

IRANICA 22

David Buyaner

Penitential Sections
of the *Xorde Avesta* (*patits*)

Critical Edition
with Commentary and Glossary

Harrassowitz Verlag

IRANICA

Herausgegeben von Maria Macuch

Band 22

2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

David Buyaner

Penitential Sections
of the *Xorde Avesta* (*patits*)

Critical Edition
with Commentary and Glossary

2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2016
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage
and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Typesetting and Layout: Tatsiana Harting
Printing and binding: Memminger MedienCentrum AG
Printed in Germany
ISSN 0944-1271
ISBN 978-3-447-10603-0
e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19491-4

Моей Маме

Contents

Acknowledgements	IX
Introduction	1
The collated manuscripts and the principles of the edition	6
<i>Patit ī pašēmānīh</i> I	6
<i>Patit ī murdagān</i>	7
<i>Patit ī pašēmānīh</i> II	7
<i>Xwad Patit</i>	9
Penance of sins in the Avesta and in Pahlavi literature.	10
The “degrees of sin” in Zoroastrianism	49
<i>Patit ī pašēmānīh</i> I	63
<i>Patit ī murdagān</i>	81
<i>Patit <ī> pašēmānīh</i> II	91
<i>Xwad patit</i>	175
Commentary	188
Appendix: <i>Zand ī kustīg abzūdan</i>	457
Glossary.	459
Index.	493
Avesta and PT	493
Pahlavi and Pāzand Texts.	494
New Persian Texts.	496
Other Texts	496
Abbreviations.	499
General Abbreviations	499
Texts	500
Manuscripts	501
Journals and Editions	503
Bibliography	505

Acknowledgements

This book is based on research conducted in the framework of a project undertaken in the Institute of Iranian Studies FU Berlin with the financial support of German Research Foundation (DFG) in 2010–2013. I would like to express my profound gratitude to the then director of the Institute Prof. Dr. MARIA MACUCH, whose initiative and support played the decisive role in the go-ahead for the project, as well as to all the employees of DFG and Free University of Berlin who contributed to its fulfilment.

Naturally, any new project in a new place brings new contacts and acquaintances with colleagues. It is, however, an outstanding luck that the colleagues I met in Berlin became my closest friends. It is not only due to their highest professional skills, but also in virtue of their truly outstanding human qualities (the things which coincide by no means always) that the work on the project became one of the most valuable experiences in my life.

In the course of the work I faced numerous and various tasks connected with an edition of Pahlavi and Neo-Pahlavi texts, in particular the interlinear Pāzand-Pahlavi compositions, such as *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II. It is owing to inestimable help and collaboration of Dr. MIGUEL ÁNGEL ANDRÉS-TOLEDO and Dr. JUAN JOSÉ FERRER-LOSILLA that I could get acquainted with the methods of editing Avestan *zand* manuscripts, which were elaborated in the University of Salamanca under the guidance of Prof. ALBERTO CANTERA and apply them to my work. The first and most important steps in this direction were made during the first travel to India in November and December 2010 which I undertook in their company. For both Dr. ANDRÉS-TOLEDO and Dr. FERRER-LOSILLA it was not the first time in India, and their previous experiences helped me to avoid many dangerous situations in this marvellous but not always safe country. I also use this opportunity to thank the whole staff of The First Dastur Meherjirana Library in Navsari and of the library of K.R. Cama Institute in Bombay, in particular to Mrs. BHARTI GANDHI, who generously allowed us access to the manuscripts and rendered kind assistance in our work. I recall with gratitude my second travel to Navsari and Bombay in the beginning 2013, since it endowed me with further acquaintance with Prof. CANTERA, which subsequently turned into close collaboration and friendship. Now I hope to have a right to profess being a member of his team.

After the relevant manuscripts were found, collected and examined, the main phase of the work took place, namely that of editing and commenting the texts. On this stage, it was Dr. GÖTZ KÖNIG, with his unique benevolence and utmost

expertise, which he is always ready to share with colleagues, who did me an invaluable favour. I am happy to express to him my infinite gratitude here.

Everyone who had the pleasure of cooperation with our layout editor Mrs. TATSIANA HARTING will agree with me that any academic institution cannot but dream of such a fellow. Her commitment, accuracy and evenness made the final – inevitably most stressed – stage of the work quite tolerable and sometimes even nice. I hope to repeat this experience in future.

Introduction

Choosing the recitals of penance (*patits*) as a first step towards an intended edition of the *Xorde Avesta* is justified by their unique character as Zoroastrian prayers which despite their great importance for every-day religious life have no Avestan prototype. This fact led to their being included in some *Xorde Avesta* codices in their Pāzand versions. Besides, for three of the four *patits*, namely *Xwad Patit*, *Patit ī pašēmānīh* (also known as *Patit ī Ādurbād*) and *Patit ī murgagān* (*Patit ī ruwānīg*), Pahlavi versions exist, which provided a starting point for the present study.

At a preliminary research stage, I took as a basis B.N. DHABHAR's edition of the Pahlavi versions of *Xwad Patit* and *Patit ī pašēmānīh* (the latter in two variants, a shorter and a longer one), included in his edition of the Pahlavi *Xorde Avesta* (DHABHAR 1927, pp. 54–84). By examining the manuscripts found during a visit to the Meherjirana Library in Navsari and to the K. R. Cama Institute library in Bombay in November and December 2010, however, it turned out that DHABHAR's approach to the texts at issue made him overlook some of their fundamental characteristics. The essential results of this stage of the research can be summarized as follows:

1. Contrary to the established opinion (WEST 1896, p. 110; ASMUSSEN 1965, p. 89, etc.) that only two of the four *patits* (namely, *Xwad patit* and *Patit ī pašēmānīh*) exist in both the Pāzand and the Pahlavi versions, the *patit* contained in cod. K²⁷ (ff. 28r–34r) and edited by HAMPEL (1974, pp. 136–159) as *Patit ī pašēmānīh*¹ is almost certainly a unique remnant of the Pahlavi version of *Patit ī murgagān*. The mistake was obviously brought about by the fact that *Patit ī murgagān* is nothing else than a vicarious version of *Patit ī pašēmānīh*, i.e. essentially the same canon of repentance, modified to be read for the sake of another person. The only difference between the two *patits* is therefore the substitution of the 1st pers. pronoun (*Patit ī pašēmānīh*) by a name to be spoken (*Patit ī murgagān*) and the “vicarious” penance formula occurring in *Patit ī murgagān* instead of the standard one. It is the identity of the Pahlavi “vicarious” formula as represented in K²⁷ with the one occurring in the Pāzand version of *Patit ī murgagān* (e.g. E¹, f. 66v, ll. 5–12 et passim; see KOTWAL/HINTZE 2008, p. 127) that makes the identification quite obvious.²

1 See HAMPEL 1974, p. 137, n. 2: “Dies hier ist mit dem ‘Patī-Āturpāt’ zu identifizieren”.

2 For a detailed discussion, including references to the two available readings of the fragment at issue (namely, those by HAMPEL 1974, pp. 143, 174–176 and SHAKED 1978, p. 105),

2. While the long Pahlavi version of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* is a facultative part of the *Xorde Avesta* and does not occur anywhere else (see below), the short version is also found in collections of original Pahlavi texts. Pahlavi *Xwad Patit* and *Patit ī murdagān*, on the other hand, **never** occur in the *Xorde Avesta* codices examined by me. The same holds true for mss. E (*Patit ī pašēmānīh* I)³ and Mf (*Xwad Patit*), which were used by DHABHAR (1927, Introduction, pp. 31, 33) but remained beyond my reach: the two mss. are collections of Pahlavi miscellanea. Ms. D was attributed by DHABHAR to Dastur SANJANA and described as a unique *Xorde Avesta* codex containing both the long and the short Pahlavi versions of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* (DHABHAR 1927, Introduction, p. 31f., nn. 318–319), but unfortunately it remained beyond my reach too.
3. The long Pahlavi version of *Patit ī pašēmānīh*, i. e. the only *patit* included in some late codices of the *Xorde Avesta*, turned out to be an expounded Pahlavi retranscription of the Pāzand version, arranged in the same way as an interlinear Pahlavi translation and commentary of the Avesta (*zand*), which fact was entirely ignored by DHABHAR. This finding caused me to radically reconsider the approach to different versions of *patits*, to their interrelationship, system value, etc. Thus, it is worth noting that it were the Pāzand versions that were deemed sacred enough to be attached to the corpus of Avestan texts, whereas the Pahlavi versions (which I believe to be the original ones, see below) were not included. Properly speaking, the Pahlavi commentary to the Pāzand *Patit ī pašēmānīh* should not be regarded as an independent version of the *patit* but, together with the Pāzand core, as a bilingual text whose relationship to the “pure” Pāzand (i. e. the one without a Pahlavi commentary) is in perfect analogy to the relationship between the Avesta with *zand*, on the one hand, and *sāde*, on the other.
4. All the copies of the Pāzand version of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* with a Pahlavi retranscription and commentary (*Patit ī pašēmānīh* II, see above) are found in the very late codices of the *Xorde Avesta*: T¹⁵ (second half of the 19th century), T¹⁰ (1844), T¹¹ (1851), F⁶ (1851), E⁸ (1865), whereas the older codices contain the “Pāzand-*sāde*” alone.
5. The introductory part of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II is identical with a passage of another text of a similar nature, namely, the *Nerang ī kustīg*, which exists only in *zand* form, i. e. as a Pāzand core with Pahlavi “translation” and commentary (DHABHAR calls it *Zand ī kustīg abzūdan*).⁴ Apart from this

see Commentary, §21.1.

3 The short version will henceforth be quoted as *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I (Pp I) and the long version as *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II (Pp II).

4 A critical edition of the relevant passages of *Nerang ī kustīg* has been made by me on the basis of mss. E⁸, F⁵, F⁶, T⁹, T¹⁰, T¹¹, T⁵¹, T⁵² examined during the visit in Meherjirana Library in Navsari.

mixed text in *zand* form, there is no extant Pāzand or Pahlavi version of the original text of *Nerang ī kustīg* (i.e. one without the relatively late commentary); its only remnant may therefore be apprehended in the initial passage of *Patit ī murdagān* corresponding to the introductory part of the Pāzand core of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II:

Patit ī murdagān

0.3 *yaḏāhuwairyō panj az hamāg
wināh patit pašēmān hēm
az harwistīn dušmat dužuxt
dušwaršt*

Patit ī pašēmānīh II Pāz.

0.3 *yaḏā. ahū. vairiūō. pañj. až. hamā.
gunāh. patit. pašēmānōm. až.
har.vastīn. dušmata. dužūxta.
dužuuarēšta.*

“*yaḏāhuwairyō* (is to be recited) five (times); of all sins I am penitent and repentant, of any evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds.”

0.4 *kū man pad gētīg +mānīd pēš <ī>
ašmā wehān menišnīg gowišnīg
kunišnīg tanīg ruwānīg gētīg
mēnōgānīg axw abaxš pašēmān
pad se gowišnīh pad patit hēm*

0.4.1 *məm. pa. gētī. manīt. pēš. šumā.
vahan.*

0.4.2 *manašnī. gavašnī. kunašnī.*

0.4.3 *tanī. ruuqñī. gētī. mīnōuuqñī.*

0.4.4 *uxa. aβāxša. pašēmān. pasē.
gaβašnī. pa. patat. hōm.*

“that is, (of) my fault⁵ in the material world, before you, O righteous ones, (regarding) thought, speech, action, (regarding) body, soul, material and spiritual realms, O Lord, (being) contrite (and) repentant, I do penance with the three sayings.”

6. The structure of the *patits* is analogous to that of some late Avestan texts, such as *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*, since they use quotations from the *Yasna* as a framework: in Pp I 1.1–6 and Pm 1.1–6, the Pahlavi version of Ny 1.3–4 (which in turn has its source in Y 0.4–7 = Y 11.17–18) is quoted with some additions and partly reproduced at the end of Pp I, thus building up a sort of enclosed construction. The corresponding passage of *Xwad patit* (Xp) seems to originate immediately from the *Yasna*, i.e. from the first sections (called by their first words *Frastuiiē* and *Frauuarāne*, respectively, Y 11.17–18 – Y 12.1) of the so-called “profession chapter” (*Fraoraitiš hāitiš*, see TREMBLAY 2006, pp. 248–257). The interrelationship between these parts of the *patits* and the Pahlavi version of *Xwaršēd Niyāyišn*, on the one hand, and the Pahlavi Translation of Y 11.17–18, on the other (especially with regard to the glosses), is of special interest for any comparative study of the *Xorde Avesta* and the other monuments of the *zand* (CANTERA 2004, pp. 166–167).

These findings will take research to a new level by highlighting formerly unclear focal points, such as the actual significance and function of Pāzand in Zoroastrian booklore. For such a complicated and multilevel task as is the reevaluation of

5 About mynyt / +mānīd ‘fault’ see Commentary, §3. For more details see §§51.1 and 71.

Pāzand literature, a pathbreaking case-study is indispensable, and I believe that a mixed Pāzand-Pahlavi text (such as *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II) matches the criteria: the similarity of its structure to that of Avestan texts with *zand* allows us to apply the methodology developed for the study of the Avesta. Moreover, a comparison of this relatively late stage of text evolution with the two original versions (i. e. the Pahlavi and Pāzand without commentary) could possibly provide the diachronical examination with a considerable time depth. Compared with our initial calculation of the volume of the work to be performed, the updated scope of the research was approximately 50% more, because it implied an examination of the Pāzand constituent of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II, which is entirely omitted in DHABHAR's edition of *Zand ī Xorde Avesta*.

It was also established with a reasonable degree of certainty that the Pahlavi versions of the *patits* (i. e. *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I, *Patit ī murdagān* and *Xwad Patit*), conventionally regarded as specimens of “retranscribed” Pahlavi having its source in the Pāzand, must be “rehabilitated” as being original Pahlavi compositions. This conclusion is based on an analysis of the scribal and linguistic characteristics of said versions, none of which can satisfyingly be accounted for by the alleged influence of Pāzand on Pahlavi. This point is of utmost importance for a comparative evaluation of the texts at issue and is worth a more detailed consideration.

The above attribution of the Pahlavi *patits* (in particular, *Patit ī pašēmānīh*) goes back to a short remark by WEST: “...owing to a few peculiarities in the orthography of its text it seems probable that it was derived from Pāzand original” (see WEST 1896, p. 110) which was taken up by DHABHAR (relating to *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I, see DHABHAR 1927, Introduction, pp. 15–18), repeated by ASMUSSEN (1965, p. 90) and CANTERA (2004, p. 176) and extended in scope so as to cover “the majority of the *Zand ī xwurdag Abestāg*” by DE JONG (2003, p. 76).

The essential characteristics of the “retranscribed” Pahlavi occurring in *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I are as follows according to DE JONG (2003, p. 73f.):

1. A “mysterious” phrase ⟨pšncyhl ’nd’ pšncyhl LOYN’ ZYš’n BYN⟩ corresponding to *pšš ōi cāhēr andā pšš ōi cāhēr pšš yač šan andar* of the Pāzand version. DE JONG cites it in accordance with DHABHAR's edition, where ⟨ZYš’n⟩ appears as *yadšān* written in Pāzand script (DHABHAR 1927, p. 55, ll. 21–22), and points to Phl. ’nd’/andā as being an allegedly unambiguous testimony of Pāzand origin. Since DE JONG's argument is based on the premise that the passage is unintelligible, both in Pahlavi and Pāzand, it can be disproved by a plausible reading of the Pahlavi passage. For a detailed discussion of this problematic phrase, and a suggested reading, see Commentary, § 17.1.
2. Confusion between the suffixes -yk/-īg and -yh/-īh, between the words *ka*, *kē* and *kū*, and use of the ending -d/-ad instead of -yt/-ēd for the third person singular present. DE JONG himself admits that the first two features “...are common to both ordinary and retranscribed texts” (DE JONG 2003,

p. 73). It must be added that in *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I and *Patit ī murdagān* only the first feature can be observed, whereas all of them are present in *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II.

3. Use of rare or peculiar ideograms, such as ⟨SUBLA⟩ for *ummēd* ‘hope’, or pseudo-ideograms, such as ⟨BYNc plm’n⟩ for *bandarz-framān*.⁶ Since the genuine form ⟨’ndlc⟩ for *bandarz* is found in ms. K²⁷, this argument, weak in itself, is inapplicable in this particular case.
4. Improper spelling of Middle Persian words. DE JONG confuses two different phenomena here: a corruption of certain Pahlavi forms caused by popular etymology or by the influence of close but non-cognate words (such as ⟨’wzdysn⟩ instead of ⟨’wzdys/uzdēs⟩ ‘idol’, by analogy with ⟨m’zdzsn/māzdēs⟩), and the introduction of New Persian words written in Pahlavi characters (e.g. ⟨cygwn’n/cīyōnān⟩ for ⟨cygwn(’)/cīyōn⟩ due to NP *conān*). The first phenomenon is confined to the limits of Pahlavi and could occur at any stage of the language development, whereas the second one is indeed specific to Neo-Pahlavi. As regards the Pahlavi *patits*, it occurs in *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II alone.

To summarize, it can be argued that the features which DHABHAR claims point to a Pāzand origin of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I (and of most parts of the *Xorde Avesta*, according to DE JONG) are unspecific, being shared by late Pahlavi in general, and may well be interpreted as a result of the centuries-long transmission of the texts, which has nothing to do with their origin. CANTERA (2004, p. 165f.) provides a number of characteristics of late Pahlavi, i.e. of a language that had already come under strong influence of New Persian. These characteristics are:

- (a) substitution of genuine Pahlavi words by their New Persian equivalents, such as ⟨dykl/dīgar⟩ for AHRN/*any* or ZK-’y/*any*, or corruption of Pahlavi forms under New Persian influence, such as the above-mentioned ⟨cygwn’n/cīyōnān⟩ for ⟨cygwn(’)/cīyōn⟩ due to NP *conān*;
- (b) use of the ideogram ⟨BRA⟩ instead of ⟨PWN⟩ for *pad* (because of the confusion between MP *pad* and *be* merged in NP *ba/be*);
- (c) confusion between the suffixes -yk/-īg and -yh/-īh (both of them merged in NP -ī);
- (d) arabisms (e.g. ⟨maḡrūr menišn/mglwr mnšn’⟩ for QDM mnšn’/abar menišn).

All these features, as well as some additional ones of the same nature (such as the almost total absence of the preposition OL/ō, mostly replaced by MN/az in all manuscripts of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II except R⁴¹¹, and the use of New

6 The examples DE JONG draws from *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II, i.e. ⟨KSPMN⟩ for *arz-iz* and ⟨SLYA MNWš⟩ for *wad-kēš* (DE JONG 2003, p. 73), are mistaken: the first ideogram should be read ⟨KYYPE⟩ (not KSPMN!), designating MP *gōbr* ‘jewel’ (see MIRZA 1967, pp. 53, 65; NYBERG 1988, pp. 13, 48, 86), and the second one, according to DHABHAR (1927, p. 67, l. 6) as well as to mss. examined by me, is SLYA MRYA/*wad-saxwan* ‘blasphemy’.

Persian syntactic constructions instead of or in line with Middle Persian ones) are abundant in *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II, but entirely absent from *Xwad patit*. As regards *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I and *Patit ī murdagān*, only characteristic (c) is present in them consistently, i. e. throughout all the manuscripts; some other features of late Pahlavi occur sporadically in certain manuscripts, while the parallel passages in other mss. give genuine Pahlavi forms. Thus, in *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I 11.1, the single arabism m'clyk/**mawājerī* '(passive) sodomy' occurs in mss. TD²³ and T⁸ (the latter being a copy of the former, see below), whereas R²⁷⁰ gives the original Pahlavi wyptyny/**wiftēnīh*. As CANTERA points out, "wenn diese Züge isoliert vorkommen, sind sie eher der handschriftlichen Überlieferung zuzuschreiben. Erscheinen sie aber gehäuft, haben wir es höchstwahrscheinlich mit einem nachislamischen Text zu tun" (CANTERA 2004, p. 165f.), and the striking contrast between *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I, *Patit ī murdagān* and *Xwad patit*, on the one hand, and *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II, on the other hand, exemplifies exactly this distinction.

I therefore see no reason to consider *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I, *Patit ī murdagān* and *Xwad patit* secondary texts re-written from Pāzand originals. Despite the undoubtedly late origin of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II, the term "retranscribed Pahlavi" seems to me inapplicable to it as well, because it veils rather than reveals the Patit's threefold structure (*zand* core, "retranscribed" part, sometimes omitted, and commentary in Neo-Pahlavi).

The collated manuscripts and the principles of the edition

In the course of this work the following manuscripts were examined.

Patit ī pašēmānīh I

Parsi MS 4/3, a part of the composite manuscript Parsi MS 4 (WILSON, no. 12), formerly belonging to JOHN WILSON (1804–1875), John Rylands University Library, Manchester, approximately end of the 14th century AD, six dislocated folios. The manuscript was written by the famous scribe PEŠŌTAN RĀM KĀMDĪN (the scribe of K²⁷ and M^{51a});

TD²³, *Xorde Avesta* codex, Private Collection of B. T. ANKLESARIA (*The Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches* 4, Asia Institute of Pahlavi University, Shiraz, 1976), AY 1142/AD 1773, ff. 106v–110v;

T⁸, a collection of different Pahlavi texts, both original and translated from the Avestan; Meherjirana Library in Navsari, AY 1142/AD 1773, ff. 7v–13v.

I have not included ms. T⁸ in the critical edition of the text, because its examination led me to the conclusion that the text of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I in it is a copy

of the corresponding piece of TD²³. The direction of copying (from TD²³ to T⁸ and not vice versa) is proved by a number of instances, which can only be explained on the basis of TD²³. The most definitive of them is the following example: on f. 11r, l. 12 of T⁸ we find the sequence ⟨'mwlddt⟩, corresponding to ⟨'mwrđt 'wlwl⟩ of the text (as it appears in R²⁷⁰). By examining the parallel passage of TD²³ it becomes clear how this absurd form arose: the scribe of TD²³ initially wrote ⟨'wlwl⟩ omitting ⟨'mwrđt⟩ and then used the first two characters of ⟨'wlwl⟩ to insert ⟨-mwrđt⟩ below the line and added ⟨'w-⟩ above, thus accomplishing ⟨'wlwl⟩, so that the two words became written one under the other on three levels. The scribe of T⁸ did not obviously understand the structure of the original passage and expounded it in one line. Such a procedure can only be reconstructed on the premise of the direction of re-writing TD²³ → T⁸.

R²⁷⁰, which also contains *Bundahišn* and *Nām Stāyīšn*; The Library of K.R. Cama Institute in Bombay, relatively new ms., European paper, no colophon, ff. 86r–95v.

Patit ī murdagān

K²⁷, miscellaneous Pahlavi texts, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, Copenhagen, approximately end of the 14th century AD, ff. 28r–34r; the ms. written by PEŠŌTAN RĀM KĀMDĪN.

This manuscript, containing about half of the text (0.1–9.8), is of special interest for being a unique source of the Pahlavi *Patit ī murdagān* (i.e. the “vicarious” version of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I, see above). Although it has no colophon, the above date seems quite likely, considering the closeness of the orthography⁷ and handwriting to that of PEŠŌTAN RĀM KĀMDĪN, who also wrote mss. Parsi MS 4/3 and M^{51a}, both used in the present edition. The use of the proper name PEŠŌTAN in K²⁷ instead of a general designation for a beneficiary (cf. *flān*. ‘such-and-such’ in E¹, f. 66r, l. 5 and passim, see KOTWAL/HINTZE 2008, p. 126) suggests that the *patit* was scribed by PEŠŌTAN RĀM KĀMDĪN in order to make the orderer pray for salvation of the scribe’s soul after his death.

Patit ī pašēmānīh II

R⁴¹¹, *Xorde Avesta* codex, The Library of K.R. Cama Institute in Bombay (facsimile edition of the Asia Institute of Pahlavi University, *The Pahlavi*

7 For example, the genuine form ⟨'ndlc plm'n'⟩ for *andarz-framān* in Pm 5.1 (≈ Pp I 5.1), represented by the pseudo-ideogram ⟨BYNc plm'n'⟩ in the other manuscripts of Pp I, or the replacement of the abstract suffix -yh/-īh with -yk/-īg in wn'sk'lyh/*wināhgārīh* and gwšnyh/*gōwīšnīh*, or of MNWš/*kē-š* with AYŠ/*kas* in Pm 3.1 (≈ Pp I 3.1), etc.

Codices and Iranian Researches 23, Shiraz, 1976), European paper (not earlier than 1828),⁸ no colophon, ff. 206v–221v.

In contrast with the Pāzand core, whose representation in R⁴¹¹ agrees with that in the other mss., the Pahlavi part (especially the commentary) differs from the corresponding parts of the text to be reconstructed on the basis of mss. T¹⁵, T¹⁰, T¹¹, F⁶ and E⁸ to such an extent as to suggest an independent line of transmission, which cannot be approached on the usual basis. Therefore, two versions of the Pahlavi part of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II are given in the present edition, marked as A. (mss. T¹⁵, T¹⁰, T¹¹, F⁶, E⁸) and B. (ms. R⁴¹¹) throughout the text. The necessity of considering the versions separately can be demonstrated by the following examples:

4.1.16

Pāz.: *jīhi.maraz. gūnāh.*

“the sin of copulation with a whore”

PT: A. [*ān rāy gōwēd kū zan ī wad-kār andar wāzār xānag dārēd ud andar ān xānag mardān āyēnd ud abāg ān zan wad-kārīh kunēnd ān zan ī wad-kār rāy jehī zan gōwēd*]

“[(Thus) that is called: an obscene woman keeps a house on the market, and men come to this house and practise obscenity with that woman; that obscene woman is called a whore].”

B. [*ān rāy gōwēd kū zan <ī> wad-kār andar wāzār ud andar gyāg-ē xānag <dārēd ud> andar ān xānag harw kē mard āyēd ān zan wad-kārīh abāg harw mard kunēd ān rāy jehī zan gōwēd*]

“[(Thus) that is called: an obscene woman <keeps> a house on the market or wherever, and whichever man comes to this house, the woman practises obscenity with him; that is called a whore-woman].”

11.1.16

Pāz.: *warunī.*

“lust”

PT: A. *warunīg [kū axweškārīh xwad-dōšag kunēd]*

“(the sin of) a lustful one [that is, (that of him who) makes the unworthy things self-willingly]”

B. [*abzōn-rōnīh kardag*]

“[(the sin of him who has) practised divagation]”

11.1.23

Pāz.: *bahrina.duāršnī.*

“gadding about naked”

PT: A. *brahnag-tan dwārišnīh [kū sudrag ud kustīg nē dāstag ud āmadan ud raftan kardag]*

“gadding about (with one’s) body naked [that is, (the sin of him who has) put on neither the sacred under-shirt nor the sacred girdle and (has) practised going to and fro (in such a manner)]”

8 This information I owe to a private communication by Dr. GÖTZ KÖNIG.

B. [*be sudrag ud kustīg āmadan ud raftan kardag*]

“[(the sin of him who has) practised going to and fro without the sacred under-shirt and the sacred girdle]”

These passages make it clear that any attempt to reconstruct a common prototype for the two versions would yield a fictitious text that has nothing to do with one actually attested. These and further instances will be discussed in detail in the relevant sections of the Commentary.

T¹⁵, *Xorde Avesta* codex, Meherjirana Library in Navsari, definitely mid-19th century AD (the date AY 767/AD 1398 as filled out in the colophone cannot be accepted), ff. 64v–79r, 18r (relatively close to T¹⁰ and T¹¹);

T¹⁰, *Xorde Avesta* codex, Meherjirana Library in Navsari, AY 1213/AD 1844, ff. 60v–78r. This manuscript was used by DHABHAR in his edition of *Zand ī Xorde Avesta* under the name MR;

T¹¹, *Xorde Avesta* codex, Meherjirana Library in Navsari, AY 1220/AD 1851, ff. 54v–70r (very close to T¹⁰);

F⁶, *Xorde Avesta* codex, Meherjirana Library in Navsari, AY 1220/AD 1851, ff. 70r–84v (very close to the ms. used by DHABHAR under the name D);

E⁸, *Xorde Avesta* codex, Meherjirana Library in Navsari, Samvat 1922/AD 1865, ff. 127v–163r (relatively close to F⁶).

In contrast to all the Pahlavi texts which are the object of the present edition (i. e. Pp I, Pm, Pp II Phl. A. and B. and Xp), the Pāzand version of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* (i. e. Pp II Pāz.) cannot be edited on the basis of the classical principles of critical edition set out by LACHMANN, due to the lack of an orthographic norm which could serve as a guide. Therefore, I chose ms. T¹⁵ for a diplomatic edition of the Pāzand version, with the critical notes representing the variants which occur in the other mss. of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II.

Xwad Patit

M^{51a}, miscellaneous Pahlavi texts, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, 766 AY/AD 1397, ff. 143v–147v; the manuscript written by PEŠŌTAN RĀM KĀMDĪN.

K²⁰, miscellaneous Pahlavi texts, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, approximately 14th–15th century AD, ff. 175v–177v (about two folios lost at the end of the text); the manuscript was used by SPIEGEL (1860, pp. 309–316) and ASMUSSEN (1965, pp. 90–98) for their respective editions;

F³³, miscellaneous Pahlavi texts, Meherjirana Library in Navsari, AY 1245/AD 1876, copy of a ms. AY 1142/AD 1773, ff. 95v–104v;

G²², miscellaneous Pahlavi texts, Meherjirana Library in Navsari, Samvat 1920/AD 1863, ff. 126v–133r.

Penance of sins in the Avesta and in Pahlavi literature

Before discussing the *patit* texts, the varieties of usage of Phl. *patit* in Pahlavi literature should be analysed and the relevant passages of the Avesta (together with their parallels in Pahlavi sources) considered, namely, V 3.20–21 (\approx 9.49–50), 3.38–40 (\approx 8.27–28), 5.26, 7.51, 7.71–72, 13.7 and 18.68 (JAMASP 1907, I, pp. 74–76, 89–94, 167–168, 287–289, 324–325, 415–417, 459–460 and 601–602).⁹ The questions to be elucidated thereby are as follows:

1. What is the relationship between Phl. *patit* and Av. *pa(i)tita-*, *pa(i)titi-*, usually regarded as its source?
2. What is the semantics of Phl. *patit*? Can we establish a meaning consistently preserved throughout the different texts, or was there some semantic development? If so, which were its stages?
3. What is the semantic difference between the locutions *pad patit būdan*, *pad patit h-*, *patit kardan*, *patit kard būdan*? What is the meaning of the derivatives of *patit*, such as *patitīg*, *patitīh*, *patitīh-kār*, etc.?

To answer the first of these questions, we will start by considering those passages of the *Vīdēvdād* in which Av. *pa(i)tita-*, *apa(i)tita-* and *pa(i)titi-* occur. The occurrence in the first of those passages, namely V 3.21 (\approx 5.26 = 9.50) is, however, preceded by V 3.20 (\approx 9.49), whose quotation is indispensable for a proper understanding of the context, all the more so because the locution *pad patit būdan* is found in the Pahlavi commentary to its last phrase:

V 3.20¹⁰ (\approx 9.49¹¹)

V 3.20

Av.: *āaṭ. yaṭ. hanō.^a vā. zaururō.^b vā.*
paīrīštā.xšudrō.^c vā. bauuāt.^d
 “And when he has become (as
 old as) a crone, or a dotard, or
 one whose semen has been
 exhausted,

V 9.49

Av.: *dātara. kā. hē.^{bs} asti. ciṣa.*
 “O Creator, what is his
 atonement?
 PT: *dādār kadār^{bt} ōy^{bv} hast^{bw} tōzišn*
 “O Creator, what is his
 atonement?

9 The detailed discussion of these passages by ASMUSSEN (1965, pp. 40–49) is too sophisticated to be taken as a basis for any further study. Notwithstanding some valuable observations (which will be considered below), his ways of translating Avestan and Pahlavi, his text arrangement etc. make it almost impossible to use his work as a point of reference. Besides the Pahlavi *Vīdēvdād* edition by JAMASP (1907), the one by SANJANA (1895a) has been consulted, and some problematic passages have been restored in accordance with the available mss.

10 See mss. L⁴, ff. 37r, l. 2–37v, l. 10; B¹, ff. 50r, l. 13–51v, l. 1; Bh¹¹, ff. 62r, l. 4–63r, l. 9; M³, ff. 42r, l. 7–43r, l. 2.

11 See mss. K¹, ff. 216r, l. 5–216v, l. 12; L⁴, ff. 174r, l. 9–174v, l. 12; B¹, ff. 274r, l. 4–275r, l. 2; M³, ff. 191r, l. 4–191v, l. 7.

- PT: *ka han.^e zarmān pādīrān-šudr-ē^f*
būd^g hād^h [...]
 “When this¹² old man becomes
 one with restrained semen [...],¹³
- Av.: *aojīštəmca. dim. pascaēta.ⁱ aēte.^j*
mazdaiiasna. tañcištəmca.^k
vaēdūō.təməmca.^l upa. maitīm.^m
barəzayhəm.ⁿ
 then these Mazdayasnians
 should in the strongest, the
 most vigorous, and the most
 skilful way, at the summit of
 mountains
- PT: *[ān ī °] ōjōmandtom^p ōy pas az^q*
māzdēsān^r [ī^s hēnd^t] tagīgtom
[kū⁺ tēztom^u ud^v pāktom^w]
frāhixttom^x [pad ān kārih]
abar [ēd] mānēnīd^y pad^z bālist^{aa}
[pad sar ī^{ab} kōf]
 [the] strongest of Māzdayasnians,
 (and) then (again), those who
 are most dexterous [that is, the
 quickest and purest], the most
 instructed [in this matter], in this
 waiting (space) at the summit [on
 the top of the mountain]
- Av.: *pāstō.fraḍayhəm.^{ac} hē.*
kaməradəm. vīnāḍaiien.^{ad}
 scalp his noddle by the hairline
- PT: *pōst-pahnā^{ae} ōy^{af} kamār ē^{ag}*
kušēnd^{ah} [kū-š^{ai} sar be ē brīnēnd]
 (will) sever the noddle [of him]
 from the width of (his haired)
 skin [that is, (will) cut off his
 head]
- Av.: *aš.x^varətəmaēibiūō.^{aj}*
spəntō.mainīiauanəm.^{ak}
dāmanəm. kərəfš.⁺x^varəm.^{al}
kərəfš. paiti.nisrinuiiāt.^{am} vaiiəm.
kahrkāsəm.^{an}
- Av.: *āaṭ. mraoṭ. aburō. mazdā.^{ax}*
haṇdarəzacit.^{by} haṇdarəzaiien.^{bz}
aēte.^{ca} +yōi.^{cb} mazdaiiasna.^{cc}
 Then Ahura Mazdā said: ‘May
 they bind (him) with bindings,
 those who (are) Mazdayasnians;
- PT: *u-š guft ohrmazd [kū-š^{cd}] pad*
hambandišn^{ce} ō^{cf} ham⁺ ē^{cg}
bandišn^{ch} awēšān^{ci} kē^{cj} māzdēsān^{ck}
[hēnd]
 And Ohrmazd said: ‘May they
 bind [him] with binding, those,
 who [are] Mazdayasnians;
- Av.: *zasta. hē.^{cl} paoirīm.^{cm}*
haṇdarəzaiiaṇta. apa. hē.^{cn}
vastrāt.^{co} baraiien.
 May they first bind his hands,
 may they take him away from his
 clothes;
- PT: *dast <ī> ōy^{cp} fradom^{cq} ō^{cr} ham⁺ ē^{cs}*
bandēnd^{ct} be^{cu} az ōy wistarag⁺ ē^{cv}
barēnd^{cw}
 May they first bind his hands, may
 they take away his clothes;
- Av.: *pāstō.fraḍayhəm.^{cx} hē.^{cy}*
kaməradəm.^{cz} vīnāḍaiien.^{da}
 may they scalp his noddle by the
 hairline
- PT: *pōst-pahnā^{db} ōy kamār⁺ ē^{dc}*
kušānd [kū-š⁺ sar be⁺ ē^{dd} brīnēnd]
 may they sever the noddle [of him]
 from the width of (his haired)
 skin [that is, cut off his
 head]
- Av.: *+aš.x^varətəmaēibiūō.^{de}*
spəntō.mainīiauanəm.^{df}
dāmanəm. kərəfš.^{dg}x^varəm.^{dh}
kərəfš. paiti.nisrinuiiāt.^{di} vaiiəm.
kahrkāsəm.^{dj}

12 Written as *h(a)n*. (in Pāzand script). Probably the result of a misinterpretation of Av. *hanō*. ‘old man’ under the influence of Phl. *ān*/Pāz. *hān*. ‘this, that’.

13 The Pahlavi Commentary which follows is omitted here, being of no interest for the present discussion.

<p>the corpse should be delivered unto the greediest of the corpse- eating creatures of the Holy Spirit, unto the vultures,</p> <p>PT: <i>ō^{ao} was-xwardārān ī</i> <i>spenāg-mēnōg dāmān^{ap} ī^{aq}</i> <i>kirb-xwārān [ā-š^{ar}] kirb be ē</i> <i>abespārēnd^{as} ō wāy ī^{at} kirb-xwār</i> may they commit [then his] corpse to the greediest of the corpse-eating creatures of the Holy Spirit, to the corpse-eating birds.</p>	<p>the corpse should be delivered unto the greediest of the corpse- eating creatures of the Holy Spirit, unto the vultures,</p> <p>PT: <i>ō^{dk} was-xwardārān^{dl} ī^{dm}</i> <i>spenāg-mēnōg dāmān ī</i> <i>kirb-xwārān [ā-š] kirb^{dn} be^{do} + ē^{dp}</i> <i>abespārēnd^{dq} ō wāy ī^{dr} kargās^{ds}</i> may they commit [then his] corpse to the greediest of the corpse-eating creatures of the Holy Spirit, to the vultures,</p>
<p>Av.: <i>*uitīiaojanō.^{au} auuā.^ā</i> <i>hīm.^{av} paiti.miḍnāiti.^{aw} vīspəm.</i> <i>dušmatəmca.^{ax} dužūxtəmca.^{ay}</i> <i>dužuuarštəmca.^{az}</i> when they say (thus): ‘That (man) loses (lit.: “lets go of”, D.B.) all evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds’.</p>	<p>Av.: <i>uitīiaojanō.^{dt} auuā.^{du}</i> <i>hīm.^{dv} paiti.miḍnāiti.^{dw} vīspəm.</i> <i>dušmatəmca.^{dx} dužūxtəmca.^{dy}</i> <i>dužuuarštəmca.^{dz}</i> when they say (thus): ‘That (man) loses (lit.: “lets go of”, D.B.) all evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds’.</p>
<p>PT: <i>ēdōn^{ba} ē^{bb} gōwēd^{bc} kū abar ēn^{bd}</i> <i>zamīg be + misnēm^{be} [kū pad patit</i> <i>bawēm^{bf} az^{bg}] harwīsp dušmat^{bh}</i> <i>ud^{bi} dušhūxt^{bj} ud^{bm} dušxwaršt^{bk}</i> <i>[ī-m^{bl} az^{bm} + ēk^{bn}-barīh^{bo} ō^{bp} bun</i> <i>būd^{bq} ēstēd^{br}]</i> May he say thus: ‘On this earth I lose [that is, I become redeemed from] all evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds [which have accrued to my account because of carrying- corpse-alone].’</p>	<p>PT: <i>ēdōn ē^{ea} gōwēd^{eb} kū abar ēn hīm</i> <i>[abar^{ec} ēn zamīg^{ed}] be + misnēm^{ee}</i> <i>[kū^{ef} pad^{eg} patit bawēm az]</i> <i>harwīspīn^{eh} dušmat^{ei} dušhūxt^{ej}</i> <i>dušxwaršt^{ek} [ī-m az yōjdāḍrgarīh^{el}</i> <i>ō^{em} bun būd^{en} ēstēd]</i> May he say thus: ‘On this earth I lose [that is, I become redeemed from] all evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds [which have accrued to my account because of the (improper) purification].’</p>

a L⁴, Bh¹¹: *hanu*. b Bh¹¹: *zarurō*. c L⁴: *xšūdrō*; Bh¹¹: *pairistā.xšūdrō*; M³: *xšūdrō*. d L⁴: *bauuāt*; B¹, M³: *bauuāt*; Bh¹¹: *buuāt*. e L⁴, B¹, M³: *han*; Bh¹¹: *hn*. f L⁴, Bh¹¹, M³: *šwsl*; B¹: *šwsl-1*. g L⁴, B¹, M³: YHWWNt; Bh¹¹: YHWWNyt'. h Mss.: HWE't et M³: s.l. -'t scr. i L⁴: *pascaēta*; B¹, M³: *pascata*; Bh¹¹: *pascaētae*. et -ae del. j M³: *aētē*. k L⁴: *təñjištəmca*; B¹, M³: *tañcištəmca*; Bh¹¹: *təñcištəmca*. l L⁴, B¹, M³: *vaēdīiōtəmāmca*; Bh¹¹: *vaēdīiōtəmāmca*. et s.l. sec. -m- scr. m L⁴: *mitim*; B¹: *mitīm*; Bh¹¹: *matim*; M³: *matīm*. n L⁴, Bh¹¹: *barəzañhəm*; B¹, M³: *barəzañhəm*. et M³: s.l. -qm scr. o B¹, M³: Y om. p Mss.: 'wc'wmndtwm et Bh¹¹: s.l. -d- scr. q L⁴, Bh¹¹: MN om. r Mss.: mzdšn'n' et M³: s.l. -'n' scr. s M³: s.l. Y scr. t L⁴, B¹, M³: HWE'd om. u Mss.: tytwm et L⁴, B¹: Y BRA, Bh¹¹: Y, M³: BRA add. v B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: W om. w L⁴: p'ktwm; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: p'ktwm et L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: Y add. x L⁴: plhhtwm et s.l. -w- scr.; B¹: plhhtktwm; Bh¹¹: plhhtwm et s.l. pr. -t- scr.; M³: plhhtytwm. y L⁴: m'nyny't; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: m'nyny't et s.l. -' scr. z L⁴, B¹, M³: PWN; Bh¹¹: BRA. aa L⁴: b'lyst; B¹, M³: b'lst'; Bh¹¹: b'lst. ab B¹: Y om. ac L⁴: *frasayhəm*;

B¹: *fraδsaṇhəm*; Bh¹¹, M³: *fraδaṇhəm*. **ad** Bh¹¹: *vnāδaiien*. **ae** L⁴, B¹, M³: *phn'y*; Bh¹¹: *phn'*. **af** Bh¹¹: Y add. **ag** L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: HNA; M³: 'y. **ah** L⁴, Bh¹¹: *kšynd*; B¹: *kkšynd*; M³: *kwšynd*. **ai** M³: *AYKš om*. **aj** B¹, M³: *šarətimaēibiiō*; Bh¹¹: *šarətəmaēibiiō*. **ak** B¹: *mainiūuanq̄m*; Bh¹¹: *mainiūvanq̄m*; M³: *mainiūuanq̄m*. **al** Mss.: *kərafs.šāraqm*. et L⁴, B¹: s.l. sec. m. scr. **am** L⁴, Bh¹¹: *nisrənuiiāt*; B¹: *nisrinuiiāt*; M³: *nisrinuiiāt*. **an** L⁴, Bh¹¹: *karkāsqm*; B¹, M³: *kabrəkāsqm*. **ao** L⁴, Bh¹¹: OLE; B¹, M³: OL. **ap** L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: *d'm'n*; M³: *d'm'n* et s.l. -'n scr. **aq** M³: s.l. Y scr. **ar** L⁴, Bh¹¹: 'š et W praescr.; M³: in marg. 'š... hw'l scr. **as** L⁴: 'psp'lynd; B¹: 'psp'lynnnd; Bh¹¹: 'sp'lynd; M³: 'wsp'lynnnd. **at** Bh¹¹: Yom. **au** L⁴: *uiti.aojan(ō)*; B¹, M³, Bh¹¹: *uiti.aojanō*. **av** L⁴: *hī*. sec. m. scr.; Bh¹¹: *him*. **aw** L⁴, B¹, M³: *paiti.miδnāiti*. et L⁴: -i.miδnāiti. sec. m. scr.; Bh¹¹: *paiti.maiδnāiti*. **ax** L⁴, Bh¹¹: *dušmatəmca*. et L⁴: *dušmatəm*- sec. m. scr.; B¹, M³: *dušmatəmca*. **ay** L⁴: *duužūxtəmca*. et *du*- et -*təmca*. sec. m. scr.; B¹, M³: *dužūxtəmca*; Bh¹¹: *duužūxtəmca*. **az** L⁴: *dužūarštəm*. sec. m. scr.; B¹: *dužūuarštəmca*; Bh¹¹, M³: *dužūuarštəmca*. **ba** Mss.: 'ytwn' et L⁴: sec. m. scr. **bb** L⁴: 'y om. **bc** L⁴: AMRNyt et -MRNy- sec. m. scr.; B¹, M³, Bh¹¹: YMRWNyt. **bd** L⁴: ZNE... ptyt sec. m. scr. **be** L⁴: msynnm; B¹: msynm; Bh¹¹: ms'nm; M³: msnm. **bf** L⁴: YHWM; B¹, M³, Bh¹¹: YHWWNm. **bg** Mss.: MN et L⁴: -N sec. m. scr. et ' add. **bh** L⁴: *dwšmt'*... MN sec. m. scr. **bi** L⁴, B¹: W om. **bj** L⁴, B¹: *dwšhwht*; Bh¹¹: *dwšhwht* et sec. -w- del.; M³: *dwšhwht*. **bk** L⁴, B¹: W om. **bl** L⁴: *dwšhwłšt'*; B¹: *dwšhwłšt'*; Bh¹¹: *dwšhwłšt*; M³: *dwšhwłšt*. **bm** L⁴, B¹, M³: ZYm; Bh¹¹: Zm et m- praescr. et del. **bn** B¹, M³: MN om. **bo** L⁴, Bh¹¹: 'ywk om; B¹, M³: 'tk et M³: s.l. scr. **bp** L⁴, B¹, M³: *blyh* et L⁴: *bly*- sec. m. scr.; Bh¹¹: KBD. **bq** Mss.: OL et L⁴: -L sec. m. scr. **br** L⁴: YHWWNyt et -y- del.; Bh¹¹: YHWWNt et s.l. -t scr.; B¹, M³: bwt. **bs** L⁴: YKOYMWNNyt sec. m. scr.; B¹: YKOYMWNN't; Bh¹¹: YKOYMWNyt; M³: YKOYMWNN't. **bt** K¹: *he*; B¹: *kābe*; M³: *kābē*. **bu** K¹: *k(t)[.]l*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *kt'l*. **bv** K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; L⁴: OLE. **bw** K¹: *[.JT]*; L⁴: AYT; B¹, M³: AYT'. **bx** K¹: *mazd(a)*. **by** L⁴: *hetarəzacit*. **bz** L⁴: *haṇdarəzaiien*; B¹: *haṇdarəzaiien*. **ca** K¹: *(aē)te*. **cb** Mss.: *yō*. **cc** L⁴: *mazdaaiasna*. **cd** K¹, B¹, M³: AYK; L⁴: AYKš. **ce** K¹, B¹, M³: *hmbndšnyh*; L⁴: *hmbndšn'n*. **cf** K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; L⁴: OL. **cg** Mss.: HNA. **ch** K¹, L⁴, B¹: *ASLWNšn'* et L⁴: s.l. -N- scr.; M³: *ASLWNšn'yh* et s.l. -' - scr. **ci** K¹: *O(L)[.]šn'*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *OLEšn'*. **cj** K¹: *M(N)[.]*; L⁴, B¹, M³: MNW. **ck** K¹: *[.]zdsn*; L⁴: *m'zdsn*; B¹, M³: *m'zdsn'* et M³: s.l. -sn' scr. **cl** K¹, B¹, M³: *be*. **cm** K¹: *pa[.]i[.]*. **cn** K¹, B¹, M³: *be*. **co** K¹: *vas(t)rāt*. **cp** K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; L⁴: i.l. OLE scr. **cq** K¹: *p[.]t*wm; L⁴, B¹, M³: *pltwm*. **cr** K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; L⁴: OL. **cs** Mss.: HNA. **ct** Mss.: *ASLWNx₁*. **cu** K¹: *B[.]A*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *BRA* et M³: s.l. -A scr. **cv** Mss.: HNA. **cw** K¹, L⁴, B¹: *YBLWNx₂*; M³: *YBLWNx₁*. **cx** K¹: *fraδaṇh(a)[.]*. **cy** K¹, B¹, M³: *be*. **cz** K¹: *ka(m)[.]r*əδəm. **da** K¹, B¹, M³: *vanāδaiien*. **db** K¹, B¹, M³: *p'hn'y*; L⁴: *phn'y*. **dc** K¹, L⁴: HNA; B¹, M³: 'w'. **dd** Mss.: HNA. **de** K¹: *ašx^oarətəmaēibiiō*; L⁴: *ašx^oarətəmaēibiiō*; B¹, M³: *ašx^oarətəmaēibiiō*. **df** K¹: *[.](i)niūauuanq̄m*; L⁴: *mainiūauua*. **dg** K¹: *kəra[.]š*. **dh** B¹, M³: *šāraqm*. **di** K¹, B¹, M³: *nisrinuiiāt*; L⁴: *nisrinuiiāt*. et s.l. -i add. **dj** L⁴: *kəbrəkāsqm*. **dk** K¹: *lac*; L⁴: OLE; B¹, M³: 'w'. **dl** K¹: *[.]l't*(n); L⁴: *hwlt'l'n*; B¹, M³: *hwlt'l'n*. **dm** L⁴: Y om. **dn** K¹: *k[.]*; L⁴, M³: *klp*; B¹: *klp'*. **do** K¹: *lac*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *BRA*. **dp** Mss.: HNA. **dq** K¹, B¹, M³: 'sp'lynd; L⁴: 'psp'lynd. **dr** B¹, M³: Y om. **ds** K¹: *k(lk)'s*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *klk's* et L⁴: *klphw'l* praescr. et del. **dt** K¹: *u(i)ti[.]a*ojojanō; B¹, M³: *aiti.aojanō*. **du** M³: *auuaō*. et s.l. -a scr. **dv** K¹, B¹: *auuaohīm*. **dw** K¹: *miδn[.]iti*. **dx** K¹, M³: *dušmatəmca*. **dy** K¹: *du(žūx)təm(c)a*. **dz** M³: *dužūuarštəmca*. **ea** K¹, B¹, M³: HNA; L⁴: 'y. **eb** K¹, B¹, M³: YMRWNyt; L⁴: YMRWNyt. **ec** B¹: ZN praescr. et del.; M³: W praescr. **ed** Mss.: *zmyk* et M³: s.l. -yk scr. **ee** K¹, B¹, M³: msynm; L⁴: msynm. **ef** K¹: *AY(K)*; B¹, M³, L⁴: *AYK*. **eg** K¹: *lac*; B¹, M³, L⁴: *PWN*. **eh** K¹, B¹, M³: *hlwspyn'*; L⁴: *hlwstn'* et s.l. *yn* add. **ei** K¹: *dwm*(')t'; L⁴, B¹, M³: *dwšmt'*. **ej** K¹: *[....](h)t*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *dwšhwht*. **ek** K¹: *dwšhwłšt[.]*; L⁴, B¹: *dwšhwłšt'*; M³: *dwšhwłšt*. **el** K¹, L⁴: *ywšd'slkyh*; B¹, M³: *ywšd'slkyh*. **em** K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; L⁴: OL. **en** K¹, B¹, M³: bwt; L⁴: YHWWNt.

V 3.21¹⁴ = 5.26¹⁵ = 9.50¹⁶

V 3.21

Av.: *yezica.^a hē.^b aniia. aya. śīiaoθna.^c*
fraunaršta.^d

“And if any other evil deeds have
 been done by him,

PT: *agar-ez^e ōy any ī^f wattar^g kunišn^h*
frāzī warzīd [kū-šⁱ any-ez^k wināh
kard^l]

“And if he did another evil deed
 [that is, committed another sin]

Av: *+patita.^m hē.ⁿ ciša.*
 the atonement has been settled by
 him.¹⁷

PT: *patitihā-šo ōy^p [tōxt^q bawēd^r*
+sōšyans^s guft ē ān bawēd
ka^t ān ī^u did^v nē margarzān
+kayr-ādurbozīd^w guft ē
patitihā-š^x ōy tōzišn u-š az-ez^y
abārīg wināh^z jud-jud pad^{aa} patit^{ab}
bawīšn^{ac}]

may he be (regarded as) redeemed
 [(his sin) has (actually) been
 atoned for; Sōšyans¹⁸ said: ‘May
 it be (so) if the further (sin) be
 not a mortal sin (*margarzān*);
 Kayr-Ādurbozīd¹⁹ said: ‘May his
 atonement and his (necessity of)
 redemption from any other sin
 separately be (regarded as) settled’]²⁰

V 9.50

Av.: *yezica. hē.^{ar} aniia.^{as} aya. śīiaoθna.^{at}*
fraunaršta.

“And if any other evil deeds have
 been done by him,

PT: *agar-ez^{au} ān any ī^{av} wattar kunišn*
warzīd [kū-š^{any-ez^{aw}} wināh-ē^{ax}
kard^{ay}]

“And if he did another evil deed
 [that is, committed another sin]

Av: *+patita.^{az} hē.^{ba} ciša.^{bb}*
 the atonement has been settled by
 him.

PT: *patitihā ōy^{bc} [tōxt^{bd} bawēd*
+sōšyans^{be} guft ē ān^{bf} bawēd^{bg}
ka ān ī did^{bh} nē margarzān
kayr-ādurbozīd^{bi} guft ē^{bj}
patitihā ōy^{bk} tōzišn u-š az-ez^{bl}
abārīg wināh jud^{bm}-jud pad patit
bāš^{bn}]

may he be (regarded as) redeemed
 [(his sin) has (actually) been
 atoned for; Sōšyans said: ‘May
 it be (so) if the further (sin) be
 not a mortal sin (*margarzān*);
 Kayr-Ādurbozīd said: ‘May his
 atonement be (regarded as) settled
 and be it (necessary) to redeem
 any other sin separately’].

14 See mss. L⁴, ff. 37v, l. 10–38r, l. 6; B¹, ff. 51v, l. 1–52r, l. 1; B^{h1}, ff. 63r, l. 9–63v, l. 9; M³, f. 43r, ll. 2–14.

15 V 5.26 is not given here on grounds of similarity.

16 See mss. K¹, ff. 216v, l. 13–217r, l. 8; L⁴, ff. 174v, l. 12–175r, l. 7; B¹, ff. 275r, l. 2–275v, l. 1; M³, ff. 191v, l. 7–191v, l. 19.

17 Or: “His atonement (is) settled”. However, the Avestan combinations of PPP with enclitic personal pronouns or with nouns in genitive are hereinafter translated as a possessive periphrastic perfect (corresponding to the Pahlavi ergative/possessive preterite) and not as a passive construction.

18 On the spelling *sōšyans* see CANTERA 2004, p. 208, n. 118.

19 On the spelling *kayr-ādurbozīd* see CANTERA 2004, p. 209, n. 122.

20 The suggested translation of the commentary is quite the opposite of the one given in CANTERA 2004, p. 212, n. 132: “Kay-Ādurbozīd sagte, daß diese Strafe als gebüßt für ihn gilt, und daß er jede weitere Sünde einzeln beichten muß”. Theoretically, both readings are possible: the one given here assumes that both *tōzišn* and *bawīšn* are *nomina actionis* and depend on *patitihā*, whereas the one by CANTERA implies that *bawīšn* is

Av.: <i>āaṭ. yezi.^{ad}šē.^{ae} anīia. aya. šīiaoḍna. nōiṭ.^{af} fraunaršta.</i> And if no other evil deeds have been done by him,	Av.: <i>āaṭ. yezi.šē.^{bo} anīia. aya. šīiaoḍna. nōiṭ. fraunaršta.</i> And if no other evil deeds have been done by him,
PT: <i>agar-ez^{ag} ōy any^{ah} ī^{ai} wattar kunišn nē^{aj} frāz warzīd</i> And if he did no other evil deed,	PT: <i>agar ōy^{bp} any^{bq} ī^{br} wattar kunišn nē frāz warzīd^{bs}</i> And if he did no other evil deed,
Av.: <i>patitəm.^{ak} ahe.^{al} narš. yaūuaēca. yaūuaētātāēca.</i> this man has expiated (it) for ever and ever.”	Av.: <i>patitəm. ahe.^{bt} narš. yaūuaēca. yaūuaētātāēca.</i> this man has expiated (it) for ever and ever.”
PT: <i>patitihā-š^{am} ōy mard tā^{+ō}an^{an} ^{+hamē^{ao}-hamē^{ap} rawiśnīh^{aq}} this man shall be (regarded as) redeemed to perpetuity.”</i>	PT: <i>patitihā^{bu} ōy^{bv} mard tā^{bw} ō^{bx} ^{hamē-hamē rawiśnīh} this man shall be (regarded as) redeemed to perpetuity.”</i>

a L⁴: *yazica. et yazica...* anīia sec. m. scr.; Bh¹¹: *yezeca.*; M³: *yezihca.* b L⁴: *he.* c L⁴: *ayšīiaoḍana. et ay-* sec. m. scr.; Bh¹¹: *ayašīiaoḍna.* d L⁴: *fraunaršta.* sec. m. scr.; Bh¹¹: *frarunaršta.* et sec. -r- del. e L⁴: W HTc... Y sec. m. scr. f L⁴: ZK sec. m. scr. et Y sec. m. add.; Bh¹¹: ZK et Y add.; B¹, M³: ZY. g Mss.: SLYt et L⁴: SL- sec. m. scr. h L⁴, B¹, M³: *kwnšn'* et B¹: š- praescr. et del.; Bh¹¹: *kwnšn.* i L⁴, Bh¹¹: *pr'c* et L⁴: -c sec. m. scr.; B¹, M³: *pr'c'.* j L⁴: *AYKš...* krt sec. m. scr. k L⁴, Bh¹¹: *AHRNc.*; B¹, M³: *AHRc'.* l L⁴, Bh¹¹: *krt.*; B¹, M³: *krtn'.* m L⁴: *pataca.* et *pa-* sec. m. scr.; B¹, M³: *patica.*; Bh¹¹: *patata.* n L⁴, Bh¹¹: *bē.*; B¹, M³: *be.* o Mss.: *ptytyh'š* et B¹: Y add. et Bh¹¹: s.l. -š scr. p L⁴, Bh¹¹: *OL.*; B¹, M³: *OLE.* q L⁴, Bh¹¹, M³: *twht.*; B¹: *twht'.* r L⁴, Bh¹¹: *YHWWNyT.*; B¹: *byt.*; M³: *byt.* s L⁴: *swš'ns* et s.l. -s scr.; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: *swš'ns-1.* t Mss.: *AMT* et L⁴: -š add. et del. u B¹, M³: Y om. v L⁴, B¹: *TWb.*; Bh¹¹: *TWW.*; M³: *TWWb.* w Mss.: *kry'twrwbwcyt* et M³: s.l. *bwcyt* scr. x Mss.: *ptytyh'š* et L⁴, M³: Y add. y L⁴: *MNc.*; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: *MNcy* et M³: s.l. -y scr. z B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: *wn's* om. aa B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: *PWN* om. ab L⁴, Bh¹¹, M³: *ptyt.*; B¹: *PWNtyt.* ac L⁴, B¹: *YHWWNšn'*; Bh¹¹: *YHWWNyTšn'* et -yt- del.; M³: *YHWWNyT.* ad M³: *yezī.* ae Bh¹¹: *yezīshē.* af Bh¹¹: *naoṭ.* ag L⁴: *HTcy* et ZK add. et del.; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: *HTc.* ah Mss.: *ZK'y* et Bh¹¹: s.l. scr. ai L⁴: Y et ZK praescr.; B¹, M³: ZY et M³: s.l. sec. m. scr.; Bh¹¹: om. aj L⁴, M³: s.l. LA scr. ak B¹, M³: *patōtəm.*; Bh¹¹: *patitəm.* al Bh¹¹: *ahē.* am Mss.: *ptytyh'š* et L⁴, B¹, M³: Y add. an L⁴, Bh¹¹: *OLE.*; B¹, M³: *OL* om. ao L⁴: *[j]m[.]y* et s.l. sec. m. *MNW* add.; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: *hm'k.* ap L⁴, M³: *hm'y.*; B¹, Bh¹¹: *hm'k* et Bh¹¹: *BRA* add. aq L⁴, B¹, M³: *lwbšnyh.*; Bh¹¹: *lwbšn'.* ar K⁵: *(he).*; B¹, M³: *he.* as K⁵: *a(nīia).* at K⁵: *(š)īiaoḍ[.]a.* au K⁵, B¹, M³: *HTc.*; L⁴: *HT'c.* av K⁵: *lac.*; L⁴: *CY.*; B¹, M³: *ZY.* aw K⁵: *AHRc.*; L⁴: *AHRNc.*; B¹, M³: *AHRcy* et M³: s.l. -y scr. ax K⁵: *[...]s[.]*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *wn's-1.* ay K⁵: *lac.*; L⁴: *krt'* et *p-* add.; B¹, M³: *krtn'.* az K⁵, B¹, M³: *patitəm.*; L⁴: *patitim.* ba K⁵, B¹, M³: *he.* bb L⁴: *ciḍa.* i.l. sec. m. scr. bc K⁵, B¹: *'w.*; L⁴: *OL* et Y praescr. et add.; M³: *W.* bd K⁵, B¹, M³: *twht.*; L⁴:

to be understood as a necessitative participle (see MacKENZIE 1971, p. 46). The parallel passage V 9.50 suggests that at a certain stage of the Pahlavi Commentary's later interpretation, the attitude of the exegetes was indeed close to CANTERA's reading. The peculiar morphology, however, and in particular the combination of the enclitic 3rd pers.sg. pronoun -š by APš/u-š with the 2nd pers.sg. imperative YHWWN'š/bāš (or *bawēb*; see about this form in FERRER 2013, pp. 170–172), suggests this variant is of secondary nature. Thus, the exegetic opinion of Kayr-Ādurbōzīd is translated here in two different versions, the first (V 3.21) being the original one and the second (V 9.50) reflecting the later stage of text evolution.

twht. **be** K⁵, B¹, M³: swš'ns-1; L⁴: sš'ns. **bf** Mss.: ZK et B¹: s.l. scr. **bg** Mss.: YHWWNyt et M³: s.l. -yt scr. **bh** Mss.: TWB et L⁴: L praescr. et del. **bi** K⁵, M³: kyly'twr bwcyt; L⁴: kyl'twrwbcyt; B¹: kyly'twr wbcyt. **bj** K⁵, B¹, M³: yy; L⁴: 'y. **bk** K⁵, B¹, M³: KN; L⁴: OL et Y praescr. **bl** K⁵: MN(c); L⁴: ME; B¹, M³: MNc. **bm** Mss.: ywdt et M³: s.l. -dt scr. **bn** K⁵, B¹, L⁴: YHWWN's; M³: YHWWN'pš et -'p- del. et s.l. -' add. **bo** K⁵: šē; L⁴: yezišē; B¹, M³: šā. **bp** K⁵, B¹, M³: 'w'; L⁴: OL. **bq** K⁵: ZK-1; L⁴, B¹, M³: ZK'y. **br** K⁵, B¹, M³: ZY; L⁴: Y et ZK praescr. **bs** K⁵: [l]cyt; L⁴, B¹, M³: wlyt. **bt** K⁵: (a)hē; L⁴: hē. **bu** K⁵, L⁴, B¹: ptytyh' et L⁴: s.l. -yh' scr.; M³: pytytyh' et -yy- del. **bv** K⁵, B¹, M³: KN; L⁴: OL. **bw** K⁵: [J]D; L⁴, B¹, M³: OD. **bx** K⁵: lac.; L⁴: OL; B¹, M³: 'w'.

It is quite clear that in the original text the phrase *auuā. hīm. paiti. miḏnāiti. vīspəm. dušmatəmca. dužuxtəmca. dužuuarštəmca*. “That (man) lets go of all evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds” is put into the executors’s mouth and designates the fact of redemption of the sinner owing to the punishment suffered by him. The change of the person of the verb in Pahlavi Translation is peculiar and suggests that from the viewpoint of the translator and commentators, the sentence *abar en zamīg be misnēm [kū pad patit bawēm az] harwisp dušmat ud dušhuxt ud dušxwaršt [ī-m az ēk-barīh (9.49: yōjdāḏrgarīh) ō bun būd ēstēd]* “On this earth I lose [that is, I become redeemed from] all evil thoughts, evil words, evil deeds [which have accrued to my account because of carrying-corpse-alone (9.49: (improper) purification)]” comes from the sinner himself, probably in the very moment of the execution. This discrepancy between the Avestan text and its Pahlavi Translation is closely connected with the publicity of penance (*patit āškārāgīh*), an idea totally alien to the Avesta, but quite prominent in Pahlavi literature (see below).

Another aspect of the later exegesis is a result of an inadequate understanding of the Avestan text. As ASMUSSEN (1965, p. 45) rightly shows, the phrase *abar en zamīg* of the Pahlavi Translation of V 3.20 and the Pahlavi Commentary to V 9.49 corresponds to *auuā. hīm.* of the Avestan text and should be read as an abbreviated allusion to V 2.8: Av.: *nōiṭ. hīm. gātuuō*. “...there is no room...”; PT: *nē abar en hīm [abar en zamīg] gāh* “...there is no room on this *hīm* [on this earth]...”, with Av. *hīm*. (Phl. *hīm* (?) understood as a rare synonym of *zam-* (Phl. *zamīg*). The Pahlavi Translation of the above passage, together with this addition gave rise to the later commentary found in the following fragments of the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* accompanying the *Dādestān ī dēnīg* (DHABHAR 1913, pp. 41–42) and *Šāyast nē-Šāyast* (TAVADIA 1930, pp. 105–106):²¹

PRDd 15a5

*kē-š margarzān-ē kard ēstēd ud gētīgihā pad patit bawēd u-š sar be brīnēnd *ē pad gyāg stōš abāyēd sāxtan ud yaštan ud ahlaw ud ka patit u-š gētīgihā sar nē*

- 21 All quotations from the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* are given in accordance with DHABHAR’s edition of 1913, for the relatively recent edition by WILLIAMS (1990) contains many errors, and his emendations (often introduced without any explanation) are sometimes misleading. See e.g. Commentary, p. 301, n. 253.

šāyēd +brīdan u-š mēnōgihā šab ī sedīgar pad bun ī publ sar be brīnēnd ā-z ī cabārom <rōz> stōš abāyēd dāstan <ud> ablaw

“(If) he who has committed a capital crime (*margarzān*) becomes redeemed in physical state²² and one cuts off his head, one must prepare and celebrate the commemoration ceremony (*stōš*) on the spot, and (then he is) saved; and when he (is) redeemed, and it is impossible to cut off (his) head in physical state, then on the third night at the bottom of the Bridge one cuts off (his) head in spiritual state, and then on the fourth day one must hold *stōš*, and (then he is) saved.”

PRDd 15a6

ud ka pad patit nē būd be ō dušaxw šawēd <ud> tā tan <ī> pasēn pad dušaxw bawēd
 “And when he does not become redeemed, he goes to hell <and> remains in hell until <the> future body.”

PRDd 15a7

u-š zamān tanōmandihā abāz kunēnd u-š sar be brīnēnd u-š pādīfrāh ī dušaxw be nimāyēnd

“And one recreates him in bodily state for a time, cuts off his head and shows him the punishment of hell.”

PRDd 15a8

būd dastwar kē-š guft kū kē-š margarzān-ē kard ēstēd ablaw ōh bawēd kē-š dō kard ēstēd nē bawēd ēd rāy cē ōy gētīgihā mard be ōzad ēstēd be ka-š pad gētīg xwad abāz ōzanēnd tā-š ān tōzišn nē kard bawēd

“There was an authority who said: ‘He who has committed one capital crime (*margarzān*), becomes thus saved, he who has committed two (of them), does not, because he has killed a man in physical state, so unless one kills him in the material world in return, he will not have settled the atonement’.”

PRDd 15a9

ōy kē-š guft kū ēk margarzān ablaw ōh bawēd ud dō margarzān nē bawēd +u-š ciš cim be guft kū sar <ī> ān ē bar be šāyēd brīd ī pad gētīg

“He who said: ‘(One having committed) one capital crime (*margarzān*) becomes thus saved, and (one having committed) two capital crimes (*margarzān*), does not’, then gave the reason of the matter: ‘One can cut off his head (only) once in the material world’.”

PRDd 15a10

ud ān-ez kē-š guft ud dō margarzān ablaw ōh bawēd u-š ciš <cim> be guft <kū> ka-š pad gētīg sar ī tan be brīnēnd u-š šab ī sedīgar pad mēnōg pad bun ī publ ān ī ruwān be brīnēnd

“And he who said: ‘(One having committed) two capital crimes (*margarzān*) becomes thus saved too’, gave <the reason> of the matter: ‘If in the material world one cuts off the head of (his) body, then on the third night (after his death), in the spiritual world, at the bottom of the Bridge one cuts off that of (his) soul’.”

22 It seems quite plausible that all the above speculations concerning the efficiency of a redemption fulfilled “in physical state” (*gētīgihā*) or “in the material world” (*pad gētīg*) are a result of the erroneous translation of Av. *auuā. hīm.* as *abar ēn zamīg* (see above).

PRDd 15a11

ud pōryōðkēš hamāg pad ēn abar ēstād hēnd kū ka-š patitīgīh kard be ō dušaxw nē šawēd ēd cē ka sar ī ruwān brīnēnd ruwān was bār sar brīd šāyēd

“And all the primal teachers insisted that if he has settled the redemption, he will not go to hell, for the reason that when one cuts off the head of (his) soul, the soul can be beheaded many times.”

PRDd 15a12

ka-š margarzān was kard ēstēd <ud> pad patit nē bawēd be ō dušaxw šawēd u-š pad tan ī pasēn tanōmandīh abāz kunēnd u-š harw ēk-ē rāy ēk bār sar be brīnēnd u-š pādīfrāh <ī> dušaxw be nimāyēnd ud ahlaṭw

“If he has committed many capital crimes (*margarzān*) <and> does not become redeemed, he goes to hell, and in the future body one recreates him in bodily state and for each one (of his crimes) cuts off his head and shows him the punishment of hell, and (then he is) saved.”

ŠnŠ 8.5–7²³

[5] *margarzān ka-š tan ud xwāstag ēwāz ō ratān abespārdan ud pad wināh ī jastag^a menišnīg pad patit būdan^b az-eš^c ratān^d pad kār ud kirbag dastwarīh dahēnd ā-š kār ud kirbag ī pēš^e kard abāz rasēd ka andar se šabag pādīfrāh kunēnd ud ō dušaxw nē rasēd* [6] *ud agar rat sar brīdan framāyēd pad gyāg ahlaṭw ud stōš <ī> ^{+ōy}^f yazišn^g u-š āmār ī stōš abar nē bawēd^h* [7] *ud agar nē pad patit tā tan ī pasēnⁱ pad dušaxw ud pad tan ī pasēn az dušaxw be āwarēnd ud harw margarzān-ē rāy ēk bār sar be brīnēnd u-š bār ī^k abdom ^{+zīndag}^l abāz kunēnd^m ud se šabag pādīfrāh īⁿ garān be nimāyēnd*

“[5] If a (person guilty of a) capital crime (*margarzān*) will only submit his body and property to (spiritual) chiefs and sincerely do penance²⁴ for the sin occurred, whereby the chiefs give him permission for meritorious deeds and acts, then the meritorious deeds and acts which he did before return (to his account); if they inflict (upon him) the punishment within the three nights (after his death), he does not go to hell. [6] And if a chief orders to cut off (his) head, (he becomes) saved on the spot, and a commemoration ceremony (*stōš*) <for> him (is) to be celebrated, and the counting of nights up to the *stōš* is not applied to him.²⁵ [7] And if he (be) not penitent, he (will remain) in hell until the future body, and in the future body one takes him from hell and cuts off (his) head once for each capital crime, and finally makes him alive again, and shows (him) the severe punishment of the three nights.”

a K²⁰: ystk; M^{51a}: yst. b K²⁰: YHWWNtnⁱ; M^{51a}: YHWWNyt. c K²⁰: MNš; M^{51a}: ‘cš. d M^{51a}: lt’n’ PWN om. et spatium add. e K²⁰: LOYNⁱ; M^{51a}: LOYN. f Mss.: OL. g K²⁰:

23 See mss. K²⁰, ff. 66v, l. 13–67r, l. 3; M^{51a}, ff. 99r, l. 3–99v, l. 16.

24 Here *menišnīg* should not be translated as ‘mentally’ (TAVADIA 1930, p. 105) but as indicating that redemption is impossible without sincere repentance. This idea is rooted in the Pahlavi commentary to V 3.40 (= 8.28), which is quoted in ŠnŠ 8.8, i.e. immediately after the passage considered here (see the discussion below).

25 That is, the death-penalty through decapitation replaces the “punishment of the three nights” (*se šabag pādīfrāh*), thus making it unnecessary to count three nights before celebrating *stōš*.

YZBHWNšn'; M^{51a}: YZWHWNšn. h K²⁰: YHMTWNyt del. et i.l. YHWWNyt add.; M^{51a}: YHWWNyt. i K²⁰: Y om. j K²⁰: psyn'; M^{51a}: psyn. k K²⁰: Y 'ptwm lac. l Mss.: zyndk. m Mss.: OBYDWNd et K²⁰: s.l. -N- scr. n K²⁰: Y om.

In the edition of the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* accompanying the *Dādestān ī dēnīg* by WILLIAMS, the locutions *patit*, *pad patit bawēd*, *patitīgih kard* are translated as 'he confessed' (WILLIAMS 1990, II, pp. 27–28 et passim), probably in the wake of the brief review of the theme in BOYCE 1975, pp. 319–321. I believe that this semantic aspect of the term *patit* has indeed developed in the course of time, but has never superseded that of 'redemption'. At any rate, the semantics of the term are much more complicated than it may appear on the basis of Boyce's exposition.

As we have seen, in V 3.21 (= 5.26 = 9.50) the peculiar form ⟨ptytyh'h⟩ rendering Av. *pa(i)tita-* occurs three times. Elsewhere in the *Vidēvdād pa(i)tita-* is rendered into Pahlavi in a somewhat different form, viz. ptytyh'/*patitihā* (see below). The two forms were discussed by ASMUSSEN (1965, p. 43f.), although with no plausible result. He begins with a self-refuting statement which I shall reproduce in full, excluding only the quotation from the Avesta and PT (otherwise the author's logic would remain obscure):

"The Pahlavi text of 3,21 with parallels... appears as an in every way correct rendering of the Avestan original, the clarity of which, however, is veiled by the form of the *paitita-* and *paititəm-* (sic, D.B.) translation (or transscription [sic, D.B.]) which is difficult to see through graphically. If we accept the form *patitihā*, a grammatically warrantable form (the plur. of a postulated *patit*, or an adv.) will indeed be obtained, but when this form is to stand the test of its syntactical practicability, the construction breaks up, especially at the end. Furthermore, the graphical pictures in the great majority of passages in the manuscripts just do not allow the rendering *patitihā*, but a form like *pttdaada* and *pttdaaa* (transliterated according to the principles of Bartholomae)".

Trying to solve the problem, ASMUSSEN suggests we consider all the "graphical pictures" at issue corrupted forms of ...*patitih i* or *patitikih i* and translate the passage V 3.21 = 5.26 = 9.50 as follows:

"Also if that (man) has performed an evil deed [i.e. he has also committed another sin], then his penance (compensation, repentance) [is] the punishment (payment), but he is also to repent each of the other sins]. And if this (man) has not performed any other evil deed, his penance (compensation) (is valid) for ever" (ASMUSSEN 1965, p. 44).

The positive element in ASMUSSEN's reasoning (viz. his understanding of the dominant element in the semantics of Av. *pa(i)tita-/Phl. patit* as "compensation", which is basically correct, although I would prefer to translate the two terms as "atonement" or "redemption") is partly brought to naught by the ambiguity of the series of synonyms he uses to translate one single word.

As we will see below, the issue of the form ⟨ptytyh'h⟩, as well as of the varieties ⟨ptytyh's⟩ (ms. L⁴ et al.), ⟨ptytyh'y⟩ (once in ms. G³⁴) and especially

(ptytyh'), regularly corresponding to Av. *patitəm*. in V 7.51 and 13.7 may well contribute to our understanding not only of the history of the notion of penance etc. in Zoroastrianism, but also of some trends in the development of the translation techniques of the Pahlavi scholars:

V 7.51²⁶ (≈ 13.7²⁷)

V 7.51

Av.: *yasca.^a mē.^b + aētaēšqm.^c yaṭ.
daxmanqm. auuauuantəm.^d mazō.
vīkānaiiāt.^e yaṭa. hē.^f tanuš.
aṇhaṭ.*

“And he who should tear down
for me such one of these tombs,
(so much thereof) as is the size
of his body,

PT: *kē az^g aṇwēšān^h man hazzān ān
ī andī-masā be kanādī ciyōn^k ōy
tan hast*

“He who tears down for me such
one of these tombs, as is the size
of his body,

Av.: *patitəm.^l hē.^m manō. aṇhaṭ.
patitəm.ⁿ vacō. patitəm.^o
šīiaoḍnəm.*

he shall (thus) have expiated (his
evil) thought, have expiated (his
evil) speech, have expiated (his
evil) deed;

PT: *patitihā^p ōy^q menišnīg^r [†hast]^s
patitihā^t [†ōy^u] gōwišnīg^v
patitihā^w [†ōy^x] kunišnīg^y
[ciyōn^z kē az tanāpuhl-ē
menišnīg gōwišnīg kunišnīg pad^{aa}*

V 13.7

Av.: *yasca. dim. janat. spitama.^{aq}
zaraḍuštra. daēum.^{ar} yim.
zairimīiaṇurəm.^{as} yim. mašyāka.^{at}
auui.^{au} dužuuacaṇhō. zairimīiākəm.
nqma. +aōjaite.^{av}*

“And he who kills, O Spitama
Zaraḍuštra, the demon tortoise
(*zairimīiaṇura*) who is called
by vituperators by the name
zairimīiāka

PT: *kē-z^{aw} +ōzanēd^{ax} spitāmān
zarḍušt^{ay} dēw <ī> zārimangur kē
mardōm abar pad duš-gōwišnīh^{az}
zairimīiāka.^{ba} nām gōwēd [ē ka
nē gōwend ā-š kem tuwān^{bb} hē^{bc}
kardan]*

“And he who kills, O Spitāmān
Zarḍušt, the demon tortoise
(*zārimangur*) who is vituperatively
called by people by the name
zairimīiāka [if they do not call
(him so), he is thereby less able to
do (this)]

Av.: *patitəm.^{bd} hē.^{be} manō. aṇhaṭ.
patitəm.^{bf} vacō. patitəm.^{bg}
šīiaoḍnəm.*

he shall (thus) have expiated (his
evil) thought, have expiated (his
evil) speech, have expiated (his
evil) deed;

PT: *patitihā^{bh} +ōy^{bi} menišnīb^j [hast]
patitihā^{bk} [†ōy^{bl}] gōwišn [hast^{bm}]
patitihā [†ōy^{bn}] kunišn [hast^{bo}
ciyōn ka tanāpuhl-ē^{bp} menišnīg^{bq}
ud^{br} gōwišnīg ud^{bs} kunišnīg pad*

26 See mss. K¹, ff. 147v, l. 12–148r, l. 9; B¹, ff. 184v, l. 11–185r, l. 12; M³, ff. 128r, l. 12–128v, l. 7; F¹⁰, f. 130r, ll. 1–14.

27 See mss. K¹, ff. 233r, l. 14–233v, l. 15; L⁴, ff. 190r, l. 8–191r, l. 6; B¹, ff. 294v, l. 12–295r, l. 1; M³, ff. 204v, l. 4–205r, l. 2.

*patit bawēd^{ab} [be wizārēd]
ā-š wināh^{ac} <ī> tanāpubl-ē be
kanēd^{ad} kirbag ōh ēstēd^{ae}
ōy-ez^{af} ēdōn^{ag}]*
he shall be [is]²⁸ (thus) redeemed
as regards (his) thought, shall
be [is] redeemed as regards (his)
speech, shall be [is] redeemed as
regards (his) action [so that he
who becomes redeemed from
a *tanāpubl* sin as regards (his)
thought, speech and action, (that
is), discharges (the sin), destroys
a sin <of> *tanāpubl*, so the merit
remains, thus it is];

Av.: *uzuuarštəm*.^{ah} *hē*.^{ai} *manō*.
aṇhaṭ. *uzuuarštəm*.^{aj} *vacō*.
uzuuarštəm.^{ak} *šiiāoḏnəm*.
he shall (thus) have made up for
(his evil) thought, have made up
for (his evil) speech, have made up
for (his evil) deed.”

PT: *ul⁺ōy^{al} warzīd menišn hast ul*
[⁺ōy^{am}] warzīd^{an} gōwišn^{ao} ul
[⁺ōy^{ap}] warzīd kunišn
thus he made up for (his) thought,
thus he made up for (his) speech,
thus he made up for (his) action.”

*patit bawēd^{bt} [kū be wizārēd^{bu}]
ā-š wināh^{bv} <ī> tanāpubl-ē be
kanēd^{bw} kirbag-ē^{bx} ōh ēstēd
ōy-ez^{by} ēdōn]*
his thought shall be [is] (thus)
redeemed, [his] speech shall be [is]
redeemed, [his] action shall be [is]
redeemed [so that when a *tanāpubl*
sinner becomes redeemed as
regards (his) thought, speech and
action, that is, discharges (the
sin), then he destroys a sin <of>
tanāpubl, so the merit remains,
thus it is];

Av.: *uzuuarštəm*.^{bz} *hē*.^{ca} *manō*.
aṇhaṭ. *uzuuarštəm*.^{cb} *vacō*.^{cc}
uzuuarštəm.^{cd} *šiiāoḏnəm*.
he shall (thus) have made up for
(his evil) thought, have made up
for (his evil) speech, have made up
for (his evil) deed.”

PT: *ul-warzīd⁺ōy^{ce} menišn hast^{cf}*
ul-warzīd [⁺ōy^{cs}] gōwišn
ul-warzīd [⁺ōy^{ch}] kunišn^{ci}...
he made up for (his) thought, he
made up for (his) speech, he made
up for (his) action.”

a K¹, B¹, M³: *yaṣaca*. b K¹, B¹, M³: *me*. c K¹, B¹, M³: *aētae.šqm*. et M³: s.l. sec. -a- scr.; F¹⁰: *aētae.šqm*. d F¹⁰: *auua.auuantəm*. e F¹⁰: *vikāniiāt*. f K¹, B¹, M³: *he*. g K¹, B¹, M³: MN; F¹⁰: MNW. h K¹, B¹, M³: OLEŠ'n; F¹⁰: OLEŠ'n' et Y add. i F¹⁰: 'nd om. j K¹: APALWNt' et sec. -A- del.; B¹, M³: APLWNt'; F¹⁰: APLWNšn'. k K¹, B¹, M³: *cygwn*; F¹⁰: cnd. l B¹: *pa(t)ətəm*; F¹⁰: *paititəm*. et s.l. -a- add. m K¹: *he*. n F¹⁰: *paitaitəm*. o F¹⁰: *paitaitəm*. p K¹: *ptytyh'h*; B¹, M³: *ptytyh'*. q K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; F¹⁰: OLE. r K¹, B¹, M³: *myšnnyk*; F¹⁰: *myšn'*. s K¹, B¹, M³: *AYT'* om.; F¹⁰: 'ytwn'. t K¹, B¹, M³: *ptytyh'*; F¹⁰: *ptytyh'*. u K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; F¹⁰: om. v K¹, B¹, M³: *gwbšnyk*; F¹⁰: *gwbšn'*. w K¹, B¹, M³: *ptytyh'*; F¹⁰: *ptytyh'*. x K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; F¹⁰: om. y K¹, B¹, M³: *kwnšnyk*; F¹⁰: *kwnšn'*. z K¹, B¹, M³: *cygwn*... *kwnšnyk* om. aa Mss.: PWN et F¹⁰: W praescr. ab K¹, B¹, M³: YHWWNt; F¹⁰: YHWWNyt. ac Mss.: *wn's* et M³: s.l. -s scr. ad K¹, M³, F¹⁰: APLWNyt et K¹: s.l. -N- scr.; B¹: APL(W)yt. ae Mss.: YKOYMWNYt et B¹: s.l. -O- scr. af K¹, B¹, M³: KNcy. ag Mss.: 'ytwn' et M³: s.l. -wn' scr. ah M³: *uzuuarāštəm*; F¹⁰: *uzuuarāštəm*. ai K¹: *he*. aj M³: *uzuuarāštəm*; F¹⁰: *uzuuarāštəm*. ak M³: *uzuuarāštəm*; F¹⁰: *uzuuarāštəm*. al Mss.: KN. am K¹, B¹, M³: OL; F¹⁰: om. an Mss.: *wlcyt* et B¹: s.l. -yt scr. ao K¹, B¹, M³: *AYT'* add. et K¹: del. ap K¹, B¹, M³: KN; F¹⁰: om.

28 The copula (viz. “is”) has been put into square brackets despite its apparent correspondence to Av. *aṇhaṭ*. because of the conjunctive copula being comprised within the form *patitihā* (see below).

aq B¹: *spātama*. ar K¹, B¹, M³: *daeum*. as M³: s.l. pr. -i- scr. et *nāma*. add. at L⁴: *mšyākām*. et -ām. del. et s.l. -a add. au B¹: *auuai*.; M³: *auua*. av Mss.: *aojaiiti*. aw K¹, B¹, M³: MNWc; L⁴: MNW et CE add. ax K¹, B¹, M³: *zltwšt'* et M³: s.l. -št' scr.; L⁴: *zltwhšt*. ay K¹, B¹, M³: 'w' znyt; L⁴: OL MHYTWNYt. az Mss.: *dwšgwbšnyh* et M³: s.l. -bšnyh scr. ba K¹, L⁴: *zairimiiāk*. bb L⁴: *twb'n'* om. bc K¹, L⁴: HWEyđ; B¹, M³: HWEđ. bd B¹, M³: *paititām*. be K¹, B¹, M³: *be*. bf L⁴: *patātām*.; B¹, M³: *paititām*. bg L⁴: *patitām*. et s.l. -i- add.; B¹, M³: *paititām*. bh K¹, L⁴, B¹: *ptytyh'*; M³: *pytyty*. bi K¹, B¹, M³: 'w'; L⁴: OLE et Y praescr. bj K¹, B¹, M³: *mynšn'*; L⁴: *mynšnyk*. bk K¹: *ptytykyh'*; L⁴, B¹, M³: *ptytyh'*. bl K¹, B¹, M³: KN; L⁴: om. bm K¹, B¹, M³: AYT'; L⁴: om. bn K¹, B¹: 'w'; M³: KN; L⁴: om. bo K¹: AYT'; L⁴, B¹, M³: om. et L⁴: s.l. PWN add. bp K¹, L⁴, B¹: *tn'pwhl-1*; M³: *tn'phl-1*. bq K¹, L⁴, B¹: *mynšnyk*; M³: *mynšn'yk* et s.l. -šn'yk scr. br K¹: W om. bs L⁴: W om. bt K¹: YHWNyt; L⁴, B¹, M³: YHWWNYt. bu K¹, B¹, M³: *wc'lyt'* et K¹, B¹: W praescr.; L⁴: *wc'lyt*. bv Mss.: *wn's* et B¹: *wn's* praescr. et del. bw K¹, B¹, M³: APLWNx; L⁴: APLWNYt. bx K¹, B¹, M³: *krpk-1* et B¹: s.l. -r- scr. et M³: s.l. -pk-1 scr.; L⁴: *krpk*. by K¹, B¹, M³: OLEc et K¹: W praescr.; L⁴: OLE. bz K¹: *uzuuar(š)/Jam*.; M³: *uzuuarāštām*. ca K¹, B¹, M³: *be*. cb M³: *uzuuarāštām*. cc K¹: *vaf.jō*. cd K¹: [...]*Jarštām*.; M³: *uzuuarāštām*. ce K¹, B¹, M³: KN; L⁴: s.l. 'w' scr. cf K¹, M³: AYT'; L⁴, B¹: AYT. cg K¹, B¹, M³: KN; L⁴: om. ch K¹, B¹, M³: KN; L⁴: om. ci K¹, B¹, L⁴: *kwnšn'*; M³: *kwnšnyh*.

It is quite evident that the last passages of the two fragments (i.e. those beginning with Av. *uzuuarāštām*/Phl. *ul* (ōy) *warzīd*) are parallel to the preceding ones beginning with Av. *patitām*/Phl. *patitihā*. Phl. *ul* (ōy) *warzīd* (a calque of Av. *uzuuarāštām*. *hē*.) 'he made up for, compensated' is thus a counterpart of *patitihā*, i. e. their syntactic role is one and the same. Put differently, the form *patitihā*, which can apparently be understood either as an adverb or as a collective plural, functions in the present context as a past participle combined with the indicative copula AYT'/*hast* erroneously translating Avestan conjunctive *aṇhaṭ*. This gives rise to the question how such a peculiar rendering could have been caused in this particular case. A possible explanation is that actually *patitihā* is not an adverb, but a combination of the adjective *patitīg* (or substantive *patitih*) with the conjunctive 3rd pers.sg. form *hā(y)* of the verb 'to be' (cf. the alternation of the readings 'mhrspnd HWEyt(')/*amahraspand hēd* and 'mhrspndyt/*amahraspand-ēd* in different mss. of Ny 1.4.1 = Y 0.5.1 = Y 11.18.1 (see Commentary, § 10, p. 201, nn. i and j). The coexistence of the varieties ⟨ptytyh'⟩, ⟨ptytyh'š⟩, ⟨ptytyh'y⟩ and ⟨ptytyh'h⟩ (see above) is thus due to the well-known hesitation in the ending of the copula in conjunctive (see e.g. MOLČANOVA/RASTORGUEVA 1981, p. 110), and should not lead to confusion. The indicative form AYT'/*hast* rendering Avestan conjunctive *aṇhaṭ*.²⁹ can thus

29 The Pahlavi copula is omitted in the oldest mss. of V 7.51 (see n. s, p. 21). Its being a secondary addition follows also from the fact that in the following passage it is used pleonastically with the past participle 3rd pers.sg. *ul-warzīd* (~ Av. *uzuuarāštām*), which can only be explained through the tendency to apply the word-by-word translation technique consistently. The next layer of the Pahlavi text is represented by the copula repeated twice in V 13.7: *patitihā* *ōy *menišn* [*hast*] *patitihā* [*ōy] *gōwišn* [*hast*...]. Dr. M.A. ANDRÉS TOLEDO has drawn my attention to an additional instance of an

be accounted for as a relatively late interpolation, which was probably made when the discrimination of the Avestan moods had been lost. This assumption goes quite well with the conclusion by CANTERA (2004, p. 296) that the Avestan conjunctive is in general rendered with the corresponding Pahlavi forms, but a tendency can be observed of widening the range of use of the Pahlavi indicative against the conjunctive in the course of the transmission of the Pahlavi Translation of the Avesta.

If we would assume that Phl. ⟨ptyt⟩ was borrowed directly from Av. *pa(i)tita-*, we would expect it to function as a participle (ptyt/**padīd*), which is not the case: both in the Pahlavi Commentary to the *Vīdēvdād* and elsewhere in Pahlavi literature *patit* is a substantive frequently preceded by the preposition *pad*. The meaning of the locution *pad patit* is obviously identical with that of the artificial³⁰ derivative *patitīg*, which provided the background for the translation (see above), and must be reconstructed as ‘(being) redeemed’.

In contrast to Phl. *patit*, which did probably not yet function as an independent term in the time of the emergence of the Pahlavi Translation of the *Vīdēvdād* and could therefore not be used as a “natural” equivalent of Av. *pa(i)tita-* for morphological reasons (see above), Phl. *apatit* occurring in PV 15.1 is a typical transcription (< Av. *apatita-*):

V 15.1³¹

Av.: *caiti. tā.^a šīiaoθna.varšta. yā. aḡbuš.^b astuuā. vərəziieiti.^c*

“How many are those acts that a corporeal being commits,

PT: *cand awēšān^d kunišnān^e warzišn kē [andar] axw ī astōmand warzānd [kū kunānd^f]*

“How many are those commitments of (sinful) deeds, which people commit [that is, do] in the corporeal world,

Av.: *fraēta.^g apatita. anuzuuaršta.^h*
done unexpiated, not made up for,

PT: *[ka] frañāft [kū kard] apatit [kū-š nē pad patit] an-ul-warzīd [kū nē wizārd ēstēd]*
[if (these people)] promoted [that is, did (them)], (that go) unredeemed [that is, not expiated] did not make up for (them) [that is, have not discharged (them)],

Av.: *aḡbaṭ.ⁱ haca. +šīiaoθnāuuarəza.^j aḡa. bauuainṭi.^k pəšō.tanuua.*

so that the committers are thereby surrendering themselves (*pəšō.tanū-*)?”

Avestan adjective rendered into Pahlavi by means of an apparently adverbial form: Av. *ratufriš* ~ *ratīhā* (*Nērangestān*, passim). Whether this case belongs with the issue of *patitīhā* is a matter of further investigation.

30 Under the artificial nature of Phl. *patitīg* I mean its being probably “derived” not from Phl. *patit*, which occurs exclusively in the Pahlavi Commentary of the *Vīdēvdād* and not in the Pahlavi Translation, but immediately from Av. *pa(i)tita-*.

31 See mss. K¹, ff. 259r, l. 11–259v, l. 5; L⁴, f. 215v, ll. 7–15; B¹, f. 324r, ll. 4–13; M³, f. 225v, ll. 7–16.

PT: *az ān [ān^l] kunišn-warz ēdōn bawēnd tanāpuhl^m [bawēd kaⁿ dēn bawēd ka margarzān]*

so that [these] committers are thereby surrendering themselves (*tanāpuhl*)? [It occurs that the verdict is (that they are) *margarzān*].”

a B¹, M³: *caititā*. b B¹, M³: *aphōuš*. c B¹, M³: *varəzaieiti*. d K¹: OLEšⁿ; L⁴: OLEšⁿ; B¹, M³: OLEšⁿ. e K¹: kwnšⁿ; L⁴: kwnšⁿ; B¹, M³: kwšⁿ. f Mss.: OBYDWN_{X1}. g L⁴: *faēšta*. et sec. m. -š- del. h M³: *anuzunarəšta*. i L⁴: *aybaṭ*. j K¹, B¹, M³: *šīiaoṭna.varəza*; L⁴: *šīiaoṭna.varəza*. k L⁴: *bauuaiti*; B¹, M³: *bauuanti*. l Mss.: ZK et W praescr. et L⁴: OD add. m Mss.: tn^lpuhl et M³: s.l. -p- scr. n Mss.: AMT et L⁴: s.l. Y praescr.

Both the secondary gloss to *pad patit bawēd*, interpolated in the Pahlavi commentary to V 7.51 and 13.7, viz. (*kū*) *be wizārēd*, and the primary gloss to *an-ul-warzīd*, viz. *kū nē wizārēd ēstēd* “that is, have not discharged” (V 15.1), testify to the fact that not only the main body of the Pahlavi *Vīdēvdād* but also the commentary treats the notions of *pad patit* and *ul-warzīd* as terms referring to certain aspects of practical expiation of one’s sin rather than to ‘confession’ or ‘repentance’. The same holds true for the only occurrence of Av. *apatita-* outside the *Vīdēvdād*, viz. in *Nērangestān* 36.5 (54) (TD, ff. 74v, l. 14–75r, l. 5; HJ, f. 109v, ll. 5–14; G⁴², f. 134v, ll. 1–9; KOTWAL/KREYENBROEK 2003, pp. 156–157):

N 36.5 (54)

Av.: *tada. yaṭ. paiti.barənti* + *yā*.^a *arədušaṭ*. + *apatitaṭ*.^b *ājayaruua*.

“Then, when they offer (to the *Ratus*) those (cows) which one has taken for an unexpiated *arəduša-* sin.”³²

PT: *ēdōn kē abar arduš <ī> apatitīg grift [hād arduš-ē ō bun būd ēstēd kē dādwar wizīr kard frēzbān dād +patitih^c abāg u-š yāt-ē andar ō bun būd <ud> yāt dādwar wizīr kard frēzbān dād u-š kār +ēd^d bawēd kū pad patit bawēd pādixšāy ka-š abāg nē dahēd]*

“So (also) that taken for an unexpiated *arduš* sin [may it be (so when) an *arduš* sin has accrued to (one’s) account, (for) which a judge made a decision (that it is obligatory) to give (cattle and to perform) an atonement in addition (to this); and one by whom a *yāt* (sin) accrued to the account, <and> a judge made a decision (as regards) the *yāt* (sin) (that it is obligatory) to give (cattle), while his (i.e. the sinner’s) deed is that he becomes atoned, (then it is) permitted that he does not give (cattle) in addition (to the atonement)].”

a Mss.: *yā*. b Mss.: *apaiti.taṭ*. (note the error in KOTWAL/KREYENBROEK 2003, p. 156, n. 810). c TD: pytytyk; HJ: pytytyk et s.l. -tyk scr.; G⁴²: pytytyk. KOTWAL/KREYENBROEK 2003, p. 156: **petitigih*[?]. d Mss.: *y*.

It is worth noting that, in contrast to V 15.1, Av. *apatita-* in N 36.5 (54) is translated with Phl. *apatitīg*, i.e. with a derivative of Phl. *patitīg* ‘penitent’, and not with the borrowed form *apatit* (< Av. *apatita-*).

The following passage elucidates the meaning of this ‘payment’ or ‘discharge’:

32 For the meaning of Av. *arəduša-/Phl. arduš* see Commentary, §30.

V 18.68³³

Av.: *kaṭ. a aiñhe. b asti. c paititiš. d kaṭ. aiñhe. e asti. āpərətiš. f kaṭ. aētahe. g paiti. varšta. h šiiāoṣna. i ciciṣṣā. j azaēta. k*

“What is <his> expiation, what is his punishment, what should he take upon himself for the acts committed, when he has meditated (them)?”

PT: *kadār <ān> hast tōzišn [pad xwāstag] kadār¹ ān^m hastⁿ puhl [ī^o pad^p aštar +ud^q srōšōcaranām^r] ciyōn ān ī pad ān kunišn warzišn tōzišn rawēnēd^s [kū ciyōn be wizārād^t]*

“What is his atonement [by property], what is his punishment [by whip and *srōšōcaranām*], how does he carry out (lit.: ‘makes proceed’) the atonement for the committed act [that is, how would he discharge (it)]?”

a L⁴: n- praescr.; M³: in marg. *kaṭ... paitiṣ*. scr. b Bh¹¹: *aiñhē*. c L⁴: p- praescr. et del.; Bh¹¹: *pait-* praescr. et del. d K¹, B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: *paitiṣ*. e L⁴: s.l. -ñ- add.; Bh¹¹: *aiñhē*. f K¹: *āp(ər)[.](t)[.](š)*. g Bh¹¹: *aētē*. h K¹: *v(aršt)a*; L⁴: *varšta*; M³: v- praescr. i K¹: *šii(a)o(ṣna)*. j K¹: *[.](ciṣṣā)*. k K¹, B¹: *azaita*; M³: *azaiti*. l L⁴, Bh¹¹: W praescr. m K¹, B¹, M³: ‘n’ et K¹: s.l. scr.; L⁴, Bh¹¹: OL. n K¹, B¹, M³: *twcšn’ PWN* add. o Bh¹¹: Y om. p Mss.: PWN et M³ s.l. scr. q K¹, B¹, M³: W om.; L⁴, Bh¹¹: Y. r K¹, B¹, M³: *slwšcln’m*; L⁴, Bh¹¹: *slwšwcln’m*. s Mss.: SGYTWNynyt et L⁴: W praescr. t K¹, L⁴, B¹, M³: *wc’l’t*; Bh¹¹: *wc’lyt*.

The most significant information to be drawn from this passage is that in this particular case (Av. *paititi-*/Phl. *tōzišn*) the most typical strategies of rendering Avestan legal terms into Pahlavi by means of either transcription, cognate or borrowing are discarded in favour of a translation using a semantic equivalent with no regard to etymology (cf. Av. *patita-*/Phl. *patitihā*, see above). This fact adds evidence to the above suggestion that the term *patit*, occurring in Pahlavi literature both independently and (more frequently) in the set phrases *pad patit h-* and *pad patit būdan*, cannot be regarded as borrowed immediately from an Avestan source. As an appellative, it cannot be brought into line with the participle *patita-* which, as we have seen, is regularly translated by Phl. *patitihā*. Nor can it be treated as merely borrowed from the appellative *paititi-*, for the latter has another Pahlavi equivalent, viz. *tōzišn* ‘atonement’. I am inclined to think that the meaning of Phl. *patit* cannot be deduced from the semantics of its Avestan cognates. If reconstructed on the basis of the context (first of all, of the Pahlavi *Vidēvdād*, with the other Pahlavi texts taken into account), it turns out to refer to the subjective state of a person trying to redeem himself, rather than to an objective atonement in the way of a compensation paid or a punishment received.

The difference between the locutions *pad patit h-* (\approx *patit kardan*) and *pad patit būdan* (\approx *patit kard būdan*) is of importance here. To my mind, some texts (such as the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* accompanying the *Dādestān ī dēnīg*, *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī xrad*, etc.) suggest that they refer to two stages of the redemption process, depending on the semantics of either verb. The latter pair of locutions

33 See mss. K¹, f. 303r, ll. 6–13; L⁴, f. 259v, ll. 4–10; B¹, ff. 382r, l. 11–382v, l. 4; Bh¹¹, ff. 231v, l. 10–232r, l. 4; M³, f. 261v, ll. 3–9.

designates an accomplished redemption, whereas the former one corresponds to the stage of its inception and progression. For illustration, the following passages of the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* accompanying *Dādestān ī dēnīg* (see DHABHAR 1913, pp. 43–45) may be compared with each other:

PRDd 15b3

mardōmān pad be widērišnūh patit pēš <ī> ōy abāyēd kardan kē-š dād zand warm ud az wināh ud kirbag āgahtar u-š wināh ēk ēk be abāyēd ōšmurdan

“At the (time of) death, people must do penance before someone who (knows) by heart the interpretation of the law and (is) better acquainted with (the matter of) sins and meritorious deeds, and they must narrate to him (their) sins one by one.”

PRDd 15d1

mard ī andar se rōz az hamāg wināh ī-š kard pad xwurdag pad patit bawēd <ud> be wizārēd <ud> pas kāmagihā did-ez ān wināh ōh kunēd ēg-eš hamāg se wāy abāz ō bun bawēd

“A man who within three days does penance (i. e. becomes redeemed thereby, D. B.) <and> minutely pays for every sin that he committed <and> afterwards deliberately commits those sins in the same way again, (will see) all three woes return to his account.”

PRDd 15d3

būd dastwar kē-š guft kū az abestāg ēdōn paydāg kū ka gōwēd kū ēw-kardagihā az hamag wināh ī-m jast pad patit hēm ē patit kard bawēd

“There was an authority who said: ‘It is evident from the Avesta that if (one) says: ‘I do penance (i. e. want to redeem, D. B.) once (and forever) for all the sins which occurred with me (i. e. which I committed unintentionally, D. B.),’ (then) may he have done the penance (i. e. his penance will be taken for redemption, D. B.).’”

The aspect of incompleteness and of the wish to accomplish the act of redemption is particularly manifest in all the *patit* texts, where the locution *pad patit hēm* is used consistently. The translation “I do penance” (as against “(one) becomes redeemed” for *pad patit bawēd*) seems thus to be the best.

On the other hand, the majority of texts, such as the above fragment of *Šāyast nē-Šāyast* (ŠnŠ 8.5–7), as well as its continuation (ŠnŠ 8.8) which will be considered below, do not admit of translating *pad patit būdan* as ‘becoming redeemed’. In contrast to the Pahlavi *Rivāyat*, most Pahlavi sources concerning the subject of sin and redemption give the set phrase *pad patit būdan* a decided preference over all other locutions involving Phl. *patit*. The lack of a counterpart like *pad patit h-* or *patit kardan* blurs subtle semantic distinctions. The most general meaning applicable to any of the above locutions (viz. “to do penance”) thus takes precedence, and the aspect of ‘repentance’ supersedes that of ‘atonement’. The corresponding exegetic trend covers, apart from the *Šāyast nē-Šāyast*, *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī xrad*, some fragments of the *Dēnkard* and even some passages of the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* (thus testifying to the heterogeneous nature of this source) and demonstrates the tendency to reinterpret the notion of redemption as a sort of confession almost in a Christian spirit (see below).

Nevertheless, the Avestan idea of practical atonement (i. e. corporal punishment or pecuniary penalty) remains in the background for the mainstream of Pahlavi exegesis. This fact is reflected in the adjustment of *patit* to the “Zoroastrian triad” (“good thought, good speech, good action”). Cf. e. g. the following passage of *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī xrad* (K⁴³, f. 169r, ll. 7–12):

DMx 53.7–8

[7] *ud agar pargast andar yazdān ī mēnōgān ud gētīgān ud mardōmān ud stōrān ud gāwān ud gōspandān ud sagān ud sag-sardagān ud abārig dām ud dahišn ī ohrmazd ī xwadāy wināh-ē ayāb frōdmānd-ē jast* [8] *pēš ī xwarxšēd <ud> mihr ud māh ud ātaxš ī ohrmazd abaxš ud *pašēmān^a ud pad *patit^b būdan*

“[7] And if heaven forbid a sin or a malice against the spiritual and material *yazatas*, people, beasts of burden, oxen, sheep, dogs and the dog species, and other creatures and creations of Ohrmazd the lord has occurred, [8] (one should) **be contrite, repentant and do penance** before the sun, Mihr, the moon and the fire of Ohrmazd.”

a Ms.: pšm'n. b pytyt'.

It is quite evident that the threefold set phrase *abaxš ud pašēmān ud pad patit būdan* is an indivisible unit corresponding to the “Zoroastrian triad”: *abaxš* designates mental contrition (*menišn*), *pašēmān* implies verbal repentance (*gōwišn*), and *patit* refers to the penitential ceremony or redemption in practice (*kunišn*). A somewhat different correlation is found in *Dēnkard*:

Dk 3.14.2 (DkM 14.8–20 = DkB 10.21–11.7)

*hād rāh^a ī ō dušaxw pad rēmanīh ī ruwān az wināh wizārišn^b ud yōjdahrih <i> darmān ī az wināh andar weh-dēn ōšmurišn u-š dastwar <i> ruwān bizešk āgāhīh *waxšīgtar^c kū dārūn <i> abārig harw wēmārih andar pēšag ī tuwān <i> bizeškīh ud āgāhīh ī ān tan bizešk rēman ud ālūdag ī pad wināh ruwān ka abāg pašēmanīh ī menišnīg ud abaxšīh ī gōwišnīg-ez az wināh patit ī kunišnīg az weh-dēn dastwarīh <ud> framāyišn ī az weh-dēn dastwar ruwān bizešk ciyōn wizārd^d bawēd kard ruwān az wināh rēmanīh ud ālūdagīh *yōjdādrēnīhist^e rāh ī az dušaxw ōwōn *brīd^f bawēd*

“May it be (set forth as follows). The way to hell is through impurity of the soul. The redemption from sins and purification <which> (is) a remedy against sins (lie) in studying the Good Religion, and its authority <as regards> the knowledge of soul treatment (is) more profitable than (any) drug (used) against all the other maladies in the strong guild <of> physicians and than the knowledge of a body-doctor. (Being) impure and polluted by the sin, the soul, when becomes redeemed with **regret (by) thought, (with) repentance (by) speech, (with) redemption from the sins (by) action** in accordance with the authority of the Good Religion <and> (with) engagement of a soul-doctor (appointed) by the authority of the Good Religion, the soul (has been) purified from the impurity and pollution (caused) by the sin, so the way to (lit.: ‘from’) hell becomes cut off...”

a Ms.: iter. b Ms.: W praescr. c Ms.: whš'yktl. d Ms.: wc'ltn' et Y add. e Ms.: ywšd'slynytyhstn'. f Ms.: PSKWNYt.

Evidently, the first two elements of the “repentance formula” (i.e. *abaxš(īh)* and *pašēmān(īh)*) can be interchanged, associating one or the other with *menišn* ‘thought’ or *gōwišn* ‘speech’. It is, however, the relationship *patit* ‘redemption’ ~ *kunišn* ‘deed, action’ that remains invariant, a fact that makes it impossible to view the term *patit* as referring to a specific text (cf. ASMUSSEN 1965, p. 53) and to translate the locutions *pad patit h-* and *pad patit būdan* as ‘to confess’ (as e.g. in BOYCE 1975, pp. 319–321; WILLIAMS 1990, I, p. 328; II, pp. 27–30).³⁴

Considering the above passage, ASMUSSEN suggests an interaction of the “Zoroastrian triad” with the Christian scheme of penance (attritio + contritio – confessio – satisfactio). However impressive this conjecture may seem, the similarity noticed by ASMUSSEN should rather be accounted for by the legalism characteristic of both Zoroastrianism and scholastic Catholicism, which naturally eventuated in similar institutions. The Catholic formula “contritio cordis – confessio oris – satisfactio operis” originates in the Thomistic strand of Catholic thought and was first used by Pope Eugenius IV in his “Decretum pro Armenis”, issued during the Council of Florence as late as 1439. The style of Eastern Christian dogmatic theology is entirely different, and no hint of the threefold “*quasi materia*” of penance can be found in the writings of the Eastern Fathers. Whatever the date of the *patit* texts, the occurrence of the analogous formula in the *Dēnkard* rules out any kind of influence. However, the general idea of this exegesis, namely the healing nature of penance, seems to point to some sort of interaction with Christianity in a much more convincing fashion than any superficial similarity of the formulae could do.³⁵ Thus, St. Gregorius Nyssenus, discussing the imposition of penances (ἐπιτιμία) in his *Epistula canonica ad Letoium* writes:

[00009] Ὡσπερ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σωματικῆς θεραπέιας, ὁ μὲν σκοπὸς τῆς ἱατρικῆς εἰς ἔστι, τὸ ὑγιαίνει τὸν κάμνοντα [00010] τὸ δὲ εἶδος τῆς ἐπιμελείας διάφορον [00011] κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ποικιλίαν τῶν ἀρρώστημάτων καταλλήλως καὶ ἡ θεραπευτικὴ μέθοδος ἐκάστῳ τῶν νοσημάτων προσάγεται [00012] οὕτω πολλῆς οὔσης καὶ

34 As we will see, the refrain *menišnīg ud gōwišnīg ud kunišnīg abaxš (pad) pašēmān pad patit hēm* “regarding thought, speech and action, being contrite (and) repentant I do penance” serves also as a penitential formula in *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I and *Xwad patit*, while the two Pahlavi versions of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* II introduce into it changes caused by linguistic development leading to a loss of important ideological ties and intertextual relationships (see Commentary).

35 Still, the notion of redemption in Christianity is quite different from the one in Zoroastrianism. Any closeness between Sasanian Zoroastrianism and Eastern (especially Syriac) Christianity can therefore be traced only to the level of canonic law and has nothing to do with dogmatic theology. As for the Christian sources that might be examined with respect to their possible influence on Pahlavi literature, the most relevant are *Epistula canonice ad Amphiloichium* by St. Basil the Great and *Epistula canonica ad Letoium* by St. Gregory of Nyssa.

ἐν τῇ ψυχικῇ νόσῳ τῆς τῶν παθῶν ποικιλίας, ἀναγκαίως πολυειδῆς γενήσεται ἡ θεραπευτικὴ ἐπιμέλεια, πρὸς λόγον τοῦ πάθους ἐνεργοῦσα τὴν ἴασιν... [00140] Πανταχοῦ καὶ ἐν πλημμελήματος εἶδει τοῦτο καθορᾶν προσήκει πρὸ πάντων, οἷα ἐστὶ τοῦ θεραπευομένου διάθεσις, μὴ τὸν χρόνον οἶσθαι πρὸς θεραπείαν ἀρκεῖν. [00141] τίς γὰρ ἂν ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου ἴασις γένοιτο; [00142] ἀλλὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν τοῦ ἑαυτὸν δι' ἐπιστροφῆς ἱατρεύοντος.

“[00009] For just as by bodily therapy the focus of healing is one: curing a patient, [00010] whereas the mode of the treatment is variable [00011] for because of the diversity of the diseases, to each one of the maladies (a certain) therapeutic method is applied [00012] so because of the great diversity of passions in the mental disorder, the therapeutic treatment necessarily becomes diversified, producing the cures in accordance with (the kind of) passion. [00140] And in every kind of fault one ought first of all to observe what is the disposition of the patient, (and) not to consider the time sufficient for the therapy, [00141] (for what cure may emerge from the time?) [00142] but the (free) will of the one who heals himself by conversion.”³⁶

The association of ‘redemption’ (*patit*) with a ‘change of mind’ (*abaxših* or *pašēmānīh*) and its ‘declaration’ (also *pašēmānīh* or *abaxših*, depending on the particular text, see above) indicates that, as we said before, a process of reframing the notion of ‘redemption’ and of its approximation to that of ‘confession’ took place. Especially illustrative to this effect is the fragment PRDd 15e1–15e3 (see DHABHAR 1913, p. 45):³⁷

PRDd 15e1

az abestāg paydāgēnīd kū ēn harw se abāyēd kardan abaxših ud āškāragih ud patitīgih

“It is known from the Avesta that one must do all three (things): contrition, confession and redemption.”

PRDd 15e2

ud abaxših ān ka pad menišn abaxš bawēd

“And contrition (is) that when (one) becomes contrite in thought.”

36 It seems to me highly symptomatic that St. Gregory, unambiguously speaking about penances, uses the term ἐπιτίμιον only four times [00073], [00139], [00135] and [00087], preferring the metaphor θεραπεία ‘healing, therapy’ and its derivatives instead. It is also worth noting that the notion ἐπιστροφή ‘conversion, passage’ functions as a synonym of μετάνοια ‘repentance’ (e.g. [00007] ...διὰ τῆς μετανοίας τε καὶ ἐπιστροφῆς ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὴν ζῶσαν ὁδόν... “...through repentance and the turning back from the dead deeds onto the path of life”) and is used more than four times as often as μετάνοια. As will be shown below, such a closeness of the notions ‘repentance’ and ‘conversion’ has a direct analogy in Zoroastrianism and is therefore of much interest for the present discussion.

37 WILLIAMS (1990, I, p. 84f.; II, p. 30) arbitrarily distorts the transliteration, transcription and translation of this passage: he emends 3/se into 2/dō and reads *āškāragih i patitīgih* ‘avowal, i.e. confession’ instead of *āškāragih ud patitīgih* given in all the mss. used by DHABHAR.

PRDd 15e3

*ud āškāragih ān bawēd ka šarm tar sar abāz abganēd ud wināh ī-š kard ēstēd ēk
ēk pēš ī rat ud dastwar gōwēd <ud> pad patit bawēd*

“And confession is that when one takes the shame repeatedly³⁸ upon (one’s) head³⁹ and declares the sins which one has committed one by one before a chief and authority, and becomes redeemed.”

Here again we come across the threefold scheme “contrition – confession – redemption”, known to us from *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī xrad*, *Dēnkard* and the *patit* texts. However, the act of redemption (*pad patit bawēd*) is mentioned in such a way that one can easily imagine that it did not necessarily involve any kind of atonement but was a natural result of a sincere confession in the presence of a religious authority.

In order to better understand the mechanism and inner logic of this development, some further fragments of the *Vīdēvdād*, together with the relevant passages of the *Dēnkard* and the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* will now be considered. The following passages refer to a woman drinking water after miscarriage, which is exactly the sort of case in which the punishment might be commuted or transferred to another person:

V 7.71⁴⁰

Av.: *āaṭ. mraoṭ. ^a ahurō. mazdā. huuarāṭ.*

“Then Ahura Mazda said: ‘May she drink’.

PT: *u-š guft ohrmazd [kū ēd^b] xwarād*

“And Ohrmazd said: ‘May she drink [it]’.

Av.: *auuaṭ. ^{+hē.} asti. masiiō. arəθəm. yaṭ. uštānəm. bunjaiiāṭ.*

It is her major concern, that she should save (her) life.

PT: *[cē] ēdōn ōy hast meḥ dādestānih^d ka ān gyān bōzēd*
[because] thus she has more reason, if she saves (her) life.

38 Lit.: ‘back, again’, Phl. *abāz*.

39 WILLIAMS (1990, p. 84) emends Phl. LCTr/**tar* (mss. BK, J: LQDr; MR¹: LDr, see DHABHAR 1909, p. 45, n. 17) as l’d/rāy. The present reading is but an approximation; cf., however, a passage of *Rivāyat ī Ēmēd ī Ašawahištān* (ms. TD², f. 297, ll. 7–10; ANKLESARIA 1962, p. 107f.; SAFA-ISFEHANI 1980, p. 199f.; KÖNIG 2010, p. 296) concerning a penitent *margarzān*-sinner (sodomite), in which a similar expression (“to take upon oneself”, lit.: “to take on one’s head”) is used: RĒA 29.4: *be agar pēš ratān ^{+mānīdag} griyēd menišnīhā az im wināh <pad> patit bawēd tan ^{+ō} pādīfrāh ī tōzišn abespāred agar-eš pad sar pādīfrāh girēd ēg-eš gētīgīhā wizārd* “But if he bewails (his) crime before the chiefs, he becomes redeemed from this sin (as regards) the spiritual world. He delivers (his) body for the atoning punishment; if he takes upon himself (lit.: ‘upon (his) head’) the punishment, then he has discharged (his sin) in the material world.” The existing translations of this passage, i.e. “...si on reçoit le châiment (en payant) de sa tête (*pat sar*)” (DE MENASCE 1962, p. 86); “...if his retribution reaches its uttermost (*pad sar*)” (SAFA-ISFEHANI 1980, p. 200); “wenn seine Bestrafung zu Ende geht” (KÖNIG 2010, p. 296) seem to me less satisfying.

40 See mss. K¹, ff. 153v, l. 3–154r, l. 9; B¹, ff. 192v, l. 5–193r, l. 13; M³, ff. 133r, l. 4–133v, l. 7.

Av.: *para. +kahmāi.^c +atciṭ.^f +dahmanqm.^g +dahmāhu.^h vaēdāhu. +dahmaca.ⁱ ašauuanasca.*

From somebody of the pious community members, (who are) the righteous and pious (men expert) in the pious institutions⁴¹

PT: *be <az> kadār-ez-ēⁱ az dahmān [ī dēndārān +ōy^k] dahmān [ī dastwar kē] āgāh [kū <pad>] dahmīh <ud> ablawīh [ī^l dahmīh dastwar]*

From (the hands of) somebody of the pious community members [religious (men, that is) those authoritative] laymen, [who (are)] wise [that is, <in>] piety <and> righteousness [authoritative (as regards the matters of) piety]

Av.: *ada.^m aēša. nāirika. zastō.mitīm. āpəm. frajuharāt.ⁿ*

may then this woman drink a palmful of water.

PT: *ēdōn ān nāyrīg tuwānīgīh^o āb xward^p [hē^q]*

[may] thus this woman drink fortifying⁴² water.

Av.: *āat. vō. yūžəm. yōi. mazdaiiasna. ciḍqm. +frāḍβərəsaēta.^r*

Then you, who (are) Māzdayasnians, must set forth your atonement.

PT: *ān ī ašmā [rāy kū tā nē bawād^s wināh ō bun] ašmā kē māzdēsna [hēd ā-š] tōzišn^t frāz brēhēnēd [kū-š wināh pādīfrāh be^u gōwēd]*

You, who [are] Māzdayasnians, set forth [for] yourself [to the end that there not become a sin on the account] an atonement [for her] [that is, determine a punishment for her sin].

Av.: *aoptō. ratuš. aoptō. sraošaunuarəzō. ciḍqm. frāḍβərəsaiti.*

The chief (*ratu-*) being appealed to, the executor (*sraošaunuarəza-*) being appealed to prescribes the (kind of) the atonement.”

PT: *[ān <ī>] guft rat [kū dastwar dārēd] guft srošāwarz [kū wināh^v garzēd ā-š] tōzišn^w frāz^x ē brēhēnēd [kū-š wināh pādīfrāh be^y ēd gōwēd]*

[(In accordance with) what] the chief (*rat*) said [that is: ‘Keep the commandments!’], (what) the executor (*srošāwarz*) said [that is, ‘Confess the sins!’] – (that) atonement you should set forth for her [that is, determine this punishment for her sin].”⁴³

a B¹, M³: *mraot. aburō. mazdā^ā. om.* b K¹: s.l. HNA scr. c Mss.: *be.* d Mss.: msDYNAYh.
e K¹: *kaṃāi.*; B¹, M³: *parakaṃāi.* f Mss.: *adciṭ.* g Mss.: *daṃanqm.* h Mss.: *daṃāhu.*

41 The use of the nominative (*dahmaca. ašauuanasca*) suggests that the phrase *dahmāhu. vaēdāhu. dahmaca. ašauuanasca.* should be regarded as an Avestan gloss to *dahmanqm.*

42 The translation of Av. *zastō.mitīm.* ‘handful, palmful’ (in most mss. *zastō.maitīm.*, *zastō. maiti* etc., see GELDNER 1896, p. 56) through Phl. *tuwānīgīh* ‘fortifying’ is obviously a result of its erroneous interpretation as a feminine form of **zastamant-* and of its being merged with *zastauuaitīm* ‘tatkraftig, fem.’ (BARTHOLOMAE 1904, col. 1686). The error might have been facilitated by the productive MP suffix *-ōmand*. ASMUSSEN (1965, p. 48) claims that “...tuvānikīh... was interpreted as a characteristic of *nairīk*”, and builds his argument on this false premise.

43 Cf. BT, Yoma 82a: *mšnh:* ‘wbrh šhryhbh m’kylyn wth d štšyb npšh hwlb “p bqy’yn w’m y’n šm bqy’yn m’kylyn wtw d šy’mr dy || gmr’: t’r wbrh šhryhbh bsr qwdš w bsr hzyr twbhyn lh kwš brwtb wmnhyhyn lh l pyb m ntyšbh d’tb mwṭb w’m l’w m’kylyn wth rwṭb šmw w’m ntyšbh d’tb mwṭb w’m l’w m’kylyn šmw š’yn lb dkr š’wmd bpny pqwḥ npš hwš m”z wgyṭwy r’wyt wšpykwē dmym “Mishnahh: If a woman with child smelts, she must be given to eat until she feels restored. A sick person is fed at the word of experts. And if no experts are there, one feeds him at his own wish until he says: ‘Enough’. ||

i K¹: *damasca.*; B¹: *dahmasca.*; M³: *damasca.* j Mss.: ktlcHD et M³: s.l. HD scr. k Mss.: OL. I B¹, M³: Y om. m B¹, M³: *aḍa.* om. n M³: *fraṇuḥarāt.* et s.l. -u- scr. o M³: twb'nykyh et s.l. -ykyh scr. p K¹: OŠTENT; B¹, M³: OŠDENT. q K¹, B¹: HWEyd; M³: HWE'. r Mss.: *frāḍβarəsaiti.* s Mss.: YHWWN't et M³: s.l. -t scr. t Mss.: twcšn' et M³: s.l. -šn' scr. u Mss.: BRA et M³: s.l. -A scr. v B¹, M³: wzys. w Mss.: twcšn' et M³: s.l. -šn' scr. x M³: b praescr. et del. y Mss.: BRA et M³: s.l. -A scr.

V 7.72⁴⁴

Av.: *kā. +abe.^a asti. ciḍa.*

“What is the atonement therefor?”

PT: *kadār ān hast tōzišn*

“What is this atonement?”

Av.: *āaṭ. mraoṭ.^b ahurō. mazdā.^a aētabe.^c paiti. pəšō.tanuiie. duiie. +saite.^d upāzananām.^c upāzōiṭ.¹ aspabe. aštraia. duiie. +saite.^g sraošō.^h caranaia.*

Then Ahura Mazda said: “The (atonement) for this (deed) is that of surrendering himself (*pəšō.tanū-*): may one inflict (upon him) two hundred stripes with a horsewhip, two hundred with the Sraošō.caranā’.”

PT: *u-š guftiⁱ ohrmazd kū pad ānī ī +ōy^k tanāpublīgānīh^l dō sad pad abar zanišnīh^m abar zanišn aspⁿ aštar dō sad +srōšōcaranām^o [ka nē atuwānīgīh <ī> ziyānag^p rāy hē^q ā paydāg bawē^r kū kē kasān rāy^s pad patit bawēd ā-š patitīh^t-kār aburnāyag ī šaš sālag rāy az abestāg paydāg ka-š pid pad patitīh ā šāyēd yezi. aēšqm. ptarō. +iṣarō.^uštāitiia.]*

And Ohrmazd said: ‘For her self-surrender guilt (*tanāpublīgānīh*) she is to be lashed two hundred times with the horsewhip (and with) two hundred *srōšōcaranām* [be it (so) except pursuant the incapability <of> the young woman (to endure the punishment);⁴⁵ (then) may it be clear that he who atones for the sake of another – may he perform the act of redemption.⁴⁶ For a six-year old child, it is known from the Avesta that if his father redeems him, (this) is allowed: “If their fathers immediately...”].’”

a K¹: *be.*; B¹: *kāhe.*; M³: *kāhē.* b B¹: *maroṭ.* c B¹, M³: *aētababe.* d K¹: *saiti.*; B¹, M³: *duiiesaiti.* e M³: *upā.* f B¹, M³: *upāzōiṭ... sraošō.* om. et OD add. g K¹: *saiti.* h K¹: *d-* praescr. i M³: gwpt et s.l. gw- scr. j M³: ZK Y om. k Mss.: ’w’. l M³: tn’phlyknyh et s.l. -p- scr. m B¹: znšnyh et s.l. -yh scr. n M³: ’sp et s.l. -p scr. o Mss.: slwšcln’m. p K¹, B¹: *zyd’nk*; M³: *zyd’n.* q K¹, B¹: HWEyd; M³: HWE’. r Mss.: YHWWNyq. s M³: s.l. l’d scr. t B¹: ptytyh et s.l. -yh scr. u Mss.: *iṣarām.*

These cases are generically treated in the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* accompanying *Dādestān ī dēnīg* 53.1 (DHABHAR 1913, p. 164):

Gemara: Our Rabbis taught: If a woman with child smelts the flesh of holy flesh, or of pork, we put for her a reed into the juice and place it upon her mouth. If thereupon she feels that her craving has been satisfied, it is well. If not, one feeds her with the juice itself. If thereupon her craving is satisfied it is well; if not, one feeds her with the fat meat itself, for there is nothing that can stand before [the duty of] saving life, with the exception of idolatry, incest and bloodshed.”

44 See mss. K¹, ff. 154r, l. 9–154v, l. 6; B¹, ff. 193r, l. 13–193v, l. 11; M³, f. 133v, ll. 7–18.

45 Or: *ka nē atuwānīgīh +ziyān rāy hā* “If there is no (fact of the guilty person’s) incapability (to endure the punishment) because of the injury (undergone)”.

46 See below n. 61.

PRDd 53.1

patitīgih ka zan atuwānīg ud ka šōy pādixšāy mard rāy šāyēd pid <ī> aburnāyag ī hašt sālag tā pānzdah sālag ka be kunēd šāyēd abārig kas pad rāh ī paydāmbarih ka mard-ē be ō mard-ē gōwēd kū šaw +ud⁴⁷ man rāy pad patit bāš šāyēd kirbag ī pus ī padixšāyihā kunēd pid ī padixšāyihā hamāg ōh bawēd ud ān ī cakarihā cahār ēk-ē bawēd būd dastwar kē-š guft kū ōy-ez hamāg ōh bawēd

“(Performance of) penance, if the woman is incapable, and if the husband (is) *pādixšāy*, is allowed for the man; if the father <of> an eight- to fifteen-year old child performs it, (it is) allowed; (for) another man by way of commission, when a man says to another man: ‘Go and do penance on my behalf’, (it is) allowed. All the meritorious deeds of a son of *padixšāy* (status) thereby become (accrued to the account) of the father of *padixšāy* (status), and (so does) one quarter of those (of a son) of *cakar* (status); there was an authority who said: ‘All of these also (ac-crued to the father’s account) thereby’.”⁴⁸

It unambiguously follows from the context of both the commentary to V 7.72 and PRDd 53.1 that the word *atuwānīg* is to be understood in these two cases in its primary meaning, viz. as ‘unable, incapable’ in the broad sense.⁴⁹ However, a more specific meaning ‘insolvent’ is typical for Pahlavi literature, as e.g. in the passage we shall consider next.

As can be deduced from the later exegetical treatises (e.g. ŠnŠ 1.2, see TAVADIA 1930, p. 28; CERETI 2001, p. 158), every grade of the corporal punishment had an equivalent in money and could be commuted to it. It appears that in certain circumstances, in particular, in case of destitution, the notion of *patit* ‘redemption’ could occasionally be reinterpreted as ‘penance’, reduced to the performance of certain ceremonies (*patitih* or *patitīgih*), e.g. in the following passage of the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* accompanying the *Dādestān ī dēnīg* (see DHABHAR 1913, p. 43):

PRDd 15b4

harw ān ī tuwānīg +ē be abāyēd wizārdan ī ka tuwānīg ud nē wizārēd +ē patit⁵⁰ nēst cē patit ciš-ē <ī> atuwānīg bawēd

“Everyone who is capable must discharge (his sins); if one (is) capable and does not discharge, there is no penance for him, for penance is a matter <for> the incapable.”

47 DHABHAR: Y for W.

48 This passage is of special importance for the present study, given that *Patit ī murdagān* represents the text of *Patit ī pašēmānīh* I modified for the purpose of vicarious penance (see Commentary, § 21). Besides, two important notions are alluded to here, namely the penance done on behalf of the dead ancestors (in particular, one’s parents, see below) and the idea of both unatoned sins (*wināh*) and meritorious deeds (*kirbag*) accruing to one’s account (Phl. *ō bun būdan*, see Commentary, § 16), to be finally settled after one’s death.

49 Cf.: “Mit den ‘Hilflosen’ (*atuvānikān*) sind Geschäftsunfähige und darum eines Vertreters Bedürftige gemeint“ (BARTHOLOMAE 1917, p. 21).

50 Mss. MR¹ and J: *ptytyk’ k’l’/patitih-kār* (DHABHAR 1913, p. 43, n. 18), thus: “may he not perform the (ceremony of) penance” (cf. note 61).

Here the verb *wizārdan* ‘to discharge’ obviously implies both *tōzišn pad xwāstag* ‘atonement by property’ and *puhl pad aštar ud srōšcaranām* ‘punishment by whip and *srōšcaranām*’ mentioned in PV 18.68, and is opposed to *patit* (which probably has to be translated here as ‘penance’, not ‘redemption’), regarded as a substitute for *wizārišn* in the case of the sinner’s incapability. The term *atuwānīg* may thus be taken here in two ways, literally (in the sense of ‘incapable’) and metaphorically (in the sense of ‘insolvent’).

A special case of the vicarious penance, namely, the one performed for the dead, particularly for one’s parents, is of great importance for the history of Zoroastrianism (cf. above PRDd 53.1). The conjecture by BOYCE that this practice was a later addition, because it violated the principle of personal responsibility proclaimed by Zaratustra (BOYCE 1975, p. 321; ASMUSSEN 1993, p. 128), is unconvincing. A ceremony of penance accompanying the commemoration of dead relatives is no more contrary to the spirit of Zaratustra’s teaching than the cult of Haoma, included in the Zoroastrian pantheon as early as in the Avestan period. The cult of ancestors, whose integral part is the penance on behalf of the dead, has of course nothing to do with what GERSHEVITCH called “Zoroaster’s own contribution”, but nonetheless has been incorporated in Zoroastrian doctrine just as well as other elements inherited from the Indo-Iranian period, such as the myth of Yima/Jamšēd or the cult of Vərəθraϋna/Warhrān. The absence of the idea of penance (or rather atonement)⁵¹ on behalf of the dead in the Avesta may well be explained by loss of the passages of the *Vīdēvdād* in which it was mentioned.⁵² Besides, we may safely assume that some popular beliefs and practices could for a long time remain beyond the official doctrine. In the course of time, however, the emphasis could have shifted due to interaction with other traditions, first of all Christianity, which developed similar practices independently.

Even more significant for our understanding of the dynamics of development of the Zoroastrian concept of penance is the last passage of the *Vīdēvdād* (V 3.38–40 ≈ 8.27–28) to be considered here:

- 51 In denying ancient roots to the penance ceremony performed on behalf of the dead, BOYCE overlooks the fact that no kind of penitential ritual is referred to in the Avesta at all. All the examined passages of the *Vīdēvdād* (including one below) make it quite clear that the notion of ‘penance’ occurs only on the level of the commentary, while both the Avestan original and the Pahlavi Translation deal with ‘atonement’, ‘expiation’ etc., i. e. with different kinds of punishment. According to PETTAZZONI (1930, p. 437), “... confession of sins seems to be rather incongruent with the very spirit of Zoroastrian religion in its genuine form”.
- 52 That this possibility cannot be ruled out follows, in particular, from the fact that the Avestan source of such an important notion as *sturīb* (institute of vicarious reinstatement of one’s heirdom, see Commentary, §54) is known from a single fragment cited in the Pahlavi *Rivāyat* of *Adurfarnbag* and *Farnbag-Srōš* (see KLINGENSCHMITT 1971, pp. 136–142).

V 3.38⁵³ (≈ 8.27⁵⁴)

Av.: *dātārə.^a +gaēdanəm. +astuuaitinəm. ašāum.*

“O Creator <of the> corporeal world, the Holy one!

PT: *dādār^b <ī> gēhān^c <ī> astōmandān^d ahlaw^e*

“O Creator of the corporeal world, the Holy one!

Av.: *yaṭ. aiñhā.² zəmə. nikaṇte.^f spānasca.^g irista.^h naraēca.ⁱ irista.^j biīārə.drājō.⁺anuskante.^k (V 8.27: *yaṭ. usō. +vīfīeite. vīfīeitica.*)*

He who buries in this earth dead dogs and dead men, and does not disinter (them) within two years (V 8.27: ‘He who voluntarily (practises) active and passive sodomy’)

PT: *ke^l andar ēn^m zamīg nigānēnēdⁿ sag ī^o rist [ayāb] mard^p ī^q rist dō sāl drabnā^r anulkand^s (V 8.27 *kē +hunsandihā⁵⁵ wiftēd [ayāb] wiftēnēd*)*

He who buries in this earth dead dog and dead man, and does not disinter (them) within two years (V 8.27: ‘He who voluntarily (practises) active and passive sodomy’)

Av.: *kā. hē.^t asti. ciḍa.*

What is his atonement,⁵⁶

PT: *kadār^u ōy hast tōzišn^v [pad xwāstag]*

What is his atonement [by property],

Av.: *kā. hē.^w asti. āpərətiš. kaṭ.^x hē. asti. yaoždāḍrəm.*

what is his punishment, what is his purification?”

PT: *kadār ōy^y hast puhl [pad aštar ud^z srōšōcaranām^{aa}] ciyōn hast ōy^{ab} yōjdāḍrih^{ac} [pad^{ad} ruwan]*

what is his punishment [by whip and *srōšōcaranām*], of what kind is his purification [by soul]?”

a L⁴, B¹: *gaēdanəm. astuuaitinəm. om. et OD add.*; Bh¹¹, M³: *gaēdanəm. +astuuaitinəm. ašāum. om. et M³: OD add.* b L⁴: *d’t’l om.* c L⁴: *gyh’n; B¹, M³: gyh’n’s’t’wmnd’n om.*; Bh¹¹: *gyh’n’s’t’wmnd’n’hlwb’ om.* d L⁴: *’st’wmnd’n.* e L⁴: *’hlwb’ om.*; B¹, M³: *’hlwb’.* f B¹: *nkanti.*; Bh¹¹: *nikanti.*; M³: *nikaṇti.* g Bh¹¹: *spānaēisca.* et *-ē-* del. h B¹: *airišta.*; M³: *irišta.* i Bh¹¹: *naērica.* j L⁴: *s.l. irista. scr.*; Bh¹¹: *iristi.* k L⁴: *nanuskante.* et sec. m. *-n-*scr.; B¹, M³: *anuskanti.*; Bh¹¹: *anuskanti.* l Bh¹¹: PWN ZK add. m L⁴, Bh¹¹: ZNE om.; B¹, M³: ZNE. n L⁴, B¹, M³: *nk’nynynt;* Bh¹¹: ZNE *nk’n’ OBYDWNx₁.* o B¹, Bh¹¹, M³:

53 See mss. L⁴, f. 44v, ll. 1–8; B¹, ff. 60v, l. 5–61r, l. 2; Bh¹¹, f. 72v, ll. 1–13; M³, ff. 49v, l. 10–50r, l. 2.

54 V 8.27–28 are absent from the oldest mss. (i.e. K¹ and L⁴), as well as from their relatively old reliable copies (B¹, Bh¹¹ and M³). The corresponding passages of both the Avestan original and the Pahlavi Translation are given in round brackets according to JAMASP 1907, pp. 324–325.

55 Both SANJANA 1895a, p. 149 and JAMASP 1907, p. 324 give here the erroneous form *anusand* (thus repeating the correct translation of Av. *anusō.* in the preceding paragraph). The correct variant *hunsand* is found at least in one of the mss., namely E¹⁰. For a detailed discussion of Av. *usant-* ‘voluntary’/ *anusant-* ‘forced, unwilling’ and their counterparts in the Pahlavi *Vīdēvdād* see CANTERA 2004, p. 195f. and Commentary, §59.2 below.

56 Cf. *paititiš.* ‘expiation’ used instead of *ciḍa.* ‘atonement’ in the analogous context in V 18.68 and translated into Pahlavi in the same way (i.e. *tōzišn* ‘atonement’, see above).

Y om. **p** L⁴, B¹, M³: GBRA; Bh¹¹: mltwm. **q** B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: Y om. **r** L⁴, B¹: dl'n'y; Bh¹¹, M³: dl'n'. **s** L⁴, B¹, M³: 'n LALA APLWNt; Bh¹¹: 'n LALA APLWNd. **t** L⁴, B¹: *kāhē*. **u** Mss.: kt'l et L⁴: k praescr. **v** Bh¹¹: *āaṭ. maraot. ahurō. mazdā*. add. et del. **w** B¹, M³: *kāhē*. **x** L⁴: s.l. *kaṭ... yaoždāθrēm*. scr.; B¹, M³: *kaṭ... yaoždāθrēm*. om. **y** L⁴, Bh¹¹: AYT OLE; B¹, M³: OLE AYT'. **z** L⁴, Bh¹¹: W om. **aa** L⁴, M³: slwšwcl'n'm; B¹: slwšcl'n'm; Bh¹¹: slwšwcl'm. **ab** Bh¹¹: L praescr. et del. **ac** L⁴: ywšd'sl; B¹, M³: ywšd'slyh; Bh¹¹: ywšd'slyy. **ad** B¹, M³: Y praescr.

V 3.39⁵⁷ (= 8.27)

Av.: *āaṭ. maraot.^a ahurō. mazdā. nauua. hē.^b asti. ciṣa. nauua. hē.^c asti. āpərətiš. nōiṭ.^d hē.^e asti. yaoždāθrēm.*

“And Ahura Mazda said: ‘There is no atonement (for) him at all, there is no punishment (for) him at all, nor is there any purification (for) him

PT: *u-š guft ohrmazd kū nē ōy hast tōzišn^f [pad^g xwāstag] nē ōy^h bastⁱ puh^l [pad aštar <ud> srōšōcaranām^l] ud^k nē ōy hast yōjdāθrīb^l [pad ruwan^m]*

“And Ohrmazd said: ‘There is no atonement (for) him [by property], there is no punishment (for) him [by whip <and> srōšōcaranām], and there is no purification (for) him [by soul]

Av.: *anāpərəša.ⁿ haca.^o šīiaoθna. yaunaēca. yaunaētātāēca.*
from the indelible deed for ever and ever’.”

PT: *[cē] anāpuhragān^p ān^q wināh tā ō^r hamē^s hamē^t rawišnīb^u [hast^v kē^w any-puhr^x gōwēd^y]*

[because] indelible (is) that sin to perpetuity [there are (those) who call (it) “other-punishment” (any-puhr)]’.”

a Bh¹¹: *maraot*. **b** B¹: *nauuahē*. **c** B¹: *nauuahē*. **d** Bh¹¹: *naoiṭ*. **e** L⁴: *aē*. et sec. m. **a**-scr. **f** L⁴: twcšnyh; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: twcšn' et M³: c praescr. et del. **g** Mss.: PWN et L⁴: W praescr. **h** L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: OLE; M³: OL. **i** L⁴, Bh¹¹: AYT; B¹, M³: AYT' et M³: s.l. -' scr. **j** L⁴: slwšwcl'n'm; B¹, M³: slwšcl'n'm; Bh¹¹: slwšwcl'm. **k** Bh¹¹: W om. **l** L⁴, B¹, M³: ywšd'slyh; Bh¹¹: ywšd'slyh et y- del. **m** L⁴: lwb[...]; B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: lwb'n'. **n** B¹, M³: *anā.pərəša*. **o** L⁴: s.l. *haca*. scr. **p** L⁴, Bh¹¹: 'n'pwhlk'n'; B¹, M³: 'n'pwhlyk'n'. **q** L⁴, Bh¹¹: om.; B¹, M³: ZK. **r** L⁴, Bh¹¹: OL; B¹, M³: 'w'. **s** L⁴, Bh¹¹: hm'y; B¹, M³: hm'k. **t** L⁴, Bh¹¹: hm'y; B¹, M³: hm'k. **u** Mss.: lwbšnyh et Bh¹¹: s.l. -yh scr. **v** L⁴: AYT(') iter. **w** B¹: 'ytwn' YMRWNyt add.; M³: 'ytwn' YMRWNyt add. **x** Mss.: ZK'y pwhl. **y** L⁴: YMLLWNyt; B¹: YMRWNyt et 'd add.; Bh¹¹, M³: YMRWNyt et 'd add.

V 3.40⁵⁸ (= 8.28)

Av.: *kuua. +aēuua.^a*

“When so?

PT: *[be] kay^b ēdōn [ka^c anāpərəša.]*

“[But] when (is it) so [when (the deed is) indelible]?

Av.: *yezi.^d aṇhaṭ.^e āstūtō.^f vā. aiβi.srauanō.^g vā. daēnəm. māzdaiiasnīm.*

If (he) has sworn allegiance to or been instructed in the Religion of Māzdayasna;

57 See mss. L⁴, ff. 44v, l. 8–45r, l. 1; B¹, f. 61r, ll. 2–13; Bh¹¹, ff. 72v, l. 13–73r, l. 9; M³, f. 50r, ll. 2–12.

58 See mss. L⁴, ff. 45r, l. 1–46v, l. 2; B¹, ff. 61r, l. 13–63v, l. 7; Bh¹¹, ff. 73r, l. 9–75v, l. 7; M³, ff. 50r, l. 12–52r, l. 1.

- PT: *agar hast āstawān^h [kū web-dēn dānandⁱ kū wināh] + ayāb-ešⁱ abar-ašnūd^k dēn ī^l māzdēsnān [kū ag-dēn <ī> az-eš pad wināh uskār^m ēstēdⁿ...⁵⁹*
 If (he) be (one) professing [that is, (an adept of) the Good Religion, knowing⁶⁰ that (burying corpses is) a sin], or having heard about the Religion of Māzdayasna [that is, (if he be an adept of) the bad religion <who> therefrom (i. e. through the knowledge of the Religion of Māzdayasna) has considered (burying corpses) a sin...];
- Av.: *āaṭ. yezi.° aṇhaṭ. anāstūtō.^p vā. anaiβi.srauuano.^q vā. daēnqm. māzdaiiasnīm.*
 and if he be (one who has) not sworn allegiance to, nor been instructed in the Religion of Māzdayasna,
- PT: *agar hast^r anāstawān^s [kū^t ag-dēn^u ī^v az-eš^w pad kirbag uskār^x ēstēd^y] ayāb-eš^z an-abar-ašnūd^{aa} dēn^{ab} ī māzdēsnān [kū^{ac} web-dēn^{ad} pad xwāhišn^{ae} ud^{af} pursišn^{ag} wināhgār pad^{ah} abēgumānīh ī^{ai} kirbag^{aj}-menišnīh kunēnd^{ak}]*
 and if he be not professing (the Religion of Māzdayasna) [that is, (an adept of) the bad religion who therefrom has considered (burying corpses) a merit], or did not hear about the Religion of Māzdayasna [that is, (when,) by desire and demand (on the part of a sinner), the (adepts of) the Good Religion bestow upon the sinner invulnerability as regards the meritorious thinking]
- Av.: *aētāciṭ. aēibiīō.^{al} spāṇhaite.^{am} āstauuanaēibiīō.^{an} daēnqm. māzdaiiasnīm.*
 then this (blame) is deflected away from these (people, when) swearing allegiance to the Religion of Māzdayasna
- PT: *awēšān-ez^{ao} [wināh] az^{ap} awēšān^{aq} [mardōmān] abganēd^{ar} āstawānīh^{as} [patitigīh^{at}] ī^{au} pad dēn ī^{av} māzdēsnān^{aw} [paydāg]*
 (then) [public] conversion [declaration of redemption] to the Religion of Māzdayasna shifts (lit.: ‘casts off’) these [sins] from these [people]

59 In the relevant mss. of PV 3.40 an ample commentary is added which is omitted here as being of no interest for the present discussion.

60 The form dⁿnd/dānand ‘knowing, aware of’ testifies to a productive present participle suffix *-and*, inherited from OP *-(a)nt-* (< OI **-(a)nt-* < IIr. **-(a)nt-* < IE **-(e/o)nt-*). Its existence in Early Middle Persian could be expected on the basis of the non-productive deverbative suffix *-ndk’/-(a)ndag* (e.g. *bwndk’/bowandag* ‘complete, entire, perfect’, *zȳ(w)ndk’/zīndag* from the earlier *zīwandag* ‘alive, living’ etc.) which is a result of the augmentation of the productive suffix *-ag* (< OI **-aka-*) to the old present participle marker in Early Middle Persian rather than an inherited combined suffix. As convincingly shown by CANTERA (1999, p. 202), the language of the Pahlavi Translation of the *Yasna* and the *Vīdēvdād* demonstrates some archaic features, such as the full inflectional paradigm of the conjunctive and the distinction between *Casus rectus* and *Casus obliquus* of the 1st pers. sg. pronoun. These features enable us to oppose the idiom of the Pahlavi Translation of the essential Avestan texts (primarily those of the Long Liturgy), together with the Pahlavi of the Sasanian inscriptions and with the Manichaean Middle Persian, to the Book Pahlavi as being instances of Early Pahlavi in contrast to the relatively late form of the language. The unsubstantiated character of the form dⁿnd/dānand prevents us from considering it an isolated relic, but a final judgement would require an examination of the relevant texts for further comparative material. The old present participles, if attested in the Pahlavi Translations and possibly misunderstood by scholars as finite verbal forms, would provide an important confirmation of CANTERA’s hypothesis.

Av.: ⁺əuuərazənbiiō.^{ax} pascaēta.^{ay} araθβiia. šiiəoθna.

(and) hereupon not committing the undue acts.”

PT: [ka]awarzi^zdār pas ān ī abārōn kunišn [kū pad ēd^{az} menišn pad^{ba} patit^{bb} bawēd^{bc}
kū az^{bd} nūn^{be} frāz wināb nē kunēm]

[if] hereupon he is no more a committer of the sinful deeds [that is, he does penance with this thought: 'Henceforth shall I not do sin'].⁶¹

a L⁴, B¹, M³: *aēnuua*. om.; Bh¹¹: *yuuu*. b L⁴, B¹, M³: AYMT; Bh¹¹: MNW. c L⁴, Bh¹¹, M³: AMT; B¹: AMT'. d B¹: *yeŋa(ŋ)baŋ*. M³: *yeŋbaŋ*. e B¹, M³: *aŋbaŋ*. om.; Bh¹¹: *aŋbatt*. et -t- del. f L⁴: *anāstūtō*. et an- del.; Bh¹¹: *āstaoto*. g Bh¹¹: *sraouuaonō*. et pr. -o- del.; M³: *saraauuanō*. h L⁴: 'stwb'n; B¹, M³: 'pytwb'n; Bh¹¹: 'stwb'n'. i L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: d'ndnd et B¹: W praescr.; M³: d'nnnd. j Mss.: 'tpš. k L⁴, M³: OŠMENT et M³: s.l. -t scr.; B¹: OŠMET; Bh¹¹: OŠMENyt. l Bh¹¹, M³: Y om. m L⁴, Bh¹¹: 'wsk'lt et L⁴: sec. m. scr.; B¹, M³: 'wšk'lt' et M³: s.l. -lt' scr. n L⁴: YKOYMW⁷; B¹, Bh¹¹: YKOYMW⁷Nyt; M³: YKOYMW⁷Nyt'. o B¹, M³: *yeze*. p B¹, M³: *anāstūtō*; Bh¹¹: *anāistūtō*. et -ia- del. et s.l. -ūt- scr. q Bh¹¹: *anaisraauuanō*. r L⁴: AYT; B¹, M³, Bh¹¹: AYT' et B¹, M³: AYK add. s L⁴: 'n'stwb'n; B¹, M³: 'n'stwb'n' et M³: s.l. pr. -t scr.; Bh¹¹: 'nk'stwb'n' et -k del. t B¹, M³: AYK om. u L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: 'kdyŋ'; M³: 'kyndyn' et pr. -yn- del. v L⁴, B¹, M³: Y om. w Mss.: 'čš et M³: iter. x L⁴, Bh¹¹: 'wsk'lt; B¹, M³: 'wšk'lt'. y L⁴, Bh¹¹, M³: YKOYMW⁷Nyt; B¹: YKOYMW⁷Nyt'. z Bh¹¹: 'dwpš 'nQDM om. aa L⁴, B¹, M³: OŠMENT et L⁴: sec. m. -t scr., M³: s.l. -Nt scr.; Bh¹¹: OŠMENT'. ab L⁴: sec. m. dyn'... PWN scr. ac Bh¹¹: AYK om. ad L⁴, Bh¹¹: ŠPYL dyn'. B¹, M³: wyhdyn'. ae L⁴: BYHWNšn' et sec. m. BY- scr.; B¹, M³: BOYHWNšn'; Bh¹¹: BOYHWNšn. af B¹, M³: W om. ag L⁴: pwrššn; B¹, M³, Bh¹¹: pwrššn'. ah Mss.: PWN et L⁴, B¹, M³: W praescr. ai L⁴, Bh¹¹: Y; B¹, M³: W. aj Mss.: krpk et M³: s.l. -k scr. ak L⁴, Bh¹¹: krtŋ; B¹: OBYDWN_{x2}; M³: OBYDWNnd. al Bh¹¹: *aēbiū*. am B¹, M³: *spāŋhaiti*. an L⁴: *āstauuanaēbiū*; M³: *ātauuanaēibiū*. ao L⁴, B¹, M³: OLEš'nc; Bh¹¹: OLEš'n'. ap L⁴: MNW; B¹, M³: MN; Bh¹¹: MN... 'stwb'nyh om. aq L⁴: LE et s.l. -š'n add.; B¹: OLEš'n; M³: OLEš'nc. ar L⁴, B¹, M³: LMYTWNyt et B¹, M³: W praescr. as L⁴: '(st)wb'nyh; B¹, M³: 'stwb'nyh. at L⁴, B¹, M³: ptytykŋh; Bh¹¹: ptytyk'h. au L⁴, B¹, M³: s.l. Y scr.; Bh¹¹: Y om. av L⁴, Bh¹¹: Y om. aw L⁴: m'zdyysn'n; B¹, M³: m'zđšn'n; Bh¹¹: m'zdsn'n'. ax L⁴: *ənuəɾəzinibiū*; B¹: *ənuəɾəzinibiū*; Bh¹¹: *ənuəɾəzinibiū*. et pr. -r- del.; M³: *ənuəɾəzinibiū*. et pr. -r- del. ay B¹, M³: *pascaita*. az Mss.: HNA et M³: s.l. -A scr. ba B¹, M³: PWN om. bb Mss.: ptyt et L⁴: s.l. p- scr. bc L⁴: YHWWN; B¹, M³, Bh¹¹: YHWWNyt et M³: s.l. -WNyt scr. bd L⁴: MN; B¹, M³: MN om.; Bh¹¹: MNW. be L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: KON; M³: PWN et P- del. et s.l. K- add.

Here for the first time the idea occurs that moral repentance is a necessary condition of (if not an alternative for) physical atonement.⁶² As we have seen,

61 The last phrase of the Pahlavi commentary from the above passage is cited in ŠnŠ 8.8 (TAVADIA 1930, p. 107, K²⁰, f. 67r, ll. 4–9): *mard harw ciyōn az wināh pad patit bawēd ā-š patitiḥ-kār u-š āškāragihā ud *menišnibā pad patit bawišn āškāragih-kār ē *ka wināh-ē dānēd kū-m jast ā-š nāmcištīg be gōwišn *menišnib-kār ēd bawēd kū pad ēd menišn pad patit bawēd kū az nūn frāz wināh nē kunem* “Whenever a man does penance for (his) sins, may he perform the act of penance and do penance both through confession and by thought; the repenter, when (regarding) some sin he knows: ‘(It) occurred (with) me’, then may he speak (about) it publicly; the contrite is the one (who) becomes redeemed with this thought: ‘Henceforth shall I not do sin.’” Note also the locution *ā-š patitiḥ-kār* “may he perform the act of penance” alluding to the Pahlavi Commentary to V 7.72 (cf. note 50).

62 It is for this reason that the translation 'does penance' for *pad patit bawēd* is preferred here to the usual 'becomes redeemed'.

it seems to be quite alien to the *Vīdēvdād*, but in this particular case it may be accounted for by the close association between *āstawānīh* ‘confession (of faith), conversion’ and *patitīgīh* ‘declaration of redemption’, which has a direct counterpart in the other proselytic religions, such as Christianity, where the fact of confession (treated by Christianity as rebirth through Holy Baptism) redeems a proselyte *ipso facto*, without need of any additional purifying action.⁶³ It is thus legitimate to treat the act of conversion in both Christianity and Zoroastrianism as the penance *par excellence* and all the further penances as partly reproducing this essential act and restoring the ideal state.⁶⁴

The idea of the possibility of wiping out an inextinguishable sin by adopting the “Good Religion” is expounded in the following passage of the *Vīdēvdād*:

V 3.42⁶⁵

Av.: *maṇaiēn.^a ahe. spitama.^b zaraḍuštra.^c daēna. māzdaiiasniš. narš. ašaonō. framarəzaiti.^d vīšpəm. dušmatəmca.^e dužūxtəmca. dužūuarštəmca.^f yaḍa. vātō.^g dərəzi.takaḍrō.^h θβāšəm. dašīnāt.ⁱ pairi. framərozōiṭ.^j*

“In the same way (lit.: ‘they should think about it’), O Spitama Zaraḍuštra, the Māzdayasnian faith sweeps away from a righteous man all the evil thoughts, evil words and evil deeds, as the strong blowing wind sweeps the airspace from the west all around.”

PT: *humānāg^k ī^l ōy spitāmān^m zarḍuxštⁿ dēn ī māzdēsān^o az mard ī^p ahlaw frāz mālēd^q harwisp^r dušmat^s ud^t dušhūxt^u ud^v dušhwaršt^w ciyōn wād^x +ī^y škof^tz ud tag [ka] tēz^{aa} [āyēd] ud dašt frāz mālēd [ud^{ab} +giyāhīzagīh^{ac} ud^{ad} ciš-ē^{ae} be^{af} +barēd^{ag}]*...

“In the same way (lit.: ‘(it is) well thought about it’), O Spitāmān Zarḍuštra, the Māzdayasnian faith sweeps away from a righteous man all the evil thoughts, evil

63 Thus, as the Nicene Creed says, Ὁμολογῶ ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν “I acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins”.

64 ManParth. *wxāstawānift/xwāstawānift* ‘confession’ (not *x^wāstwānift*, as in ASMUSSEN 1965) must obviously be regarded as a cognate of MP *āstawānīh*: *wxāstawānift* < **xwa-* + *āstawān* + *-ift* = ‘one’s own confession’, cf. Phl. *xwastūgīh* ‘confession’ (or, according to BARTHOLOMAE 1918a, pp. 37–40, ‘acknowledgement of one’s responsibility’), occurring instead of *pašēmānīh* ‘repentance’ in the threefold formula “contrition – repentance – penance” in Dk 5.10.1–2 (DkM 443.17–19 = DkB 346.11–12, see also AMOUZGAR/TAFAZZOLI 2000, p. 46f.: *abar tōzišnīh* <ī> *wināh* ud *šōyišn* <ud> *yōjdābrīh* ī *az-eš* *fradom abaxšīh xwastūgīh* ud **patitīh* ud *ciyōn wināh marag was ēdōn-ez wizārišnīhā be hast* “As regards atonement <for> sin and cleansing <and> purification from it. First is contrition, (afterwards) confession and penance; and just as the number of sins is great, so (many) are also the discharges.” It seems to me highly symptomatic that Manichaeism emphasizes the spiritual aspect of the confession, leaving the Zoroastrian notion of physical atonement unattended. It thus becomes clear why no trace of MP *patit* and its derivatives can be found in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian.

65 See mss. L⁴, ff. 47r, l. 10–47v, l. 3; B¹, ff. 64v, l. 11–65r, l. 8; Bh¹¹, ff. 76v, l. 13–77r, l. 11; M³, ff. 52v, l. 14–53r, l. 9.

words and evil deeds, as the strong and swift wind, [when (it) comes] quickly⁶⁶ and sweeps the plain⁶⁷ [and takes (away) the grass and (every)thing]...”

a B¹, M³: *mānāiēn*. et M³: s.l. -ii- scr. b Bh¹¹: *spatama*. c Bh¹¹: *zaraḡuštara*. et tert. -a- del. d L⁴: *framaraēzaiti*. in *framaraēzaita*. sec. m. corr.; Bh¹¹: *framaraēzaiti*. et tert. -a- del. e B¹: *dušmatəmca*. f L⁴: *dužuuarštəmca*. et s.l. -a scr. et in *dužuuaraštəmca*. sec. m. corr.; B¹, M³: *dužuuarštəmca*; Bh¹¹: *framaraēzaiti*. et tert. -a- del. g B¹: *vā*. h L⁴, Bh¹¹: *dərəzi*. *tākaθrō*; B¹: *takəθrō*; M³: *darəzatakəθrō*. et quat. -a- del. i Bh¹¹: *dašnšanāt*. et -šn- del.; M³: *dašināt*. et s.l. -i- scr. j B¹: *framərəz(ō)it*; Bh¹¹: *framaraēziōit*. et sec. -a- del. et s.l. -ə- add. k L⁴, Bh¹¹: *hwm'n'k*; B¹, M³: *yw'm'n'k*. l B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: Y om. m L⁴, B¹, M³: *spyt'm'n* et L⁴: s.l. scr.; Bh¹¹: *spyt'm'n'*. n L⁴, Bh¹¹: *zltwhšt*; B¹: *zltwšt*; M³: *zltwšt* et s.l. -št scr. o L⁴: *m'zsn'n*; B¹, M³: *m'zdsn'n*; Bh¹¹: *m'zsn'n*. p L⁴, Bh¹¹: Y om. q L⁴, Bh¹¹: *m'lyt*; B¹, M³: *m'lyt'*. r L⁴: *hlwst*; B¹, M³: *hlwsp*; Bh¹¹: *hlwspyn'*. s L⁴: *dwšmt*; B¹, M³: *dwšmt'*; Bh¹¹: *dwmštmt* et pr. -mt- del. t B¹, M³: W om. u L⁴, Bh¹¹: *dwšhwht*; M³: *dwšhwht*; B¹: *[.]wšwht'*. v B¹, M³: W om. w L⁴, Bh¹¹: *dwšhwłst'*; B¹, M³: *dwšhwłst'*. x L⁴: *w't-1*; B¹, M³: *w't*; Bh¹¹: *w'ptk* et -k del. y B¹, Bh¹¹, M³: Y om. z L⁴, Bh¹¹: *škwpt*; B¹, M³: *škwpt* et Y add. aa Mss.: *tyc* et Bh¹¹ *tyc* praescr. et del. ab Bh¹¹: W om. ac Mss.: *k'hyckyh* et Bh¹¹: s.l. -yh scr. ad Bh¹¹: W om. ae L⁴, Bh¹¹: MNDOM-1; B¹, M³: MNDOM. af Mss.: *k'BRA* et M³: s.l. -A scr. ag L⁴, B¹, Bh¹¹: *bld*; M³: *blt*.

The Pahlavi Translation of this passage is cited with slight differences in Pahlavi *Rivāyat* accompanying *Dādestān ī dēnīg* 7.5 and in *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī xrad* 52.18:

PRDd 7.4–5⁶⁸

[4] *ud +kē⁶⁹ margarzān ka ō dād ī weh-dēnān āyēd pad gyāg ahlaw barwēd*
[5] *weh-dēnān ā-š +kīrbagōmandih⁷⁰ ka girēd kū yašt be kunēd ā-š ān yašt hamāg*
wināh ēdōn az bun be barēd <ud> be rōbēd ciyōn wād ī tēz ī škeft ka abar dašt-ē
be šawēd ud be rōbēd <ud> be barēd ud ān-ez yašt ruwān ī mērag ēdōn az wināh
pāk be kunēd

“[4] And when one who (is guilty of a) capital crime (*margarzān*) comes to the law of the adherents of the Good Religion, he is (lit.: ‘becomes’, D.B) saved on the spot. [5] The profession of the Good Religion (is) thus (regarded as) the sum total of meritorious deeds, when one accepts (it), that is, performs worship, then this worship takes <and> sweeps from his account all the sins, just as the strong and swift wind, when (it) passes over a plain and sweeps <and> takes away (the grass), so this worship makes the soul of the young man pure from the sins.”

DMx 52.16–18⁷¹

[16] **patitig^a būd rāy mādagwar ciš ēn kū wināh^b nē kunēd xwēš-kāmihā* [17] *ud*
agar adānīh ayāb wastārīh ud dušāgāhīh rāy wināh^c-ē jahēd ēg pēš ī dastwarān
*ud wehān pad *patit^d bawēd* [18] *ud pas az ān nē kunēd ēg ān wināh^e ī-š kard ēštēd*

66 Note Phl. *tyc/tēz* ‘fast, quick’ being misinterpretations of Av. ²ββāša- ‘Luftraum’ as ¹ββāša- ‘eilig, rasch’ (BARTHOLOMAE 1904, col. 797f.).

67 Note Phl. *dšt(’)/dašt* ‘plain’ used erroneously for Av. *dašina-* ‘the right or western (side)’.

68 See DHABHAR 1913, p. 8.

69 Mss.: MN.

70 Mss.: *krpk’* ¹wmmnyh. Cf. DHABHAR 1913, p. 8, n. 6; WILLIAMS 1990, I, p. 239, n. 7(10).

71 See ms. K⁴³, f. 168v, ll. 8–16.

az tan ī ōy ēdōn +ādwarag^f barwēd ciyōn wād ān ī staft tag ka tēz ud saxt āyēd dašt ēdōn frāz mālēd kū harw giyāhizag-ē ud ciš-ē ī ān gyāg kaft ēstēd be barēd

“[16] As regards being penitent, the essential thing is that (he) does not commit a sin willingly; [17] And if a sin occurs out of ignorance or through obstinacy and stupidity, then he does penance in the presence of pious (laics) and (religious) authorities [18] and (if he) afterwards does not commit (this sin), then the sin which he has done gets away from his body, just as the strong, swift wind, when (it) comes quickly and severely, sweeps the plain in such a way that takes (away) every grass-blade and (each) single thing which has fallen on this place.”

a Ms.: pytytyk. b Ms.: W praescr. c Ms.: W praescr. d Ms.: pytyt. e Ms.: W praescr. f Ms.: 'dw'lk'.

Here we find the next step on the way of the interpretation of penance as a sort of recurrent confession of the faith. If we compare this passage with V 3.40–42, we will see that the notion of ignorance being an extenuating circumstance, a notion reserved in the *Vīdēvdād* for willing and forced (not to be confused with active and passive) sodomy (see V 8.26–27) and for the case of a confessing unbeliever, is extended in the *Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī xrad* to every sin committed, thus introducing into the doctrine the idea that malicious intent is of crucial importance for determining a sinner's destiny. It seems to me unjustified to regard this exegetic trend as “conservative” and “rooted... in very primitive thought and practice”, as does PETTAZZONI (1930, pp. 438–440).

The parallelism between confession of the faith and penance for one's sins, with the emphasis put on the seriousness of the two actions is also manifest in the following passage of the *Dēnkard*, which ASMUSSEN (1965, p. 47) took (unplausible, to my mind) as a commentary to V 3.40 (= 8.28):

Dk 3.67 (DkM 56.19–57.13 = DkB 41.19–42.9)

abar wizēn ī +menišn-ez^a <ī> abērtar menišn gōwišn ud kunišn pad kārān mādagwarihā az nigēz ī weh-dēn hād menišn fradomih ud abāyišnīgih ī pad hamāg kār <ud> dādestān xwēš be društāgihā mādagwar wizēn <ī> menišn pad āstawānīh ī abar dēn <ud> patit ī az wināh abar kē astawānēh abar dēn nē menišnīg ka gōwišnīg was-ez xwānēh ud kunišnīg was nimāyēh ēg-ez ō dēn nē rasēh ud gōwišnīg kunišnīg-ez patit ī az kehtar-ez wināh ka menišnīg abaxših ī az-eš nē abāg be burdār nē gōwišn pad rawāg wizirih ī gētīg dādwarān abar dādestānīhā <ī> gēhān cē mowbedān mowbed drustih ī wizir az cim ud cim paydāgih ī abērtar pad gōwišn barwēd ud kunišn pad kirbag mizd xwēših ī az dāšn ciš cē dāšn menišnīg rādēnīdan ī gōwišnīg-ez niwēyēnid dāšn ō ān ī dāšn arzānīg ka-š kunišnīg abespārd ī aweš nē abāg mēnōg mizd xwēših ī pad-eš nē barwēd

“Concerning conscious choice, <which> (is) the most essential as regards thought, speech and action in (legal) causes from the exposition of the Good Religion: May it be (known that) priority and necessity of intention (is) proper to all (good) deed and decision, but especially essential is the conscious choice for the profession of the faith <and> (for) the penance of sins. He who does not profess the faith sincerely, even if, as regards the speech, he proclaims much and, as regards the action,

shows much, does not come to the faith. And penance by speech and action for even the smallest sin, if by thought it is not associated with contrition about it, should not be uttered in the current judgement of the worldly judges concerning the affairs <of> the world, because the soundness of the decisions of the Chief Mowbed (stems) from (his) reason, (from) the obviousness of the reason, which is realized mostly through speech, and (from) the action (which consists) in obtaining a reward for the merit by (means of) a certain gift; because the intention to bestow a gift which is also announced by word of mouth (as) a gift to one worthy of it, if not associated with the actual presentation of it to this (one), no obtaining of a spiritual reward occurs thereby.”

a Ms.: m'nšn'c.

On the textual level, the understanding of penance as a sort of recurrent confession of the faith is manifest in the fact that the *patit* texts start with quotations from the *Frastūiē* and *Fraunuarāne* chapters of the *Gāṇās* (Y 0.4.1 = Y 11.17.1–Y 0.6.2 ≈ Y 11.19.2 for *Patit ī pašēmānīh*, Y 0.4.1 = Y 11.17.1–Y 0.7.1 ≈ Y 12.1.1 for *Xwad patit*).

Another important requirement is hinted at in the above passage of the *Vīdēv-dād* (V 3.40 = 8.28): both the conversion to Zoroastrianism and the confession must be performed in the presence of authoritative witnesses (here *paydāg* ‘open, obvious’). Cf. PRDd 15b3 (DHABHAR 1913, p. 43):

*mardōmān pad be widērišnīh patit pēš <ī> ōy abāyēd kardan kē-š dād zand
warm ud az wināh ud kirbag āgahtar u-š wināh ēk ēk be abāyēd ōšmurdan*

“At the (time of) death, people must do penance before someone who (knows) by heart the interpretation of the law and (is) better acquainted with (the matter of) sins and meritorious deeds, and they must narrate to him the sins one by one.”

The necessity of the presence of a spiritual chief (*rat*), religious authority (*dastwar*) and a pious laic (*weh*) in every act of penance is emphasized in all Zoroastrian texts concerning this subject, in particular throughout the *patit* texts. One of the most characteristic statements of this sort is to be found in ŠnŠ 8.1 (TAVADIA 1930, p. 104):⁷²

*wināh ī hamēmālān andar hamēmālān wizārišn ud ān ī ruwānīg andar ratān
wizārišn*

“The sin (against) accusers (is) to be redeemed in favour of the accusers, and the sin (against one’s) soul (is) to be redeemed in favour of the (spiritual) chiefs.”

This requirement is probably rooted in the Avestan practice of the *ratu-* and *sraoṣānuarəz(a)-* establishing a penalty (V 7.71, see above), but this conjecture does not contradict interference of Christian influence, namely by the institute of public confession in early Christianity which was subsequently replaced by confidential confession before a priest, rooted in the notion of apostolic

72 See also K²⁰, f. 66v, ll. 2–3.

succession (cf. John 20: 22–23).⁷³ In contrast, repentance in Judaism may only be public in case of a sin committed against one's neighbour (\approx Phl. *wināh ī hamēmālān*) and not when a sin against God (\approx Phl. *wināh ī ruwānīg*) is concerned:

BT, Yoma 86b⁷⁴

"r yhwadh rb rmy ktyb thylym l"b šry nšwy pš' kswy hť' wktyb mšly k"b mksh pš'yw l' yšlyh l' qšy' h' bht' mpwrsm h' bht' š'ynw mpwrsm rb zwtr' br twbyh 'mr rb nhmn k'n b'byrwt šbyn 'dm lhbrw k'n b'byrwt šbyn 'dm lmqwm

"Rab Judah said: 'Rab pointed out the following contradictions. It is written (Psalms, 32): Happy is he whose transgression is covered, whose sin is pardoned; and it is also written (Proverbs 28): He that covereth his transgression shall not prosper. This is no difficulty, one speaks of sins that have become known [to the public], the other of such as did not become known.' R. Zutra b. Tobiah in the name of R. Nahman said: 'Here we speak of sins committed by a man against his fellow, there of sins committed by man against the Omnipresent'."⁷⁵

In Islam the penance is performed before God alone:

Qoran 4: 48–50⁷⁶

[48] 'inna llāha lā yağfiru 'an yušraka bihī wa-yağfiru mā dūna dālika li-man yašā'u wa-man yušrik bi-llāhi fa-qadi ftarā 'itman 'aẓīma' [49] 'a-lam tara 'ilā

73 As for the secrecy of confession, to be compared with the "Seal of Confessional" in both Catholicism and Orthodoxy, cf. ŠnŠ 8.9 (K²⁰, f. 67r, ll. 9–14): *ud ān kē pēš patit bawēd ā-š xūb be niyōšišn 'u-š nē āwēnišn 'u-š rāz be nē barišn cē ka pad wināh kard be āwēnēd ayāb rāz be barēd ā-š hāwand bawēd hast kē se srōšōcaranām gōwēd ud hast kē gōwēd ē ka pad se srōšōcaranām wināh rāz be barēd margarzān <ud> hast <kē> hāwandih gōwēd* "And he before whom the penance occurs should listen well, not reproach (the penitent) and not reveal the secret, for when, as regards the sin committed, he reproaches or reveals the secret, he becomes (a sinner) likewise; there is (an authority) who says (that he becomes guilty of) a sin of three *srōšōcaranām*, and there is one who says: 'When one reveals a secret concerning a sin of three *srōšōcaranām*, he is (guilty of) the capital crime (*margarzān*)', <and> there is one <who> says: 'Likewise' (i.e. 'he becomes guilty of the same degree of sin as the one he has revealed', D.B.)."

74 Transl. Soncino.

75 Cf. MAIMONIDES, *Mišneh Torah*, HaMadda', Təšubah 2, 5: *wšbh gdwl lšb šytwdh brbym wywdy' pš'yw lhm wmgllh 'byrwt šbynw lbyn hbrw l'pym... bmb hdbrym 'mawrym b'byrwt šbyn 'dm lhbrw 'bl šbynw lbyn hmqwm 'ynw šryk lprsm 'šmw w'zwt pnyw lw 'm gylm 'l' šb lpny h'l brwk hw' wpwrt hť'yw lpnyw wmtwdh 'lyhn bpny rbywm stm wtwbh hy' lw šl' ntglh 'wnw šn'mr 'wry nšwy pš' kswy hť'h (thylym l"b, ')* "It is very praiseworthy for a person who repents to confess in public and to make his sins known to others, revealing the transgressions he committed against his colleagues... When does the above apply? In regard to sins between man and man. However, in regard to sins between man and God, it is not necessary to publicize one's [transgressions]. Indeed, revealing them is arrogant. Rather, a person should repent before God, blessed be He, and specifically mention his sins before Him. In public, he should make a general confession. It is to his benefit not to reveal his sins as [Psalms 32:1] states: 'Happy is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered'."

76 Translation according to H. A. YUSUF ALI.