

Estudios Iranios y Turanios

سجاء . سجاء . سجاء . سجاء . سجاء . سجاء . سجاء . سجاء . سجاء . سجاء .

aṭ hōi aōjī zaraṭuštrō paōuruuīm

¿Habló Zaratustra?

Homenaje a Jean Kellens en su 80º aniversario

Editores

Alberto Cantera
Éric Victor Pirart
Céline Redard

Número 6
Año 2024

Edita

SOCIEDAD DE ESTUDIOS IRANIOS Y TURANIOS
(SEIT)

Girona

Estudios Iranios y Turanios

Director:

Alberto Cantera

Secretario:

Jaime Martínez Porro

Comité de redacción:

Miguel Ángel Andrés-Toledo

Agustí Alemany-Vilamajó

Alberto Cantera

Juanjo Ferrer-Losilla

Götz König

Jaime Martínez-Porro

Éric Pirart

Depósito Legal: GI 1630-2024

ISSN: 2386-7833

Imprimida por: Printcolor

Ctra. de Mollet a Sabadell Km. 4,3 – Pol. Ind. Can Vinyals, Nave 18
08130 Santa Perpètua de Mogoda (Barcelona)

© Queda prohibida la reproducción total o parcial de los contenidos de este Boletín sin permiso expreso de la Sociedad de Estudios Iranios y Turanios.

Envío de originales a:

Alberto Cantera, Fachbereich Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften, Institut für Iranistik, Fabeckstr. 23-25, Raum 1.1024, 14195 Berlin (Deutschland). Correo-e: alberto.cantera@fu-berlin.de.

Jaime Martínez Porro, Fachbereich Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften, Institut für Iranistik, Fabeckstr. 23-25, Raum 1.1025, 14195 Berlin (Deutschland). Correo-e: jaimemporro@zedat.fu-berlin.de.

Table des matières

Préface.....	IX
Liste des publications de Jean KELLENS	XI
Miguel Ángel ANDRÉS-TOLEDO <i>The Iranian Paragnā</i>	1
Alberto CANTERA “For You, Ahurānī of Ahura.” <i>The Performance of the Service for the Waters in the Long Liturgy and its Reflection in the Sacred Landscape</i>	21
Bernhard FORSSMAN <i>Yasna 8.4</i>	71
José Luis GARCÍA RAMÓN <i>Vedic ṛṇá-, Young Avestan arənaṭ.caēša-: Reparation of a Misdeed as a Fitting Adjustment</i>	77
Claudine GAUTHIER <i>Réflexions à propos des rituels funéraires de la communauté parsie de Bombay par temps de crises. Modifications du rituel et efficacité symbolique</i>	93
Toshifumi GOTŌ <i>Konstruktionen mit mā im Altiranischen</i>	105
Almut HINTZE <i>An Enigmatic Word in the Gathas: auuōmīrā in Yasna 49.10</i>	125
Stephanie W. JAMISON <i>Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian</i>	137
Judith JOSEPHSON <i>The Meaning of dādan</i>	145

Götz KÖNIG maṭ.āzaiṇti und maṭ.paiti.frasa bzw. maṭ.pərəsu / maṭ.paiti.pərəsu <i>Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der jungavestischen Gāthā-Exegese</i>	155
Bruce LINCOLN <i>On Yima's Unhappiness and Disquiet</i>	169
Alexander LUBOTSKY <i>Indo-Iranian *nabh- 'to be wet'</i>	185
Jaime MARTÍNEZ PORRO <i>Tracing Back the Sources of the Yašt in Manuscript F1</i>	191
Norbert ÖTTINGER <i>Die Bedeutung von avestisch zgaḍ-, *zgaṇḍ-</i>	211
Antonio PANAINO <i>Av. kauui- and Ved. kaví- The Reasons Behind a Semantic Polarization</i>	215
Benedikt PESCHL <i>Traces of Textual Fluidity in the Zand: Extracts from the Pahlavi Yasna in the Old Pahlavi Codex K20</i>	229
Éric Victor PIRART <i>Moi Zarathuštra</i>	245
Céline REDARD <i>Les trois pas du prêtre lors du Y64.4</i>	269
Adriano V. ROSSI <i>The End of DNb: Who Speaks to Whom?</i>	279
Velizar SADOVSKI <i>The Rite Time to Worship (Ritual formulae and ritual pragmatics in the Veda and Avesta, VI)</i>	289
John SCHEID <i>Sacrifier à Rome et dans la Chine des Han. Quelques comparaisons</i>	315

Martin SCHWARTZ <i>Yasnas 46 and 32: A Gathic Confrontation</i>	321
Bernard SERGENT <i>Tripertita Iranica</i>	329
Nicholas SIMS-WILLIAMS <i>Avestan puxda-, gouru-, gufra-</i>	349
Michael STAUSBERG <i>Die fünfte Geburt Zarathushtras</i>	355
Philippe SWENNEN <i>Le Mihr Yašt entre deux récitatifs liturgiques</i>	365

Traces of Textual Fluidity in the Zand: Extracts from the Pahlavi Yasna in the Old Pahlavi Codex K20

Benedikt PESCHL
Freie Universität Berlin

ABSTRACT: Among a variety Pahlavi texts, the 14th-century CE Pahlavi codex K20 contains two extracts from the Avestan Yasna and its Pahlavi version: the *Fraōrəiti Hāiti* (Y12), followed by a partial rendition of the Gāthic stanza Y29.6. By examining a number of sample passages taken from these extracts, this article analyses how the Pahlavi version of K20 relates to the more familiar “standard” version known from complete Pahlavi Yasna manuscripts such as J2_500 and K5_510, which are roughly contemporaneous with K20. The minor divergencies observed provide insights into the textual history of the Pahlavi text, especially regarding the continued textual fluidity in the transmission of its commentary layer at a period as late as the 14th c. CE. Moreover, the material discussed in this article demonstrates that, when doing text-critical work on the Pahlavi Yasna, it is necessary to take into account not only its main manuscript witnesses but also its *Nebenüberlieferung*.

KEYWORDS: Pahlavi Yasna, Avestan, Middle Persian, Pahlavi codicology, Zand, Zoroastrian exegesis.

1. Introductory remarks on ms. K20

As an avid reader of Prof. Jean KELLENS’ publications on the Avesta and as someone who has benefited immensely from his recorded lectures, I am delighted to make the present humble contribution to the Festschrift in his honour.

One of the most precious Zoroastrian manuscripts housed by the Kongelige Bibliotek in Copenhagen is the miscellaneous codex K20 (more precisely, K20a)¹ from the late 14th (or early 15th) c. CE. Among a variety of Pahlavi works — see the description by CHRISTENSEN (1931) — K20 contains a group of Avestan texts or textual fragments and their Pahlavi version (REDARD 2016), among which are found two extracts from the Yasna: the *Fraōrəiti Hāiti* (Y12), followed by a partial rendition of the Gāthic stanza Y29.6.²

The manuscript itself (no. 68 in HINTZE 2012) cannot be dated exactly and its scribe is unknown. But three dated colophons are found at different points in the manuscript (on folios 38r, 51r and 74r) and help to date the source manuscripts of some of the major texts contained in K20 roughly to the years 1321, 1351 and 1331 CE. If the dates mentioned in the colophons are thus correctly interpreted, 1351 CE is a *terminus post quem* for the production of K20.³ All of the

1 K20b is a fragment of the Indian Bundahišn. On its relation to the Indian Bundahišn contained in K20a, see CHRISTENSEN 1931: 15.

2 Passages from the Yasna (Y) liturgy are given following the numbering system established by the Corpus Avesticum Berolinense (CAB) project (<https://cab.geschkult.fu-berlin.de>). Correspondences according to the conventional Geldner system are supplemented with the siglum GY.

3 The exact interpretation of the dates mentioned in colophons 2 and 3 is impeded by the ambiguity of the Pārsīg dating system used. Possibly, one should add another 20 years when converting the

source manuscripts that can be identified through the colophons were written by Mihrābān Kayxōsrō, who is also the scribe of the two oldest extant manuscripts of the Pahlavi Yasna, 500_J2 and 510_K5.

As is apparent from the obvious palaeographical similarities between K20 and Mihrābān's own manuscripts, K20 itself seems to have been written by a scribe close to Mihrābān and his school. As noted by WEST (1880: xxvii), the 'appearance of the paper' also points to a date not long after the dates of its source manuscripts. CHRISTENSEN (1931: 11) considers it 'fairly certain that K20 was written at the latest in the beginning of the 15th century of our era; it is most probable that it dates from the latter half of the 14th century.'⁴

The lineage of the remaining texts in K20 beyond those covered by the colophons is unclear. This includes the entire series of (partial) Avestan texts with their Zand (REDARD 2016), including the Yasna extracts. It cannot be ascertained that these, too, stem from a manuscript written by Mihrābān Kayxōsrō. All that can be said with some certainty is that someone originating from Mihrābān's environment produced the compilation that we are looking at in K20. At least for some of the texts, this scribe relied directly on copies made by Mihrābān, as shown by the colophons. For others, he may have adduced other source manuscripts of unknown provenance. This latter option applies especially to those texts that are not also transmitted in ms. M51, another major 14th-century miscellaneous codex that contains many of the same texts as K20 (BARTHOLOMAE 1915: 38–72), pointing to an older compilation at the core of both codices.⁵ Although the textual constitution of K20 and M51 is, to some degree at least, traditional, the text portions exclusive to either manuscript (such as the Yasna extracts in K20) also attest to subsequent copyists' decisions to add new textual units or to leave out certain parts of the traditional collection.⁶

2. The Yasna extracts in K20 and their relation to the "Standard" Pahlavi Yasna

When compared to the "Standard" PY (StPY), the extracts from the Pahlavi Yasna (PY) in K20 provide an interesting glimpse into the textual history of this Zand text, in particular on the incomplete degree of fixation that its exegetical comments had reached by the 14th c. CE, the era when both K20 and the oldest mss. of the StPY were written.

Pārsīg into CE dates, which would lead to a dating of 1371 and 1351 CE for colophons 2 and 3 respectively. However, a production of a manuscript by Mihrābān as late as 1371 CE, 50 years after his writing of the first colophon and almost 50 years after the production of his other known manuscripts, is unlikely (cf. CANTERA 2014: 124, 142). The existence of a fourth, undated colophon on fol. 39r has been pointed out by REDARD (2016: 189). Since the numbering of the dated colophons from 1 to 3 is common in previous literature, we may refer to this minor colophon as 2a.

4 See also ASMUSSEN 1992 with further references.

5 While a variety of texts is exclusive to only one of the two manuscripts, both of them contain the *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag*, the *Mādayān ī Yōišť ī Friyān*, *Šāyist nē Šāyist*, *Hadōxt Nask*, *Frahang ī Ōim*, the Smaller ("Indian") *Bundahišn*, *Čim ī Gāhān* and *Patit ī xwad*. The colophons following the *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag* and the *Mādayān ī Yōišť ī Friyān* in both manuscripts indicate that, for these sections, K20 and M51 go back to a common ancestor (CERETI 2004: 125).

6 Similarly CANTERA 2014: 143: 'les copistes ne se sont pas limités à copier un manuscrit collectif préexistant, mais qu'ils ont fait leur collection avec des critères différents.'

Here and below, “Pahlavi Yasna (PY)” refers to the Zand of the Yasna in a more abstract sense, whereas “Standard Pahlavi Yasna (StPY)” refers to the more or less uniform shape in which the PY appears in those few authoritative, mutually independent manuscripts that contain the text in its entirety: Mihrābān Kayxōsrō’s two manuscripts (500_J2 and 510_K5), and the “Combined Manuscripts” 400_Pt4 and 410_Mf4. Even though the manuscripts of the StPY, too, show some occasional differences in their lexical choices or in the presence/absence of an explanatory comment — especially if one compares the two main lines of transmission —, most of these differences are likely to be due to accidents of the transmission. When reading the two main lines of the StPY side-by-side, the overall impression is one of strong transmissional cohesion and textual fixation, so that it is certainly legitimate to speak of the StPY as one single manifestation of the PY. As I will show in the remainder of this article, the extracts in the miscellaneous codex K20 represent a somewhat distinct manifestation of the same abstract text. From this conclusion, the follow-up question arises whether K20 is nevertheless likely to derive from the first bilingual manuscript of the PY, a 11th-c. manuscript that has been plausibly assumed to underly both lines of transmission of the StPY (CANTERA 2012). As I will suggest, the PY extracts of K20 are indeed likely to derive from the same ultimate ancestor as the StPY, but that their transmission branched off from the “mainstream transmission” (as it appears to us now) before the last common ancestor of the StPY, preceding its bifurcation into the Mihrābān line and the Combined Manuscripts.

To give an impression of the degree to which the Pahlavi text in K20 (dis)agrees with that in the manuscripts of the StPY, the initial segments of the Fraōrēiti Hāiti as given in K20, followed by the extract from Y29, will be analysed in detail in section 3.⁷ Examples for divergencies of the types that are exemplified below — some more, some less meaningful with regard to matters of textual history — could be easily multiplied by drawing from the remaining segments. Trivial orthographic and phonetic alternations that constantly recur in the transmission of Pahlavi texts (such as *harwisp* ~ *harwist* or the spelling variants of *māzdēsna* (*īh*)) are not taken into consideration. In the transliteration, both the Avestan and the Pahlavi text are presented exactly as they appear in K20. Only the Pahlavi text is also given in a normalised transcription (including emendations).

3. Samples passages from K20

Y12.2 (GY11.17)

[159v.5] fristuiiaē. humatōibiiascā. hūxt[...]iiascā. huuarəštōibiiascā. maθβ[...]ibiiascā. vaxəduuōibiiascā. varəst[...]ōibiiasca. aiβigairiā. daēθē. vīspā. dušmatācā.⁸ dužuxtācā.⁹ dužuuarəštācā.¹⁰ paiti.riciā. daiθē. vīspā dušmatācā.

⁷ Mss. 400 500 510 are accessible through the Avestan Digital Archive (ADA) at <https://ada.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/>. Ms. 410 was consulted through the facsimile edition of JAMASPASA/NAWABI (1976).

⁸ Cor. to *humatācā*.

⁹ Cor. to *hūxtācā*.

¹⁰ Cor. to *huuarəštācā*.

dužūxtācā. dužūuarštācā. : pr'c st'yym hwmt W hwht hwwlšt PWN mynšn W-ğwbšn W-kwnšn' QDM 'HĎWNšnyh YĤBWNm hlwsp hwmt W hwht W-hwwlšt BR' ŠĖKWNšnyh YĤBWNm hlwsp dwmt¹¹ W dwšhwht W-dwšhwlšt

^(A) *frāz stāyēm humat ud hūxt ud huwaršt pad menišn ud gōwišn ud kunišn*

^(B) *abar-gīrišnīh daham harwisp humat ud hūxt ud huwaršt* ⁽¹⁾ ^(C) *bē-hilišnīh daham harwisp dušmat ud dušhūxt ud dušhuwaršt* ⁽²⁾

I loudly¹² praise good thoughts and good words and good deeds by thinking, speaking and acting. I determine as something to be appropriated all good thoughts and good words and good deeds. I determine as something to be rejected all bad thoughts and bad words and bad deeds.

Textual differences K20 vs. StPY:

- a. In the StPY, the text that is given coherently in K20 is split into units ^(A) to ^(C). In other words, the Avestan and Pahlavi segments alternate at shorter intervals.
- b. K20, together with 500, renders Av. *aiβigairiīā* with *abar-gīrišnīh*, whereas 400, 410 and 510 give *bē-gīrišnīh*. Since *abar* is the usual rendering of Av. *aiβi* (JOSEPHSON 1997: 192), K20 and 500 probably preserve the original state of affairs.
- c. The StPY (all four mss.) adds the comments [*kū kirbag kunam*] 'i.e., I perform meritorious actions' and [*kū wināh nē kunam*] 'I do not commit sins' at positions ⁽¹⁾ and ⁽²⁾, respectively.

Y12.3 (GY11.18)

frā. vō. rāhī. aməšā[...]¹³spəntā¹³ yasnəmca. vahməmca. frāmanahā. frāuuacanhā. frā. šiaōthanā. frā anhāiī. frātanuuascī. x'axīiā[...]¹⁴ [...]¹⁴stanəm. staōmi.¹⁴ pr'c 'LH LKWM l'tynm M[...] [...] [160r] HWHýt W ycšn' 'šn'k' W nyg'yšn' 'wstwplyt pr'c PWN mnšn' pr'c PWN gwšn' pr'c PWN kwnšn W-pr'c PWN 'hw' mnšn' W pr'c tn'¹⁵ W-ZK Y NPŠH HÝ' PWN hwyšyh LKWM YĤSNNm PWN hwyšyh LKWM đ'stn' HĤN¹⁶ 'YK' MT tn' lwb'n l'd BR' 'p'yt YĤBWNtn' 'c BR' YĤBWNm :

^(A) *frāz *ō ašmāh rādēnam k[ē amahraspand(ān'?) hēd* ^(B) *yazišn [āšnāg] ud niyāyišn [ustōfrīd]* ^(C) *frāz pad menišn frāz pad gōwišn frāz pad kunišn ud frāz pad ox [menišn] ud frāz *pad¹⁷ tan ud ān ī xwēš gyān [pad xwēšīh ašmāh dāram pad xwēšīh ašmāh dāstan *ēd kū ka tan ruwān rāy bē abāyēd dādan ā=z bē daham]*

I provide liberally forth to you, who are the Amahraspands, sacrifice [openly] and prayer [votive offerings], forth by thinking, forth by speaking, forth by acting and forth by means of (my) existence [of thinking] and forth by means of (my) body and my own life-soul. [I possess (it) while it is owned by you; 'possessing (it) while it is owned by you' (means) this: that, when it is necessary to give away the body for the sake of the soul, then I will indeed give it away.]

11 Cor. to ⟨dwšmt⟩.

12 Tentative interpretation of *frāz* in this context.

13 Cor. to *aməšāspəntā*.

14 Erroneous anticipation of the next segment.

15 Ink to the right of ⟨tn'⟩ faded, but the available space is hardly sufficient for ⟨PWN⟩ to fit in.

16 Sic, for ⟨HĤN'⟩.

17 See fn. 15.

Textual differences K20 vs. StPY:

- d. In the StPY, the text is split into units ^(A) to ^(C).
- e. Together with 500, K20 gives the 2pl of the copula in its common heterographic spelling ⟨ḤWHyt⟩. The other manuscripts of the StPY instead give the enclitic spelling ⟨-yt⟩ = *ēd*.
- f. Whereas K20 has *menišn* ‘thinking’, all four manuscripts of the StPY gloss the noun *ox* ‘existence’ more meaningfully with *menišnīg* ‘belonging to (the world of) thinking’. The gloss is meant to clarify that *ox* ‘existence’ here refers to the mental as opposed to the material existence, given that *ox* (especially its plural *axwān*) may as such also refer to ‘the two types of existence, existence in its entirety’.
- g. The StPY (all four mss.) gives *agar=im* ⟨ḤTm⟩ ‘if my’ where K20 gives *ka* ⟨’MT⟩ ‘when’.
- h. The StPY (all four mss.) lacks *ā=z* after *dādan*.
- i. 500 and 510 (but not 400 and 410) each show an addition to the final comment, following *bē daham*: 500 has *ā=z abāz nē stāyēm ēn dēn ī ohrmazd zardušt* ‘I also do no abjure this Dēn of Ohrmazd and Zardušt’, 510 merely *ā=z abāz nē stāyēm*.

Y12.4 (GY11.19)

stāumi. aṣəm. st’yym ’hl’dyh ’šwhšt st’yym
stāyēm ahlāyīh [*ašawahišt stāyēm*]
 I praise righteousness [I praise Ašawahišt].

The representation of this passage (together with the following Aṣəm Vohū = Y 12.5) in the manuscripts of the StPY is diverse. Ms. 500 inserts *was* ‘much’ before *ahlāyīh* and adds the comment *kū=m arzōg pad kār ud kirbag wēš* ‘i.e., my desire for meritorious work and deeds is stronger’. Mss. 510 400 410 do not share this peculiarity with 500.

Y12.6 (GY12.1) (segment 1)

nāismī. daēuuō. fraurāne. mazdaiiasmī.¹⁸ zaraθuštriš. vīdaēuuō. ahuraṭkaēšō.
 : nkwhywm ŠDY’ⁿ ’ȳ LWTHc ZNH ’YK ’MTm ’hl’dyh st’yt’ ’m ŠDY’ ’Lhyt
 YḤWWDĀ ’š’n ’ḤLc PWN ywdt’kyyh nkwhm pln’mm m’zdytyh Y zltwšt’
 ywdt ŠDY’ ’YK ’ndlg Y SLYtl’n YMRRNm :

**nikōhēm dēwān* [*ay abāg=iz ēd kū ka=m ahlāyīh stāyīd ā=m dēw *nikōhīd
 bawēnd ā=sān pas=iz pad jūdāgīh nikōham*] *franāmam *māzdēsnih ī zardušt
 jūd-dēw* [*kū andarg ī watarān gōwam*]

I scorn the demons. [With this, the following is implied: at the moment when I praise righteousness,¹⁹ the demons (thereby) count as having (already) been scorned by me. And afterwards I also scorn them separately.] I profess being a worshipper of Mazdā, following Zardušt, opposing the demons [i.e., I say (it) in the midst of the bad ones].

¹⁸ First hand cor. to *mazdaiiasnō*.

¹⁹ On the interpretation of *=m stāyīd* as a “performative preterite”, see PESCHL 2023: 32f.

Textual differences K20 vs. StPY:

- j. K20 gives the plural ⟨ŠDYʹʹn⟩ *dēwān*, which agrees with the acc.pl value of *daēuuō*. This contrasts with the spellings found in the StPY:

transl. of Av. <i>daēuuō</i>	K20	<i>dēwān</i> ⟨ŠDYʹʹn⟩
	StPY	a) <i>dēw</i> : 510 ⟨ŠDYʹ⟩, 500 ⟨ŠDYʹʹ⟩ — or is 500 to be read as ⟨ŠDYʹyy⟩ <i>dēwī</i> < * <i>dēwīh</i> ? b) <i>dēwīh</i> : 400 ⟨ŠDYyh⟩ (for *⟨ŠDYʹyh⟩), 410 ⟨ŠDYʹyh⟩
resumption in the Pahlavi comment	K20	<i>dēw</i> ⟨ŠDYʹ⟩
		a) <i>dēw</i> : 510 ⟨ŠDʹ⟩, 500 ⟨ŠDYʹʹ⟩ (or again <i>dēwī</i> ?) b) <i>dēwīh</i> : 400 410 ⟨ŠDYʹyh⟩

Some possible implications of the alternation between *dēwān*, *dēw* and *dēwīh* in the transmission of this passage are addressed in section 4.3 below.

- k. In K20, the first comment is introduced by the particle *ay* ⟨ʹȳ⟩ ‘this implies’, whereas the StPY (all four mss.) gives the roughly synonymous *hād* ⟨ḤWHt⟩.
- l. **nikōhīd*: in K20, the original reading ⟨nkwhyt⟩ as preserved in the StPY has somehow become corrupted to ⟨ʹLhyt⟩ (with the characteristic ⟨L⟩ used in heterograms).
- m. At the end of the first comment, K20 gives the simple verb *nikōham*, whereas all of the StPY manuscripts transmit *nikōhēm* and add the preverb/verbal particle *bē* ⟨BRʹ⟩.
- n. *jud-dēw* ⟨ywdt ŠDYʹ⟩: in the StPY, a confusion of spellings similar to the first occurrence of *dēw* is observable: 400 ⟨ŠDYyh Y⟩ and 410 ⟨ŠDYʹ Y⟩ (both with nonsensical *ezafe*) point to *jud-dēwīh* ‘opposition to the demons’. Mss. 500 and 510 give the singular ⟨ŠDYʹ⟩ in accord with K20.
- o. K20 accidentally omits *ohrmazd-dādestān* (thus in the PY) after *jud-dēw*, thus lacking a translation of *ahura.tkaēšō*.
- p. After *ohrmazd-dādestān* (omitted by K20), ms. 500 inserts the additional comment *kū=š dādestān ān ī ohrmazd* ‘i.e., his judgement (corresponds to) that of Ohrmazd’.
- q. *wattarān gōwam*: similar to the case of *nikōham* shortly before (see above), the StPY (400 410 510) adds ⟨BRʹ⟩ *bē* before *gōwam*; 500 gives *wattarān=iz ī gōwam*.

Y12.6 (GY12.1) (segment 2)

staōtā. aməšanəm. spəntanəm. yaštā. aməšanəm. spəntanəm. ahurāi. mazdāi.
vaṅhauu {ī}. vohū stʹyym ʹmhrspndʹn ycwmm ʹmhrspndʹn ʹYKŠʹn BYN yčšn K̄N
stʹdym :
stāyēm amahraspandān yazom amahraspandān [kū=šān andar yazišn ōh
stāyēm]

I praise the Amahraspands, I sacrifice to the Amahraspands [i.e., I praise them in the usual way in the sacrifice].

Textual difference K20 vs. StPY:

- r. *yazišn*: K20 agrees with ms. 500 in giving mere ⟨ycšn'⟩; 400 ⟨ycšn'-Y⟩, 410 ⟨ycšn'-ȳ⟩ and 510 ⟨ycšn'HD⟩ point to *yazišn-ē* 'a sacrifice'.

Y12.6 (GY12.1) (segments 3 + 4)

ahurāi. mazdāi. var̄hauuē. vohūmaēde. vīspā. vohū. canahmī. : 'L 'whrmzd Y ŠPYL Y wyhptm'n hlwst 'p'tyh c'sm 'YK hm'k PWN hwyšyh Y 'whrmzd YHSNNm : yeṅhe gāuš. yeṅhe. ašəm. yeṅh[160v]e. raōcā. yeṅhe. raōcābš. raōiθβən. x'āθrā : MNW 'LH ḡwspnd YHBWNt MNW 'LH 'hl'dyh MNW 'LH lwšnyh MNW 'LH 'L lwšnyh gwmyht hw'lyh 'YT MNW mzd²⁰ YMRRWnyt :

ō ohrmazd ī weh ī weh-paymān harwist ābādīh čāšam [kū hamāg pad xwēšīh ī ohrmazd dāram] ^{(B)-(C)} [[omission]] ^(D) *kē ōy gōspand [dād] kē ōy ahlāyīh kē ōy rōšnīh kē ōy ō rōšnīh gumēxt xwārīh [ast kē mizd gōwēd]*

I assign all prosperity to Ohrmazd, the good, the one of good measure [i.e., I possess everything while it is owned by Ohrmazd] [[omission]], the one who created cattle, who (created) righteousness, who (created) light, who mixed bliss with the light [there is (a commentator) who says: (priestly) rewards].

The transmission in K20 agrees with that of the StPY except that textual units ^{(B)-(C)} of the StPY (including the corresponding Avestan text) are omitted in K20, presumably by accident. The Pahlavi of the missing text as transmitted in the StPY goes as follows: ^(B) *ahlaw [ān Ohrmazd] rāyōmand ī xwarrahōmand* 'the righteous one [that is Ohrmazd], the wealthy, the glorious' ^(C) *kē čēgām=iz=ē pahlomīh [ōy dād]* 'the one who [created] whatever belongs to the best things.'

Y12.7 (GY12.2) (segment 1)

spəntəm. ārmaitīm. var̄hīm. vərənē. ~~stuiē~~.²¹ hāmōi. asti. us. gāuš. stuiē. tāiīā. atcā. hazaṅhačcā. : : spndrmt ŠPYL d̄wšm PWN 'YTyh W ZK Y L 'YT 'YK̄m PWN tn' mhm'n YHWWN't : L'L' ḡwspnd̄ st'yym MN d̄wc'n W sthmk'n 'YK̄š L' NPŠH :

^(A) *spandarmad weh dōšam [pad astīh] ud ān ī man ast [kū=m pad tan mehmān bawād]* ^(B) *ul gōspand stāyēm az duzzān ud stahmagān [kū=š nē xwēš]*

I love good Spandarmad [in (my) being] and she is mine [i.e., she shall be inhabiting my body]. I 'praise up' the (small) cattle from thieves and robbers [i.e., it is not their own].

Textual differences K20 vs. StPY:

- s. In the PY, the text is split into units ^(A) and ^(B).
- t. *kū=š*: the StPY (all four mss.) gives *kū=šān*. As the enclitic refers back to the plurals *duzzān ud stahmagān*, =*šān* is preferable, even though =*š* is occasionally also used with plural referents (JÜGEL 2015: 225–226).

20 Preceded by deleted (s).

21 Deleted by corrector.

Y12.7 (GY12.2) (segment 2)

us. māzdāiasnanam. vīsqm. ziiānaiaēcā. vī.vāpaḍcā. L'L' MN ZK Y m'zdsn'n
wys W-wyd'p'nyh 'YK L' 'p'yt krtn' :

ul az ān ī māzdēsnañ wis ud wiyābāñh [kū nē abāyēd kirdan]

I '(praise) up' from the villages of the Mazdā-worshippers both damage and delusion [i.e., one ought not to bring (them) about].

K20 agrees with the StPY, except that K20 accidentally omits (*ud*) *ziyān*, the rendering of Av. *vīsqm*.

Y12.8 (GY12.3) (segment 1)

frāmaniiāiēibiiō. rāñhē. vasuiiāitīm. vasušaētīm. jāiš. upairī. āiazəmə. gaōbīš.
šiiēntīm.²² pr'c PWN mnšn l't HWHm 'L k'mk Y'TWNšn'n W k'm'nšn'n MNW
PWN 'p'dst BR' 'L ḍyn' Y'TWNḍ W-QḌM ḍyn' BR' YK 'YMWNḍ 'š'n mnšnyk
l'tyh QDM 'BYDwm MNW QDM PWN ZNH zmyk PWN gwspnḍ' wmnḍyh
KTLWNḍ ḍhšk YMRRWNyt :

^(A) *frāz pad menišn rād ham ō kāmag-āyišnān ud *kāmag-mānišnān [kē pad
abāyist bē ō dēn āyēnd ud abar dēn bē ēstēnd ā=šān menišnīg rādīh abar kunam]*

^(B) *kē abar pad ēn zamīg pad gōspandōmandīh mānēnd [daxšag gōwēd]*

I am, by thinking, liberal forth to the ones coming according to wish and the ones staying according to wish [the ones who come to the Dēn and stay by it as it is necessary: I practice liberality towards them in a way relating to the world of thought], the ones who remain in the state of being rich in (small) cattle [(this) denotes a characteristic (of theirs)].

Textual differences K20 vs. StPY:

- u. In the PY, the text is split into units ^(A) and ^(B).
- v. K20 *abar dēn*: the StPY (all four mss.) gives *pad dēn* instead.

Y12.8 (GY12.3) (segment 2)

nəmarñhā. ašāi. uzdatā. paiti. auuaṭ stuiiē : ~~nyd~~²²ⁿ [161r] nyg'yšn 'L 'hl'dyh
L'L' YHBWNm 'YK tn' BR' 'L ḍyn' YHBWNm W-QDM 'ytwn' st'yym
'YK MND'My nywk :

*niyāyišn ō ahlāyīh ul daham [kū tan bē ō dēn daham] ud abar ēdōn stāyēm [kū
tis=ē nēk]*

I give prayer 'upwards' to righteousness [i.e., I give (my) body to the religion], and I thus perform praises towards (it) [i.e., (it is) something good].

K20 agrees with the StPY.

Y12.8 (GY12.3) (segment 3)

nōiṭ.²⁴ amāṭ. āziā. oīienīm. nōiṭ. vī.vāpəm. xštā. mazdaiiasnīš. aōi. vīsō : L' MN
ZK cygwn L' 'p'yt krtn' L' PWN zyd'n' L' PWN wyd'p'nyh²⁵ SGYTWNm

22 Cor. to *šiiēntīm*.

23 Deleted by corrector.

24 Preceded by deleted *n*.

25 Preceded by deleted ⟨w[1]⟩.

QDM 'L ZK Y m' zdsn'n wys
*nē az ān [čiyōn nē abāyēd kirdan] [nē] pad ziyān nē pad wiyābānīh rawam abar
 ō ān ī māzdēsnañ wis*

Neither on the basis of “that” [how one ought not do it], nor with damage, nor with delusion will I approach the villages of the Mazdā-worshippers —

Textual differences K20 vs. StPY:

- w. In the comment, K20 supports the presence of a negator as given by 500 510 (*nē abāyēd*) vs. 400 410 (mere *abāyēd*).
- x. Together with 500 and against 510 400 410, K20 repeats *nē* before *pad ziyān*.
- y. K20 (correctly) has *abar ō* ‘towards’, where the StPY has *čē* <MH> (510 400 410) or =*iz* (500). On the mechanism of transmission behind this discrepancy, see section 4.4.

Y12.8 (GY12.3) (segment 4)

nōiṭ. astī. nōiṭ. uštānhe. cinmānī. L' tn' W L' HŶ' ḏwš' lm l'd L' PWN wyh
 zywšnyh W=wyšzywšnyh l'd MN ZNH ḏyn L' WHL L' YK YMWNm
 :

*nē tan ud nē gyān dōšāram rāy [nē pad weh-zīwišnīh ud wēš-zīwišnīh rāy az ēn
 dēn abāz nē ēstam]*

— nor due to love of the body nor due to that of the life-soul. [I will not stand back from this Dēn, not for the sake of a better and longer life.]

Textual difference K20 vs. StPY:

- z. Where K20 together with 510 400 410 has the plain *abāz nē ēstam* ‘I will not stand back’, 500 gives the extended *abāz nē stāyēm az=iš abāz nē ēstam* ‘I will not abjure and will not step back from it’.

Y12.9 (GY12.14) to Y13.11 (GY13.8)

Not discussed here.

Y29.6.1

[165v. 4] aṭ. ē. waōcaṭ ahur[...] mazdā. vīduuā. vafūš. viiānaiiā. 'y[tnwš]²⁶ PWN
 PWMH gwpt 'whrmzd 'YK 'k'syh' wš[...] wc'lšn' ZNHš MND'M ḏ'nšnyk
 gwpt 'YK 'n'kyh MN [...]yh c'lk' 'YT' :

*ēdōn=iš pad dahān guft ohrmazd kū āgāhīhā *wišōbišn wizārišn [ēn=iš tis
 dānišnīg guft kū anāgīh az <[...]yh> čārag ast]*

Ohrmazd spoke thus to him with his mouth: ‘With awareness must the destruction be redeemed.’ [This thing he spoke knowingly: that there is a remedy to the evil (which comes) from [the Foul Spirit (?)].

The wording of the Pahlavi version in K20 disagrees with the StPY in three matters of detail:

²⁶ Supplied by a second hand.

- aa. K20 adds *kū* (marker of direct speech) after *ohrmazd*.
- bb. After *wizārišn*, K20 has *ēn=iš tis* whereas the StPY has *kū=š*.
- cc. In K20, the text corresponding to *gannāg-mēnōy* ‘the Foul Spirit’ is lacunose. The lacuna is followed by the sequence ⟨-’yh⟩ at the beginning of the next line. This does not agree with how the end of *mēnōy* ⟨mynwy⟩ is usually spelled.

Y29.6.2

nōiṭ. aēuuā. ahū. vi[...]. naēdā. ratuš. ašātcī. haca L’ ’yt[...]. ’dwýkyhy²⁷ wndšn’ ’YK
 ZNH Y ’MTš PWN gyw’k c’lk’ L’YT²⁸ L’ š’yt’ HD l’dc Y hwt’y PWN hwt’y
 L’ YHŠNND L’ dhšn’ Y ltyh MN ’hl’dyh cyk’mc-HD ’YK dštwbl[c]²⁹ ’ytwn’
 cygwn ’p’yt d’štn’ L’ YHŠNND

*nē ēdōn *ahūīgīh windišn [kū ēn ī ka=š pad gyāg čārag *kirdan nē šāyēd
 *ēd rāy=iz ī xwadāy pad xwadāy nē dārēnd] nē dahišn ī radīh az ahlāyīh
 čegām=iz=ē [kū dastwar=iz ēdōn čiyōn abāyēd dāštan nē dārēnd]*

There is thus no acquisition of lordship [i.e., (it refers to) this (kind of situation): when it is not possible to provide a remedy for it on spot, (it is) especially for this reason that they do not regard the lord as the lord]. There is no establishing of *rad*-ship on the basis of righteousness whatsoever [i.e., they also do not have a *dastwar* (figure of religious authority) in the way they are supposed to have one].

Textual differences K20 vs. StPY:

- dd. K20 *kū ēn ī ka=š pad gyāg* vs. StPY *kū ān ī pad gyāg*.
- ee. K20, 510 *ēd rāy=iz ī* (⟨-c Y⟩) vs. 500 *ēd rāy=iz* (⟨-c⟩) vs. 400 410 *ēd rāy čē* (⟨MH⟩).

4. Evaluation

The analysis of the sample segments above has sufficed to illustrate some general trends regarding the relation between the Pahlavi Yasna extracts in K20 and the equivalent passages as transmitted in the StPY. The present section will serve to summarise these trends and to outline some of their possible implications for the transmission history of the Pahlavi Yasna.

4.1 Avestan and Pahlavi text alternate at different intervals

The most obvious difference between K20 and the StPY is the fact that the latter tends to interpolate the Pahlavi segments into the Avestan text at shorter intervals, resulting in a more fine-grained segmentation of the text: see (a), (d), (s) and (u) above. This seems to reflect a greater concern for the semantic continuity of the text on the part of K20 as against the StPY. Whereas the StPY follows what were perceived to be the most basic structural units of the Avestan recitation text, the compiler of the text in K20 placed more value on presenting the Pahlavi text in com-

²⁷ Cor. to ⟨°yh⟩.

²⁸ Cor. to ⟨krtn’⟩.

²⁹ Supplied by a second hand.

plete syntactic units. On a side-note, it is worth mentioning that a reduced concern for the Avestan recitation text can also be observed in the way in which M51, the sister manuscript of K20, presents its own Yasna (Gāṇā) extracts: for some of them, the Pahlavi text is given first and the Avestan text only added as an afterthought following the phrase *abestāg ēn ast* ‘(its) Avesta is this’. This contrasts with the manuscripts of the StPY, whose Pahlavi text always follows the Avestan text. At the same time, it is worth noting that, despite their primarily exegetical concern, the scribes of K20 and M51 (or perhaps rather the original compilers of the Yasna extracts contained in them) did not dare to omit the Avestan text altogether.

4.2 *Static Pahlavi translation vs. fluid Pahlavi comments*

The text of the Pahlavi translation proper (the “word-by-word” translation) is virtually identical in K20 and the StPY. The Pahlavi comments, however, exhibit a greater degree of variation. In the case of (c), a small explanatory comment found in the StPY is absent from K20. Elsewhere, the comments repeatedly exhibit a certain fluidity with regard to their precise wording, and usually neither the K20 nor the StPY version is evidently more original than the other. For example, with regard to (g) (unless it is due to a scribal confusion of the similar sequences ⟨HTm⟩ and ⟨’MT⟩), one variant yields a temporal and the other a conditional clause, both being meaningful in the context:

- K20 ‘Possessing (it) while it is owned by you’ (means) this: that, **when (ka)** it is necessary to give away the body for the sake of the soul, then (*ā*) I will indeed (=iz) give it away.’
- StPY ‘Possessing (it) while it is owned by you’ (means) this: that, **if (agar)** it is necessary to give away **my (=m)** body for the sake of the soul, I will give it away.’

Further instances that illustrate the fluidity of the commentary layer at a time as late as the 14th century CE are (h), (v) and (aa)–(dd). The same kinds of fluctuation may rarely also be observed within the transmission of the StPY itself. Among the sample passages above, this is exemplified by (i), where the addition of a concluding comment in 500 510 — which do not fully agree among themselves — stands against the joint evidence of 400 410 K20. Another example is (z), where 500, contrasting with all the other manuscripts, shows an extended comment. However, based on my ongoing preparation of the Pahlavi Yasna for the corpus of the DFG-project “Zoroastrian Middle Persian Digital Corpus and Dictionary” (MPCD)³⁰, it is obvious that these kind of fluctuations are much rarer within the StPY than when the latter is compared to K20 (or M51).

4.3 *Instances of a more original state of the text in K20*

As noted in section 1, K20 originates from the same scribal milieu as Mihrābān Kayxōsrō’s StPY manuscripts 500 and 510. However, since K20 sometimes seems to give a more original text compared to both of Mihrābān’s manuscripts (and, indeed, to the StPY as a whole), the extracts in K20 are unlikely to have been taken

30 Cf. <https://www.mpcorpus.org/about>.

from 500 or 510 directly. This is also confirmed by the Avestan text which, certain affinities with 500 aside (see section 4.4), is clearly not copied directly from either 500 or 510.³¹

In the cases of (m) and (q), the versions of the comments as given in K20 are arguably primary to the ones the StPY, as the addition of the verbal particle *bē* in the StPY can be regarded as a sign of a linguistic updating: the increased usage of *bē* (or *be*) as a verbal particle with ‘emphasising’ (PAUL 2003: 114f.) or focussing (LENÉPVEU-HOTZ 2018: 427ff.) function reflects New Persian influence.

Regarding (y), K20 alone shows the expected rendering of Av. *auui* (K20 *aōi*) with the double preposition *abar o* ‘towards’, whereas in the StPY *abar* ⟨QDM⟩ has become corrupted to the visually similar *čē* ⟨MH⟩ (510 400 410) and further to *=iz* (500).

Yet another case where K20 may preserve a more original text compared to the StPY manuscripts concerns the confused transmission of StPY *dēwīh/ dēw* (vs. K20 *dēwān*) in Y 12.1 — see (j) and (n) above. Due to their confusing appearance in the script, ⟨ŠDYʹ⟩ *dēw* and its plural ⟨ŠDYʹʹn⟩ *dēwān* frequently show aberrant spellings in the Pahlavi manuscripts. This general tendency aside, however, the variant spellings attested in Y 12.1 may still be taken as representing meaningful textual variants. Whereas K20 *dēwān* ‘demons’ is the predictable rendering of the Av. acc.pl **daēuuō*, the variants *dēw* (also *dēwī* < **dēwīh*?) of 500 510 and *dēwīh* of 400 410 may be explained as due to an adaption of the original Pahlavi translation of the passage to the more recent phonetic change, still traceable in the transmission of the Avesta corpus, from **daēuuō* (acc.pl) to *daēuuō* (on the surface nom.sg).³² In its transmitted form, *daēuuō* must by all means have looked like a singular form to the copyists of our manuscripts while, at the same time, they must have also been aware of the fact that a plural form was expected in meaning (“we scorn the demons”). The manuscripts bear witness to two strategies to cope with the seeming formal discrepancy between the received Pahlavi and Avestan forms:

1. The singular ⟨ŠDYʹ⟩ *dēw* chosen in 510 remained semantically open to a plural interpretation, but did not formally contradict the Avestan form anymore.
2. The variants ⟨ŠDYʹyh⟩ of 410 as well as perhaps ⟨ŠDYyh⟩ of 400 may represent an abstract or collective noun *dēwīh* ‘demondom, collective of the demons’, which likewise preserved the contextually required plural semantics while not formally contradicting the received Av. *daēuuō* in the same way as the older *dēwān* had done.³³

31 Cf. the digitized manuscripts with transcriptions on <https://ada.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/>.

32 For the secondary character of *-ō* in *daēuuō* (against older **daēuuō*), see DE VAAN 2003: 314; TREMBLAY 2006: 253. In other occurrences of this form (e.g., V 18.16), variant spellings such as *daēuuū*, *daēuuē*, *daēuuī* still reflect the original acc.pl form **daēuuō* more closely. In Y 12.1, by contrast, the spelling *dāēuuō* (resulting from *daēuuū* < *daēuuō*), happens to be transmitted unequivocally: cf. MARTINEZ PORRO/CANTERA, Corpus Avesticum Berolinense (CAB), Y 12.6, available online: https://cab.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/exist/apps/cab/pages/tools/stanza.html?stanza_id=Y12.6&stanza_location=2 (last accessed 20.02.24).

33 The noun *dēwīh* is, for example, also attested in PV 3.7, there in the function of an abstract rather than a collective noun: *dēwīh druzīh harw dō hamgōnīh* ‘*dēw*-ness and *druz*-ness

The reading ⟨ŠDYʾ⟩ of 500, finally, could either be taken as an irregular spelling of ⟨ŠDYʾ⟩ *dēw*, or it could be read as ⟨ŠDYʾyy⟩ *dēwī*, that is, as reflecting the New Persian pronunciation of *dēwīh*.

4.4 Secondary affinity with *Mihrābān's PY*, especially with *ms. 500*

As the previous sections have shown, the Combined Manuscripts (400 410) and *Mihrābān's* manuscripts (500 510) generally transmit the PY in a cohesive fashion (the “StPY”). K20 repeatedly contrasts with the text of the StPY, occasionally showing the primary reading. This is remarkable given the fact that K20 and *Mihrābān's* manuscripts originate from a shared temporal-geographical setting and scribal milieu. Since it seems fair to say that, overall, K20 and the StPY present versions of one and the same text — the Pahlavi translation widely agrees and the commentary disagrees only in wording —, the text of K20 should ultimately go back to the same first bilingual manuscript of the PY that is mentioned in the colophons of the Combined Manuscripts and whose creation probably equalled the final compilation of the PY as a coherent text.³⁴ However, K20 seems to derive from an early offshoot of the subsequent transmission of the PY, one that had branched off following the creation of the first bilingual manuscript but preceding the last joint predecessor of the Combined Manuscripts and of *Mihrābān* manuscripts.³⁵

At the same time, examples such as (y) nevertheless indicate a certain proximity between the extracts in K20 and *Mihrābān's* manuscripts in particular. Here, the readings of both K20 and of 500 510 presuppose the former presence of an unusual phonetic spelling of *čē* (normally ⟨MH⟩, thus in 400 410) with ⟨cy⟩. This sequence was erroneously interpreted as consisting of the particle =*iz* ⟨-c⟩ followed by an ezafe, yielding K20 510 ⟨-c Y⟩. In 500, ⟨Y⟩ was then omitted according to the usual fluctuations in the spelling of the ezafe. Beyond this example, it is noteworthy that K20 sometimes agrees specifically with 500 against all the other manuscripts of the StPY, including 510. This repeatedly concerns minor deviations in the explanatory comments, for example in (b) (with K20 and 500 here retaining what seems to be the original reading), (r) and (x). See also the agreement between K20 and 500 in their spelling of the copula in (e). Although some of these instances are of a trivial type when considered in isolation, the cumulative trend cannot be denied.

The overall situation may be accounted for by assuming that the text of K20 was secondarily influenced by the StPY as transmitted in *Mihrābān's* milieu. Considering (A) that major sections of K20 were indeed copied from manuscripts

are both the same’. It is also repeatedly attested in *Dēnkard* 3 as an antonym of *yazadīh* ‘*yazad*-ness’.

34 While scholars agree that the colophons refer to the creation of such a first bilingual manuscript, the complex remaining information that they provide on the prehistory of the Combined Manuscripts (and, by implication, also of *Mihrābān's* manuscripts) has received competing interpretations; compare CANTERA/DE VAAN 2005, CANTERA 2012, and, more recently, KHANIZADEH 2021, with further references.

35 CANTERA (2012: 516) proposes a tentative reasoning for the hypothesis that, among the sequence of manuscripts mentioned in the colophons, the one of *Māhpānah*, son of *Āzādmard*, was this last joint predecessor.

written by Mihrābān and (B) that the commentary layer of the StPY itself shows some vestiges of textual fluidity (that is, of orality?), such a secondary influence of one of Mihrābān's manuscripts on a parallel text in K20 would not be surprising.

As regards the spellings and phonetics of the Avestan text of K20, they do not agree particularly closely with either 500 or 510. Through some shared non-trivial variants, however, K20 again shows a certain affinity with 500: Y 12.3 *aṅhāiiā* (= 500 vs. 510 *aṅhāiiā*, for expected *aṅhūiiā*); Y 12.6 *canahmī* (cf. 500 *canamī* vs. 510 *cinamī*); Y 12.7 *vī.vāpaḍcā* (cf. 500 *vīvā*[...]cā vs. 510 *vīuuāpaḍcā*, for expected *vīuuāpaḍcā*); Y 12.8 *frāmanīiaēibiiō* (cf. 500 *fārā. manīiaēibiiō* with the Indian transmission vs. 510 *frā. manaēibiiō* with the Iranian one³⁶).

5. Conclusion

The examples discussed in this article illustrate a certain degree of textual fluidity that was preserved in the transmission of the Pahlavi Yasna, particularly its commentary layer, in a period as late as the 14th c. CE. In a forthcoming complementary publication to the present article, I aim to show that this is even more so the case with the collection of extracts from the Avestan and Pahlavi Gāḍās in ms. M51.

Moreover, the observations shared above underline the importance of taking into account the limited amount of *Nebenüberlieferung* that we possess when doing text-critical work on the Pahlavi Yasna. Looking beyond the Yasna extracts in K20, other old specimens of the PY as transmitted outside the “StPY” manuscripts include above all the Gāḍā extracts in ms. M51, but also some shorter segments such as (P)Y 45.2 in ms. K7a (added at the end of the Pahlavi Visperad) and perhaps also (P)Y 31.3–32.9 in ms. M82.³⁷ To this, one needs to add the numerous quotations from the PY that are found in the wider realm of Pahlavi literature. The complete indexation and annotation of all pre-18th-c. CE Pahlavi codices in the framework of MPCD will, for the first time, provide the means for comparing the StPY and its *Nebenüberlieferung* in a comprehensive fashion.

Bibliography

- ASMUSSEN, J.P. 1992: “Codices Hafnienses”. In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* 5.8: 886–893. Available online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_7773.
- BARTHOLOMAE, CHR. 1915: *Die Zendhandschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München*. München.
- CANTERA, A. 2012: “Los manuscritos de Yasna con traducción pahlaví e instrucciones rituales (*abāg zand ud nērang*)”. In: A. AGUD/A. CANTERA/A. FALERO/R. EL HOUR/M.Á. MANZANO/R. MUÑOZ/E. YILDIZ (eds.): *Séptimo Centenario de los Estudios Orientales en Salamanca*. Salamanca (Estudios Filológicos 337): 503–521.

36 Cf. MARTINEZ PORRO/CANTERA, *Corpus Avesticum Berolinense (CAB)*, Y 12.8, critical commentaries, available at https://ada.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/exist/apps/cab/stanza.html?stanza_id=Y12.8 (last accessed 20.02.24).

37 BARTHOLOMAE (1915: 306), referring primarily to the Avestan text, considers this fragment to derive directly from ms. 510.

- 2014: *Vers une édition de la liturgie longue zoroastrienne: pensées et travaux préliminaires*. Paris (Cahiers de Studia Iranica 51).
- CANTERA, A./M. DE VAAN, 2005: “Remarks on the colophon of the Avestan manuscripts Pt4 and Mf4”. In: *Studia Iranica* 34: 31–42.
- CERETI, C.G. 2004: “Sul codice M51 di Monaco”. In: C.G. CERETI/B. MELASECCHI/F. VAJIFDAR (eds.): *Varia Iranica*. Roma (Orientalia Romana 7): 119–129.
- CHRISTENSEN, A. 1931: *The Pahlavi codices K 20 & K 20 b, containing Ardāgh Vīrāz-Nāmāgh, Bundahishn etc.* Copenhagen (Codices Avestici et Pahlavici Bibliothecae Universitatis Hafniensis 1).
- HINTZE, A. 2012: “Manuscripts of the Yasna and Yasna ī Rapithwin”. In: A. CANTERA (ed.): *The Transmission of the Avesta*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 20): 244–278.
- JAMASPA, K.M./M. NAWABI, (eds.) 1976: *Manuscript D90. Yasnā with its Pahlavi translation*. 2 vols. Shiraz (The Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches 19–20).
- JOSEPHSON, J. 1997: *The Pahlavi translation technique as illustrated by Hōm Yašt*. Uppsala (Studia Iranica Upsaliensia 2).
- JÜGEL, T. 2015: *Die Entwicklung der Ergativkonstruktion im Alt- und Mitteliranischen. Eine korpusbasierte Untersuchung zu Kasus, Kongruenz und Satzbau*. Wiesbaden (Iranica 21).
- KHANIZADEH, M. 2021: “Zoroastrian ritual and exegetical traditions: the case of the Iranian Pahlavi Yasna”. In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 84(3): 469–504.
- LENEPVEU-HOTZ, A. 2018: “Evolution of the subjunctive in New Persian (10th–20th): From disappearance to reappearance”. In: *Folia Linguistica* 52: 421–440.
- MACKENZIE, D.N. 1971: *A concise Pahlavi dictionary*. London.
- PAUL, L. 2003: “Early Judaeo-Persian between Middle and New Persian – re-examining a well-known hypothesis”. In: S. SHAKED/A. NETZER (eds.): *Irano-Judaica V*. Jerusalem: 96–104.
- PESCHL, B. 2023: “Avestan-Middle Persian tense mismatches in the Zand and the Middle Persian “performative preterite””. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 128: 9–64.
- REDARD, C. 2016: “Le fragment Westergaard 10”. In: C. REDARD (ed.): *Des contrées avestiques à Mahabad, via Bisotun. Études offertes en hommage à Pierre Lecoq*. Neuchâtel (Civilisations du Proche-Orient. Série III. Religions et Cultures 2): 187–206.
- TREMBLAY, X. 2006: “Le pseudo-gâthique. Notes de lecture avestiques II”. In: A.C.D. PANAINO/A. PIRAS (eds.): *Proceedings of the 5th conference of the Societas Iranologica Europaea held in Ravenna, 6–11 October 2003*. Vol. I: *Ancient & Middle Iranian studies*. Milano: 233–281.
- DE VAAN, M. 2003: *The Avestan vowels*. Amsterdam/New York (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 12).
- WEST, E.W. 1880: *Pahlavi texts. Part I: The Bundahis, Bahman Yast, and Shâyast Lâ-Shâyast*. Oxford (Sacred Books of the East 5).