



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Boekbespreking

Vaan, M.A.C. de

Citation

Vaan, M. A. C. de. (2004). Boekbespreking. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 47, 366-369. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14938>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14938>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

intensity and precision. His work having long gone out of date, it is most welcome to see that after nearly a century Zysk is entering on the sadly neglected subject with comparable enthusiasm and, as this handsomely got-up book shows, with remarkable success.

Indologisches Seminar
Regina-Pacis-Weg 7
 53113 Bonn
 Deutschland

CLAUS VOGEL

Panaino, Antonio, *The Lists of names of Ahura Mazda (Yašt I) and Vayu (Yašt XV)* [Serie Orientale Roma XCIV]. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente 2002, pp. 167. 27.

The study of the Young Avestan texts has expanded in a remarkable way since the 1990s. One of the most active contributors to this field has been Antonio Panaino, who earlier published two monographs on Yašt 8 (the Tištrya Yašt) and who has concentrated on the interpretation of the content of the texts, in particular on astronomical data and on the connection with historical data of the Old and Middle Iranian periods.

In the present monograph, P. does not confine himself to one Yašt of the Young Avestan canon, but instead discusses the occurrence of the so-called 'lists of names of Ahura Mazda', which can be found in Yt. 1 and Yt. 15. Already in earlier research, these lists have been connected with the *nāmastotras* which we find in Sanskrit. In the introductory chapter, P. discusses the importance of divine names in the religious and historical framework of the Indo-Iranian tradition, with some comparative remarks and references to other cultures. The main questions which these lists in the Yašts pose to the researcher, and to which P. tries to find answers, are the following three: (1) How do these lists relate to the surrounding parts of the Yašts in which they occur? Can they be subdivided into parts which maybe had different origins? How and when did they come to form part of the YAv. canon which was transmitted to us? (2) Many of the names occurring in the name lists show an aberrant ending from the point of view of 'mainstream' YAv. grammar. How can these endings be explained? (3) Can a semantic analysis of the names in

question tell us more about the practical aim for which they were conceived? And can such an analysis be meaningfully compared with the content of lists in other traditions, such as the Sanskrit *nāmastotras* or later Zoroastrian lists of names of Ohrmazd?

As far as the first question is concerned, P. reaches some interesting results. Within Yašt 1, the Ahura Mazda Yašt, we can separate the list of 20 names in sections 7 and 8 from the longer list in sections 12–15. Following earlier scholars, P. argues that only the 20 names belonged to the original version of Yašt 1. The second list can be subdivided in two parts, as was proposed by Johannes Hertel, the first part going until *vīta nāma ahmi*. In Yašt 15, the names of the god Vayu occur in sections 43–48. Again, this list can be split in two parts on the basis of the way in which the phrases are constructed.

For all the lists, P. provides a table which separates the names with a correct nominative singular ending from those which certainly or probably have an incorrect ending. The latter forms mainly concern the endings *-a*, *-e* and *-ə* for *a*-stems (correct would be *-ō*) and *-ə* for *i*-stems (instead of *-iš*). He then proceeds to discuss the implications of these errors for the text history, and concludes that they stem from "a later stage, when the Avestan language was submitted to a stage of evolution and decay toward a Middle Iranian status, namely when it was suffering a phase of weakness particularly of the final syllables" (pp. 93–94). Apparently, it was possible to combine old, regular forms with the newer, more eroded forms into a single litany. Consequently, the 'erroneous' endings reflect a linguistic reality of some stage of the transmission (p. 98), and their presence within Yašt 1 and 15 shows that these name lists contain materials of heterogeneous provenance. As to the form of the aberrant nom.sg. endings *-a*, *-e* and *-ə* in the name lists, I have discussed this topic myself from a linguistic point of view in de Vaan 2003: 446–450 [M. de Vaan, *The Avestan Vowels*, Amsterdam – New York, 2003]. It now appears that P. and I have independently reached very similar conclusions on this subject, especially as regards the explanation of *-ə* and the decay of Old Iranian endings. We partly disagree on the origin of the variant *-e*, which P. regards as a possible corruption of the nom.sg. of *iia*-stems (p. 96) and of the voc.sg. of *i*-stems (p. 101). To my mind, the variant *-e* is more easily explained as a scribal variant of the ending *-ə*, which was due to the similarity of the vowels *ə* and *e* in the contemporary pronunciation of the scribes. The latter fact is also shown by the frequent manuscript



spelling *-ē* for original *-ā*, see de Vaan 2003: 492. In my book I ascribed the erroneous ending *-a* in these lists to influence from stems in *-tar-* and *-uuan-*, which regularly have the nom.sg. in *-a*, and from the recurring word *nāma* 'name'. This still seems very probable to me (the ending *-a* is especially frequent in the superlative suffix *-tāma*, which rhymes with *nāma*), but I agree with P. (p. 98) when he argues that it is also conceivable that the composers of the name lists no longer distinguished between nom.sg. of *a*-stems and of *tar*-stems; in other words, that *-a* was a linguistic reality at this (late) stage.

The semantic analysis of the names is the least elaborated part of P.'s study (pp. 107–112). The main conclusion is that Ahura Mazda's names stress his majestic role in the pantheon and his omniscience, whereas Vayu's names mainly denote movement with respect to atmospheric phenomena, and warfare. The usefulness of a structural analysis of the lists is shown by P. in the interpretation of the hitherto unclear name *aojiš* in Yt 15.46. The first six names of this section consist of the juxtaposition of a qualifying adjective and its superlative: *auruuō nāma ahmi*, *auruuōtāmō nāma ahmi*, *taxmō nāma ahmi*, *taxmōtāmō nāma ahmi*, *dərəzrō nāma ahmi*, *darəjištō nāma ahmi* 'Swift I am by name, Swiftest I am by name, Strong I am by name, Strongest I am by name, Steadfast I am by name, Most Steadfast I am by name'. The text proceeds by means of *aoji nāma ahmi*, *aojiš nāma ahmi* 'Brave I am by name, ... I am by name.' Panaino (p. 79) now draws the obvious conclusion that the form *aojiš* is most likely a corrupted superlative, viz. original **aojištō* 'Bravest'. The first epithet *aoji* is generally interpreted as the nom.sg. of *aojin-* 'strong', an otherwise unknown formation. One would expect *uyrō*, the usual adjective meaning 'strong'. With more likelihood, *aoji* represents **aojā*, nom.sg. of *aojah-* 'strong', as in Yt 10.140, where this adjective is used of *miθra-*. Of course, the ending *-ā* normally occurs in compound adjectives such as Yt 10.25 *bāzuš.aojah-* 'with strength of arm' (in a context very similar to that of Yt 10.140). However, since the ending *-ā* is preserved in the names which follow in Yt 15.46 (*hupairitā*, *hupairispā*), one wonders why **aojā* would not have been preserved. Maybe *aoji* is a corruption of an earlier, 'late-YAv.' form **aojə*; the vowel *-i* can easily be due to the palatal consonant *j* which precedes it.

The book is concluded by two appendices which provide more background for the study of the Avestan epithets of Ahura Mazda and Vayu. The first (pp. 119–130) is a list of the 101 names of Ahura Mazda which are used by the present-day Zoroastrian com-

munity, given in Pārsī, Pāzand and Gujarātī. P. adds translations and some small comments. The second appendix (pp. 131–154) is written by Raiomond Doctor from Pune and Éric Phalippou from Paris, and carries the title 'The List of the 125 names of Hormazd brought back by Anquetil-Duperron. A Commented Edition'. It is an interesting study into the function of this list of names in the Zoroastrian religion, and into the possible influences which it has undergone from the Islamic tradition.

Comparative Linguistics
Leiden University
Postbus 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden
The Netherlands

MICHIEL DE VAAN

Skjærvø, Prods Oktor: *Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library. A Complete Catalogue with Texts and Translations, with contributions by Ursula Sims-Williams*. [Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Part II Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. V Saka. Texts VI.] London: The British Library 2002, pp. LXXVIII, 609, Plates 8. ISBN 0-7123-4798-4. £ 85,-.

Khotanese is an Iranian language which was spoken by the inhabitants of Khotan, one of the ancient cities situated on the Southern route of the Central Asian Silk Road. Khotanese is attested in documents which were found at the sites of former shrines and monasteries within the ancient kingdom of Khotan. The manuscripts published in this catalogue were collected on various expeditions, most of them were acquired by Sir Marc Aurel Stein and A.R. Rudolf Hoernle. The earliest extant manuscripts date to the 5th and 6th centuries A.D., the latest to the 10th century. Khotanese has traditionally been categorized as Old Khotanese and Late Khotanese. For some years P.O. Skjærvø has adduced sound arguments for the classification of a further stage Middle Khotanese so that we have to distinguish three stages of the language Khotanese with significant differences in phonology and morphology.

Khotanese culture was formed by Iranian and Indian as well as by Chinese and Tibetan influences. Its dominant, and unifying feature, however, was Buddhism. Chinese travellers between the 4th

