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REPÊTECTIONS OR OMISSIONS? DIFFERENT VERSIONS OF WIDÊWDÂD 22 *

SUMMARY

The present paper analyses two versions that appear in the 22nd chapter of an intercalated text of the Zoroastrian Long Liturgy, the Wîdêwîdâd: a longer version in the Iranian manuscripts and a shorter in the Indian ones. It is shown that we stand before two different real versions in the ritual praxis of this ceremony, though it is difficult to evaluate the date in which each version appeared or whether one version could arise from the other after the beginning of the written transmission. Other passages of the Wîdêwîdâd containing similar problems are analysed in a brief appendix.

Keywords: Iranian philology; Avestan manuscripts; Zoroastrian written transmission; Zoroastrian Liturgies.

RÉSUMÉ

Le présent article analyse un texte, issu du 22ème chapitre d’un texte intercalé de la Liturgie Longue Zoroastrienne, le Wîdêwîdâd. Ce texte a été transmis en deux versions : l’une plus longue dans les manuscrits iraniens et une autre plus courte dans les indiens, ce qui reflète deux versions différentes dans la pratique rituelle de cette cérémonie. On montre qu’il est difficile de déterminer la date à laquelle chaque version fut créée et, encore, de savoir si une version pourrait provenir de l’autre après le commencement de la transmission manuscrite. D’autres passages du Wîdêwîdâd, posant des problèmes similaires, sont analysés dans un bref appendice final.

Mots clés : philologie iranienne ; manuscrits avестiques ; transmission manuscrite zoroastrienne ; liturgies zoroastriennes.

The present paper falls in the context of the Avestan Digital Archive (ADA) research project (http://www.avesta-archive.com) funded by the Spanish Junta de Castilla y León and the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. The signatures of the manuscripts have been taken from the numeric system for Avestan manuscripts created by Alberto Cantero (available at http://ada.unal.edu.gov/pdf/Num/bers.pdf), by indicating in brackets Geldner’s correspondences, insofar as they exist. The images which have been used in this paper have been published with the permission of the Avestan Digital Archive (©) and are available online at: www.avesta-archive.com
During the last years many Iranian Avestan manuscripts have been brought to light. Although the oldest extant Iranian manuscripts were written down three centuries after the first manuscripts written in India, the Iranian ones are more conservative than the Indian ones in several features. Notwithstanding, the Iranian manuscripts were underrepresented in Geldner’s (1896) edition.

Some differences between the Iranian and the Indian Avestan manuscripts have been shown by Canter. The most important of these concern the ritual praxis, but there are also differences in the text of the recitative. Thus, Avestan citations taken from the exegetical manuscripts were introduced in the Indian text of the recitative; the text of Visperad-Sále 39 §6 adds the text imq. aṣōṃsc. baidōṃc. yāzamaide. tāvā. ə̃hrā. mazā. puthra (taken from Y25 §3) in the Indian-Sále manuscripts, etc.

A further difference is to be found in the 22nd chapter of the Widewdād. We face two versions of a text, which do not belong to the recitative text of the long liturgy senku stricto, but to an intercalated text. Since the Widewdād is the only text which was not learnt by heart and could directly be read from a manuscript in the liturgy, the different versions could be due to a mistake in the written transmission.

The 22nd fragar in the Widewdād is divided into twenty-six paragraphs according to Geldner’s edition. The first part (V22 §1-18) is arranged in three parallel sequences:

1. V22 §1-5: Ahura Mazda tells Zarathustra the story of the sminca-żerka- (the “nice house”), the counter-creation made by Ahrā Māništū (999999 sickness), and how he calls Māhara Späta in order to fight this counter-creation, by giving offerings, sacrifices and prayer.

2. V22 §8-12: Ahura Mazda asks Nairīa Saŋha to go to Ariaianian’s house and to tell him the same story he has told Zarathustra, and to give him the same offerings, sacrifices and prayer.

The texts of V22 §8-12 and V22 §14-18 are exactly the same, since the words which Ahura Mazda spoke to Nairīa Saṅha are repeated by the latter to Ariaianian. The only difference between these sequences and the first one (V22 §5-12) is the second recipient: V22 §2 is addressed to Māhara Späta (ə̃zh. mān. tūm. bāziżiziš, māhara. spānt. yō. až.əxəranə), V22 §21 (= V20 §9, V21 §18) paiti. ārān. əξire... , V22 §22 (= V20 §10, V21 §19) paiti. ārān. əξipam... , V22 §23 (= V20 §11, V21 §20) əξijenis n. ārān... , V22 §24 (= V20 §12, V21 §21) jaŋtj. əξijenis n. ārān... , V22 §25 (= V20 §13, V21 §22) γə̃t. əξijenis n. ārān... , V22 §26 (= V20 §14, V21 §23) əξipam. γə̃tj... .

3. V22 §14-18: Nairīa Saṅha repeats the same words in the presence of Ariaianian.

Each sequence is separated by the interlude of the various characters: V22 §6-7 with the response of Māhara Späta and the interpellation to Nairīa Saṅha, V22 §13 with Nairīa Saṅha’s acceptance of Ahura Mazda’s request, and V22 §19-20 with Ariaianian’s responses to Mazda’s praying. The fragar ends with the apotropaic texts (V22 §21-26) which also appear at the end of V20 [§9-14] and V21 [§18-23]. The following table shows the correspondences of the three sequences and the repeated texts in each paragraph:

Table 1: The three sequences of V22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st sequence</th>
<th>2nd sequence</th>
<th>3rd sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of the sminca-żerka-</td>
<td>~22 §1 (Ahura Mazda - Zarathustra)</td>
<td>~22 §7 (Ahura Mazda - Nairīa Saṅha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-creation and plea (bāziżisiš + recipient)</td>
<td>~22 §2 (plea to Māhara Späta)</td>
<td>~22 §9 (plea to Ariaianian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dafǎni: horses (+ yaziš) camels (+ yaziš)</td>
<td>~22 §3</td>
<td>~22 §10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dafǎni: boids (+ yaziš) small cattle (+ yaziš)</td>
<td>~22 §4</td>
<td>~22 §11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ašišndi</td>
<td>~22 §5</td>
<td>~22 §12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>~22 §6 (response of Māhara Späta)</td>
<td>~22 §13 (Nairīa Saṅha - Ariaianian)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shaded paragraphs are exactly the same in the three sequences: the lighter colour is for a repetition not included in the first sequence, the darker – for a repetition in all three sequences. The sign is used for indicating a parallel text.

1 Iranian ms. 4000 was written by Frevdūn Marzabīn Frevdūn Wāhvram Rostom Būdhū Bāhrām Dēnīr in Šarī Ābīd in 1607, while the Latin ms. 2000 (K5) and 2350 (K7a) were written in Anklel in Rōtām Mēhērān in 1278, and mss. 4610 (L4), 4610 (K1), 500 (E2) and 501 (K8) by Mēhrbān Kayxzor in Nāwērā in 1323 and 1334.
2 Canter 2011, pp. 11, 221-2; Id. 2012, pp. 284-5; Id. 2014, p. 264 ff. These differences are mainly orthographic and palaeographic, but concerning the Widewdād-Sāle manuscripts, farther differences appear, e.g., Indian manuscripts begin in Yasna 0 §4, while the Iranian ones do it in Yasna 0 §4 (Canter 2012, p. 285).
4 These differences have been recently investigated in depth by Canter 2014, p. 265 ff.
5 See Appendix for a similar difference of the text of the recitative in other passages of Widewdād.
7 V22 §21 (= V20 §9, V21 §18) paiti. ārān. əξire... , V22 §22 (= V20 §10, V21 §19) paiti. ārān. əξipam... , V22 §23 (= V20 §11, V21 §20) əξijenis n. ārān... .
while V22 §9 and V22 §15 are adressed to Ariaiman (dat. mgn. tām-bēzāzōtā, ariāma, yā, šīītā).

In the Widēvīdd-sāde manuscripts we find two versions: a long version in the Iranian manuscripts and a shorter one in the Indian manuscripts.9 The afrīnīnī text (V22 §§ 22, 22 §12 and 22 §18, in Geldner’s edition), which appears after the last of the offerings (that of the small cattle, amunation-) in the three aforementioned sequences of the Indian-Sāde manuscripts, as well as in the Iranian ones, it also appears consistently after the offering of horses (V22 §§ 22 §10, 22 §16 —first part—), of camels (V22 §§ 22 §10, 22 §16 second part), and of boids (V22 §§ 22 §11, 22 §17 —first part—) in the Iranian liturgical manuscripts.10 The following table shows the text of the Sāde manuscripts:11

Table 2: V22, daftānī, yazālī and afrīnīnī texts in the Widēvīdd-Sāde manuscripts

| daftānī | tē, aštābhe, paiti, hakat, hastrum, amunation, mūnañi, dārzi, tāzāram, yazālī, sañka, vaj, hī, mazādātā, ašālin, išā, ša, aš. amunation. |
| afrīnīnī | šrām, deskā, afrīt, frīka, deskā, afrīt, yā, yā, amunation, mūnañi, karonanātā, saranam, vīrāzālātēi, amunation, mūnañi, saysā, daftānī, ašālin, išā, ša. amunation. |
| afsāra | šrām, deskā, afrīt, frīka, deskā, afrīt, yā, yā, amunation, mūnañi, karonanātā, saranam, vīrāzālātēi, amunation, mūnañi, saysā, daftānī, ašālin, išā, ša. amunation. |
| afsāra | šrām, deskā, afrīt, frīka, deskā, afrīt, yā, yā, amunation, mūnañi, karonanātā, saranam, vīrāzālātēi, amunation, mūnañi, saysā, daftānī, ašālin, išā, ša. amunation. |
| afsāra | šrām, deskā, afrīt, frīka, deskā, afrīt, yā, yā, amunation, mūnañi, karonanātā, saranam, vīrāzālātēi, amunation, mūnañi, saysā, daftānī, ašālin, išā, ša. amunation. |
| afsāra | šrām, deskā, afrīt, frīka, deskā, afrīt, yā, yā, amunation, mūnañi, karonanātā, saranam, vīrāzālātēi, amunation, mūnañi, saysā, daftānī, ašālin, išā, ša. amunation. |

9 The oldest copies of the Widēvīdd-Sāde we know of are dated from the beginning of the 17th century, both the Indian and the Iranian manuscripts (ms. 4000 copied in 1607, ms. 4210 [B2] in 1626). Furthermore, several Iranian Sāde manuscripts were sent from Iran to India at that time, e.g. the original manuscript of ms. 4000 (M27), if ms. 4020 is not the original one (see Cémera 2014, p. 87 ff.), but there is no influence over the Indian ones. Noteworthy is the case of the Iranian manuscript 4070 (K9), which, though copied in India, has the afrīnīnī texts like all other Iranian manuscripts. Thus, the Indian and the Iranian Sāde manuscripts reflect two different traditions which, at least for the text of Widēvīdd 22, did not influence each other.

10 Thus, ms. 4000, 4010, 4020 (M2), 4025, 4030, 4040, 4045, 4050, 4055, 4060, 4065, 4070 (K9), 4060, 4090, 4100, 4105, 4110, 4115, 4158, 4160. According to Geldner’s apparatus, it appears also in the lost manuscript of Frēdōn Marzīn Jp1.11

11 The shaded-cursive texts only appear in the Iranian manuscripts.

The Indian liturgical manuscripts agree with the exegetical ones, i.e., the (Indian) Pahlavi-Widēvīdd manuscripts, the latter using abbreviations of the repeated texts. Since Geldner gave mostly priority to the witness of the exegetical manuscripts, the texts of V22 §§ 10-12 and V22 §§ 14-18 appear abbreviated in Geldner’s edition (1896, p. 139); V22 §§ 10-12 do not appear at all in Geldner’s edition (1896, p. 139); V22 §§ 14-18 appear abbreviated in Geldner’s edition (1896, p. 139); V22 §§ 10-12 do not appear at all in Geldner’s edition (1896, p. 139); V22 §§ 14-18 appear abbreviated in Geldner’s edition (1896, p. 139). The position of the Indian exegetical manuscripts is not clear. Unfortunately, no Pahlavi-Widēvīdd Iranian manuscript is known at this time, however, the Indian Widēvīdd-Sāde manuscript 4000 includes an interlinear Pahlavi translation of the Widēvīdd (except for V1, V2 and V12) written by a second hand. Skjærvé has recently compared this translation with the readings attributed to the lost Pahlavi-Widēvīdd manuscript IM in Jamasp’s edition (1907), the only known (but today lost) Iranian exegetical manuscript of the Widēvīdd.12

As mentioned above, the afrīnīnī text, together with its Pahlavi translation, is just reproduced in V22 §§ in the Indian Pahlavi-Widēvīdd manuscripts, as it appears, e.g., in ms. 4600:13

V22 §§ (ms. 4600): 14 (§ 1) ij uta. tē, azom. afrīnīnī, šrām, deskā, afrītī, frīka, deskā, afrītī. (§ 2) ij mān. 4601, s1, 14. ĀNE LK prīyam MN ZK y nyuk

12 About the afrīnīnī texts, Geldner 1896, p. 138, mentions that after ašālin, (Iranian) ms. Jp1 and 4020 (M2) always add uta. tē, azom till karonanātā (V22 §5). It must be noticed that the correspondences indicated by Geldner in footnotes, i.e., paragraphs 10-12 = §4-6, and 14-18 = §1-4, are misunderstood. In fact, paragraphs 10-12 are equivalent to §3-5, and paragraphs 14-18 to §8-12. The same mistake is repeated in Titus (http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/itize/sran/siran/avesta/avesta.htm).13

13 As aforementioned, the Indian liturgical or Sāde manuscripts agree with the Pahlavi ones, except for not using the abbreviations (marked in the exegetical manuscripts through Pahl. <OD> –). The abbreviations of the exegetical manuscripts appear from V22 §§ 10 to V22 §§ 16 (i.e., the text which repeats V22 §§ 3-5) and from V22 §§ 14 to V22 §§ 18 (i.e., the text which repeats V22 §§ 8-12).14

Ms. 4600 and 4610 are, according to the colophons, indirect copies of a single manuscript going back to Ardāfīr T Wāhinni Rūzhouh Sīhrūzūn Sīhrūzūn. Ms. 4600 and 4610 were copied in India by Mīhrābīn Kayyurā in 1332/4, while IM was copied in Kermān by Marzīn Frēdōn Wāhrānī in 1375.15

The commentaries of the Pahlavi translation have been indicated through "(§)" in transcription and transliteration.
However, a different exegetical tradition could be shown by the Pahlavi Translation of ms. 4000 (see Table 3). The Pahlavi version of the afrināni text is repeated three times: twice in V22 §3 (first after the horses and then after the camels), and one more time after the small cattle (i.e. in V22 §5), but there is not any translation of it in V22 §4 (after the boids) nor in the rest of the abbreviated texts of the exegetical manuscripts (V22 §10-12 and V22 §14-18).

Table 3: The interlinear Pahlavi versions of the afrināni text in ms. 4000
It seems then than the manuscript IM, source of the interlinear translation of ms. 4000 contained the Avestan text and the Pahlavi translation of the afrinani text in these three passages in accordance with the Iranian liturgical manuscripts.20 Supporting this hypothesis we can adduce two arguments:

1. The three translations are not identical. Although there are no significant differences between the three texts, some differences do appear: a) the different beginning (<LK ANE-wm 'plym'>, <ytwm> ANE LK 'plym'>, <ytwm> ANE LK 'plym'); b) the different text in d (<hdyb 'lynyst' 'wym' l>, <hdyb 'lynyst' OLE-y 'wym' l>, <hdyb 'lynyst' OLE-y 'wym' l>). These differences could be due to a different original text, rather than to the same text copied three times.

2. The third afrinani text (that of V22 §4) is not translated, although it is exactly the same text.21 If the original manuscript would have had just one translation of the afrinani text and the scribe of the Pahlavi translation of ms. 4000 tried to translate all the afrinani texts when they first appeared (i.e., V22 §3 [2X], §4 and §5), it is not easy to understand why he has not translated the third afrinani text (after the bovids).

If the Pahlavi translation of ms. IM is the one we find in ms. 4000, one can assume a different version of the text of V22 for the exegetical tradition also. Notwithstanding, the absence of the afrinani text in V22 §4 would be strange.

There are, in fact, arguments for assuming that the interlinear translation of ms. 4000 could just be an attempt for completing the translation of the texts missing in the original exegetical manuscript. Thus, although the Pahlavi text is basically the same as that of ms. 4600 and 4610's family, the Pahlavi translation of Av. paranom (Phl. purr) is systematically omitted in the three texts of ms. 4000:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>yā. ānum. paranom. karṇaḥāti.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phl. ms. 4600 (and the rest)</td>
<td>&lt;MNW ZK y km pw1 kwbd&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phl. ms. 4000 (omits purr)</td>
<td>&lt;MN YK y MNW km kwbd&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 The two variants mentioned by Janasp (1907, p. 668) for ms. IM agree with the forms found in the aforementioned three translations of ms. 4000: ms. IM <spu p'> vs. ms. 4600 <spu p'; [and rest of PV nms.] ms. IM <QBYDWNy> vs. ms. 4600 <QBYDWNy> [rest PV <sw-m, <ym>]. Further differences found in the Pahlavi translation of ms. 4000 are, however, not consigned in Janasp's apparatus.

21 N.B.; this afrinani text, that of V22 §4, is noted through three dots (•) separating the previous asaîne of the uta. tā. axem, while this separation in only noted through one dot in the other parallels.

Thus, the latter situation can be an argument supporting that the text of the Pahlavi translation of ms. 4000 was copied from one single translation. That is to say, the Pahlavi translation of V22 §5 would have been secondarily copied in those sequences having the same text in ms. 4000 (V22 §3 after horses and V22 §3 after camels). Therefore, the position of the Iranian exegetical manuscripts is not completely clear.

But it remains the fact that two different versions of the text of the recitative of V22 were current in the ritual praxis at least from the 17th century on, one in India and another in Iran.

Firstly, we can conclude that the texts of the (Indian) exegetical and the Indian liturgical manuscripts were abbreviated. In fact, when there are repeated texts, the common practice of the exegetical manuscripts is to reproduce the first sequence and abbreviate the rest (through abbreviation marks, e.g., Phl. <MN ... OD ...> az ... tā ... “from ... to ...” which include the first [and sometimes the last] words of the abbreviated sequence), but here we find exactly the contrary: the text appears only at the end, without any abbreviation mark in the former examined occurrences.

Secondly, we can also exclude a mistake in the transmission. On one hand, the same “mistake” is repeated nine times in the Indian manuscripts. On the other, two types of manuscripts, the Indian liturgical and the (Indian) exegetical ones, share the same version, but it is hardly likely that a mistake in the exegetical manuscripts would have influenced the Indian liturgical ones or vice versa. In fact, the Pahlavi-Widēwld tradition, less influenced by the ritual praxis, shows important mistakes in the transmission of the text that do not appear in the Indian Widēwld-Sāde manuscripts and neither in the Iranian ones, e.g., big omissions due to the loss of a folio in the original or the absence of the fragaard 12 of the Widēwld.22

Thus, we can conclude that the Iranian and Indian liturgical manuscripts show two different versions of this text. The question is whether there were two old versions, or one of these versions could have emerged from the other, either in India or in Iran.

The Iranian liturgical tradition, though attested later, could show the original situation. According to Cantera (2014: 267) the parallel text in the three sequences (adlāni + yazāi + afrinani) of the Iranian manuscripts is probably the original one, since the repetition of the yazāi sentence (yazāi. saola. vayjī, mazdaōta. aṣaîni "I will sacrifice [to you], oh good Utility, created by Mazda [and] right") appears both in the Iranian and in the Indian manuscripts, but that of the afrinani sentence is only omitted in the Indian ones. However, the adlāni and the yazāi sentences are coordin-
nated in parataxis, whereas the afrinānī sentence is clearly separated from the previous dešānī and yazād through the nexus, the explicit subject and the introduction of the indirect object (omitted in the yazād sentence): ukt... tē. azm. afrinānī “Then I will pray to you...”. Thus, the separation of the afrinānī text from the two previous sequences could be an argument against the three parallel sequences (dešānī + yazād + afrinānī).

In fact, we cannot exclude completely either the possibility that the Iranian manuscripts show an Iranian innovation. All Iranian liturgical manuscripts of the Widēvdād go probably back to a single manuscript.23 Precisely in the Widēvdād 22 we find an additional proof for their common origin. The repetition in V22 §7 of the following text:

dehānī. tē. aštēke. pātīt. hahag havaqum. asahānām. apronā. tannāqum. yazād. saqā. vaṛi. mazānqitā. āṣānā. ukt. tē. azm. afrinānī. sṛvā. dahāma. āfriti. frītī. dahāma. āfriti. yā. ūnām. poramān. karanānā. poramānā. viṣqārānā. avamānā. bandānā. bātaqānā. drīm. karanānā,

is common to all Iranian manuscripts. This repetition has been lacunary indicated by a circle in mss. 4000 and 4040 (not in the rest: mss. 4010, 4020 [295v], 4025, 4050 and 4055). But there is no trace of this mistake in the Indian manuscripts.24 Therefore, the extended version goes back to a single manuscript that could have innovated.

Nevertheless, since the afrinānī text is repeated nine times, it can be excluded that we face a simple mistake in the transmission. We have also mentioned the possibility that the Iranian exegetical manuscript IM included as well the repetitions of the afrinānī section. Therefore, we stand before two different real versions in the ritual praxis of the Widēvdād. Unfortunately, we are not able to evaluate at what time did appear each version. It is impossible to know whether there were two different versions already before the beginning of the written transmission, or whether one arose from the other during the written transmission.25 In the case of the Widēvdād, changes after the beginning of the written transmission are less likely than in the Yasna or in the Visperad, but they cannot be excluded completely. In either case, this variation in V22 shows once again that the transmission of the Avestan recitatives of the long liturgy is more fluid than it has been traditionally assumed.

24 However, ms. 4070 (K9) does not have this repetition mistake. Note that ms. 4070, though being a careful copy of ms. 4020 made in India in the 18th century, introduced some changes in the text influenced by the Indian manuscripts, e.g., the three chuations of the Pahlavi translation at the end of V1 §1, which are absent in all the rest of the Iranian Śāde manuscripts, vid. Ferrer-LOSILLIA 2012, p. 396.
25 For other passages offering similar problems, see Appendix.

APPENDIX

Alberto Canteras has indicated to me several passages of the Widēvdād which show a problem similar to the one I have exposed concerning V22, viz. the repetition of a text in the liturgical Iranian manuscripts and its absence in the Indian ones (including the exegetical): a) V5 §28-32, b) V3 §32-33, c) V16 §15 and d) V18 §55. I will briefly deal with them in the present appendix.

1. The case of V5 §28-32
The passages of V5 §28, §29, §30, §31 and §32 repeat the sentence artika. pounutika. ādītika. frānānātī “[she] reaches [X] with disease, decay and degradation” in all the liturgical Iranian manuscripts every time when Ahura Mazdā mentions the subject ašēa. druxā. yā. nusu, but this repetition does not appear in the Indian liturgical manuscripts (nor in the exegetical ones), as we see in the following table:26

Table 4: V5 §28-32 in the Widēvdād Śāde manuscripts

26 The shaded-cursive texts only appear in the Iranian manuscripts.
The sentence *aitka, *atopicia, *itikva frēalnoliht has been taken from the end of the previous paragraph (V5 §27), in which Zeruštaha asked to Ahum Mazdē: *cwaç, aprasa, narki, aitka, drčik yd nesk *aitka, *atopicia, *itikva, frēalnoliht “How many among these men reached the Druj Nasu with disease, decay and defilement?”, concerning the contamination of people sitting or lying together or are when a human or an animal dies.

There are two versions, the longer Iranian and the shorter Indian, just like in V22. In this case, on the contrary, it seems to me that the Iranian one is the weaker candidate for being the original, if we consider syntactical arguments. The sentence *aitka, *drčik yd narki, *aitka, *atopicia, *itikva, frēalnoliht does not show any explicit direct object in the repetitions, but had shown it when it appeared in the first time (DO in V5 §27 cwaç, aprasa, narki). But we could assume an elipsis of the direct object. Furthermore, the sentence *aitka, *drčik yd narki is the subject of a main verb (frēalnoliht) and the committed subject in the following hypotactical sentences (yeti ... frēalnoliht ... yeti ... pasti radiafrēalnoliht). Thus, if one wants to take the Iranian version not as secondary, these repetitions must be syntactically considered as para-tactical sentences with an omitted subject (easily to assume) and an omitted object (more debatable). All in all, the Iranian version makes perfect sense semantically, emphasizing on the diseases, decay and defilement of the Druj. Since the syntactical arguments are not so strong that they ascertain one or other version as primary or secondary, the editorial decision remains open.

2. The case of V13 §32-33

The text of V13 §31,27 which describes the frame of the punishment for each time a dog attacks the cattle or hurts a man, is repeated twice in V13 §32 (after the first and the second punishments) and twice again in V13 §33 (after the third and the fourth punishments) in the Iranian liturgical manuscripts, but this repetition does not appear in the Indian liturgical manuscripts nor in the exegetical ones and it is not edited by Geldner (1896). V13 §34 has this text both in the Indian and in the Iranian manuscripts after the fifth punishment. The following table shows the text of the exegetical manuscripts.28

---


28 The shaded-cursive texts only appear in the Iranian manuscripts.
3. The case of V16 §15

The text of V16 §16 from ym. antara till ahūrō, mazdā is repeated thrice after the first question to Ahura Mazdā about the punishment for each time a man has sexual intercourse with a woman having her period. We can observe the text of the liturgical manuscripts in the following table:31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: The repetitions of a section of V16 §16 in V16 §15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V16 §16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātarīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārtā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātarīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārtā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātarīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārtā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, we are probably facing a transmission mistake in both traditions. For the Iranian one, it appears an anacolutho or a speech-disruption, since Ahura Mazdā is interrupted before finishing his answer, through the repetition of the question about the punishment (kā hē asti cīha) and the introduction of the speaker by the narrator (dāta niwāh mazdāh). The same is true for the Indian liturgical manuscripts, though after the fourth situation only (§16). Furthermore, the text of V16 §16 from ym. antara till ahūrō, mazdā describes a condition (viz. that the semen is not discharged) which affects every previous situation in paragraph 15; so it should be expected to appear in the first question and not in the last one. In fact, paragraph 16 does not appear in the exegetical manuscripts.32 Geldner (1896, p. 100) indicates that it is uncertain whether the paragraph 16 is a later addition or a gloss.33 The question, I think, remains open.

4. The case of V18 §35

The passage of V18 §55 has two versions in the liturgical manuscripts of the Widēvdād: once again, a long version appears in the Iranian manuscripts and a shorter one in the Indian ones. Iranian manuscripts have (see the shaded-cursive text in Table 4) the text of V18 §35 (= V18 §41 = V18 §47), the text which closes the different sections about the males of the Druj at the end of this paragraph:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: The repetitions of V18 §35 in the Widēvdād-Sēke manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V18 §34 + 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātarīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārtā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātarīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārtā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātarīlī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mārtā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In any case, we face two different liturgical traditions that, after the "first" composition of these texts, have tried to incorporate the important feature in the analyzed passage concerning the non-discharge of the semen, in order to distinguish it from the next passage, V16 §17, where it is described the punishment for the man who has sexual intercourse with a woman having her period, but discharging his semen on her (xādrāh. asti, frāhapsāhāIT).
The Druj closes her speech about her first, second and third males with the following comparison: “This [male] mates with me like the other males mate also with the females through their semen”. In the case of the fourth of the males this comparison does not appear in the Indian liturgical manuscripts. It could be alleged that it is just an omission and that the Iranian manuscripts have the original version, but the conditions of paragraph 54-55 are, however, different to the previous ones by two reasons: 1) semantically, this “male” can be a man or a woman (bo... aršīnām, tātārīlī, yāt, nā, jahāka), so the repetition of the comparison with other males which mate with females has no sense at the end of paragraph 55; and 2) syntactically, there is a change of subject in V.18.54-55: in 18.54 the Druj speaks in I.p.sg.; by contrast, in 18.55 they are the došnāna who speak in the I.p.pl. (vādēn, yāh, dešnāna). Therefore, the pronoun of the repeated comparison (mām) does not agree either in number or in gender.

If the case is such, it seems very probable that the Iranian manuscripts show here an innovation.
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