



# **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](mailto: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](mailto: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.āzaiṅti 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

## Yasnas 46 and 32: A Gathic Confrontation

Martin SCHWARTZ

*University of California, Berkeley*

**ABSTRACT:** *A fresh approach to the study of the Gathas, based on compositional principles discovered by the present author and developed over the course of a long series of articles, will be applied here to the formal comparative examination of Yasna 46 and Yasna 32, from which general conclusions about the Gathas will be drawn. The structural phenomena involved here are: 1) systematically concentric ring composition, which characterizes every Gathic poem; 2) the equally systematic bidirectional stanza-by-stanza lexemic correlations revealed by the charting of pairs of poems throughout the corpus, a process which illumines, inter alia, the order in which the poems were composed.*

**KEYWORDS:** Avesta, Gathas, ring composition, Yasna 32, Yasna 46, Zarathushtra, Zoroaster.

It is a pleasure to participate in this celebration of Jean KELLENS. My personal esteem of him was solidified in 2008, when, though he was very much aware of essential differences in our outlooks as to our special shared interest, the small field of study of the Gathas, he, in an unusual act of collegiality, invited me to give a lecture series at the Collège de France. There, moreover, he was an excellent host, *inter alia* being sympathetic (rather than exasperated!) when, due to a problem of the trains from Germany, I showed up at the Collège for my first presentation at the last minute. I was also pleasantly surprised that he remembered from a conversation in the distant past that I enjoy the North African cuisine, and he took me to a very fine Algerian or Moroccan restaurant. As for the Gathas, apart from his very important work as editor and translator of that corpus, his questioning of conventional views about those difficult poems, especially as to whether a sole and historical person, Zarathushtra was their composer, and how much one can confidently say about the circumstances of their authorship, commands a certain respect, for its bravery, and because of its inherent stimulus to further engagement with the Gathic texts. It is indeed the Gathas which will be the subject of this article, but with focus on the interrelations of the poem in the corpus, rather than the problem of their authorship. Thus, I shall merely refer to “the Gathic poet(s)” *vel sim.*, although I shall briefly note various possibilities raised by the foregrounded name Zarathushtra at the end of Y 46, which poem, together with Y 32, will provide the material on which I shall concentrate.

It was already in SCHWARTZ 1991: 148 and 161 that, together with demonstrations of various types of phonic crypticism and complex (systematically concentric) ring composition that I first charted the stanza-by-stanza lexemic correspondence between Y 46 proceeding backwards (Y 46.19–Y 46.6) and part of Y 32 proceeding forwards (Y 32.7–end, the Y 32.16; see Chart I below). It was only quite later that I realized that Y 32.7 is the end of precisely the first half of Y 32 in the poem’s systematic (concentric) ring composition, and, much more importantly, that the entire Gathic corpus was built up by such correspondences, in both directions,

between various pairs of the poems, as I illustrated by an abundance of charts (SCHWARTZ 2002 [2006]). Since then, I have published a long series of articles with many more such charts, using them to demonstrate various aspects of the Gathas, compositional, conceptual, and lexicological (most recently SCHWARTZ 2022, with bibliography); there I used two acronymic neologisms, SOLOS (= Stanzaically organized, lexemically obligated symmetry) for the systematic concentricism, and SCRIM (now = Serially correspondent recursive intertextual matches). Here, for the first time, I shall give a systematic account, with charts, of the various SCRIM correspondences between Y 46 and Y 32.

In the SCRIM charts which follow and my citations thereof, for concision and clarity I show the consecutive correlations at the levels of roots (preceded by (√) stems (followed by hyphen), and complete correspondences, with minimal common-denominator glosses. As for word-forms represented merely by roots, these should be clear enough from consultation with the relevant passage, but more explicit data may be helpful for the following: In Chart I, Y 46.16b' PN / haugva-/ & Y 32.10b' *gqm*, stem /gau-/ 'cow, bovine' is obvious for the second item, 'cow (acc.)', while the personal name /haugva-/ (*hūuō.gūua-*) is a vrddhi adjective \*'having good bovines' corresponds to /gau-/ 'cow, bull' in other SCRIM matchings; see SCHWARTZ : 2002 [2006]: 56. Y 46.10b' *dāiiāṭ*, like Y 32.14a" *nī dadat* 'deposits, has √dā = Vedic √dhā 'to place, establish, bring about and not √dā 'to give' as shown for *dāiiāṭ* in the central stanza of Y 46 corresponding via SOLOS to Y 46.18a–c *yaoš...daidītā* 'would bring about vitality', and cf. Y 50.5d" *x<sup>v</sup>āθrē dāiiāṭ* 'would place in relaxation'. In Chart II, Y 46.5a *xšaiia-* 'have ability, rule' & Y 32.13a' *xšatθra-* 'power' being reconciled by √xš(H)ai- 'have power' is paralleled e.g. by Y 29.2b" & Y 48.8a', SCHWARTZ: 2022: 477, (SCRIM) Chart VII.

### Chart I

46.19e" <i>tuuōm mazdā vaēdištō</i>	32.7 <i>tū ahurā...mazdā vaēdištō</i>	'Thou Mazdā Ahura wisest'
46.18c <i>vīciθa-</i>	32.8c" <i>vīciθa-</i>	'discernment'
46.18d" √xšnu	32.8b √xšnu	'gratify'
46.18b <i>īšti- + vahu- manah-</i>	32.9b' <i>īšti- + vahu- manah-</i>	'power' + 'Good Mind'
46.17c" √sru	32.10c' √sru	'hear(ken)'
46.16b" /gau-/ (see above)	32.10b' /gau-/	'cow'
46.15' <i>dāθəṅg</i>	32.10b" <i>dāθəṅg</i>	'lawful ones (acc.)'
46.14a' <i>maz-</i>	32.11a" <i>maz-</i>	'great'
46.13b' <i>marəta-</i>	32.12c" <i>marətān--</i>	'mortal'
46.13b" √sru	32.12a' √sru	'(be) hear(d), famed'
46.12e' <i>aēibiiō...mazdā</i>	32.12b' <i>aēibiiō...mazdā</i>	'to them, Mazdā...'

Yasnas 46 and 32: A Gathic Confrontation

46.11e' <i>dəmānē</i>	3 2.13a" <i>dəmānē</i>	'in the House'
46.11a" <i>kāuuaiias(-)</i>	32.14a" <i>kāuuaiias(-)</i>	'the <i>kavi</i> -s
46.10b' <i>√dā</i> (see above)	32.12a' <i>√dā</i>	'to place'
46.9d" / <i>gau-/</i>	32.14c' / <i>gau-/</i>	'cow'
46.9d" / <i>mrau-/</i>	32.14c" / <i>mrau-/</i>	'say'
46.8e" <i>nōiṭ ... (-)jiiāti-</i>	32.15b" <i>nōiṭ jiiātu-</i>	'not of (...) life'
46.7b <i>drəguuaṇt- ... aēnaṅhē</i>	32.16c' <i>aēnaṅhē drəguuaṇt-</i>	'wrongsome' + 'to harm'
46.6b" <i>√hāi</i>	32.16c" <i>√hāi</i>	'to tie up (in a trap)'

*Chart II*

46.1c', e" <i>√xšnu</i>	32.8b' <i>√xšnu</i>	'to gratify'
46.2c' <i>gərəzōi</i>	32.9c" <i>gərəzē</i>	'I complain'
46.2c" <i>-uuāēna-</i>	32.10a" <i>vaēna-</i>	'see'
46.3b' <i>ahu-</i> 'existence'	32.11b' <i>ahu-</i> 'lord'	(homophony)
46.4c' <i>šiiāoθna-</i>	32.12a" <i>šiiāoθna-</i>	'action'
46.5a' <i>xšaiia-</i>	32.13a' <i>xšaθra-</i>	'have power, rule'
46.6b" <i>haēθa-</i>	32.14a' <i>haēθa-</i>	'trap, snare'
46.7c' <i>vahišta-</i> 'best'	32.15c" <i>vohu-</i> 'good'	'*goodness'
46.7b <i>hiiaṭ ... drəguuaṇt- ... aēnaṅhē</i>	32.16c <i>hiiaṭ aēnaṅhē drəguuaṇt-</i>	'that' + 'wrongsome' + 'for harm'

*Chart III*

46.1b' <i>x<sup>v</sup>aētu-</i>	32.1a' <i>x<sup>v</sup>aētu-</i>	'family'
46.1b" <i>airiiāman-</i>	32.32.1a" <i>airiiāman-</i>	'tribe'
46.1b" <i>vərəzəṇa-</i>	32.1a" <i>vərəzəṇa-</i>	'community'
46.2c' <i>√ah</i>	32.1c' <i>√ah</i>	'to be'
46.3e" <i>√var</i>	32.2a" <i>√var</i>	'to choose'
46.4a' <i>drəguuaṇt-</i> 'wrongsome'	32.3b" <i>druj-</i> 'Wrongness'	'wrong-'
46.4a" <i>aša-</i>	32.4c" <i>aša-</i>	'Rightness'
46.4d" <i>jiiātu-</i>	32.5a" <i>-jiiāti-</i>	'life. living'
46.5a" <i>xšaiia-</i>	32.5c" <i>xšaiia-</i>	'to have power'
46.6e' <i>vahišta-</i>	32.6b" <i>vahišta-</i>	'best'
46.7b" <i>aēnah-</i>	32.8a' <i>aēnah-</i>	'harm, violation'

46.8d" <i>-jiiātōiš</i>	32.9a" <i>jiiātēuš</i>	‘of living, of life’
46.8a" <i>aēnah-</i>	32.8a' <i>aēnah-</i>	‘harm, violation’
46.9a" <i>huuō...mā</i>	32.10a' <i>huuō...mā</i>	‘he(...)memy’
46.9c" <i>ašauuan-</i>	32.11c' <i>ašauuan-</i>	‘righteous’
46.9d" <i>mraoṭ</i>	32.12b' <i>mraoṭ</i>	‘speaks’
46.9d" <i>gēuš</i>	32.12b' <i>gēuš</i>	‘of the cow’
46.10b" <i>aṅhāuš</i>	32.12b' <i>aṅhāuš</i>	‘of existence’
j46.11a" <i>kāuuaiias(-)</i>	32.14a" <i>kāuuaiias(-)</i>	‘the <i>kavi</i> -s ‘
46.11e" <i>*dāmānē</i>	32.15c" <i>dāmānē</i>	‘in the House’
46.12e" <i>mazdā- ... ahura-</i>	32.16b" <i>mazdā- ahura-</i>	‘Mazdā(...)Ahura’

*Discussion:*

It is clear that Y32, vis-à-vis Y46, was formally built (in fact yielding the Y32 as a concentric ring-compositional structure), via three successive lexemic “skeletons” or “scaffoldings”, each based on the completed donor poem, Y46, as per the order of the above charts. In each of the three stages of contribution, the 19-stanza Y46 “runs out” when the desired sequence of stanzas for Y32 is reached. Since from a viewpoint of compositional order Y46 precedes Y32, it follows that the present numerical ordering of the seventeen individual Gathic poems (*hāiti*-s) is secondary and is based on the ordering the poems into the five metrically etc. based “Gathas”. This conclusion also follows from the various SCRIM charts of relationships between other poems in the Gathic corpus (whose charting also attests the overarching semantic as well as compositional unity of the corpus; see the material and arguments in SCHWARTZ 2010. Therefore, analyses of the corpus based on what is now seen as a secondary sequence are not valid and should be replaced by the relative compositional chronology based on SCRIM tabulation. The details of formal correspondence involved in the above-charted compositional relative chronology Y46 > Y32 are thus relevant for the relationship of the contents between the two poems.

However, the latter project must obviously be preceded by separate accounts of the contents of each of the two poems, beginning with Y46. For Y46 a preliminary analysis, which takes into consideration the ring-compositional structuring of the poems, is at hand in SCHWARTZ: 2003a: 233–239, which I shall now summarize and supplement. Y46.2–9, ring-compositionally a complete poem, was composed when the Gatha-poet was still in quest of patronage. Subsequently, upon acquiring his core patrons, which he names, he completed the poem as an elaborate overall ring composition by adding Y46.1 and Y46.11–19, forming two ring compositions meeting in the center, whereby the totality consists of stanzas paired from each end of the poem, which meet overlappingly in the central Y46.10.

The semantic key to this arrangement is the root  $\sqrt{xšnu}$ , roughly ‘to gratify’ but with connotations of reciprocity. As I hope to detail anew elsewhere, this root is cognate and synonymous with Archaic Greek *\*ksenw-*, which like the Avestan root re-

ferred to three pairs: guest and host, patron and poet, and worshiper and god, all based on the Indo-European model of gift-exchange. Av.  $\sqrt{xšnu}$  and Arch. Gr. *\*ksenw-* go back to *\*-w-* extensions of a Proto-Indo-European root *\*ksen* ‘to exchange, be mutual’, which gave OAv. *xšqnmānē* Y 29.9 ‘instead’ (corresponding often in SCRIM charts with  $\sqrt{xšnu}$ , SCHWARTZ 2010: 221, paragraph 4, and 221 f., Charts I and II), Ossetic *(æ)xsæn* ‘mutual, in common’, and Old Irish *ar son* ‘in requital, instead’. Indeed, the naming of the patrons follows the poet-priest’s rhetorical question of who will /xšnau/ him gain eternal fame and well-being. More importantly, the first two and last two stanza-pairs of Y46 are in an obligatory formal relation with the center, Y 46.10, in which the poem’s composer assigns paradisaical reciprocities to his supporters. In the final stanza-pair the poet(-priest), claiming to be requiting ( $\sqrt{xšnu}$ ) his god (for the patronage gained, as promised at Y 46.1), metes out eschatological boons and banes in accordance with those treated him with hospitably and inimically. Thus, the poem’s structuring is an iconic representation of the cycles of patronly/cultic exchange, based on the realia of the poet-priest’s need for patronage.

We may now turn to how Y 32 is related to Y 46. Whereas in Y 46 the Gathic poet’s quest for patronage achieves fulfillment in Y 32, the problem is the result of his having gained great patronage, whereby the rivals of the poet-priest and their doings, whose duplicity is indicated throughout the poem, must be addressed. One may now begin with the SCRIM charts as reflecting how Y 46 yields a counterpart of sorts in Y 32, for which relationship only a few important points will be made.

Re Y 46.1 & Y 32.1: In the former, family, community and tribe are listed as not treating the poem’s author with hospitality/patronage; in the latter the same list refers to the righteous followers of the Gathic poet’s advocacy of Mazdā Ahura and make declaration that they will be His messengers (*dūta-*), and be holding back /(*dāraiiō*) the Godhead’s enemies, whereas the society of the devil-worshippers, mouthing these same words, mean that they will be obscurant smoke (*dūta-*) and uphold the Godhead’s enemies (SCHWARTZ 2015: 54). Both Y 46.11 and Y 32.14–15, i.e. toward the ends of the poems, the final destination of the patrons of the demons, the *kauui-*s, will be in the “House” of hell. Chart II: Y 46.18–19 & Y 32.8–9: in the former, the Gathic author confidently promises commensurate requitals for the good and the evil, this being his own decision, thus gratifying Mazdā’s will whereas in the latter page, the author, distinguishing himself from the hybris of Yima (minion of the demon Haoma) “Yima ... who went astray swearing (falsely) as he wished to gratify’ (*cixšnuša-*,  $\sqrt{xšnu}$ ) his subject ‘mortals by means of god (himself, cf. e.g. Firdousi on Jamšēd), now humbly declares to Mazdā Ahura that the discernment/decision (*vīciθa-*) is His as to whether our poet-priest is among committers of harmful violation such as Yima. This declaration, in its context, would reflect his poet-priestly rivals’ imputation of his being hybriatic, in view of Y 46.18; cf. as further self-justification Y 49.1 ‘And the greatest Plague(r) ever combats me, who am wishing to gratify (*cixšnuša-*) the poorly herded (flock) with Rightness’.

Now, the analyses given above, if they are correct, seem to attest a real poet-priest in an archaic Indo-European oral society, with a theological message different from that of his traditionalist rivals (as I plan to detail soon elsewhere),

and who has the concerns for profession and mission expected for such a person. Moreover, even from the merely formal sampling discussed above, he is the sort of poet whose skillful and intricate compositions promoting worship of Mazdā Ahura would attract a powerful following in his own time (as is suggested by the lists of patrons), which could be expected to leave at least a trace on the further development of Iranian religious tradition.

This leads us to the following questions: Was it the historical author of the Gathas who is named in the final stanza-pair self-referentially as Zarathushtra, which name also occurs elsewhere in the Gathas as an apparent “signature” in final stanzas (Y 43.16, Y 49.12) or in middle stanzas or stanza-pairs (Y 43.8 as self-identification, and Y 51.11–12 in a question of hospitality/patronage with  $\sqrt{x}šnu$ , and even in absolute central position in Y 28 and Y 50)? And can the Gathic mentions of this name in its variation between first-, second-, and third-person reference nevertheless indicate the real author, as maintained, along with other pertinent considerations, by SCHMIDT 2003? Was our Gathic poet indeed someone whose real name was Zarathushtra, as Zoroastrian tradition has held, and as would fit a self-naming in a competitive Indo-Iranian oral society in the poet-priestly domain? (For Gathic evidence of such a rivalry, see especially Y 31.1 with Y 31.17–19. (For such Gathic passages and those inveighing against the worship of false gods and their priests, most specifically against the Haoma cult at Y 32.10 seq., see last SCHWARTZ 2022: 482 seq.) The praise and recommendation of the worship of Mazdā Ahura, the Gathic author’s appeals to him, all of which pervade the corpus’ passages, provide seemingly inescapable evidence our poet was a priest. But should the lack of a personal name in the only identification of a specific priestly office in the Gathas, i.e. *zaotar-* in the first-person passage Y 33.(5)-6, cast doubt on the equation of this *zaotar-* with the figure who is named as Zarathushtra in the final stanza (14) of our Y 33? Or was Zarathushtra merely a pseudonym? And could the name Zarathushtra been taken from some culture hero known by the Gathic audience as said to have existed in the dim past, and was therefore regarded by them as a pseudonym taken by the still-living authorial reciter of the Gathas? Or could someone, or some group, for some reason, have managed self-effacingly to concoct, for an audience of their time, the Gathic corpus with all its concerns for patronage and address to patrons, all under the name of a fictive Zarathushtra, and why?

The foregoing digressive paragraph is not meant as a complete account of questions pertaining to the realia behind the name Zarathushtra in the Gathas, and there may in future be other questions directed against the simple thesis that “Zarathushtra”, so to speak, WAS Zarathushtra, i.e. the real name of the real author of the Gathas. Having reached my main goal of comparing Yasnas 46 and 32, I shall now end this study. In doing so, I again thank Jean Kellens for the spirit of his *défis* to comfortable and unexamined assumptions, and in concluding, I can only agree with his declaration as to Gathic research, “Le temps est venu d’imaginer de nouveaux modes d’approche” (KELLENS 2017: 206).

## Bibliography

- KELLENS, J. 2017: “Les Gâthâs dites de Zarathushtra”. In: E. MORANO/E. PROVASI/A. V. ROSSI (eds.): *Studia Philologica Iranica: Gherardo Gnoli Memorial Volume*. Roma: 119–206.
- SCHMIDT, H.-P. 2003: “Zaraṭuštra and his patrons”. In: C.G. CERETI/F. VAJIFAR (eds.): *The Fire Within, Jamshid Soroush Soroushian Memorial Volume II*. San Diego: 357–376.
- SCHWARTZ, M. 1991: “Sound, sense, and ‘seeing’ in Zoroaster: The outer reaches of orality”. In: *K.R. Cama Oriental Institute International Congress Proceedings*. Bombay: 127–163.
- 2002 [2006]: “How Zarathushtra generated the Gathic corpus”. In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 16: 53–64.
- 2003a: “Gathic Compositional History, Yasna 29, and Bovine Symbolism”. In: S. ADHAMI (ed.): *Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*. Costa Mesa: 195–249.
- 2003b: “Encryptions in the Gathas: Zarathushtra’s variations on the theme of bliss”. In: C.G. CERETI/M. MAGGI/E. PROVASI (eds.): *Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia, Studies in Honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli*. Wiesbaden: 375–390.
- 2010: “Pouruchista’s Gathic Wedding and the Teleological Composition of the Gathas”. In: W. SUNDERMANN/A. HINTZE/F. DE BLOIS (eds.): *Exegisti Monumenta, Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Wiesbaden: 449–448.
- 2015: “Dimensions of the Gathas as Poetry”. In: M. STAUSBERG/Y.S.-D. VEVAINA (eds.): *Wiley Blackwell Companion to Zoroastrianism*. Oxford 51–58.
- 2022: “Gathic *ḥmaṇarōiš*: A Hapax Expatriated Compositionally”. In: C. CANTERA/M. MACUCH/N. SIMS-WILLIAMS (eds.): *The Reward to the Righteous, Festschrift for Almut Hintze*. Wiesbaden: 469–485.