

AN EARLY TRAIT OF GATHIC PERFORMANCE

Martin Schwartz

In this article I shall marshal (I-III) a disparate variety of noteworthy Gathic textual spellings (for which there are no significant differences in the manuscripts), and (IV) note their positions in the relevant poems, and conclude (V) that these data together point to an early feature in the vocal performance of the Gathic poems.

I. Spellings with $\bar{a}\bar{a}$ - for /a-/ and /ā-/:

There are a number of Gathic words in passages with odd $\bar{a}\bar{a}$ - representing what is elsewhere indicated as *a-* or *ā-*. The words are $\bar{a}\bar{a}n\bar{u}$ ‘along, in correspondence with’ Y. 32.16 and Y. 47.2, vs. Young Avestan *anu*, Vedic *ánu*: Y. 28.12 $\bar{a}\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{a}$ ‘by mouth’ vs. Y. 30.3 $\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{o}$ ‘of mouth’; Y. 29.7 $\bar{a}\bar{a}uu\bar{a}$ ‘down’ vs. Y. 44.13 *uuā*; and, in the text of the Y(asna) H(aptanhāiti), 35.6 $\bar{a}\bar{a}d\bar{u}$, which was taken as ‘cereal grain’ via comparison with Sogdian $\bar{a}\bar{d}\bar{u}k$: However, the latter YH. 35.6 $\bar{a}\bar{a}d\bar{u}$ was separated from the Gathic words with $\bar{a}\bar{a}$ - by Narten (1986: 111-114), who reconstructed for $\bar{a}\bar{a}d\bar{u}$ an origin in **tat[ə-ād-ū (tat-]ə āt̥ ū*); Narten’s further views on the subject will be noted below.

The $\bar{a}\bar{a}$ - words are discussed in de Vaan (2003: 448-449). Here is cited the suggestion of Kellens–Pirart I (1988: 44), that the sequences $\bar{a}\bar{a}nu$ and $\bar{a}\bar{a}d\bar{u}$ have a kind of “*u*-infection” (note however that clearly Kellens–Pirart II (1990: 119; 140, 220; and 225) employ Narten’s reconstruction for $\bar{a}\bar{a}d\bar{u}$). De Vaan also comments on $\bar{a}\bar{a}uu\bar{a}$ and $\bar{a}\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{a}$ that “one may envisage the influence of a back vowel and glides to have caused a centralized off-glide. At all events, this is only a sporadic development characteristic of OAv., and can be traced to a more dragging recitation of these texts.”

Beekes (1988: 29) had remarked, “ $\bar{a}\bar{a}$ is found initially in $\bar{a}\bar{a}n\bar{u}$, $\bar{a}\bar{a}v\bar{a}$, $\bar{a}\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{a}$, where it has no phonological value [...]. Probably \bar{a} was at the end of a preceding word, the second \bar{a} a kind of offglide to the next word beginning with a vowel.”

Both Beekes and de Vaan (who, like Kellens–Pirart, follow Narten in rejecting a word $\bar{a}\bar{a}d\bar{u}$), in effect partially echo Narten (1986: 113-114), who attributed

the onset vowels of $\bar{e}\bar{a}\bar{n}\bar{u}$, $\bar{e}\bar{a}\bar{u}\bar{u}\bar{a}$, and $\bar{e}\bar{a}\bar{h}\bar{h}\bar{a}$ to a non-phonological effect of recitation or singing, she could find no contexts for occurrence.

II. Y. 48.12 *aēšam.mahiiā* and Y. 44.20 *hīm mizān*: Y. 48.12 has *aēšam.mahiiā*, an oddly spelled genitive of this word for ‘wrath, fury’ with *-m.n-* vs. *-m-* in *aēšamam* Y. 29.2, Y. 30.6, and Y. 49.4; *aēšamā* Y. 44.20; and *aēšamō* Y. 29.1. and Y. 48.7. For the gemination of *m* in *aēšam.mahiiā* (where the un-canonical **mm*, motivated orthographical quasi-retrenchment with intervening morpheme boundary), Insler (1975: 253) compared Y. 44.20 *nōiṭ hīm mizān*, seeing here an original **izān* (thus earlier Geldner [1926: 3 fn. 11]), aorist of $\sqrt{\text{iz}}$ ‘be eager’, cf. pres. *iziiā* Y. 33.6, Y. 49.3. Thus, ‘they are not eager [to promote] her [sci. *gqm* “the cow”]’.

Before offering conclusive evidence for **izān*, some critical evaluation of the older proposals is necessary. Bartholomae (1904: 1108-1109) took *mizān* from a hapax etymon *maēz-* ‘pflegen (to foster)’, comparing Middle High German *smeichen*, ‘schön tun’, which lacks genuine etymological support¹ suggested a nasal-infix form *mizān* for which, contempating stem ablaut **/minz/*, **/minaz/* from a root **maiz* ‘to foster’, he adduced Y. 46.14 *hadāmōi mināš* ‘Thou fosterest in (Thy) abode’. In fact, for the latter, Bartholomae’s translation, though etymologically baseless, approached what shall be suggested as the correct rendering: (Bartholomae 1904: 1190) “du im selben Haus (mit dir) vereinigen sollst”. Here Bartholomae was operating with an etymon *myas* ‘mischen’, wrongly extracted from Y. 30.9 *mōiiastrā* ‘vicissitudines, changes’ **/maistrā/*, $\sqrt{\text{mai}\theta}$ ‘to change’, see e.g. Humbach 1991: 55, and what should be read in Y. 30.3 as *hāmiiāsaitē* < **/ham yāsa-/* ‘be taken together (in consideration), cf. Humbach 1991: 93.

For Y. 46.14 *hadāmōi mināš* I translate ‘Thou minglest in (Thy) residence’.

The Proto-Indo-European root of *mināš* like that of OInd. *miśrā-* ‘mixed’, Av. *misuuan-* ‘(the eschatological state) containing mixture’ would be **meiḱ* ‘to mix’, for which I posit ablauting nasal infix stems **mineḱ-* (> OAv. **minas-*, 2nd. pers. sg. *mināš*) and **minḱe-*, the latter > Lith. *mystù* etc. (via **minša-*) ‘sich vermischen, verwirrt werden’ according to Rix (1998: 385), where also from $\sqrt{\text{meiḱ-nu-}}$ suffix, Gr. $\mu(\epsilon)\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\upsilon\mu\iota$ ‘mix’.

For Y. 46.14 *hadāmōi mināš* to Homer, Od. 24.314 $\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\xi\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\eta$ (ἡδ’ ἀγλῦα δῶρα διδῶσειν) ‘to mingle in hospitality (and give splendid gifts)’. Here $\xi\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\eta$ refers to the same Indo-European institution of gift-exchange manifested in hospitality, patronage and cult as its OAv. verb cognate Y. 46.13 *xšnāuš* ‘gave patronage, was hospitable [to Zarathushtra],² for which the reciprocity (in the triangulation of exchanges between patron, poet-priest and god) is Mazdā’s hospitable “mingling” of Zarathushtra’s patron in His abode. In Y. 46.14

1 Cheung 2007: 262. Humbach 1959: 60, 72, and 1991: 162, mentioning Insler’s solution, 186.

2 For *xšnāuš*, $\xi\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\eta$, etc. see Schwartz, forthcoming.

Zarathushtra's 'Those whom Thou minglest in Thy residence, them do I invoke ...' refers to the patrons he names: Vīštāspa (Y. 46.14), the Haēca aspas (Y. 46.15), Frašaoštra (Y. 46.16) and Djāmāspa (Y. 46.17). In addition, the same basic divine reciprocity is mentioned at Y. 46.12 the patronly Tūra, son of Friia, and his family: Mazdā Ahura will commingle them (iš.hām.aibī.mōist) with His Entities, Aša and Vohu Manah, where *hām.aibī.mōist* 'commingles' is from $\sqrt{mai\theta}$ 'to (ex)change', whence MPers. *mēhmān*, Pashto *melmə* 'guest', again referring to hospitality as gift-exchange. The semantic relationship between 'to exchange' and 'to mix, mingle' will be discussed below, after presentation of the material for the most important (though apparently unnoticed) example in Iranian.

What appeared to be an Iranian etymological *unicum* was published by Sims-Williams (2007: 232a): Bactrian $\mu\iota\gamma\delta\omicron$, $\mu\iota\gamma\alpha\delta\omicron$ 'to exchange', taken from **mixta*- and compared Proto-Indo-European **h₂mei-g^w*-, Gr. ἀμείβω '(ex)change', and duly noted the alternative view of Skjærvø (2005 [2006]: 315), 'combine with' via comparison with Parth. *āmixt(-)* 'mixed', etc. The uniqueness of the Bactrian word as Iranian cognate of ἀμείβω is explicitly noted by Cheung (2007: 178), assigning the Bactrian to Proto-Iranian $\sqrt{*Hmai\dot{y}?$ 'to exchange'. For *āmixt(-)*, etc., Cheung (2007: 261) has $\sqrt{*maiz}$ 'to mix, mingle', listing,

MPers. *āmēz-* 'mix', *gumēz-* 'to mingle',
 their (inchoative-)passives ManMPers. (')*myxs-* and *gumēxs-*, past. ptc. *'myxtg*
 Parth. *'myj-* 'to mix', *'myxs-* 'to be mixed with',
 and Sorani *āmēžan* 'addition'.

Cheung comments that all these forms from his $\sqrt{*maiz}$ derive from (IE) root-variant **meiĝ-*, although such an etymon holds only for Greek, whose γ has been explained, e.g., by Rix 1998: 385 s.v. **meiḱ* 'mischen', as due to assimilation of **k* to a following voiced consonant. However, the etymology carried forward explicitly by Cheung is more elementary flawed.

The semantics and the superficial comparability in the sounds of the foregoing Iranian words for 'mix' to Engl. *mix*, Gr. $\mu(\epsilon)\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\nu\mu\iota$, $\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\gamma\omega$ etc., seem to have resulted in the false impression of a single underlying etymon. However, West Iranian *-xt-* and *-xs-*, Parth. *-j-*, and Sorani *-ž-* are irreconcilable with PIE palatal **ĝ* or **ĵ*, but require a post-(labio-)velar antecedent (whence Persic *-z-* as regular). One should put the Iranian words given by Cheung under $\sqrt{*maiz}$ < ***meiĝ* 'to mix' instead under PIE $\sqrt{*h_2mei\dot{g}^w}$ (*h₂meiĝ^w*) 'to exchange'. Thereby Bactrian $\mu\iota\gamma\delta\omicron$, $\mu\iota\gamma\alpha\delta\omicron$ would cease to be the Iranian isolate under this PIE root. For 'exchange': 'mix, mingle' one need only bethink semantic relationship between the material operation of *exchange* and that of *interchange*, seen resultatively. The semantics of the interchange, against exchange, are marked by preverbs *ā* and *vi* (resp. approximately directive and dispersive/diversive). As observed above, the genuine Iranian representative of PIE $\sqrt{*mei\dot{k}}$ (**meiḱ*) 'to mix' are limited to archaic formation OAv. *minas-* (Y. 46.14 *minasš*)

and the derivative Av. *misuuan*. This paucity of Iranian reflexes of the latter PIE root should be explained by the fact that the past stem of $\sqrt{*}mais$ (PIE $\sqrt{*}meik̂$), $*mišta-$, would have coincided with the homophonous past stem of $\sqrt{*}(H)maiz$ “to urinate” (see the data in Cheung 2007, 179 in which Pers. *mēxtan* is due to influence of *rēz-* *rēxtan* “to pour”). Thereby $\sqrt{*}mais$ became supplanted by forms of $\sqrt{*}(h)maǐj$ “to exchange (mix, mingle)”, which was partially similar phonologically. supplantation via the partially phonically similar. The entire matter illustrates the importance of attention to semantics and no less to phonology in etymological study.

We now return to Y. 44.20 (*m*)*izān*. It has been seen that both *mizān* and $*mizān$ lack foundation, which leaves Insler’s thesis of $*izān$ with *m-* from a preceding geminated *-m*. Insler’s $*izān$ from *īz-* ‘be eager’ may now be confirmed by the compositional history of the poem in which $*izān$ occurs. As a preliminary: Y. 44 consists of two parts, Y. 44.1-10 and Y. 44.11-20, each part showing concentric linkage of its stanzas.³ Just as Y. 44.10 has its outer stanzas (1 & 10) linked by *saxiiāt* ‘would proclaim’ + *θβāuuas* ‘like Thee’, so the second part of Y. 44 has its outer stanzas (11 & 20) linked by *ašā* ‘with Rightness’ + *frāda-* ‘to promote’ (in reference to livestock). The concentric linkage of the inner stanzas is: 11 & 19 *paouriiā-* ‘first’; 12 & 18 interrogative + *aša-*; 13 & 17 nouns from \sqrt{hac} ‘associate’; 14 & 16 *sāṅgha-* ‘proclamation’; 15 & 14 $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘to give’; 15 & 16 *pōi* ‘protect’ and \sqrt{jam} ‘go, come’; 10 & 15 & 20 $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘to give’. Thus Y. 44.10-20 has the formal structure of an independent composition, only secondarily integrated into what became the final Y. 44.

In fact, the lexemic scaffolding underlying Y. 44.10-20 comes, stanza by stanza, from Y. 49 recalled backwards, stanza by stanza, in conformity with principle of composition whereby the Gathic corpus was built up, as I have shown via an abundance of charts over the course of a now long series of articles. These charts illustrate the phenomenon which I now call Serially Correspondent Recursive Intertextual Mechanism, acronym, SCRIM.⁴ Here is the SCRIM chart showing the dependence of Y. 44.10-20 and Y. 49 backwards, whereby confirmation for Y. 44.20 $*izān$ emerges: (1) gives the detailed formal correspondences, and (2) the reduction of the relevant forms to their most basic correlations.

3 For systematic stanzaic concentricity in Gathic ring composition, see Schwartz (2002) [2006]; 53 seq. Y. 44.4 should be reversed.

4 The principle was introduced and illustrated with an abundance of charts, in Schwartz 2002 [2006]: 54-64; further articles in which I discuss and provide other illustrative charts are listed in Schwartz 2018: 117, where the acronym SCRIM and the phrase it designates are first given, followed by illustrative charts on in the rest of the article. For the relevant compositional connection between Y. 44 and Y. 51, see Schwartz 2002 (2006): 62, fn. 15.

In what follows, the letters a-e refer to the sequence of lines in a stanza; raised single strike after a letter indicates first hemistich, and double raised stroke indicates second hemistich.

(1)

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|------------|------------------------------|
| Y. 49.12d” | <i>vahištəm</i> | Y. 44.10b” | <i>vahištā</i> |
| Y. 49.11b’ | <i>duždaēnēṅ</i> | Y. 44.11c” | <i>daēnā</i> |
| Y. 49.10b” | <i>ašāunqm</i> | Y. 44.12b’ | <i>ašauuā</i> |
| Y. 49.10b’ | <i>manō vohū</i> | Y. 44.13e” | <i>vanḡhāuš ... mananḡhō</i> |
| Y. 49.9b” | <i>*dadqs drəguuātā</i> | Y. 44.14d” | <i>dāuuōi drəguuasū</i> |
| Y. 49.8c” | <i>xšaθrōi</i> | Y. 44.15b” | <i>xšaiiehī</i> |
| Y. 49.7d” | <i>frasastīm</i> | Y. 44.16v” | <i>sāṅghā</i> |
| Y. 49.6c” | <i>srāuuaiiaēmā</i> | Y. 44.16d” | <i>səraošō</i> |
| Y. 49.5b” | <i>sārəštā</i> | Y. 44.17d’ | <i>sarōi</i> |
| Y. 49.4d’ | <i>dqn</i> | Y. 44.18e” | <i>dāṅhā</i> |
| Y. 49.4c” | <i>nōiṭ</i> | Y. 44.19b” | <i>nōiṭ</i> |
| Y. 49.4a” | <i>aēšəməm</i> | Y. 44.20a” | <i>aēšəmāi</i> |
| Y. 49.3c” | <i>iziiā</i> | Y. 44.20e’ | <i>*izān</i> |

(2)

| | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Y. 49.12d” & Y. 44.10b” | <i>vahišta-</i> | ‘best’ ⁵ |
| Y. 49.11b’ & Y. 44.11c” | <i>(-)daēnā</i> | ‘envisionment’ |
| Y. 49.10b” & Y. 44.12b’ | <i>ašauuā</i> | ‘righteous’ |
| Y. 49.10b’ & Y. 44.13e” | <i>vohu- + manah-</i> | ‘Good Manah’ |
| Y. 49.9*” & Y. 44.14.d” | <i>√dā</i> | ‘set; give’ + <i>drəguuant-</i> ‘to wrong some’ |
| Y. 49.8c” & Y. 44.15b” | <i>√xšā(y)</i> | ‘to rule. be able’ |
| Y. 49.7d” & Y. 44.16b” | <i>√sanh</i> | ‘to proclaim’ |
| Y. 49.6c” & Y. 44.16d” | <i>sr(a)u</i> | ‘to hear’ |
| Y. 49.5b” & Y. 44.17d’ | <i>√sar</i> | ‘to connect, unite’ |
| Y. 49.4d’ & Y. 44.18e” | <i>√dā</i> | ‘to set; to give’ |
| Y. 49.4c” & Y. 44.19b” | <i>nōiṭ</i> | ‘not’ |
| Y. 49.4a” & Y. 44.20a” | <i>aēšəma-</i> | ‘fury’ |
| Y. 49.3c” & Y. 44.3c” | <i>√iz</i> | ‘to be eager’ |

Having seen that Y. 44.20 originally had *izān, we may take *hīm mizān* as a retrenchment of what Insler rightly saw as an *m*-gemination paralleled by

5 The overt correspondence is of Y. 44.10b” *vahištā* to Y. 49.12a” *vahištəm*, but covertly to Y. 49.12a” *vā ištā* ‘in Your might’ = */vah ištā/. With the pun a part of Y. 49.12e”, ... *yāsq̄s ... / vah ištā/ vahištəm* parallels its sources Y. 28.8a-b’ *vahištəm ... vahištā ... vahištā ... yāsā*, where, again with *yāsa-* ‘entreat’, there is morphological play on *vahištā*.

aēšəm.mahiiā, However, Insler left unaddressed why the corpus has only two examples of the gemination of *m*.

III. *haiθiiām* vs. *haiθīm*: Y. 34.15 *fərašəm vasnā haiθiiām dā ahūm* ‘By (Thy) (power of) will Thou shalt make existence truly splendid’ is immediately comparable with Y. 46.19 *haiθīm ... varəšaitī ... hiiat vasnā fərašō.təmam* ‘He who truly ... brings about ... that which is, by (power of) will, that which is most splendid’. The form *haiθīm*, nom./acc. sg. neut., and acc. sg. masc. of *haiθiia-* ‘true, real’ (**/haθya-/*) also occurs at Y. 31.6,8 and Y. 34.6, thus four Gathic examples (**haiθīm* should also be read for Y. 34.10 *hiθam*; see the compositional and cross-textual evidence given by Schwartz in Schwartz and Manaster-Ramer 2019: 359, fn. 3) against *haiθiiām* only at Y. 34.15. The dominant form *haiθīm* shows the influence of the Young Avestan matrix of transmission, with *haiθīm* < **/haθya-/* a typical YAv. contraction. Why Y. 34.15 *haiθiiām* resisted the contracted form awaits explanation.

IV. The textual locations of the phonically exceptional spellings treated in I-IV: All the relevant instances are found in final lines of the poems concerned. Final-line position: holds for Y. 32.16c’ *əəanū* and Y. 28.11c’ *əəāŋhō*; Y. 48.12d” *aēšəm.mahiiā* (whose geminated *m* presupposes that *ə* was pronounced) and Y. 44.20e” *hīm mizān*; Y. 34.15c” *haiθiiām*. Y. 47.2b” *əəanū* is explainable as influenced by Y. 32.16c”; note that both Y. 47.2a and Y. 32.16a have *vahišta-*, a likely additional factor in the influence of Y. 32.16 on Y.47.2. This leaves Y. 29.7c” *əəauuā* to be explained as to its not occurring at the poem’s end. Its position does amount to a climactic to a series of questions, taken up within the godhead by Mazdā Ahura, Aša, and Vohu Manah, as to whether there is a mediator for the cow, after this culmination, the answer, Zarathushtra, is given in Y. 29.8.

V. Conclusion: The forms in question occur in final lines (six primary instances) or at a culmination (one instance). The relevant forms in the position all show some kind of extra duration of sonorants. Thus, */*a-/* and */*ā-/* both are attested long with gliding onset *əə-* (*əəānū*, *əəāuuā*, *əə□ŋhā*) **m* is geminated in *aēšəm.mahiiā* and *hīm mizān*, **/haθyam*, through stressed second vowel, resists Young Avestan contraction to *haiθīm* and emerges as *haiθiiām*. These phenomena are thus not phonologically conditioned, but reflect a marking of culmination/finalization within the performance (recitation/chanting) of the poetry, independently from, and sometimes in violation of, the underlying prosody. Such an idea was set forth by Narten (1986: 114) from consideration of the Gathic spellings with *əə-*, although she could not find any motivation for these formal manifestations. It may now be said, with regard

to Narten's discussion (loc.cit.), thus YH. 35.6 *əəādū* is a reflection of *əəānū* (etc.) from after the oral fixation of the Gathas. From the oral diaskeuasis of the Gathas, the marked performance-forms eventually entered the written textual tradition.

The fact of Y. 34.15c" *haiθiiām* vs. the numerous Gathic instances of the constructed *haiθīm*, which comes from the Young Avestan matrix of (oral) transmission, shows that *haiθiiām* and the other positionally-motivated forms antedate the Young Avesta. Their consequent original in Old Avestan performance tradition makes it likely that we have testimony of a performance feature that goes back to Zarathushtra himself.

Bibliography

- Bartholomae, Chr. (1904) *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg, Verlag von Karl J. Trubner.
- Beekes, R. S. P. (1988) *A Grammar of Gatha Avestan*. Leiden – New York – København – Köln, E.J. Brill.
- Cheung, J. (2007) *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden – Boston, Brill.
- Geldner, K. F. (1926), *Die Zoroastrische Religion: das Avesta*. Tübingen, Mohr Verlag.
- Humbach, H. (1959) *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*, II. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Humbach, H. (1991) *The Gāthās and the Other Old Avestan Texts*, in collaboration with Josef Elfenbein and Prods. O. Skjærvø. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Insler, S. (1975) *The Gāthās of Zarathustra*, Tehran-Liège, Bibliothèque Pahlavi, E.J. Brill.
- Kellens, J. – Pirart, E. (1988-1990) *Les Textes vieil-avestiques*. Parts I-II. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Narten, J. (1986) *Die Yasna Haptañhāiti*. Wiesbaden. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Rix, H. (1998) *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben*. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von M. Kümmel – Th. Zehnder – R. Lipp – B. Schirmer. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schwartz, M. (2002), How Zarathustra Generated the Gathic Corpus: Inner-textual and Inter-textual Composition. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* [2006], pp. 53-64
- Schwartz, M. (2018), A Preliterate Acrostic in the Gathas: Cross-textual and Compositional Evidence. *Dabir* 6, pp. 116-124.
- Schwartz, M. – Manaster-Ramer, A. (2019), Some Iranian Interlinguistic Conundrums. In *A Thousand Judgements. Festschrift for Maria Macuch*. Ed. by A. Hintze – D. Durkin-Meisterernst – Cl. Neumann. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz,

pp. 357-362.

Schwartz, M. (forthcoming) *√KSEN,*KSENU- √KSN(E)U: Indo-European Reciprocity and its Gathic Iconicity. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Sims-Williams, N. (2007), *Bactrian Documents II, Letters and Buddhist Texts*. London, Nour Foundation in Association with Azimuth Editions.

Skjærvø, Prods. O. (2005), Review of N. Sims-Williams, *BD I. Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 75/2 [2006], pp. 311-316.

Vaan, M. de (2003) *The Avestan Vowels*. Second edition. New York, Rodopi.