprising to find how much of this literature must have been still extant in the ninth century. The eighth and ninth books of the Dînkard, which, as we have seen, must have been chiefly the work of Âtûr-pâd, son of Hêmêd, at the end of the ninth century, contain a detailed statement of the contents of the Nasks, such as could have been drawn up only by some one who had access to nearly all the Nasks themselves. The writer acknowledges that he has not discovered one Nask at all, and has not found the Pahlavi version of another, but of the remaining nineteen he gives an account in more or less detail. He began his statement with the intention of giving a short summary of the contents of all the Nasks in the eighth book, and a detailed account of the contents of each of their fargards in the ninth. The short summary is given for the first fourteen and last two Nasks (excepting the two that could not be found); but the contents of the four Nasks Nos. 15—18 are given in far greater detail, while those of the Vendîdâd are described with an intermediate degree of diffuseness. In the ninth book he has given a detailed account of the contents of each fargard of the first three Nasks, and has then discontinued the statement.

From the account given in the eighth book of the Dînkard it is perhaps possible to form some conception of the total extent of the twenty-one Nasks, or sacred books of the Zoroastrians, in Sasanian times. The Nasks that are still extant may be assumed as three in number: the Vendîdâd; the Stôd Yasht (*Staota yêsnya*), or Yasht (*Yasna*),

Digitized by Google

which appears to have consisted of the Yasna and Visparad; and a third Nask which may be considered equivalent to the extant fragments we have in the Nîrangistân, Vishtâsp Yasht, Hâdôkht, and Aogemadaêcâ. And the total extent of these three extant Nasks may be estimated at about 51,000 words[1]) of Avesta text and 126,000 words of Pahlavi version. The writer in the Dînkard uses about 17,000 words to describe sixteen of the Nasks that are no longer extant; we may therefore allow another 2000 words for the remaining two Nasks that are not described, making a total of 19,000 words for describing all the eighteen Nasks that are now no longer extant. As the 48,000 words of the Pahlavi Vendîdâd are condensed by the describer into 1270, and as this description is one of average extent, we may perhaps assume that 19,000 words of description would represent something like 718,000 words of Pahlavi version. And, if we were to take the 3,200 Avesta and 28,000 Pahlavi words of the Nîrangistân as a fair average specimen of the proportion of the two versions in the lost Nasks generally, we should come to the conclusion that the eighteen lost Nasks may have contained about 82,000 words in their Avesta texts, besides the 718,000 words in their Pahlavi versions. Adding these numbers to the contents of the three Nasks extant, we should obtain a total estimated extent of the whole of the twenty-one Nasks in Sasanian times, amounting to 133,000 words of Avesta text and 844,000 words of Pahlavi version. This estimate is based, of course, on rather hazardous assumptions, but these happen to be the fairest and best that are at present available, and the result is by no means unreasonable.

---

1) Not including the Yashts I—XX and minor texts of the Khurdah Avesta, whose connection with the Nasks has not yet been ascertained.

Digitized by Google

It might be argued that the account in the Dînkard may have been compiled merely from old records, and not from the Nasks themselves; but the fact that the writer in the Dînkard attempts no description of the two Nasks which had not reached him is rather against this view. We have, moreover, references made to several of the lost Nasks in Pahlavi works which can hardly be considered older than the Dînkard. Thus, the Shâyast-lâ-shâyast quotes passages from no less than thirteen of the lost Nasks, the Vijirkard-i Dînîk quotes from three, and Mânûshcîhar and Zâd-sparam also quote from three.

In conclusion it may be remarked that, though this review of the present state of our knowledge regarding Pahlavi literature is intended to be fairly accurate in all particulars, it is quite possible for valuable information to remain unnoticed for years in accessible texts. In fact, no one can be sure that he knows the contents of any Pahlavi text until he has fully and literally translated it; and, even then, he may have misunderstood some portion of its statements.

Der Classensecretär Herr v. Prantl legte eine Abhandlung des Herrn Unger vor:

„Ueber den Gang des altrömischen Calenders."

Dieselbe wird in den „Abhandlungen" veröffentlicht.

Digitized by Google