

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_160955

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

INDO-IRANIAN STUDIES I

Dr. J. C. TAVADIA

OUP—880—5-8-74—10,000.

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 295

Accession No. P.G.T 1584

Author

T23 I

Tavadia, J.C.

Title

Indo-Iranian studies. 1950.

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below

To be had of
The Visva-Bharati Publishing Department
6/3 Dwarkanath Tagore Lane, Calcutta.

PRICE RUPEES FIVE

Printed and Published by Prabhat Kumar Mukherjee
Santiniketan Press, Santiniketan, Birbhum.

CONTENTS

I.	Comparative Study of Indo-Iranian	...	1
II.	Iranian Studies in India and in the West	...	10
III.	Iranistic and 'Islamic' Studies	...	43
IV	Zarathustra's Path of Peace	...	51
V.	Some Gleanings from Al-Biruni	...	61
VI.	Some Remarks on a Sanskrit-Chinese Glossary with special reference to Iranian words therein	...	69
VII.	A Didactic Poem in Zoroastrian Pahlavi	...	86

PREFACE

Out of the studies that are given in the following pages the first was published with some editorial changes in the *Visva-Bharati Quarterly*, Aug.-Oct. 1948 ; the rest appear here for the first time. There is hardly anything more that need be said about them by way of introduction or explanation except perhaps this :

The criticism of the work done in the field of Iranian studies in India may appear severe, but it is made solely in the interest of the subject. I may repeat what I said in my Presidential Address in the Iranian Section of All India Oriental Conference at Bombay, November 1949, about it :

‘I need not assure you of my *bona fides*, nor that it is an unpleasant matter for me to indulge in this so-called negative and destructive thinking. I am rather constrained to do so for the sake of truth, for the cause of Iranian studies, which I have the pride and pleasure to represent and which lie so near my heart as nothing else,—even now in spite of various doubts and disappointments. Nor need I dwell upon the value and necessity of *bona fide* criticism. Everybody is expected to know it’. Therefore nobody should take a wrong view of my object and attitude, which is for constructive co-operation in spite of destructive criticism likely to be noticed here and there. As to the Western publications, I may add that most of them were not at my disposal. The remarks about them are based upon my former acquaintance with them.

Then to complete the picture given below I may add a few remarks on the beginning of the Iranian studies on Western lines in Bombay and the neighbourhood. There was a sort of traditional method of learning Zoroastrian subjects pursued by a few priests ; but it could not be compared with the sister methods among Hindus and Muslims. Whatever may be the defects and short-comings in the manner of studying Sanskrit and Indian lore on the one hand and Persian-Arabic and Islamic lore on the other in traditional schools, these represented a very solid factor, and

even now serve some good purpose. Compared to them the scholastic activity of the Parsis was very poor, a mere "shadow of the shade", and their schools have long passed out of existence. They were perhaps no schools at all but only private classes for occasional friends and relatives of a couple of learned high-priests. Nobody has left any account of the traditional mode of study ; yet one can form a fair idea from the manner in which the MSS. are prepared (for the earlier period see my article, 'Zur Pflege des iranischen Schrifttums im Mittelalter', ZDMG. 98. 294 ff.), and also from the printed work done before and about the advent of the Western method.

The honour of introducing it belongs to a layman, a scion of a business family and himself a businessman—K. R. Cama. During his sojourn in Europe he studied Avesta and Pahlavi under Spiegel at Erlangen, and on his return to Bombay opened a class to impart the new knowledge to an intelligent band of young priests. This was really a unique thing and an epoch making event. The beginning was good and the progress not bad. The first generation of scholars left a creditable record of work. Mention may be made of the services of K. E. Kanga in the field of Avesta, of T. D. Anklesaria in that of Pahlavi, and of S. D. Bharucha in that of both in a general manner,—for the spread of religious knowledge. This work was carried on and extended to other Iranian subjects by no less a personality than Jivanji J. Modi. Moreover, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Parsi Panchayet he helped the cause of Iranian studies in various respects. Khurshedji Pavry may also be mentioned as a distinct type out of our early scholars. (It is strange, let it be added here, that his son Dr. Jal Pavry practically gave up this line soon after his Doctorate). But somehow or other in spite of these as well as other capable scholars to whom I have paid my homage below a full contact was not kept up with the Western progress—especially in the field of Avesta, and certain methods were not changed in that of Pahlavi. Enough has been said about this in the proper place ; and nothing shall be added about the numerous Parsi Funds and Institutions started for advancing the cause of this scholarship, however necessary and desirable it may be.

Yet one suggestion as regards the study of Avesta should be made. Everybody recognises the value of Sanskrit in this respect. Therefore ways and means should be found to apply that useful instrument even for young pupils taking up Avesta in schools. Those who take up Pali do not begin with Pali but with Sanskrit. Can we not adopt this wise plan for Avesta also? If the text book of Sanskrit commonly used for learning the language is not suitable, a new one may be written with the special purpose in view, say by adding the necessary Vedic elements and omitting the unnecessary details of Classical Sanskrit. As to the study of Pahlavi, the suggestion made about its transcription should be applied in school books also. Of course, all this means hard work and is a costly affair; but nothing worth the name can be achieved without proper means.

It is thanks to the kind offer of Dr. P. C. Bagchi, Director of Research Studies, Visva-Bharati, that the several studies appear together in this First Part of the series. It may be considered as a sort of Introduction to the rest that may follow, as something to create proper interest in the subject. The Second Part—*The First Three Gathas of Zarathustra* with an Appendix, is ready and will follow immediately. The Third may contain Readings from the Avesta or some Pahlavi theme concerning Handarz or the so-called Zurvān texts.

The Santiniketan Press has not all the facilities of diacritical marks—'j', for instance, appears without any. Due apology is made for this and other short-comings of technical nature.

Santiniketan,
November, 1949.

J. C. TAVADIA

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDO-IRANIAN

In the domain of Oriental research Indo-Iranian studies form a combined group, officially ; but in reality they are seldom treated together. Both fields have widened so enormously that it is impossible to do justice to them jointly. Moreover, the centre of interest has shifted from related branches to remoter ones. Yet, it is essential that the comparative stand-point should not be set aside altogether. One must look beyond the other side of the Indus, especially as regards the older periods. This is done at least partially in western countries, where nobody thinks of taking up Avesta without a sufficient knowledge of Sanskrit, particularly of Vedic Sanskrit. But this does not mean that we should restrict ourselves to linguistic studies alone, nor should it be a one way traffic from that side of the Indus. Specialists in both branches, Indology and Iranistic, can have mutual benefit, and that too not only in the restricted domain of linguistics but also in matters relating to literature, religion, philosophy, and culture in general. In the following pages will be found some examples bearing on this point, particularly as to what Iranian literature can teach an Indologist.

Under the rubric Iranian literature falls also what is usually called Persian literature (plus the Arabic writings by Persians during the first centuries of Islam). What this can teach us is or can easily be known, for there exist proper means to get oneself acquainted with it. Of course, as regards this branch too there is room, and immense room to boot, for further and better knowledge through research, as well as for historical and critical method in its study. But that is a different matter. On this occasion I want to restrict myself to the older branches of Iranian literature, about which there reigns not only ignorance but—which is worse—also erroneous information.

The older branches, though mostly fragmentary and limited

in extent, teach us many things. But in this short article I can mention only a few things and that too in a few words. However, if I were to apply the Indian angle of vision in the selection of these few things, that will amply repay my trouble and will also be, I hope, interesting and instructive to the readers.

Leaving aside the question as to how far the Old Persian inscriptions of Darius I and others served as model for the inscriptions of Asoka—the resemblance in protocol is generally emphasised—I shall make only one observation about their language. The language of the inscriptions appears to be in a slightly more advanced stage than the other old Iranian dialect known to us, namely, that of the Avesta, but in certain respects it represents the old stage more faithfully. For this and other reasons the Avestan orthography, especially as regards the vowel system, is not to be considered genuine, but is to be changed on sound philological grounds, so as to make it represent the original state. This state will then show how closely related are Avestic and Vedic.

This fact should be fully recognised and also applied for mutual help in elucidation. On my arrival in India I was painfully surprised to read and hear that Vedic forms—both declensional and conjugational—were considered irregular and even faulty by some Indian Sanskritists. But if they are told that Avestic also presents the same alleged ‘faulty’ forms, they will be better able to understand their true nature. However this may be, even most of those Indian Sanskritists who recognise the resemblance between the two languages follow some old works, and more or less mechanically repeat some stereotyped comparisons without any knowledge about the restored forms which alone show the close and genuine relation. For instance, *dasyu* is compared with *daiṇhu* and *dakhyu*; whereas as a matter of fact both of these orthographies conceal the genuine word *dahyu*. Let it be added that the difference in the meanings of this term is not properly explained till now. The suggestion that the original meaning was ‘enemy’, from which was developed ‘enemy people or enemy country’, is not convincing; for in such a case the phrase *aryanam dahyunam* ‘of the countries (or people) of the Aryas’ would be very strange in the mouths of Avestic

adorers. I think that the word meant 'people or country' without any bad connotation originally ; but it got associated with this odium when applied to the conquered people or natives by Vedic tribes. Just remember how this very word 'native' came to have a bad flavour in India and elsewhere in the mouths of Englishmen,—so much so that even a well-known Indian translated it as *gāmathī* 'rustic' in a Gujarati book of travel, rather unconsciously.

There is no doubt about the mutual help rendered by Old Iranian or Avesta and Old Indian or Sanskrit to each other in the elucidation of their phonology and accidence. It should not be supposed that Sanskrit being rich in every respect does not require the help of fragmentary Avesta. Any elementary but reliable work on the subject is sufficient to show the contrary. But it is a pity that even elementary facts are not a matter of common knowledge among those who deal with the subject on this side. Else I should not have come across, in a linguistic work, a remark to the effect that Indo-European consonants are best preserved in Sanskrit, especially the aspirates. This is misleading. Sanskrit has preserved the old aspirates but not the whole consonantal system. It has not only changed, for instance the original palatals into sibilants, like other *satem* languages, but it also shows some further development which can be checked by Avestan. Similarly, the greater mixing up of gutturals and palatals followed by *s* can sometimes be distinguished with the help of this sister tongue. It is very probable that the above-mentioned remark was not meant to be taken seriously. It was perhaps thrown out to arouse the interest of the general public. It is of course necessary to make the public take interest in such matters, but that should not be done at the cost of science. Moreover, grammatical facts are like natural or climatic laws, for which the people living in that particular climate do not deserve any merit or demerit.

Not only in grammatical structure and vocabulary but also in literary form, in certain metres like the *Triṣubh* and in a way *Gayatri*, there is resemblance between the Avesta and the *R̥gveda*. This fact is usually mentioned in good manuals. But there is a peculiarity about these points of resemblance which is

not so commonly known. It is the eighth Maṇḍala which bears the most striking similarity to the Avesta. There and there only (and of course partly in the related first Maṇḍala) do some common words like *uṣtra* and the strophic structure called *pragatha* occur. To this may be added also the use of the term *sapta sindhavaḥ* for N. W. India or the Punjab—thus confirming the Avestic name *hapta hindu*. Further research in this direction is sure to be fruitful.

There are also other remarkable literary devices and forms which are common to both sacred books, the Ṛgveda and the Avesta. In a not yet published German article, 'Zur Interpretation der Gatha Zarathustras', I contend that the use of Zarathustra in the third person does not mean that these hymns are composed by some one else. The use of the third person instead of the first person is a literary device to produce a stronger or more dramatic effect. It is with this view that the change from the first to the third person is also resorted to in the Gathas. It can be shown that such is also the case in what are known as *saṃvāda-sūkta* or dialogue-hymns of the Ṛgveda. For instance in l. 165. 10 : *ahám hy āgró maruto vídāno. yāni cyāvam, índra id íś eṣāṃ* 'I am indeed known as the mighty, O Maruts. Whatever I undertake, over that commands Indra.' Here *íś* is to be taken as the third person singular and not as the first.

There are various theories about these *Saṃvāda*-hymns, the most controverted being the *Ākhyāna*-theory of Oldenberg, who assumed the loss of prose passages from between the verses. Geldner explains them as ballads ; and he may be right as regards simpler hymns. But on the whole L. von Schroeder is justified in declaring them to be dramatic scenes. The best proof is afforded by one of the Gathas of Zarathustra—Yasna 29, which is a very characteristically dramatic piece with 5-6 persons taking part in it. Meillet tried to apply the *Ākhyāna*-theory to this hymn, but in vain.¹

These Gathas (hymns, songs) may be taken as the most ancient and at the same time most precious literary products of Iran. They, as suggested above, come directly from Zarathustra,

1. See my forth-coming study in *The First Three Gathas of Zarathustra*.

and as such contain his own teaching. This teaching shows a wonderfully advanced stage of religious thought compared with that reached by all other Indo-European peoples. The Gathas preach pure monotheism as well as a definite moral system. The so-called dualism is nothing but a part or another aspect of monotheism,—or better expressed something which does not affect it. It is a common practice to compare the monotheistic and ethical side of Ahura with that of Varuṇa. But really speaking in one case it is far more pronounced and clear, (especially now when the mistake about the function or treatment of the aspect terms *mazdah*, *aša* i. e. *ṛta*, etc. is finally cleared up) ; in the other, the higher tendency was not allowed to proceed to its logical goal, it was retarded. The majestic Varuṇa might have taken the place of the supreme Lord—Ahura—and the principle of *ṛta* might have led to high morality. But in the R̥gveda none of them seems to be living and growing forces ; they appear to be rather the shades of the past. The whole R̥gvedic system is said to be “unstable and in decay”. However that may be, the fact is that Varuṇa and *Ṛta* were not retained and developed but neglected and dropped. Varuṇa vanished from the scene after a period during which he was regarded to be a minor water god, and *ṛta* all at once, although its place was taken by *dharma*. The thinkers and teachers of India, passing through the maze of the Brahmanas, and emerging from the Āraṇyakas, and arriving at the Upaniṣads took a different turn—to the more abstract study of the nature of reality. They passed on to metaphysics rather than to ethics.

Leaving aside the other aspects of the Gathic teaching of the prophet himself, we may turn to the popular and priestly religion represented in the other Avesta. (It is better to use the term ‘other’ than ‘younger’ or ‘later’, which does not always correspond to the facts now ascertained). From the Indian point of view one will find in the Yashts and similar pieces many a parallel notion about religion and society, about heavenly powers and their worship, and so forth. There are occasional references to this matter in various works, and there are also special monographs ; yet a detailed and critical study might bring out new points.

The most obscure and neglected branch of Iranian literature is the middle one written in Pahlavi or Middle Persian. The language is simple enough, but it is clothed in a peculiar script, ideographic and at the same time highly cursive and ambiguous. Yet this difficulty can be and also is overcome to a great extent. What is then required is a sufficient 'feel for the language' (Sprachgefuehl), since there is very little of grammatical guide and control. However, very few care to apply themselves to the study of this language and literature. There is also a certain prejudice about its utility. But as a matter of fact, it contains many an old conception of the Iranians, and may contribute a great deal towards the elucidation of the Indo-Iranian or Aryan period. On several occasions the present writer has brought to light parallels to Indian wisdom—philosophy, metaphysics or whatever one calls it—from these very Pahlavi writings.

In the article 'An Iranian Text on the Act of Dreaming'', published in Winternitz Festschrift, it is shown how the teaching of Yajñavalkya on the same subject can be traced in Zoroastrian literature. The question of the origin and history of the belief is rather difficult to solve, but the existence of that unique text, preserved in an obscure place and manner, is sufficient for our purpose. On another occasion I have dwelt upon certain parallel notions about body and soul amongst the Jains and the Zoroastrians (see Zeitschrift fuer Indologie and Iranistik 10. 192 ff. and Journal of K. R. Cama Oriental Institute No 31. 161 f.). More recently a Swedish scholar has emphasised the importance of Pahlavi writings for the investigation of primitive, that is, earlier, not later, views as regards Indo-Iranian divinities (see Stig Wikander, Vayu p. ix).

It is perhaps necessary to add that these new means of comparison can shed also unexpected light on Indian texts. As an illustration it was intended to take up Yajñavalkya's dictum on *karma* in Brh. Up. 3. 2. 13 in a rather detailed manner, since it has not been dealt with up to now ; but the subject grew far beyond the scope and limits of this paper. It will suffice to note only the main results. Yajñavalkya does not teach the common *karma* theory involving re-birth on earth, but rather expounds

the view that the dead pass on to the other world, to heaven or hell according to the merits of the deeds performed by them. Of greater significance is his conception of *karma*, 'work'. He uses this term in place of soul, ego, personality - or whatever one likes to call it—that which is immortal and eternal in human beings. It is like *nāma* 'the name, the idea', as (elsewhere) opposed to *rūpa*, 'the form, the body', referred to by him in the parallel § 12 that just precedes the passage under discussion.

This unique conception of *karma*, as something essential and immortal like the soul inhabiting the human frame, was first suggested by the Middle Persian glosses, where 'work, activity, and endeavour' are used to elucidate certain terms meaning the soul or psychic organs. While discussing them in connection with the "Middle Persian Evidence for the Avestan Conception of Fire" (in *Studia Indo-Iranica*, Ehrengabe fuer Wilhelm Geiger, p. 244 f.) and also with the "Jaina Parallels to Zoroastrian Beliefs about Body and Soul" (in *Zeitschrift fuer Indologie and Iranistic* 10,192 and *Journal of the K. R. Cama Or. Inst.* No. 31 p. 161), I had not thought of this Upaniṣad passage. But later on while reading it, the mutual relation between all the three sources—Parsi, Jain, and Hindu—became apparent and so also their real significance. The 'work-soul', for instance, postulated as a parallel to the 'work-body' (*kārmāna-śarīra*, Pkr. *kammaga-sarīra*) of the Jains is now confirmed by Yājñavalkya's teaching about the fate of a person after death in Bṛh. Up 3. 2. 13. According to this not only his body merges into earth but also his soul (*ātman*) passes into ether or heaven (*ākāśa*), and there remains only his work (*karma*) with which to continue his future state.

This, in its turn, suggests a further conclusion that the theory of different souls, psychic organs or faculties, must have been in vogue already in the Aryan period. But in course of time it seems to have lost its force, so that only a few traces were left which too came to be misunderstood or not understood. Then the fact, that out of different souls the one which we may conveniently call the 'work-soul' is given pre-eminence by Yājñavalkya as well as by Zoroastrian authors, is worthy of notice. It speaks highly of their sense of ethics, of

the principles of the good life. One may argue that by work both of them must have primarily meant religious work, that is performance of rites rather than of what is right. For in those days the adage "Work is Worship" was most probably used the other way round. Yet some sort of social service, work for one's community, if not for humanity at large, was not totally excluded. This is not a mere favourable or self-complimentary surmise but an actual fact.

A direct and unimpeachable proof is afforded in the very place where the 'work-soul' is referred to,—in that picturesque account of the soul's journey to the other world, Hadoxt Nask 2. Here in 13 f. the *daena*, the work-soul, of a good person declares to his *urvan*, the choice-soul (from *var* 'to choose'): Whereas thou sawest another setting fire, and practising *baosana* deed and deportation, and doing destruction to plants, yet thou satest down reciting the Gathas, and adoring good (or bright?) waters and the fire of Ahura Mazdāh, and satisfying a 'holy' man coming from near or from afar. And thus thou madest me who was beloved more beloved, who was beautiful more beautiful, etc.—The last item about satisfying a 'holy' man refers to hospitality which one must offer to a member of the same faith,—a religious obligation which became a very prominent feature in Islam. Then the mention of evil deeds by way of contrast presupposes also other good works, say, the corresponding ones. In the translation of those evil deeds I follow Hertel; tradition differs and Bartholomae leaves out all but the last. In any case, they refer to some worldly deeds injurious to economy, the opposite of which, the beneficial ones like agriculture, must have been performed by the good man as declared in the *Vidēvdāt* 3. 4, 23. Thus the 'work-soul' did not consist of merely religious rites but also of deeds of practical utility for the benefit of all.

It may not be possible to adduce such evidence in the case of Yājñavalkya. But we know that in his days, as in the whole period of the Upaniṣads, the old faith in religious ceremonies as the only means to attain supreme bliss inculcated by the Brahmanas was no longer in force; and although the new trend of thought was mainly towards metaphysics, ethics too might have had some share in it. When Yājñavalkya speaks of the 'work-

soul', we can safely assume such share and see in his teaching in Brh. Up. 2. 3. 13 the recognition of the great truth that one is what one does, one's very essence or soul is what one achieves. By means of this interpretation arrived at by comparative study one does far better justice to the great teacher and thinker than by the usual application of the common *karma*-theory involving re-birth on earth. This theory is also a later indigenous growth not in consonance with the old Vedic views. Not only the meaning of Karma in Brh. Up. 3. 2. 13 is 'work-soul' as proved by the Pahlavi glosses but also other details in it show remarkable resemblance to the Iranian comparison between Macrocosmos and Microcosmos or great world—nature, and small world—human body. More about this elsewhere.

These few notes and remarks concerning the scope and importance of the comparative study of Indo-Iranian will also show the necessity of the proper cultivation of the Iranian branch, which is either totally neglected or poorly treated by the seats of learning and learned societies in India. This is however a different subject and need not be pursued here. It is enough to note that however little and fragmentary and in whatever shape the Iranian matter may have come down to us, it is of great value. The more one studies it, the better one appreciates it, as can be seen from the achievements of a few western scholars. The value of Iranian is very much enhanced by the discovery of a large number of manuscripts and other matter from the sand-buried ruins of Turfan and other places in Eastern or Chinese Turkistan in the beginning of the present century. Their ingenious decipherment brought to light a number of new dialects and languages of the Middle Iranian stage. But it is the language only that is Iranian; the matter or contents are mostly Indian and sometimes also the script. For leaving aside some Manichean and Christian texts and fragments most of the Sogdian and all of the Saka or Khotanese manuscripts, those written in Brahmi, contain translations of Buddhist works on various subjects, religious as well as medical. Although only translations, they are likely to shed additional light on the matter. Indeed there is no lack of real work; what we lack is real workers.

II

IRANIAN STUDIES IN INDIA AND IN THE WEST

XALEPA TA KALA

‘The Beautiful is Difficult’

OR

High Quality involves Hard Work

Regnum Scientiae ut Regnum Coeli non nisi sub persona
infantis intratur.

‘Into the Kingdom of Knowledge, as into the Kingdom of
Heaven, whoso would enter must become as a little child.’

Francis Bacon.

vir i ṅn vāh, kē ṅn cē nē dānēt, dānēt, ku nē dānom.

‘His intelligence is good, who, (as to) whatever he does
not know, knows : I do not know (it).’

Dēnkart 6. 2. (3).

The preceding article “Comparative Study of Indo-Iranian” is meant to show how the various branches of Iranistic can be helpful to the Indologist. Here is a field that ought to have attracted a good number of Sanskritists to apply their knowledge in its study and investigation. But in spite of official recognition of this branch, what is the result ? Of course, compared to my student-days at Bombay there is some, or, if one likes, great progress—as far as the outward show is concerned. In those days candidates for the M. A. degree in Sanskrit were recommended to read some general books on Iranian culture and religion, for instance, *Essays on the Parsis* by Martin Haug ; and then they were tested in their knowledge by making them deal with such common-place or, in fact, complicated questions as the comparison between the Indian Āditya-s and Iranian Amesha Spenta-s (actually *amṛta spanta* as it ought to be known at least

now), Asura and Ahura, Soma and Haoma, and such other trivialities. To-day, to judge from the curriculum of Calcutta University, one might be quite contented as far as Avesta and Old Persian are concerned. For one finds therein such standard works as Tolman, Johnson, Meillet (but still the 1915 edition, although the second one revised by Benveniste is available since 1930-31) and Jackson. Compared to this Pahlavi is poorly represented ; evidently the authorities have no better knowledge or choice. Also the *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie* and Reichelt's *Awestisches Elementarbuch* are at least recommended. —All this forms only a part of the curriculum for the M. A. degree in Persian, Group E Philology. I am afraid the whole is only a theoretical plan, an ideal, to achieve which no practical steps seem to have been taken.

Be this as it may, some of these works are stated to be for reference only, and wisely so, because they would be very probably beyond the comprehension of all those concerned. It is only a truism when I say this. The works prepared from the stand-point of linguistics or comparative philology cannot be acceptable or congenial to students of literature. But the approach of our Indian students is literary, and even what passes as linguistics for them is a very poor substitute. If I mistake not, the situation described by Prof. S. K. Chatterji has practically remained the same in spite of some notable exceptions. Here are his words, and if they are not true to-day I shall be very happy to be corrected :

“Linguistics as a modern science is still in its infancy in India, and the meagre dose of ‘Comparative Philology’ or ‘Historical Grammar’ which our college students reading advanced courses in Sanskrit or English, not supplementing it by any acquaintance with another language of equal importance, most unwillingly gulp down, is hopelessly inadequate to create an intelligent interest in the subject. Added to this initial difficulty, Indo-Aryan linguistics both of the classical and modern periods has formed the favourite haunt of mere amateurs who seek to compensate for their want of knowledge of the principles of historical grammar and of the modern science of language by professing utter contempt of it ; and the professed

student of literature who knows the language but not its history shares in this contempt. To make confusion worse confounded, the spirit of scholasticism is not yet dead : we have elaborate grammars of Sanskrit masquerading as Bengali grammar, in which the genuine Bengali forms have been branded as vulgar (*asādhū*) beside the so-called 'polite' (*sādhū*) forms borrowed from Sanskrit" (*The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, p. xv).

I have quoted also the remarks pertaining to Modern Indian languages, since the sphere of my study and interest includes at least some of them. Here too a vast field of research lies before us ; but it should be based on sound principles and programme : Collection of all available MSS., their critical estimate and faithful use for the edition of texts with linguistic and other notes and indexes. On these can then be based the history and dictionary of different languages, and then comparative study of these as well as other studies—social, religious, historical, etc. For non-literary words and matters one must go to the living sources and collect them from their actual use. The new spirit and the new method are already at work. Besides Dr. Chatterji's monumental study on the Bengali language I have come across a couple of others, and still more may have appeared in the meantime. However, the tradition holds its own in various quarters, else much can be expected and achieved in this line. But I need not dwell upon this matter of modern Indian languages any further¹ and must restrict myself to the question of Iranian studies, which are prosecuted not fully and independently but only as part of "Linguistics" or Indo-Iranian Philology. Here I feel that Dr. Chatterji's remarks still hold good, and that the situation is not materially changed. Let us examine this point in detail.

For the M. A. degree in Sanskrit, Group B, a small (one-fourth) part of the sixth paper is devoted to Avesta—"Haoma Yast, ix" (which means Yasna ix) and "Students are expected to have a working knowledge of Avestan Grammar", for which purpose Jackson's work is "recommended". A student—not to

1 See, however, a few remarks at the end.

say a wise, practical student—may not take all this trouble, for he can get what he wants by devoting himself to the other, three-fourth part of the paper. Then in Comparative Philology, Indo-Aryan Branch, one paper is devoted to what is strangely called “Indo-Iranian (Aryan) Philology, with elements of Avesta and Old Persian”. Here the prescribed books include Jackson’s and Johnson’s Grammars but Tolman’s edition is replaced by Sen’s. The same is the case with the full-fledged Iranian Branch where Pahlavi is again poorly represented, whereas Persian is in a strange fashion—without any texts, although for (Vedic) Sanskrit and even Arabic texts are prescribed along with grammars and the like (s. The Calendar, Supplement for 1948, pp. 321-349). Of course, all this is meant only as plan and theory.

I shall, therefore, leave aside other details and restrict myself to Avesta and Old Persian, to provide for which is within the bounds of facility and possibility. If French and German authoritative works are beyond the horizon of our students there are also excellent English ones. But instead of Reichelt’s *‘Avesta Reader’*, which practically makes Bartholomae available in English and gives all other necessary information, Taraporewala’s *‘Selections from Avesta (and Old Persian’*, which latter never appeared), said to be specially prepared for Indian students, is given preference. Similarly, Dr. Sukumar Sen’s edition of *‘Old Persian Inscriptions’* replaces Tolman’s as said above. Naturally the University wants to ‘patronise’ its own publications. If it was necessary to provide Indian students with greater help—“with full and exhaustive notes” as the advertisement formula runs—this could have been supplied in companion volumes to the above-mentioned standard works. Or if it was considered desirable to prepare new editions, these should have been prepared with much greater care, so that they turned out as good as if not better than the old ones. But actually the reverse has happened. This is not a wild, hasty charge just thrown out at random, but a considered opinion based on facts and figures. I also very much regret that such has been the result of my inquiry in the matter. The contrary would have pleased me and also others, since Dr. Sen, for instance, had undertaken the task of bringing all the

Old Persian inscriptions in one place. This was a great desideratum, for a number of new inscriptions—some of them very important—were scattered in different places. On receiving this volume, I wanted to encourage the author and appreciate his labours ; accordingly I added a few remarks on it while writing a short, general article on the subject (*Indo-Iranica* 3. 43 ff.). Besides differing about the plan of the work I referred to some discrepancies. But on closer acquaintance later on I found that the work was rather poorly executed. A little more care and consideration would have improved it to a great degree. There are all sorts of mistakes ; they should not have been committed in a tutorial work of this type, which remains in use for a great many years. It is safer to follow the standard works in all cases of doubts and difficulties. Nobody would object to new suggestions, if they were made in a proper manner—and when necessary. Unnecessary innovations should be avoided. Of course, there can be errors of judgment ; yet they should not form a rule but should remain an exception.

As to *Avesta Selections*, the matter is worse as it is also more complicated. It is indeed a wise plan to give Sanskrit equivalents in the beginning, especially because the Avestan orthography does not show the real state of the language. Of course, one should recognise the genuine sound changes ; the others should be corrected to get the proper view. For instance, it is all easy to say that *vivaṇha* in Y. 9. 4 is nom. sg. , but one should also know how nom. sg. of *vivaṇhvat* came to assume that form. (Or is it unnecessary to bother one's head about it ?) The two kinds of changes are neither adequately nor always distinguished in Jackson's Grammar,¹ that being a matter of more recent research. This is a special affair and Taraporewala may not be expected to take it into account. But what he certainly should have taken into account is the correct explanations of Reichelt based upon Bartholomae. It is no use repeating older explanations when they are evidently wrong and antiquated. In doubtful cases they may be mentioned either for choice and comparison or even for

1. This Grammar was published in 1892. Later editions are mere reprints by mechanical process but these could have contained an appendix on the points raised by Bartholomae.

preference. After so many years there is also room for totally new explanations, but to provide them requires other qualifications. Above all one cannot and should not depart from the recognised standard of linguistic and historical—this word includes everything—method. Fanciful flights of imagination cannot achieve that task. Happy inspiration and acute imagination can give us many a right start, but it is only the dry light of reason that can guide us to the goal.

One may question why I am speaking at length about the University curriculum and the University text-books. The answer is that these form the foundation of Iranian research in India; and the foundation should be solid and not so full of defects. For this same reason I ought to have included in my survey the way and manner in which Iranian languages are taught in schools and Madres(s)as for University or other examinations on the Bombay side. But without entering into the vexed question of our educational system in general and that for the Parsi priesthood in particular, I will only remark that reform is long due in this particular subject. Even general training of mind and general diffusion of knowledge need not be carried on by questionable methods and questionable means. But when post-graduate studies and research come in operation, these—the methods and means—must necessarily be such as to correspond with and be conducive to the high aims. Dr. Tara-porewala has put forth the following claim in his presidential address at the 7th All India Oriental Conference, Proceedings and Transactions p. 849; “No wonder when Hindu scholars steeped in Sanskrit learning take to the study of Iranian along scientific methods, they very soon leave us Parsis far behind. This I know from personal experience of teaching Iranian languages ... in the University of Calcutta”. To me also it would have been no wonder; for I have been preaching the same in and out of season. But the real wonder is that nobody has learnt Avesta as it ought to have been learnt. I am also frankly told that what is actually done is just for “Indian Linguistics”, and that is quite sufficient; nothing more is needed. It is therefore no wonder if the net result is almost nil.

I will not discuss the nature and contents of the books or

compilations like the *Aryan Trail in Iran and India* by N. Ghose; there are worse things on the market. The author with law as his profession is perhaps an amateur, although the book is published by the University of Calcutta, 1937. But even the serious articles by recognised scholars betray the same defects. First of all one cannot depend upon the old, antiquated translation of the Avesta (and the Pahlavi works too) in SBE while using Iranian or Zoroastrian evidence in support of some new theory. It is worth while to dwell upon one such article. Prof. S. K. Chatterjee in his enthusiasm to trace Islamic mysticism in ancient India and Iran has certainly gone astray (*Indo-Iranica* I, 25 f.). He has to admit that in the Avesta the female divinities "remain distant and worshipping divinities after all." But he must find out something that even dimly and distantly reminds him of his theme. He therefore refers to what is generally known as the *Hadoxt Nask* 2 and what Darmesteter gives as the eighth section of the *Vistasp yast* (which contains slight changes, one being the strange apostrophe 'O my son Frashaostra' !) and adds : "The whole passage is a beautiful one, and is redolent with the romance that beathes in every page of Persian Sufi lyrics, and is worth quoting".

Here follows the translation from SBE 23. (It is immaterial that this translation requires correction ; for instance, the beginning of 59 should be : 'And who has loved thee ...' followed by the reply 'Thou '). No doubt, the passage is beautiful but with no stretch of imagination can one see therein "the romance that breathes in every page of Persian Sufi lyrics". It is enough to remember that the beautiful—and mark, also ugly—maiden described in ideal terms, whom the dead one's *urvan* or 'choice-soul' meets and speaks to, is not any divinity, but his or her own *daena* 'ego, conscience' or, as I have exactly defined, 'work-soul' (*Visva-Bharati Quarterly* 1948, p. 129 f.). Hence there can never arise the question of Sufic union between the worshipper and the worshipped. Similarly the Gatha passage, Y. 46. 2, has nothing to do with "the Sufi idea of God as the Bride or the Friend of the soul", as Chatterji would like to believe. A glance at the strophe in its context will convince anybody. There Zarathustra admits his lack of power and possessions and adds :

I cry unto thee, see thou to it, O Lord,
Granting support as friend to friend

It is possible that Dr. Taraporewala has misled Dr. Chatterji ; for in his recent free translation he renders the phrase *fryo fryai* 'as Lover to Beloved.' I shall have to speak about this work later on ; but here it is enough to note that the context, a prayer in material need for material support, excludes any notions about the Lover and the Beloved. Maybe the terms are used in their "spiritual" sense, but they are misleading. Not *frya-*, but *vanta-* and its cognates are the Av. words for them. Moreover, the idea of divine union in the Gathas is of different nature and is expressed by a different term, *sar-*. I may as well add that Dr. Chatterji is not justified in his conclusion (p. 24), from the Brh. Ar. Up. IV, 3. 21. If the bliss enjoyed in the union of the individual soul with the universal soul is compared with bliss in embracing a beloved, one cannot say that "the Divinity is made the Sweetheart of man's soul." A simile is not a dogma.

All this should not be considered as an isolated piece of criticism. My object is just to point out that one cannot expect to achieve anything worthwhile in this easy or rough and ready manner. Dr. Taraporewala himself has made some apt remarks about "very wrong and hazy notions of what these languages (Avesta and Pahlavi) really are" among the present generation and about the 'neglect of grammar and philology' in the above mentioned presidential address p. 848 f. But I regret to say that I have to apply the same criticism and something more to his own work. I may not say anything about the "hazy notions" and even names about things lying beyond his proper subject ; but in spite of his being a Sanskritist and also acquainted with French and German his work in Avesta too is far from being what it ought to be,—far from the standard laid down by himself. This is all the more regrettable, because he is looked upon as an authority in India, where his advice and guidance are sought by all and sundry. Since he calls his translation of the Gathas "free", (which is also elegant,) he has shut the door of criticism to it. But the way in which he has changed the text, and also from his notes in the *Avesta Selections*, one can obtain some

idea of his knowledge and method. And that idea, I really regret to say, is poor, compared to the advance already made. Taraporewala, however, claims for his version that "every point of grammar and construction has been examined in the fullest detail", which is also "ready for publication." Therefore the final judgment or examination of individual cases should be deferred till then.

Yet there is still something more that can be said even now, namely, about the principles on which the translation is prepared. Dr. Taraporewala's charge against Western scholars of "the double bias of being Europeans and Christians" is misleading, and so are also his remarks about one's faith or no faith (p. vi f.). If their translations are still defective, it is due to lack of other factors which are to be considered in interpretation of literary products. As to the principles announced by Dr. Taraporewala (p. ix f.), the first one, that "the Gathas must be understood by themselves and in the light of their own contents," is to be fully subscribed and followed. But the second one that, "the nearest to the Gatha both in language and spirit, stands the Vedic literature of India," is only partly correct. The linguistic relation is well known, and so the words and idioms of Rv. may be compared but hardly the ideas. I do not think this last can be done satisfactorily. The spirit however is certainly different,—even in Varuṇa hymns. Anyhow, what is false in theory and is sure to be fatal in practice is the third principle : "The Gatha versification, as also the Vedic, follows invariably the rule that 'a unit of verse is also a unit of sense'." This is one of the pet ideas of Dr. Taraporewala ; and he preaches it on every occasion, the latest being his article in Bulletin, Deccan College... Research Institute VIII, p. 57 ff., where he tries all sorts of shiftings. This is unnecessary. The dictum is not even "mentioned by almost every scholar" as he would like us to believe. If the unit of verse yields also the unit of sense, well and good. It is quite natural. But to make it a hard and fast rule and force it upon the Gathas is wrong. Zarathustra has not bound himself by any rule like that. Times without number the words belonging syntactically together will be found in separate verses or lines—no doubt for some artistic or stylistic reason. This is

one of the difficulties of the Gathas, which are also not otherwise "perfectly simple and direct in their style and diction." Tara-porewala's fifth principle is also misleading when he says "The Gathas are *spiritual* in the fullest sense of the word. Therefore, we must never bring down their Message to the material level." As a matter of fact Zarathustra appears there fully alive to the material evils and goods of the world which he strives to remove and advance respectively by his message. The recognition of this fact helps us to interpret the Gathas properly (see below 'Zarathustra's Path of Peace' and the forth-coming study *'The First Three Gathas of Zarathustra'*).

Be this as it may; my contention is briefly this: Any additional aid of any nature whatsoever may be brought in to explain the words of the prophet; but the first and the last condition is that the principles of linguistic and historical methods or grammar and philology as understood by competent authorities are not set aside. The best way would be to show by one's own attempt how a new translation of the Gathas should be made. But my article 'Zur interpretation der Gatha Zarathustras' has not yet appeared; and my intention to supplement it with the translation of a few select Gathas could not be carried out for various reasons. However, specimens mentioned above will serve the purpose.

While speaking of the Gathas, I am expected to consider Khabardar's big volume on the Ahunavaiti Gatha. This work evokes one's admiration but at the same time also indignation—or shall I say 'righteous indignation'? The author deserves our admiration and thanks for the pains that he has taken in the production of his work under abnormal circumstances, but he cannot be freed from the censure about the futility of such unguided efforts and for the false notions that obscure the matter further and deeper instead of clearing it up. It is certainly wrong to judge or prejudge this work from the author's former occupation and acquirements. These need not disqualify him from undertaking a new type of work. If Khabardar claims to have studied the Veda in his youth—although the study may be on traditional lines—and if he now takes up Avesta with the help of Jackson's Grammar, the thing is not impossible. Of

course, Bartholomae remains a sealed book to him, unless occasionally through some indirect means. Compared to his Dictionary Kanga's is no proper guide. But Khabardar mainly depends upon his comparisons with or rather transformation into Sanskrit and then appeals to Monier-William's Dictionary, and for grammatical purposes also to Macdonell's Vedic Grammar.

But in spite of this learned apparatus, Khabardar's work does not satisfy the needs of a serious student. Leaving aside other matters about plan, method, and the like, my main objection is to his fanciful comparisons and transformations. He disregards even elemental sound laws. And no wonder. Even the would-be scholars indulging in "Comparative Philology or Linguistics" sometimes make such poor show while embarking upon the field of Avesta, that one can forgive a layman like Khabardar. But one cannot and should not forget that his method is often a matter of fancy, a far off seeming resemblance in sound, or absolute disregard for other factors. A few glaring illustrations will suffice. In spite of the perfectly clear etymology (the formation is equivocal but the choice is not difficult) of *dazda* in the Ahunavar formula, the word is equated with *dakṣa* "with uprightness." I must save the reader—and of course myself also—the trouble of discussing his page-long comment giving, inter alia, the astrological proof for this innovation. Then *drigubyo* in the same formula is said to be *dhriḡubhyo* and translated by "for the self-restrained". He does not say why the hitherto accepted and ascertained meaning 'for the poor (pious)' is rejected. In support of the new one he refers only to *adhrigu* "unrestrained". But actually this means 'unrestrained going' (mostly spoken of Gods, twice only of men, according to Grassmann). Such facts, however, are never weighed. Liberty with grammar too is not wanting in this short piece. *Ahurai a* is not dative 'unto Ahura' but ablative "from Ahura"—because of the postposition *a*, declares Khabardar. Now if the new interpretation offered by him is based upon such apparent misinterpretations of individual words, how can it be trusted? And who has got time and leisure or will and capacity to control it at every point of departure from the usual interpretation? One has not only to go through his long and round about comments but check

the linguistic details of which he makes such free use—and also false one. As an example of his disregard for other factors while making comparisons may be mentioned the derivation of the holy and mystic syllable *Sk. om* from *Av. ahuna > auna > aun > om*, as if there is nothing like history or chronology of sound-changes. This derivation comes from another Parsi author.

I will say nothing about Khabardar's astrological key and such other things for the interpretation. I leave it to those who have any knowledge about the matter. But, indeed, my general remarks concerning additional aids hold good in this case also. From the purely philological point of view his work is to be used with caution and control. With this reservation—unfortunately a large one—I have no hesitation to say that Khabardar has rendered a great service to the study of the Gathas. His reproduction in Vedic Sanskrit will be of particular use. It will bring the much desired light in the chaotic orthography of the original. But unfortunately it is not free from mistakes about common words too. Certain vagaries like the retention of *aša* instead of *ṛta* will be ignored by the concerned. It is also not clear why Khabardar has done this. Is it because he considers *aša* to be the older form of *ṛta*? I hope nobody requires me to refute this and other wild notions. (I apologise if the expression 'wild' is non-parliamentary or too strong). Had the author cared to follow the proper guide, his grammatical analysis too would have been more useful.

Also one of the special chapters added in this work deserves careful consideration. I mean the one entitled "The Meter of the Ahunavaiti Gatha' and the Accents embodied in it, and Specific Differences in Phonology between the Gathas and the Vedas". The last point may well be left aside. But since Khabardar is a poet and a deep student of the art of poetry—metrical systems, etc., he can guide us in this matter. We are already acquainted with some of the points, but it is a question whether he is right in others too. For instance, we know the original value of *oi* and other such diphthongs; but Khabardar argues that they are introduced to designate different accents (p. 591, § 6); and it is for the same purpose, he adds (593), that the surds are changed into sonants to show the acute accent (*udatta*), and the other

way round to show the grave accent (anudatta). The author is so convinced of his view that he declares that now even the Brahmins will learn from it the correct way of reciting the Veda ! Leaving aside such self-complimentary remarks and exaggerations, of which there are many, one must first separate the data about the accentuation from other details and see how far they can stand the test elsewhere. That would be a very useful task, but I must leave it for some other occasion, or much better to some other person.

All this, I may repeat, is not a question of individual mistakes, but that of the proper method, principle, and outlook. Mistakes occur in the works of Western scholars also. Their whole theories too may be wrong. Yet there is always something to gain from them. For instance, Hertel's 'Feuerlehre' is generally denounced and rejected. This is partly due to his exaggerations and partly also to his polemical tone which often verges into impoliteness. Yet nobody would seriously deny the merit in his work. If properly used one can learn a great deal of new things. Even his exaggerations become a question of taste in the choice of expressions. Similarly, Nyberg's picture of Zarathustra and his Gathas is wholly misleading, to say the least, —one may rather say, it is monstrous. I have had an occasion to speak at length as regards his interpretation of Y. 30. 3 in my above-mentioned article on the Gathas. And Herzfeld has dealt with his other wild theories of the ordeal and the like, which the prophet performed to establish the truth—not of his new religion, which he is wrongly credited to have preached, but the old inherited one of his tribe and forefathers ! Yet Nyberg's work too, *Die Religionen des alten Irans*, should be consulted for the individual strophes (or even the whole chapters) of the Gathas. The same can be said of Herzfeld's own work *Zoroaster and His World*, where he presents a different picture of the prophet, more or less on the usual lines but bringing him quite in the limelight of history, even in blood-relationship with the royal houses of Media and Persia. This work, published by the Princeton University Press, covers 851 pages, but contains no index. This addition would have facilitated the task of the fellow-students, who will have to consult the work for various

problems of the whole of the Avesta or ancient Iran in general.

Besides these broadly laid out works we have also the special translations of the Gathas—by Lommel who, so to say, continues the work of Andreas, and by Maria Wilkins Smith (*Studies in the Syntax of the Gathas...*) who follows Bartholomae in the main but pays due regard to other researches by accepting them on special occasions. One of her own particular contributions deserves mention: the so-called *aməša spənta* (*amṛta spanta*) are nothing but several aspects of the one God or Lord, Ahura, (or occasionally virtues of men); and when they occur in the instrumental case, they are meant as 'means' or 'instruments' through which He works. It is, I believe, not necessary to restrict the meaning to means; association can also be meant, or still better the instrumental of quality, as Markwart proposed in his study on the first chapter of the Uṣtavaiti Gatha.

In spite of all these new attempts Bartholomae still remains our principal authority because of the comprehensiveness of his lexical and grammatical apparatus. Any new attempt at the translation of the Gathas should consider all these standard authorities by way of check and control, choice and preference, light and guidance even for one's own new views or constructions. One cannot manipulate with one's whim and wish; one's fancy is to be controlled; it is not to be allowed to wander as one listeth. For instance, words are not to be twisted and tortured, nor arbitrary meanings attributed to them. Words can have different meanings and their grammatical forms also different uses and applications. To make the right choice in order to meet the exigency of the context and the general trend of thoughts, is the essence of research in the interpretation of the Gathas—as also of the other Avesta in general.

I use the attribute 'other' in preference to 'later' or 'young', because the main parts of the principal Yašt-s and possibly some of other texts are actually older than the Gathas. Their language, as is the universal practice with secular songs and even religious hymns, may have been retouched and brought up-to-date at the time of redaction, when particularly Zoroastrian formulas were

also introduced. This practice of retouching or remodelling is often hinted at in the *R̥gveda*, and is also corroborated by means of numerous repetitions occurring therein. There are sufficient reasons to assume the same process of modernization of the language in the *Yāst-s*, for instance. But their matter remains still old. Even as regards their language, the minute examination of Meillet has revealed certain archaic features, which are replaced by new forms even in the *Gathas*. This might be taken as the proof of Zarathustra's using the actual or his own language instead of copying old models, which latter is, however, the common view.

Be this as it may, what I want to affirm here is this that also for the other Avesta there is no lack of work, which is recently done in Europe and still remains to be done. But nobody here in India seems to care for the new approach taken up there by many a Western scholar. Besides the already mentioned works of Hertel, Nyberg, and Herzfeld we have Widengren's *Hochgotiglube im alten Iran* and Wikander's *Vayu*, in particular. There is also Weller's *Anahita* dealing with Yt. 5. I cannot undertake here any review of all these works. There are many problematic questions and divergent views and theories in them. But their high value is beyond any doubt. We may not agree partly or wholly with one or another of the authors ; but all of them show that textual criticism is as essential as fruitful for the advance of our knowledge in matters Iranian. Roughly speaking, the main theme is about the religious history—about several chief Gods who ruled supremely at one time or place in Iran—Mithra, Vayu, and Zurvan besides Ahura Mazda. Wikander, who puts forward the claim of Vayu as a once supreme God, sees in the texts relating to him not only traces of religious opposition but also dialectical differences. In his more recent work, *Feuerpriester in Kleinasien und Iran*, the author continues his researches in the different currents and movements to be observed not only in the Avesta but also in the later writings. It is remarkable how he lays foreign sources under contribution and gains important data for the corroboration of various theses.

It is of course not so easy to form a correct and final view of all the different matters discussed in such learned works.

More often than not one has to re-examine the whole question in the light of other facts and one's own investigation therein. (I hope to take up the question of the history of the Avesta—its composition, preservation, passage through vicissitudes, partial destruction, and final redaction—in the light of several other recent studies on the subject). But it would be useful to give at least some general idea of these voluminous researches in English. Then our students might get an idea of the right type of work. Not only the language, French or German, in which it appears is unknown to them, but also the subject and the treatment must appear far from easy and familiar. Herzfeld's is a special case as regards both of these, yet his *Zoroaster and His World* should be taken up as a trial by anybody who wants to convince himself of what I say.

A few words more on this remarkable man, who recently passed away, will not be considered out of place. Herzfeld was an eminent archaeologist but his knowledge of Iranian languages, history, geography, etc. was not less profound. His command over original sources as well as over the work done on them was astounding. His contribution has the same character, both in value and volume. I may mention only his other recent publications in English: *Archaeological History of Iran* and *Iran in the Ancient East*. There is of course great deal of repetition and much that is doubtful and even wrong.

Henning, for instance, characterizes some of Herzfeld's studies in the *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* as a result of liberal use of the possibilities of the legendary "Arsacid text" and the highly hypothetical "Avestan Metrics", large-minded treatment of grammatical niceties and philological rules, ruthless emendation, implicit trust in the value of etymology, and exaggerated application of "the principle of mutual elucidation". This method, hardly paralleled in other branches of historical or philological studies, is bound to produce the most astonishing results. (BSOAS. 10. 503). Indeed, this is a very severe criticism, but it at least shows that one has to be very careful in following Herzfeld's guidance in matters which lie more or less far from him. I shall have to refer to some of his Gathic interpretations in another place. Here I may add one general remark that

Herzfeld is sometimes very liberal in explaining a minor point by means of words, comparisons, and quotations, whereas almost obscure about things that really matter. Of course, he cannot simplify his learned contributions for general readers; but even special students require a clearer view than he sometimes presents.

On the other hand, our students take a very superficial view of highly serious subjects. Mr. J. E. Sanjana's pamphlet, *Zoroaster and his World—a Critique*, is an illustration in the case. The whole 'critique' consists of some stray lines and passages almost without any import on one or two points; whereas the main part of the pamphlet is taken up by Hafiz's verses on mystical or divine union and their comparison with Gathic references on the same theme. It seems to have become a fashion to read ancient Iranian or Zoroastrian ideas in Hafiz. Anyhow, the author could have served the purpose much better by giving a solid summary of the principal chapters from Herzfeld's book—not an easy task, no doubt, but all good and useful work is difficult.

Let me now leave this more or less nebulous region of Iranian studies, where too many ways and cross-ways bewilder an unwary traveller, and turn to some solid ground. One solid ground was supplied some fifty years ago, the *Altiranisches Woerterbuch* of Christian Bartholomae,—“an amazing work”, “the indispensable instrument of all our studies”, as Herzfeld describes it. But, as he justly adds: “semantics is its weakest side”. I have already referred to this point, when I said above that our task lies in the choice of the suitable meaning out of those which might have been developed from the root sense. Also in the choice of the suitable grammatical form we may differ from Bartholomae and yet have to follow or use the rich mine supplied by him.

That Bartholomae's work requires revision from the linguistic or grammatical point of view also, should neither be denied nor wondered at. What I deny and wonder at is the way in which our scholars want to tackle this supreme task. It should be left to Western scholars well-versed in Iranian and Indo-European Comparative Philology—to men like Benveniste.

Besides a number of smaller studies it is his *Infinitives avestiques* that has laid the foundation for the revision of Avestan grammar. This work is not merely a treatise on one of its parts, namely, the Infinitive, but a solid contribution to the exegesis of the Avesta. The same can be said of *Les composés de l'Avesta* undertaken under Benveniste's inspiration and guidance by Duchesne-Guillemin. The great work on the Avestan Compounds was to follow by others on the whole nominal system. But, as I heard from Prof. Renou, the author has given up the plan and turned to some other studies. This is regrettable, but let us hope that the old plan may be taken up again. (I cannot say anything about the same author's *Zoroastre*, because I have not yet seen it.)

It is not a little consolation to observe that Pahlavi studies are also flourishing in spite of great demands on the limited number of Iranists from various other branches. First and foremost occurs to me the name of Bailey. After a number of smaller studies on individual words and passages, he lately brought forth his Ratanbai Katrak Lectures of 1936: *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books* (Oxford 1943). Bailey is as strict and exact as he is sound and erudite; and so he is on the whole a faithful guide. As far as I remember I found him mistaken on one occasion only,—about the word generally read as *dōkan* or *dōgān*. His emendation was unnecessary and explanation wrong. The above reading is correct and the meaning is 'detail'. The author of the *Great Bundahishn*, after a brief account of something, often says *pat dōkan gōwam* '(now) I shall speak in detail (or: with details)', or the like, and actually gives a fuller account of the same subject. I can for the present cite only one place, 86.9: *ut-šan dōkan gōwam* 'I shall speak their details'.

(Years ago I had sent a note on this word to the late Prof. Arthur Christensen at his request, but he does not seem to have used it anywhere. Hence the above brief remark.)

While dealing with Avestan studies I forgot to mention Christensen's latest monograph, *Le premier chapitre du Vendidad*. This gives a very clear and convincing solution of the geographical list and other details of that chapter. Additional remarks will be found in my review in *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeiger*. With

the passing away of Prof. Christensen we have lost another great Iranist. I cannot say anything about the work of his successor K. Barr nor about that of his other pupils like Andersen.

To return to Bailey, I want to draw the attention of all the concerned to the following words from his Preface : "In taking leave of Zoroastrian studies I may confess to mingled feelings, a sense of regret at leaving so many problems still to be solved, and also a feeling of relief at leaving a subject of research where the little that is surely known allows so large a room for imagination, at times somewhat uneasily controlled". Thus he sums up and confirms what I have often touched upon during the course of this address. It is a pity that we are deprived of the full services of a man like Bailey in the field of Pahlavi studies in particular. His last gift however is a sort of very precious consolation. Its contents must be well known to you. In many respects they reveal new lines of research. On some of them, specially on the *patvand* or history of the Avesta, etc., I shall have to speak elsewhere. It should be remembered that among the texts out of which Bailey has drawn his data, the *Denkart* and the *Datastan ı denık* are the most difficult. I do not claim to have made any extensive study thereof ; yet general acquaintance and a few particular attempts have revealed their character. The style of the *Denkart* is mostly such as to baffle one's attempt at construing the sentences or even phrases in a definite manner so as to leave no alternative possibilities. Carelessness in the use of ı and the like enhances our difficulties. The style is long-winded, or, as others have called it, involved and crabbed, or, to use a learned term, synthetic. The analytic style, in conformity with the genius of the language, would have helped us to grasp the meaning easily. It may be that the author could not adopt the simple, narrative style of other works. But the question is whether he followed the style of older works on similar, philosophical subjects, or he himself was the inventor of it. I am inclined to the belief that there is too much artificialness in the matter as well as in the manner of the earlier books of the *Denkart*. The same can be said of the *Datastan ı denık*. Yet attempts should be made to unravel the mystery, whatever may be its value.

I am happy to see that Zaehner (of whom Bailey says :

"He has already shown promise of carrying farther the work which I am now giving up") has culled a large number of extracts relating to time (*zaman*) from the *Denkart* and subjected them to a critical study in BSOS. 9. Pahlavi being my principal line I undertook a thorough examination of this as well as all what he has done on the subject. My corrections and critical remarks may fill up as much space as his original work, which should be therefore done anew. Others repeat a whole thing while offering one or two new suggestions. But this would be a different case altogether. Nevertheless, that would not mean any depreciation of Zaehner's work. He has certainly solved various difficulties, specially about hitherto unknown words by means of etymology, parallel passages, and so forth. Moreover, his modest, matter-of-fact manner has appealed to me most sympathetically. In the absence of his study I should not have thought of taking up these extracts from the *Denkart* and the two chapters from *Zat-spram*. Surely, everybody would have liked Zaehner's carrying on his meritorious work ; but, as I heard from Henning, he seems to have given it up. This is another distinct loss. But I am happy to add that Gershevitch, the new recruit, will take up his post in one respect or another.

The next scholar who deserves mention in this connection of Pahlavi studies is P. de Menasce. Unfortunately, I have not yet seen his translation of the *Škand gumānik vicar*, and so I cannot say anything about it. A new study of this important, so to say philosophical work, for which we have also a guide in its Sanskrit version, is sure to be fruitful. And Menasce has given proof of his ability to undertake it. (In the meantime I have seen this study. A careful examination has revealed that the translation could have been more exact, but as to the commentary Menasce has supplied all the helps necessary for following the author, especially the parallels from the scriptures, etc. discussed by him.) Quite recently he translated the whole passage from the *Denkart* Book 4, to which Bailey drew our attention, and found out the titles and brief contents of a couple of Indian works. Besides *tark* 'Logic' we now know of *avyākaran* 'Grammar', astrological *hora* (borrowed from the Greeks) and *kala kośa*(k). (See Journal Asiatique [1949.] p. 1 ff.). I tried to translate the context in

which these works are mentioned but in vain. The whole book is interesting but more efforts are necessary to unravel its secrets.

I believe I have tried your patience already too much and should not put it to more severe test by recounting other Iranian researches carried out by Henning, particularly in Sogdian with which Hansen too is busy at Berlin, and by Bailey in Saka, or as it is now called Khotanese. The war and its after effects have put our studies into disorder, but efforts are surely made to advance them as usual. I may not be aware of all of them.

For example, I cannot say anything about German Iranists like Junker, Lentz, and others, (Schaefer, who is now at Goettingen, is expected to continue his work in our field too ;) nor about Italian Pagliaro and Messina. From a recent traveller in Russia I learnt that Freiman was alive. I have also heard of some new studies of Nyberg in Sweden, but I have not yet seen them. There remains the Norwegian Morgenstierne. I do not know whether he has added anything more to his numerous monographs and studies on Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages. These being beyond the horizon of our students may be passed over. But I must refer to his lengthy study 'Orthography and Sound-System of the Avesta' (in *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, 12. 30 ff. 1940). He is one of those few scholars who have expressed themselves against bringing Avestan orthography into reasonable distance from Vedic phonology. His argument is that the pronunciation represented by it is genuine as regards vowels also, because the so-called corruptions can be accounted for linguistically. But this argument is beside the point, since it does not distinguish between redaction and composition(see *Idg. Forsch.*). Besides this article Morgenstierne promised another on the vocabulary of Avesta, which was to prove its Eastern origin ; but I have not yet seen it ; nor anything from B. Geiger and Tedesco.

I have here purposely refrained from various other branches of Iranistic ; but since I have referred to Herzfeld's works on art and archaeology I may as well mention two important publications on the subject by Kurt Erdmann : *Das Iranische Feuer-Heiligtum*, to which I have added some data from MP. and NP. writings (see *Or. Lit. Zeitung* 1943, 57 ff.), and *Die Sassanidische Kunst* ; and also the scattered work on Pahl. inscriptions.

For Iranian history we have the monumental work on the Sasanian period by Arthur Christensen, *L' Iran sous les Sassanides*, already in second edition, 1944. (I may observe in parenthesis that this work is translated not only in Persian but also in Urdu, which means there is a taste and demand not only amongst Persian Muslims but also Indian Muslims for knowing the facts about the past of Persia. This is a happy sign. They often translate such works in Persia ; and the efforts may well be directed to linguistic and other aspects also—in a sound and serious manner, cf. below in III. There was a time when Parsis too were supplied with Gujarati translations or adaptations of standard works on Persian history ; but now the things are managed differently.) For the Parthian period there appeared a few years back (1938) *A Political History of Parthia* by N.C. Debevoise. It is valuable for sources and facts, but lacking in historical spirit or philosophy. Lastly, for the Achaemenian period we have quite a recent attempt, *The History of the Persian Empire*¹ by A. T. Olmstead, the well-known author of a number of monographs on the period. Besides the usual due regard to literature and art Olmstead emphasizes the factors of administration, economics, and social movements. It is claimed that he has gathered previously unknown material into the story of the Persians. How they struggled with the problems of high taxes, rising living costs, and fixed incomes, how they mingled cultures, and so forth. Some of these things are really new, and even in political history new view-points are not lacking. Particularly I am happy to find that Olmstead has exhibited the relation between the Persians and the Greeks in a right perspective. The dominant view was extremely exaggerated. I do not think Persian success would have stemmed the tide of Greek civilization, and still less that the whole Europe would have become Zoroastrian through such an event. But as generally happens in a comprehensive work of this type one may not be satisfied with the treatment of one's special subject—say, religion or art. Anyhow, here too Olmstead offers new suggestions and theories

1. The book is published by the Chicago University Press ; and contains maps, plates with specimens of art and architecture, index, etc.—a good guide in every respect and in excellent get-up about 600 p. for 10. dollars.

side by side some old notions which require to be revised in the light of recent studies. The fact is we are in the flux about matters Iranian—more so than in any other branch of studies. For this reason, moreover, it is not quite right when Olmstead argues that “the historian need not, in a narrative history, interrupt the continuity of his story by detailed arguments for the soundness of the views which he presents.” He is right in withholding detailed arguments, but he should not withhold the opposite view altogether. For instance, when Olmstead speaks of “Usurper Darius”, his reader does not even dream that the majority of scholars—and some of them as great and qualified as, if not also more so than, the author himself—hold a different opinion. So this is misleading. The full argument may have been given in the special article ‘Darius and His Behistun Inscription’. But just to argue, that there is complete disagreement between our sources as to the time, place, and manner of Bardiya’s murder by his brother Cambyses as proclaimed by Darius, and therefore this proclamation is a lie, is surely no argument. Moreover, Darius uses the terms ‘lie’ and ‘liar’ in wider connotation, and so really “he doth not protest too much.” I wonder how the eminent enthusiasts for the Great King received this bombshell from Olmstead which appeared first in 1938.

It might be supposed that I have forgotten the efforts made by Parsi scholars in the advance of Pahlavi studies. But that I have not. I am coming to that presently. I must of course leave out the past and then also restrict myself to the essentials. One of our oldest and most silent workers is still serving the cause. I mean Mr. B. N. Dhabhar who is occupied with his edition of the Pahlavi Yasna. This will supply a great desideratum, for we possess only the almost century old edition by Spiegel from a single ms. Mr. Dhabhar is not a man to edit a text mechanically. He has certainly tried to understand it. But it may not be in his plan to give translation of obscure passages. Owing to this defect we have been deprived of his knowledge as regards the *Pahlavi Rivayat* which he edited years ago. This is one of our best books—in good style and full of interesting subjects. (Dastur Dr. Mirza worked upon it for his Ph. D. degree, but he has not yet published his translation or whatever

else it is. If it is as good as his articles in the *Dinshah Irani Mem. Vol.* one may be fully satisfied.) It is a great pity that Mr. Dhabhar's preparations for a Pahlavi Dictionary are so neglected. Something should be done to utilize them for general benefit.

Another and, to my mind, still greater scholar of Pahlavi passed away some years back. I mean the late Mr. B. T. Anklesaria, to see whom I was so anxious. It was very unfortunate that he did not publish most of his works soon after their printing was finished, but left them for years awaiting an introduction or the like. His labour and learning remained thus unused and unappreciated ; science however was the greater sufferer. And now the cruel fate has done the rest. Even the printed forms of *Zat-spram*, for instance, are destroyed in fire. I do not even know what happened to his translation of the *Great Bundahishn*. The two prize-works, one on the *Rivayat of Emēt ī Aša-vahistān*, and the other on the *Pahlavi Videvdāt (Vendidad)* are also not yet published.¹ Is it not the duty of all the concerned that this unusual state of affairs is ended ? Instead of wasting time, money, and energy on worthless objects efforts should be directed in the publication of such really scholarly works.

There is, however, no response to such self-evident appeals. And I do not know the art of persuading or pressing the powers that be. Else in my enthusiasm and appreciation for the work of Mr. Behramgore, as he is known among us Parsis, I went so far as to include in my general suggestions the task of editing the translation and notes written, or dictated to pupils, by him. I do not mean to say that Mr. Anklesaria was infallible. There may be mistakes in his work, especially when done in haste. I myself have noted down several critical remarks to his edition of *Zand ī vohuman yasn*. But such things one may add in a sympathetic, scholarly manner and spirit, and yet preserve what

1. One of these works, Pahlavi Vendidad, is now edited by Prof. D. D. Kapadia and published by the K. R. Cama Or. Inst. Bombay. It is hazardous to offer an opinion about it without proper study. But I may say that the learned author sometimes differs from my interpretation given here and there in my *Shāyast nē shāyast* and in *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeiger*. A thorough comparison etc. would be useful

is good and useful—and I am sure there is a great deal of it—in what is left by the late scholar.

There is another suggestion that I should repeat here : Cataloguing of mss. in private libraries should not be neglected as in the case of Mr. J. C. Katrak's work, *Oriental Treasures*, but carried out in a systematic manner. We must know what mss. exist and where. Then we must bring out a facsimile edition firstly of unpublished Pahlavi works, and later on of even published ones in special cases, from the oldest manuscripts in the library of Mr. Anklesaria and others. It was one of the unique services that his father rendered to the cause of Pahlavi studies, that he as a private individual with limited means thought of obtaining old manuscripts from Persia and preserving them. (The other service is the preparation of types, far more reliable than any other, for the printing of Pahlavi works.) But those manuscripts should have been made accessible to all. Actually there was also a plan, and I was told that the Victoria Jubilee Pahlavi Text Fund was started for that very purpose, but somehow or other it was not carried out fully. The plan should be revived and also other old manuscripts like the *Denkart* one, DM, should be published by some facsimile process. This is not a parrot-like repetition for a superfluous luxury, but a serious demand for a great necessity. It is a pity that just for the sake of a few thousand rupees and other petty matters it was decided to bring out only a printed edition of the *Dēnkart* by Mr. D. M. Madan. Whenever I see the couple of folios in facsimile given by Dastur Darab Sanjana in his edition of the work, Vol. 13, I wish to see the whole manuscript in that beautiful and unalloyed form. The editor can then have ample opportunity to show his knowledge in the notes, etc. As to the reading or transliteration of Pahlavi there should be now no doubt or hesitation in adopting the purely Iranian mode. For this we still require a certain uniformity in details ; instead of that new innovations are resorted to by almost every worker in the field.

Moreover, almost all of the Pahlavi books require to be translated again. One can no longer depend upon the work—admirable indeed for the time when it was executed—of that

great scholar Dr. E. W. West. I wish I could have continued the task begun with the *Shayast nē shayast*. Even the translations prepared after West, for instance, by Dastur Darab Sanjana and Mr. Bulsara, require revision. Till now I have had no occasion to examine the *Matikan ʾi hazār dāustān*; but having had to busy myself with the *Ēhrpatastān* and *Nīrangastān* in connection with the *Shayast nē shayast*, I can say that Bulsara would prove a poor guide for that book, which is also very difficult. Here I should mention I should have done it already above—the new edition of the *Nīrangastān* by A. Waag, an excellent work. He has treated both the Avesta and Pahlavi basic texts but left out the longer comments added to them. If my notes on this edition are still preserved they will form a further contribution.

It should not be forgotten that there is almost nothing like finality in our big and small studies; but whenever they are undertaken there should be conscientious efforts to remain up-to-date and to clear as many obstacles as possible, so that the work may be useful to others. This outlook and attitude are generally lacking in the publications undertaken under the scheme of “encouraging higher studies and research ... among the students,” as well as that of prize-essays. It is indeed very creditable on the part of our young and old friends, that in spite of quite other professional duties they devote their spare time to such work. But they should not take everything so easy nor write mechanically after some questionable models, but try to follow recognised standards. I must refrain from making individual criticisms in their cases. But should I not wonder when it happens that I have to tax my brains in finding sense or removing obstacles almost at every step in a defective text, whereas someone has translated it without any break or hindrance, and calls its style to be simple and so forth; or when I come across the following eloquent passage which I find to be misapplied? “Manushchihr’s power of analysing and recording impressions was extraordinarily great. We must translate, as the acquired instinct of a true critical faculty will gradually enable us to do, his language into our own; in doing so we shall come to learn how far the thought or feeling below the language is our own also. He did bring to

his writing heavy armament of scholarship, and did give to it the qualities of industry, patience and conscientiousness. They are qualities with which criticism can hardly dispense. But he had a miraculous gift of expression, never surpassed, seldom if ever equalled." There are also surprises of other type but I may leave them aside.

I add all this not out of love for criticism ; I have also no desire to disparage anybody ; I want rather to encourage everybody. But it must be emphasized that such things do not serve the great and good purpose of pure studies. It is all very well to show interest and enthusiasm, yet they should not be made an end by themselves but should remain the means to the end. If these qualities are properly put into work by one's own discipline and by other people's guidance—which guidance can be both personal and otherwise—much better results can be achieved. Personal guidance might have been lacking in the past. But this should be remedied. Dr. Unvala, who is now so to say at the helm of Iranian studies at Bombay, should look to it. Of course, willing response and co-operation from both sides are essential for that purpose. We have to remember that these gentlemen will be or are already the leaders, on whom depends the future fate of Iranian studies at Bombay. Mr. M. F. Kanga and Mr. H. F. Chacha have already shown some signs of good scholarship. Other teachers and former students should also be encouraged for the right sort of work. What is done at present is neither adequate nor enough.

Speaking of Dr. Unvala reminds me of his admirable work on the Sanskrit Yasna which he seems to have discontinued because of his archaeological and numismatical studies. But now he may take it up again, especially for the sake of providing help to the Pahlavi Yasna.

Originally it was my intention to discuss our other needs including the provision for works on religion, history, culture, etc. for the use of the general public. But that is too vast a field for the present occasion. I shall however not omit to mention the prominent name of Shams-ul-Ulama Dastur Dr. Dhalla who has only recently added one such work, *Ancient Iranian Literature*. Indeed, I expected it to be much more comprehensive, especially

as regards Pahlavi books. There are pieces which deserve to be known as specimens having some literary beauty and charm, to say nothing about their cultural value.

I believe this general review of Iranian studies will give you some idea of their present state and future prospects. One may naturally expect to have it in another form and order. I have, however, just related the things as they occurred to me. In any case, my words alone by themselves cannot achieve the object that is at my heart. For that one must do actual work—in study rooms with a few devoted minds who are prepared for patient labour and hard thinking. Herzfeld somewhere speaks of working in the field of the Avesta as working on an archaeological site full of debris containing some precious finds. But the same applies to the entire Iranian literature, both ancient and middle. In spite of its literary character our work therein is more of a scientific nature, something like solving mathematical problems with all sorts of computations and permutations. This is true of various other branches, but it is more particularly so with the Iranistic. For that very reason Iranian scholars have a right to demand greater care and consideration, support and encouragement from all sides—the Government, the Universities, the Oriental Societies, and the like. Essential books and learned journals should be provided, and also means for publishing researches. The matter should not be considered as the private concern of the Parsis.

Also in the past, when the ways and means to promote Oriental, that is, practically Sanskrit or Indian with some regard for Persian-Arabic, studies in our country were discussed, Avesta and, in a more general fashion, Iranian were coupled with the Vedic section. I refer to the *Report of the Conference of Orientalists...at Simla, 1911*. Of course, no proper provision was made for them. But now the things should be improved.

Therefore, once again at the end as in the beginning I turn to our brother-Indian-Sanskritists. They have contributed a worthy share to the progress of Indological studies on Western lines. They have taken up also non-Brahmanical literature—in Prakrit of the Jainas and in Pali of the Buddhists. For the latter they have attacked even the difficult field of Chinese,

besides that of Tibetan. And sooner or later Indonesian languages, Malay, Javanese, Kavi, etc. will also be studied. Now, Indian Sanskritists may not take up so assiduously the entire field of Iranian studies, but some of them at least can easily include Avestan in the sphere of their work. Its grammar is practically the same as that of Vedic Sanskrit, and the knowledge of its phonology naturally forms part of Aryan or Indo-Iranian Philology. The beginning has been made. In spite of my criticism Dr. Taraporewala deserves our thanks for his personal instruction as well as for his *Avesta Selections* that have led to that beginning. Yet let us not stop at that beginning but take steps for its reform and progress. And then, but only then, it must be emphasized—some tangible, useful results will be obtained. One does not expect a batch of specialists every year ; but those who take up this subject either in part or as the whole should be able to follow, understand, and appreciate the labours of specialists. They may form the much desired link between these and the general public interested in the subject. And why not, one or another of them may contribute something even original. Let it be little but let it be right. Similarly scholars of Persian and Arabic can be of great help to us, as can be seen from the works of some Western scholars. But more about it in the next article 'Iranistic and "Islamic" Studies.'

Some more words about the peculiarly difficult nature of Iranistic may not be out of place. When I say that in spite of its literary character our work therein is more of a scientific nature, I mean also that there does not arise the question of the choice between the historical and the literary—i. e. aesthetic or artistic—study of a literature. The latter aspect is not altogether absent. I myself have demanded its inclusion in the study of the Gathas, for instance, and also in that of even some Pahlavi texts (*Indo-Iranica*, 3. 29). But the very preliminary task of formal interpretation is not yet fully achieved,—a task which is often as thankless as full of difficulties. There is more work and less or no pleasure, which is not denied to workers in the field of other ancient literatures. Both Greek and Latin, for instance, possess works of highly artistic and aesthetic value. One reads them and translates them not only to know and diffuse

the facts and ideas they contain but also to enjoy and spread the joy they afford. Hence there are elaborate discussions on the method and manner of translating them so that the latter object may be attained in some measure. Recall the lengthy essays and counter-essays by Matthew Arnold 'On Translating Homer'. I may also refer to a remarkable passage from *Day Dreams of a School-Master* by D'Arcy W. Thompson, protesting against calling Greek a dead language. He can understand, he says, what is meant by a Dead Sea. He describes it graphically as a sheet of water cut off from all intercourse and slumbering in a desolate wilderness. But, he then asks, can such a term be applied to that Hellenic speech which in the Iliad has rolled, etc.,—mentioning other illustrious names like those of Pindar and Plato, Aeschylus and Demosthenes—and ends with a just challenge : If it be dead, then what language is alive ? Someone has adapted this passage to the Sanskrit language and Sanskrit authors. And actually we know that Sanskrit literature is studied and enjoyed like those of Greek and Rome. Indeed, for all these languages too there is a seamy side, demanding hard thinking and strenuous labour for dry fields and difficult problems—but there is always some compensation.

Iranian on the whole is a field of ruins and fragments which are put together by 'editors' devoid of art and thought. And yet the matter is not so hopeless as Geldner once expressed. These ruins conceal precious gems. One has of course to try hard to get at them. And for this we require more and more workers of real calibre,—with brains, method, and application, besides special knowledge. Even in the West their number is extremely limited. Their achievement however is indeed superb. Here in India one should follow their guide more and more ; instead of that it is done less and less. The few facts mentioned above about the work done in the West and in India speak for themselves. I need not dwell upon the point further. Yet I most earnestly appeal to all the concerned to change this chaotic condition. The Indian Government and other bodies should shoulder the responsibility as they have done in the case of Sanskrit and Persian-Arabic studies ;—if necessary, even at the cost of these. I make the same claim for Modern Indian languages. We can

spare some Sanskrit scholars, for instead of doing duplicate work in the same field or for the same text or subject, they can well take up Avesta. Prospects of course there can be none, but is not an additional qualification a reward by itself?—Parsis too should improve the management of their learned institutions. Instead of starting new ones, the old should be amalgamated and brought up-to-date. The K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, for instance, should have been in a position to stand side by side with the University and the Asiatic Society on the present occasion of the All India Oriental Conference.

Besides Oriental scholars, other professional authors should also take interest in things Iranian; for Iranian contribution to human culture in general and religious thought in particular is by no means insignificant. In this respect too the West is ahead of us. There the name and work of the Iranian Zarathustra may not be so familiar as that of the Indian Buddha and the Chinese Lao Tse and Confucius for want of sufficient guides; yet theologians like Bishop Gore and historians like Toynbee have seen his greatness. Not only the ancient Gathas but also the medieval Pahlavi books contain some noble thoughts. For instance, the dualistic account of Ohrmazd and Ahriman is nothing but the "encounter between two super-human personalities" which Toynbee finds in the greatest dramas from the Bible to Goethe's *Faust*, and in which he sees the geneses of civilisations. There is also a 'wager', called treaty or agreement *pašt*, in that account. Similarly the disquisitions on Time, for instance, are really philosophical. But first of all they must be exactly translated, and, whenever necessary, freed from their priestly environment;—a task which is by no means easy, as I said in my remarks on this head above. And yet every effort must be made in that direction. In this connection it should be remembered that even if we cannot clarify truth it is worth while at least to illuminate confusion. In other words, to find out faults and ascertain mistakes is also a step forward in our search for truth. Lastly I may draw your attention to the mottos placed at the beginning. They give in nutshell the essence of my contentions in general. To them may be added : Know Thy Texts—an advice of a witty professor when he was requested to give

some hints for the examination ; and 'spare me your lucubrations, give me facts or ideas' as Amiel wished ; and also, as a saying runs : 'Let not the Good be the Enemy of the Best !'

The remarks (see above, p. 12) about Modern Indian languages are not restricted to purely linguistic or literary matters, but they refer also to allied subjects, for instance, sociological. These studies should not be carried on as something quite apart from the language or without any due regard to it. Such is, however, the case with a few articles I have come across in *Journal of the University of Bombay*, Vol. 17. Parts 1 and 4. The transcription in 'The Raniparaj Proverbs' is not exact ; it may be called either learned in the wrong sense or mechanical. Anybody who knows Gujarati and Marathi can see it for himself ; I need not illustrate my charge. Then, one would have liked to see the specific dialect words and forms explained in notes and collected in a list. The translation too is far from exact, sometimes even incorrect. In short, the whole article is unsatisfactory from the view-point of the language student. One could have brought out many instructive data from the material. As a general remark I may add that the proverbs show a great deal of Marathi influence, whereas Bhil languages are classed along with Gujarati by Grierson. The whole work may be done again for linguistic purposes.—A similar disregard for language questions may be observed in 'A Sociological study of the Jats in Kathiawad'. More information about the speech of this people or tribe could have easily been gathered and made available. The writer has at least not omitted the original text of their songs, as he has done in his later study on the Mianas in Part 4. But even a superficial comparison with the translation shows that this is far from exact, so much so that not only linguistic facts and literary charm, humour, etc., remain concealed, but also sociological ones—peculiar marriage and other customs referred to in the songs—are obliterated. One may think a different version is rendered, as it seems to be the case sometimes. It is a pity that Miana songs are not quoted in the original ; they would have been of still greater interest, since their language is said to be mixed with Cutchhi. I sincerely hope that these and other aspects. e. g. sources of information, may be attended to in a scholarly

spirit, so that more useful work can be achieved by just a little more trouble.—Also historians, for instance, should not miss the opportunity of acquainting us with rare words and idioms while dealing with their original sources. They cannot simply declare they as historians are concerned with the facts about their 'heroes' and the like

It may be a digression but I must refer to one particular matter. As to the Parsi history I am pained to read again and again the old wrong dates, etc., in spite of the new ones supplied by the masterly research of Prof. S. H. Hodivala. In general this sort of 'essay writing' or compilations from more or less doubtful sources should not be tolerated in learned societies and learned journals. The time, money, and energy—and today also paper should be saved for better and nobler purposes.

III

IRANISTIC AND "ISLAMIC" STUDIES

Some words about the true nature of the break between the Ancient or Zoroastrian and Modern or Islamic Persia are necessary, since the matter is not yet properly investigated nor correctly represented. Literature is closely allied to life, and life to religion. Consequently, literature is greatly affected by religion. Even the predominantly secular literature of the West is tinged with Christianity; some consider it unthinkable without it. Then how much more so in the East where the whole life in general and literary and artistic spheres in particular are fully submerged in religion? Here the literature is not merely tinged but totally permeated by it. We really cannot think of the one without the other.

Because of this general phenomenon then, there is no wonder if Modern or New Persian literature as a post-Islamic product is more allied to the literature of Arabia than that of ancient or Zoroastrian Persia. With the adoption of Islam as religion and, at least for the first few centuries, that of Arabic as the language of culture and science, the influence of Arabia became especially predominant. With the exception of a couple of metres the whole metrical system and even the whole poetical art in general can be said to be based on Arabic models. It is therefore natural and also necessary, if new Persian studies are coupled with Arabic ones. But the point should not be stretched too far, as is generally done,—so much so that the limitation 'New' is generally omitted, and the matter is treated as if there is nothing like Old and Middle Persian.

Indeed, New Persian literature exhibits an extreme case; yet it is not wholly isolated or absolutely unique. Something of the sort has happened in the case of English literature too. While speaking on its lineage Quiller-Couch very pertinently and emphatically remarks: "From Anglo-Saxon Prose, from Anglo-Saxon Poetry our living Prose and Poetry have, save

linguistically, no derivation." He italicizes these words and, after suggesting that Anglo-Saxon literature died of inherent weakness, proceeds: "Chaucer did not inherit any secret from Caedmon or Cynewulf, but deserves his old title, 'Father of English Poetry,' because through Dante, through Boccaccio, through the lays and songs of Provence, he explored back to the Mediterranean, and opened for Englishmen a commerce in the true intellectual mart of Europe" (*On the Art of Writing*, p. 143 f.). Later English poets naturally followed suit. Elsewhere the same author declares something to the following effect (I have missed the page and so am not sure of his exact words) : for historical and still more for religious and mythological figures and models Western nations look to Greece rather than to their own Nordic ancestors. Apollo and the Muses, Zeus and the other great ones of Olympus remain the authentic Gods of modern European literature, beside whom the Gods of northern Europe—Odin, Thor and others—are strangers, unhomely and uncanny as anything.

Now, all this forms an excellent commentary to the nature of New Persian poetry in its relation to ancient or Zoroastrian Persia. We are just to change the names, and the whole remains true. Of course, there are also exceptions and those too of no mean value but of most sublime character—like the immortal epic of Firdausi, the *Shāh-nāma*. Thanks to this national epic ancient Persian heroes, either legendary or historical, are no strangers, unhomely and uncanny, to Persian poets and even to Persian people. There are also other works which deal with and derive their material from the ancient period, the most notable being the *Gerāsp* (for the correct *Kersāsp*) *nāma* of Asadi. Huart's edition with French translation, on which I have prepared some critical—textual and exegetical—remarks, has remained incomplete ; but later on a Persian scholar has supplied a complete edition of this work. Then I may mention *Vis u Ramin* on which no less a scholar than Minorsky has written a full commentary in BSOAS. 11. 741 ff. to prove it to be a Parthian romance in accordance with the tradition that it was originally in Pahlavi. Even these exceptions breathe a different spirit as far as religions and other factors are concerned. In

short, it is natural and necessary if new Persian studies go together with Arabic and Islamic studies rather than with ancient Persian or Zoroastrian studies.

But there is no justification for the total break which is assumed and also acted upon. Just as nobody doubts the venerable character of Anglo-Saxon and divorces it from the study of English literature, so nobody should do the same with the Old and Middle Iranian remains, while studying new Persian literature. Anglo-Saxon is considered worthy to be studied as the mother of Modern English, and its historical, if not literary, value is always recognised, perhaps more so in Germany than in England itself. When specialization comes in question, then of course a dividing line is drawn between the philological and literary periods for practical reasons. This is done also in the case of German literature where they begin the modern period, say, with Goethe, and leave the older period to the philologist so to say. But nobody thinks of a complete break and divorce between the two. Everybody is expected to know at least the elements of both.

This plan and attitude should be adopted in the branch of Iranian studies also. Claims of Old and Middle Iranian are of course recognised officially and theoretically by, for instance, Calcutta University, as we have said above in the previous article; but that is not enough. Practically they are ignored as of old. Proper steps should be taken to remedy this evil and this drawback. For want of real, first-hand knowledge of the subject writers depend upon second or even third-hand sources, and repeat some old, antiquated views and theories. One of them calls the Gathas "dull sermons" of the prophet about which I shall be speaking elsewhere. Another declares that there does not survive "a single specimen of Sassanian poetry"; about this I may add a few words here.

It is strange that this view should be repeated long after Benveniste brought to light good, bad, or indifferent specimens of epic, narrative, and religious poetry of that period; and also after the present writer took an occasion to refer to them with some additional data (see my article 'Some Thoughts on *Shah-nama* Vocables' in the *Iran League Quarterly*, 6. 89 ff. 1936).

More recently, I have added another specimen to the number, (see below, 'A Didactic Poem in Zoroastrian Pahlavi'). I should not conceal the fact that these specimens reveal only more or less crude verses. But however remote they may be from a measurable distance from high class poetry, they at least allow us to surmise that more of the type must have existed before, but is now lost in the general destruction of ancient records.

As to the real dearth of high class poetry, I have given the reason in the first named article, namely, the stern ultra-religious attitude of the early Sassanids. There I compared a similar phenomenon under the Safavids, which occurred in the very midst of the fully developed poetical period. But such parallels of narrow-minded Church and Clergy retarding the growth and spread of poetry are not so isolated. History of Christianity offers a number of them as can be gathered from Quiller-Couch, *On the Art of Writing*, pp. 171-174. Moreover, my surmise finds a direct confirmation in some early Muslim writers by whom "the prohibition of poetry was called 'foreign (or Persian) pietism,'" (BSOAS 10. 838). There is little doubt that the original must be '*ajam*' which refers here as usual to the next lying Persian and no other foreign people.

Besides those traces of fine literature, there are others about scientific literature. Years ago Nallino showed that Greek astrological and agricultural books in Arabic translation came through Middle Persian. And now Bailey has culled various references on this point, especially from Pahlavi writings, as I remarked while mentioning his *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books* (see p. 80 ff.) ; cf. also below, in 'Some Gleanings from Al-Biruni.' As to the *Dēnkart* evidence in particular, it is necessary to investigate the context in which these matters are discussed and the foreign, Greek and Indian, works are mentioned, so that one can decide whether the author refers to ancient Pahlavi writings or to some modern versions with which he was otherwise acquainted.

Then, even for religious ideas in Islam Zoroastrian writings afford some interesting data. I do not mean the superficial comparisons which are now and again brought forward. They

have very little scientific value. But it is worth while to trace some characteristic conceptions preached by the Islamic sects having their origin in Persia. In my article 'Eine Pahlavi-Glosse ueber die Vierheit Ormazds' I have done this in connection with some Mu'tazilite beliefs about the Godhead. As to religious customs the matter is far more clear and evident.

Thus, on the one hand, 'Iranian' is not to be identified with or limited to 'Zoroastrian' ; it is a much wider term, and Zoroastrianism forms only a part, although a very important part, a fundamental factor indeed. But on the other hand, things do not cease to be 'Iranian' with the advent and adoption of Islam in Persia. They obtain no doubt another aspect, a new life and vigour,—for instance, the blossoming forth of high class literature and sciences. A distinct break in religious matters is not to be denied, but as I just said a comparative study can be fruitful to a certain degree. Moreover, popular customs and beliefs even in Islamic Persia can form a commentary to Zoroastrian texts. All this is a matter of course. Old links are never fully or universally obliterated. But it requires patient study and scientific research to establish them.

In this connection I should not forget the efforts made by modern Persia for the spread of knowledge about its past among its own people. The new interest began many years ago together with the political awakening. One of the poets who sang of the new spirit, Poure Davoud, took particular interest in Zoroastrianism, and later on prepared a Persian version with the help of European translations of the Avesta, and added various antiquarian matters from other researches. This work, published under the patronage of some Parsis, must have induced other Persian scholars to devote some time to the study of the Avesta and allied literature. A few like S. H. Taqizadeh did it even before this event and have produced also scholarly work of research. I mean his various contributions in BSOAS, etc., in particular. Standard works on history and the like have been also made available to the general reader as I mentioned above in one case. These efforts are laudable, and the approach is really scientific. But there plays sentiment too its part, which is inevitable, yet should not be allowed to take upper hand, for

it does not enhance but rather retards the cause of science. At least in the seat of learning it should find as little encouragement as possible.

Now in Teheran University too they have included Iranistic as one of the subjects of study. P'oure Davoud is the Professor of Avesta and ancient Iranian culture (*ostād e avestā o farhang e irān e bāstān*). There are also some other gentlemen who are supposed to know and teach Pahlavi. But the subject is full of pitfalls, and care should be taken from the very beginning to introduce a sound system and strict procedure. Else the result would be of doubtful character only. Without any training in Greek and Latin or in Sanskrit Avestan grammar is not easy; and Pahlavi has its own special difficulties.

Recently (1948) there has appeared a voluminous work, *mazdayasnā va ta'sir e an dar adbeyāt e pārsī* by Dr. M. Moin as one of the publications of the Teheran University (No 9). It is accompanied by an Introduction in French by Henry Corbin, giving a summary of the work. Its French title *L'influence du Mazdéisme dans la Littérature persane* led me to believe that the work must be dealing with recent Persian literature showing the influence of the new movement but it does not. It deals with the classical Persian literature or rather poetry as far as it contains references to Zoroastrian matter and terms. This is also a laudable theme. A matter-of-fact collection with purely scientific commentary would be always useful. There is also a Bombay Ph. D. thesis by a Parsi student Dr. B. M. Gai : 'Life in pre-Islamic Iran as gleaned from Persian Mathnawis.' It does not seem to have been published. Such studies should be made available, and that for two reasons : firstly for the advancement of knowledge, for the further impetus in the same or another direction, and secondly for judging the scholarly character of the thesis, for public criticism which works as check and demand on the candidate. The beneficial effect of this method is apparent. That is perhaps one of the reasons why even a successful candidate is not allowed to bear the degree and call himself Doctor before the publication of his thesis—in Germany and probably elsewhere on the Continent.

In the Persian Preface to that work contributed by Poure

Davoud claim is made that the influence of the religion of ancient Iran is to be found not only in poetical works like the *Shah-nama* and *Geršasp-nama* and prose treatises like *Qabūs-nama* and *Siyāsat-nama* but throughout the Persian literature of one thousand years and, it is added, it is impossible that it can be otherwise, because our (that is, of modern Persians) land, race, and language are the same as they were before for several thousand years ! Now this goes far, far beyond what I myself have claimed and what is reasonable. Pouré Davoud's view may be a noble sentiment, but it is not a sound scholarship or true history. Also Henry Corbin takes rather a too optimistic view of the whole situation in general and of Dr. Moin's work in particular. I admit I may be too pessimistic and hyper-critical and hold too strict opinions about higher studies and researches. Yet one can easily judge by the results achieved. Although Corbin's studies on the *Esraqiyan* philosophers—Sohravardi and others—are not known to me, I am prepared to believe what he says about them. But what the Persian poets as such have transmitted about the ancient religion, its beliefs and customs, can neither be called adequate nor authentic ; it is meagre and often incorrect. I do not see how Corbin can declare it as authentic records of spiritual tradition preserved by those who secretly honoured or openly disowned Zarathustra and what passed as his religion—the tradition which is based on other criterions than those of positive history ("authenticité d'une tradition spirituelle, fondée sur d'autres critères que celle de l'histoire positive", p 8). However this may be, it cannot be my object to examine what he calls "les visions très neuves" especially in the last chapter on 'mazdéism and Sufism'. But I must warn the reader not to put absolute trust in such illusory matters. It is true "wine" and other terms in Sufi poetry are symbols, but they cannot be proved direct reminiscences of *hauma* etc. in the Yasna ceremony of the Zoroastrians. And if they are, what do we gain as positive and new notions about the ancient ritual ? Surely not that 'Zoroastrianism in the beginning was an extatic mystery' (p. 12), if by Zoroastrianism is meant the religion of Zarathustra. Of course, Nyberg too puts forth this extatic theory, but he is wholly mistaken. Leaving aside other details my advice and contention

is that Iranistic will flourish only if it is cultivated by linguistic and historical methods as illustrated in the best and most successful examples of the West.

A useful service that Persian and Arabic scholars can render in the cause of Iranistic, is to prepare monographs on Iranian antiquities scattered in early historical and other treatises—critical edition of the sources, their exact translation, and necessary commentary. P. Schwarz, for instance, has included such details in his monumental work *Iran im Mittelalter*; but his principal object being different, this task may be undertaken anew,—advisably in co-operation with a competent Iranist. I am happy to add here that a young Muslim scholar of Bombay, Prof. B. M. Tirmidhi, has prepared a paper for the All India Oriental Conference Bombay 1949 on 'Zoroastrians and their Fire-temples' from Arabic sources. Some such solid studies should be really encouraged, and I hope that the author will continue his meritorious labours in the right direction. More difficult but not less important task would be a new examination of the religious movements in the first centuries of Islam. Any reader even of E. G. Browne's account thereof in the first volume of his *Literary History of Persia* must be convinced of the supreme importance of this subject for the religious history of ancient Iran. But neither favourable sentiment nor unfavourable prejudice—both products of shallow or narrow mindedness—should have place in the domain of study or research.

IV

ZARATHUSTRA'S PATH OF PEACE¹

In one of his most beautiful Gathas or Songs (Yasna 29) Zarathustra describes, in a symbolic-dramatic and yet realistic manner, the lament of the world over its miseries and his own call to end them by his teaching and thereby to bring peace and happiness on earth. People were then at the pastoral stage of civilization, and the ox formed the basis of the whole economic life. The poet therefore conceives and represents them as "the soul of the ox", which he depicts as raising its voice of complaint and utter helplessness in an appeal to the Almighty. In order to make the appeal more effective it is addressed to all the aspects of Godhead—hence the Deity is invoked in the plural number. The words of the complaint and prayer are :

- (1) For whom have ye shaped me ?
who (ever) did fashion me ?
Me hath entangled raid,
also robbery, assault, audacity, and brute force ;
(but) there is for me no shepherd other than ye !—
(And) then provide for me the good things
pertaining to pasture.

Confronted with this cry for help, the Fashioner of the Ox, one of the divine aspects, turns to another, namely Asha (Rta), the principle of Light, Justice, and Holiness or Wholesomeness, and asks :

- (2) Well, hast thou a teacher for the 'ox',
so that the ruling ones may provide this :
cattle-fostering zeal along with pasture ?
(And) whom do you wish as lord-protector for him,
who may repel the raid (made) by the wicked ?

Asha in its turn replies thus :

1. This article was written for the World Pacifist Meeting at Santiniketan 1949. For most of the translations here the second part of this series, *The First Three Gathas of Zarathustra*, gives the necessary explanation.

- (3) For him, the 'ox', there is no helper
 that keeps harm away according to Asha (Justice).
 And theirs is not to know,
 how the righteous treat the lowly.

These two or three strophes put the whole problem in a nutshell : they define the cause and the remedy for the miseries of the world. The cause is, to put it in one word, *war*, from which all the above-named evils arise. The remedy is twofold, for which both the people and their Fashioner pray, but with a significant difference. The people in their ignorance and impatience ask first for a shepherd, a powerful protector, who can put an end to their miseries by the strength of his arms ; and then secondly for the provision of pasture. Their Fashioner, however, knows better through his wisdom ; he enquires first for a guide and teacher who can show them the right path of living by their own endeavour, and then secondly for a protector against the wicked.

This difference is not without vital significance. It shows that the proper guidance and instruction of the people, their inner development and their own efforts in the right direction, are of greater need and importance than their succour and protection from outside. And actually, as we learn in the course of the dialogue, only a teacher, a prophet, to guide the people in their mode of life is selected, whereas the choice of a powerful prince to protect them against the wicked is not at all made. This matter is to be decided in a different manner—by the prophet's efforts at converting a powerful prince, not by divine choice.

The reply of Asha brings another moment into prominence when it adds : "theirs is not to know how the righteous treat the lowly", which means : the people do not know this cardinal virtue, and that is the reason why misery and injustice reign in the world and will continue to do so. Thus it is made unequivocally clear that the right path of living was not limited to "the cattle-fostering zeal and the provision of pasture", but it embraced every sphere of life. These things of course were the great practical needs, which suited also the dramatic setting, and were

therefore expressly mentioned ; but the symbols stood for something much larger too.

In order to achieve this, to teach and preach the right conduct of life as such, divine choice falls upon Zarathustra. God in his aspect of Good Mind or Benevolence declares :

- (8) This (man) is known to me now,
who alone hath heard our commands—
Zarathustra Spitama.
He willeth through wisdom and for Justice (or
Wholesomeness) to sing our praises.
So let us grant him sweetness of speech.

In this strophe the mission is said to be “to sing our (i. e. of the divine aspects) praises. This too brings something good and new for the solution of the problem. Because “to sing their praise” means to uphold and preach as models the new, ethical conceptions like *Mazdah* (Wisdom), *Asha* (Justice or Wholesomeness, lit. Holy-Light), *Vahu Manah* (Good Mind, Benevolence, Love), *Āramati* (Devotion, Zeal), and others. All these stood for higher morality and right conduct and for humanity at large, unlike the old clan or party gods taking sides according to their caprice or the sacrifices offered up to them. Those ethical aspects of Godhood bear the original stamp of Zarathustra, who must be considered as their creator in spite of the inherited terminology.

But the common people did not understand these high-flown ideals. Their outlook was narrow, and they did not see far beyond their present needs. They therefore clamoured at the choice of Zarathustra and his mission, as we learn from the next strophe :

- (9) Thereupon the soul of the ‘ox’ lamented :
That I must take refuge with a powerless patron—
with the word of an impotent man—
I who wish me a powerful prince !
When ever shall there be he,
who shall give him strong-handed help ?

This was a question of doubt and despair on the part of the people. They had however faith in the Almighty to whom they now prayed for the wish of their hearts :

- (10) Do ye, O Lord, as Asha (Wholesomeness)
grant them (Zarathustra and his disciples) strength,
and as Vahu Manah (Good Mind) that dominion,
whereby they can provide good dwellings and peace.

Leaving aside other matters let us first consider how Zarathustra tackled the problem of bringing "good dwellings and peace", that is to say, peace and happiness in general - the problem with which we are here primarily concerned. One need not suppose that he preached only the pursuit of cattle-breeding and agriculture as required a little above in this Gatha. We have already said that the limitation was due to dramatic reasons, and have also seen that even there the question was decidedly of whole conduct as such. Consequently, we find Zarathustra in his "Sermons in Song" discussing more than once the basic problem of good and evil, and preaching about the duties that arise from it. The special treatment of this problem is found in the next Gatha, Yasna 30, where he proclaims his doctrine of the two Spirits, or the so-called dualism. Let us first hear, by way of introduction, the parallel strophe, Yasna 45. 2 :

Now will I speak of the Spirits twain at the beginning
of existence,
of whom the more (very) beneficent one thus spake to
the inimical :
Neither our thoughts nor sayings, neither wills nor
choices, neither words nor deeds,
neither selves nor souls (will ever) agree.

And here are the crucial verses from the former piece,
(30. 3 ff) :

Now there were those Spirits twain at the beginning
(of existence),
who heard (from each other) their own ever-united
activities :
both the better (thing) and the bad (thing) in thought,
word, and deed.

And between these two the well-knowing ones chose
aright ; not the ill-knowing ones.

- (4) And when these Spirits twain came together,
from the first they fixed life and not-life,
and that at the last there shall be the worst
existence for the followers of Destruction,
but the best thought (heaven, beatitude) for that of
Wholesomeness.

Here life and not-life mean good and evil ; the parallel strophe at the end, which sums up the whole doctrine, having happiness and pain instead. The next two strophes develop the point of 'choice' between the two Spirits, with the remark that those who did not choose aright "went over to raid (war), whereby they sickened the life of man". But we are assured in strophe 7 that divine attributes as good virtues come to his help and deliverance ; and still more in strophe 8 :

And when there cometh
the punishment of these evil ones,
then, O Wisdom, Thy kingdom will be found through
good mind
for those who deliver (the power of) Destruction
unto (the power of) Wholesomeness.

And such vanquishers the prophet and his followers
wish to be, as declared in strophe 9 :

And may we be for Thee those
that make this existence advanced.

Zarathustra thus not only recognises the existence of evil, but also stresses the necessity of its being fought and annihilated in order to realise the Kingdom of God and thus usher in the era of eternal peace. He commands his followers not only to do good and eschew evil, but also, perhaps more urgently, to resist evil and destroy it.

Now, what were the method and the means he preached for the resistance and destruction of evil ?

The constant and strong-worded tirades used by the prophet against the partisans of evil let one easily surmise that his method could have been also militant. There were occasions when he directly recommended the use of arms,—of course, in defence of his good cause as expressly stated :

Now let none of you listen
to the sayings and commands of the follower of
Destruction.

Really he brings house and village
and district and country into misery and ruin.
Therefore resist them with the weapon.

Yasna 31. 18.

Elsewhere the clarion call runs :

Raid must be put down ! Stand up against assault (and
deportation). *Yasna* 48. 7.

This must have sounded like "Down with the war ! Up against slavery and bondage !" in modern paraphrase.

Zarathustra dubs his adversaries, the members of the old faith, as the followers of Destruction (*Drug*) for solid reasons. Their religion consisted of the celebration of rites wherein hundreds of cattle were slaughtered in sacrifice. In order to carry out more and more such celebrations cattle-raids were often resorted to, which menaced society. So also did the orgies where intoxicating drinks like the Hauma (the Soma of the ancient Indians) were largely indulged in and where drunken fury raged. Later Zoroastrian priests no doubt sang the glories of this plant or fruit and its juice ; they even had the audacity to put this praise in the mouth of the Prophet (*Yasna* 9), who had actually denounced it as "the urine of this intoxicant" (*Yasna* 48. 10).

It was Zarathustra's mission to put down such harmful practices and to preach a new religion which was to bring peace and happiness to the people at large and to pave the way of progress and civilization. No doubt, for this noble purpose he must have tried his power of persuasion, his "sweetness of the tongue". But the party in power did not like to give up their

habits, nor their authority and vested interests, so easily and freely. Some would have seen the light and followed it, but many would have preferred to stick to the faith of their fathers, and even to fight against any innovation. This they really did, and that too with such vehemence and success that the Prophet had to give up his task for a while and flee. We hear of his plight and lament in the Gatha of the Flight (Yasna 47), which begins thus :

To what land....., whither shall I go.....

Under such circumstances there remained no other way but of physical force for self-defence. Hence the demand : "Down with the war ! Up against slavery and bondage ! Resist them with the weapon !

Thus Zarathustra cannot be said to have preached and used only the weapon of love for vanquishing the enemies of the right and light, as Jesus and Buddha are said to have done, or as Mahatma Gandhi in our own days. But this does not mean that he was lacking in this greatest and noblest of virtues. Far from it. Love was the driving force that moved him to preach his new religion in the interest of the dumb creatures and their poor breeders, as is so finely set forth in the dramatic allegory already referred to. Not less significant is the touching reference to his "two steeds shivering with cold", when he was refused shelter during his flight (Yasna 51. 12). It was really for love of the people at large, for "providing good dwellings and peace" to them, that he had resort to physical force, when other peaceful means failed to serve his purpose.

By this 'peace' (*raman*) is meant 'repose and quietness', if not 'joy and pleasure' as well. For 'peace' as opposed to 'war' we have another word *axiti*, still current in Persian as *āstī*. Although Zarathustra does not use this term, it was this peace he strove to establish ; and his efforts were crowned with success, as is borne out by later writings as well as by later events. The priest of the *Vidvdat* 3. 1, while describing the first of the most happy places, namely where divine service is carried on, adds that this was possible "thanks to the peace brought about by the religion" of Zarathustra. Raids of the old type, which still

occurred sporadically and brought all the horrors of war to the weak and the innocent, are strongly detested ; one of the most unhappy places described there (strophe 11) is that "where they drive the women and children, raising the voice of lament, along the path of captivity, dry and dusty".

This peaceful attitude is faithfully maintained even after Zarathustra found a powerful patron in King Vishtaspa. There is no war-like undertaking for the spread of the new religion with the support of his arms. Tradition speaks of a war of religion, but that too is a war of defence. A rival prince demands from Vishtaspa that he should give up the new religion or prepare for war. And Vishtaspa being convinced of the truth of his new faith accepts the challenge, and defeats the enemy. History too knows nothing of religious wars nor of forced conversions ; on the contrary, it records the marvellous examples of religious tolerance of men like Cyrus and Darius. This attitude may be due to the teaching of Zarathustra himself, the good effect of which is observed in other respects too. Eminent historians have remarked that the Achaemenian Empire was based upon quite a novel ground, viz. of justice and peace for the people at large, compared with the Assyrian and Babylonian ones, whose records tell a different tale of constant religious wars with annihilation in mass. This change is attributed to the teaching of Zarathustra. The oft-recurring prayer of Darius and his successors in their inscriptions is said to refer to this new ideal : "A great God is Ahura-Mazdah who created this earth, who created yonder heaven, who created man, who created 'peace' for man, who made Darius (or Xerxes, etc.) King, one king of many, one lord of many". For 'peace' is used still another term here, *ziyati* which is generally translated as 'welfare' ; but it is an exact equivalent of Latin *quietus*, i. e. quietness, just like *raman* in the Gathas, from another root with the same meaning, and so can be rendered as 'peace'. This prayer is interpreted to mean that God made Darius and his successors kings with a view to achieve the objective of peace for mankind.

Here we see the inter-relation of State and Church demonstrated in actual practice. It was not in vain that the people, as

related in the dramatic piece above, wanted some powerful supporter for the Prophet. Mere proclamation of the principles of truth and justice is not sufficient. There must be some power, some authority to protect and, if necessary, also to enforce them. The idea that a religion needs the secular support of a king or state, and vice versa, recurs again and again in Iranian writings, from the very beginning as in that Gatha right up to the *Shahnama*, to mention only the final summing up of pre-Islamic Persia. The Church and the State—united they stand, divided they fall. History also teaches us that society grows and thrives on these twain pillars. The modern man may not like to speak of Church, not even of Religion, only of Ideology ; but the inter-relation referred to above holds good even today.

Yet another point in the Gatha of Good and Evil or the World-Drama has bearing on the subject of this essay, and therefore, deserves to be further considered. It is said there that Zarathustra, like Christ for instance, had hoped to bring about the Kingdom of Heaven on earth during his own life-time. When this dream was not realized, when the evil was only partially eradicated from the surface of the earth, then the priestly theologians adopted a myth of the world's history and existence of nine or twelve millenniums, at the end of which would appear a Saviour to finish that task and fulfil that dream. In the meantime, however, man is not to sit idle with folded hands and await the great event. He has to contribute his share by leading a beneficent life, by treading the path of good and eschewing and fighting evil, and thus help to bring about that consummation. Till this happens the existence of evil is inevitable and in a certain sense even necessary. A dictum runs that the Evil Spirit cannot be made ineffective except through war (*Great Bundahishn*, p. 9.1). Evil must be there to wage this war against, that is, for man to pass through the test and attain beatitude. But the war against evil is one thing ; the modern war of devastation, supposed to be in the name of truth, justice, and ideology, another. The former assures peace and happiness and brings the Kingdom of God nearer, the latter destroys them and retards this. Lovers of truth and justice have to strive for the

war against evil only, and in fulness of time the goal will be reached. So far this realistic but also optimistic theory of ancient Iranians,

It is the same view which Toynbee (*Civilization on Trial*, p. 14 f.) contrasts with the "cyclic view of the process of history taken by even the greatest Greek and Indian souls and intellects—by Aristotle, for instance, and by the Buddha," and compares with the Jewish one. He says: "In the vision seen by the Prophets of Israel, Judah, and Iran, history is not a cyclic and not a mechanical process. It is the masterful and progressive execution, on the narrow stage of this world, of a divine plan." This representation becomes fully true for Zarathustra, if we add to it the clause: 'with human agency.' Toynbee's further remarks about the prophets having "anticipated Aeschylus' discovery that learning comes through suffering" are also implied in the Iranian account of the fight between good and evil, referred to just above. Lastly, his assumption that the two views, Graeco-Indian and Jewish-Zoroastrian, are not fundamentally irreconcilable, finds support inasmuch as the Iranian theory admits almost regular ups and downs in the process of history, though never losing sight of, or doubting about, progress and final consummation.

To summarise the great lesson we learn from the authentic words of Zarathustra, one can say that Justice must precede Peace. Let the people know what is just, and peace will follow automatically. Of course, one may have to fight for it against those who persist in the old order of things. But the eternal question remains: what is truth and what is justice, for which one may fight to procure peace? As Chesterton once observed: "What is wrong with the world?—What's wrong is that we do not ask what is right." Indeed there is a far greater need of agreeing about the remedy than about the disease. Can mankind, or rather its leaders, agree about the remedy?

V

SOME GLEANINGS FROM AL-BIRUNI

Two principal works of this medieval renowned scholar of Islamic Persia, *Al-aṭḥār'l-baqiyat*...and *Ta'rikḥ'l-Hind*, show him as worker in the field of Orientalistics in the modern sense. In preparing them he was not actuated by any personal motives, but solely by the desire for knowledge about peoples of various countries and religions different from his own, and that out of pure intellectual curiosity of finding out the truth, be it pleasant or not.

Al-aṭḥār'l-baqiya contains a mass of useful and even unique information about Iranian antiquities, for instance, about religious customs amongst Zoroastrian communities in different provinces like Sughd and Khwarizm. The local names of months, festivals, etc., give us also some insight into the characteristic traits of their dialects, thus helping us to identify the Middle Sogdian texts in the manuscripts discovered from Turfan, and Khwarizmi notices elsewhere. When Sachau prepared the text and translation of *Al-aṭḥār*, the mss. at his disposal were defective, but now the complete ones have been brought to light. This new material requires to be worked out and also the old one is not quite exhausted. But as the work, better known by its English title *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, is not accessible to me, I cannot give any examples to the point.

Taqizadeh has drawn our attention to some of the data to be gleaned from the account of Zoroaster given by Biruni, which was missing in Sachau's mss. (BSOS. 8. 947 ff.). But there are many more which may be discussed here. The statement, "Zoroaster lived after this and preached his religion for seventy years, though some say (only) forty-six years," is not an exact translation. It should be: 'Zoroaster continued to preach etc.' So I do not think, as I first did, that it should be understood as if he lived for seventy years and preached for forty-six years. The number seventy, moreover,

then must be a scribal mistake for seventy-seven. In this manner alone can the account be brought into conformity with the Zoroastrian tradition handed down to us, which gives the age of thirty (evidently the age of manhood) as the date of revelation and that of seventy-seven years and forty days as that of death, (these figures too may have some other significance). The detail about the days is given by Zāt-spram only (SBE 47. 165); but it can be deduced also from the prophet's birth and death anniversaries observed by the Parsis. There still remains a little discrepancy of one year in the period of the preaching. That may be due to some mistake or different method in calculation. Zāt-spram too says first : "In the forty-seventh year Zaratušt passes away," meaning after full forty-six years of preaching.

Then the transcriptions of Iranian names preserve some linguistic features that deserve notice. The orthography *Por(u)kšasp* with *k* points to the Pahlavi original where vowels are prolonged or accompanied by *k* at the end of an old word or of its component part. Now the question is whether this *k* was pronounced or served only some orthographical purpose. Phonetically or linguistically there is no reason to assume the actual pronunciation, and therefore while transcribing such ancient names, etc. in Roman characters I place that *k* in brackets. But when Bīrūnī retains it in the Arabic script, the question requires reconsideration,—or we must account for his method in some other way. As far as I remember it is not ascertained whether Bīrūnī knew Pahlavi and used the sources in this language independently or he was ignorant of it, and relied upon the information given by Zoroastrians. In order to know Pahlavi he required only the acquaintance with its alphabet and system of ideographic writing; the rest was a matter of course;—as a Persian he knew the Persian language. Be this as it may, he or his guide may have tried to reproduce the Pahlavi orthography mechanically or in a pseudo-learned manner, without any regard for the actual pronunciation—just as it was done by the writers of the New Persian Rīvayats later on and just as even modern scholars do now.

Still more remarkable is the orthography *Sfīdtoman*,—first

of all with *dt* for *t*. This reminds one of Markwart's view that the Pahlavi orthography *ywdt* (for *yut*, NP. *jud(a)* 'separate, different') shows the later phonetical change of *t* to *d* side by side. I must admit that this explanation never impressed me favourably; rather I found it fanciful; and even now I am sceptic about it. Further examples of the type in Arabic script might give us a clue to the solution of the problem. But as to that Pahlavi word I think that *dt* or *yt* stands for *t* by mistake. Such mistakes are occasionally stereotyped and become regular. A contrary case for *t* instead of *yt* is found in the pseudo-ideogram of *zt* 'this' used in the sense of 'lo, behold' at the beginning of a statement. While discussing this word in my *Šayast ne-šayast* (p. 7f.) I omitted the clear evidence of the *Pahlavi Rivayat* which actually uses the Iranian term *zt*, because *t* is written like Av. *t* so that the whole appears like *ku* serving the same purpose. The provisional reading *hat* is to be given up and replaced by *zt*. The variant *z* then is the normal, later form of the same word *zt* originally meaning 'this'. To return to the Arabic form, the vowel *i* in *Sfidtomān* is written *plene*, possibly under the influence of the popular etymology *safīd*, *safēd* 'white',—Av. *spitama*—itself is connected with *spita*—'white', but the rest is doubtful; whereas the vowel *o* represents *a*. It is also possible that the whole name is meant to be *Safēd-tōmān*.

The genealogy of Āturpāt Mahraspand is a welcome addition to our knowledge. Unfortunately one of the name, *ssb*, is mutilated and another *Dūšrīn* not clear, but the last, *Minō-sībr*, shows the Northern (NW) change of *c* to *s* to be observed in the well-known city and fire-temple of *Šīz* < *Cēc* < *Caicast*. If I mistake not, Sepahbed Marzbān, son of Rostam, the oft-mentioned authority of al-Biruni, hailed from the same region, N. W. Iran.

Out of several otherwise known and un-known traditions attention may be drawn to the injunction that "No one is allowed to have access to the book of Avesta which Zoroaster brought, except those who are trusted in their faith, etc." It cannot be decided whether it refers to the late injunction in Vyt. 10 about teaching the religion only to one's brother, etc., (cf. AiW 972) or to the scarcity of Avesta mss. Then we are told that after

the devastation by Alexander "three-fifths of the book are lost". This means that the loss was not so great as popularly believed. It is however difficult to reconcile the usual number of twenty-one Nask-s, with what is stated by Biruni: "It contained thirty Nask-s, but now what remains in the hand of Zoroastrians is only twelve Nask-s".

The second standard work, *Ta'rikh'l-Hind*, has got another type of interest for us. A detailed commentary on the facts about Indian antiquities recorded in this work would not be superfluous. By way of illustration I may dwell upon a few details.

While speaking of the *Rgveda* al-Biruni remarks :

P. 128 : .."It treats of the sacrifices to the fire, and is recited in three different ways. First, in an uniform manner of reading, just as every other book is read. Secondly, in such a way that a pause is made after every single word. Thirdly, in a method which is the most meritorious and for which plenty of reward in heaven is promised. First you read a short passage, each word of which is distinctly pronounced ; then you repeat it together with a part of that which has not yet been recited. Next you recite the added portion alone, and then you repeat it together with the next part of that which has not yet been recited, etc. Continuing to do so till the end, you will have read the whole text twice."

The first statement, now, can be said to refer to the fact that all the so-called Family Books (2—7) as well as the first one open with the hymns to Agni or fire. Of course, we cannot say whether the above conclusion was drawn by al-Biruni from the reports given to him by some native scholar or the same was presented to him by the latter. The same doubt remains as regards the account about the recitation. al-Biruni may have actually heard and observed the recital, or may have read about it in some works, or may have received oral information. In any case, the first two modes of recital are clear. They refer to the *Samhita-paṭha* and *Pada-paṭha* respectively. The third is not quite properly represented, but it certainly refers to the *Krama-paṭha* in which the words are recited ab, bc, cd, and so forth. Instead of individual words, al-Biruni speaks of "short

passages". This is of course a slight oversight or misunderstanding. But why and where this mode of recital is said to be meritorious, I do not know,—as to why, perhaps because it is so difficult and complicated. In a recent article on the subject there is nothing about this meritoriousness, as a matter of fact nothing new about the whole subject of recitation itself, with the exception of the interesting notice about the feats of a modern Pandit, who has all the three modes of recitation by heart and also various other details about the *R̥gveda* (*Annals, Bhandarkar Or. Res. Institute* 28, 140).

The story given by al-Birunī about the reason why the *R̥gveda* cannot be recited as a text connected by the rules of Saṃdhi, refers, I believe, to the *Pada-p ha*, but its source is unknown to me. The legend in *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 23 varies in various respects; it is about learning the *Yajur-Veda*, for instance. Other details are not so remarkable, and even the above ones may be considered puerile and not worth attention; yet I think they have some value as to how Indian antiquarian details were presented to al-Birunī or how he grasped them. They may also point to a different tradition of a matter or a different version of a story. Hence by way of example I may refer to the ambiguous answer given by Yudhiṣṭhira, his only departure from truth, which has even resulted in proverbial sayings. In al-Birunī's version of the story, the answer is said to be "Asvatthaman, the elephant, has died"; but it is added, Yudhiṣṭhira "had made a pause between Asvatthaman and the elephant, by which he had led Droṇa to believe that he meant his son." In the *Mahābhārata* (*Droṇa-Parva* 191. 57) however, we are told that the word elephant (*kuṇjara*) was added indistinctly (*avyaktam*). Is it possible that the difference has arisen from the fact that some languages have one and the same word for 'low' (soft, not loud) in tone and 'slow' in time? I remember how an oriental mixed up 'leise' and 'langsam' in German quite promiscuously or rather preferring the latter. Of course, one must consult the original Arabic for such minute details and points of niceties. The event or anecdote is referred to in various other places: hence varying versions are not out of the question either. In Gujarat, for instance, even the phrase *naro vā kuṇjaro*

va 'either the man or the elephant' is attributed, (mark that *nar-* is declined thematically).

Then there occur also notices on beliefs and customs of other peoples. These are referred to by al-Birunī for the sake of comparison and elucidation just as a modern scholar does. Sachau has prepared a separate Index for them, and so one can study any or a particular group of them. For the present a few remarks will suffice.

P. 21 : The statement "There are some Magians up to the present time in India, where they are called Maga" seems to me out of place. Before and after it al-Birunī speaks of Buddhists and Hindus, and I think the statement ought to refer to the Buddhists. Moreover, Magas were, strictly speaking, not Magians or orthodox Zoroastrians, but a sun-worshipping tribe of Iranian extraction with some Iranian customs. If, however, al-Birunī does mean Magians or Zoroastrians, then he must be referring to some Parsi colonies in Sindh and the Punjab like that at Uch, about which see my article "Zur Pflege des iranischen Schrifttums im Mittelalter," ZDMG 98. 294 ff., especially pp. 309 ff.—Parsen-Kolonie in Uch, Sind Punjab.

P. 54 : The remarks about body and soul from Mani's Book of Mysteries are very interesting. I hope to return to them in my study on the Manichean fragment S 9.

P. 100 : The four classes of Iranian Society are based upon the actual state under the Sassanids ; hence they resemble the accounts in other historical works and not that in the religious literature of the Parsis which mechanically repeats the more ancient state of affairs.

P. 109 ; Details about "a man's being married as the substitute for another man" will clear up some of our false notions about marriages among ancient Iranians.

P. 158 : While giving the title *Saravali*, of a Hindu work on astrology, al-Birunī adds "similar to *Vazadaj*" which Sachau equates with "Persian *guzida* ?", thus with a mark of interrogation or doubt. But the term is really Persian, *vizdaj* representing the later Middle Persian pronunciation *vizīdag*, the earlier one would be *vičītak* 'selected, selection'. This should be the meaning of the Arabic explanation which Sachau has rendered with

"chosen one". The Sanskrit title, which is very common, is made up of *sara* 'essence, substance', and *avalī* 'row, series, etc'. The comparison by al-Birunī is really remarkable. It suggests that he must have met with a considerable number of older Persian books bearing that Middle Persian title. Here is another proof of the existence of a vast secular and even scientific literature in pre-Islamic Persia. Very probably it was more or less extant up to the days of al-Birunī and even a little later. The adoption of Arabic as the language of science and literature caused its gradual decay, which decay was crowned very probably by the coup d'état delivered by the Mongol invasion. Barthold may well try to remove the charge of ruthless destruction against the Mongols, so vehemently and eloquently laid by Browne, as far as the Islamic science and letters are concerned ; but I believe there is still enough truth in that charge. Zoroastrians too failed to preserve their entire religious literature only after this epoch. For we know for certain that even up to the tenth century a considerable part of it was extant, and selections and summaries were prepared from it. To return to the point of our departure I may add that one such work bears the same title as referred to by al-Birunī. It is the well-known *Viṣṭakihā* i *Zāt-spram*.

P. 260 : The remark about confusing two countries under the name of the land of five or seven rivers deserves further investigation.

Lastly I may refer to one point from the second volume, p. 167 : The bodies of the dead are said to be exposed to the wind. Is there any connection with the wind god, Vayu, who once played the role of the chief god and is still known as the god of death ?

It goes without saying that this varied and various mass of details referred to by al-Birunī cannot be satisfactorily dealt with by a single individual, however learned and well read he may be. Sachau no doubt has achieved a masterpiece, yet not only the obscurity and difficulty of Arabic may well necessitate a new attempt, but also the commentary should be revised and enlarged. This task should be undertaken with all due care and co-operation at least of a Sanskritist or rather Sanskritists, for al-Birunī traverses a vast field of some eighty subjects.

There is another task which equally deserves to be undertaken. A critical edition of the author's *Tafhim* in Persian will provide us a good specimen of early prose in this language.

A few words on the name of this remarkable and almost unique scholar and I have done with these ramble notes and stray thoughts upon him. The full name is Abū Raiḥān al-Bīrānī. Bīrānī is a Persian word meaning 'of or belonging to the outside (*bīrān*)', in this case the outside or outskirts of the city Khiva. Sachau writes *Bīrānī* in accordance with the older pronunciation of *bē* 'out'; but then one must be consequent and adopt also *rēn* 'side', as some have actually done (cf. also Master *Aliboron* used in the West). It is under this name or so to say surname that this renowned scholar of ancient times is known to us moderns. Formerly among his compatriots he is generally referred to as Abū Raiḥān. If I am right in my conjecture the great romantic poet Nizāmī refers to our scholar as well as to the literal meaning of the term *raiḥān* in his *Haft Paikar*, in the story of the Russian Princess. I cannot cite the exact verse, as neither this work nor my article on it in *Or. Lit. Zeitung* is accessible here. My conjecture was based upon the variants given in the edition by Ritter and Rypka.

VI

SOME REMARKS ON A SANSKRIT-CHINESE GLOSSARY

WITH

SPECIAL REFERENCE TO IRANIAN WORDS THEREIN

The Sanskrit-Chinese Glossary which forms the subject of the present study is a remarkable work,—remarkable both in its compilation as well as in its edition with translation and commentary. I mean the first piece, entitled *Fan yu tsa ming* in *Deux Lexiques Sanskrit-Chinois* by Dr. P. C. Bagchi. Being recently reminded of this learned edition by a reference in an article of Bailey, I thought of acquainting myself with it. Accordingly I borrowed a copy from Dr. Bagchi himself, and went through it with great interest and attention it deserved. The result was that I was provoked to write these few notes.

The *Fan yu tsa ming* is a facsimile reprint of the Japanese edition of 1732, which edition was already referred to by Max Muller in his *Buddhist Texts from Japan* (1881). This glossary along with other works is said to have been brought by Jikaku Daishi (794-864) and deposited in the library of Hieizan. Later on (the date is not given) it was published by Shin-gen.

At the end of the text it is stated, obviously in a colophon by someone, that the work was compiled by the *Śramaṇa* Li-yen of the country of Kucha, with some details about him including his connection with the college of Han-lin. This college was founded in 713, which means that the work was compiled after that date and before 847 when it was brought to Japan by Jikaku. The reference to Kucha is quite clear. So I do not understand why Bailey (BSOAS 13. 122) puts a mark of interrogation before the author being a Kuchean. Probably because the name Li-yen sounds Chinese, but that is a different matter. At least the fact that it is expressed by the author, improper symbol does not affect that statement. Further reasons adduced by Bagchi for its correctness are the geographical data and linguistic changes including those in Chinese transcriptions, though both may be

accounted for otherwise, if necessary. Anyhow, by adopting the different symbols one can identify the author with a famous man. Here are some essential facts about him from the biographical notice translated by Bagchi.

The date of Li-yen's birth is not known, but it can be roughly judged from his ordination in 726 under the Śramaṇa Dharma-candra who came from India. Li-yen possessed very good memory and easily learnt languages. Besides Sanskrit and Chinese he knew a number of Central Asian dialects. In 730 he accompanied his teacher Dharma-candra to China (reaching their destination in 732), and helped him in translating Sanskrit works into Chinese. In 741 began the return journey to India, but the master having died on the way at Khotan in 743, Li-yen came back to his native country, Kucha. Then he received an invitation to help Amogha-vajra, which he did from 755 onwards. On the third occasion he appears as the collaborator of Prajña, monk of Kapiśa in N (W) India, who came to China in 782.

These bare facts, even without the details of the travels and the translation work, open before us so to say a new chapter in the cultural life of Central and Further Asia. Li-yen's example is sufficient to show the importance of the part played by a small community in bringing the spiritual goods of one great nation to the other like the Indian and the Chinese. He seems to have been a mediator in expounding Buddhist texts to Persians also. Besides this help in learned matters Li-yen supplied even the practical needs of ordinary travellers, merchants and others, by means of his Sanskrit-Chinese Glossary, which he is said to have prepared during the last years of his life, which extended up to 789-795.

In this connection it is worth while to add a few words for the part played by Kucha and Kuchean scholars in the spread of Buddhist literature. One of the most celebrated translators of Buddhist works into Chinese, Kumāra-jīva, was a native of Kucha, born of an Indian father and Kuchean mother in 344. In his days there were in the country about 10,000 monks, and principal Buddhist texts must have been translated for the local clergy before they were turned into Chinese. Also other non-Buddhist works were rendered into the native tongue when the

Indian influence was at its zenith ; see Filliozat's Introduction to his *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens de Médecine et de Magie*, Paris 1948, where he also discusses the whole problem of Central Asian studies. There is still some uncertainty and even obscurity about several points, especially about the much debated question of the name of the sister dialect of Turfan-Qarašahr, called "Tokharian" A as opposed to B which is Kuchean,—along with others by Pelliot, 'Tokharien et Koutchéen' *J. As.* 1934, 23ff., see especially p. 63 and still more p. 65 ff. on a typical term used at Kucha and Qarašahr and then at Peshawar.

On this question Henning (*Asia Major*, N.S. 1. 158 ff.) has recently thrown new light, which does away with one of the arguments for the name Tokharian. By re-deciphering the well known Uigur Turkish colophon which mentions the fact of Ārya-candra's having composed the Maitreya-samiti in the *Twryy* language out of the Indian language, he shows that the birth-place is to be read *'knyδyš*, that is Agni-deśa or Qarašahr—and not *n'kryδyš*, that is Nagaradeśa or Jelalabad. Thus the Bodhisattva, Guru, Ācārya Ārya-candra hailed actually from the country in which the mss. in A dialect were found, and was only a local luminary ; and the *Twryy* language in which he wrote was not the language of Tokharistan, of which Jelalabad did not form a part but being within a reasonable distance from it was supposed to come under its influence and to use its language. It was the unfortunate mis-decipherment by that great pioneer F. W. K. Mueller that led to the wrong and also otherwise impossible identification of the *Twryy* language with that of Tokharistan,—impossible because of the non-existence of *x*, *γ*, or the like in the language.

Nevertheless, the designation *Twryy* for Kuchean is to be accounted for. The mere assumption of some other Iranian dialect of that name from which the Uigur version was prepared is not sufficient,—it is even unjustified in face of the common loan-words occurring at the same place in this as well as the A version of the Maitreya-samiti. Also other attempts at explanation are unconvincing, to say the least. Bailey offers some new suggestions on the term in his 'Recent Work in "Tokharian"' (*Transactions of the Philological Society*, London 1947, p. 126ff.);

but they are not always clear. For instance, "the Turks were not employing their word *Twrry* linguistically.. but geographically or politically" (p. 152). Also his remarks about the remnants of the Tokharian language (and also people) left in the locality during the march from Kan-su to Bactria (p. 151, 153) require further discussion. A few loan-words are not sufficient to justify the name of a whole language.

To return to the proper subject, let it be first noted that the Glossary contains some geographical data also, names of cities and countries. The information is based upon older sources as Bagchi justly concludes from the Chinese transcriptions. On the name *sul* I write in detail below. Here I may just mention that *paravada* identified by S. Lévi with *paravata* or Po-lo-yue of Fa-hien (p. 349, note 29) can well be *parvata*-occurring in Pāṇini and elsewhere, with which I formerly explained the obscure *pouruta*-(*parvata*-) of Yt. 10. 14.

Also the other words are not arranged alphabetically but systematically, that is, according to subject-matter as in modern conversation guides. The first subject or section has been actually distinguished by a proper heading in Chinese: 'The Section of Animal Beings'. Other headings may have been omitted by later copyists. There are also various discrepancies, yet it would be worth while to examine the work from this point of view, as can be seen from the following.

Bagchi is perhaps right in assuming a different section with No. 78: *pratima*, namely, concerning idols—and not to men or human forms as I say.

The Glossary begins with the word for 'God'—most probably out of religiosity. Then appear 'man' and the group of men, people. With the fourth word begins a distinct subject: elements and limbs of the human body. Hence No. 4, *mamsa*, should be rendered by "chair" (flesh), not "viande" (meat). The Chinese term, I believe, forms no objection to this change.

No. 74: *bala* 'force' may well have called forth the next No. for 'protector' *rakṣa* written *skr*, a strange transposition. But the following may refer to the same subject of man and man's body till we come to No. 108, *varṇa* 'colour', which naturally leads to the mention of different colours. The intrusion of some

agricultural terms (No. 124 ff.) is not so evident. There is also another slight confusion. But with No. 113 begins the series of human activity, hearing (hence the repetition of *karṇa* 'ear' before it), seeing, etc. and the terms for speech and the like, and various other sub-groups, which I need not recount here.

No. 278 ff. are of special interest being a question and answer : *kutra gacchasi* (where do you go ?) and *tatra gacchami* (I go there), to be compared with, e. g. , No. 322 ff. about 'arrival', before which occur words of directions, adverbs of place, etc.

With no. 452 begin the numerals before which are given some terms relating to the subject, e. g. how much, count, etc.

Another clear section begins with No. 535 : cloths, jewels, metals, coins. Food and Drink cover about thirty items from No. 567 ff. Family Members begin at No. 598 ; but they recur also at the end, No. 1210 ff. Leaving aside some minor groups like that concerning books (669 ff.) I may mention the lists of divisions of time (695 ff.), natural phenomena—sky, etc. (763 ff.), waters (796 ff.), fire, etc. domestic animals (836 ff.), which are followed by the lists of some cities and countries (857 ff.) and celestial beings ? (878 ff.)—evidently an interpolation, for the natural group is the next one of wild or non-domestic animals (892 ff.). Then come fruits and other eatables (958 ff.), weapons (1022 ff.) utensils (1067 ff.) house and its components (1081 ff.),—also (1148 ff.), temple, etc. (1099 ff.), garments and ornaments (1117 ff.).

This arrangement of the Glossary gives us a fair idea of the contents, and may be helpful in ascertaining the sources used by Li-yen.

The next point that deserves to be noted is that the Sanskrit words are not always correct Sanskrit, sometimes not at all Sanskrit, and occasionally not even Indian. Besides orthographical mistakes due to copyists there are words which may be called Prakrit or even *deśi*. Bagchi has collected them in a list, to which may be suggested a few corrections and additions.

No. 39 : Besides *udara* and *kukṣi* there occurs in the other Glossary *peṭṭa*, which is modern *peṭ*. 'belly.' In Sk. *peṭa* means 'chest' (breast ?) besides 'bag, basket' ; but indeed it is the same word.

No. 123 : *pucchida*, Sk. *pruṇchita* 'rubbed, wiped.'

No. 125 : *urupita* or *oropita* seems to be only partly Prakrit ; but *vavi* in the other Glossary cannot be a mistake for Sk. *vapana* 'sowing' but a later form ; cf. modern *vav*.

No. 288 : *skara*, on the other hand, cannot be Prakrit but rather a miswritten form of Sk. *saṃskara*. So also perhaps No. 370. : *kedha* for Sk. *krodha*.

No. 329 : *nikkara* (in the other Glossary *nikkala*), Sk. *niṣkrama*, cf. modern *nikal*.

No. 376 : *huti* (*hoti*), Sk. *bhavati*, is remarkable.

No. 582 : If the archaic Bengali *tāṇla* 'rice' is from Sk. *tanḍula* there is little doubt that *cola*, *caula*, *caval* also come from it. The interchange of *t* and *c* is not strange.

No. 742 : For *ahuna* Sk. *adhunā*, we have a closer form in Guj. *a(h)unā*, *haunā*, *hamnā*.

These are more or less clear examples. A closer study is sure to yield further results. In general it should be remembered that if the Sk. and Prk. forms do not agree with the recognised rules of ancient grammarians, we are not always to assume mistakes, but rather other phenomena, namely different types of Sk. and Prk. By now we must recognise that that there was also a Central Asian (in the present case, Kuchean) type thereof. Bagchi has done well in analysing the grammatical character of the materials supplied by the Glossary. But before drawing definite conclusions we have to compare other materials.

A few interesting changes may be noted here. The change $n < nḍ$ occurs only in the final position. Therefore it is to be compared with a similar phenomenon, say, in Guj.—*gale-ban* < *-band(h)*, 'scarf', *khan* < *khaṇḍ* 'sugar', etc. Also the spontaneous nasalisation is not unknown in Modern Indian languages ; so also the mixing up of different sibilants, though each province has its special favourite. The numerals show easily recognisable and also explainable changes, but *kapamśa* for *pañcanavati* 'ninety-five' is strange and obscure.

Before I take up the loan-words a remark about the other Glossary may be inserted here. Its author is another well known scholar, Yi-tsing. His object in preparing this work was quite

different. It was, as he said in the Preface, to teach the (Chinese) language to the people of the West. Now the West is supposed to be India, but it may also include Central Asian provinces. In the present case these seem to be actually meant. For it is added at the end that if, in addition to the Glossary, one reads Sanskrit for one or two years one will be in a position to translate the texts. This remark, which is declared to be corrupt, becomes clear and intelligible, if the Central Asian scholars are kept in view. They had to learn both Sanskrit and Chinese in order to translate Sanskrit texts into Chinese. This is, moreover, in conformity with what we have said about the part played by Central Asia in the transmission of Indian civilization to China from the examples of Li-yen and Kumgrajīva.

As to the loan-words from Iranian, it should not be supposed that Li-yen introduced them in more or less Sanskritized forms in his Glossary for the first time. They must have been in common use in the Sanskrit of Central Asia, if not in that of India proper.

No. 554 : Pelliot in his note on *pin*, Sk. *piṇa*, 'steel' considers the question whether the Sk. term, which is met with only here, is derived from Chinese or direct from Iranian. Laufer *Sino-Iranica* 515, showed the Chinese expression to be a loan-word from Iranian **spaina* there being *spin* in Pamir, and similar terms in Afghan and Ossetic. Pelliot therefore thinks that in Sk. this would have remained *spina*, if directly borrowed. But the words with initial *s* plus consonant have generally doublets— with and without *s* : *smar*, *mar* 'to remember' ; *spaś*, *paś* 'to see' ; *stayu* ' *taṃ*, thief ' ; etc. Therefore the objection is weakened. Anyhow, the Iranian word is met with only in Eastern dialects ; NP. as well as MP, has a different one for 'steel'. This peculiarity will be observed almost always in the loan-words here.

No. 559 : *denara* and No. 678 : *kalama* are more or less common in Sk., and whatever may be their origin it is through the Iranian channel that they have travelled to India.

No. 675 : *kakari*, in the other Glossary *kakali*, for 'paper' is of greater importance. It is not generally adopted in Sk. but is all the more common in Modern Indian languages : *kagad*,

kagaz (*kəkaj*) direct from NP. *kagaδ* or *kagaz*. But Guj. has *kagal* from *l*, just like *kakali* above. This latter can well be from the Sogdian equivalent where in some dialects *δ* becomes *l*.—Here is again the East Iranian and especially the Sogdian channel through which Iranian words passed on to distant countries. Is Guj. *kagal* too due to this fact or some other influence or factor ? Uigur is *kägdä* and Mongolian *qayudasun* 'a sheet of paper'—both with *l* which is retained even in some Sogdian dialects.

It is worth while to add as Dr. Bagchi has done, that the fabrication of paper was introduced at Samarkand by the Chinese in 751 : but Chinese paper was imported since 661, a century earlier. It was known in Sassanian Persia as a rare object and used for royal mandates. This must have taken place even still earlier. The material for writing purposes is generally omitted in the discussions about inscribing the Avesta and other texts.

861 (I. 295) : *Sulī*, for the Chinese Hou (Hu), is explained as 'Iranian (Sogdian)'. It is of course Sogdian as applied to the people, since the word occurs in the group of the names of lands and peoples. The further comments in II 346 say that up to the end of the sixth century Hou (Hu) meant 'barbarians' in general' from which time onwards the Chinese excluded the Turks and the Indians from that term. Perhaps one may put this better thus : upto the sixth century the Chinese designated all barbarians, that is, foreigners, by the term Hu. but since then on (better) acquaintance with the Turks and the Indians they began to designate them with their own particular names, and retained Hu for the earlier known people, the Sogdian. It is natural if Sou-li (Suli) occurs as the name of their country also. And if Chou-li-kia (Šulika) is met with as the name of a country it can be justly connected with Suli, the difference being formal in orthography and formation. But the formation of both words—Suli as well as Šulika—requires explanation :

The original, Old Ir. word for Sogdia and Sogdian, that is, in topographical as well as ethnic sense, was *sugda*, although it is represented in the present Av. orthography as *suγda* and in that of OP. as *suguda*. In Mid. Ir. it became *suδ* or *sōδ* (the fall of *g*

before *d* is not recorded by Salemann in the *Grundriss* 1, 260, but it occurs in this name,—just as it does before *m* and *n*). Markwart, *Eransahr*, 88. n. 7, deducted this from Arm. and Syr. sources ; but it occurs also in Mid. Pers., for instance in GrBD. 86. 14 : *vzh-rōt pat xvarasan bē vitiret pat sōδ. būm šavēt pat hindakan* *ō zreh rēcet ut-aš anōδ mihran rōt xvanend*, ‘The Veh River passes through Xvarasan, goes to the Soδ land, pours itself into the sea in India, and there they call it the Mihran River’. The pronunciation *sōδ* instead of *suδ* is not only suggested by the Arm. and Syr. transcriptions but is also supported by other cases where the fall of *g* produces the lengthening of the vowel ; cf. also *Toδ* beside *Tusa*. Further, the sense is restricted to topography ; for the ethnic term Sogdian we have the usual formation with-*ik* : in Arm. *Sōlik* occurs as one of the peoples inhabiting Scythia, see Markwart, *Eransahr*, 140 f. (B).

Such was the state in western Iran ; also in eastern Iran some Sogdian dialects preserved the ancient *d*, as can be seen by the Ugurs employing the Sogdian letter *δ* for their *d*. But in most of the Sogdian dialects it (as well as *θ*) must have sounded very much like *l* as can be seen in Persian loan-words from Sogdian as well as in the Sogdian itself wherein *δ* equals Aramaic *l*. This phonetic phenomenon explains the existence of *sālik* (or *sōlik*) besides **sōlik*. It has even penetrated the western region inasmuch as it is found in Pahlavi or Mid. Pers. also, in GrBD. 205. 11 : *dašt ī sālik-mānišn ku-š sālik patiš mānend* ‘the plain (steppe) of the Sogdian habitation, that is to say, the Sogdians live in it’. *sālik-mānišn* is the translation of Av. *surdo sayana*, and the same recurs with a different gloss in the Pahlavi *Vidēvdāt* 1. 4. One may not draw any conclusion about the place of this translation from a solitary eastern word, yet the occurrence of that word in such a work as this is indeed remarkable.

Now, it is quite natural if this typically eastern (and not western) name *sālik* has penetrated further east, in Tibet, in India, and in China. Gauthiot, *J. As.* 1910, II 541. f., drew the Tibetan and Indian sources to prove the unequivocal value *l* of the equivocal letter *r* or *l* in Chinese and Iranian. In this *sālik* we have the explanation of the above-mentioned Chinese ex-
pre-

ssions *suli* and *chou-li-kia*. The latter represents the Sanskritization *śulika*. The other Sk. forms with the initial *c* or *t* and further differences are nothing but phonetical or orthographical variants; for *s* can be pronounced as *c* and this as *t*, and vice versa, just as *d* can stand for *l*. In Indian sources the term occurs in company with Tukhara, Yavana, Pahlava, Cina, etc.—all designating neighbouring peoples. This fact is a further proof for the identification.

More recently Dr. Bagchi brought out a new and far reaching fact in his article '*Śulika Cūlika and Cūlika-Paiśaci*' in the *Journal of the Department of Letters XXI* (Calcutta Univ. 1930). As to the relation of *śulik* (: Sogdian) and *śulika* etc. the facts are as stated above. But he is perfectly justified in identifying *Cūlika* in *Cūlika-Paiśaci* with Sogdian and thus seeing in this Prakrit a variety of some north-western Middle Indian dialect formed under the influence of the Sogdians (or at any rate of their language). He has fairly put together the characteristics of the *Cūlika-Paiśaci* and compared them with those of Sogdian with illustrations. The point raised deserves to be considered and further investigated by competent authorities. Here I will notice only one discrepancy: Sogdian *wyspyδr'k* is not related to Pali Vessantara, although Gauthiot thought so. It is as Schaefer, BSOS (1936) 8. 737 ff., showed, Parthian *vispuhr* 'prince'—with the inverse orthography *δr* for *hr*. (On this Sog. orthography—(y)δr—there are some further corroborative remarks by Benveniste, BSOS 9. 506 ff.)—It should also be remembered that Sogdian is transcribed mechanically, which transcription cannot always be safe for comparative phonetical purposes.

Besides the linguistic factors there are also historical ones which Bagchi has well brought to bear upon his thesis. The Sogdians were the most enterprising businessmen of the time. Their language was a sort of lingua franca in the whole of Central Asia, which they carried even to far off China and Mongolia, where inscriptions in that tongue are found. Besides being excellent merchants they are said to be also good agriculturists—although not so by the Armenian geographer Ps. Moses Xorenac'i, see Markwart *Eransahr* 141 (B). In both these capacities a

number of Sogdians might have migrated to NW India during one of the Voelkerwanderungen about the Christian era. Bagchi refers to a Chinese notice about a Buddhist monk "born of a Sogdian (merchant) family long established in India", and quotes from *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab* names of agricultural clans resembling the term Sogdian—Sulki, Solgi, Solkah and Sud, Suda, Sudgi. These numerous people could not have failed to influence a local speech. Even modern Panjabi shows, in actual speech though not in conventional script, some similiar traits, the use of unasiprate surds instead of sonants, for instance, which may be due to this early Sogdian influence. Also politically these people seem to have played some role, for the question about the origin of the Calukya and Śolaṅki dynasty can well be settled by connecting the words with Sogdian, as is suggested by Bagchi.

I may take this opportunity and add some words about the home of Paiśāci Prakrit. It is true that Lacote like Pischel and Grierson locates it and therewith the home of the *Byhat-katha* in NW India, because of certain common traits of this Prakrit and the Dard dialects. But Konow has again recently upheld his theory of Central India (*Acta Orientalia*, 19. 140 ff.). As far as I can judge the linguistic data speak for him. Direct evidence is adduced for both theories, but that can be reconciled by the assumption of earlier and later homes in NW India and Central India respectively of the Bhil tribes. Thus Konow may be right in his conclusion that Paiśāci was an Aryan dialect but spoken by an aboriginal tribe. In that article (148 ff.) he adds a Bhil version of the Grimm tale 'True John' from an English novel *The Final Image* of Dennis Kincaid. This version may be considered as the Indian original from which are derived different versions of different localities—Gujarat, Maharashtra, and Bengal with local changes and colouring. I discussed this question in a short article in *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 1944, 20. 197 f.—after having given a translation of the Gujarati version together with its relation to Bengali and other versions in *Hamburger Fremdenblatt* of 14th March, 1944, both of which journals may not be accessible and therefore this note here.

No. 844 : *vakara* 'goat' is the same as *varkara* in common

Sk. and *bak-ra* in Hindi, etc. If at all, it must be a special East Iranian term, for in the west we have *buz*, MP. as well as NP.

No. 905 : Since *makara* 'monkey' does not exactly correspond with Sk. *markaṭa* nor with Prk. *makkaḍa*, Bagchi like Pelliot would compare Sogd. *mkkr'*. He would do the same regarding No. 570 *medya* 'fermented drink' ; but this may simply be an orthographical variant of Sk. *madya*.

No. 960 : *aru* 'peach' is evidently NP. *ālū* in *šaftālū* 'peach' wherein *šaft* means 'fat, grease' as well as 'course, thick', and *ālū* 'plum' as well as various other fruits.

No. 967 : *akmira* 'nut, walnut' as well as the commonly used *ākhoṭa*. *akṣoṭa* is of Iranian origin but the exact equivalent is not known, which must be again sought in eastern Iran, for in western Iran, we have *goz* in MP., in Armenian as loan-word, and in NP. ; see my Sn§. 2. 120. N. 1, where I reject Laufer's view. The fact that also MP. has *goz* and not *agoz* shows that the Chinese loan-word with the initial *an* or *a* must be looked for elsewhere,—in some East Iranian dialect, cf. Yidgha *oghazoh*.

No. 1117 : *kuratu*, explained by Chinese *chan* (*šan*) 'chemise', is marked with '?' (I, 308) but is further commented upon in II. 354 as being absent in Sk. and as being related to Hindi or Hindustani *kurtā*. The alleged Portuguese (*curta cabaya*) origin of this is justly contested, but the real one is not given ; and *kuratu* is declared inexplicable. The origin of the Hindustani word is certainly NP. *kurtu(h)* which must assume there the form *kurtā*. And therefore *kuratu* itself can be either a Sanskritised or an inexact orthography of *kurtu* (?—or *ta*, the words in *u* being actually rare in Glossary) and can certainly be considered as an earlier loanword from Iranian where it occurs from Av. downwards. The term is repeatedly discussed, and now its spread in and beyond the frontiers of Iran can be seen from Benveniste's latest article, *J. As.* 1948, p. 184 ff.

The following, however, may still be added. The Av. term *kərēti* (= *kṛ(t)ti*) in Nir. 168. 13 is not translated in the Pahlavi version by *kurtak*, but by an obscure word read as *kirrenitak* by Bartholomae. Nor *kəša* —(= *kṛ(t)a* in Yt. 17. 14 ; recognised by Bailey, Zor. Prob. p. 8, as its side form, has that rendering in the Frahadg 5 where the whole phrase is quoted,

unless *kartak* be for *kurtak* (see Aiw 1385 and for the translation, 955 which. if genuine supports Bartholomae. Probably it was the other way round : he must have followed its hint.) To judge from Bulsara's translation, *Aerpatastan and Nirangastan* p. 419, n. 4, *kurtak* seems to occur in Nir. 166. 1 ; but in the absence of the original I cannot check it. The matter may be quite different from what he assumes ; cf. his n. 3 where he changes a word to suit Arab. *fñta*, which is simply inadmissible ; and so *kartak* may be the usual verbal form 'made'. Note that the passage with *kərətī* occurs a little below, first there being another with *karəta*. Also this word seems to mean some garment construed with another verb for 'put on', *aiwi-yah*, and not with *vah*, and translated also differently—by *karten* (?). But Bulsara renders it with 'cutting arms', i. e. weapons ! However this may be, the fact that such a common term as *kurtak* is not used in the Middle Persian Version, shows that it was not current in Persia proper, in SW Iran, at that time. The Arabi-cised *qurtaq* would presuppose *kurtak* there, but I find only *qurta(h)* in Firdausi, which means that the loan-word is late,—first in the New Persian period.

Also in NW Iran, since it occurs in Kurdish with the final *k*, it can be an old loan-word from the East, where it is well attested : first in Av., then in Sogdian, and lastly in a number of modern dialects. It is also from Eastern Iran that the word passed into India, as recorded in Niya documents. (—*karcī*, which may be from the specific Sog. form *Kur θ*, *Kurs*) and into Central Asia, to judge from its adoption in this Sanskrit-Chinese Glossary or word-book compiled in Kucha. The word travelled in the Western direction also. Besides being in Kurdish it passed through Ossetic to Caucasus and then to Russia (*kurtka*) and even to Germany. Perhaps the above mentioned Portuguese word is to be accounted for in this manner.

In course of time, that is, if not in Middle Persian as said above then at least in early New Persian, *kurta* found its way in SW also. Already Firdausi uses the word. But it should be considered a loan-word from the East (or the North) because of its history, although philologically it cannot be distinguished. It is naturally from NP.—and hardly from earlier sources—that

the word entered Hindustani, and through this into other parts of India.

There is however a peculiarity about the use of *kurta* or rather *kurtu* among the Parsis using Guj. as their mother tongue. The change in form is normal; the word ends in-*u*, so to say the neuter ending, like other similar Persian terms; *xānu* : *khānu*, *nāma* : *nāmu*, etc. The meaning, however, is not 'a shirt' as such, but only the children's 'short sleeved shirt (or underwear) made of simple white cloth' called by other Gujrat people—Hindus-*paheṛan* or *peheṛan*, a general term, also derived from Persian : NP. *pirahan*, *pirahan* ; MP. *pirahan*, once used for the sacred shirt, DdA. 39 1. (Mark that *n* is cerebralised in Gujarati because of *r* as in *daran* (*drāṇa*, MP. *dron*). A similar shirt for children but of superior cloth, coloured and otherwise adorned, is designated by the common term *jhabh-lu*, apparently a diminutive of *j(h)abbho* 'robe,' 'cloak,' which too is from NP. *juba(h)*. originally Arab. *jubbat* 'coat of mail', 'cloak'. That restriction in the meaning among the Parsis—whatever may be the reason and history—is very interesting inasmuch as it is just the opposite of what Hesychius remarks in his Greek gloss on *kurta*, brought to light by Benveniste in the same article, *J. As.* 1948, p. 183. According to this gloss the term was a Parthian name of the sort of "toge virile" a male garment for the virile age. Also in Sogdian it seems to have indicated a 'ceremonial garment' And Benveniste aptly remarks that the word possessed from the very beginning this special signification, which was a favourable condition for the propagation of a cultural term. Also the Parthian origin accords well with the diffusion of the modern forms in various directions.

It is of course hazardous to see in the opposite sense among the Parsis an old opposition between Parthia and Persia. As a matter of fact the Parsis came from Khorasan, which is nearer to Parthia and far away from Persia. The only thing is that the Parsis see in the term neither a ceremonial nor even an adult application but just the contrary—a shirt and that too a commonplace one used by the minors before their investiture or the so-called 'Naajote' ceremony; but we have to leave it at that. In the absence of any other data we cannot trace it to its cause or

origin. (As to the difference between the use of *nōzōd* or *nāzōd* among the Parsis in India and the Zoroastrians in Persia I think that the latter are right : the word means 'a new sacrificer, a new priest'; hence it should be applied to the 'Navar' ceremony whereby a person finishes his studies and is ordained as priest. I do not think that the Parsis in India took the word in a modified meaning, namely, 'a new worshipper,' but rather they applied it to the beginning of the priestly studies and not to their end. The studies may well have begun under a ceremonious act at the age of seven and finished similarly at that of fifteen. The whole thing and especially the aspect of study is long changed and even obliterated, so that a mere shadow and a farce seem to have replaced the substance and the reality.)

To return to the point at issue, it is worth while to observe that *kəṛəti-* (*kṛt (t) i*) is used in the Npr., where alone it occurs, as a garment of the adults but in contradistinction from the sacred shirt :—these two are not properly distinguished, yet there is nothing to suggest that *kəṛəti-* itself stands for the sacred shirt. Bulsara's supposition "thick jacket" is doubtful, because the Pahlavi gloss on which it is said to be based is far from clear and certain.

Waag, in his recent study on the *Nīrangīstan*, has thrown some new light on the problem. He does not distinguish the above-mentioned *kəṛəta-* from *kəṛəti-* but identifies it with it and corrects it accordingly. But the verb with which it is construed he interprets differently : 'to put on (to tie) the sacred cord on the shirt whereas in the other case 'to put on the shirt'—(p. 91 f.). Then he ascertains the meaning of *kəṛəti* as 'shirt as distinguished from the two other articles of dress used with it, namely, jacket and trousers ; yet as to its formation he still thinks of the *i* suffix—and not of the *-ti*, which alone occurs with *kṛt-* in Sk. (p. 131) But NP. would not be *kurta* but also *kurda*. Hence the reading *kṛtti-* is justified.

While discussing the original home and age of our term Benveniste sets aside the evidence of the Avesta, the home and age of which being itself a debatable point. Very probably it is Herzfeld's contention that makes him wavering about the more ancient and north-eastern thesis. Yet Waag has adduced some

facts for the relative antiquity and eastern origin of the Nīr. Indeed this text is generally considered to be a late one ; but it is certainly not so late as its corrupt condition may lead one to assume. The corrupt condition is due to some other reasons ; primarily to the nature of its contents. It is a ritual code giving rules about ceremonial affairs, not a ritual text to be recited on ceremonial occasions. Hence it was not properly committed to memory and kept intact for centuries. Anyhow, there are many cases where the correct Palhavi version presupposes a better text than is met with in the same extant mss., which too are only two in number and might be so hopelessly corrupt by chance during the transmission. The original must have been far superior. If one prefers Herzfeld's view about the *Videvdāt* being first composed—not only written down—during the Arsacid or Parthian period, one can say the same thing about the Nīrangāstan too ; and thus bring it in consonance with Hyschius' gloss on *kurta*.

No. 1124 : *kavaši* 'boot' is a total stranger to Sk. Pelliot already compared it with NP. *kafš* 'shoe, slipper', used today also by the Turks in Central Asia as *kupīš*, *kipiš* 'sandal', and as Dr. Bagchi adds, by the Tibetans—*kabša* 'shoes'. Although common in NP it must be a loan-word of eastern origin, for in MP. we have a different word—*mōk* in the technical term for a sin '*ev-mōk-duvārišnāh* 'running with one foot-covering', *Sns.* 4. 12. This term is borrowed in Aramaic—*mōk* (*J.As.* 1935, p. 247), in Arm.—*moik*, and also in Arabic,—*maq* or *mauq*. There must have existed also the side-form *mōč* to judge from *mōčak* 'stocking' and Arm. loan-word *mučak* 'small shoe'. In NP. we have only the later form,—*mōza* (or : *māza* ?) which is borrowed in Pushtu and Baluchi as well as in a number of Modern Indian languages,—Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi, where it means 'sock, stocking'—and even 'glove'. It is the diminutive form *moj-dā* that has preserved the sense of 'shoe, slipper.'

I may also point out an Iranian word and certain other features in the so-called Appendix to the Glossary of Yi-tsing. No. 1069 quotes *tašta* for 'cup.' Bagchi puts the mark of interrogation '?' after it, and also later on (p. 444) declares it to be not clear. But evidently it is Av. *tašta*- 'cup, saucer,' which, besides

being retained up to NP., is extensively borrowed—in Armenia, Arabia, and India ; in the last named country Hindustani *taštari* is probably a diminutive form with *-qi*, *-ri*, and Guj. *tas* has got a limited sense of 'bowl or vessel for spitting in' kept near the bed. In Arabic the word is written with the initial *t*, and hence sometimes declared as Arabic instead of Persian. The term is borrowed also further west, in Aramaic where it appears as *taštaka* (*J. As.* 1955, p. 245).

As to another word on the same p. 444, *guyara* or *guyara* 'cucumber', the exact pronunciation of the Arabic (Persian) term is *k'hiyār* (*xiyār*), which comes nearer to it.

Lastly in *ṭakura* or *ṭakkura* 'palace' on p. 445 I see Iranian influence from the semantic viewpoint. The word is of course the same as Sk. *ṭhakkura*, later *ṭhakor ṭhakur*, *ṭhākur*, *ṭhakar* 'prince, chieftian' etc. The change in meaning is simply metonymy—the residence for the resider, and is comparable to the double sense of OP. *vis-* 'tribe, chief of the tribe' as well as 'palace.'

VII

A DIDACTIC POEM IN ZOROASTRIAN PAHLAVI

It was in early thirties that Benveniste brought to light specimens of epic, narrative, and religious poetry from the Pahlavi writings of Zoroastrians. He tried to show that *Ayātkār ī Zarērān*, *Draxt Asurīk ut Buz*, and *Zand ī Vahuman Yasn* were not in prose, as hitherto believed, but in verse. However, the theme was not further pursued. His demonstration involved also many drastic changes in some parts, which as I wrote to him, might better be taken as prose. For a mixture of verse and prose in one and the same piece is not unusual. It is common in many an old Indo-European tongue, and so in Pahlavi it may be even an ancient heritage.¹ Further, as to *Draxt Asurīk ut Buz* I added that it could be scanned in eleven-syllable lines to bring the metre in exact consonance with the *Mutagarib*, which is originated in Persia itself and not like many other metres innovated or borrowed from Arabia.² In any case, there is now no question about the existence of poetry in Sasanian Persia.

To those specimens I can now add one more of another type, namely a didactic poem, which naturally comes from what is called Handarz literature under the Sasanids. While going through this in

1. This mixture of verse and prose has also a very natural reason, a reason rooted in the very characteristics of the two forms of expression. To quote Quiller-Couch: "Verse is by nature more emotional than prose." And it is not appropriate—to be which is the supreme qualification of all writings—to introduce emotion into a theme which does not properly admit of emotion. "The capital difficulty of verse consists in saying ordinary things, the capital difficulty of prose consists in saying extraordinary things." This can be overcome only by the greatest masters, like Homer, for instance. Quiller-Couch finds faults even with Milton and more easily with Wordsworth and Tennyson (see *On the Art of Writing* p 64 f.). Hence it was a wise and natural plan of ancient bards to mix verse and prose as required by the different types of things to be expressed about a theme, and thus to avoid that capital difficulty.

2. My notes on this unique and difficult text which still requires further investigation shared the fate of my other papers. They were taken away and then said to be lost by the military authorities (Indian Security Unit) on the close of the War at Hamburg.

winter 1945-46 I was struck *inter alia* by some peculiar style and rhythm in the last piece of the "Pahlavi Texts" edited by Asana. So I tried to find out by means of scanning whether there were regular verses in it. And with the greatest ease, without any drastic changes, there came out eight-syllable lines. This is the most primitive Indo-Iranian verse-form known to us from the Yashts and similar pieces of the Avesta. The original notes being not with me at Santiniketan, I had to try the scanning, etc. again. The result is given below as fully worked out. The few mistakes either of commission or omission I have found are certainly due to copyists, and the corrections and additions I suggest are justified not merely on metrical ground, but especially on those of grammar and idiom, style and sense.

The whole text requires a critical study.³ The very heading given to it by the editor is not adequate. The piece does not deal with the Nature and Wisdom of a Fortunate Man (*hēm ut xrat ī farroxxv mart*) but rather with several men of various qualities. Then there are all sorts of corruptions. But even after their removal I do not think that the text can be proved to be entirely in metre. The piece may be from the very beginning a mixture of prose and verse, or it may be even a compilation from different sources. For the present I leave this question open, and restrict myself to some of the portions in verse.

The clearest is that in which the author begins to speak of himself. Unfortunately he remains anonymous, and the few details are too general to be of special interest. It should be noted that the passage occurs neither at the beginning nor at the end, but in the middle of the text, sec. 16. This is rather strange, and yet we are not to assume a dislocation, for it begins with *čz*, a particle used for introducing a change in the subject or a new turn of thought as several times in this text. Cf. my *Šāyast nē Šāyast*, I. 3. n. 8, where this usage with the meaning 'well', further is ascertained. (Since—*čē* can better belong to the preceding sec., I have placed it in (?)). The later part of sec. 16 I have made distinct as sec. 16a; it contains a sort of maxims, although they may have been derived from the author's experience and observation. Sec. 17, however, is again autobiographical; it refers to the fact of his enquiries, followed by the result thereof.

As to the transcription, I have adhered to the present mode, but

3. The translation published at Bombay (Parsi Panchayet, 1982) does not give any essential help.

at least for *ut* and *pat* see n. 17. 1. The translation is kept within the strict literal sense, and yet, I think, it has turned out quite readable. Of course, nobody should expect high-class or even mediocre poetry. The contents can be only rude and primitive like the verse-form, and only with due excuse and apology can the piece be called a didactic poem, but it has certainly great historic value.

16. (čō ?) vas raft hom undar awām,
 vas-am vičit kustak kustak,
 vas-am just hač dēn ut¹ mānsr,²
 vas-am hač nipōk ut nāmāk.
 kart hom dastowar vičārtār,
 kart hom hampursakih³ stāyitak⁴

(Well ?), much I have advanced in time,⁵

Much I have discerned⁶ in various regions,⁷

/ Much I have searched from scriptures and sayings.

Much I (have learnt) from writings and books.

I have (also) taken a discerning guide,

(And) I have held praiseworthy conversations.

- 16a. nē¹ dit dānāk i xrat āpēt,
 nē-č vičitār dit a-čārak

16. 1 Metre requires this common addition, and the sense is also as given above and not 'scriptural sayings' *dēn-mānsr*.

2 To be read *mānsar* or *mānsra* for the sake of metre.

3 Metre suggests *hampurāh*, but I have retained the usual *hampursakih*, for it yields better rhythm.

4 Ed. has -yt- instead of -yyt-, but in section 8 and also elsewhere the verb is *stāyitan*.

5 This means 'I am old'—'advanced in years' as also Anklesaria gives, and not 'I have travelled or wondered much in (my) time.'

6 Anklesaria gives "travelled," probably as a free rendering.

7. Or 'from region to region'; in both cases adv. phrase without any preposition. For *kust* (or *kōst*) as a geographical unit, see *PT.*, p. 18 ff. (*šahrastānīhā* = *ērān-šahr*) sections 2, 21, 84, where it represents the four principal divisions of Iran.

16a. 1 This addition is necessary for sense and syntax as well as metre. As to sense, the statement refers to the common saying that 'knowledge and wealth (in Sk. *sarasvatī* or *vidyā* and *śrī* or *lakṣmī*) do not go together.' There is also a

nē husrav andar -?.²
nē pat niyāz mart i pat xrat.

I have not seen a sage of wisdom prosperous,
Nor seen a discerning man helpless,
Nor a famous man in, -?.² ,
Nor a man with wisdom in need.³

17. ut-am¹ hanjaman dīt vuzorkān,
pat guft uskār ut vir ut² xrat ;
ut-am¹ dēn dastowarān pursit,
ku xvāstak vēh aḍāp³ hēm xrat ?

And I saw an assembly of the great,
With speeches and discussions, intellect and wisdom,
And I asked the leaders of Religion,
Namely, is wealth better⁴ or good-nature and wisdom ?

18. ut-šān pat hamak čaštak guft,
ku nām-barišnīh hač¹ zōr² i xrat

quatrain by Šahid on the theme ; for references, see Jackson, *Early Persian Poetry* p. 26. The author could not have maintained, as Anklesaria translates, the opposite opinion, for which, moreover we must add something like 'always' ; else the statement remains abrupt and isolated. As to syntax, the following nē-č 'also not=nor' presupposes here nē 'not=neither' ; else č in nē-č becomes meaningless.

2 I do not know nor can ascertain for want of books a (three-syllable) reading and meaning of the next signs an r sp n ; Anklesaria's 'distress' does not seem to me suitable

3 This does not contradict the first statement. There the question is of 'prosperity, opulence', here of 'neediness, want or desire', perhaps of 'worry, anxiety' (Kn. 72).

17. 1 By reading *ut-am* the line becomes a nine-syllable one. This shows that we may have to read *u* and *pa* instead of *ut* and *pat* in Zoroastrian texts, which are evidently late Sasanian.

2 Added for the sake of metre and rhythm.

3 So Bartholomæ, Nyberg's *aiwāp* is not followed, e. g. by Bailey, who reads *ayāp* (*Zor. Problems* 86 etc.), but I do not know on which grounds.

4 This is not only the etymological sense of *vēh* from *vahyah*, but also the real, living one in actual use, cf. *vēh ut frāčtar* 'better and more advanced' Kn. 16. 4. *apartar ut vēh PT.*, 25 sec. 1 and the common phrases *vāy i vēh* and *vay i vatlar*, where *vēh* is used along with other comparatives.

seems to be a lacuna ; that is, the statement about 'a pure man' is missing. Anklesaria connects that word with the following thus : "a holy man of discerning judgment" ; but to judge from the context etc., it is not a happy combination. I begin, therefore, from the third word, whereby is also gained an eight-syllable line.

3. mart vičtār hač¹ ēn pētāk :
 kē² dōst handōčēt xrat xvāhēt
 <tāk stāyitaktar bavēt,
 tāk-iō.....>⁴
 pas⁵ ān i xvēškār ut husrav :
 kē frārōn,⁶ āzāt⁷ hač āhōk.
 pās šāt dil^{7a} ut šāt-mēnišn,
 [kē.....]^{7b}
 pās čarp-nihātak [ut narm-gōw ?]⁸
 kē apak har kas dānēt raftan,
 ut-aš brāt bavēt ut ham-tāk
 ut-aš dōst bavēt¹⁰ ut ham-tan

4 Ed. omits.

5 Ed. adds i *ham-uskār xrat*, which phrase does not suit the context and disturbs the metre too. It might well have been a gloss on *hēm*. Anklesaria has not translated this section in his summary ; hence his view about the phrase remains unknown.

6 As suggested in Ed., n. 58 ; *pahartar* (?) 'more protective' (?) does not suit the context. Note that all these comparative forms are used in the emphatic or superlative sense, and the translation may be changed accordingly.

8 1 Ed. omits, see n. 18.1 ; but both context and syntax require it.

2 This is not a mistake for the conjunction *ku* 'that,' as may be supposed from the context ; cf. the following and many similar cases in Dk. 6,

3 Lit. 'desires,' but see the last but two lines.

4 The style and sense shows that this part is a later gloss. The first clause almost forms a verse ; the second is not complete.

5 Ed. omits, owing to a lacuna in the mss. I add it from the parallel clause. Mark that it does not continue the 'definition' of a discerning man, but introduces another person of a different quality, followed by the specific higher or moral definition as opposed to the general or popular one in vogue. Such metaphorical definitions are a common feature in Dk. 6. The line is elliptical, the phrase "is manifest from this" being omitted. For my addition cf. "This" in the last but one line.

6 This is the definition of *xvēškār* ; cf. its use as 'right dealing,' *sat-hārin* in Sk. version.

7 Thus, instead of *zāt*, because it supplies the missing syllable and also the

mart baxt hač aparkarān¹¹ aδyārth,¹²
 [kē] xvat hunar xvāstan bē tuxšēt.
 ēt rōšn ut vināpatāk :¹³
 kē nām ut awrang bavēt i dūtāk.¹⁴

A discerning man is manifest from this :
 (It is he) who² gathers friends and seeks³ wisdom.
 < So that he becomes more praiseworthy,
 Also so that.....⁷⁴
 Then⁵ the dutiful and the famous (man is he) ;
 Who is upright⁶ and free⁷ from blemish.
 Then of cheerful heart and of cheerful mind (is he) ;
 [Who.....]^{7b}
 Then of sweet disposition [and of soft speech?]⁸ (is he) :
 Who knows (how) to behave with every person,
 And becomes his brother and peer,
 And becomes his friend and companion.
 A man destined with help from higher powers ¹¹ (is he) :
 Who himself strives to seek some skill (or art).
 This is resplendent and well-known :
 Who becomes the name and splendour of the family.

necessary meaning in the definition of a 'famous man'; he is not born free from blemish, but is or should be from it.

7a Mss. *zyr* for *dyr* *dil* (Persian) or may be for *zyrd*, *zird* (Parthian) : if the latter, then we have an additional loan word from the north.

7b I assume a lacuna containing the definition or description.

8 Some such epithet is to be added for metre and also parallelism.

9 Lit. 'to go' ; the same idiom in Av., *šyav*. Y. 29, 9.

10 Ed. adds *han-hax* ; it being an isolated term I take it to be a gloss of one of the synonyms here. The two lines are certainly metrical, whether one reads *ut-aš* or *u-š*.

11 Av. *upara-karya*, an epithet of gods like *vayu* ; here for 'gods' in general or 'stars,' see at the end.

12 Thus better than *aδyār*. The rest I leave as it is. Mark that the line brings a somewhat different matter.

13 Bailey reads *-dāk*, but I do not remember his reasons.

14 The unusual word order is intended to give poetical effect.

APPENDIX

(1) TO PAHL. TEXTS 132 ff

A few words more about the special use of *čē* referred to above in the introductory remarks will be useful. Besides places mentioned in my *Šnš.* 1 3n. 8, I have noticed this use also elsewhere. Yet it has been ignored by others with the result that strange translations have been offered and stranger explanations have been resorted to. Some typical cases may be noted here.

In the treatise on Model Letters, *Nāmak nṛpēsišnīh*, section 27, (Asana, Pahl. Texts, 132 ff. and Zaehner, *BSOS.*, 1937, pp. 91ff.). The context, sections 25-27, gives end formulas : (25) *apāk asāk drūt (ut) yazdān apastānīhā vahmān ī vahmānān nṛpišt*; (26) *hač vahmān pat* (or : *bē [ō]*) *vahmān drūt ī vas* ; (27) *pat vahrān apar* (or : ?) *bavēt* ; (27a) *čē nāmak pat ōstāp*.⁶ With innumerable greetings (lit. welfares) and with faith in God such-a-one, son of such-a-one, wrote ; (26) From such-a-one to such-a-one many greetings (lit. welfares) ; (27) May you be exalted through *Vahrān* (or : something else benedictory ; (27b) Well (here = lastly), the letter is (written) in haste.

It is evident that one cannot adopt here the usual sense of *čē* 'because' or 'which', nor accept Zaehner's solution who changes the preceding sentence and connects the present one with it thus : "May you have a kindly lot (*bahr ī xvāpar*) :—if the letter is (written) in a hurry." Surely, nobody would write like that. The particle *čē* does not serve the purpose of connecting the preceding but rather that of expressing a change of thought or situation in the following.

(2) TO THE MANICHEAN FRAGMENT M 3.

This usage is not unknown even in Manichean Mid. Persian, but it is not yet recognised. I find it in M. 3 which fragment is recently subjected to a new study by Henning in his article *Mani's Last Journey*, in *BSOAS*, 10.941 ff. (949). The fragment gives the account of Mani's visit to King Bahram I. I shall quote the relevant passage from line 9 onwards to show the context. '.....And the King sent message to the lord (i. e. Mani) : "wait a moment till I can come to you myself." And the lord again sat to one side of the guard till the King washed the hands (= finished his meal). Now he (the king) himself was to go

a-hunting. And he rose from the banquet, and...'. The original for 'till...a-hunting' is : *d' š'h dšt šwst oo cy xwdyc 'w nhcyhr prnptn bwd oo*" which Henning renders "until the King should have finished his meal when he was to go hunting." Of course, he admits in a note on 'when' that "the use of *cy* (normally = 'because') is not clear ; possibly mis-translation of *Syr. mā d'* (cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Grammar*, p. 179) ?" But this is certainly far-fetched and unnecessary. By applying the special sense of *cy* one can render the sentences smoothly as above, without neglecting also the marks of punctuation in the original, which begins a new sentence with *cy*, and not as Henning does. Moreover, the King's unfriendly attitude towards Mani comes out clearly in this manner. The King will not grant him any audience but just speak to him while going out a-hunting. That is why he asked Mani to wait outside where he was to pass.

Some other points out of this fragment may as well be noted here. (22) (*m*)' (*dr*)[*y*]st '*wr* is justly explained as "the reverse of the usual formula of greeting (when receiving a friend)". '*wr* may be *āwariṭan* 'to come', as in other like formulas '*y* and *wys'y* have the same meaning ; but if it be *āwartan* 'to bring', then one must compare the NP. formula or idiom *tašrīf āwardan* 'to bring honour' = 'to visit'. Mani's reply to this unwelcome is not simply : "what wrong have I done ?" but : 'why, have I done anything wrong ?' (24) *cym r'y tyswm wynst*. In *cym r'y* (which occurs in Vyt A. G. 14 also) I see the combination of *cym* 'why' (so often in Zor MP.) and *cy r'y* 'why'. Also in (36) we have *cym* 'why', but in the sense of 'rather', 'on the contrary'. Henning finds the answer of the king "evasive", but one has to read the whole of it to appreciate the first sentence. In (42) '*xyzn'd* should be '*xyzyn'd* for the causative "made rise".—Henning may have been knowingly free, but I should like to add that the meaning of *bzm* in (5) 'society, company, entertainment' should have been brought out in the translation ; say, 'the king was in company taking his meal'. The king was also not really alone at his table. Lastly in (21) *pā sr (sx)wn* may mean 'by way of introduction or greeting' (lit. 'beginning of a speech'), though of course Henning's "as first words" is non-committal.

(3) TO PAHL. TEXTS, 133.

As a confirmation of my view about *aparkarān* in sec. 3 note 11 I should add that the term occurs in the same sense in the tract on Model Letters, *Nāmak nipēsiñih*, Pahl. Texts, p. 133 sec. 4 : *kē-tān rasāt hač aparkarān burzišn xvēš kāmakihā.....* (Would) that to you may reach from 'gods' exaltation of your own wishes ' (Zaehner, *BSOS.*, 1937, p. 97, renders : "May those whose works are high grant you honour according to your desire....." Leaving aside other points, it must be said that "those whose works are high" is pointless, or if it be literal with purpose one should be told what is really meant by it. There is no doubt that *apakarān* (also in 13) is to be compared with *γazdān* 'gods' in sec. 3 ; hence it means 'gods' or, by way of variety 'stars' as dispensers of good things, good luck. The meaning of *kē* here and often in this text is clear ; it is that of Lat. *utinam*, as Zaehner, p. 102, remarks. But the question is whether it should not be rather *ku* in spite of the regular use of *kē*. The origin of NP. *ki* in special application is also debatable ; Christensen against Hans Jensen and others decided in favour of the particle *ki* and not in that of the pronoun *ki*.—There are also other problematic points in this text as regards the interpretation, *e. g.*, in the very first sec., but they may be taken up on another occasion.

GENERAL INDEX

Accent in the Gathas	21	Dēnkart	28, 29, 34
Aerpatastan and Nirangastan	35, 81	Dialogue-hymns	4
Aeschylus	60	Dualism	40, 54 f.
Agnideša	71	Draxt Asurik ut Buz	86
Ākhyāna theory	4	Dušrīn	63
Al-athar'l baqiyat	61 ff	Fire-temple	30
Alaxander, destruction of the		Feuerlehre	22
Avesta by	64	Gatha, versification of	18
Aliboron	68	interpretation of	18 ff
Aməša Spənta	23	Gāyatri	3
Amṛta Spanta	23	Geršasp-nama	44, 49
Anglo-Saxon, its relation to		God's aspects	43
modern English	43	Greek and Latin influence on	
Aristotle, his cyclic view of the		English literature	44
process of history in Iranian	60	Haft Paikar	68
Asoka, inscriptions of	2	Indian books in Pahlavi	29
Aspect theory	5, 23, 51, 53	Iranian, contribution to general	
Aturpat Mahraspand's		thought and culture	40
geneology	63	—fragments	37, 38 f.
Avesta, divergent elements in	23f.	—history	31 f.
extent of	64	—society	66
orthography of	2, 30	—studies in India	10 ff
history of	25	—studies in Persia	48 ff
Ayatkār i Zarērān	86	Islamic sects, Iranian influence	
Book of Mysteries of Mani	66	on	46 f, 49 f.
Buddha	40, 60	Jats in Kathiawad	41
Brahmaṇas	5, 8	Karma theory	6f, 9
Bṛhatkathā	79	Khotanese	9
Caicast	63	Kingdom of God	55, 59
Cēc	63	"Knydyš (Agnideša)	71
Christian fragments from		Kramapaṭha	64
Turkestan	9	Literature—its relation to	
Cutchhi dialect	41	religion	43
Darius I, inscription of	2, 32, 58	Li-yen, Śramaṇa of Kucha	69

Magians	66	Sanskrit books in Pahlavi	29
Mahābhārata	65	Sanskrit consonants	3
Macrocosmos	9	Sapta Sindhavaḥ	4
Manichaean fragments from		Sassanian poetry	45, 46
Turkistan	9	Sepahbad marzbān	63
Manuṣhchihr	35	Shah-nāma	44, 45, 49, 59
Marriage songs among Jats and		Śiz	63
Mianas	41	Skand gumanik Vičar	29
Mianas of Kathiawad	41	Sogdia	76
Microcosmos	9	Sogdian	9
Minō-gihr	63	Sohravardi	49
Mithra	24	Spirits' pair	54 f
Modern Indian Languages,		Ssb	63
Research in	12, 41	Sufism	16, 26, 49
Mutaqarib	86	Tafhim	68
Nask-s	64	Ta'rikh'-l-Hind	61, 64 ff.
Navar ceremony	83	Trštubh	3
Nordic Gods	44	Twryy	71, 72
Old Persian	2	Upaniṣad	5, 8
Padapāṭha	64, 65	Varuṇa	5
Pahlavi language and literature,		Varuṇa hymns	18
6, 27, ff, 32, 34 ff, 45 ff.		Vayu	24
Pahlavi Rivayat	32	Vicitakīha 1 Zatspram	29, 67
Persian literature—		Vis u Rāmīn	44
—Arabic influence on	43	Vištāspa	58
—Old Iranian and Zorostrian		Vištāsp yašt	10, 63
elements in	44, 49	Viṣṇupurāṇa	65
Paiśāci	78 79	Vidēvadat	84
Culika—	78	'Wine' in Sufic poetry	49
Pragatha	4	Yajñavalkya	6 ff.
Raniparaj proverbs	41	Zand 1 Vahuman Yasn	86
R̥gveda	4, 64f.	Zarathustra,	
Saravali	66	his fight against evil	57 f.
Safed toman	63	al-Biruni's account of	61 ff.
Saka	9	Zurvān	24
Sambhita pāṭha	64	Zoroaster and Ecstatic religion	49
Samvada Sūkta	4		

INDEX OF WORDS

agoz	80	kāgad-kāgaz	76
ahurāi a	20	kala-kōša (k)	29
akmira	80	kərēta	81, 83
aparkaran	95	kərēti	80, 81, 83
apēcak	90	kipiš	84
avyākaran	29	kirrānitak	80
axšti	57	ku	63
aša	5	kuratu	80
ālū	80	kurtu (h)	80
āru	80	kurtak	80
awartan	94	kurθ	81
birūn	68	makara	80
ce	93	mād'	94
cy	94	mkk'r'	80
cym	94	mōk	84
daiṇhu	2	mōza	84
dakhyu	2	muçak	84
dazda	20	mūq	84
dōgān	27	oghūzoh	80
dōkān	27	paravada	72
drigu	20	pin	75
et	63	pīrahan	82
fr (i)ya	17	pouruta	72
goz	80	poruškasp	62
guyara	85	qurtaq	81
hapta hindu	4	raihān	68
hat	63	rāman	57
juba (h)	82	šaftālu	80
juda	63	šiyati	58
kabša	84	spaina	75
kafš	84	sōdik'	77
kakari	75	suδ-soδ	76
kapiš	84	suγða	76
kavaši	84	sulī	76

sqlik	77	vis	85
çakkura	85	vispuhr	78
çakura	85	vivanhgo	14
tark	29	vizıdag	66
taştı	84	vizıdaj	66
taştı	84	'wr	94
taştaka	85	wyspyδr'k	78
vakara	79	xiyar	85
vanta	17	'xyn'd	94
vazadaj	66	yut	68
viçitak	66		

