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Manuscripts of the Avesta either contain only the Avestan text (Sāde manuscripts) or the Avestan text with its Pahlavi translation and commentary. All the known Pahlavi Vidēvdād (PV) manuscripts were written in India. We can only hope that one day PV manuscripts written in Iran will come to light in Iran in the same way that several Iranian Vidēvdād Sāde (VS) manuscripts have appeared in the last years. Meanwhile, we have to be content with the Indian PV manuscripts, but to be able to use them critically, we have to study the history of the transmission of these manuscripts.

There are two milestones in the transmission of PV. In the 13th century, no PV manuscript was available in India, but at this time one was brought to India from Sistān. Māhyār Māhādād brought to India a manuscript written by Ardašīr i Wahman i Ṣūrūl Ṣāhmard from a manuscript copied by ῾Homast Wahīšt. All later Indian PV manuscripts are supposed to go back to Ardašīr's manuscript. This was copied twice in India. From one of these two copies, from the copy of ῾Rūstām Mihraḵān Marzabān, two other copies were made by Mihraḵān Kayhusraw, from which all the PV manuscripts in India are descended. According to Westergaard, these are the manuscripts L4 and K1. In the colophon of K1 and the copies of the lost colophon of L4 in E10 and Pt2, it is stated that Māhyār Māhādād was in Sistān, and a copy of Ardašīr's manuscript was given to him. This happened in the
year 1231 A.D according to the colophon of IM (and not in 1205 as Geldner thought). In India, two copies were made of this manuscript of Ardašīr, according to Anquetil. One is the copy made by Rostām Mihrābān Marzabān, L4, K1 and all the other manuscripts known by Geldner are descended from it. Fortunately, we know about the existence at the beginning of the 20th century of a manuscript independent of the copy of Rostām Mihrābān, namely the manuscript IM used by Jāmasp in his edition of Vidēvdād. This manuscript was written in Kermān in 1575 A.D., by Marzabān Frēdōn Wahrām Rostām Bundār. A Zoroastrian Iranian named Siyāwax̌ Ormazdyār brought it to India and presented it to Mānakji Sōhrābji Kāuṣuji Ashburner in 1853 A.D., according to a Persian colophon on the last folio. Finally, it was in Jāmasp’s possession in 1907, but we still do not know where it is now. This manuscript contains a colophon at the end of V9 and other colophons at the end of the manuscript, all of them reproduced by Jāmasp. According to the colophon after book 9, it was copied by Marzabān Frēdōn Wahrām Rostām Bundār in 944 A.H. (1575 A.D.) from a copy by Sahryār Ardašīr Erīc Rostām Ėrīc that goes back to a copy by Wēžan Wahrāmsāh Wēžan, who copied it from the manuscript of Ardašīr. Therefore, it would be very important to locate this manuscript and therefore have a manuscript from a transmission line different from all other known manuscripts.

The second milestone in the history of the transmission of the PV is an event that took place almost 500 years later. It is again Anquetil-Duperron who informs us about it. Because of a dispute between traditionalists and reformists concerning the use of the padām, a priest named Jāmasp came from Kermān to Surat forty years before Anquetil wrote his travel report, that is, sometime in the 1720s. After resolving the dispute, he decided to check the current version of the PV used in Gujarat. He concluded that it was too long and not very accurate in several passages. In order to change this regretful situation he taught Avestan and Pahlavi to three Parsi Dasturs: Dārāb from Surat, Jāmasp from Nawsarī and a third one from Baruch and furthermore left in Surat a corrected PV manuscript. After he went back to Iran, his students continued teaching and correcting their PV manuscripts.

This visit from Sīstān and Jāmasp’s teaching activities were a turning point in the history of the PV transmission. As we will show in this paper, all PV manuscripts copied after his visit are no longer simple copies, but the result of a conscious attempt to improve the transmitted text by correcting it according to the directions dictated by Jāmasp Īrānī. This fact is extremely important, because, with the exception of L4, K1, M13, IM (see above) and, eventually, B1, all known PV manuscripts were copied after this date (as far as we have determined, this is the case of P2, P5, K2, F10, T44, E10, P10, M3 and probably P2). We can not rule out that similar tendencies to correct the transmitted text existed before or elsewhere, but in any case not in the same degree as in the 18th and 19th centuries in Gujarat. Therefore, it is essential to know what kind of modifications they introduced in the transmitted text before we can use them to establish a reading or for the edition of the Avestan and/or Pahlavi versions of Vidēvdād.

1. Jāmasp’s PV manuscript.

Anquetil-Duperron stated that Jāmasp left behind, among other manuscripts, a copy of the PV. According to the information from Rask on the first page of K2, which was recorded by Westergaard, too, Jāmasp Īrānī brought with him a PV manuscript from Iran, but it is not clear whether the manuscript he brought to Surat from Iran and the manuscript he left in Surat are the same. Since we do not have a single PV manuscript from Iran, it would be very interesting to find Jāmasp’s manuscript and be able to check if it is really an Iranian PV manuscript or not. Unfortunately, the current whereabouts of this manuscript are also unknown. Nevertheless, at least two
manuscripts can give us important information about the shape of this manuscript and the sort of corrections and modifications that Jāmāsp introduced in the transmitted text. They are the manuscripts P5 and K2.

In fact, on the first page of K2 there is a note written in Danish by Rask himself13 according to which this manuscript was copied by Dastur Darab from an exemplar brought from Persia by Dastur Jāmāsp Irānī. In fact, it seems very likely that K2 was written by Dastur Darab since the handwriting is very similar to the final section of P5 (that is, everything except the Vidēvdād). Consequently, K2 could be a direct copy by Dastur Darab of Jāmāsp's manuscript.

Our information about P5 (Suppl.Persan 39 of the Bibliothèque National of Paris) is very scanty. In this manuscript at least two different manuscripts are bound together: the first (from the beginning to fol. 295) is a PV; the second contains copies in another hand of Visparad (Avestan and Pahlavi), Srōš Yašt Hādōxt (Avestan, Pahlavi and Sanskrit), Srōzag (Avestan and Persian). The handwriting of the PV manuscript is quite different from that of K2 and the other parts of the manuscript, but the handwriting of the rest of the manuscript is very similar to that of K2. The PV manuscript has a colophon, according to which the manuscript was copied on the day Day pad Mihr, month Day, year 1127 Y.E. (1758 A.D.), that is, the same year that Anquetil started working with Dastur Darab. On the first page of the PV manuscript Anquetil writes: "Manuscrit de Zoroastre avec la traduction pehlevie mêlée de pahz(end) dépouillées par le Destour Darab des chahhrehs ou commentaires superflus qui défigurent celui de Manscherdji."14

As Cantera15 has shown, the manuscripts from Nawsarī, written after Jāmāsp's visit, show a clear tendency to restore parts of the Avestan texts or their Pahlavi translation (PT) missing in the old and seriously worn PV manuscripts L4 and K1. P5 and K2 share this tendency, but, in general, their readings usually agree with one another, but are often different from the readings in the manuscripts of Nawsarī. We shall analyze the editorial procedures of the manuscript copyists below, but it may be useful to mention some points already here to show the proximity of P5 and K2.

In the manuscripts P5, K2, T44 and E1016, in particular, we very often find additions to the text transmitted in L4 and K1. These additions are mainly of two types:

1. Avestan text missing in L4 and K1, but present in the Sāde manuscripts is included
2. Missing PT is included

All the manuscripts contain both these types of additions, but P5 and K2 are much more consistent in adding missing PT. So far, we have found a considerable number of additions to the text of the L4 and K1 family that P5, K2, T44 and E10 have in common. Fourteen of them are Avestan texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V3.41</th>
<th>V9.46</th>
<th>V11.9</th>
<th>V11.1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spiaieiti. yatu.ynam.</td>
<td>yada.</td>
<td>parane. muida.</td>
<td>parsta. ham.radipoam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiaieiti. aashuuyam</td>
<td>yada. va. namato. taro.</td>
<td>parane. muida. kapasti</td>
<td>ham.raedipoam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiaieiti. auuuyam</td>
<td>yada. va. namato. tr.</td>
<td>parane. muida. kapasti</td>
<td>(on the left margin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiaieiti. yatuuyam</td>
<td>yada. va. namato. taro.</td>
<td>parane. muida.</td>
<td>ham.raedipoam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on the margin)</td>
<td>yara.</td>
<td>parane. muida.</td>
<td>(on the left margin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
<td>parane. kapasti</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yada. va. namato. taro.</td>
<td>yara.</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on the right margin)</td>
<td>yara.</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
<td>pasca. aparam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parsta.</td>
<td>parsta.</td>
<td>parsta.</td>
<td>parsta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ham.raedipoam</td>
<td>ham.raedipoam</td>
<td>ham.raedipoam</td>
<td>ham.raedipoam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII.4( , yada. yatu. yada. yatu. yada. yatu. yada. yatu. (on the margin)
VII.15(, yada. yatu. yada. yatu. yada. yatu. yada. yatu. (on the margin)
On several occasions they also agree on the addition of a missing PT, for instance the PT of Ƿରାଣେ. ମୃଦୀ. ପରାଣେ.  କପାତିଶୀ. in V11.9 or the PT of ṭାଦ୍ୱ.ଚନ୍ଦୋ. ୟଳ୍ୱ. ତାତ୍ୱସ. in V13.47.

On the other hand, P5 and K2 share additions missing in T44 and E10. Most of them are additions of missing PT:

- V15.21 PT of ṭ ispem. ṛ. ahmāṭ.  ṯrahām.  kārēnaunaait. ṣaṭ. ǣtē. ṣyōi. śpānā. uz.jarṣan;
- V18.5 PT  mā. dim. mṛuīā.  āṭrauwaunām. uītī. mṛaōt. ahrūō.  mazdā. ā. aṣâum. zaraḏūsṭra.

Only on two occasions do P5 and K2 agree on the addition of an Avestan text that does not appear in T44 and E10: V15.8 yezi. ṭat. paitī. irišiiciti and V17.8 pairī.karom. pairī.kārāiōis.

Conversely, P5 and K2 are the only known PV manuscripts that omit the PT of V18.6 tam. dim. mṛuīā.  āṭrauwaunām. uītī. mṛaōt. ahrūō.  mazdā. ā. aṣâum. zaraḏūsṭra. In all other PV manuscripts, with the exception of T44 and E10, the Avestan text is omitted, but not the PT.

Other very revealing cases are V13.37g vaēmi. vā. urūdi. vā. urūdi. vā, which is missing in LA, K1 and M3. P5 and K2 have vaēme. vā and apō. vā, while urūdi. vā is missing. P2 and E10 (and T44 on the left margin) restore the whole text.

P5 and K2 also agree on an extreme tendency to rearrange texts that are out of order in L4 and/or K1 and similar manuscripts. As we will see later, this is a general trend, but in P5 and K2 the number and details of the agreements are very significant. For example, these two manuscripts are the only ones that remedy the disorder in V3.25 to V3.30. They are also the only manuscripts that tend to rearrange the word order of the PT in order to preserve the Avestan word order in the PT, even in the case of the enclitics.

In our opinion there is no doubt about the close relationship between P5 and K2, although it is not easy to establish the exact relationship between the two. It is not very probable that one was copied from the other, because K2 includes the Avestan text and PT of V12, not included in P5, as in the old PV manuscripts. In its turn, K2 cannot be a direct copy of P5, because small additions in the PT present in P5 are sometimes, though not often, not wholly completed in K2, for instance, the PT in V13.47 t'lyk k'mk cgwnc
dwc, which appears only in P5, T44 and E10, while in K2 only cygwn dwc is written. There are also small Avestan fragments present in P5 but missing in K2, for instance, V16.8-9 hê. pa.ncạ. xaflower. sa.cânte... yaṭ. hê. pa.ncạ. xaflower. sa.cânte. airime. gât. hê. nîshdâta. vi spas. à. ahmâl. yaṭ. hê. missing in K2 (L4, K1 and T44), but present in P5 (also in P2, E10 and M3).

Although the concrete role of Dastur Darâb is yet to be established, it is clear that the two manuscripts are situated in the sphere of Dastur Darâb and somehow related to Jâmâsp Irânî’s visit to Surat. For K2 we have Rask’s information that K2 is a copy of Jâmâsp’s manuscript. Concerning P5, Anquetil’s note (see above) that useless parts of the PT had been taken out reminds us of his remark that Jâmâsp thought that the PT was too long. Thus, it seems very likely that P5 and K2 provide us with information about the shape of Jâmâsp’s manuscript, and both of them must therefore be checked in order to establish whether they continue a manuscript tradition different from the L4 or K1 family and whether it is an Iranian independent tradition or not.

If Jâmâsp really brought one manuscript from Iran and P5 and K2 were copies of it, then P5 and K2 would contain the only evidence for the Iranian PV transmission line and so be very important manuscripts, indeed. However, as Westergaard already pointed out, K2 also has variants and omissions in common with L4 and K1, which means that it cannot have belonged to a different manuscript family. Geldner seems to have shared this opinion, because he stated that K2 is simply a revision of the Vidēvdâd text prepared by Dastur Dârab at the instigation of Dastur Jâmâsp.

In fact, P5 and K2 share several omissions with L4 and K1. Westergaard noticed that in V13.47b the Avestan text +xâpâiaoao. yađa. tâiuish is lacking in L4 and K1 (also missing in P2 and M3) and in P5 and K2 (but present in T44 and E10). Other such omissions are:

V13.37g vaême. vâ. urûdî. vâ. apô. vâ missing in L4, K1, and M3. P5 and K2 have vaême. vâ. apô. vâ, but omit urûdî. vâ. P2 and E10 (and T44 on the margin) have the whole text.

V13.48 ai.št. haem. yađa. apa. namelytûkahe is missing in all PV manuscripts, with the exception of T44 and E10.

V18.6 tam. dim. mruiiâ. aďarauanam. uti. mrao. ahu. mazdâ. âi. ašdâm. zaradûstra is missing in all PV manuscripts, with the exception of T44 and E10 too.

On the other hand, although several displaced texts have been corrected in P5 and K2 (as the well-known displacements in V3.25-32 and 18.7-51), in other passages P5 and K2 show the same displacements as L4 and K1 (e.g. V2.18 ff.). Consequently, it is clear that the manuscript which Jâmâsp supposedly corrected did not belong to a tradition different from the other Indian PV manuscripts. Among the Indian PV manuscripts, P5 and K2 belong, beyond reasonable doubt, to the family of K1. This is clear from the fact that, despite the tendency to restore omissions, P5 and K2 have several omissions in common with the family of K1:

V9.9: kađa. gâmañ. hancajita appears in L4, T44 and E10, but is missing in all the manuscripts of the K1 family (except P10, where it is completed by a second hand on the margin), as well as in P5 and K2.

In V18.51 the omission of upa. sûram. frašô. kârtim and its PT is very interesting. This text appears in L4 and the manuscripts of its family, but it is missing in the family of K1 (K1, M3, P2, P10 [included by a second hand]). In P5 and K2 the PT is omitted and, regarding the Avestan text, only upa. sûram is included, while frašô. kârtim appears on the margin (K2) or above the line (P5).

V19.24: K1, P2 and M3 (and the available manuscripts of the K1 family except P10, where it is completed by a second hand).
leave out vohu gaonanqm, which is present in L4, T44 and E10, but missing in P5 and K2.

Actually, there is not a single omission in common only with the family of L4, with the exception of Ph1. MTA in the gloss of V11.10.

It is also noteworthy V8.34b-c noit. huškō. +huškuuai. +sraššieiteit. yezi huškō. huškuuai. sraššieintim. xāṅhāt. The copyist of K1 springs from the first huškuuai to the second one and omits sraššieiteit. yezi huškō. huškuuai. This mistake appears in all manuscripts of this family, including P5 and K2, but not in the manuscripts of the L4 family.

Also revealing are variants like the one found in V13.36. Here K1 and the manuscripts of the L4 line have variants for xisgmno (K1, K9 isimno) with s similar to asmano (L4, E10 asmano; T44 asmano), while the rest of the manuscripts of the K1 line have variants with p: P2, P5 ipimno; K2 isimno; M3 ipimno. Although K1 has a variant with s, it is obvious that P5 and K2 represent the same tradition as P2 and M3, descendants of K1.

Accordingly, it seems obvious that P5 and K2 belong to the family of K1 and cannot be copies of a manuscript brought by Jāmāsp from Kerman to Surat. If Jāmāsp brought a manuscript from Iran we do not have a copy of it. Probably he compared his manuscript with the standard copies in Surat (most of them belonging to the tradition of K1). Thus P5 and K2 are a group of manuscripts from Surat corrected according to the teachings of Jāmāsp Īrānī in the sphere of influence of his main disciple, Dastur Dārāb.

2. The modifications of the transmitted Avestan and Pahlavi text in P5 and K2

As mentioned above, Anquetil informs us that, when Jāmāsp examined the current Vidēvdād tradition in Gujarat, he found the translation to be too long and not very exact. Hence he started to teach Avestan and Pahlavi to three Parsi Dasturs: Dārāb from Surat, Jāmāsp from Nawsarī and a third one from Baruch. Anquetil attributes the continuation of this task to Dastur Dārāb:

"Darab, premier Disciple de DJamasp, & Destour Mobed consommé dans le connoissance du Zend & du Pehlvi, voulut corriger la Traduction Pehlevie du Vendidad & rectifier quelques endroits du Texte Zend, qui lui paroisoient ou transposés, ou présenter des répétitions inutiles".

Thus, various "editorial" activities are attributed by Anquetil to Jāmāsp and Dastur Dārāb. Concerning the PT he mentions:

1. Jāmāsp found the PT to be too long, so he presumably tried to shorten it.
2. Both Jāmāsp and Dastur Dārāb found the PT not very accurate, so both tried to correct it.

As far as the Avestan text is concerned, Anquetil attributes modifications of the transmitted text only to Dastur Dārāb, namely:

1. rearrangements of misplaced texts
2. deletions of useless repetitions

2.1. Editorial changes in the Pahlavi translation

As for the PT, compared with the old PV manuscripts, this appears to have been both shortened and corrected in P5 and K2. First of all, both manuscripts tend to leave out the long commentaries and many of the short glosses in the PT. When the glosses or commentaries include Avestan quotations, then these are included in the manuscripts with their PT too, which is always missing in the old PV manuscripts. A good example is the first paragraph of Vidēvdād (V1.1), where a gloss with Avestan
quotations is included. The standard transmitted text is the following:

1.1 | a] gwpt-š ‘whrmzd OL. spytm’n 26 zltwšt 27 | b] L YHBNW-t spytm’n 28 zltwšt 30
gyw’k l’mšn 31 dhšn 32 LA AYK dt 33 [YKOYMWN-yt] š’n’yh [ZNE 34 AYK 35 ANŠWA 36 ZK gyw’k AYK KN [YLWYNW-yt ZY-s 38 xN9 39 plwlynd 2-s 40 ŠPYL MDNEN-yt 41 AYK nywktl W 42 š’n’t x 43 L YHBNW-t 44 | c] ME HT L LA YHBNW-t HWE-yd spytm’n 42 zltwšt 46
gyw’k l’mšn dhšn 47 LA AYK 48 YHBNW-t [YKOYMWN-yt 49] š’n’yh 50 [d] hlwsp 51 hw y 52 š’t’wmd 53 ‘yl’ntwc 54 pr’c OZLN-šnyh 55 YHBNW-t 56 HWE-yd 57 [ på] 58 k1 YKOYMWN-š 59 HWE-yd OD-š’n 60 OZLN-tn 61 LA twb’n YHBNW-t 62 HWE-yd ME MN kyšwl OL 63 kyšwl BRA 64 PWN 65 plw’n 66 <y> yžd’n OD OZLN-tn 67 LA twb’n AYT MNW ’ytwn YMRRWN-yt 58 y9 69 PWN-c ZK <y> ŠDYA-s’n 70 š’yt OZLN-tn | B] ‘asö. rámā, dāītim. 71 nōit. ajoj, rámišt ām. 72 ] KRA 73 2 3ywK 74 2 l’mšn y 75 gyw’k AYT MNW ZK wyc 76 l’mšn 77 MN lwššk’yh 78 YMLWN-ym 79 [C] ‘paoirīm. hitūm 80 ] HNA 81 m1 AYK pltwm k1 W 82 DYN-OL 83 ZK’ 84 gyw’k blhynt 85 dtysl 86 OL ZK 97 gyw’k OD mynwg y 88 zmyk 89 hm’k PWN 90 ‘ywkltkyh 91 BRA YHBNW-t 92 ptyd’lk KRA 93 ZK gyw’k 94 AYK 2 BRA 95 YMLWN-ym 96 3ywK ZK PWN bwn dhšn 97 3ywK 98 ZK PWN 99 AHL [’uč. ahe. paitiārām.] 100 hm’k 101 ZK y 102 AHL | D] gyw’k W 103 lwst’k ZK 104 AYT MNW ’ytwn 105 YMLWN-ym 106 y 107 gyw’k ZK gyw’k AYK 108 ANŠWA 109 QDM LA 110 KTLWN-d 111 W

In P5 and K2 the text runs as follows:

1.1 | a] gwpt-š ‘whrmzd spytm’n zltwšt | b] L YHBNW-t’ spytm’n zltwšt gyw’k l’mšn dhšnh LA AYK dt [YKOYMWN-yt] AYK nywktl W 3’n’t L YHBNW-t 3 | c] HT ME L LA YHBNW-t HWE-yy spytm’n zltwšt gyw’k l’mšn’ dhšnh LA AYK YHBNW-t [YKOYMWN-yt] 3 [d] hlwsp 3 hw y š’t’wmd 3’yl’ntwc 34 pr’c OZLN-šnyh 35 YHBNW-t 36 HWE-yd 37 [ ] 38 HNA 39 k1 YKOYMWN-š 40 HWE-yd OD-š’n 41 OZLN-tn 42 LA twb’n YHBNW-t 43 HWE-yd ME MN kyšwl OL 43 kyšwl BRA 44 PWN 45 plw’n 46 <y> yžd’n 47 OD OZLN-tn 48 LA twb’n 49 AYT MNW ’ytwn YMRRWN-yt 50 y9 51 PWN-c ZK <y> ŠDYA-s’n 52 š’yt OZLN-tn | B] ‘asö. rámā, dāītim 53 nōit. ajoj, rámišt ām. 54 ] KRA 55 2 3ywK 56 2 l’mšn y 57 gyw’k AYT MNW ZK wyc 58 l’mšn 59 MN lwššk’yh 60 YMLWN-ym 61 [C] ‘paoirīm. hitūm 62 ] HNA 63 m1 AYK pltwm k1 W 64 DYN-OL 65 ZK’ 66 gyw’k blhynt 67 dtysl 68 OL ZK 69 gyw’k OD mynwg y 70 zmyk 71 hm’k PWN 72 ‘ywkltkyh 73 BRA YHBNW-t 74 ptyd’lk KRA 75 ZK gyw’k 76 AYK 2 BRA 77 YMLWN-ym 78 3ywK ZK PWN bwn dhšn 79 3ywK 80 ZK PWN 81 AHL [’uč. ahe. paitiārām.] 82 hm’k 83 ZK y 84 AHL | D] gyw’k W 85 lwst’k ZK 86 2 hmkwnyh 87 AYT MNW ’ytwn 88 YMLWN-ym 89 y 90 gyw’k ZK gyw’k AYK 91 ANŠWA 92 QDM LA 93 KTLWN-d 94 W

A striking and systematic difference between P5 and K2 is the fact that K2 leaves blanks for the omitted texts, as we can see in this reproduction of the beginning of the commentary of V1.1:
In P5, however, the omissions are not marked at all and the text always runs on. Only the omission of the long commentary in V3.14 is made visible by almost a whole page being left blank.

Another way the transmitted PT has been shortened is by summarizing rather than taking out the glosses or commentaries, which often results in a barely understandable text. This kind of alteration gives us an approximate idea of the limited skills that Jámasp and his disciples had in Pahlavi, but at the same time reveals the existence of a philological and exegetical debate in Surat after Jámásp’s visit similar to that of the Sassanian period attested in the glosses of the standard PT. A good example of an abbreviated commentary is the Pahlavi commentary in V3.7. The standard text is:

In accordance with this trend to shorten the transmitted PT, which Jámásp considered too long, P5 and K2 tend to remove everything that does not have a direct correspondence in the
Avestan text. If we compare the PT of V1.1 (quoted above) in the standard version and in P5 and K2, we easily notice that most prepositions of the standard version (where they replace the case forms of the Avestan) have been removed in P5 and K2, since they have no correspondence in Avestan, for example: gwpt-š ʰwhrmzd spyṭ’m’n” zltwš’ instead of gwpt-š ʰwhrmzd OL spyṭ’m’n” zltwš’; ʰy’l’nwyć instead ʰw’ ʰy’l’nwyć. In the same paragraph, further omissions of words lacking correspondence in Avestan include búd in pr’c OZLWN-šnyḥ YHWWN-t172 HWE-yd, for which P5 and K2 we have pr’c OZLWN-šnyḥ HWE-yd.

It is also interesting to compare the two versions of V2.1b. The standard one is:

\[ \text{kaʃmāi.}^{173} \text{xhrdaesaiō.}^{174} \text{daēnqam.}^{175} \text{yam.}^{176} \text{āhūrīm.}^{177} \text{zaradaṣṭrīm.}^{178} \]

\[ \text{hr}^{179} \text{W}^{180} \text{MNW}^{181} \text{pr’c}^{182} \text{nmwt} \text{ZNE} \text{dyn’}^{183} \text{y}^{184} \text{whrmzd}^{185} \text{W}^{186} \text{zltwš’}^{186} \]

In P5 and K2 the PT runs as follows:

\[ \text{MNW pr’c nmwt dyn’}^{185} \text{y}^{186} \text{whrmzd zltwš’} \]

As in the previous example, the prepositions are missing, as well as the agent ʰa-t and the demonstrative ēn, all without correspondence in Avestan.

Another example of this is the trend to omit also postpositions like rāy, e. g. V2.4c in the standard version:

\[ \text{ADYN}^{187} \text{ZK}^{188} \text{L}^{189} \text{MKBLWN}^{190} \text{gyh’n}^{191} \text{gyh’n’}^{192} \text{hr’}^{193} \text{sl’}^{194} \text{sl’}^{194} \text{plwšn’}^{195} \text{plwšn’}^{195} \text{sr}^{196} \text{sl’}^{196} \text{YHBWN-tn’}^{197} \text{PWN}^{198} \text{nk’s}^{199} \text{dl’snh’}^{199} \text{dl’snh’}^{199} \text{p’nkyh’}^{200} \text{krtn’}^{200} \text{krtn’}^{200} \]

but in P5 and K2:

\[ \text{ADYN’}^{201} \text{ZK L MKBLWN-x2 gyh’n’}^{202} \text{sl’yśn} \]

Probably this inclination to remove every word without a correspondence in Avestan text reflects not only the trend to shorten the PT, but also the attempt to fit the PT as well as possible to the Avestan text in order to produce a more “accurate” PT, which was Jámaśp’s second aim.

Comparable to this trend is the total adaptation of the word order of the PT in P5 and K2 to the Avestan word order. Even in the standard transmitted text, the word order of the PT reflects the word order of the Avestan text, but in P5 and K2 this tendency is more extreme. For example, in V13.4 the standard PT does not preserve the word order of the Avestan text exactly, but adapts it to fit the Pahlavi syntax:

\[ \text{yo.}^{203} \text{janat. spānəm. sīḏrəm.}^{205} \text{urūuṣarəm.}^{205} \]

The standard PT is:

\[ \text{MNW}^{204} \text{KLBA}^{205} \text{MHYTWN}^{206} \text{y}^{207} \text{x}^{208} \text{syd}^{208} \]

In P5 and K2 we find:

\[ \text{MNW MHYTWN}^{207} \text{y}^{208} \text{ZK KLBA sydk} \]

The same trend is reflected in the preservation of the Avestan word order even in the case of the enclitics, as we have already seen before in the PT HT ME for yeū5izi. (V1.1) instead of the standard PT ME HT. The case is similar in V4.1:

\[ \text{aēsəmcī.}^{210} \text{idrə.}^{210} \text{vā.}^{211} \text{idrə.}^{212} \text{vā.}^{213} \text{xənfəncə.}^{213} \text{maēdənahe.}^{214} \text{x’āi.}^{215} \text{pairi.}^{216} \text{guruaiaeite.}^{216} \]

The standard PT is:

\[ \text{OLE-š’n’}^{216} \text{cygwn}^{216} \text{BYN}^{218} \text{YWM}^{218} \text{yəp}^{218} \text{TME}^{219} \]

\[ \text{BYN}^{219} \text{L}^{220} \text{LY}^{220} \text{myhn’}^{220} \text{PWN}^{220} \text{NPŞE-yh’}^{220} \text{QDM}^{220} \text{OH}^{220} \text{DWN-yt}^{222} \]

but in P5 and K2:
Jāmāsp's attempt to make the PT more accurate was not limited to matching the word order and the number of words of the PT with the Avestan original. In fact, in P5 and K2 we note a reflection about the correction of the transmitted PT. Consequently, the transmitted PT was changed in several passages, such as V2.1:

\[ + \text{kāmā,} \text{paoirīō,} \text{māṣṭiānaam,} \text{aparāsaagha,} \text{tūm,} \text{yō,} \text{ahūro, mazdā.} \]

The standard PT is:

\begin{align*}
\text{OL}^{230} \text{MNW pltwm MN ANŚWTA-} \text{h}' \text{hmpwrskyh}^{231} \\
\text{HWE-}y’d^{222} \text{LK MNW}^{233} \text{'whrmzd } \text{HWE-}y’d^{234} \\
\text{[AYK-t hmpwrskyh}^{235} \text{y}^{236} \text{PWN dyn’ pltwm}^{237} \\
\text{LWTE MNW}^{238} \text{kr}‘^{239} \text{]} \\
\end{align*}

In P5:

\begin{align*}
\text{MNW pltwm ANŚWTA-} \text{h}' \text{hmpwrskyh} \text{LK MNW} \\
\text{'whrmzd AYK LWTE LTK pwrskyh PWN dyn’} \\
\text{MNW kr}‘ \text{MN pltwm} \\
\end{align*}

In K2:

\begin{align*}
\text{MNW pltwm ANŚWTA-} \text{h}' \text{hmpwrskyh} \text{LK MNW} \\
\text{'whrmzd MNW LWTE LTK pwrskyh MNW kr}‘ \\
\end{align*}

There is a slightly different understanding of the Avestan text in P5 and K2. The standard PT correctly translates 'aparāsaagha as a verb, while Jāmāsp and Dastur Dārāb translate it as a substantive. Obviously they have taken the PT hampursaghī from the gloss and we can seriously ask ourselves if they had skills enough to form new Pahlavi sentences. In fact, when we find a different PT in P5 and K2, mostly it is taken from the glosses or a mixture of the standard PT and the glosses. It is very interesting that, as we will see later, the majority of the differences between P5 and K2 are found precisely in cases where the standard PT has been altered.

Sometimes we have noted differences between the standard PT and that in P5 and K2 in the choice of words, as in V11.10, where, instead of the standard PT MN 'hīyyh pyt’kyh for Av. asa.cīdra, P5 and K2 have MN 'hīyyh twhmk. This obviously reflects a different understanding of and an exegetical debate about Avestan cīdra in this compound.

To conclude this survey of the modifications of the PT, we must mention that on some occasions P5 and K2 include certain glosses missing in the standard PT that probably go back to the teachings of Jāmāsp, as in the PT of V4.1 yō. naire. nāmāhānte. moī. nāmō. pait. baraiti. The standard PT is:

\begin{align*}
\text{MNW 'OL}^{240} \text{GBRA y}^{241} \text{'nyhśn’wmnd}^{242} \\
\text{[MDNOM}^{243} \text{p’yt’ YHBWN-t}^{244} \text{]} \text{ś LA nyhśn}^{245}, \\
\text{LAWH}^{246} \text{YBLWN-d}^{247} \text{[AYK-ś LA YHBWN-yt}^{248} \text{]} \\
\end{align*}

P5 and K2 have:

\begin{align*}
\text{MNW}^{249} \text{GBRA 'nyhśn’wmnd}^{250} \text{ZK LA nyhśn}^{251} \\
\text{QDM YBLWN-d}^{252} \text{[AYK LA YHBWN-t’ MNW twb’n’HT OL YMRWN-yh}^{253} \text{]} \\
\end{align*}

Here the two manuscripts add the gloss MNW twb’n’ HT OL YMRWN-yh, but omit half of the PT.

2.2. Editorial changes in the Avestan text

As we have seen, the modifications of the transmitted Avestan text attributed by Anquetil to Dastur Dārāb are, on the one hand, the deletion of unnecessary repetitions and, on the other hand, the rearrangements of displaced texts.
As far as the first is concerned, P5 and K2 do not show a greater tendency to abbreviate repetitions than the old manuscripts L4 and K1. In fact, they have fewer abbreviations of repetitions than the old manuscripts.

For instance, in V13.25, L4, K1, T44, E10 and M3 abbreviate tarō.pi[həm]. daste. yim, repeated from V13.20 to 13.27, but not P5 and K2.

A larger omission in the standard PV manuscripts appears in V8.19-20. Here the Avestan texts of the Ahunavairia (Y27.13), of the kōn.nā (Y46.7) and of the kā. varəərım (Y44.16) are shortened, but are complete in the Sāde manuscripts and in P5 and K2 (but not in F10, T44 and E10).

As for the rearrangement of the Avestan text, we have to differentiate between two procedures: 1. the rearrangement of Avestan texts misplaced in the course of the written transmission, often because some folios were in the wrong order in an earlier copy; 2. different divisions of the Avestan and Pahlavi texts with respect to the standard PV manuscripts.

Regarding the first type, it is clear that, when the scribes noticed that a displacement existed, they would restore the correct order. This is the case with the displacement of one folio in V3.25-32. At the end of V3.25c the PT stops and a part of V3.29 follows. After V3.32d the missing part of V3.25c appears and continues with V3.26 up to the missing part of V3.29. Obviously a folio was misplaced. All manuscripts have this displacement except P5 and K2, where the original order has been restored. In V18 two folios are misplaced. The folio containing V18.7-11 is placed after V18.51 and the folio with V18.12-16 after V18.44. Only in P5, K2, T44 and E10 the original order has been restored. The restoration of the original order in these passages is certainly the result of the teachings of Jāmāsp, at least that of V18. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that in other instances the displacements were not recognized, either by Jāmāsp or by Dārāb, and the arrangement of L4 and K1 was maintained (e.g. V2.18ff., see above).

When Rask bought the manuscript K1, folios 201 and 203 were misplaced, so that the sequence of the folios was 199-201-200-203-202-204. The consequence was in great disorder in V9.16-24. This disorder was reproduced in all the manuscripts stemming from Mi3, so it must be at least so old as 1594 A.D. Since P5 and K2 stem probably from Mi3, they should show the same disorder. Nevertheless, in P5 and K2 the text appears in the right sequence.

It is a further peculiarity of P5 and K2 that they often divide the Avestan text and its PT differently from the standard PV manuscripts. Interestingly, although both manuscripts share the same tendency, they differ in the concrete divisions. For instance, in V13.37 the standard division is the following:
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In K2 the Avestan text is not interrupted by the PT until aŋaṭ. haca. +iriššiāt. In P5 the first division of the Avestan text appears after fra.himcit. nidadarazaiûn. The second division comes after yezi. nōt. spā. ... nāuuaiani. pāioišiāte, as in the standard manuscripts. Also the third division agrees with the standard version.

But the greatest modification of the Avestan text lies in the addition of all the Avestan quotations included in the Pahlavi glosses and commentaries. As already mentioned, most of the Pahlavi glosses and all the commentaries were taken out of P5 and K2, but the Avestan quotations are included, but only Avestan quotations that refer to other Avestan passages (extant or lost). Avestan words that are used as terms technici or technical expressions are not included. This is why expressions like dāitiīo. pāirišta or vitasti.drajō frrārānī. drajō, repeated several times in the Pahlavi commentary of V5.4, for example, are not included either in P5 or in K2.

Not only the Avestan texts from the Pahlavi glosses were added, but also Avestan texts available in the Sādē manuscripts (including K2, P5, E10 and T44, see above), but missing in the PV manuscripts probably because of transmission problems. The common additions of Avestan texts of P5, K2 and E10, T44 were already listed above. The following ones are exclusive of P5 and K2:

- V15.8 yezi. tāt. paitī. iriššiicitī
- V17.8 paitī.kārōm. paitī.kāraioiš

It is also interesting the addition in P5 and K2 of texts missing in the family of K1, but available in the family of L4. In V7.41c the

Avestan text visō. vispaitī. bišaziiaṭ. mādēmām. staarom. arajō and the PT of mmānahe. mmāna.paiti. bišaziiaṭ. nītāmām. staarom. arajō are omitted in the manuscripts of the family of K1 (K1, M3 and P10 [though added on the margin]), but appear in P5 and K2 (and in P2 as well). The fact that not only the Avestan text but also the PT is added and agrees with the PT of the manuscripts of the family of L4 point out to a direct comparison of P5 and K2 with at least one manuscript of the L4 family. That is not very surprising if we take into account the fact, for example, that Jāmāsp from Nawsāri was participating at Jāmāsp's teaching and probably had at hand a manuscript from this family.

It is also very interesting to notice that the Avestan texts were not only completed, but sometimes also corrected, when the Avestan text was corrupted in the written transmission. For instance, in V9.21 both L4 and K1 show yezi. stri338. aŋhaṭ. pasca. hē. pourum. paitī.hiŋcōiś.339 instead of the correct text yezi. stri. aŋhaṭ. paitiša. hē. pourum. paitī.hiŋcōiś. pasca. aparom. which appears in the Sādēs and is confirmed by the PT: HT-ε NKB AYT ptyλk OLE pyš ODM Șncyyh AHL ps. In K2 the omission pasca. aparom is completed, as it happens often. Consequently, the PT is changed for better corresponding the Avestan text in HT NKB AYT AHL AHL OL LOYN ODM Șncyyh / AHL ps. But in P5 the Avestan text is modified according to the Sādēs and the PT in: yezi. stri. aŋhaṭ. paitiš. hē. pourum. paitī.hiŋcōiś. pasca. aparom.

When new Avestan citations were included and a PT was not available, a new PT was invented for them. An example of this systematic practice has already been shown above in the reproduction of V1.1 in the standard version and in P5 and K2. It is interesting only to note that, although K2 includes every Avestan quotation, some of them are missing in P5, frequently the last of several. Their PTs in P5 and K2 are identical, only with some minor differences. Consequently, we can assume that they go back to the teachings of Jāmāsp.
To sum up, it is clear that, in general, P5 and K2 show the tendencies which Anquetil attributes to the editorial activity of Jāmāsp Irānī and Dastur Dārāb, with the exception of abbreviations of repetitions. According to Anquetil’s information and our scrutiny of the two manuscripts, we can state that an intensive revision of the transmitted text took place indeed. The main alterations of the transmitted text affected the PT, which was drastically shortened by the deletion of most of the glosses and all the long commentaries. Moreover, an extreme adaptation of the PT to the Avestan text took place: most of the words without equivalents in the Avestan text were omitted (prepositions, postpositions, etc.); the Avestan word order was maintained in the PT, even in the rare cases where the Pahlavi translators of the standard PT felt the need to change it. Finally, the PT was quite often changed, mostly by shortening the standard PT and combining it with the following gloss.

As far as the Avestan text is concerned, the interventions of Jāmāsp Irānī and Dastur Dārāb were limited, on the one hand, to the inclusion of Avestan texts missing in the transmitted version of the PV manuscripts, but present in the Sāde manuscripts, and, on the other hand, to the inclusion in the Avestan text of the Avestan quotations in the Pahlavi glosses. After the Avestan quotations were added, a PT was provided for them, as well.

3. Jāmāsp’s teachings and the appearance of "didactic" manuscripts.

Despite the scanty information about Jāmāsp Irānī’s teaching activities and their continuation by Dastur Dārāb in Surat, the comparison of P5 and K2 sheds light on the processes of his teaching and the students’ learning. Above, we have discussed the similarities between the two manuscripts and shown that they probably reflect the main interests of Jāmāsp’s teaching. Summing up what we have already said, we can identify the following main points of Jāmāsp’s editorial teaching:

In the Pahlavi translation:

1. elimination of unnecessary glosses (in fact, most of them).
2. adjustment of the PT to the Avestan text, mainly by preserving the Avestan word order even in extreme cases (where the standard PT shows the usual Pahlavi word order) and by eliminating every word without an equivalent in the Avestan text (mainly prepositions, but also subject/agent markers, etc.).
3. incorporation of a PT for every Avestan text without PT in the standard PT, either by creating a new PT, since the old one was probably lost during the written transmission of the PV manuscripts, or by including also a new PT for the Avestan quotations included in the Pahlavi glosses and commentaries.

In the Avestan text:

1. inclusion of the Avestan texts missing in the transmitted version of the PV manuscripts, but available in the Sāde manuscripts.
2. insertion of the Avestan quotations from the Pahlavi glosses and commentaries.

These modifications were not made once and for all, however. The process not only implied that Jāmāsp made a corrected copy from a PV manuscript and that Jāmāsp’s copy was further copied in Gujarat. According to Anquetil’s information, Jāmāsp’s activity was continued by Dastur Dārāb in Surat, and it seems very likely, as we have already mentioned, that in Surat (and in other cities in Gujarat) a philological and exegetical analysis of and debate over Vidēvdād arose as a result of Jāmāsp’s visit, similar to the process that took place in the Sassanian period. This time, however, it was much more limited, chiefly to the inclusion of the Avestan texts they considered missing and the correction of the PT and, only very seldom, to exegetical questions. The inclusion of the Avestan text of V12 and the creation of a new PT for it was surely a consequence of this new exegetical process.
Since some changes introduced in the transmitted text of the PV manuscripts are shared as well by K2 and P5 as by other manuscripts of Gujarat (like E10, T44, F10 and, although less frequently, by P2 and M3), it is likely that Jāmāsp’s visit originated in Gujarat an exegetical and editorial debate about the transmitted text of PV. But a closer comparison will reveal that there is a remarkable number of differences between K2 and P5 that let us see that the process was not altogether uniform and consistent. Hence, it is clear that there was an initial and central process, namely Jāmāsp Irānī’s teachings and that this process was continued in Surat by Dastur Darāb in his teaching activities as well as in the editorial work. In other places others continued the work and even in Surat other schools existed, as we will see in the second part of this paper.

Direct evidence of the existence of this new exegetical process is, beside V12 and its PT, the fact that certain Avestan words whose PT is not attested in the standard PT, because their meaning was still unknown in Sassanian times, usually show a blank in K2, while in P5 they are usually translated. This translation is hardly to be attributed directly to Jāmāsp, because, if that were the case probably all manuscripts of this kind would have the translation, but the translation is not the same in all manuscripts. The case of V11.9 illustrates this. As we have already seen, the PT of pāro.nē. mūdī. pāro.nē. kapastī is missing in the standard PT. In K2 only pāro.nē is translated and blanks are left for mūdī and kapastī. But in P5 the PT pwltnm mwtk pwltnm ḳp̣c appears. Phl. mwtk/mūd/ is a transcription of Av. mūdī. The PT of T44 and E10 differs: pwltnm mwtk ḳḷ ṭ ḷ pwltnm ks-dyẉ wḳ. The PT mwtk ḳ ḷ ṭ ḷ "destroyer" appears in Y9.32 for Av. māo.dān.kai̊ rīi̊ a and in Y11.6 for Av. mūra.kācā. Phl. ks-dyẉ wḳ is probably to be interpreted as keh-dēẉ ḳ "little leech". This variation clearly indicates that this PT does not go back to Jāmāsp Irānī.

A striking difference between P5 and K2, which allows us a glimpse at this teaching and editorial activity, is the use of blanks. We have already mentioned that K2 uses them systematically every time it omits a gloss or a long commentary, while P5 uses blanks only rarely. The only large blank in P5 comparable to the blanks in K2 is used for the omission of the long commentary in V3.14. Small blanks appear sometimes in P5 for the omission of glosses, but by far not as often as in K2. One example is V11.1, where the gloss [AYK OD 'aireme.' ṭ 3̣ 3̣ 2̣ LA YHẈ WN.-ṭ 3̣ 4̣ 3̣ ] is omitted:

![Image](image.png)

The same omission and blank are found in K2, but in K2 the use of blanks for the omission of glosses is general, while in P5 it is rare.

In principle, the use of blanks is curious. If Jāmāsp was convinced that the glosses were to be taken out, then it is not easy to imagine that he left a blank in order to complete the missing texts later. One possibility is that it was not Jāmāsp who made use of blanks, but his student Dastur Darāb. Then the question arises why blanks are not present in P5 and also in the other manuscripts of this tradition, among which only the manuscript F10 from Nawsari makes a somewhat similar use of the blanks.

In our opinion, it seems more likely that the introduction of blanks is a direct consequence of Jāmāsp’s teachings. Probably Jāmāsp read aloud before his disciples an in his opinion correct version of a PV manuscript and pointed out every difference between his version and the standard version they found in their manuscripts. In this context the introduction of blanks most likely had a clear practical reason: the blanks were useful to locate
texts to be omitted when copying-correcting other manuscripts later. They were clear marks of texts to be omitted for further copies. That means that manuscripts with long blanks marking omissions were intended primarily as "didactic" or "scholarly" manuscripts, as instruction materials for future copyists and not as the basis text for ritual or other uses. These manuscripts were not properly manuscripts, but guides for the correct copying of further manuscripts. Probably, if one of those manuscripts was copied, then the blanks were omitted and the running text was copied. Thus it is easy to understand why at the end of 1758 A.D. Dastur Dārāb handed out to Anquetil not his own manuscript (K2 or a similar copy), but a copy made by Dārāb Framrōz from Dastur Dārāb's manuscript\(^{345}\), in which no blanks were left. For a stranger who wanted to know the sacred books the "didactic" manuscripts were unsuitable.

Another editorial aspect of this new method is the use not only of long blanks for marking text omissions, but also for marking small parts of the PT which the copyist-editor did not know. V11.9 illustrates this well, where pārāne. kūndi. pārāne. xkūndija is not translated in the standard PT. Moreover, in the same paragraph the standard PV manuscripts omit the Avestan text pārāne. mūidi. pārāne. kāpāstiš. In P5 and K2 the text reappears, but the copyist-editor of K2 notices that the PT of these Avestan words is missing. He seeks a PT, but only pārāne is sufficiently well known to him to try a new PT. For the rest of the words K2 has small blanks:

P5, on the other hand, completes the PT also of the words for which K2 leaves a blank\(^{346}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
|c| & \text{pārāne. } \text{xrū.}^{347} \text{pārāne.}^{348} \text{xruui.}^{349} \text{pārāne.} \\
& \text{būdi.}^{350} \text{pārāne.} \text{būdi.}^{351} \text{pārāne.} \text{kūndi.}^{352} \\
& \text{pārāne.} \text{xkūndija.}^{353} \text{pārāne.}^{354} \text{būsiāsta.}^{355} \text{yā.}^{356} \text{zārīna.}^{357} \\
& \text{pwltynm hlwydlws } \text{pwltynm hlwydlws } \text{znk } \text{pwltynm } \text{bwtk } \text{pwltynm } \text{bwtc } \text{pwltynm } \text{kwand } \text{pwltynm } \text{bws' p' MNW } \text{zhl } \text{[AYK wš } \text{HLMWN-yt W } \text{zhl hnd]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
|d| & \text{pārāne.}^{358} \text{būsiāsta.} \text{yā.}^{360} \text{daRAYGauua.}^{361} \text{/e/} \\
& \text{pārāne.}^{362} \text{mūidi.} \text{pārāne.}^{364} \text{kāpāstiš.}^{365} \text{/f/} \\
& \text{pārāne.}^{366} \text{pairikam.}^{367} \text{yā.}^{368} \text{āiti.}^{369} \text{ātrām.}^{370} \text{apam.} \\
& \text{zām.} \text{gām.} \text{uruuarā.}^{371}
\end{align*}
\]
Another example of the same procedure is V13.35. This time the PT was transmitted (I4, T44, E10 ‘bw, K1, M3 ‘bw probably instead of ‘bw), but the copyist-editor seems not to have been sure about how to correct the transmitted PT (in his original probably ‘bw) and left a blank instead:

```
......
```

This procedure is very common in K2 in the PT of V12. Since there is no tradition of PT of this book, there are a lot of words which the copyist-editor of K2 was not able to translate and for which he left a blank.

In P5 examples of this type are very rare and not quite certain. One possible case of such a blank might be V11.6. The standard PT of gauuc. adaiis. tais. siaoOdnaIs. yais. vahistais. FraEsiamahi (= Y 35.4) is:

```
ZK v*'72 gwspnd'n' dhIs'n' [MYA W w'st] ZK*74 OLE-s'n' kwnsn' [p'hst] OLE-s'n' [ANSWTA- n] p'hIwm plm'dsn' [AYK-s'n'] gwspnd'n' l'd p'hIwm k't ZNE krt' YHWN-yl
AYK p'hst-l [BRA OBYDWN-x] AP-š MYA W
```

Here there is a blank at the end of the PT filled in afterwards by a second hand with the last word of the gloss in the standard PT.

This passage is very interesting as an example that K2 uses blanks not only when the copyist does not know the PT, but also when he is not sure about the accuracy of the transmitted PT. Such cases are not infrequent in K2.

Another similar example is the PT of the quotation of Y38.3 apó. at. yazamaide. +maekaiantiscá. houbuamisca. in V11.5. In the Pahlavi-Yasna the PT of the second part of the passage is reproduced in Paezand:

```
MYA 'ytwn' YDBHWN-m 'maekαιαντις' [pşng y PWN 'wil QDM YKOYMWN-ųt mvny] 'haebuamis / [gI'n' tcšn' ZK-c / [y w3l'ny]
```

In the standard PT the words 'maekαιαντις. houbuamisca are not translated:

```
MYA 'ytwn' YDBHWN-m [MNW /x'ai. 384 aca.385 / ŠM386]
```

In K2, as expected, there is a blank for them, but this time also in P5, again filled by a second hand:
Blanks do not appear in the older manuscripts and consequently it seems clear that this procedure was introduced by Jâmâsp, at least for marking the omission of transmitted texts. However, blanks for an unknown PT are characteristic specifically of K2 and probably an innovation of Dastur Dârâb's and his circle. This agrees with our view that the principal function of the blanks is to mark for a future copyist that the portions of the text omitted have been taken out deliberately and have to be left out when future copies from other manuscripts are made.

In fact, it is evident that the exegetical debate and the process of teaching was not only oral, but was based also in the use of "didactic" manuscripts. In fact, the existence of some differences between P5 and K2 can be explained only if we take a written manuscript as a starting point. A clear example is the PT of V2.6:

\[ \text{áat, hê, zaiia, frabarám, azám, yô, ahuró, mazdā} \]

The standard PT is:

\[ \text{ADYN° OL OLE zy} \ pr{c} YBLWN-x, w L MNW, hwrmdz HWE-m} \]

The PT of K2 that we reproduce shows some differences:

\[ \text{AP-§ 'w' ZK zywnydh pr'c YBLWN-x2 L MNW hwrmdz HWE-m} \]

But there is a striking difference: the PT of zaiia. In K2 it is the usual zyd /zay/ but in P5 ZK zywnydh. In our opinion, ZK is a misreading of \[ \text{zyd} \] and then the copyist had to find a translation for zaiia and he added the wrong zywnydh /zinda/. Consequently the copyist-editor of P5 must have been copying from a manuscript similar to K2.

The copyist-editor of K2 was also working with a manuscript, as passages similar to V1.3 show. In V1.3 P5 as well as K2 shorten the gloss to wóýne, the PT of Av. wóýnanám. The gloss in the standard PT runs as follows:

\[ \text{ADYN}^{388} [\text{AMT}^{389}] \text{ zmst'n}^{390} \text{ BRA}^{391} \text{ pyt}^{392} \]

\[ [\text{AYK}^{393} \text{ OZLWN-yt}] \text{ ADYN}^{394} \text{ physt}^{395} / \]
When the winter falls (it comes), then there are a lot of voíyné [that is, with the misfortune of the winter, everything goes away. There is (a commentator) who says that there is nothing where it cannot get in.]

A short version of this gloss appears in P5: AYK LOYT MNDOM yh "that is, there is nothing". In K2 the gloss is AYK LOYN y MNDOM yh "that is, before the things". Here LOYN is without doubt a misreading of LOYT and understandable just as a misreading of a written version. Since this gloss is a new creation of the Dárâb's school, it is clear that the diffusion of the Jâmâsp's teachings was also based in the use of "didactic" manuscripts.

Nevertheless, most of the differences between K2 and P5 cannot be interpreted as misreadings in one or another manuscript, but reflect real differences of opinion. These differences may reveal that Jâmâsp's teachings were not always identical for all students and sometimes he changed his mind or, more probably, that the instruction and the task of correcting and completing the transmitted manuscripts persisted beyond Jâmâsp's visit and Dastur Dárâb's activity. In fact, despite P5 and K2 both being manuscripts in Dárâb's sphere, the two manuscripts show differences that are not only to be explained by the different type of manuscripts they are (K2 a didactic manuscript; P5 a "normal" manuscript), but show a different reflection on the text and to some extent a different method.

Besides the unlikely use of blanks, the following (already mentioned) are more or less consistent, though small, differences between the two manuscripts:

1. The PTs missing in the standard version and appearing as a blank in K2 are often completed in P5 (e.g. V11.9c-d), that is, P5 is more systematic in completing missing PT.
2. K2 is more systematic than P5 in including all Avestan quotations from the glosses.
3. K2 includes V12 and its PT. The first impression would be that K2 is later, but as we know, at the time of Anquetil's visit, Dastur Dárâb was already an old man and therefore, if Dastur Dárâb was really the copyist of K2, it is not very likely that K2 is much older than P5. Perhaps it is more a difference in method than chronology.

A non-consistent, but systematic, discrepancy is the fact that, when P5 and K2 have a different division of the Avestan and Pahlavi text than the standard transmitted text, they never agree on the division. This means that the possibility of different divisions is common to the practice of both manuscripts, but its concrete application is different.

On the other hand, the PT often differs between the two manuscripts. A very common difference concerns the use of prepositions. As we have already observed, prepositions are often omitted in P5 and K2 in order to reach the same number of words in the Avestan text and the Pahlavi version. This tendency is common in both manuscripts, but in P5 it is more systematic than in K2, although there are cases in which the situation is the opposite one.

We often find differences in the lexical choices. In V5.11 Av. iristahe is translated in the standard PT as lyst. The PT of P5 is similar, namely lystk, but K2 has wtltk instead. In V11.10 Av. vohu appears in the standard PT as 'p'tyh. The same translation is found in K2, while in P5 the PT is wyh. The case of V14.3 is similar: for Av. haðânaepatâiâ the standard PT has a transliteration hdnp'd, but P5 has hwšk "dry". Fluctuation between causative and non-
causative verbs is also frequent, for instance: V5.8e P5 wcyt :: K2 wcynyt; V5.9f P5 lsynyt :: K2 YHMTWN-yt, etc.

To sum up, Jāmāsp's visit was the beginning of a new exegetical process whose principal aim was to produce truthful manuscripts by correcting the standard PV manuscripts common in Gujarat at that time. Most corrections of the transmitted text can probably be traced back directly to Jāmāsp's activity, but the principal consequence of Jāmāsp's visit was in our opinion the rise of a new exegetical movement that continued this task of correcting manuscripts. The main consequences of Jāmāsp's teaching were the modification of the Avestan text, on the one hand, by adding the Avestan texts extant in the Sāde manuscripts, but missing in the standard PV manuscripts, and by adding most of the Avestan quotations included in the Pahlavi glosses in the PV manuscripts. On the other hand, the PT was modified by taking out all the long Pahlavi commentaries and most of the glosses. Other glosses were not left out, but only reformulated in a new and shorter way. Moreover, the word order and the number of words in the PT were modified to fit the Avestan text perfectly. Finally, this new exegetical movement changed some traditional translations, added new short glosses, etc.

The teaching task started by Jāmāsp Īrānī was continued in Surat by Dastur Dārāb and also in other cities (as we will see in the second part of this paper). The principal aim was to create as many new copies of the old manuscripts as possible, but corrected according to the criteria established by Jāmāsp. Beside the teaching activity, the most important tool for this purpose was the creation of a new type of "didactic" manuscripts intended to serve as a guide for the modification of other standard PV manuscripts. The most specific feature of these manuscripts is the use of blanks for marking fragments of the PT to be deleted, when making copies of older manuscripts. A further consequence of this exegetical movement was not only to copy new manuscripts according to the new criteria, but also the correction of available manuscripts. That is the main source for the appearance of a great number of second- and third-hand corrections in a great number of the PV manuscripts.

4. P5, P2 and P10: Anquetil's manuscripts in Paris

A well-known piece of the history of the Avestan studies is the adventures of Anquetil in Surat in obtaining Avestan manuscripts from his teachers Dastur Dārāb and Kaus. He arrived in Surat on March 1st, 1758. Three months later (that is, June 1758) he obtained from them a first copy of the Vidēvdād, namely a PV manuscript, which Dastur Dārāb and Kaus must have copied for him for 100 rupees. According to the information of Anquetil himself, this first manuscript that he got from Dastur Dārāb and Kaus was P5 and the date of the colophon (Day pad Mīr, month Day, year 1127 Y.E.) fits this scenario.

Later he obtained a second manuscript from the chief of the opponent faction of Dastur Dārāb, namely Mancherji. At the end of November 1758, he got a second PV manuscript from Mancherji by means of M. Taillefer. He mentioned that in Mancherji's opinion this was the "most authentic and most accurate copy made in Surat". Anquetil compared the two manuscripts carefully ("lettre par lettre", he says) and concluded that P5 was "trouvé altéré". In February 1759 he confronted Kaus with this information showing him the manuscript of Mancherji. The next day Dastur Dārāb came and brought a third manuscript "parfaitement semblable à celui de Manscherdji". He ensured that all PV manuscripts were similar to this third manuscript. In the first one only the PT was corrected, while in the Avestan text there were only a few transpositions and changes of some letters. He promised a new manuscript of this type and, in addition, a Sāde manuscript.
In this account Anquetil’s use of three different Pahlavi manuscripts is mentioned (a fourth was promised by Dastur Dārāb). In the description of the manuscripts he brought to Paris, however, only two PV manuscripts are recorded:

1. Number 2 from Anquetil is a PV mixed with Pāzand. In his description Anquetil states: "Collationné sur l’Exemplaire de Bikh, Destour Mobed de Surate, & exactement semblable a tous les Vendidads du Guzarate". It has 488 pages.

2. Number 5 from Anquetil is without doubt P5 (Suppl.Pers. 39).

Regarding number 2 of Anquetil, the colophon reproduced by Anquetil coincides with the colophon of P2, which proves that this second manuscript is P2 (Suppl.Pers. 26). The problem arises when it becomes clear that Anquetil brought to Paris not two, but three PV manuscripts.

In principle, the solution seems easy, since Anquetil mentions three PV manuscripts in his travel report (Dārāb’s shortened manuscript, Mancherji’s manuscript and Dārāb’s second, unshortened manuscript) and he brought to Paris three Pahlavi manuscripts. Since P5 is certainly Dārāb’s first manuscript and P2 Dārāb’s second manuscript, P1O (Suppl.Pers. 25) must be Mancherji’s manuscript. Nevertheless, an analysis of the annotations by Anquetil’s hand shows that he has used and collated at least a fourth PV manuscript.

In all three PV manuscripts in Paris we discover annotations by a second hand in a finer ink that are to be attributed to Anquetil. We find four different annotations:

1. Fragard divisions
2. Small numbers about some words
3. Division lines, sometimes with the indication "Page + number"
4. Avestan and Pahlavi quotations

Annotations 3 and 4 are certainly the result of the collation of several manuscripts. As for number 2 we are still not definite about their function. The most frequent Pahlavi annotations are to be found in the first pages of P2. All of them are the result of a collation by Anquetil of P2 with P1O:

- V1.1A

- V1.1B

- V1.1B

- V1.1B

Annotations in P10 stemming from P2 are very rare, but we find at least two:

- In V1.7c the PT of *ayämca. viманāhīm* is *gumānīh*. After this we find *krtn' mltwm'n* in some manuscripts (P2 *krtn' mltwm'n*; F10 *krtn' AN'SWTA'-n*; E10 *krtn' mltwm'n*). In P10 it appears above the line in Anquetil’s hand *krtn' mltwm'n*.

- In V1.20a P10 leaves out *gufrāsc. bārāxāsca* (also K3b, P5, K2, M3 [on the margin]), but it is present in P2, K3a, F10, T44,
E10, L4a and in the Sāde manuscripts. In P10 and in P5 it is written by Anquetil, probably copied from P2.

There is no annotation which could not stem from one of these three manuscripts.

But we reach a different conclusion when we analyze the data of the division lines Anquetil added in his manuscripts. Thus, in P2 and P10 Anquetil marks the beginning of a new folio in another manuscript with a big X and the indication "Page + number" as we can see in the figure:

The change of page is marked in several ways (with two parallel lines, with two X or even with one X), but always without indication of page number.

Since the indications of P2 and P10 agree completely, we can be sure that both manuscripts were collated with a third one. Unfortunately the pagination reflected in these marks does not agree with the pagination of P5, so we must conclude that Anquetil used and collated a fourth, unknown, manuscript.

The divisions give us some indications about the type of manuscript it was. For instance, it is clear that it was not a manuscript of the sort of P5 and K2, as it is shown by the fact that the beginning of page 24 is marked in the middle of the long commentary of V3.14, exactly between AMT-ś and nsḥy in 3.14L. Consequently, Anquetil collated at least four different manuscripts. P2 and P10 were compared to each other and to a third unknown one, while P5 was also collated, but the annotations by Anquetil’s hand are indistinct and it is not possible to determine the manuscript they stem from, since they could stem from either P2 or P10 or even a third one. These manuscripts were not versions corrected according to the new exegetical movement in Surat, but more or less standard PV manuscripts. With the available data it is not possible today to decide if Mancherji’s manuscript was P10 or the unknown manuscript X which was collated with P2 and P10, or even none of them. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that P5 as well as P10 contain at the beginning of the manuscript the same index of fragments, not found in P2. Could that mean that they were the first two manuscripts he had and afterwards he no longer needed such an index? For the time being this question must go unanswered.

One fact we know for sure. Anquetil used not three, but four manuscripts. The first one which Dastur Dārāb gave to him was a manuscript that reflected the exegetical reformist movement in Surat, but not so the other three. When Dastur Dārāb chose this manuscript for Anquetil's instruction he was not trying to cheat him. On the contrary, he handed to him the manuscript he considered had the right version, a manuscript free from the errors that affected other manuscripts in Surat as he had learnt from his teacher Jāmāsp Īrānī.

Actually, Anquetil himself changed his mind regarding this first manuscript. In his travel report it is clear that after collating Mancherji’s manuscript he felt himself cheated, since Dastur Dārāb’s manuscript was "shortened and changed". But when he presented this manuscript to Bibliothèque National he wrote that this manuscript was "stripped of every addition and unnecessary commentaries". He was also convinced by the new, reformist exegetical and editorial trend.

* * * * *
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3 The colophon of IM says:

m'hyt m'hmtr hypt MN hndwk'nh MN'wck str' MNW PWN kn'k' y MYA synnd MNW PWN dynyk wyhwt' KRYTWN-d ŠNT QDM 600 PWN yždkrt' MLKA-'n MLKA ...

Mähýr Mähdâd, Herbed from India, from the city of Ucab, which is near the river Sind, which they call Wehrdz in the Religion, was in the year 600 of Yazdagird, King of kings (…).


7 The identification of this Dârâb, student of Jâmâsp's and Anquetil's teacher years later, is not clear. He has commonly been identified with Dârâb Sohrâb (Westergaard, op. cit., p.6) (Unvala, J. M. (1940), Collection of colophons of manuscripts bearing on Zoroastrianism in some libraries of Europe. The Trustees of the funds and properties of the Parsi Punctayet, Bombay. p.13), but Tehmurâs Dinshâhjî Anklesaria introduced some confusion with a letter accompanying the manuscript Suppl. Pers. 1079, which he donated to the Bibliothèque Nationale. This is a VS manuscript written by Dastur Dârâb Pâhlan in 1104 A.Y., and Anklesaria stated in his letter that this was Anquetil's teacher. Manent, M. D., (1913), "Observations sur deux manuscrits orientaux de la Bibliothèque Nationale (I)", Journal Asiatique 11.1, pp.107-118 and (1913) "Observations sur deux manuscrits orientaux de la Bibliothèque Nationale (II)", Journal Asiatique 11.1, pp.619-632, made it definitely clear that Anquetil's teacher was Dastur Dârâb Sohrâb Bahman Frâmrâz, who copied K9, among other manuscripts.


9 Ibid., volume 1, p.326.

10 "Les Livres que ce Destour a laissés dans l'Inde, sont une Copie exacte du Vendidad Zend & Pehlvi, le Feröësch, la traduction du Vaderguerd & le Nerenguestan."

11 "Vendidad med pehlevi Oversettelse afskrevne af Destur Darab efter et gammelt Exemplar bragt fra Persien af Destur Jamsap irâni".

Table: The transmission of the Pahlavi Vidēvdād in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibid., p.6.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are very grateful to Francis Richard for helping us read this passage.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very close to Geldner’s Pt2.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note that K2 translates only the last two words: <em>cygwn’ dwc.</em></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. Cit., Westergaard, N.L., pp.5-6.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprisingly, F10 includes includes the missing text on the margin.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obviously P2 and M3 as well as P5 and K2 are copied from a manuscript with <em>p</em> and continue the same tradition. It is a pity that Geldner did not record the <em>varia lectio</em> of either M13 or B1. If M13 or B1 had a <em>p</em>-variant, then we would know whether M13 or B1 represents the common origin of our four manuscripts.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibid., volume 1, p.326.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, M3, L4a; T44, E10, L4a ZNE gyw’k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 K3b, P2, F10, T44, E10, L4a; K3a, M3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 K3b, K3a, T44, E10, M3, L4a; P2, F10 ANŚWTA gyw’k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, T44, M3, L4a; E10 ‘w’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 K3a, M3; K3b, P2, F10, T44, E10, L4a ‘s’;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 K3b, K3a, F10, M3, E10, L4a ‘w’; P2, T44 OL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 K3b, P2, T44, E10, L4a; K3a, M3 ZY-s; F10 OD ‘s’;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 K3b, K3a, E10, M3, L4a; P2, F10 MDMEN-yt gyw’k; T44 Šťyhw hwím</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 K3b, K3a, E10, M3, L4a; P2, F10, T44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, T44, M3 Š; E10, L4a ‘w’;</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 K3b, P2, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; K3a &lt; ðuכ. Šl&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 K3b, K3a, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; P2 spytm’n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 K3b, M3; K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, L4a zltwhš;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 F10, T44, L4a; K3b, K3a, E10, M3 dhšnyh; P2 Wdhšn’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 K3b, P2, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; K3a</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, L4a; K3b, M3 YOYMWN-yt’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 K3b, K3a, F10, E10, M3, L4a; P2 ‘š’nny; T44 Šś’nnyh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 P2, T44, L4a; K3b, K3a, F10, E10, M3 hlwšt’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, M3, L4a; F10, E10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, T44, M3, L4a; E10 ‘š’t’ Šmnd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 K3a, F10, K3b ‘ðrṣ-p(y)š’t’ ; P2, T44, E10 Šyl’w’ wyc; M3 Šyl’nwc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 K3b, K3a, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; P2 OZLWN-šnyy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 P2, F10, T44, L4a; K3b, K3a, F10, E10, M3 bwt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, L4a; AYK BYN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 K3b, P2, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; K3a ‘n’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 K3b, P2, F10, T44, E10, L4a; K3a, M3 YKOYMWN-yt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 K3b, P2, M3, L4a; K3a șYHBN-t ; F10 Šm6g; T44 Šwod-s’n OD-s’n’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The above table lists references and corrections for specific passages in the text, indicating the manuscripts and lines affected by variant readings or corrections.
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V1.1 finishes here in P5. The last Avestan quotation and its PT is omitted in this manuscript. This kind of omissions are usual in P5. The case is similar, for instance, in V1.15, where the Avestan quotation vaēdagāhō. noōj. uzōš is included in K2, though with the usual deletion marks, but is missing in P5.

F10, E10, M3; P2, T44 — y —

F10, E10, M3; P2, T44 zmyk

P2, F10, E10, M3; T44 — QDM —

T44, E10; P2 hētōtē; F10 ḫētōtē; M3 ʿsmʾ

P2, F10, T44; E10 žmyk AYT; M3 zmy
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L4, T44, E10, M3 OHĐWN-x₁

222 L4, T44, E10, F10, M3 OHĐWN-x₁
223 P5; K2 šp
224 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, E10, M3, L4a; T44 . L1, P1, L2 kahmār, T46 kahmār, L5, E4 kahamāi
225 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a . L2, L5; L1, P1 paōiriōq, T46 paōiriōq; E4 paoriōq
226 K3b, P2, F10, T44, M3, L4a; K3a, E10 . L1, T46, P1, L2, L5, E4 mēshānam
227 K3b, F10 apērās, K3a, P2, T44, L4a . L1, T46, P1, L2, L5, E4 apērās; E10 apērās, M3 apērās, L5 apērās
228 K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, L4a . L1, T46, P1, L2, L5, E4; K3b, M3 tō
229 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a . L2, L5, E4, L1, T46, P1 yō
230 K3b, P2, T44, E10, L4a; K3a, F10 - OL |; M3 OL
231 P2, F10, T44, L4a; K3b, K3a, M3 - hmpwrsyt |; E10 hmpwrsyt krt
232 K3b, K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a HWE-ʃk
233 K3b, K3a, P2, T44, E10, M3, L4a; F10 MN
234 K3b, K3a, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; P2 HWE-ywʃ
235 K3b, P2, F10, E10, M3; K3a māwt̄ed; T44, L4a hmpwrsyh
236 T44; K3b, K3a, P2, F10, E10, M3, L4a | y |
237 K3a, P2, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; K3b pwtwor
238 K3b, K3a, F10, T44, E10, M3, L4a; P2 AYMT
239 K3b, K3a, P2, T44, E10, M3, L4a; F10 kt
240 L4, P2, T44, E10 OLE; F10, M3 ʃw'
241 L4, F10, T44, E10, M3; P2 | y | |
242 L4, P2 nhōs'wmm; F10 nyyhysn'wmm; T44, E10 nhōs'wmm; M3 nyyhysn'wmm surely, this is nīyāyīšn-omand, see Yasna PT
243 L4, P2, F10, T44, M3; E10 MNDOM-1
244 L4, P2, T44, E10; F10, M3 d'tn'
245 L4 nyyhysn; P2, T44 nyyhysn; F10, M3 nyyhysn; E10 YHBNW-τ MNW
For the close relationship between P5 and K2 it is interesting to note that, in this passage, and only in this passage, both of them have many Persian glosses accompanying the PT of the Ahunavairia.
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in P5 the complete Avestan text is translated. It is interesting to note that two manuscripts from Nawsari (T44 and E10) that usually complete the PT as well, in this passage include the PT of 11.9d, but not of 11.9c. Perhaps Jāmāsp called his disciples’ attention to 11.9d, but not to 11.9c and the completing of 11.9c is the result of the skills of each disciple.

We cannot know if the students were at the same time copying a new manuscript with the corrections of Jamasp or if they had learned them by heart and then copied new manuscripts after the teaching was finished.

Only thus we can understand why Dastur Darab took out the superfluous texts, as Anquetil informs us in the first page of the manuscript, from a manuscript that in fact was copied by Darab Framroz according to the colophon.

Note that in the PT of parane. xru. parane. xruuiy. parane. būdi. parane. *būsiāja. parane. kundi. parane. *kundai. parane. *būsiāsta. yā. zairina only two purdēnam and two blanks appear. Nevertheless,
The transmission of the Pahlavi Vidēvādī in India...

...
In the beginning pages of both manuscripts we have found the following division marks:

Page 6 1.15a 'n X p'hlwm
Page 7 1.18a 'whrmzd X HWE-m
Page 9 2.3d d't'il X HWE-m
Page 11 2.17b 'thš-c X swhl
Page 12 2.19c LA twb'n' X pr'c

Publisher's Note: This article contains photographs faithfully reproduced from the original manuscripts as provided by the authors.