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Y
ears ago I started a complete edition and commentary of the Avestan and Pahlavi versions of an Avestan text known as Vīdēvdād or law in order to keep away the dēw. From the beginning it was clear that the editions of the Pahlavi version (Sanjana 1895; Jamasp 1907; Kapadia 1949) do not maintain scientific standards, but for the Avestan text I trusted the standard edition of Geldner (1886). Therefore I started the search for Pahlavi Vīdēvdād manuscripts (from now on, PV-manuscripts) in European Libraries, in India and in Iran. After obtaining some of them it became clear that Geldner’s edition needs to be revised as well. Consequently the collection of manuscripts, its digitalization and the creation of a tool for the easy use of manuscripts has been one of our principal aims in recent years. The first results and further information about the team, the state of the art, etc. can be consulted in the web www.videvdad.com.

The task of obtaining European manuscripts is easy, but in India the situation is very different. The biggest collection of Zoroastrian (Avestan and Pahlavi)

[1] This word is the equivalent of O.I. devā- and means in Avestan and Pahlavi evil genie responsible for impurity among others.
[2] This confidence is typical among the editors of Avestan texts. For example, three new editions and translations of the Gāthās appeared between 1975 and 1993 (Insler 1975; Kellens and Pirart 1988-1991; Humbach 1991). All of them are based on Geldner’s edition (Geldner 1886) and not on the autopsy of the manuscripts. The same is true for the editions of several Yašt (Gershievitch 1959; Malandra 1971; Oettinger 1983; Panaino 1990-1995; Pirart 1992; Humberg and Isahalov 1998) with the single exception of Hintze’s Zamyād-Yašt (Hintze 1994). She also based her edition on Geldner’s apparatus but has herself seen eight manuscripts.
manuscripts is that of the Cama Oriental Institute. At present it is not possible to reproduce the manuscripts available there, and thus working with the manuscripts in this collection is not easy. The other important center in India is the Meherji Rana Library in Nawsari. A microfilm center has been built there with the support of the UNESCO PARZOR Project and ca. 90,000 pages of manuscripts in Avestan, Pahlavi, Persian and Gujarati have already been microfilmed. A catalogue of the microfilmed manuscripts is available on-line <http://www.unesco-parzor.com/mrlist.htm>.

According to Dhabhar’s (1925) catalogue the following PV-manuscripts are available at the Meherji Rana Library:

- F10 (Dhabhar 1925 7 ff.): two volumes. The first one comprises V 1-8 and was written in 1825 by Dastur Sorabji Kavasji Sorabji Meherji Rana. The second one comprises V 9-22 and at the end V 12 is added by a different hand. It was written by the same copist 8 months later.
- F11 (Dhabhar 1925 8) Vidēvdād, Visparad and Yasna Rapiðwin (all abbreviated), with ritual prescriptions in Pahlavi, as given in books written in Iran. Written in 1876.
- F108 (Dhabhar 1925 60). It contains only an imperfect first fragard.
- E10 (Dhabhar 1925 66)[3]. Complete with colophons. Closer description later.
- T42 (Dhabhar 1925 125). Written by Sorab Framji Sorab Rustom Maneck Mehernosh Kaekobad Meherji Rana, year 1855, according to the colophon in New Persian. After the last 22nd fragard, there are 6 more folios (marked 2-7) which give the 12th fragard in Avesta and Pahlavi.
- T43 (Dhabhar 1925 125). It comprises V 1 to 7.12.
- T44 (Dhabhar 1925 125). Written by Sorab Framroj Sorab Rustom (Meherji Rana), year 1840.

All dated manuscripts belong to the 19th century (F11 1876; T42 1845; T44 1840).

T42 and 43 are in such a bad state of conservation that it has been impossible to get a digitalized copy of them.

From all other complete (or nearly complete) manuscripts we have a digitalized copy: E10, T44 and F10 (although unfortunately only from the first volume). These three manuscripts share a series of very interesting characteristics that differentiate them from all other known PV-manuscripts.

All of them go back to L4, as it is easy to understand on account of the history of the transmission (see the stemma at the end of this paper). All PV-manuscripts Geldner used go back to two different copies made by the same, not very accurate copyist, Mihrābān Kayhusraw, in subsequent years (1323 and 1324).

[3] In the electronic catalogue of the Library it appears as Ed and is labeled as Vidēvdād Sāde.
out of one and the same manuscript signed by Rödstam Mihrabānī Marzabān. The manuscript copied by Mihrabān Kayhusraw in 1324 is well known to us as the Copenhagen manuscript K1. This manuscript has two colophons in which his lineage is clearly stated. It was finally written in Cambay, in 1324.

On the other hand, no manuscript has a colophon stating that it is Mihrabān Kayhusraw's copy in 1323. But already at the beginning of Avestan philology it was noticed that manuscript L4 showed a close similarity to K1 and other manuscripts by Mihrabān Kayhusraw. Unfortunately, the last pages of L4 are lost and therefore we have no colophon. West (in Sanjana 1895: xli) records the existence of a date in New Persian in folio 301b: year 652. West proposed a correction of it in 6726 and Sanjana adds that this date was derived from the colophons of the manuscript PB. The colophons of PB (Sanjana 1895: xlv ff.) reproduce more or less the history of K1, but mention a copy of Mihrabān Kayhusraw in 1323 and not 1324 (date of K1). These are likely to be a copy of the lost colophons of L4. Therefore L4 is identified with Mihrabān Kayhusraw's copy in 1323. Among the manuscripts used by Geldner the transmission line of L4 is weakly represented. Only one additional manuscript, Pt2, was available to him. This is regretful, above all if we consider that at least one half of L4 is missing.

According to the Sanskrit colophon of PB (Sanjana 1895: xlvii) L4 was copied in Nawasari. It is also not surprising that all PV-manuscripts of the Meherji Rana Library go back to L4. This is a very fortunate, because through these manuscripts the transmission line of L4 is now much better represented than in Geldner's edition. In fact, there is no doubt that the Nawasari manuscripts go back to L4. In my opinion the best feature for distinguishing the manuscripts belonging to the family of K1 from the ones belonging to the family of L4 is the

[4] We know, however, of the existence of other manuscripts that do not go back to Rödstam Mihrabānī Marzabān's manuscript. Jamasp (1907) uses a manuscript he calls IM. According to his two colophons, it is a copy by Marzabān Frādūn (Kermān, 1575) that goes back to a manuscript of Ardaxšīr Wāhman Rāzwēh. This means that IM does not stem from L4 or K1 and is independent from all other known manuscripts with PV. Unfortunately, until now we have not been able to locate this manuscript, although it should be in Bombay.

[5] They are edited and translated in Sanjana (1895: xxxvi ff.).

[6] The date is written in letters and not in numbers. Therefore a mistake is more unlikely.

[7] According to Geldner (1886 Prolegomena, xii) the colophon of L4 is reproduced in Pt2, but it cannot be ruled out that Pt2 in Geldner's edition and PB in Sanjana's edition are the same manuscript. Pt2 is a copy of 1157 A. Y. (=1788). It belongs to the library of Peshotan Bahram Sanjana. In his edition of some chapters of Pahlavi-Vidēvdād Darab Peshotan Sanjana, Peshotan Bahram Sanjana's son describes a Pahlavi-Vidēvdād manuscript that also belonged to his father and that has some similarities with Pt2, so that we can ask ourselves if both manuscripts are the same. Pt2 has, according to Geldner, 315 pages, PB 318, according to Sanjana. PB also has the three colophons of Pt2, but Sanjana also records a fourth colophon, a concluding Rōzname and a Sanskrit colophon. Since we do not have access to Pt2, it is impossible to know whether Geldner does not mention the last colophons because they are not interesting for the history of L4, and whether Pt2 and PB are the same manuscript or not.
beginning of V 9. In I4, before the first Avestan words the following Pahlavi text appears: farrax bâd <kê> zanâd nasûš kê abar dâwarâd az an murâdag saq ud mardômân abar o zîndag perôzgar bawàd dên abêzag weh mazdèsnâm -blessed might be he who strikes Nasuš that runs from the dead dog and man into the living one. Victorious might be the pure, good and mazdayasnic religion. This Pahlavi gloss is missing in K1 and all other manuscripts of this family, as far as we can check it. E10 and T44 show this gloss at the beginning of book 9.

Furthermore, these three manuscripts share a series of characteristics that join them in a special group. Geldner (1886: Prolegomena, xviii) records several omissions of Avestan clauses in all PV-manuscripts which are, however, available in the Sädeh-manuscripts. This fact is a strong argument for demonstrating that in fact all extant manuscripts stem from the same copy. Surprisingly, manuscripts E10, T44 and E10 of the Meherji Rana Library have in most cases the Avestan texts like the Sädeh manuscripts.

We distinguish three different kinds of omissions: 1. The Avestan text is omitted in PV-manuscripts, but the Pahlavi-translation (from now on, PT) is present; 2. Avestan text and PT are missing in PV-manuscripts; 3. The Avestan text is missing, the PT is present, but the PT of the precedent clause is omitted.

1. The Avestan text is omitted in PV-manuscripts, but the PT is present.

In the first kind of omissions, when the Avestan text of the Sädeh-manuscripts is missing in the PV-manuscripts, but the PT is available, Geldner systematically includes the Avestan text in his edition. In this case, manuscripts E10 and T44 include always the Avestan text with the exception of 17.8. We can find the following examples:

- 9.46: yâda, vâ. nœmatô. tarô. yâre. E10 and T44 include the Avestan text.
- 13.8: vôbunâzgaâmc. draxô.bunaranamca. On this occasion not only E10 and T44 show the Avestan text, but also P2 (o).
- 16.14: yâ. hê. daxšu. cîrôm. bauwaâtî. E10 and T44 include these words.
- 17.8: pairi.karom. pairi.kâratiš. is missing in all PV-manuscripts, including E10 and T44.

[8] I have checked K1, M3 and P2. The edition of Jarnasp (1907) does not mention these words.
[9] This list must be corrected on some points and is not complete. According to Geldner all the manuscripts omit in 19.23 the words vôbu. manô. yaozdâta. bun., but they are present in all the manuscripts, including K1 and I4.
2. The Avestan text present in the Sādeh-manuscripts is omitted in PV-manuscripts and also in its PT.

Manuscripts E10, T44 and F10 include the Avestan text and the PT of the Avestan text of the Sādeh-manuscripts. Geldner in this case is not systematic. Sometimes he includes the Avestan text in his edition, sometimes not.

- 3.41 after spāieiti. draošom the Vidēvdād-Sādeh manuscripts show spāieiti. yātūrṇīm (Jp1, MI2, L1, 2, Dh1, K10, B2, M2, P1, T46). Br1 adds: auuāyānīm. spāieiti. yātūrṇīm[11]. Finally one Sādeh manuscript available in Nawsari, E4, shows spāiaeithe. auua. ganim. spiaaeti. äuurnim[12]. In PV-manuscripts, the Avestan text and the Pahlavi translation are missing. Geldner does not include the Avestan text in his edition. In E10, spiaaetithi. yatuurin abanganed jaugith winab appears. In T44 the text runs as in other Pahlavi manuscripts, but in the margin the following is written:

    spiaaeti. auuayom. abanganed edon zadanih ay ed danend ku pad har chi zadaninh kunom a-m kirbag ne barom be ed danem kū-s ayarih spiaaetithi. yatuurinom. abanganed jaugithi zaned

In F10 the text is similar, but it is not in the margin:

    spiaiaiti. auua_yonm. abanganed edon zadanih ay ed danend ku pad har chi nek zad<an>ih ne barom be danem kū-s ayarih dahom (?) a-m kirbag[13] spiaiaeti. yatuurinom. abanganed jaugith zaned

- 11.9: the words pordne. mūdī. pordne. kaptiś are found in the Sādeh-manuscripts, but they are again missing in all PV-manuscripts and also their PT[14]. Again E4 and T44 show both the Avestan text and the PT: purđēnam mūdag-kardār purđēnam keb-dēwōk. On this occasion Geldner does include the Avestan text in his edition.

- 19.41-44. The PV manuscripts omit the Avestan text from 19.41 after the words mōṛjētiṁ māšiūnām to 19.44 atpō. maṁniuś. After the PT of the last written words of V 19.41 comes daēuuō and then the next Avestan word of V 19.41 nazdiśtā. It continues with pouru.mahrkō. The addition of daēuuō is best explained only as a secondary introduction attracted by the following pouru.mahrkō. Probably this long omission of more than two paragraphs is explained by the fact that a page was lost in the common ancestor of all PV manuscripts. On this occasion E10 again stands alone and does not show daēuuō before nazdiśtā. And what is even more interesting: at the end of the manuscript,
after a blank page of the colophon the Avestan text and the PT of the missing parts of V 19.41 to 44 are given. In T44 the missing part is inserted at the right place.

3. The Avestan text of the Sādeh-manuscripts is included in the PV-manuscripts and also their PT, but the PT of the foregoing clause is missing. It is evident that they are mistakes by one抄手 who skips the PT and the next Avestan text and jumps directly to the PT of the following Avestan clause. This mistake is very easy to understand when both Avestan texts and PT were very similar. In these cases manuscripts E10 and T44 mostly include the Avestan text but omit the PT of the foregoing clause. They show the Avestan text in the following passages:

- 18.5-6: in the PV-manuscripts the PT of 18.5 mā dim. mruittā. ādrauuanām. uttī. mraot. abhuro. mazdā. āt. aṣāum. zaradaustā. and also the Avestan text of 18.6 tām. dim. mruittā. ādrauuanām. uttī. mraot. abhuro. mazdā. āt. aṣāum. zaradaustā are missing. It is clear that one抄手 copied the PT of the very similar beginning of 18.6 instead of the PV of the end of 18.5. E10 and T44 show the Avestan text of 18.6, but not the PT of the end of 18.5.

The Avestan text is also missing in E10 and T44 in the following passages:

- 15.8: The PT of abmaat. baca. iristiāt. and the following Avestan text yezi. tat. paiti. iristiētti. is missing in all PV-manuscripts, including E10 and T44.

- 15.21-22: in the PV-manuscripts, including E10 and T44, the PT of 15.21 vistām. a. abmāt. dradām. kordonaatā. yat. āete. yōi. spāna. uζ. jasān. and the Avestan text of the beginning of 15.22 yat. nōti. baroṭomī. baraitī.15

It is clear that in all these cases we have transmission errors that were present in one of the manuscripts in the transmission line of L4 and K1, that is, the copies of Homāst Wahišt, Ardašīr i Wahman i Rōzwehr or Rōstām Mīhrābān Marzabān. Since it is beyond all reasonable doubt that E10, T44 and F10 are copies from L4, the origin of the Avestan citations and of their PT can only be sought in two different sources: 1. other PV-manuscripts from a different transmission line; 2. the Avestan texts could have been added from Sādeh-manuscripts. In the second case the PT, if it is also added, must be a late creation by the copyist. Against the first explanation we have the fact that among the extant PV-manuscripts no one can be the origin of these additions16.

[15] The PT of 15.22 that appears in the PV-manuscripts is not exactly the expected one, but u-š bámē az ān sālātībar barad (cf. V 15.19 u-š nē sālātībar barad for the same Avestan text).
[16] Even IM, which does not stem from Rōstām Mīhrābān's copy, seems to have the same ommissions as K1 and L4, if we trust the information of Jamasp's edition.
In fact, we have evidence that points out that the additions of manuscripts E10, T44 and F10 are the result of a control of several manuscripts of the transmission line of L4 with several Sādeh-manuscripts.

In 3.41 it is clear that the additions stem from the Sādeh-manuscripts. The Sādeh-manuscripts follow two different traditions: some manuscripts have only *spāiiti, yāṭurṣṇim* and others (*spāiiti, yāṭurṣṇim.* Av. yāṭurṣṇim* is clearly a mistake for yāṭum* under the influence of the following aṣauyṣṇim. Also aṣauyṣṇim is most likely to be the result of a misreading of aṣauyṣṇim. Since this reading appears only in some Sādeh-manuscripts, it is very probable that this mistake has arisen even in this transmission. However, manuscripts T44 and F10 also include the form aṣauyṣṇim. Its PT must have been invented and added after the secondary introduction of the Avestan text. The glosses are clearly shaped after parallel glosses in the same paragraph. Furthermore, av. *yṣṇim* (in yāṭurṣṇim) is translated differently in E10 (*wināb*) on one side and T44 (zanēd), F10 (zadan) on the other. In E10 wināb is added above the line after the PT of aṣauyṣṇim. in order to keep the parallelism between both translations of *yṣṇim*, but it is missing in all other PV-manuscripts.

Very instructive is the case of 11.9 and 11.12. In 11.9 pērōne. mūstī. pērōne. kāpastīš and its PT are missing in all PV-manuscripts except E10 and T44. In 11.12 the PV-manuscripts (L4, K1) include the Avestan texts pārṣṭa. mūstī. pārṣṭa. kāpastīš, but omit the PT. The case is the same in E10 and T44. In this passage the control with the Sādeh-manuscripts showed no difference and therefore no addition was made and the Avestan words remained untranslated. This was different from 11.9, where the comparison with the Sādeh-manuscripts caused the addition of the Avestan text pērōne. mūstī. pērōne. kāpastīš which was subsequently translated with an invented PT. If the origin of such additions had been a PV-manuscript, then the PT would also have been added in 11.12.

Also clear is 18.5-6. As already mentioned, in the PV-manuscripts the PT of 18.5 mā. dim. mūstī. āṭauruauam. utti. mraot. aburo. mazda. ā. aṣaum. zarathuṣtra. and also the Avestan text of 18.6 iom. dim. mūstī. āṭauruauam. utti. mraot. aburo. mazda. ā. aṣaum. zarathuṣtra. It is clear that one copyist copied the PT of the very similar beginning of 18.6 instead of the PV of the end of 18.5. E10 and T44 have added the missing part of the Avestan text from a Sādeh-manuscript, but they have not added the PT of the foregoing text, because they have only checked that the PT of the added text is already available. It is interesting to note that, although E10 and T44 take the additions from different sources, both of them have made the same mistake in this passage.

Therefore we can conclude that the PV-manuscripts of Nawsari (E10, T44 and F10, at least) are copies from L4 through a copy of Mihrābān in 1353, according to the colophons of E10. Most of the omissions of Avestan texts shared in all PV-manuscripts were completed after the Sādeh-manuscripts. These additions are independent in all three manuscripts, but T44 and F10 seem to be more closely related. This tendency to complete Avestan texts with the Avestan texts of the
Sadeh-manuscripts and to provide new PT for the added texts is not to be separated from the inclusion of the Avestan text of book 12 of Videvdad and the appearance of a new PT of this text in some manuscripts.

This Videvdad book is not usually included in the PV-manuscripts. As far as I know, only the following PV-manuscripts include the 12th book of Videvdad: F10, T42, T44, MU1 of the edition of Jamasp (1907), manuscript R1 of Dhabhar's cataloge of the Cama Oriental Institute (Dhabhar 1923 138) and K217. In all of them the 12th book is added at the end of the manuscript, often in different script and paper. All these manuscripts are late, if it is possible to establish a dating (F10 1825, MU1 ca. 1832, T44 1840, T42 1855). Only the text of the 12th book in the manuscript R1 in the Cama Oriental Institute could be older, if the identification of the mobed Rustam Sanjana, mentioned in the Persian colophon, with the Rustam Sanjana of Surat from whom we have other colophons dated in 1726, 1738 and 1760 (Unvala 1940: 189) is right. As far as we know the place of writing, most of them seem to have been written in Nawsari or Surat, that is, in Gujarat, and not in Bombay. Therefore, we can guess that in Gujarat, in the second half of the 18th century and in the first half of the 19th century, there was a tendency to complete the new copied PV-manuscripts with the missing 12th book of Videvdad.

The additions in E10, T44 and F10 could be consequence of the same tendency or, more probably, viceversa. The comparison of the PV-manuscripts of Nawsari with the Sadeh-manuscripts and the subsequent addition of the missing Avestan texts and PT might have lead to longer additions. First the Avestan text of V 19.41-44 was added. At first (E10) it was added at the end of the manuscript. Later it was copied at the right place (T44). At this stage the 12th book was also included (F10, T44). It is missing in E10 and in the rest of the manuscripts it was never copied at the right place, but always at the end of the manuscript and often by a second hand. Therefore, although the colophons stop in Mihraban 1553, we can suppose a relatively late dating for E10, probably in the second half of the 18th century or even at the beginning of the 19th century.

Antequil-Duperron (1771: cccxxvi) tells us that Dastur Jamasp from Kermán visited Surat in 1720. He checked the Videvdad manuscripts in Gujarat, recorded problems in the PV-manuscripts and tried to correct this situation. He instructed three disciples: Darab from Surat, Jamasp from Nawsari and a third one from Baruch. Antequil-Duperron informs us that, after the departure of Jamasp, one of these disciples, Dastur Darab of Surat, «voulut corriger la Traduction Pehlevie du Vendidad & rectifier quelques endroits du Texte Zend, qui lui paroissient ou transposés, ou presenter des repetitions inutiles» (Antequil-Duperron 1771: cccxxvi).

17 The coincidence in the number of folios (677) between number 1 of Dhabhar's cataloge and K2 is remarkable as well as the fact that both contain V 12, but if in Gekhner's time this manuscript was already in Copenhagen it is very unlikely that 40 years later it could be in Bombay.
Could the additions we find in the Nawsari-manuscripts be the result of these attempts at correcting the PV-manuscripts? It is very interesting to notice that P2, a PV-manuscript written by the same Dastur Darab of Surat in the year 1758, includes one of these additions (13.8). Maybe the tendency to these additions in Nawsari is to be attributed to another disciple of Dastur Jamasp, that is, Dastur Jamasp of Nawsari.

**Stemma of the PV-manuscripts belonging to the family of L4**

```
Homāst Wahišt
     (Sistān)
       |
Ardašir Wahman i Rōzweh
     (Sistān, 1205)
          |
Wizān Wahrāmšāh Wizān
   Rōstām Mihrābān Marzabān
```

```
   L4
Mihrābān Kayhusraw
   Nawsari, 1323
```

```
  K1
Mihrābān Kayhusraw
   Cambāy, 1324
```

```
Sahryār Ardašir Erīč

Mihrābān 1353

IM
(Kermān, 1575)

   Y
E10 Z
Pt2 (?) / PB (?)
(1788)
```

```
T44 (1839) F10 (1825)
```
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