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The present thesis consists of an edition of an Iranian literary work whose theme is a journey to the Other World, namely the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma. The version of this work which is here edited and commented on is a prose version in the Zoroastrian Persian language. A discussion about Iranian conceptions of the Other World is also an integrated part of the thesis.

The text of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma is edited employing a text critical method by using six manuscripts. The oldest manuscript, which has been used as the base manuscript for editing the text, was written in 896 A.Y. (Yazdgirdī)/1527 A.D. The edited text is also translated into English, and followed by a Commentary on names, unusual words and Zoroastrian terms used in the text.

Other Iranian documents about journeys to the Other World are studied in this thesis as well, and all are compared to the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma. The Zoroastrian Persian version of this work is also compared to its Parsig version.

The differences between the Zoroastrian Persian and the Parsig versions indicate that they have their background in two different world views. To prove this theory, some significant elements in the Zoroastrian Persian version, which demonstrate that this is a pre-Zoroastrian epic narrative, have been compared to some elements in the Parsig version that show that this is a religious Zoroastrian account. Possible reasons for the change in Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma from apre-Zoroastrian epic narrative into a Zoroastrian-religious one are also suggested.

A king named Davānūs is one of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma personages. In an appendix, the historical personality of Davānūs is discussed with reference to Arabic, Persian and Greek historiography.
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System of transcription

The transcription system for Persian in this thesis follows the table found on the following page. It is worth mentioning that words from other languages found in the edited text, for instance words of Avestan and Parsig origin, have all been transcribed on the basis of the same method.

The transcription method for Parsig words is based on MacKenzie (1990), and that of Avestan words on Hoffmann (1975-1976).
# List of transcription

## Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>č</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ġ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x (kh in names)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ž</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ž</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ř</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ġ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ġ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ņ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Short Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Long Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĭ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Introduction

*Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* is one of the most highly esteemed literary works among Zoroastrians, after the *Avesta*. It is the journey report of a man named Virāf to the Other World. After drinking a substance, he falls asleep. Then, guided by two of Ohrmazd’s Holy Immortals, he visits the Other World. The first part of the Other World is the place of those who pass the time in joy and happiness, because they have been virtuous in this world. The other part is the place of those who are in constant pain and torment, because they have been evil-doers in the present world. And finally, the third place is where those whose good and evil deeds have been equal in the world are to be encountered. When he woke up, Virāf asked for his journey report to be written down, for all people to be aware of what it is like in the Other World.

The influence and importance of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* was so great that during several centuries it was translated into all the languages in use by the Zoroastrians: Parsig, Pazand, Sanskrit, Old Gujarati, Zoroastrian Persian (several prose and versified versions), and New Gujarati (several versions).¹ J. A. Pope published the first translation of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* into English in 1816. Due to the importance and value of this work, researchers of Iranian studies throughout the world have been engaged either in translating the text into different languages or in researching about the work during two hundred years after Pope. The existence of several different translations of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* into French, English and Persian either in prose or in verse, in addition to much other research done around the work itself, e.g. comparing it with similar works in other cultures, shows the importance and value of the work.

The aim of the present thesis is to edit the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* and to conduct research around it.

The first chapter consists of an introduction.

In the second chapter the background and history of the different versions of the work are discussed. The name of Virāf, his personality and his time are also studied in this chapter. Furthermore, all other works available that mention Virāf’s name and his journey are referred to and discussed. In this

¹ The Sasanids attempted to remove the Parthian heritage completely and managed to do it in part. Therefore, unfortunately, there is no trace of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* in the Pahlavānīg language (Parthian) nowadays, even if there may have been such a thing at one time.
chapter, for the first time, an Arabic version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* is presented. Illustrated versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* are discussed in this chapter as well. A conspectus of all versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in different languages is presented at the end of the chapter.

The third chapter discusses the Other World in other Iranian works in different languages from ancient times to the present, the main subject of which is a journey to the Other World. The accounts in these works are compared to the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* with particular focus on similarities.

The fourth chapter identifies previous research related to the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*.

The fifth chapter describes the manuscripts of the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*. All the twelve manuscripts of this document which are known, most of which are kept in various libraries all over the world are introduced in this chapter. The six manuscripts which were used to edit the text body for the present thesis have been fully studied and described in detail. The editing method of the text is also presented in this chapter. A selection from the text itself of words such as ancient verbs and various grammatical structures is listed. A Stemma Codicum of the manuscripts used to edit the text is found at the end of the chapter.

The sixth chapter is a translation of the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* into English. This is the first time that the full Zoroastrian Persian version is published entirely in a major world language.

The seventh chapter consists of commentaries to elucidate the meaning of certain words, such as religious terms, celebrations, and mythic and Zoroastrian’s personages mentioned in the text.

The purpose of the eighth chapter is to compare the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* to that in Parsig. There is a discussion of possible reasons for the fact that some parts of the account are found in one version but not in the other, or that some sections are more expanded and detailed in one of the versions.

The ninth chapter compares the Zoroastrian Persian and Parsig versions from a new point of view. It ventures the theory that the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* is originally a pre-Zoroastrian document. By describing in detail the differences between the Zoroastrian Persian and the Parsig version, it indicates the antiquity of the Zoroastrian Persian version in comparison to the Parsig version. Then an attempt is made to demonstrate by evidence from the two versions that the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* is a very ancient narrative, belonging to the pre-Zoroastrian Iranian society where Vīrāf, the shaman, had travelled to the Other World and reported on his journey in an originally non-religious epical narration. Some traces remain in the Zoroastrian Persian version from this epical narration.

The appendix discusses a personage called Davānūs, who is visited by Vīrāf in the Other World. The name of this person has constantly been discussed during the two hundred years that have passed from the beginning of
research around the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*. Arabic, Persian and the Greek historical accounts have been studied about this personality for the first time in this chapter in order to prove that Davānūs is the Achaemenid king Darius I.

A bibliography is found at the end of the English section of the book.

The Zoroastrian Persian section begins from the right side of the book since Persian is read from right to left. It consists of the Zoroastrian Persian text of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* edited according to the critical editing method.

Since the text body of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* contains old words, terms and verbs, which give this work a special value and importance, an index is provided for selected old words, terms and verbs after the Zoroastrian Persian text.

**Previous Research**

For the first time, the full text of the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* has been edited and translated in this thesis. Prior to this, on the basis of a manuscript, manuscript M, only the introduction of this version was translated and published by Haug and West in 1872. Their work was based only on one manuscript, and all the errors and omissions of that manuscript are repeated as well. After them, Mu‘īn (1946) edited and published the same introduction on the basis of Haug and West’s edition. However, since the manuscript M was not available to Mu‘īn, and he did not have access to other manuscripts, all the misreadings by Haug and West were also repeated in his edition. ‘Affī (1964) published the edited text of Mu‘īn as the preface of a book entitled the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* versified by Zartušt Bahrām Pajdu.

Apart from these works, there are presentations of different manuscripts of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in library catalogues as well as scattered hints to these manuscripts, all mentioned in chapte IV.

**The Aim**

At the beginning, the main object of this thesis was to edit the Zoroastrian Persian version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, to translate the text into English and to compare it with the Parsig version. However, the aim was extended in the course of the work, and some other objectives were added along with the primary aim. Research concerning Iranian conceptions of journeys to the Other World on the basis of all texts available is one such aim. Others are research about all versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* which have survived, about the origin of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* and its initial version, and finally about one of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* personages named Davānūs who is mentioned in the *Sipand Nask*, the *Šāyest Nē-Šāyest* and the *Ṣaddar Natr* as well.
Because of these new objectives, the volume of this thesis grew to be twice that of the initially planned work.

The Method

The process of editing the text body of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* was carried out on the basis of a Critical Edition method. For this, manuscript N, which is the oldest of all the manuscripts, has been chosen as the basic manuscript. Differences between this manuscript and all other variants are listed in footnotes. However, due to the manuscript situation of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*, it was not possible to use a strictly critical edition method. Therefore, the editing method is a mixing of the critical and eclectic methods.

The most ancient manuscript is dated to the year 896 A.Y./1527 A.D. Even though the date of the actual translation of the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* is unknown, attempt has been made, by studying the words and also by the literary style of the work, to show that the text was probably written in the fourth or fifth century A.H./tenth or eleventh A.D.

The editing method and the style of the text are explained extensively in chapter five.

The Sources

Two types of sources have been used in the thesis: Manuscript Sources and Printed Sources. To the first group belong those manuscripts of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* that have been used to edit the text. Manuscripts of other works have been used in other chapters of this thesis. The second type, Printed Sources, include research done around the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* or in area related to the main subject of each chapter of the thesis. The complete list of all sources is found in the bibliography.
Among the pre-Islamic Iranian-Zoroastrian works, two have enjoyed particularly good luck: the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*² and the *Jāmāsp-Nāma*. The first one is a report of a journey to the Other World and a foretelling of what will happen to the human after death. The other one predicts what the end of the world will be like and what will happen to Iran at that time.

Both books talk about the unseen and what has not happened yet. They talk of a world which no one else had talked about before and about matters which the curious human being constantly wishes to discover and to get to know. Due to this, both these books have a marvellous attraction. On the one hand, the charm of the works and, on the other hand, the recommendation and exhortation by the Zoroastrian priests to study them have caused these works to be read and considered by Zoroastrians both in and outside Iran. Thus, both works have been copied, re-written and translated into other languages of Zoroastrians at all times. This in itself is another reason why these two works have survived for so long.

The main subject of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* is the journey of a man called Vīrāf to the Other World. He passes into a state of unconsciousness after using an intoxicating drink and travels to the Other World while he is unconscious. Vīrāf visits some cheerful and fortunate people in orchards and rose-gardens who are enjoying the favour and grace of Paradise. However, he also sees some other people in Hell, who are in pain and suffering and who live in frosty and miserable places, and are either being tormented or persecuted by harmful creatures. The lucky and cheerful people are those who have done good deeds in this world, but the people who are immersed in pain and suffering are those who have been malevolent and evil-doing in the present world. The third group is the people whose virtues and wrongdoings have been equal and they are now in Limbo, where they are neither suffering nor rejoicing. Vīrāf wakes up from his state of unconsciousness after seven days, and then he begins to tell about his journey and asks for a scribe to write the report down.

² The present study is done on the basis of the Zoroastrian Persian version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*. There are different forms of the name in different versions of the account, but in all parts of this study Vīrāf, Ardāy-Vīrāf and the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* are used, since these are the forms found in the Zoroastrian Persian version.
There are some main issues in the *Ardåy-Vîråf Nâma* that need special attention; the name of Vîråf, his personality, the time of Vîråf and the time when the *Ardåy-Vîråf Nâma* was written, Vîråf’s journey report and the subject of it, the various versions of the work, and finally the manuscripts of the *Ardåy-Vîråf Nâma* where illustrations are included. These are the points that have been considered and studied by Iranists in different parts of the world during the last two centuries.

The name of Vîråf

Fravardin Yašt is the most ancient text which has mentioned the name of Vîråf. Here the name has been recorded in the form of Wirâz (Fravardin Yašt: XXV.101).

The name has been recorded with the form of Wirâz (Fravardin Yašt: XXV.101).

Taking into consideration that the last letter of the name is applied for the three phonemes ‘f’, ‘p’, ‘b’, and ‘c’, in the Parsig language, the name can be transcribed as Wirâf, Wirâp and Wirâb. The last letter is also transcribed as ‘w’ in a few cases. Thus, the name can be transcribed as Wirâw as well. Probably due to this, the name is found twice with the form of Wirâv.

The name in the Pazand version is written in the form of Wirâf (Antia 1909: 358), the transcription of which is Ardd-Gvîrå (1920: II). Haug and West have transcribed the name a little differently, in the translation of the introduction of the Sanskrit version (1872: Lxxvii), namely as Ardd-Gvîrå. That is not surprising at all, since the name does not end in the letter that can be read as ‘f’, ‘p’ and ‘b’ in the Sanskrit and Old Gujarati versions. The reason for this is that both these versions have been translated on the basis of the Pazand version (Bharucha 1920: II).

3 The time of Vîråf himself and the probable time of the codification of the *Ardåy-Vîråf Nâma* will be discussed in chapter IX.
4 The main subject of the work, Vîråf’s journey to the other world, is studied in chapters III, VII and VIII.
5 See also Geldner 1886-1896; Westergaard 1852-54: I.238; Wolff 1924: 244; Lommel 1927: 125.
6 The first part of the name could be written with the form of Wirâz as well.
7 The word Wirâz could be given as an example in this case, which will be byt’ in transliteration and banved in transcription (Amuzgar-Tafazzul 1994: 42).
8 Haug and West have recorded the name in the form of Ardà Vîrå in the introduction of the Pazand version (1872: Lxxvii).
9 Thus, neither Mu’în’s transcription of the name as Vîråf (1946: 5) nor Gignoux’s Wirâz (1984: 8) in the Pazand version can be correct.
10 Bharucha has transcribed the name Arddâ-Gvîrå in his introduction (1920: II), and thus followed Haug and West’s transcription.
Apart from the Zoroastrian Persian version, in which the name has been recorded as Vīrāf, it has also been written as Vīrāf in New Persian (Arabic) script in the margin of a Parsig manuscript (Codex K26 1932: fol. 8’). In addition to this, the name has also been recorded in the form of Vīrāf in Mēnō ī Xrad in verse by Dārāb Hurmazdyār Sanjāna (S.P.38: 17b).

The researchers are not in general agreement about the name of Vīrāf. Some have written the name with the form of Vīrāf (Haug-West 1872; Darmesteter 1883: I.75, II.298; Barthélemy: 1887; Jackson 1899: 157; Jamasp Asa 1902; Maddox 1904; Pavry 1927: 53; Modi 1932’a’: 107; Blochet 1933: 49; Wikander 1946: 44; de Menasce 1949: 1-6). However, some others have recorded it with the form of Wīrāz (Bartholomae 1904: 1454; Jackson 1928: 139; Christensen 1931: 12; Henning 1951: 51; Molé 1963: 179; Nyberg 1974: II.213; Boyce 1968’a’: 48; Gignoux 1984).

It seems that because the form Wīrāz is the one found in the Avesta, this form is more accepted at present (Tafa 1997: 167). Anyway, some researchers such as Bartholomae, Nyberg and Boyce have accepted the form Wīrāz, even though they also accept the form Vīrāf as a traditional reading of the name.

There are fewer problems with the first part of the name. The Avestan word of ašvān- is artavan- in Old Persian and ahlaw or ardā in Parsig, which means ‘righteous’ (Gnoli 1979: 387). The Pazand form of the word is ašō. Ardāy is also translated into ašō in one of the manuscripts of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma in Zoroastrian Persian (MS. L: fol.7a).

The name of Ardāy-Vīrāf has a particular story in the Zoroastrian Persian version. In addition to the title of the book which is mentioned at the beginning in the form of Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma; the name of this personality is given as “Ardāy-Vīrāf” ten times in the text body. All these cases occur when he has already come back from his journey to the Other World. According to all the Zoroastrian Persian manuscripts, when Vīrāf woke up, all the priests and authorities called him “Ardāy-Vīrāf”, which means ‘the righteous Vīrāf’:

«شَدَ آمَدی اردای-ویراف و به بازیینی آن باشکه بهشتی اشتو باشد» “You are welcome, o Ardāy-Vīrāf, and that means when looking back that he is heavenly righteous” (lines 86-87). The reason for giving this name to Vīrāf at such a time, is just because he has returned from the Other World. This is actually the same name that he was called by Surūs the righteous (first episode), Amšaspandān (the Holy Immortals) (third episode) and Urdībihišt the Holy

---

11 Darmesteter has also suggested the probability of reading the name either Vīrāp or Vīrāb (Darmesteter 1883: I. 298).
12 Jackson wrote the name Vīrāf in 1899 and Vīrāz in 1928.
13 However, Ardā does not mean righteous everywhere (Gignoux 1984: 10).
14 The Pazand form of the name is ašō. Ardāy is translated into ašō in one of the manuscript of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma, manuscript L (MS. L: fol.7a).
15 The sentence is written as: «شَدَ آمَدی اردای-ویراف، که به معنی بهشتی باشد و اشو باشد» “You are welcome, oh Ardāy-Vīrāf, which means the heavenly and the righteous” in manuscript L, which in some parts is simplified in comparison to the other manuscripts (MS. L: fol.7a).
Immortal (twelfth episode) at the commencement of his journey to the Other World. While giving him the message to take to this world, Ohrmazd (sixtieth episode) also calls him in by this name at the end of his journey. However, the name of this personality is mentioned sixteen times in the form of Vīrāf, all before his departure to the Other World.  

Gnoli believes that the term Ardāy points to the post mortem fortunate (Gnoli 1979: 387-388). Gignoux holds that Ardāy has a special meaning in connection with the post mortem world (Gignoux 1979: 41-79; Gignoux 1984: 9). The idea that the “being Ardāy” of Vīrāf has occurred after his ascension to the Other World, is here introduced in the light of the previously presented examples from the Zoroastrian Persian text.  

Some of the Zoroastrian Persian and the New Persian sources have seen Ardā or Ardāy as equal to the name of Vīrāf’s himself. The Farhang-i ānan-drāf (Muḥammad Pādsāh 1956: 7.4528), has identified this name as Ardāy, and the Hikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may-i ḥalāl va ḥarām ba qā’ida-yi dīn (1922: I.270), Farhang-i Rašīdī (Tattavi 1875:1.44) and the Burhān-i Qāṭi’ (Tabrīzī 1983: 1.99) have written the name as Ardā and regarded it as the name of Vīrāf himself. Both forms, Ardā and Ardāy, are found in Nairang-i bury-dādan. In praise of Vīrāf, Ardā is mentioned as part of his name, and later in the sentence ardā meaning ‘saint’ is used as a separate adjective describing Vīrāf: “May Ardāy-Vīrāf, whose immortal soul is sacred, be kept in good remembrance now!” (Unvālā 1922: I.356).

Six forms of the name Vīrāf are found in the Zoroastrian Persian version: Ardāy-Vīrāf (line 86), Ardā-Vīrāf (line 91), Vīrāf (line 31), Vīrāf (footnote 99), Ardāvīr (MS.N: fol.0b), Ardā (line 118). One of the most remarkable meanings suggested by Kellens for Ardāy-Vīrāf is *vīra-aza- (“qui mène les hommes”), i.e. “who leads mankind”) a term which is very well-suited to Vīrāf’s personality (Kellens 1974 → Mayrhofer 1977: I/95).

Besides in the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma in Zoroastrian Persian, this name has been recorded as Ardāy-Vīrāf in other works as follows: the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma in verse by Zartušt Bahrām (Zarātušt Bahrām Pajdū 1964: 21.verse 407), the Qiṣṣa-yi sanjān versified by Bahman Kay-Qubād Sanjana (1915: 21.verse 407)
Still, the name of Wirāf is known as a boy’s name after millennia. This name is being used among the Iranian Zoroastrians in three dialect forms: Wirāf in Persian, Vīyɾāp in the dialect of the Zoroastrians in Kirmān, and Wirup and Wiruvug25 (Surūšiyan 1977: 200) in the dialect of the Zoroastrians in Yazd. Apart from the above-mentioned cases, Wirābī is a family name among the Iranian Zoroastrians (Bahār 1996: 329).

Wirāf’s personality

The name of Wirāf has been mentioned in many Zoroastrian works due to his value and importance. Wirāf himself, as well as his journey is described in these works. Wirāf’s visit to Paradise is mentioned in the Farziyāt-Nāma, and also the importance of him killing the xrafstar (noxious creature) (Pāhlan 1924: 33). The Ḩikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may-i ḥalāl va ḥarām ba qa’ida-yi dīn mentions the three bowls of wine that were drunk by Wirāf before his journey to the Other World (Unvālā 1922: I.270-271). The Kaifiyyat-in qissa-yi sultān Mahmūd-i gaznavī talks about Wirāf’s ascending to the Other World and about his return and report (Rosenberg 1909: I.30). The Jāmāspī (S.P.46: 430b) makes mention of the belief that the world will be purified and renewed by Wirāf.

In some works, Wirāf has been mentioned either as a mūbad or the mūbad of the mūbadān. Farhang-i Jahāngūrī writes that the Parsis tell that there were two mūbads at the time of Ardāšīr-i Bābakān: firstly Wirāf and secondly Mārasfand, but that Wirāf was superior and the supreme one (MS.ADD24413: 22a). Ardā is known as one of the Magi, and the mūbad of

23 Both the forms Ardāy-Virāf (Aša 2002’a’: 394) and Virāf (ibid: 395) are found in the Saugand-Nāma.
24 For more information about Ardā and Virāf, see the following studies: Mayrhofer 1977: I/95.371; Gignoux 1986: II/45.118; II/183.1005.
25 It is worth noting that this form of the name is not mentioned any other Iranian source, neither Zoroastrian nor non-Zoroastrian.
26 The Farziyāt-Nāma has two sections; the Persian section begins from the right and the page numbers are in Persian, the English section begins from the left and the page numbers are in English. This reference is to the Persian section.
mūbadān in the the *Farhang-i Rašīdī* (Tattavi: I.44). Vīrāf is also known as a mūbad and learned man in the *Farhang-i Ānandrāj* (Muḥammad Pādsāh 1956: 1.206).

Other works have also turned him into a superhuman and an epic personality. Probably for the sake of his journey to the Other World, some works have given him an even higher position than just that of a traveler to the Other World. He is known as a prophet according to the Parsis. *Burhān-i Qātī* (Tabrīzī 1983: 1.99) and *Farhang-i Ānandrāj* (Muḥammad Pādsāh 1956: 1.206) testify to this. Also the Zoroastrians in Iran view him as a prophet according to the *Farhang-i Niẓām* (Dā‘ī-ul-islām 1927: 1.121). It is quoted in the *Saugand-Nāma* that according to Āzarbād-i Mārasfandān every Zoroastrian should believe without doubt in the good religion of the Mazdayasnān (Mazda-Worshippers) and in Vīrāf’s words (*Saugand-Nāma* → Aša 2002’a: 395). The name of Vīrāf is mentioned in the *Nairang-i baydādan* together with the names of the great men of Irānshāh, such as Zarathustra, Guštasp, Manūcihr, Īraj, Farīdūn, Siyāvaš, Gūdarz, Rustam and Garšasp, (Unvālā 1922: I.355-358).

The treatise of the *Rāz-i yazdānī*27 could be one of the most important documents on Vīrāf’s personality, because this is the only source that has talked about Vīrāf’s life after his journey to the Other World. The author of the treatise, Bahrām Rustam Nīršī-ābādī (Naṣr-ābādī) (dead in 1249 A.Y./1880 AD), wrote that the Iranian Zoroastrians were divided into two groups after the time of Ardašīr (Šahmardān 1984: 387-403). One of those was the followers of Vīrāf, which the author called Ardā-y-Vīrāfī, and the others are the Āzarbādī, who were the followers of Āzarbād-i Mārasfandān. The text reads:

> It should not be secret that when the good religion was renewed and circulated due to the justice and struggles by Ardašīr-i Bābākān the righteous king of kings and under the auspicious leadership of God’s selected leaders, his holiness Ardā-y-Vīrāfī and his holiness Āzarbād-i Mārasfandān, the people left the aberrance. Thereafter, when these great fellows said farewell to the world [i.e. died], the children of their followers multiplied. The Iranians were divided into two groups; some Ardā-y-Vīrāfī and a great crowd of Āzarbādī, even though both these auspicious men did not proclaim anything other than the ritual traditions. Then, the mūbadān who recognized themselves as descendants and followers of each of these began to be separated and alienated from each other; so each group wrote a separate introduction to the *Avesta*. Then, after the Arabs’ victory over Iran, a group fled to India and the other remained under oppression in Iran. They forgot their religious rituals bit by bit due to the multiple oppression, and mixed up the religion with some other rituals. Those who escaped to India forgot some ancient religious rituals due to associating with the people there and adopted their ways.” (MS.301: 2b-3b)

---

27 There are three other manuscripts of the *Rāz-i yazdānī* with the title *Sur-nāma-yi Rāz-i Yazdānī* with sub-numbers 221a, 221b, 221c, in Maneckji’s collection, in Cama Oriental Institute Library (Garavī 1986: 59-60).
The time of Vīrāf

There are various periods for the time of Vīrāf in Zoroastrian works. According to the Mēnō i Xrad in the Zoroastrian Persian version versified by Dārāb Hormuzdār Sanjāna (S.P.38: 17b), Vīrāf lived before Guštāsp. According to the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma in Pazand, Sanskrit and the Old Gujarati, Vīrāf was contemporary with Guštāsp. Finally, Vīrāf was contemporary with Ardašīr-i Bābakān according to the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma of the Zoroastrian Persian version, the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma of the Zoroastrian Persian version in verse by Zatušt Bahrām Pajdū, the Qišşa-yi sanjān, versified by Bahman Kay-Qubād Sanjāna (1915: 4.vv.85-87), the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma of the Zoroastrian Persian in verse by Anūšīrvān Kirmānī, the Jāmāspī the Zoroastrian Persian version, versified by Dastūr Burzū, in 16th-17th century A.D. (S.P.46: 430b), the Kaifiyyat-in qišşa-yi sultān Mahmūd-i ǧaznavī (Rosenberg 1909: I.30), the Hikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may-i ḥalāl va ḥarām ba qā’ida-yi dīn (1922: I.270-271), the Rāz-i yazdānī (MS.301: 2b-3b), the Saugand-Nāma (Aša 2002’a: 394), the Qišsa-yi zartuštīyān-i hindūstān va bayān-i āṭāš-i bahrām-i Navsārī, versified by Shapurji Maneckji Sanjāna (1930: 14.vv.98-100), the Farhang-i Jahāngīrī (MS.ADD24413: 22a), the Farhang-i Rašīdī (1875: I.44), the Farhang-i Ānandrāj (Muḥammad Pādsāh 1956: I.206) and the Farhang-i Niẓām (Dā‘ūl-ul-islām 1927: I.121).

Most of the researchers who have studied the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma, as Tavadia (1956: 117), Widengren (1961: 13), Boyce (1968’a: 48) and Taftāzūnī (1991: 733) believe that this work is originally very old. The discussion about the antiquity of this work is further developed in chapter IX.

The Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma versions

The important position of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma in Zoroastrianism and its value among the Zoroastrians is clearly seen from the numerous versions of Vīrāf’s journey report that are recorded in various languages and in different times. It is safe to say that no other pre-Islamic Iranian work has been copied, re-written, translated and spread to this extent.

The initial version of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma was not a religious document but a pre-Zoroastrian (Indo-Iranian) text.28 The form and the main subject of this early version was changed into a Zoroastrian-religious form after the death of Zarathustra. The Zoroastrian priests were constantly involved in changing this work ideologically during the centuries. Thus, various versions of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma have been created. The most significant evidence

---

28 Specific epic traits, which are evidence for the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma being originally a non-Zoroastrian account, remain in the Zoroastrian Persian version. These traits will be considered in chapter VIII for a comparison between the Zoroastrian Persian version and the Parsig version, and also in chapter IX.
to prove this opinion is the existence of the Zoroastrian Persian version, where in some parts, some traces of a non-Zoroastrian epical document are still to be found.

The various versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* lead us to believe that the pre-Zoroastrian (Indo-Iranian) form of the text has been transformed firstly into a Zoroastrian form in Pahlavanig (Parthian/Pahlavi), Parsig or some other language. We have no clear evidence for this, however. Then after becoming a Zoroastrian text, it has constantly been more and more “Zoroastrified”. Perhaps due to different opinions among the priests various versions of this work and its introductions give a different time for Vīrāf’s life and journey.

The introductions and the themes of the Parsig, Pazand and Zoroastrian Persian versions clearly show that these three versions have been written on the basis of three different versions. The most logical explanation is that three Parsig versions have been written on the basis of the first Zoroastrian text which was itself written down on the basis of the initial pre-Zoroastrian (Indo-Iranian) account. One of these three versions is the source of the present Parsig version. The second one is the base of the existing Pazand version. The Zoroastrian Persian version would then be an outcome of the third Parsig version.

- Because of its language, but only for that reason, the Parsig version is the oldest version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*. In comparison with the Pazand version and, more important than that, in comparison with the Zoroastrian Persian version the form and the theme confirms that it is not an authentic version, because, it has been retouched constantly to improve the religious aims, even after the Arab invasion of Iran (Gignoux 1984: 17).

It is notable that none of the versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* have been written on the basis of the Parsig version. This will be demonstrated when comparing the other accounts with the Parsig version.

- The Pazand version gives that Vīrāf was sent to the Other World in the time of Guštāsp according to the date in the introduction of this version. Additionally, the main subject of the text is very different from the Parsig version. This indicates that the origin of the Parsig version which must have been another Parsig version (since all Pazand texts are transcriptions of Parsig texts) was different from the present the Parsig version. One of the oldest manuscripts of the Pazand version is dated 1410 A.D. (Haug-West 1872: x).

- The Sanskrit version; the Sanskrit version is based on the Pazand version (Bharucha 1920: II). The H18 manuscript is the oldest manuscript of the Sanskrit version, which contains the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in Pazand and Sanskrit in addition to its colophon in Sanskrit. It is dated to the year 1466 Samvat equal to 1410 A.D. (Katkar 1941: 250).
The Old Gujarati version; the Sanskrit version had been the basis of translating the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma into Old Gujarati (Bharucha 1920: II). The oldest manuscript of the Old Gujarati version is in a miscellany including some works, among them the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma in Pazand, Sanskrit and Old Gujarati. This miscellany is dated 784 A.Y./1415 A.D. (Katrick 1941: 250).

The first extant Zoroastrian Persian version in verse; this version consists of 1849 verses and was versified by Zartušt Bahrām Pajdū in the second half of the seventh century A.H./second half of the thirteenth century A.D.29 The origin of this version must have been the Zoroastrian Persian version in prose. However, the presence of differences between this poem and the present Zoroastrian Persian version in prose could indicate that Zartušt Bahrām’s source might have been a old manuscript of the Zoroastrian Persian version which was somewhat different from the present Zoroastrian Persian version in prose (‘Afīf 1964: twenty-one).

The first extant Zoroastrian Persian version in prose; the oldest manuscript of this version is the manuscript that was written for Shapur Āsā in the year 896 A.Y. /1527 A.D. in Iran, and he himself carried it to India in that same year. More explanation will be given about this version in chapter V.30

The second extant Zoroastrian Persian version in verse; in the Paris manuscript, this poem has a little more than 1100 couplets (S.P.46: 365b-381b). The poem was composed by Kāvūs Farīburz Yazdī31 in the year 902 A.Y./1533 A.D. in Navsari (Hodivala 1920: 303). The poem was composed on the basis of the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma and was carried from Iran to India in the year 896 A.Y. /1527 A.D. Kāvūs Farīburz Yazdī, in his poem, does not mention the versified version by Zartušt Bahrām Pajdū which predates his own version.

29 According to Dastur Jamaspji Asa’s writing, Zartušt Bahrām versified the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma in the year 900 A.Y./1530-1531 A.D. (Jamaspji Asa → Haug-West 1872: xix). However Mu’tın has proved on the basis of historical evidence that Zartušt Bahrām lived in the seventh century A.H./the thirteenth A.D. (Mu’tın 1988: 4, 2-7).
30 Dastur Jamaspji Asa mentions another Zoroastrian Persian version, entitled the Rivāyat of Rāma Khambayati [true: Kamā Khambayatī] which is not very different in theme from the versified version (Jamaspji Asa → Haug-West 1872: xix). This version is just a copy of the version written for Shapur Āsā. The title Rivāyat of Kama Asa Khambayeti is given to this version on the first page of the microfilm of the Zoroastrian Persian version of Shapur Āsā.
31 Kāvūs Farīburz Yazdī, a Zoroastrian merchant from Yazd in companion with another Zoroastrian named Afsād went for business from Yazd to Navsari in India. He composed a poem about his and his friend’s adventures under the title Qīṣṣa-yi Kāvūs va Afsād. According to this poem, Kāvūs assisted the Parsis very much (MS.F.45: fol.1-38). Haug and West mention a work entitled the Ḥūḍaṭa-Nāma, which is the story of Kāvūs and Afsād. This book was translated from Persian into Gujarati and was published in Bombay in 1831. The Qīṣṣa-yi Kāvūs va Afsād may be the same as the Ḥūḍaṭa-Nāma.
32 From the prologue and the epilogue it appears that a Mūbad named Bahrām Pāhlan, chief of the Navsari Anjuman, together with Maneck and Bahman urged Kāvūs Farīburz to turn the story of Ardāy-Virāf Nāma into verse.

The third extant Zoroastrian Persian version in verse; this poem is composed of 424 verses and was versified by Anūšīrvān Kirmānī either in the second half of the sixteenth century or the first half of the seventeenth century A.D. (Unvālā 1922: II.331-342). Anūšīrvān writes that, since the poem versified by Zartušt Bahram lacks several chapters, he and two dastūrs (authorities) studied the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma textbook in düzvāriš (hūzvāriš), meaning Parsig or may be Pazand, and then he turned into poetry the chapters that were absent in the Zartušt Bahram’s version (Ibid: 342).

The part about the golden-eared dog seen by Vīrāf is among the accounts found in the poem of Anūšīrvān (Ibid: 332). However, the lack of this part in Zartušt Bahram’s poem does not indicate that he missed out any part of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma, since he had composed his poems on the basis of the Zoroastrian Persian version in prose (Haug-West 1872: xix) and no such part of the golden-eared dog exists in this version.

It is worth mentioning that the part on the golden-eared dog does not exist in the present Parsig vision either. That is to say that the Parsig or maybe the Pazand version used by Anūšīrvān was different from the presently available Parsig version.

The first extant New Gujarati version is a rendering of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma in verse, which was composed by the Dastur Rustam Pašūtan Hurmazdīr in 1651 A.D. (Modi 1923: 106-108). This work is based on Zartušt Bahram’s version, Naušīrvān Bahram’s version and the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma-yi Kavūsī (Ibid: 108-109). Two manuscript of the work are being preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, both containing miniature paintings.

The second extant New Gujarati version was translated into New Gujarati on the basis of Zartušt Bahram poems by an unknown translator in

---

33 The existence of two translations in New Gujarati and the Dabistān-i Mazāhib in Persian created on the basis of the poem of Zartušt Bahram shows the popularity and the of Zartušt Bahram’s version.

34 Anūšīrvān Kirmānī versified his dated works approximately between the years 988-998 A.Y./1619-1629 A.D. (Āmūzgār 1969: 185).

35 It seems that this Naušīrvān is Anaušīrvān Kirmānī, because among those who versified the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma there is no known Naušīrvān/Anaušīrvān except Anaušīrvān Kirmānī. But his full name is Anaušīrvān Marzbān Kirmānī, not Naušīrvān Bahram.
the early years of the eighteenth century\textsuperscript{36} (Jamaspji Asa → Haug-West 1872: xxi).

- The third extant New Gujarati version is another translation from Zar- 
  tušt Bahrām’s poems, first printed by the Jām Jamšid Press in Bombay in 
  the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{37} and later reprinted later (ibid).
- The Arabic version. This is the first time that an Arabic translation of 
  this work is introduced. The only known manuscript of this Arabic ver-
  sion is mentioned in a miscellany including the Kitāb fī qarānāt, the Ki-
  tāb dalālata zarātušt, the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma and some other works. All 
  these works are written in Arabic but in Syriac characters. This miscel-
  lany is preserved in the Monastery of Mar Giwargis in Mosul in Iraq and 
  is one of the manuscripts that have been brought from Alqosh\textsuperscript{38} to this 
  monastery.\textsuperscript{39}

The illustrated manuscripts of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma

A number of manuscripts of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} in various languages have been illustrated with paintings during the centuries. Illustrating the books with paintings was done to ensure that the subject and the theme of the book will leave a stronger impression on readers (Tavadia 1956: 120). Although there are not many illustrated manuscript left in our time, the few existing ones are important enough.

It is not clearly known when manuscripts of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} began to be illustrated. However, the oldest information about an illustrated manuscript of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} is given by Hodivala, Modi and Dhabhar. Hodivala, in his studies in Parsi History, mentions an illustrated \textit{Vīrāf-Nāma} dated to 928 A.Y./1558 A.D. in a certain collection. Kāmdin Shāpur Kham-bātı carried this miscellany from Iran to India (Hodivala 1920: 309-310). Modi, in his introduction on the narratives of Dārāb Hormazyār’s \textit{Rivāyat} has mentioned a miscellany containing two \textit{Vīrāf-Nāmas} with pictures,

\textsuperscript{36} Dastur Jamaspji Asa writes that this work was translated 150 years ago. In view of the publishing time of Haug-West’s book in 1872, this work must have been translated around 1720.

\textsuperscript{37} Dastur Jamaspji Asa writes that this work was translated about 20 years ago. In view of the publishing time of Haug-West’s book in 1872 this work must have been translated approximately 1852.

\textsuperscript{38} Alqosh/Alqush is one of the famous Assyrian cities in Iraq, about 30 kilometers north of Mosul.

\textsuperscript{39} I am indebted to Mr. Zakky Shărifu for information on this version. His only trace of this miscellany that might be helpful for finding it is that the manuscript was brought to Mar Giwargis monastery from Alqosh/Alqush. In the year 2006, my Kurdish fellow-researcher, Nauzād Aḩmad, was after many struggles able to see this manuscript just for a few minutes on his journey to Mosul. Unfortunately, I have not yet succeeded in gaining a microfilm or photography of that miscellany or at least the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} section, in spite of two years of hard work.
which were sent to the Parsis by the Iranian Zoroastrians via Herbed-Zādah Kamdin (Modi 1922: I.12). Dhabhar also mentions a miscellany containing a \textit{Vīrāf-Nāma} illustrated with pictures in \textit{The Persian Rivayats of Hormazyar Framarz} (Dhabhar 1932: 618). All these three miscellanies are the same since all three contain similar works. There is just a single difference between them, Hodivala and Dhabhar mention one \textit{Vīrāf-Nāma} illustrated with pictures, but Modi mentions two \textit{Vīrāf-Nāmas} with pictures. Hodivala writes that is the same manuscript that was used by Pope (ibid: 310, f.54)

The illustrated manuscripts of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} which are known at present are as follows by date:

- The MS. (??)\footnote{Modi has not given the number of this manuscript.}, dated 997 A.Y./1628 A.D. in the Cama Oriental Institute Library, the Zoroastrian Persian version in verse, versified by Zartušt Bahrām, containing 57 illustrated tableaus, maybe illustrated by a “Mahomedan or Hindu artist of the time” (Modi 1931: 3).
- The MS. 149, dated 1044 A.H./1634 A.D, in the Cama Oriental Institute Library, in the Maneckji’s Collection containing the \textit{Zarātušṭ-Nāma}, versified by Kay-Kāvās son of Kay-Khusrau, and the \textit{Vasf-i amšāspan-dān}. Some parts of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} are found at the end of the manuscript. It contains 48 fine tableaus altogether, which have all been washed and destroyed together with some parts of the writings (Garavī 1986: 57).
- The MS. Indien 75, dated toward the middle of the 17th century A.D., in Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, the Gujarati version of Dastur Roustem Asa [correctly: Rustam Pašūtan Hurmazdēr]. This manuscript contains 80 miniatures about Paradise and Hell (Ibid).
- The MS. Indien 76 (Anquetil, Notices, XIV), dated toward the middle of the 17th century A.D., in Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, the Gujarati version of Dastur Roustem Asa [correctly: Rustam Pašūtan Hurmazdēr]. This manuscript contains 105 miniatures (Ibid).\footnote{Inostrantsev studied the miniatures of these two manuscripts in an article. He believes that the subject matter of some of the illustrations is in agreement with the Parsis’ ritual ceremonies (Inostrantsev 1922: 71-74). Modi, in a long critical article on Inostrantsev, holds that these manuscripts were not narrated by Roustem Asa since, there was no living Dastur called Roustem Asa at that time. He finds that to attribute the narrative to Roustem Asa was a mistake by Anquetil Du Perron which was repeated by Blochet and Inostrantsev later on. The versions belong to Rustam Pašūtan Hurmazdēr. Additionally, Modi believes that the viewpoint of Inostrantsev about the Parsis’ ritual ceremonies in connection with the illustrations of both 75 and 76 manuscripts is not true, for which he presents some evidence (Modi 1923: 101-102).}
- The MS. 132, dated 1128 A.Y./1759 A.D., in the Cama Oriental Institute Library, the Gujarati version in verse, versified by Rustam Pašūtan Hurmazdēr which has two illustrations and blank spaces for further illustrations (Dhabhar 1923’b’: 166).
• The MS. 131, dated 1217 A.Y./1848 A.D., in the Cama Oriental Institute Library, the Gujarati version in verse versified by Rustam Pašティan Hurmazdyār. This manuscript contains some very good pictures (Dhabhar 1923‘b’: 165).
• The MS. 115 (678), sans date, in the Mullā Fīrūz Library, Bombay, the Zoroastrian Persian version in verse, versified by Zartušt Bahram Pajdū, which contains some illustrations (Dhabhar 1923‘a’: 78).
• The MS. (?), dated (?), 42 in Kitābxa-na-yi anjuman-i zartuštiy-i Tihrān (The Library of the Society of Zoroastrian in Tehran), the Zoroastrian Persian version in verse, versified by Zartušt Bahram Pajdū. The title of this manuscript is Dīnkard-Nāma, and it contains some pictures about Paradise and Hell. Altogether 48 tableaus are printed as stereotypes (cliché) in yellow and black colors, at the end of the Arda-y-Vīraf Nāma, versified by Zartušt Bahram, edited by Rahīm ‘Affī (Zartušt Bahram Pajdū 1964: 167-182).

Most illustrations in both manuscripts no. 75 and 76 are so similar that it seems that each one is copied from the other. But, the illustrations in manuscript 76 are artistically better.

Among the miniatures both in manuscripts no. 75 and 76, six tableaus are printed in the L’Iran ancien (Molé 1965: 28, 55, 83, 109, 110, 111), and three tableaus in the Zarathushtra et la Tradition Mazdéenne (Varenne 1966: 90, 122, 138).

Some of the illustrations in manuscripts no. 75 and 76 contain scenes, of which there are no indications in the Arda-y-Vīraf Nāma. For example, in one scene, two horsemen are fighting with their maces (MS.75: 7b; MS.76: 8a). In another tableau a four-horse-chariot is carrying the moon (MS.75: 47b), and in a third one, a four-horse-chariot is carrying the sun (MS.75: 49a). None of these scenes are mentioned either in the Zoroastrian Persian versions or in the Parsig versions of the Arda-y-Vīraf Nāma. These scenes are, very likely, a part of transformations that have been done in the New Gujarati version.

As indicated in the title of Pope’s translation of the Arda-y-Vīraf Nāma: The Arda-y-Vīraf Nāma or the Revelation of Arda-y-Vīraf, translated from the Persian and Gujarati Versions, with notes and illustrations (1816), this book must have been illustrated. Hodivala also declares that Kāmdin Shāpur Khabbāti’s manuscript was used by Pope (Hodivala 1920: 310, f.54).43

42 The scribe of this manuscript is not known, since both the first and the last folio of the book are torn away (‘Affī 1964: three). However, Rizāzāda Malik wrote that Dīnkard-Nāma is a lithographic printed book. This miscellany is preserved in two sections in Ardašīr Sugānagi Library, and its microfilm by the number 1103 is present in Kitābxa-na-yi markaz-yi dānishgāh-i Tihrān ‘Tehran University Central Library’ (Rizāzāda Malik 1983: 2.168, 334).
43 None of the two copies of Pope’s book which were available to me are illustrated.
Conspectus of versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*

Pre-Zoroastrian

Zoroastrian (unknown language)

Parsig I  Parsig II  Parsig III

Pazand  Zoroastrian Persian (in prose) I

Sanskrit  Zoroastrian Persian (in verse) I (13th c.)

Old Gujarati  Zoroastrian Persian (in verse) II

Zoroastrian Persian (in prose) II

New Gujarati I (1651)

New Gujarati II

New Gujarati III

Arabic (in Syrian characters)

* One of the oldest manuscripts of the Pazand version is dated 1410 A.D.
* The oldest manuscript of this version is manuscript N (T.30) dated 1527 A.D.
* The oldest manuscript of the Sanskrit version is dated 1410 A.D.
* The oldest manuscript of the Old Gujarati version is dated 1415 A.D.
* The poet of this version lived in the 15th-16th centuries.
* This version has been translated in the early years of the 18th century.
* This version was first printed in Bombay in the mid-19th century.
* It is unknown when and from which version the Arabic version was translated.
III. The Other World in Other Iranian works

Since the *Ardåy-Vîrîf Nåma* will be under consideration in other sections of this thesis, only the other Iranian texts dealing with journeys to The Other World and their themes will be treated here. However, because of the importance of the *Ardåy-Vîrîf Nåma* in comparison to the other Iranian works in presenting the picture of the Other World, and because the *Ardåy-Vîrîf Nåma* is the main subject of the present thesis, the theme of several texts mentioned here will be compared with *Ardåy-Vîrîf Nåma*.

There are, in the Iranian culture as well as in many other cultures worldwide, literary accounts of journeying to the Other World in order to conceptualize beliefs of what will happen to the human being after death. Ardåy-Vîrîf’s travel account is the most famous remaining account of journeying to the Other World in the Iranian cultural realm. This work is the subject of the present study. However, in addition to the *Ardåy-Vîrîf Nåma*, there are also other works on the concept of the Other World in Iranian literature. For this study, it is necessary to penetrate also other written accounts about the Other World in some detail, something which will reveal more about the Iranian world view in general and Iranian concepts of the Other World in particular. As much as possible, the texts will be allowed to speak for themselves. Therefore, this chapter will comprise a substantial part of the whole work.

Belief in the existence of the Other World is strong in Iranian culture since very ancient times.⁴⁴ According to such a belief, to journey to the Other World is known as a possible and acceptable matter. The Iranian magi’s journey to the Other World has been well known and accepted as a fact also among other nations in ancient times. Due to this belief, when Lucian, the Greek writer from Samosata (c.120- c.190), was to write about the Other World, he inquired from the magi to profit from their knowledge of journeying to the Other World:

---
⁴⁴ The presentation of Iranian belief in the other world makes it essential to refer especially to descriptions and journeys to the Other World in an Iranian Cultural framework. For this reason, I avoid mentioning and making comparisons with texts of other cultures and languages related to the other world, as *Fís Adamnáin* in Irland (written about 1100), *Draumkvedet* in Norway (probably written in 1537) and *Divina Commedia* by Dante Alighieri in Italy (written 1307-1321).
So one time, while I lay awake over these problems, I resolved to go to Babylon and address myself to one of the Magi, the disciples and successors of Zoroaster, as I had heard that with certain charms and ceremonials they could open the gates of Hades (Hell), taking down in safety anyone they would and guiding him back again (Lucian 1925: Menippus 6).

Therefore, Ardāy-Virāf, too, is sent to the Other World. The old origin of the belief that the magi can journey to the Other World are to be found in different stories about the existence of such a world repeated numerous times in the Iranian literature. This kind of narration is shaped either in the form of journey reports from or descriptions of the Other World. Accounts of this kind are found in the Avesta and Parsig (=Middle Persian) texts. Thus, there is no comprehensive account of the Zoroastrian religion without these narrations (Zaehner 1961: 302). The purpose of the journeys to the Other World and the description that follows in these narrations can sometimes be to awaken other believers (Ardāy-Virāf journey) and sometimes to affect a special person (Wištasp/Guštasp’s journey).

Narrations with the purpose of depicting the Other World can be classified in five groups. Three groups are written in Iranian languages (Avestan, Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian), the fourth group, which includes two texts—one incomplete and one complete—is in Greek, and the fifth group is engraved as a pictorial report on stone, thus is not a written text.

I Avestan texts:

I.I Hádōxt Nask
I.II Sipand Nask as quoted in Šāyest Nē-Šāyest
I.III Wištasp Yašt
I.IV Widēwdād

45 Parsig (Pārsīg) will be used to designate the variety of Middle Iranian that was the prestigious and written language of the Sasanid period. The indigenous name of this language is found in Rivīyat ī Ėmēt ī Asawahūštān, which itself is in Parsig: hádīra wāz-e ī aheštāg pad ēvāz ī pārsīg frasang xwānēnd “Hādīra is an Avestan word which is read frasang in Parsig” (REA 1980: XIII.5; see also Lazard 1995’b’: 57).

Against Parsig stands Pahlavānīg (> Pahlavānī and further > Pahlavi) as the language of the Parthians. The indigenous name of this language is found in the Parthian text M 2 (= text h in Boyce 1975: 40): ka frēstagrōšn andar hovān šahrīstān būd, xwand ī mār *amnō hammōzāg, kē pahlavānīg dhīrī ud izwān dānīst... “When the Prophet of Light was in the town of Holvān, he called for Mār Ammō, the teacher, who knew reading and writing in Pahlavānīg” (see also Lazard 1995’b’: 52).

Despite the historical background to the use of the designation Pahlavi for Middle Persian, I find it misleading and recommend that Parsig be used in its place.

46 Wištasp, an Avestan and Parsig form, is an Iranian king contemporary to Zarathustra. This name is Guštasp in New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian. In this study, the form Wištasp has been used, as a general rule, except in the texts where the form Guštasp has been used, where this work also uses Guštasp. This name is Wištasp in Pahlavi Rivīyat, Dēnkard and Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg texts, but in Zarāōšt-Nāma, Sadar Bundahiš, Minhā-xirad [versified], Qišiy-yi dastūr..., Īskāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may... and Khulāṣa-yi Din it is Guštasp.
## II Parsig (Middle Persian) texts:
- II.I Zand ī Wahman Yasn
- II.II Dādestān ī Mēnō ī Xrad
- II.III Dādestān ī Dēnīg
- II.IV Bundahišn
- II.V Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspram
- II.VI Pahlavī Rivāyat
- II.VII Kerdīr’s inscription [Sar Mašhad inscription]
- II.VIII Kerdīr’s inscription [Naqš-i Rustam inscription]
- II.IX Aogmōdaēčā
- II.X Dēnkard
- II.XI Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg

## III Zoroastrian Persian texts:
- III.I Zarātušt-Nāma
- III.II Šaddar Bundahišn
- III.III Šaddar Naṯr
- III.IV [Pāḏsāhī-yi Jamšīd]
- III.V Mīnū-xirad [versified]
- III.VI Qīša-yi dastūr…
- III.VII Ḥikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may…
- III.VIII Khulāsa-yi Dīn
- III.IX Khulāsa-yi Dīn [versified]

## IV Greek texts
- IV.I Peri physeōs
- IV.II Politeia

## V. Pictorial report:
- V.I Wirkak’s tomb relief

Although the language division of the first three groups is chronologically based (Avestan, Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian), it is not certain that they have been written down in that historical chronological order, i.e. that the Parsig texts have been written after the Avestan texts and the Zoroastrian Persian texts after the Parsig texts. For example, it has been argued that one of the Parsig texts, Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg, may have been written as late as in the eighteenth or even the nineteenth century (Cereti 1995’a’: 142) whereas Zarātušt-Nāma, a Zoroastrian Persian text, was written in tenth century (Rempis 1963: 340-341).
Descriptions of the Other World in the texts belonging to the first three groups can be classified into two main approaches as follows:

(A) The Other World in abstract description narration
(B) The Other World in travellers’ reports

In the (A) texts, the main subject of each one is the description and explanation of the Other World, including the situation of the dead souls. There is a main difference between journeys and description, i.e. the descriptions give a concise account of the Other World whereas the journey reports give a livelier picture of how the narrator conceptualizes that world.

Although, it is impossible to classify the texts of the first three groups, which comprise altogether six travel reports, according to the time when they have been written, they can be classified according to their chronological appearance in the legendary history of these journeys.

These six journeys are as follows:
- Jamšíd’s journey
- Zarathustra’s journey
- WištASP’s journey
- Kerdīr’s journey
- Journey of Zoroaster/Er the Pamphylian
- Wirak’s journey

The travel reports in the three first of the above-mentioned groups describe four journeys. Among these, only one of them, the report of Jamšíd’s journey, is pre-Zoroastrian, and the other three journeys are all related to the Zoroastrian period. Perhaps due to the importance of these texts in the Zoroastrian religion, the travel reports are found in several accounts, and in one of the journeys (that of WištASP) as many as four (in nine different works) occur.

The fifth journey has been recorded in two reports and both of them are in Greek. But the names of the travellers are different in these two reports. The traveller’s name is “Zoroaster the Pamphylian” in the first report but “Er the Pamphylian” in the second.

The last journey, or the sixth, like the first journey has only been recorded in one report. But this one is completely different from the others, because it has been inscribed pictorially on stone in a relief.

These journeys are reported to have been done in two ways and can thus be classified in two groups:
1. Profiting from a medium for the journey
2. Not profiting from a medium for the journey

Here a medium refers to a means that helps the main personality of the text to change into a mentally and/or physically different state which means
that he is able to see the Other World. Thus, Zarathustra and Wištāsp\textsuperscript{47} profit from a medium to make their journeys, but, Jamšid, Kerdīr and Zoroaster/Er the Pamphylian do not profit from any medium.

The Other World

A: Abstract descriptive narrations

Abstract descriptive narrations (i.e. group A), divided into the three languages Avestan, Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian, include the following texts:

Avestan: \(\text{Hādōxt Nask (HN 1872: II-III), Wištāsp Yašt (Wyt 1852-54: VIII.53-64),}^{48}\) \(\text{Widēwtdūd (Wd 1907: XIX: 27-32)}\)


Zoroastrian Persian: \(\text{Ṣaddar Bundahiš (ṢDB 1909: XCIX.1-23).}\)

The presentation of the Other World in these texts gives an abstract picture, where only the precepts of religion are narrated objectively. On the basis of religion, it is the person’s good deeds that are rewarded in the Other World and his evil deeds that deserve a severe punishment. There is no vivid description of how these rewards and punishments are meant to take place. In fact these are just abstract pictures of the Other World with the purpose of reminding the believers of the religious precepts, so that they will avoid evil deeds and just do good deeds in this world.

Some similarities between the contents of the group A texts and the reports of journeys to the Other World in the texts of group B indicate that these two groups of texts have similar origins and that they have later adopted different approaches through the passing of time. There are two descriptions in these groups that, besides \(\text{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma}\), make Zoroastrian beliefs known in the shape of mythical pictures of the conception of the Other World and varieties of it through as long a time as about three thousand years.

These abstract descriptions are brief, or more or less detailed, but they are, on the whole, similar to each other. Thus, in order to avoid repetition, only one of the texts of group A, \(\text{Hādōxt Nask,}\) will be described here. It is probably the oldest text of this group.

\textsuperscript{47} In some of the accounts, however (\(\text{Ṣaddar Bundahiš and in Khulāsa-yi Dīn})\), there is no mention of any medium.

\textsuperscript{48} \(\text{Wištāsp Yašt}\) has also been mentioned in \(\text{Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk (ZKA 1927: 212-213).}\)
Hādōxt Nask

In the old section of the Avesta, the Gāthās, there are no pictures given of the Other World. But in the three Nasks (Books) of the Younger Avesta there are three descriptions of the Other World: Hādōxt Nask, Wištasp Yašt and Widōwdād.

Hādōxt Nask is the twentieth Nask of the Sasanian Avesta (Geldner 1896-1904: 17-20). What is remaining of this Nask is three chapters, where the second and third chapters are correlated and describe the Other World. Among the three Avestan texts that describe the Other World, Hādōxt Nask is the most complete and most detailed.

A description of what happens to the pious soul in the Other World is narrated in the second chapter of Hādōxt Nask. In this text, Ohrmazd informs Zarathustra that the pious soul sits joyfully above its dead body and sings cheerful chants for the first three nights. Then, at the end of the third night, the soul scents the most sweet-smelling fragrance in the world. Afterwards his daēnā (conscience/religion) becomes apparent to him as a beautiful girl and tells him: “I am you, yourself, I am the reflection of your good thoughts, good words and good deeds”. So the pious soul is led by his daēnā in four steps to the “Boundless Place”. There the other pious souls, who have died before, ask him how he died and came to that place. But Ohrmazd orders them not to ask him any questions since he has come on a dangerous path. Then Ohrmazd gives the order that he should be given the most delicious food, which is called ‘Oil of the Spring’. This is the dead person’s meal of good thoughts, good words and good deeds.

The third chapter explains the destiny of the sinful soul going to the Other World. Here, the sinful soul, reciting a hymn of sadness and pains, sits crying above the dead body. At the end of the third night the soul feels that it is passing through snow and fetid water. Then he smells the worst odor in the world. Afterwards, his daēnā becomes apparent to him as an ugly old being (gannāg mēnōg, Avestan ayrō.mainyav-, i.e. the Evil Spirit) and says to him: “I am the result of your evil thoughts, deeds and words”. Then the sinful soul is led by his daēnā in four steps to deep darkness, and there the previously dead sinful souls ask him how he died and came to this place. But gannāg mēnōg frightens them into not asking him such questions, because he has come down a very dangerous path. Then she orders poison and stench to be brought forth, because this is the meal of malevolent, misbehaving and abusive persons after death (HN 1872: II-III).

---

49 Because of the similarity between the second chapter and the third one, many of the subject matters and paragraphs of the third chapter have by mistake been eliminated the copyist. Although it is similar to the second chapter the main subject of the third chapter is what happens to the sinful soul in Other World.

50 Both pious and sinful souls are men in both chapters. But in connection with the food in the Other World, in second chapter Oil of the Spring is to be given to “youth of good thoughts”
General characteristics of abstract descriptive narrations

General characteristics common for texts of group A are:

- The bewilderment of both the virtuous soul and the sinful soul on the first three days after death.
- All souls, virtuous and sinful, see their daēnā\(^{51}\) as a pretty or ugly woman and they conceptualize those bodies as the sum of their deeds in the present world.
- Pious souls will arrive in a place of boundless light and will be fed heavenly meals, but sinful souls will go to the dark Hell and will be fed hellish meals. This will continue until the Day of Resurrection.
- The names of some of the Amšaspandān (Immortals), such as ‘Srōš’, ‘Wahman’, ‘Wāy ī weh’,\(^{52}\) ‘Mihr’ and ‘Raśn’, are mentioned in these texts, which are also the names of some of the Dēwān (demons) like ‘Wizarš-dēw’, ‘Astwiḥād-dēw’, ‘Frazišt-dēw’ and ‘Nīzīšt-dēw’ (MX 1985: I.115-118). There are also accounts of their functions.
- Among these texts, three have a unique feature that cannot be seen in other texts. They are Widēwādā, Bundahišn and Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspram.
- According to Widēwādā, in the Other World the spirit is confronted by two dogs which are guardians of the Čīnvad puhl (Chinvad Bridge) (Wd 1907: XIII.9). In Bundahišn mention is also made of a dog standing on the Chinvad Bridge; but there it is only one dog (IraBd 1956: XXX.3).\(^{53}\)
- According to Bundahišn, the pious soul sees a fat cow and a cultivated fertile garden on the road to the Other World and gets their help to pass the Chinvad Bridge. But a thin skinny cow and an abandoned dried garden appear to the sinful soul (IraBd 1956: XXX.12-19). In Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspram, there are white cows and bulls that help the virtuous soul to reach heaven (WZad 1993: XXX.52).

\(^{51}\) daēnā, a Avestan word (Parsig: dēn), means conscience. But in New Persian, the meaning of the word dēn has changed from conscience to religion.

\(^{52}\) Wāy (Zoroastrian Persian: vāy), is the goddess of wind in Iranian mythology in two different characters: ‘Wāy ī weh’ (a deity) and ‘Wāy ī wattar’ (a demon).

\(^{53}\) This dog is known as the Sāg-i zarrīn-gūš (the dog with the golden ears) in Zoroastrian literature. In the versified version by Dastūr Naušīrvān Marzbān Kirmānī, when Ardāy-Virāf reaches the Chinvad Bridge he is very afraid of seeing this dog. This dog in Dastūr Naušīrvān’s narration has not only golden ears and a collar chain but is also the guardian of the Chinvad Bridge gate (MS.S.P.46: 297a). Anyway, the presence of two dogs seems to be more original, because two guardian dogs also help ‘Yima’, the goddess of the World of the Dead in Veda (Rig Veda 1994: X.10-14).
In *Wizīdagīhā ṯ Zādspram*, four occupations apply in the Other World.\(^{54}\) There are twelve *mēnōg* (heavenly spirits), who arrange a heavenly life for pious souls (*WZad* 1993: XXX.52-61).

In short, the abstract descriptive texts of the Other World are of a general character and they do not in any way depict that world. In fact, these abstract texts only present the way to reach the Other World.

**B: Travellers’ reports**

The travellers’ reports (group B), divided according to the three languages Avestan, Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian, include the following texts:

**Avestan:** Sipand Nask as quoted in Šāyest Nē-Šāyest

**Parsig:** *Zand ṯ Wahman Yasn*, Pahlavi Rivāyat,\(^ {55}\) Kerdīr’s *inscription* [Sar Mašhad inscription], Kerdīr’s *inscription* [Naqš-i Rustam inscription], Dēnkard, *Wizīrgard ṯ Dēnīg*

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Zarāuṣūt-Nāma, Ṣaddar Bundahiš,\(^ {56}\) Ṣaddar Naṭr, [Pādsāhī-yi Jamšīd], Minī-xirad [versified], Qiṣṣa-yi dastūr…\(^ {57}\) Hikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may…\(^ {58}\) Khulāṣa-yi Dīn and Khulāṣa-yi Dīn [versified], Ardā-y-Vīrāf Nāma\(^ {59}\)

To acquire information of conditions in the Other World, in addition to abstract descriptions, travellers’ reports have been created over and over again in order to present as lively pictures of the Other World as possible. In order to leave the most effective and trustworthy impression on readers of these reports, they are always ascribed to men of good thoughts, good words and good deeds, i.e. the righteous.

\(^{54}\) These four occupations are in accordance with the four Iran social classes in Sassanid period, that is teaching of theology (āsravanīh), keeping of the army (artēštārīh), farming (vāštaryōštīh) and trade (pēštā).

\(^{55}\) *Pahlavi Rivāyat* gives a description of the world in its 23\(^{rd}\) chapter, and in its 47\(^{th}\) chapter it presents an account of the journey of Wištsp.

\(^{56}\) Ṣaddar Bundahiš is proceeded to the Wištsp journey account in 4\(^{th}\) chapter, and in 99\(^{th}\) chapter describes the universe subjectively.

\(^{57}\) The complete title of this narration is: *Qiṣṣa-yi dastūr bā yakī az dānišmand musalmanān bābat-i yazdān va ahrīman* (The Tale of Dastūr with one of the Muslim Scholars about Yazdān (God) and Ahrīman (Devil)).

\(^{58}\) The complete title of this narration is: *Hikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may-i ḥalāl va harām ba qā ḵāda-yi dīn* (“Anecdot about Drinking Religiously Permissible Wine or Prohibited Wine, according to religion”).

\(^{59}\) Naturally, the *Ardā-y-Vīrāf Nāma* is also one of the Iranian works that belong to group B according to the division made in this work. However, because the *Ardā-y-Vīrāf Nāma* will be the subject of a separate chapter in the present treatise, it will not be dealt with in this chapter.
There is more than one account of these journeys. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition in this chapter, a presentation of all texts about the same journey has been avoided. Only one account of the journey, the one which is relatively more complete than the others, has been chosen as a sample. The criterion for this choice is neither language style nor shortness or length of the account, but the intention was to choose the most comprehensive and complete description of the journey. However, for three journeys it was necessary to refer to more than one account in order to include all details. The first one is the journey of Jamšid, the second one is the journey of Zarathustra, where two accounts have been used for each journey. The third journey is that of Wištasp, where three accounts have been analysed.

Jamšid’s journey

According to the narrations, Jamšid journeyed to the Other World three times. Two of his three journeys, included in the narration of Jamšid, are related to each other, although they are described as having taken place far apart. But the goal, form and motif of the third journey are different and have been cited in another narration of Jamšid’s life.

[The Reign of Jamšid\(^{60}\)]

The original text of this myth in an unknown language has not remained. The only transcript is the version that has been versified by Dastūr Naušīravān Kirmanī between the years 1620-1630 (Rosenberg 1909: 12).

The narration begins when Jamšid becomes king and governs all “Birds, demons and fairies”. Then the \textit{Amšaspand} Surūš, by order from Ohrmazd, comes down and inspires him to wear \textit{Sidra}\(^{62}\) and \textit{Kust}\(^{63}\), so that the \textit{Dīv} (demon) and \textit{Šaytān} (Evil) will be frightened. Jamšid and his people of all classes do as Ohrmazd has ordered. Afterwards the demons will be destroyed and Jamšid will govern all justly and fairly.

After these events, the \textit{Amšaspand Bahman} takes him and leads him to heaven, to the presence of Ohrmazd. Ohrmazd asks Jamšid to accept the

---

\(^{60}\) This narrative has no title in the manuscripts MS.S.P.38 and MS.S.P.46 at Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. A copy of it, edited by Spiegel, has a very long title: “Ba padšāhī niṣastan-i Jamšid va sāxtan-i ī Himal-hā-yī har bāb va quft-kardan-i ā bar dūzax va āskār-kardan-i rasm-i sidṛa va kusṭf va naurūz va farfīla-šudan az guftār-i dīvān, va padshāhī-yī ā haft-šad sāl būd” (Jamšid becoming king and his establishing of every kind of wisdom and padlocking Hell’s gate and making apparent the tradition of \textit{Sidra}, \textit{Kust} and \textit{Naurūz} and being deceived by the words of demons, and his reign was seven hundred years)” (Spiegel 1860: 327). This narrative has been edited by Aša but his copy has no title either (Aša 1995: 293-303).

\(^{61}\) Amšaspand (Parsig: Amahraspand, Amešospand) means Holy Immortal.

\(^{62}\) Parsig: \textit{šabīg}, an under-shirt for Mazdean’s ritual.

\(^{63}\) Or \textit{kustīg}, Parsig: \textit{kustīg}, a sacred girdle.
Dīn-i Bihī\(^{64}\) (Supreme Religion) so that the demons will be destroyed. But Jamšīd wishes to be king of the entire world, and Ohrmazd accepts this. On the day when Jamšīd comes back from heaven to the Alburz mountains, people see two suns in the sky. One sun is shining in the sky, but the other sun is coming down to the ground, and this second sun is Jamšīd.

After his descent, Jamšīd begins making garments, swords, helmets, daggers, different kinds of armour and maces. Then he classifies people into four groups, and from the demons he learns to construct houses, and afterwards he learns to build ships, and gets knowledge of jewellery, perfumery and pharmacy. So Ohrmazd inspires him to ascend to the Other World again. Jamšīd goes to the Chinvad Bridge at Rūz-i Xurdād, māh-i Farvardīn (Xurdād day of Farvardīn Month),\(^{65}\) and there he padlocks the gates of Hell so firmly that afterwards no one will die during his reign.\(^{66}\)

In spite of all that, Jamšīd feels proud and selfish, so that finally, he claims to be the creator of the world. So he loses his \textit{Farra-yi īzad}\(^{67}\) (Divine Splendour), and because of this, \textit{Zahhāk-mār} attacks Iran and overcomes him. Thus Jamšīd has to leave power, and he runs away to the mountains not to be killed. He then wanders around there the rest of his life (MS.S.P.38: 116-120).\(^{68}\)

Jam’s journey to Hell

According to \textit{Dēnkard}, Jam\(^{69}\) takes a long journey to the Other World at the beginning of his reign. Before Jam’s reign, because the \textit{āsn xrad} (essential wisdom)\(^{70}\) had been stolen by the demons, the kings became weaker and weaker, and as a result āz-dēw (demon of greed) overcame the people, who lived like wild beasts.

\textit{Dādār} (God) wishes Jam to become king. At first he reconquers the kingdom from the demons, then Dādār’s \textit{Farra} assists him to go to Hell. Jam spent thirteen winters (thirteen years) there, in the presence of the demons. There he learned how to defend his people against demons and how to defeat the demons. He learned all about their secrets, and then he came back to the world and succeeded in liberating his people. So he spread essential wisdom

---

\(^{64}\) \textit{Dīn-i bih, Dīn-i vih, Dīn-i bihī} are known as mazdayasn or Zoroastrianism

\(^{65}\) Xurdād day of Farvardīn month is the sixth day of Farvardin, i.e. the first month of the Iranian calendar. The sixth day of Farvardin was called, “Naurūz-i buzurg” (= the great new year’s day) in Iranian tradition. This is equal to 25 or 26 of March.

\(^{66}\) The place of the \textit{Ahrīman} (Evil principal) is hell and one of his main act is death. When Jamšīd padlocks the gates of hell, his aim is not to prevent the dead going to hell. He intends to imprison Ahrīman in his place, so he blocks the way to one of the greatest evil acts and to dying as well.

\(^{67}\) \textit{Farrah} (Av.: \textit{xwarénah}; Parsig: \textit{xwarrah}; \textit{Farrah-yi īzadī} is Divine Splendour or Divine Glory.

\(^{68}\) See also MS.S.P.46: 131-133; Spiegel 1860: 327-332.

\(^{69}\) In Avesta and Sanskrit texts his name is \textit{Yima}, in Parsig texts, i.e. \textit{Dēnkard}, he is called \textit{Jam}, and in Zoroastrian and New Persian texts \textit{Jamšīd}.

\(^{70}\) \textit{āsn xrad} (essential wisdom) is equal to \textit{gūsān xrad} (acquired wisdom).
among people, and as a result of this all of Ohrmazd’s creation became immortal (DkM 1911: I.295 (20)-297 (5))

**Special features of Jamšīd’s journey**

The oldest myth about journeying to the Other World in Iran is Jamšīd’s journey. One of the similarities between this myth and the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* is that it is Surūš who comes to Jamšīd initially. Surūš is also the first Amahraspand (Immortal) who sees Ardāy-Vīrāf in the Other World. After Surūš it is Wahman Amahraspand who leads Jamšīd to heaven, into Ohrmazd’s presence. It is only Wahman who is capable of doing this (IraBd 1956: XXVI.12). According to the *Ardāy-Wīrāz Nāmag* it is Wahman who leads Ardāy-Vīrāf into Ohrmazd’s presence (*AWN* 1984: XI.1-3). However, according to the Parsig version of the *Ardāy-Wīrāz Nāmag*, Ādur yazd (the God of fire) prepares the Chinvad Bridge for souls to pass (*AWN* 1984: V.1-2). But in Jamšīd’s journey, like in the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in Zoroastrian Persian, Ādur yazd plays no role.

Paradise and Hell are the two important places in the Other World according to Jamšīd’s journey and the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*. However, there is a big difference between the travellers of these two journeys. Ardāy-Vīrāf is frightened of seeing Hell and asks his two fellow travellers not to take him there (*AWN* 1984: LIII). Contrary to him, Jamšīd himself goes to Hell and padlocks its gate. Compared to the other travellers to the Other World, Jamšīd is the only one who journeys there twice, and this is apart from his journey to Hell to release the āsn xrad (essential wisdom). The narration of Jamšīd’s journey is much more lively and strong in imagination, both in its contents and form, than the other journeys to the Other World that will be described below.

**Zarathustra’s journey**

Zarathustra’s journey is mentioned in *Sipand Nask* as quoted in Šāyest Nē-Šāyest and Zand ī Wahman Yasn in Parsig and in *Ṣaddar Bundahiš*, *Ṣaddar Naṭr*, Zarātušṭ-Nāma and Khulāša-yi Dīn [versified] in Zoroastrian Persian.

*Sipand Nask as quoted in Šāyest Nē-Šāyest*

*Sipand Nask* is the thirteenth Nask of the Sasanian *Avesta*. It is, however, lost but some chapters and sections are cited in other works like Šāyest Nē-Šāyest and are therefore still available. The narration in *Sipand Nask* is also found in a slightly different version in *Ṣaddar Naṭr* in Zoroastrian Persian (*SDN* 1909: IV.3-11).
While journeying to the Other World, Zarathustra sees a man in a state in which all of his body except one of his legs is in Hell. Zarathustra asks about his situation. He gets the reply that this man, who is called Davānūs, has been the king of thirty-three countries. He has never done a good deed in his life, except once, when he saw some fodder far from a fastened sheep. He pushed the fodder nearer so that the sheep could eat it. Now, that one leg remains outside Hell as a reward for just that single good deed ([Snš 1969: XII.29]).

**Zand i Wahman Yasn**

Zarathustra asks Ohrmazd to make him immortal. That is impossible, replies Ohrmazd. It is difficult for Zarathustra to understand why. Since Ohrmazd is aware of his thoughts, he gives him the wisdom of all knowledge in the form of water and orders him to drink it. Zarathustra drinks the water and then the wisdom of all knowledge captures all his existence. Seven days pass in this manner and Zarathustra finds himself in the wisdom of Ohrmazd. After seven days Ohrmazd takes back the wisdom of all knowledge.

Zarathustra thinks it has been a dream of delight. Ohrmazd asks him what his dream was about. He has seen that the soul of a rich man who was ignominious in the world is now in Hell. Zarathustra confesses that he is filled with hate for him. In addition to this, he has seen a poor mendicant whose soul is in Paradise and with whom he is pleased ([ZWY 1995: III.6]).

**Differences and similarities in Zarathustra’s journey descriptions**

Zarathustra’s journey in **Zand i Wahman Yasn** is very similar to Ardāy-Vīrāf’s:

- Zarathustra drinks the ‘wisdom of all knowledge’, in the form of water, like Ardāy-Vīrāf does.
- Zarathustra like Ardāy-Vīrāf visits both Paradise and Hell
- Both Ardāy-Vīrāf and Zarathustra come back to the world after seven days.

But there are also major differences between **Zand i Wahman Yasn** and the **Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma**. The former describes Paradise and Hell quite briefly, but instead it describes ‘the seven-branched tree’ in great detail (Aša

---

71 This paragraph of *Sipand Nask* has also been mentioned in the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in Zoroastrian Persian (XLII) and in the Parsig version (XXXII). But, they differ from each other, since in these works it is Ardāy-Vīrāf, who sees Davānūs [Parsig: dw'nws] in Hell.

72 Holy water as a medium is not limited to this work. Chadwick has mentioned several myths; according to which, after drinking some water from the holy spring, one gains access to the spirit of knowledge (Chadwick 1932: I.649-650).

73 Also in *Pahlavi Rivyat* it is mentioned that Ohrmazd gives Zarathustra the “wisdom of all knowledge” (PRed 1990: XXXVI.8-11).
2002‘a’: 370) something that is not mentioned in the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*. On the other hand, the latter work describes Paradise and Hell in greater detail.

The medium in Zarathustra’s journey is different from that in the aforementioned texts. The medium is in the form of water in *Zand ī Wahman Yasn*. In *Zarātūst-Nāma* the medium is ‘something like honey’, whereas in *Khulāša-yi Dīn* [versified] the medium is ‘a water-like milk’.

There is a part in this version of *Khulāša-yi Dīn* that has not been mentioned in any other text about the same journey: Zarathustra observes King Jamšid’s soul and Garšasp’s soul in hell. Seeing Jamšid, Zarathustra intercedes for him in Ohrmazd’s presence and Ohrmazd accepts the intercession. Afterwards, Jamšid recommends Zarathustra to keep himself from being deceived by Ahriman (Pāhlan 1924: vv.156-174).

**Wištāsp’s journey**

There are four different versions of Wištāsp’s journey to the Other World. In the first version, found in the *Pahlavi Rivāyat* and *Dēnkard* (both in Parsig), the Amšaspandān (Immortals) are in contact with Wištāsp. In the second version, that of the *Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg* in Parsig and in *Zarātūst-Nāma*, *Qišša-yi dastūr..., Minū-xirad* [versified] by Dārāb Hurmazyār Sanjāna74 and *Khulāša-yi Dīn* in Zoroastrian Persian, it is Zarathustra who requests Wištāsp’s journey to Paradise from Ohrmazd, and the request is granted. In the third version, found in *Ṣaddar Bundahiš*, Ohrmazd grants four things to Guštāsp for his accepting the Religion. These are things that no kings have ever possessed, i.e. an immortal son, Paštan, who will reveal Zoroastrianism on the last days of the world; a son, Isfandiyār, who is more courageous than anyone else in the whole world; a minister, Jāmāsp, who is wiser than anyone else in the whole world, and, finally, the gift that Guštāsp’s spirit will be brought on a journey to Paradise to see his own eternal place (*SDB 1909: IV.9-13*). In the fourth version, which is found in the *Ḥikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may...* [versified], Guštāsp drinks wine and his spirit ascends to the Other World and makes a visit there (Unvālā 1922: 1.270-271).

Because there are these different versions of Wištāsp’s journeys, an example of each one will be presented below.

**Pahlavi Rivāyat**

Zarathustra frequently invites Wištāsp to accept the good religion, but he does not accept it. The first time Ohrmazd sent Wahman, Ardwahišt and

---

74 There are two versified versions of Minū-xirad available. The first one has been composed by Marzbān Rāvarī in 980 A.Y./1611 A.D. (MS.S.P.1191) and the other one by Dārāb Hurmazyār Sanjāna in 1046 A.Y./1677 A.D. (MS.S.P. 38).
Ädur ï Burzënmíhr⁷⁵ to Wištäsp’s house to promise him that if he accepts religion, he will get an immortal son, Paštán, who will never grow old. But Wištäsp does not have faith (PRDd 1990: XLVII.12-14).

The very last time, Ohrmazd tells Neryösang to go to Ardwahišt Amahrasp and tell him to make a mixture of mang (henbane) and wine and give it to Wištäsp. Afterwards, he drinks the wine and becomes unconscious at once. Then his soul is taken to Heaven, and there he sees the place reserved for him in Paradise after he has accepted the true religion. When Wištäsp comes to his senses, he cries to his wife Hutös: “Where is Zaratustra? I am ready to believe in his religion”.

Zarathustra hears Wištäsp’s cry, comes to him and at this moment Wištäsp accepts his religion (PRDd 1990: XLVII: 15-19).

Zarëtušt-Näma

Wizïrgard ï Dëneg, Zarëtušt-Näma, Minû-xirad [versified], Qïşsa-yi dast-tür..., Ħikâyät dar bâb-i xwardan-i may..., and Khulâsa-yi Dîn are more or less similar as regards Wištäsp’s journey. Since, there is doubt whether Wizïrgard ï Dëneg in Parsig is indeed a very old text, the second version of Wištäsp’s journey has been taken from Zarëtušt-Näma instead. The reason for this is that the narration is more complete here than in other texts. The narration is retold here:

Guštäsp/Wištäsp⁷⁶ asks Zarathustra to fulfill four of his wishes in order for him to believe in Zoroastrianism. His four wishes are:

- to be aware of his place in the Other World,
- to have a body which becomes invulnerable to any kind of weapons, because he feels that, if he professes this religion, he will get entangled in many wars,
- to be informed of all good and evil that has taken place and will take place in the world,
- immortality until the day of resurrection.

Zarathustra tells him that he will ask Ohrmazd to fulfill these four wishes but also that he must request one of them for himself and the other three for others.

The next day, when Zarathustra comes to the king, the gatekeeper tells him, that there are four mounted men all dressed in green at the door. Guštäsp asks Zarathustra about these four men. The four men present themselves as Amšâspandân before Zarathustra has any time to answer. Then they order king Guštäsp to accept the religion.

⁷⁵ These names are in Zoroastrian Persian: Wahman (Bahman), Ardwahišt (Urdibihisht) and Ädur ï Burzënmíhr (Âzar Burzënmíhr)

⁷⁶ The name of Wištäsp has mentioned as Guštäsp in Zarëtušt-Näma, Şaddar Bundahišt, Minû-xirad [versified], Qïşsa-yi dast-tür..., Ħikâyät dar bâb-i xwardan-i may..., Khulâsa-yi Dîn and Khulâsa-yi Dîn [versified].
Hearing the order, the king becomes unconscious. When he comes to his senses again, he expresses his wish to accept Ohrmazd’s command. Hearing this the four Amšaspandan suddenly disappear. Then Zarathustra orders a Sufra-yi Darān (table for consecrated bread) to be brought in and wine, flowers, milk and pomegranates to be arranged on the table.

Guštasp drinks some of the sanctified wine and falls asleep for three days. During this time his soul ascends to Heaven, and there it perceives his place in the world to come, at the side of other chaste and virtuous men. It also experiences many other wonderful things.77

Pašūtan drinks the sanctified milk and becomes safe from old age and death.

Jāmāsp takes the sanctified flowers and gains all knowledge.

Isfandiyār eats the grains of the sanctified pomegranates and becomes invulnerable.

Afterwards, Guštasp wakes up and prays. Then he calls for Zarathustra and explains in detail to him what he has seen in the Other World (Zaratušt Bahrām 1959: vv.1102-1180).78

This versified text has been mentioned in Bahman Punjīyih’s Rivāyat, and is about moderation in wine-drinking with reference to Ohrmazd’s order to Zarathustra to drink moderately. The report of Guštasp’s journey “for the enlightenment of all people in the world” is found in the middle part of the text.

[Zarathustra]79 sanctifies the darān (consecrated bread) and wine, gives it to King Guštasp, the “brazen bodied” (Isfandiyār), Pašūtan and Jāmāsp. Guštasp passes out immediately and sees the Other World happily and cheerfully. His body stays asleep in the present world for a week, but his soul visits Ohrmazd. After one week, when he returns back to the world, he accepts and disseminates Zoroastrianism (Unvālā 1922: 1.270-271).80

According to Khulāša-yi Din [versified] when Guštasp saw his name on the leaf of ‘Sarv-i Kāšmar’, he was surprised at Zarathustra’s miracle then he believed in religion. But there are no words of his journey in the text (Khulāša-yi Din [versified] 1924: 53).

For a long time it was believed that Zaratušt-Nāma was a poem by Zaratušt Bahrām Pajdū. But the true poet of this work was Kay-Kāvūs son of Kay-khusrau, and Zaratušt Bahrām was just the copyist of the work (Rempis 1963: 337-342). However, due to the fact that the edition of Zaratušt-Nāma has the name Zaratušt Bahrām as the author of the work, I am using this attribution here.

* The Story about Drinking Religiously Permissible or Prohibited Wine in accordance with the Rules of the Religion

It is not clear from the text who gives ‘consecrated bread’ and wine to Guštasp. However, it seems as though there is no one but Zarathustra who could do it.

In another story entitled Kaḥfuyat-i qīṣṣa-yi sulān Mahmūd-i ḡaznavī versified by Anūširvān Kirmānī the four wishes that Zarathustra fulfills are also highlighted in five poems (Rosenberg 1909: 125, vv.43-47). The sending of Guštasp to paradise can be found in one of these five poems (v.43).
Differences and similarities, in Wištasp/Guštasp’s travel descriptions

There are only two promises mentioned in Pahlavi Rivāyat of the four given to Wištasp, the promise of visiting Paradise and Paštan being born. But there is no mention of either Isfandiyār becoming invulnerable or Jāmāsp, the minister of Wištasp, profiting of knowledge.

A mixture of may and mang (wine and henbane) is the medium of Wištasp’s journey to paradise in Pahlavi Rivāyat, but a mixture of hōm and mang is the medium in Dēnkard.

According to Pahlavi Rivāyat, the soul of Wištasp goes to Paradise to see his eternal place. But there is nothing about Wištasp having gone unconsciously to heaven in Dēnkard. Because of this, it seems that Dēnkard is incorrect. The sanctified wine is the medium of Wištasp’s journey in Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg, Zarātušt-Nāma and Minū-xirad [versified]. The means of journeying in Ḥikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may… is ‘consecrated bread’ and ‘consecrated win’. There is no medium in Ṣadder Bundahiš and Khulāṣa-yi Dīn, where Ohrmazd himself takes Wištasp’s soul to Paradise.

Wištasp’s wish for Paštan has different forms in the texts. Wištasp is informed of the glad tiding of Paštan being born in Pahlavi Rivāyat, Dēnkard, Ṣadder Bundahiš and Khulāṣa-yi Dīn. Paštan is given the ‘sanctified milk’ in Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg and Zarātušt-Nāma and due to this he becomes safe from old age and death. In Minū-xirad [versified] Paštan becomes a virtuous and brave young man instead of becoming safe from old age and death.

The wish of all knowledge for Jāmāsp is also different in different texts. There is no mention of Jāmāsp in Dēnkard and Pahlavi Rivāyat, but he receives the flower and profits by all knowledge in Wizīrgard ī Dēnīg and Zarātušt-Nāma. In Ṣadder Bundahiš and Khulāṣa-yi Dīn, we are told about Jāmāsp gaining all knowledge, but there is no mention of how this occurs. Jāmāsp smells the bōy (comprehension) in order to gain all knowledge. In the Ḥikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may… there is no word of any of Guštasp’s wishes.

In the Ḥikāyat dar bāb-i xwardan-i may… the spirit of Guštasp, just like that of Ardāy-Virāf, stays for seven days in the Other World. The interesting point is the comparison of Guštasp’s ascending to the Other World with Ardā’s journey. Thus, after drinking three bowels of wine, Ardā’s soul also ascends to the Other World, and he stays with the Holy Immortals for one

81 ‘Hōm’ (Avestan: haoma-), a plant which syrup/sap/emulsion used in religious ritual.
82 It is possible that Dēnkard has another and different version of this story.
83 It seems that this paragraph, like some others, has been added to the original text by Darāb Hurmazdyār, the versifier. Or, perhaps the source for his versification was another quotation from Dādestān ī Mēnō ī Xrād, because this paragraph is not found in the Parsig texts of Dādestān ī Mēnō ī Xrād.
84 In the Zarātušt-Nāma Guštasp is asleep for three days.
week. He is there informed of secrets, and after returning he recounts them to the King of Kings of the time, Ardašīr-i Bābakān (Unvālā 1922: I.271).

Kerdīr’s Journey

Kerdīr\(^{85}\) lived in the third century A.D. As he himself says, he upheld an important religious title in the time of four Sassanid kings, (Šāpūr 240-272), (Hurmazd 272-273), Wahrām (Bahram) son of Šāpūr (274-276) and Wahrām son of Wahrām (276-293) (Naqš-i Rajab 2001: 27-30). There are four inscriptions of Kerdīr: Sar Mašhad (KSM), Naqš-i Rustam (KNRm), Ka’ba-yi Zar¯ušt (KKZ) and Naqš-i Rajab (KNRb). The Sar Mašhad inscription was engraved about 290 A.D, but the three others have been engraved later, maybe in the beginning of the reign of Wahrām III (Gignoux 1973: 215).

Kerdīr’s report on his journey is to be found in the three inscriptions: (KSM), (KNRm) and (KNRb). The main report of Kerdīr’s journey to the Other World is found in the Sar Mašhad inscription. The account is also found in the Naqš-i Rustam inscription. Unfortunately, the second half of both inscriptions are severely damaged, so the last part of the story is missing. An allusion to Kerdīr’s journey is found in the Naqš-i Rajab inscription as well.

The Sar Mašhad and the Naqš-i Rustam inscriptions

When Kerdīr has been given a high rank in his country in the present world, he requests of the gods to show him the Other World as well, so that he may understand what will be the end of good and evil deeds and what Paradise and Hell are like. He also wants to know if he is a virtuous man and will go to Paradise or if he is an evil-doer and Hell will be his eternal place after death. Kerdīr claims that it is due to his obedience and what he has done for the sake of religion that he is allowed to see the Other World (KNRm 199: 5-6). In short, Kerdīr journeys to the Other World because he merits it (KSM 1991: 31).

After his request, Kerdīr prays ritually. Later, some creatures called rathvīg or rēsīg/rēsīg appear and reproduce pictures of the Other World. These creatures announce that they have seen a king who is riding a noble white horse and carrying a flag in his hand. Then someone whose face looks like Kerdīr’s appears seated like a king on his throne. Perhaps this is Kerdīr’s faravahr (his celestial body) (Gignoux 1968: 409)\(^{86}\). He comes face to face

\(^{85}\) There is a variation in the reading of Kerdīr’s name: Kerdīr, Kirdīr, Kardēr, Kartir (Kardel in Coptic texts and Káptra and Kapšap in Greek texts). For further information on the various readings of this name, see the following works: Henning 1942: 941-953, (952); Gnoli 1986: 105-106.

\(^{86}\) Also see Tafaqżulī 1991: 734.
with a beautiful lady who is moving towards him from the east. Kerdīr declares openly that he has never seen such a noble lady.

Kerdīr’s double takes the lady, who is the symbol of the religion, by her hand. The lady guides him on an illuminated path towards the east. They see a sovereign dressed in white who is sitting on a golden throne with a pair of scales before him. They both stand in front of him, and then they pass him and reach another king dressed in white, who is also sitting on a golden throne. The bottomless pit of Hell full of snakes, scorpions, crocodiles and all sorts of reptiles, which are very scaring to the narrators, becomes visible. A sharp razor-like bridge is fixed over the pit, and they have to pass it. While they are passing, the bridge expands in front of the two. They see another king who comes toward them from the other side. He takes them by the hand and leads them across the bridge. Afterwards, they all continue their way towards the east together.

After passing the bridge, the king, Kerdīr’s double and the lady arrive in a portico. There is a throne at the far end of the portico and the two go up and sit in a special chamber. Afterwards, Kerdīr’s double eats some bread and wine. Finally all go together into the presence of Ohrmazd, and it seems that Ohrmazd points at Kerdīr’s double and gives him a smile of satisfaction (KSM 1991: 26-58; KNRm 1991: 49-73).87

The specific circumstances of Kerdīr’s journey

After praying, Kerdīr says a benediction which he calls āvēn mahr. Perhaps this is a kind of “ritual mantra” (Utas 1989-1991: 15)88 that helps him to conceive the Other World, but there are no details about this āvēn mahr. Unfortunately, this benediction is not among Zoroastrain benedictions known to-day. It is not known if āvēn mahr used to be accompanied by any particular religious ceremonies. Because of this, there is a question about whether Kerdīr used any kind of drinkables or edibles and whether he profited of any kind of medium to journey to the Other World. Also in the Naqš-i Rajab inscription, Kerdīr points to a ritual, in fact, another ritual the name of which is kirdagān (KNRb 2001’a’: 8,12,15), for his journey to the Other World. The kirdagān ritual is also unknown. However, it seems that Kerdīr

---


Some extracts of Kerdīr’s inscriptions have been also published, for example: (Utas 1989-1991: 15-16), (Tafażzulī 1991: 733-35).

was able to travel to the Other World due to accomplishing that ritual (Daryāyī 2001: 8). 89

Gnoli and Gignoux express the opinion that according to Sar Mašhad and Naqš-i Rustam, Kerdīr has not journeyed to the Other World himself, but his narration is just intuitions that the gods have granted him (Gnoli 1979: 450; Gignoux 1984: 20). Gignoux adds that, although there is no mention of an intoxicating substance in Kerdīr’s journey, everything related to his journey is due to his dreams or his intuitions (Gignoux 1984: 20). If, on the other hand, the earlier interpretation of his inscriptions is correct, Kerdīr’s narration should be seen as a report of a journey to the Other World. Obviously, this journey and the report of it may be understood in various ways.

In Herzfeld’s opinion Kerdīr, Ardāy-Virāf and Tansar are all the same person (Herzfeld 1935: 100-102). There is a great similarity between Kerdīr’s and Ardāy-Virāf’s reports of the Other World, and that is what has caused Herzfeld to assume that both of them are actually the same account. Considering the time when they lived, Tavadia criticizes Herzfeld for supposing them to be the same and argues that, although Ardāy-Virāf’s journey report is similar to Kerdīr’s revelation, it is not correct to make them the same person (Tavadia 1956: 118).

But how has the similarity between these two travel reports become possible? Here I would like to draw attention to the similarities between Ardāy-Virāf’s and Kerdīr’s travel reports. I suppose that these two reports have the same origin, that is, Kerdīr has probably not journeyed to the Other World. He has just rewritten Ardāy-Virāf’s description and has thus produced a report of an unachieved journey.

But what was Kerdīr’s motivation for doing this?

We know that Kerdīr did all that was in his power to propagate Zoroastrianism all over Iran, and he himself confirms this too: “The Religions of Ahūrāmazdā (devil) and the demons were expelled from the kingdom and they became homeless” (KKZ 1991: 9-10). In the continuation of such methods, Kerdīr needed to do something that no one else could do, something beyond human power. What is more beyond human power than journeying to the Other World? It would not be possible to do such a thing except by being directly related to the gods and by their help. Kerdīr’s claims of journeying to the Other World and his report of that journey would first and foremost have shown him as such a virtuous man of religion that the gods are helping him to see the Other World: “The gods presented me the Other World in the way it is in order for me to obtain more confidence” he says (KNRb 2001: 6-9).

89 Nyberg (1974: II.113) has translated kirdagān as ‘divine service’ and ‘pious work’, although he has not written anything about the content of this ritual. MacKenzie (1990: 49) has translated kirdagān as ‘action’.
The choice of a subject such as journeying to the Other World was quite suitable, because Jamšid’s, Zarathustra’s, Wištasp’s and, perhaps the most important of all, Ardāy-Virāf’s journey had been fixed in the mind of the Iranians and had a very old origin in their beliefs. Especially Ardāy-Virāf had the same sense of duty as Kerdīr believed himself to have, namely journeying to and seeing the Other World to be informed of the result of virtuous and evil deeds, and then to propagate and warn people of the Other World. Since there are few details in Jamšid’s, Zarathustra’s and Wištasp’s journeys, Kerdīr chose Ardāy-Virāf’s travel report as the best and most useful one. By claiming that he had visited the Other World and that the gods had helped him to do this, Kerdīr had not only obtained a super-human and holy image among people, but this had also been a suitable way to get closer to the king and to acquire a special position and increased power. In any case, he gained such a position that no one, not even the king himself, had the courage to question his holy state. Using Ardāy-Virāf’s report had the advantage that there was no need for thinking about any details of the journey, because Ardāy-Virāf had finished it before him. Thus the account was ready and available and the sights had been described already.

As previously mentioned, it is a fact that except the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma, there were other texts in which the Other World had been explained either in details or briefly, but if the description of the Other World by Kerdīr had used these texts, they could not have gained him the desired position. Furthermore, Jamšid, Zarathustra and Wištasp were not “chosen by the gods” in the same way, and their travel reports were not detailed enough to be a useful description of such a journey. As has been said before, Kerdīr was looking for a magnificent and clear model that could represent him as a chosen one and which at the same time could give a vivid picture of his journey. He could find such a model only in the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma. Therefore, he began to re-write Ardāy-Virāf’s report.

When studying Kerdīr’s functions, we understand that he was able to increase his power more and more. One of the proofs of this power is that, even if Kerdīr was never a king, he was the only ancient Iranian non-royal person who left royal types of inscriptions as his memorial (Daryāyi 2001: 3), the main subject of his inscriptions being just the reports of his journey to the Other World.

Nobody knows when the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma was written, not even approximately. But, since its main subject matter is very old (Widengren 1961: 13; Tavadia 1956: 117; Boyce 1968’a’: 48; Tafsīzūlī 1991: 733), it was simply possible for Kerdīr to find the opportunity of profiting from it, even in its oral form. His travel reports in Sar Mašhad and Naqš-i Rustam clearly give evidence of that. The gain that Kerdīr sought to attain resulted in the similarities between his travel report and that of Ardāy-Virāf Nāma, and, due to this, Herzfeld assumed Kerdīr, Ardāy-Virāf and Tansar to be the same person (Herzfeld 1935: 100-102). However, with due attention to their dif-
ferent histories and lifetimes, it is obviously incorrect to assume that these three persons were one and the same (Tavdia 1956: 117-118).

Journey of Zoroaster the Pamphylian

The fourth group includes two texts. The first is called *Peri physeōs* (*On Nature*), and is written in Greek. This work has been attributed to Zoroaster, and a part of it, which is preserved, is about Zoroaster’s journey to the Other World. The second one is another account of the same journey, although with a different traveller, which Plato also quotes in his book *Politeia* (*The Republic*).

**Peri physeōs**

Among the works in the tradition of Hellenistic learning that have been attributed to Zoroaster, there are three well-known books. One of them is called “*Peri physeōs*”, written on papyrus rolls, which includes four “books” or four volumes (Beck 1991: 528).90

*Peri physeōs* is the most interesting of the three works, both because of its more varied contents and its frame narrative. The contents of this book are thus presented as truths revealed by the gods to Zoroaster (idem: 528-529).

In one section of *Peri physeōs*, Zoroaster talks about his journey to the Other World. His speech has disappeared as well as the book itself, but the first section of the journey report has also been recorded by Clemens of Alexandria (150-c.215 A.D.) and has remained down to our time:

> These things I wrote, I, Zoroaster, son of Armenius, a Pamphylian by race, who died in war, whatever I learnt from the gods while I was in Hades (Hell) (idem: 518).

**Politeia**

Plato has mentioned a variant of the travel account by Zoroaster the Pamphylian in the last section of his book *Politeia*, but Plato’s narrating character is not Zoroaster but someone called Er: Here follows a summary of this account, which is found in *Politeia* (1942: II.491-521):

> Er, son of Armenius, was a brave man from Pamphylia. He was killed in war. When those killed in war were gathered together after ten days, even though all the other killed men’s corpses had decayed, his body was fresh. When his

---

90 The two other books are *Asteroskopika* or *Apotelesmatika* in five volumes and *Peri lithontimion* in one volume. More information on these works can be found in Bidez-Cumont (1938: 1.134).

body was placed on firewood to be set on fire on the twelfth day, suddenly he revived and narrated what he had seen in the Other World:

When the soul left my body, accompanied by a lot of people, we reached a wonderful place. There were two hatch-ways on the ground and two others in the sky opposite each other. Some judges were sitting between the hatch-ways, they judged people's deed in their lifetime. Whoever was righteous, they installed a tablet on his chest and led him to the right up towards the sky. They installed another tablet on the back of whoever was a tyrant and guided him to the left towards the way leading downwards.

When it was my turn, the judge told me to be alert and to observe everything well, so that I would be able to inform the people of the situation in the Other World when I returned. The people whose cases had been dealt with and who had given their account to God, each group went their way via either the celestial or the terrestrial hatch-way. Then a chaste and charismatic party came down from the celestial hatch-way. From the terrestrial hatchway a dirty and dusty group came out. Afterwards, all came together on a green meadow. The first group narrated their celestial joys merrily but the second explained in tears their thousands years of punishments and sufferings.

After a seven days residence on the meadow, both groups left on the eighth day, and then they arrived in a place where the Spindle of Necessity, on which the circulation of all heavenly spheres depends, was suspended by eight intricate wheels from a chain of light.

Finally, both groups drew lots from the Spindle of Necessity which determined their personalities and the style of their new lives on earth.

Afterwards, all went into the plain of oblivion and all were forced to drink of the water in the River of Forgetfulness. But Er was not permitted to drink because his mission was to explain the Other World to people of the present world. Even so, he was not able to remember where and how his soul returned to his body. When he opened his eyes upon his return to the world he found himself on top of the accumulated firewood.

**Peri physeós or Politeia**

Concerning the author of *Peri physeós* and its travel report, Proclus\(^2\) believed that “the author [of *Peri physeós*] has simply plagiarized the opening of the “Myth of Er" from Plato’s Republic [*Politeia*] (614b), substituting Zoroaster’s name for Er’s. As often happens, the genuine and the fake changed places” (Beck 1991: 518).\(^3\)

But Colotes, an Epicurean philosopher of the mid-third century was of the opinion that the plagiarism of the Myth of Er flowed in the other direction; that it was Plato who had substituted Er's name for Zoroaster's (idem: 529).\(^4\)

There have sometimes been such arguments among philosophers. They thought that either the author of *Peri physeós* had copied Plato’s work or, on the contrary, it was Plato who had copied the author of *Peri physeós*. Per-

---

\(^2\) Proclus Diadochus is a Greek philosopher and mathematician (b. about 410-d. 485).


haps, however, there have been some exaggerations in this discussion. For example, Colotes is accused of expressing his opinion about Plato, “The natural inference from this is that Colotes knew, or knew of, the pseudepigraphic treatise On Nature [Peri physeōs] and mistook the derivative (Zoroaster’s) for the original (Plato’s) – willfully, perhaps, in sectarian zeal” (idem).95

Plato seems to have been affected by the work Peri physeōs, in which the journey is attributed to Zoroaster, and also to have been acquainted with Iranian, especially Zoroastrian, thoughts. It may be pointed out that, it is in Plato, in the First Alcibiades (I.121), the authenticity of which has been wrongly contested (written 390 B.C.), that the first definite mention in Greece of the name of Zoroaster appears, and here also the interest which Plato took in doctrines circulating under the authority of the Magi first manifests itself (Benveniste 1924: 16). Furthermore, towards the end of his life, Plato shows in the Law the importance which the distinction between the opposing realms of Good and Evil assumed in his eyes (Law: Leg X, 896).

Although already the oldest Greek philosophy delighted in regarding the world as the product of two opposite principles, it is difficult not to take into account the unanimous statements of Plato’s disciples, that he at least knew, even if he did not adopt, the dualistic conceptions of the Magi (Benveniste 1924: 16-17).

According to J. Bidez’ research,96 Eliade finds it increasingly probable that at least certain elements of the Platonic system are of Irano-Babylonian origin (Eliade 1954: 128). The 22nd paragraph of Timaeus’ treatise (Timaeus: 22d) also provides evidence that Plato seems to have been familiar with Iranian conceptions of natural disasters as a means for the purification of the human race (Eliade 1954: 122).

Finally, A.D.H. Bivar is convinced of the similarities between Iranian-Zoroastrian narrations and that of Er. He investigates and studies traces of Plato’s Mithraistic thoughts in Pliny, Cicero and Seneca’s works to make it clear that Plato was acquainted with Zoroastrianism and Mithraism (Bivar 1998: 72-74, 77). He shows evidence in proof of this that cannot be easily ignored.

1. Plato as a young man lived in the home of his stepfather Pyrilampes. He must have heard stories about Iran and its royalties from Pyrilampes, since he had been employed on embassies to the Persian king (idem: 68-71).

---

95 Bidez, J. et Cumont, F.: I, 111.
96 Eliade believes that Bidez in Éos, ou Platon et l’Orient (Brussels 1945) “takes into consideration especially the researches of Boll, Bezold, W. Gundel, W. Jaeger, A. Götzte, J. Stenzel, and even Reitzenstein’s interpretations despite the objections that some of them have aroused” (Eliade 1954: 120).
2. “A tradition attributed to Aristotle tells how a Magus who had come from Syria foretold to Socrates that his would be an enforced death” (idem: 71).  
3. “Plato encountered in Phoenicia Persians, from whom he learnt the doctrine of Zoroaster” (idem: 72).  
4. The “Myth of Er” has a quite characteristic relation to the Zoroastrian tradition (idem: 83).  
5. A certain visitor who came to Plato is described as a “Chaldaean”. He seems to have conversed with Plato during the last night of his life (idem: 73).  
6. The Persian Mithridates commissioned a portrait statue of Plato in the Academy (idem: 74). 

In addition to these, as Bivar states, Pliny (NH XXX, 30.1.9) also claims that Plato had studied the Zoroastrian religion (Bivar 1998: 72). 

In accordance with this, even if the Myth of the journey of Er the Pamphylian has not been completely copied from the journey of Zoroaster the Pamphylian, the main subject of Er’s journey to the Other World is still a result of the Greeks’, and in this context particularly Plato’s recognition of and acquaintance with Iranian-Zoroastrian thoughts and philosophy.

Wirkak’s journey

In addition to the four above-mentioned groups, there is also another report of journeying to the Other World that is not written but pictorial. 

In the summer of 2003, one of the greatest discoveries related to the Central Asian peoples of the sixth century A.D. took place outside Xi’an in China. The excavation culminated in a typical Chinese house-shaped tomb, where a stone sarcophagus was placed on the ground. Its four walls were lavishly decorated with painted and gilded reliefs depicting scenes of banquets, hunting, journeys, caravans and, the most interesting one, a representation of an ascent to heaven. All these show a close contact between the Central Asian and Iranian worlds. There were two stone inscriptions on the

---

97 See also Cumont 1975: 157.  
98 See also Westerink 1962: (page 9 of text, lines 8-13).  
99 See also Kerschensteiner 1945: 140-143.  
100 See also Kingsley 1995: 199-200.  
101 To study the effects of Iranian thoughts and philosophy upon Plato in his writing of the “Myth of Er”, refer to the following researches: Geffeken 1928: 517-528; Sanjana 1932: 39-80; Windischmann 1863. Duchesne-Guillemin has also contemplated the myth of Er, but he is in doubt whether, the other world basis on Iranian World View, has any influence on Plato; as Bidez claims (Duchesne-Guillemin 1953: 101-103).  
lintel above the door of the southern side of the sarcophagus, one in Sogdian and the other one in Chinese. The owner of the tomb was called Wirkak, an Iranian merchant, according to the Sogdian inscription.\textsuperscript{103} He died at the age of eighty-six years in 579 (Grenet, Riboud et Junkai 2004: 274\textsuperscript{104}).

**The relief of Wirkak’s tomb**

A stone door was erected at the southern side of Wirkak’s sarcophagus, surrounded by two guardian gods, each trampling a demon. There are two false mullion windows at both sides of the sarcophagus and under each one a picture of a priest-bird was painted, supposedly a symbol of Surūš (idem: 278-279).

The most important part of Wirkak’s tomb relief is three partial scenes of the Other World. Chinvad Bridge is in the centre of the scene. Four persons, a man, a woman and two children are passing over the bridge. They have nearly reached the end of the passage. The light in front of them gives light to the way of the souls.\textsuperscript{105} Some animals, such as horses, donkeys, cows, sheep, camels, a bird and some unknown animals, are following them over the bridge. Two persons dressed in Zoroastrian priest clothes are standing as guardians at the entrance of the bridge. The heads and shoulders of the two guardian dogs of the bridge are also seen immediately behind these two priests. The mountain\textsuperscript{106} which the soul must climb stands at a distance beyond the dogs.

Hell is painted as a dreadful mass of waves of a lake under the bridge. Several posts with monster headed capitals emerge out of the interior of Hell.\textsuperscript{107} Along the Hell side, in the left part of the relief, ducks are swimming in the water towards a stony bank.

A group of celestial musicians are playing different kinds of musical instruments in the sky above the bridge. A herd of winged horses are shown flying in the middle part of the relief.

A two-armed god holding a trident in his right hand, seated cross-legged on three bulls,\textsuperscript{108} is seen at the top right corner of the relief. The Amšās-pandān, the celestial beings, are pictured on Wirkak’s tomb relief at different levels in the sky (idem: 273-284).

---

\textsuperscript{103} Pay attention to close similarities between two names, Wirkak and Wirāf.
\textsuperscript{104} Rahām Ašā introduced this source to me. Thanks to him.
\textsuperscript{105} $\textit{atāxš-kirb}$ (The goddess of Fire) is the assistant of virtuous souls in passing Chinvad Bridge and destroying the darkness of Hell (WZad 1993: XXX.52).
\textsuperscript{106} “[That goddess] stands as a mountain for the soul to climb to the top” (ibid).
\textsuperscript{107} “The lower structure of the bridge is supported by posts with monster headed capitals” (Grenet, Riboud et Junkai 2004: 277). But they are more similar to monster creatures of Hell than to posts supporting a bridge.
\textsuperscript{108} Among the gods, it is Wāy who wears the armors of war and has a sharp spear and golden armours (Yt. XV 1959: 11.48). Wāy’s armours are described in Yasht XV.56. But there is nothing said about his trident.
Since Wirkak’s tomb relief is a unique pictorial specimen of an Iranian’s journey to the Other World, it is extraordinarily valuable.

**Specific circumstances of Wirkak’s journey**

Wirkak’s journey has one specific characteristic, namely that among all the Iranian journeys to the Other World it is the only one that does not show a return to this world. Due to this, Wirkak’s pictorial report of the Other World cannot be his own narration. Perhaps his successors, relatives or friends have painted his journey to the Other World. There is nothing known about any customs of this type, since Zoroastrians neither used to bury their dead nor lay them in tombs. Thus, there are no traces of Zoroastrian graves or tombs anywhere. Due to that, Wirkak’s tomb relief is unique in its kind. It can be supposed that this is due to the effect of the culture and painting style of China, the country where he lived, since there they have painted tombs and graves.

It is also possible that Wirkak’s commercial journeys had taken him to Egypt as well, and that he had been affected by the culture of that ancient country. This may be one of the reasons why he had ordered his tomb to have pictures of his journey to the Other World. It is quite clear, however, that this journey is depicted according to Zoroastrian beliefs.

Some of the motifs on Wirkak’s tomb relief give reason for astonishment. These are the fact that there are two children among those who pass over Chinvad Bridge, and, indeed, that a group of four are passing together. The different animals that pass over the bridge and the existence of celestial musician and winged horses, swimming birds and a two-armed god seated on the three bulls in the highest heaven are all reasons for astonishment. Passing Chinvad Bridge is an individual act in all abstract narrative texts. There is no indication of children passing Chinvad Bridge in Zoroastrian texts, and

---

109 There are some exceptions among royalties. For example, in spite of all doubts and debates related to the religion of the Achaemenian kings (Zoroastrian or non-Zoroastrian), the place of their tombs in Naqš-i Rustam must be considered (Herzfeld 1941: 216-220). Likewise, the tomb of King Khusrau I Anūša-Ravān (531-579 A.D.) is important because of the legends about the place where it was discovered at the time of the Abbassid Ma‘mun (Ma‘mūn-i ‘Abbāsī) (Jamālzāda 1975: 25-60).

110 It may be that the children are passing the bridge, indicates the *stīr* in Parsig and *sitar, situr, istar* or *istur* in Zoroastrian and New Persian. According to Zoroastrianism, whenever, someone dies who has had no child when his soul reaches the Chinvad Bridge, the middle part of the bridge seems to be broken. Then the soul feels astonished and perplexed at what to do? It can neither return nor continue. He is called a person of “the broken bridge”, because the Amšaspandān will not judge him at this point. He should wait there until the resurrection day. Due to this, his heirs appoint a child as his “stīr” (*istur* / *istar*). This child is the legal heir of the dead person. In this case, the Chinvad Bridge rejoins and the Amšaspandān can judge his deeds without any delay (*SDB* 1909: LXII.1-6).
there is no allusion to animals passing the bridge, neither to winged cows, swimming birds nor the god seated on bulls with a trident in his hand.¹¹¹

On the other hand, there are some common points between Wirkak’s tomb relief and the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma as well as to other Zoroastrian texts about the Other World:¹¹² Surūš is presented in the form of a bird (rooster?) that is painted twice on the southern front side of the sarcophagus, the presence of the two Amšāspandān at the entrance of the Chinad Bridge, the existence of two guardian dogs, the fire that lightens the passage way, the mountain which the virtuous soul climbs, the existence of different levels in Heaven, and the fact that different Amšāspandān and Ohrmazd are found in different positions in Heaven.

**After Islam**

Belief in the existence of the Other World, as well the reports of a journey to this Other World was so extensive and deep in ancient Iran that its effects can easily be found upon Iranian culture after Islam. This influence is manifested, for example, in a variety of religious and non-religious, versified or prose works.¹¹³ A citation of a few examples of famous Iranian works related to the Islamic period can give an indication of this massive influence.

New Persian literature, from the early days of the New Persian language up to now, has seen plenty of works in which the soul, after dying, has given a report of what it has met in the Other World. This is indeed a major part of the Islamic-Iranian religious classical mystical and gnostic literature. To explain this, just a few examples of such works from different ages will be presented briefly. This can prove Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma’s influence on the Islamic Iranian literature.

The first effects are present in Ṭabarī’s¹¹⁴ (Ṭabarī 1961:3.666)¹¹⁵ Maibudi’s¹¹⁶ (Maibudi 1985:4.259,286) and Rāzī’s¹¹⁷ commentaries of the

---

¹¹¹ Wirkak’s tomb relief represents a mixture of eastern mythological beliefs, but why these mixed motifs have been pictured on a Zoroastrian tomb, is a question that probably has plenty of answers.

¹¹² For more information related to the main subject of Wirkak’s tomb, refer to comments in Grenet, Riboud et Junkai 2004: 278ff.

¹¹³ As was mentioned at the beginning of this section, in this study we just review some descriptions and journeys to the Other World in the Iranian tradition in order to study the effects of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma upon the Iranian Islamic culture and works that have been created in this cultural sphere at different times. Attention to the probable effects of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma upon works created beyond the Iranian tradition such as the Risālat-ul gufrān (Epistle of Forgiveness) by Abul-’alā Ma’arr and Divina Commedia by Dante Alighieri, are not discussed, since there is enough research and debate related to them.

¹¹⁴ Muhammad Jarīr-i Tabarī has written his Commentary of the Quran in ten volumes in the year 966-975.

¹¹⁵ About the effects of Iranian culture upon Tabarī, refer to Henry Corbin’s writings: Corbin, Henry 1971: *L’Homme de lumière dans le soufisme iranien*, Paris, p. 56.
Quran: “It has been quoted that the prophet said: when a righteous dead person rises up from the grave, his good deeds come to him in a very beautiful appearance, the dead asks, who is it? I see you as very good-looking, of a good nature and beneficent. He replies: I am your good deeds. Then he leads him and gives light to his way towards Paradise. On the contrary, when the unbeliever rises up from his grave, his evil deed comes to him in an ugly and ill-tempered shape. The dead asks; who is it whom I see as an ill-favoured man. He replies: I am your evil deeds, I will not leave you until I lead you to Hell”, Rāzī states in his commentary (Rāzī 1965: 5.209).

Another work clearly and exactly affected by Iranian beliefs, is Imam Muhammad Gazzālī’s (1058-1111) recapitulation of good deed (daēnā: conscience/religion) visiting the dead souls in the Other World. In Gazzālī’s version the face and figure of good deed (daēnā/dīn) has been modified to a handsome man because of Islamic restrictions, but the message and the main words are all the same as in the Iranian ancient narration: “Then a well dressed, sweet-smelling, handsome man comes to him (the soul of the dead) and says: I give you good tidings of your Creator’s mercy and of the Paradise where you will enjoy eternal bliss. The soul replies to him: Peace upon you, who are you then? - I am your good deed, he says”. (Gazzālī → Muhâqqiq 1960: 103).

Maulavī’s view of “bad death” as opposed to “good death” is also an indication of how he has been directly affected by the concept of the soul visiting his daēnā (conscience/religion) in Zoroastrian tradition. In his book, Maṯnâvī-ya maʿnavî, he states: “death as a mirror in which we see the reality of ourselves, whether it is ugly, it is not the fault of death and if it is nice, its beauty is nothing, except the reality of our personality” (Šafʿī Kadkanī 1974: 73).

The subject matter of the poem Sair-ul-‘ibâd ilal-maʿād of Sanāʾī Gāznāvī (died about 1130) is also a description of an imagined journey to the seven firmaments and the place of evil-doings, Hell of snakes, and fires, then to the Kingdom of Heaven (place of the angels), the place of the good and radiant human beings, and at the end to the highest point of Heaven (sky of skies), the place of light and the righteous (Sanāʾī Gāznāvī 1969: 179-233). Another description of the same as journey can be seen in Mîsbâḥ-ul arvâh (Lantern of the souls), versified by Šamsuddîn Muḥammadden-i Bardsî at the

116 Abulfazl Aḥmad ibn-i Muḥammad Maibūdī began writing a ten volume Commentary, Kašf-ul-asrâr wa ’uddat-ul-abrâr (Discovering the Secrets and Promise to free men), in 1126.
117 Abul-futūh-i Rāzī, born in about 1087 dead after 1157, is the writer of a ten volume Commentary, called Rawḥ al-jinān va rūḥ al-janān (The Breeze of the Gardens and the Spirit of the Heart).
118 »بی‌خیال، آتیه‌ای از حسین اصناف، از حسن النبی، از حسن الثیاب، فیقول ابترا بر حمّه رنه، رنه، رنه، دعو به مقوم، و فیقول: بخشک الله.«
119 یک مرگ برای یک پیامبر، می‌گویند، هر مرگ، هر کسی، هر مرثی، هر مرکب، هر مرگ، روند را ضرر نمی‌کند، نه ضرر، نه درخواست مرگ. روند را ضرر نمی‌کند، نه ضرر، نه درخواست مرگ. روند را ضرر نمی‌کند، نه ضرر، نه درخواست مرگ. روند را ضرر نمی‌کند، نه ضرر، نه درخواست مرگ. روند را ضرر نمی‌کند، نه ضرر، نه درخواست مرگ.
end of the eleventh century A.D. This journey is divided into seven stages. The name of each is extracted from an attribute of the soul. The first stage is the \textit{nafs-i ammāra(h)} (spirit of lasciviousness), his place is Hell, full of fire, smoke and devils, and the last stage is the \textit{nafs-i fāniyya(h)} (mortal spirit) (Utas 1989-1991: 18-21). Both of these poetic texts, are clearly influenced by the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma}, especially as regards the description of the journeys and the places that the journeys at last reach.

These traditions have even affected the literature of Iran after the constitutional revolution (1906), which is the time of the foundation of Iranian modern literature. At that time, a Muslim priest, Ḥujjat-ul-islām Āqā-Najafī Qūcānī (1878-1944) was profoundly influenced by the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma}, when he wrote his “novel-like” work” called: \textit{Siyyāhat-i ġarb} (Touring the West), which is an idealistic-imaginary journey to the Other World.


However, none of them has been published yet. In the chain of journeys to the Other World in Iranian literature, whether profiting from the ancient story of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} or reproducing it directly, or even applying it to Islamic beliefs, it has been used continuously throughout the centuries, being related to different matters and problems of the actual periods. The ultimate goal of these citations is to show the beauty of good deeds and the enormous pleasant reward in Heaven for them. They also try to show the ugliness of evil deeds and how they are punished in Hell. Still, the evil deeds of humanity have increased more than ever. Does this not show that mankind more and more seems to doubt the existence of retribution in the Other World?

120 The text version that I use has been established according to the Badī‘ulzamān-i Furūzān-far’s posthumous notes (found in the edition publ. by I. Afsār). I have utilized the critical edition of Bo Utas, which he has not published yet.

121 About the ‘West’ writers refer to this citation of Īmām-Muḥammad Bāqir, the fifth Imam of the Shiites: “There is a garden in the west of the world, irrigated by the Euphrates, where the believers’ spirits enjoy God’s gifts every morning and evening.” (Āqā-Najafī Qūcānī 2001: 3)

122 There are two major secondary works on Iranian conceptions of the Other World, namely Söderblom (1901) and Pavry (1926).
Figure 1: Sogdian tomb, Xi’an: drawing of the eastern side.\textsuperscript{123}  

\textsuperscript{123} This drawing has been published in an article in \textit{Studia Iranica} (2004: 280). I thank Mr. Frantz Grenet for his permission to use this sketch.
IV. Previous Research

During the last two centuries, on several occasions mention has been made of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in Zoroastrian Persian prose. Three different approaches to the work can be seen, as follows:

- Indication of the existence of the work, sometimes with an explanation about its theme
- Presentation of manuscripts of the work found in different libraries
- Research about the contents of the work

The occasions in the scientific literature where the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* has been mentioned are in chronological order as follows:

1816  J. A. Pope is the first researcher who presents a translation of *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in one of the European languages. Pope’s translation is closely similar to the Zoroastrian Persian prose version of *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*. He presents three different texts as the basis of his translation into English, all three in Zoroastrian Persian (Pope 1816: xiv).

- The first, in prose, by Nūšīrvān Kirmānī
- The second, in verse, by Zartuṣṭ Bahram [Pajdū]
- The third, in prose, by the same

There are two points which need correction in Pope’s presentation of his sources. The first is that the narration by Nūšīrvān Kirmānī is in verse, not in prose, and it has been printed in the *Dārāb Hormazyār’s Rivāyat* (Unvālā 1922: II.331-342). The second point is that it is not clear, what he means by the words “by the same” in his third source. Does it mean Zartuṣṭ Bahram?

This would be the natural interpretation. However, there is no track of any *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* narrated in prose by Zartuṣṭ Bahram, and, furthermore, he himself has never been mentioned in connection with such a text anywhere. Here it is necessary to mention that Kay-Khusrau Isfandiyār has indicated the existence of a prose version of *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* versified by Zartuṣṭ Bahram, in his *Dabistān-i Mažāhib* (The school of religions) (Kay-Khusrau Isfandiyār 1983: 2.94-100). But, is this exactly the same text as the one referred to by Pope? However, in one part, this cannot be “that prose narration by the same”, i.e. Zartuṣṭ Bahram, because this is a narration in prose by

---

124 According to the sub-title of Pope’s book (*The Ardai Viraf Nameh, or the Revelations of Ardai Viraf, Translated from the Persian and Guzeratee versions*), he has also used the Gujarati version for his translation, but there is no mention of this in his references.

125 Neither Haug and West (1872), nor Mu’in (1946) mention this fact.
Kay-Khusrau Isfandiyar of this work.\(^{126}\) On the other hand, Pope has not mentioned any version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* narrated in prose by Kay-Khusrau Isfandiyar anywhere. Haug and West supposed that Pope’s third text might refer to a copy of the *H28* manuscript (Haug-West 1872: xix). Since Pope’s translation is very close to the Zoroastrian Persian prose *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, thus, it is probably a true supposition.

Finally, it must be mentioned that Pope had stated in the end of his preface that the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* had been originally written in Zand and it has later been translated into Persian, Sanskrit and Hindi of Gujarat (= Gujarati) (Pope 1816: xiii-xiv). However, the question is whether Pope means the original meaning of *Zand*, because *Zand* means the translation of the Avestan texts into Parsig, often accompanied by a commentary. In other words, nothing is “written originally” in *Zand* but rather translated into *Zand* (= Parsig) from the Avestan language. It cannot be ruled out that, like many others who have used the word *Zand* in former times, Pope also understood something else by this word than the way it is used today. The three terms *Avesta*, *Zand* and *Pazand* have earlier been mixed up and used in an inconsistent way (Tafażzul 1997: 115).\(^{127}\)

1870 Ed. Sachau mentioned the Zoroastrian Persian prose translation of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in his research about Zoroastrian Persian works and their themes. He considers this Zoroastrian Persian text the basis of Pope’s translation into English (Sachau 1870: 234).

1872 Martin Haug and E.W. West published the first extensive investigation about different versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* together with a Parsig text edited by Dastūr Hoshangji Jamaspji Asa. They also published two other texts; *Gosht-i Fryano*, edited by West (pp. 205-266) and *Hadokht-Nask* edited by Haug (pp. 267-316). The work also contains a transcription and translation of all three texts.

In their research, Haug and West point out the existence of various versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in several languages, such as Parsig, Pazand, Sanskrit, Old Gujarati, New Gujarati and Persian. Furthermore, they also introduce many of its manuscripts; among them the *H28*, which consists of the Zoroastrian Persian prose text. In addition to introducing the text, they have printed the preface of *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, which is a part of this very manuscript. Haug and West’s work includes the translation of this preface, too.

Reading this preface, they have made some mistakes, for example, they have read “binid” as “bilind” and “plīnam” as “bīstār.”

---

\(^{126}\) The name of the first character is *Ardā-Vīrāf* in Zartušt Bahram’s version, but it is *Ardāy-Vīrāf* in Dabistān-i Maštān.

\(^{127}\) Nowadays *Zand* is again used in its original meaning of Avestan text translated into Parsig, often accompanied by a commentary.
These mistakes may originate from difficulties in reading the Persian handwriting of the manuscript.

Furthermore, Haug and West (Haug-West 1872: iii-Lxxvii) have made several assumptions and observations about the Zoroastrian Persian prose version, of which the following are the most important:

- The probability of 200 years’ antiquity of the $H28$ manuscript$^{128}$
- Similarities between the preface of the $H28$ manuscript and the first three chapters of the Parsig version
- The probability that the $H28$ manuscript is in fact the third text, referred to by Pope (see above)
- The fact that three to five folios of the $H28$ manuscript could be missing
- The likelihood that the same $H28$ manuscript is the possible source that has been used by Zartušt Bahrām for his versified version
- Important differences in the themes of the three texts; the Parsig version, the Zoroastrian Persian prose version and Pope’s version
- The existence of another version of Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma in Zoroastrian Persian prose which does not differ much from those in verse, but without any preface, narrated by Rāmā Khambāyatī. Dastūr Hoshangji is mentioned as a source for this information.

It is important to note that Khambāyatī’s version mentioned by Haug and West is just the same version that is found in the $H28$ manuscript, and there is no “other Persian prose version” of this work. This version also has a preface and shows just the same divergence from the $H28$ manuscript, which has been seen between the $H28$ and the versified version. There are several transcripts of Khambāyatī’s version in the Navsari and Bombay libraries.

Furthermore, one of the most important points in Haug’s and West’s research is their assumption about the original account and the first version of this visionary journey. Haug and West believe that the original account of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma lacked a preface and that it was added later by other authors who stood in close relation to the Zoroastrian cleric circles (Idem: lxxiii).

1873 In the first catalogue of the manuscripts of Mulla Firuz’s Library in Bombay, Edward Rehatsek recalls a collection in Persian named rivāyat (narration) with the sub-number VIII.2. One of the treatises in this collection is a Zoroastrian Persian prose Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma, about which Rehatsek has given some information (Rehatsek 1873: 179).

1889 While presenting the Bodl. Or. 719 manuscript of Bodleian Library, Ed. Sachau has mentioned an anonymous prose-version of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma. He supposed this was the text from which Dastūr Zartušt Bahrām Pajdū’s versification originated. Afterwards, he mentioned Pope’s translation of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma. Then, quoting the first lines of the Bodleian

---

$^{128}$ This means that it would be from the mid-17th century.
manuscript, he says that it is identical word for word to the H28 manuscript in Munich. Finally, he indicates the existence of another manuscript of this same text in the India Office Library (Sachau 1889: I.1112-1113).

1896-1904 While presenting the Zoroastrian Persian prose and verse works, i.e. “The Modern-Persian Zoroastrian Literature of the Parsis” as he himself names it, E.W. West also makes mention of the H28 manuscript of the Ardaš-Virāf Nāma in the Munich Library which is an incomplete copy (West 1896-1904: 125).

1900 E. Blochet introduces the Suppl. Pers. 47 manuscript in the Catalogue des Manuscrits Mazdéens de la Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The Ardaš-Virāf Nāma is the sixteenth text of Blochet’s catalogue (Blochet 1900: 100). Many years later, Blochet repeats this information in the first volume of the Catalogue des Manuscrits Persans de la Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Blochet 1905: 1.169).

1902 Dastur Kaikhusru Jamaspji Jamasp Asa, published the Parsig version of the Ardaš Virāf Nameh, in addition to the Gujarati text and Zartušt Bahram’s versified version. He refers to research done by Pope, Haug-West, and Barthélemy. In his introduction, Jamasp Asa points to the discrepancy between the time setting of the Parsig and the Zoroastrian Persian versions, and, following this, he quotes part of the introduction to the Zoroastrian Persian version in Pope’s translation (Jamasp Asa 1902: i-xii).

1903 Hermann Ethé presents the manuscript 2818 of the India Office Library with reference also to the manuscript in the Bodleian Library. In his presentation, he mentions Haug’s and West’s research (Ethé 1903: xv-xx). Ethé also supposes that the text he has presented might be the same as the version used as the basis of the versified Ardaš-Virāf Nāma by Dastur Zartušt Bahram Pajdū (Ethé 1903: I.1518-1519).

1904 Ervad Bomanji Nusserwanji Dhabhar, along with presenting the Saddar Bundihīš, proceeds to make a comprehensive presentation of all manuscripts: T.30 in Navsari, the M, belonging to Unvāla (E.M.R. Unvāla), the E in Navsari, and the K belonging to Dastūr Kaikhusro Jamasp Asa, and he emphasizes the presence of the Zoroastrian Persian Ardaš-Virāf Nāma in all of these (Dhabhar 1909: xix-xxi).

1904 On the basis of Pope’s English translation of the Ardaš-Virāf Nāma, Geo Maddox publishes a poetic translation of this same work. Maddox calls his work “A Rendering in Prose-Verse of a Translation by Mr. T. A. Pope”, and he divides it into two “books” “Heaven” and “Hell” (Maddox 1904: 1-29, 30-65).

---

129 In this edition Arday Viraf Nameh has 1162 verses, which is incomplete (Mu’īn 1946: 48). The original version of this work in ’Affī’s edition (1964) contains 1849 verses.

130 This name has been written in the second title of the book, both on the cover and the first page, but it is wrong, because the name is actually J.A. Pope and not T.A. Pope.
Christian Bartholomae introduces the prose version of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* of the Munich Library M73 (*H28*) comprehensively, and he quotes three short selected sections from the text (Bartholomae 1915: 290-292).

In his book about the history of the Parsis, Shahpursha Hormasji Hodivala proceeds to the Rivāyat of Kama Asa and a description of how the work, including *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*, was taken from Iran to India. He then tells about the colophon and the date of copying of the prose version of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* and relates it to this narration. He also mentions another manuscript of the text which is in prose and dated the year 901 A.Y. /1532 A.D., along with recalling several other manuscripts of various versions of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* (Hodivala 1920: 296-301).

E.B.N. Dhabhar introduces a prose manuscript of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*, in K. R. Cama Oriental Institute Catalogue sub-numbered MS.65, showing that it has lost several pages in different places (Dhabhar 1923’a’: 149-150).

E.B.N. Dhabhar presents two other prose manuscripts of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*, from Mulla Fīruz Library, in two separate collections, sub-numbered *M.S.105* and *M.S. 128* (Dhabhar 1923’b’: 71-72; 85-86).

E.B.N. Dhabhar presents the *T.30* collection in Meherji Rana Library, in Navsari city, which is the oldest prose manuscript of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*. He also introduces another manuscript of this work sub-numbered F.44 in this same catalogue (Dhabhar 1923’c’: 25-26, 118-120).

Jamshedji Maneckji Unvālā introduces colophons of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* manuscripts from the *Suppl. Pers. 47* of Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, the *830. 280. 18A* of the London India Office Library, and *Bodl. Or. 719* of the Bodleian Oxford Library (Unvālā 1940: 18, 100, 120).

In his *Oriental Treasures* catalogue, Jamshed Cawasji Katrak gives a brief description of Kama Asa’s Rivāyat collection and the date when it was taken from Iran. He mentions that the prose *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* is part of this collection and also tells about the existence of a copy of it. Furthermore, he states the place where the manuscript and its copy are being kept (Katrak 1941: 209-10).

Muḥammad Muʿīn publishes an investigation about the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* and its various versions in different languages, among them the Zoroastrian Persian prose version. However, Muʿīn has profited from Haug’s and West’s investigation to provide information about the prose version of this work, i.e. the *H28* manuscript. His research presents some new contributions as well:

- A reconsidering of Pope’s sources
- An attempt at dating the *H28* manuscript to the 4th and 5th century A.H./10th and 11th century A.D. on the basis of a stylistic analysis
- If Haug’s and West’s guess is true about Zartušt Bahrām basing his versified text on the Zoroastrian Persian prose translation, of which the
H28 manuscript is a copy, this translation must have come into existence before the 7th century A.H./13th century A.D.


While editing the preface, Mu‘īn has also amended some words that have been written erroneously by the copyist and some where Haug and West are mistaken in their reading. However, it seems that he has not had any microfilm or photocopy of the original manuscript. Thus, due to that, he has done his edition on the basis of the edition of Haug and West; because of this, some reading mistakes of these two researchers were retained in his edition, for example; he reads \(“\text{nīyati" as \text{nīpsī”} \text{“sāxtdand” as \text{pasāxtdand”} \text{“pasāxtdand”} \text{“pasāxtdand”}}\) and then he had to explain the meaning of these words in the footnotes.

1964 Rahīm ‘Affi edits and publishes the versified version of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} by Zartušt Bahrām Pajdū. In the beginning of his book, he re-publishes the same preface of the Zoroastrian Persian prose version that Mu‘īn has edited according to the Haug and West edition, including Mu‘īn’s explanations (‘Affi 1964: 42-52).

1967-1969 Žala Āmūzgār mentions the prose \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} in her doctoral thesis, which is an investigation about Zoroastrian Literature in Persian (1969). Referring to the MS.S.P.47 manuscript of Paris, she finds this a complete copy of the work written in a simple style. Consequently, she quotes West’s opinion about the Munich copy as incomplete (Āmūzgār 1967: 64; 1969: 199). \textsuperscript{131}

1983 Žala Āmūzgār collates two versions of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma}; the Parsig version and Zartušt Bahrām Pajdū’s versified text. She also mentions the prose version of \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} and the two manuscripts of it in Paris and Munich (Āmūzgār 1983: 105). \textsuperscript{132}

1995 Referring to the study made by Haug and West in 1872 and the long preface of the H28 manuscript, Carlo G. Cereti points out that Ardā Vīrāf and Ardashīr Pāpakān were coevals, and states that as “an interesting ‘mytheme’ widespread among Indian Zoroastrians that links Ardā Vīrāz with Ardašīr” (Cereti 1995’a’: 142).

2001 Carlo G. Cereti refers in a chapter about \textit{Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag} to Pope’s translation based on the Persian and Gujarati versions and also mentions the \textit{M73 (H28)} manuscript in which Ardāy-Vīrāf and Ardaxšīr ī Pābāgān are coevals (Cereti 2001: 122-123).

2001 Bižan Ġaybī studies the differences between two versions of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma}; the one versified by Zartušt Bahrām Pajdū and the Parsig

\textsuperscript{131} The number of the Munich manuscript is \textit{Haug MH7} in both these investigations; that is a mistake and the correct number is \textit{M73 (Haug 28)}.

\textsuperscript{132} Āmūzgār does not mention the number of the Munich manuscript in this work. She just gives the page numbers of the Barthelemy in which this manuscript has been presented.
version. Along with that, he also here and there makes several references to the Zoroastrian Persian prose version.

Moreover, he proposes the existence of two versions of the Arđāy-Vīrāf Nāma, which are originally of two different and disparate backgrounds. One is the versified version by Zartušt Bahrām which originates in an irreligious and mythic source and the other one is a Parsig text that has been created according to religious traditions.

As previously mentioned, Haug and West were the first scholars to bring up the probability of an originally irreligious account of the Arđāy-Vīrāf Nāma (Haug-West 1872: lxxiii). Ġaybī also cites several examples from the “irreligious” version of Zartušt Bahrām to confirm this thesis and then he compares these examples with the same matters in the Parsig version, which is a “religious” text (Ġaybī 2001: 8, 14).133

In addition to the above mentioned persons, there are many other researchers who have commented on the Zoroastrian Persian prose Arđāy-Vīrāf Nāma and of its manuscripts; some of them are the following: Rustamji (1868),134 Jamasp Asa (1902: i; iii), Modi (1922: I.12), Pavry (1926: 108-110), Tavadia (1956: 118), Gignoux (1984: 29-31), Tafažzulī (1997: 169).

Naturally, this presentation of research is what I have found during my careful investigation of the matter. In other words, there may be more studies of the Zoroastrian Persian prose Arđāy-Vīrāf Nāma than the ones I have mentioned here.

133 Ġaybī thanks Dr. Omidsalar (Umīdsālār) for presenting important points about the subject to him.  
134 I have not seen Rustamji’s work myself, though it has been written in the title of his book that he has used the Persian [Zoroastrian] Arđāy-Vīrāf Nāma version: Rustamji, Sorabji 1868: Ardaiviranamu (Gujarati rendering of the Persian translation of original Pahlavi text), Bombay 1844; 2nd ed. 1868 → Gignoux, 1984: 31.
The Iranians were defeated by the Arab Muslims in the year 20 A.Y. (Yazdgirdi)/ 651 A.D., which led to Arab dominance upon Iran. The Muslim rulers’ pressure on those Iranians who had not converted to Islam and were adherents of their ancestors’ religion Zoroastrianism was increasing more and more. Finally, due to these pressures some of the Iranian Zoroastrians had to escape to India in order to be able to retain the religion of their forefathers (Choksy 1997: 110-137). These Zoroastrians, who nowadays are known as Parsis, have since then lived from generation to generation in India.

There was no connection between the Parsis and the Iranian Zoroastrians until the year 846 A.Y./1477 A.D., and the Iranian Zoroastrians were not even aware of the Parsis in India. The Parsis, who knew about their origin, sent a messenger named Nařmān Hūšang to Iran in the year 847 A.Y./1478 A.D. His duty was to find out more about the religion in order to provide solutions for existing religious conflicts among the Parsis and to study the correct performance of the religious rites (Hodivala 1920: 243-245).

After that time, twenty-six messengers were sent by the Parsis to Iran until the year 1142/1773. Each one of these messengers carried back letters to India, where answers to religious queries, explanations of different rites and ceremonies, the calendar, and the Zoroastrians mythology etc. can be found. Besides these letters, the Iranian Zoroastrians sent some other original books, copies and treatises on the religion to the Parsis. These letters and other works were known as Rivāyat and are composed in Avestan, Parsig, Zoroastrian Persian and Pazand. These Rivāyats are known by the name of the messenger who carried them to India (ibid.: 343-345).

The sixth messenger of the Parsis, Shapur Āsā, returned from Iran to India in 896/1527. He carried back a letter and also several other important Zoroastrian works in Parsig, Pazand and Zoroastrian Persian, which had been re-written for him as a miscellany in the same year in Yazd. One of these works is the Zoroastrian Persian version of the Ardaī-Virāf Nāma in prose (ibid.: 297-298).

---

135 Patel has recorded the number of these messengers to 22 in his list (Patel 1900: 170-182). However, their number is 26, as recorded by Hodivala, West (1896-1904: II. 125-127), Vitalone (1996: 1-21) and some other researchers.
Several manuscripts of Shapur Āsā’s full miscellany were copied during the centuries. Some other manuscripts contain only parts of this miscellany, such as the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma. These manuscripts are found in different libraries in India and Europe.

Several of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma manuscripts that are mentioned either in scholarly works or in library catalogues have been lost or ruined, and there are no traces of them now. However, all known manuscripts of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma will be presented in this thesis, both those that have been used for the edition of the text in this thesis and those to which it was impossible to get access.

The manuscripts are listed in chronological order according to their colophon. The three final manuscripts (M, BC, L) lack dating and are therefore placed after the others. Every manuscript is here given a code, e.g., N, O, NH, that indicates where it is located or by whom it has been mentioned. If there is another code in brackets for the manuscript [e.g. T.30], this refers to the code in square the catalogue of the library where it is kept, or to the code found in research related to that manuscript.

In order of their antiquity the manuscripts are as follows:

N = Navsari, Dastur Meherji Rana Library, [T.30], 896 A.Y./1527 A.D.
O = Oxford, Bodleian Library, [Bodl.Or.719], 896 A.Y./1527 A.D.¹³⁶
NH = Navsari, Dastur Meherji Rana Library, in Hodivala’s study, 901 A.Y./1532 A.D.
U = Belonging to E.M.R. Unvala, [M], 927+928 A.Y./1558+1559 A.D.
K = Belonging to Kaikhusro J. Jamasp Asa, 954 A.Y./1585 A.D.
P = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, [S.P.47], 954 A.Y./1585 A.D.
B = Bombay, Mulla Firuz Library, [105(352)], 1040 A.Y./1671 A.D.
BC = Bombay, Cama Oriental Institute, [R.III.65], 104-[-?] A.Y./167-[-?] A.D.
N² = Navsari, Dastur Meherji Rana Library, [F.44], 1248 A.Y./1879 A.D.
M = München, Staatsbibliothek, [Zend 73‘H28’], No date
BC² = Bombay, Cama Oriental Institute, [R.III.102], No date
L = London, British Museum Library, [No.830], No date

In the following presentation of the various manuscripts of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma, two manuscripts will be more specifically presented than the others because of their greater importance. The first one is manuscript N, which is found in Shapur Āsā’s miscellany, and which seems to be the most ancient manuscript available of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma in Zoroastrian Persian. The other one is manuscript L, which, for the reason of its style and language, seems to be the last manuscript of the work even though it is not dated. For that reason, a special presentation of manuscripts N and L is given here be-

¹³⁶ This manuscript, which appears to be much more recent than the colophon suggests, is copied word for word including the colophon, from the original manuscript N.
low. Contents and other details of these manuscripts are also presented in the full presentation of all manuscripts.

Manuscript N

The miscellany that Shapur Āsā brought with himself from Iran is known by various names: Revāyat of Šāpur Āsā (Vitalone 1987: 9-10), Kama Asā’s Revayet (Katrac 1941: 209-210), Revāyat of Kāmā Bohrā or Revāyat of Kāmā Vohrā (Hdiivala 1920: 296), Rivāyat of Rāmā Khambāyatī (Haug- West 1872: xix), Kayām-Aldyn Khambāytī (Rehatsek 1873: 178-179) and Revayat of Kama Asa Khambayeti (Dhabhar 1923c: 118-120). This version, to which the code N has been applied here, is nowadays preserved with the code [T.30], in Meherji Rana’s Library.

The scribes of this miscellany have recorded the date 896 A.Y. /1527 A.D. as the finishing date of their re-writing in three places, in Pazand (Avestan characters) on folios 106b and 150a, and in Persian characters on folio 148b. Unfortunately, there is no indication of the original manuscript from which N was copied or of its date of completion. The probability of the existence of a manuscript that could have been the basis for N still preserved in Iran is very small, next to impossible. According to Chardin, King ‘Abbās I (1581-1629) forced the Zoroastrians to bring the book on the Prophecies of Abraham about the End of the World to him. The Zoroastrians brought him several of their books. However, since the king still did not find this imaginary book by Abraham the prophet, he ordered the execution of the Dastūr-i dastūr (the highest Zoroastrian authority) and some other religious persons (Chardin 1735: II.179 → Boyce 1987: 181).

Coincident to this event, one of the dastūrs of Kirmān sought refuge from Balkh to Kirmān. Hearing about the gathering of the Zoroastrian books by order of the King ‘Abbās I and about the killing of Dastūr-i dastūr and two mūhabs, in fear he concealed 300 volumes of his books in a wall and covered the wall with mud. When Dastūr Kay-Khusrau Kirmānī destroyed the wall in the year 1257 A.Y./1888 A.D., he found that all the books except a small number had perished (Šahmardān 1984: 269). The Iranian Zoroastrians sent many of their valuable manuscripts to the Parsis (ibid: 268), which can be seen as a natural reaction to pressure of the kind described above. Thus, it is likely that the original manuscript of the Ardāv-Vīrāf Nāma in Zoroastrian Persian, on which Shapur Āsā’s version may have been based, is lost forever.

137 Shapur Āsā’s version is known as Khambāyatī, because Shapur Āsā himself was an inhabitant of Cambay (Dhabhar 1909: xix) and one of the narrators was a native of Cambay as well (Katrac 1941: 209).
If the scribes of the miscellany of Shapur Āsā had mentioned the date of the original manuscript, it would maybe have been possible to find out more about the translation date of the Zoroastrian Persian version of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* and other Zoroastrian Persian works, but unfortunately, there is no information available to reveal when the Zoroastrians began to make use of Zoroastrian Persian for translating and writing their works. In this regard, Molé believes that the Zoroastrians finally decided to use the Persian language at a time which is not totally clear, but at least it should have happened before the Mongolian invasion of Iran (611 A.H./1214 A.D.), because the language is different from that of the Persian Muslims and contains a large number of Parsig words (Molé 1965: 36-37).

Although there is no information available about the time when the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* was translated into Persian, the style of writing, the vocabulary and the grammatical structure of the text can reveal the approximate but not accurate date of the text. Since there are no adequate historical documents available to determine the approximate compilation time of the text, we have to judge this on the basis of prose linguistic standards (Umidsâlîr 2006: 8).

Mu’in states that the style of writing is to some extent similar to the epistolary style of the fourth or fifth centuries A.H./tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. (Mu’in 1946: 57). Some of the characteristics of the prose texts from the tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. are the abridgement of prefaces, usually limited to a number of short sentences, infrequent use of Arabic words, the non-existence or a limited extent of Islamic influence on the texts, a simple language free from rhyme and literary eloquence, use of ancient Persian words and specific grammatical points (Bahar, M.T. 1991: 2.54-61; Khatibi 1996: 2.124-134). The above-mentioned points are clearly found in the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* text. These characteristics indicate that the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* was translated during the tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. and not later than that.

It should not be forgotten that manuscript N, is a re-written text which was copied in the year 896 A.Y./1527 A.D., and it is not known to what extent this fact contributed to changes in the present text in relation to its origin. Some examples of changes are obviously presented in some ortho-

---

138 It is noteworthy that Mu’in’s judgement is based on the introduction of the manuscript M (H28), which was written about 300 years ago, near the end of the seventeenth century (Haug-West 1872: xv). However, about 150 years of interval is not the only difference between the manuscripts M and N. Important changes in the language must have occurred during this time, which are clearly visible in grammatical, stylistic and lexical changes in the latter manuscript.

139 To find a complete list of words in use in Persian texts from the fourth century A.H./tenth century A.D., some of which also occur in the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*, refer to the studies of Muhammad Taq Bahar (1991: 1.208-221) and Mu’in (1955: 342-390).

140 Refer to Umidsâlîr’s research (2006: 9-12) about grammatical rules in Zoroastrian Persian works composed before the sixth century A.H./twelfth century A.D.
graphic rules of the text. In this manuscript, the preverb bi- is sometimes separated from the verb and written «بی» e.g. in «بیکرد» bi-karda (142b) and «بیگایی» bi-gâyî (143b). In the same manner, the negating particle na- is sometimes written separated from the verb «نه» e.g. as in «نایستا» na-yašt-a-and (141a) and «نکند» na-kunand (148a). These spellings were used before the sixth century A.H./twelveth century A.D. (Umîdsälâr 2006: 10-11). The letter «ی» is occasionally written for the kasra-yi izâfa, in manuscript N as well: «جیزی» ĩîzî instead of «جیز» ĩîz-i (139b) and «جایگاهی» jâygâhî instead of «جایگاه» jâygâh-i (145b). This spelling is one of the characteristics of works written during Firdausi’s time, the fourth century A.H./tenth century A.D. and one or two centuries afterwards (Qarîb 1996: 367). Frequent use of connectives like «و» va “and” is another indication for the antiquity of the text and the translator’s faithfulness to the original Parsig text.141 This means that at that time, the translation of Parsig works was still done mechanically and that New Persian rules for the connective va were not applied in translation. These stylistically unmotivated connectives are omitted in the other manuscripts, among them manuscript M (H28), which has changed the style of the text to some extent.

These writing rules are evidence indicating that the text of the Zoroastrian Persian version of the Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma belongs to the tenth or eleventh century A.D. These rules are, however, observed just in some cases in manuscript N rewritten for Shâpûr Asa in 896 A.Y./1527 A.D. The reason for the variety of rules in this manuscript is obviously that this text was re-written at a time when there were no traces of the rules left in Zoroastrian Persian works written later. An example of this is an Iranian Zoroastrian’s letter written in the year 928 A.Y./1559 A.D., that is 32 years after Shâpûr Asa’s version was re-written. This letter (S.P.46: 17a-18a), contrary to the Zoroastrian Persian version of the Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma, both has a long introduction and contains a considerable amount of Islamic influence. There are many Arabic words in it, the style is both elegant and rhyming, and ancient Persian words are few here. There are likewise no traces of old orthographic conventions for bi-, na- and the kasra-yi izâfa, and there is no superfluous use of va.

Manuscript N includes two tables of contents, of which the first one (fol. 01, 06-09)142 looks very old and decayed in the microfilm. The title of the collection is given at the top of the list as: 143 »فهرست روایت ایرانی« fîhrist-i rivâyat-i Irânî (Table of Contents of the Iranian Narrative). This table is not complete. It seems that the table is the original one, but just as the margin of this remaining part of the list is decayed and torn, the rest is ruined as well.

141 Bahâr finds that the conjunction va «و» is in use abundantly in Pahlavi (Parsig) manuscripts, but when it is necessary it is sometimes missing in the texts. (Bahâr 1990: 17).
142 There are no traces of folio numbers in any of the tables of contents of manuscript N.
143 Originally «فهرست» firist.
The second table (fol. 1b-4a) is written in a handwriting different from the first table and the other works in the manuscript. The title of the collection is here.\footnote{Fihrist-i rivâyat-i īrānī bābat āvarda bihdin Kāmā Āsā Kumbāyī (Table of Contents of the Iranian Narrative Brought by the Righteous Kāmā Āsā Kombāyī). Since this list was written and added to the collection later, it is a complete table of contents for the whole collection.} Fihrist-i rivâyat-i īrānī bābat āvarda bihdin Kāmā Āsā Kumbāyī (Table of Contents of the Iranian Narrative Brought by the Righteous Kāmā Āsā Kombāyī). Since this list was written and added to the collection later, it is a complete table of contents for the whole collection.

Manuscript L

There is also a manuscript in the British museum library (formerly India Office Library, with (No.803) of the prose version of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} in Zoroastrian Persian.

Manuscript L, like all manuscripts, has its defects and advantages. Firstly, some words are written by mistake. It is interesting that these mistakes originate both in the copying of the text (in writing) and in hearing when someone reads the text and the copyist writes it down. Mistakes due to hearing the text may be, among others, «istādan for »‘istādan, »guftand for »‘guftam, »pursīdand for »‘pursīdam, and »isfandārmarz for »‘isfandārmaz. Among mistakes due to read/written copying, are »’chas-m-and for »‘chas-m āmad, »hamān rūz for »‘hamāzūr, »nāz mīkardand for »‘nāz mīkardand and »zangī va ḡabašī for »‘zangī va ḡabašī as well. Furthermore, some sentences are in a complete disorder, for example in folios 6a, 11b, 13a and 18b.

The most important characteristic of this manuscript is that it is concise, and whenever something appears important to the scribe, he just records that and avoids more explanations about the matter. Therefore omissions are frequent in L. Maybe these omissions and mistakes were already there in the mother manuscript. Of course, the abridgement of the text, as it had been said earlier, is a defect of this manuscript. To abbreviate a text may not be in agreement with the responsibility of the scribe and may cause misunderstandings, but abbreviating a text could also be an advantage, since in some cases it may diminish complications in the text. Therefore, the abridgement of the text can be seen as one of the positive aspects of manuscript L as well.

It must be emphasized at this point that although the rule of ‘lectio brevior praeferen-\textit{a est}' or ‘brevior lectio potior' (the abridged form is more acceptable) (Epp-Fee 1993: 14-15) is applicable in many cases, this principle is unacceptable as regards manuscript L. The version of the \textit{Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma} in manuscript L is not abridged in the meaning of its being more authentic...
and devoid of the later additions. The abridgements here consist of eliminated sentences that the scribe found unnecessary. Meanwhile, manuscript L also has a newer language style in addition to the abridgements. Hence, some of the ancient words have either been deleted or changed into more modern synonyms.

There are several precedent examples of reducing explanations in a text and representing it in an abridged form in Zoroastrian Persian’s literature. For example, in addition to several translated texts of the Minū-xirad in Zoroastrian Persian either versified or prose, there is an abridged version called the Minū-xirad, rivāyat-i digar, which is about one quarter of the original text (M52, ‘Haug7’: 71a-78b). In addition to this, there are many examples of abridgements in Classical New Persian literature, the most famous being abridged versions of the Baxtiyār Nāma, the Dārāb Nāma and the Abū-Muslim Nāma.

Another great advantage or even the most important advantage of the Manuscript L is its episodes. This is the only manuscript of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma that is divided into several episodes, and the scribe has chosen a suitable heading related to the main subject of each episode. The headings are written in coloured ink at the beginning of each episode.

The epithet Anūšīrvān [Anūsa-Ravān] is another notable characteristic of manuscript L in the second heading of the text: » Ağāz dāstān va qiṣaṣ-yi šāh-Ārdašīr-i Bābakān-i Anūšīrvān (The Beginnig of story of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma and the tale of king Ardašīr-i Bābakān-i Anūšīrvān). Since Anūšīrvān [Anūsa-ravān]145 is an epithet of Xusraw I (531-579), one of the Sasanid kings, it has been supposed that wherever the epithet anūšīrvān has been used, the intention is this very Xusraw I, whereas anūšīrvān in the meaning of “deceased”146 is an epithet also used for Ardašīr-i Bābakān. But since Ardašīr has not been mentioned anywhere as Ardašīr-i Bābakān-i Anūšīrvān in historical documents, nobody has paid enough attention to the matter that anūšīrvān sometimes may refer to Ardašīr-i Bābakān. For example, Ibn-i Nadīm in his famous book, Al-Fihrist, has mentioned two books about adventures and stories of Iranian kings, and both the books have anūšīrvān in the titles. The first one is » Kitāb ul-kārnāmaj fi sīrat-i Anūšīrvān and the other one » Kitāb-i

145 Variants of Anūšīrvān are Anūšīrvān and Anūsa-ravān.

146 “Middle Persian Anāšīr-gurūn- in New Persian [A]nōshēr-gūrūn (with the usual -ēr from -agr, as in NP. dēr, “late”, from MP. dagr) or, by popular etymology, [A]nōshēn-gūrūn, “whose soul is sweet”– means literally “whose soul is immortal”, but it is commonly used in Middle Persian as a euphemism for “deceased”. It is thus likely that the epithet was not applied to Khusrūy I until after his death (c.f. Chr. Bartholomae, Zur Kenntnis der mitteliranischen Mundarten III, Heidelberg 1920 p. 9 n. 2). However, it is frequently used as a name for Khusrūy I both in Middle Persian and Arabic texts” (de Blois 1990: 96). Anaušīrvān / Anaušīrvān or Anauša-ravān (Parsig: anūša-gurūn) means the late, deceased (MacKenzie 1990: 10).
Anūširvān (Ibn-i Nadīm 1871: 305). The first title must be the same the Kārnāmag ī ardašīr ī pābagān. The word anūširvān in this title has been assumed to be a mistake due to carelessness of the scribes re-writing Ardašīr as Anūširvān (Muḥammadī 1995: 173; Muḥammadī 2001: 221), but that seems rather unlikely and the more likely explanation is that this epithet is here applied to Ardašīr. Tafaẓżuli believes that perhaps these two books were one and the same, and that the second title is an abbreviation of the first one (Tafaẓżuli 1997: 222). Anyway, the adjective Anūširvān added to the title of the first book which Ibn-i Nadīm has mentioned strengthens the argument for the correctness of Ardašīr-i Bābakān-i Anūširvān. Manuscript L is the only place where the name is found as Ardašīr-i Bābakān-i Anūširvān (Anūšā-ravān). This is another point worth noting in this manuscript.

The abbreviated character of the text of manuscript L makes it less useful as a basis for correcting and editing the text. Here manuscript L was used together with the other manuscripts in the first steps of the editing, but since it turned out to be an unreasonable amount of instances where asterisks (*) and footnotes would have to be added for omissions in manuscript L, this manuscript was later considered less useful for editing the text.

The fate of a possible original manuscript from which manuscript L has been copied is unknown. Maybe all the existing changes in manuscript L originate from such a mother manuscript. It is also possible that all these changes are innovations by the scribe of L and that this manuscript should be regarded as a new and last version of the Zoroastrian Persian Ardašīr-Virāf Nāma.

Presentation of manuscripts

N = NAVSARI, DASTUR MEHERJI RANA [T.30] (896 A.Y.)


Contents:
1. 01. Old contents (in Zoroastrian Persian)
2. 02-05. Persian verses by different poets

147 The format of the presentation of the manuscripts is based on the method used by Bo Utas in his treatise on the Ţariq ut-taqiq (1973: 11-40).
3. Old contents (incorrect in Zoroastrian Persian)
4. New contents (in Zoroastrian Persian)
5. Letters from Iran to the Dasturs and Behdins of Navsari viz., to Ervad Rana bin Hoshang (changed correctly, in a late hand, to Jesang), Mehryar bin Dhahyon, Ervad Chanda bin Pahlon, Ervad Behram bin Pahlon, Dehyoved Behdin Maneck bin Changa, Behdin Asa bin Vahram, Behdin Dhahyon bin Changa etc.; and to the Mobeds and Behdins of Cambay, viz., Ervad Shapur bin Hira, Ervad Asa bin Neryosang, Ervad Jiva bin Khorsched, Behdin Nakhva bin Asa, Behdin Bahman Shyavax kayomuddin bin Asa, Behdin Shyavax bin Chanda, Behdin Limbai bin Kamdin, etc.
6. 33 hunars of the Pairāmun Hāvan.
7. Barsam rods to be used in the Yasna ritual.
8. 15 characteristics (hunar) of the Ervads.
9. How is the Yasna in the Panji-i Veh (i.e. the last 5 Gatha days) to be performed? In what manner should the Barsom be tied and what is the Khshnuman?
10. The Lengths of the different Gāhs.
11. How is the Rapithwan Gāh to be reckoned?
13. Ceremonial paring of nails.
14. How to consecrate the Nirangdin (nirang av va gomez yashtan).
15. How to pass the days of the Bareshnum period.
16. How is the Bareshnum vitiated?
17. How should the Barshnumgāh be prepared?
19. Avesta to be recited during each Gāh – with Nām-Setayashn in full.
20. How should the parental property be divided among children?
22. Afrīngan-i Rapithwan.
23. The Ahunvars to be recited in the different Yasna rituals.
24. Contact with Nasu – how treated.
25. Who is a Chakarzan?
27. Pādshāh zan, Chakar zan, Ayok zan.
28. A man has a Pādshāh zan, has no issue, but leaves some brothers and relatives: To whom should his property go after his death?
30. What should be done on the 4th, 10th and 30th day and every day of the month, after a man’s death? The Khshnuman of the Sirozas.
31. The five larger Gāhs.
32. The 11th fargard of the Vendidad with explanation.
Colophon (f. 99-101): Written by Shehryār Ardeshir Erach Rustom Erach in consultation with Giv for the Parsees of India at the instance of Dastur Shehryār Rustom and others and completed on day Depadar, month Behman, A.Y. 896.148

33. 106a. Blank.
34. 106b-107a is lost.
II The following subjects (107b-242a) are all given in Zoroastrian Persian:
36. 110a-110b. Xūršid-Niyāyiš.
40. 117a-117b. [Haft āfarīda-yi Jamšīd].
41. 117b-121b. ‘Ulamā-yi islām.
42. 121b-123a. Hāft sitārīgān bar āsimān.
43. 123a-124b. Šad u yak nām-i īzad.
44. 124b-131a. Ma‘nī-yi yatā-ahū.
45. 131a-135b. Dāstān-i nūšīrvān-ī ʿādil (Farrux-Nāma-yi Yūnān Dastūr).
46. 135b-137a. Dāstān-i marğūzan-ī anūšīrvān (incorrect).
47. 137b. Blank.

Beginning:

Colophon:

تمامت الكتاب ويراشفته از تاريخ دوم مردادماه قيم سنه 896

50. 149a-150a. Nāma-yi zardušṭiyān ba pārsiyān (in Zoroastrian Persian and Parsig)
51. 150b. Blank.
52. 151a. [Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma] (in half page; repetition of the above text).
53. 151a-183a. Sāyist nā-sāyist.
55. 184b. Blank.
56. 185a-186a. Farrux-Nāma-yi Yūnān Dastūr (incorrect).
57. 186a-187b. Dāstān-i marğūzan-ī anūšīrvān (incorrect).
60. 193b-212a. Šad dar-i naẓm.
61. 212a-218b. Pursiš u pāsux.

148 The description of Nos. 5-32 is quoted verbatim from Dhabhar 1923’c’: 118-119. The transcription of names in Dhabhar’s list of contents is retained.
63. 219b-228b. Pursiš u pāsux.
64. 228b-232b. Šad dar-i nār (incorrect).
66. 237a-238b. Suxanī čand čigar az aḫḵām-i Jāmāṣp.
67. 239a-242a. Patat-i īṟānī.

Date: 896 A.Y./1527 A.D. (fol. 106b) in Pazand, (148b) in Zoroastrian Persian, (fol. 150a) in Īrānī.

Scribe: Šahriyār Ardašīr Īraj Rustam Īraj (fol. 98b); Gīv Ispandiyār Gīv (fol. 144b) (in Pazand).

Description: “Half-bound in strong covers; ff. 102 marked in Arabic [correctly: English] as well as Gujarati numerals (of which f. 78b and f. 102 are blank), written generally 17ll to page, + ff. 103 to 257 marked in Gujarati numerals (of which f. 133b and f. 146b are blank; f. 168 is marked twice; f. 188a is blank; f. 197 left unmarked, although there is no gap in the writing; f. 208 marked twice and the folio after 227 is wrongly marked f. 248, etc. up to end), generally written 25ll to page. 8".5x6".2." (Dhabhar 1923'c': 120).

Manuscript N (T.30) is written in a relatively fine nastālaq until folio 138b, but from folios 139a to 232 the text is in a rather bad nastālaq, and thereafter it is written in a handwriting different from that in folios 233a to 242a.

The folios of this manuscript are numbered in both Gujarati and English, but the Gujarati numbers cannot be seen clearly in the microfilm. Furthermore, some numbers have disappeared, since the margin of the folios is putrefied. Both the Gujarati and English numberings are written on the verso side of the folios, in the right corner, not on the recto side. However, this type of numbering is not specific for only this manuscript. There is a Yasna manuscript in the Carolina Rediviva Library in Uppsala (MS. Onova 741), where the number of the folios is written on the verso side of the page as well.

Orthography: The Persian letter «پ» p is sometimes written as «ب» b and occasionally as «پ» p; the letter «چ» c as «چ» j and «چ» چ; the letter «ژ» ژ often as «ژ» z but sometimes as «ژ» ژ; and the letter «گ» g sometimes as «گ» k and occasionally as «گ» گ. The vowel «آ» ā is sometimes written as «و» ə and sometimes as «و» ə.

There is no consistent rule for the writing of compound words. For example, «یکگام» tan-durust is written as two detached words and «یکگام» yagām is written in an adjoined word.

The preposition «ب» ba is sometimes detached as in «ب» ba bastār, but it is sometimes adjoined as in «ب» ba-pādsāhī.

The demonstratives in and ān are sometimes written separately «آن جهان» ān jahān, sometimes attached to the noun «باتش» bidān-jahān is written in an adjoined form.

The letter «ه» h is normally omitted in plural forms both when it represents h as in «گو» gurūh and the short vowel a as in «گو» karfa. They are
written «گروه» gurūh-hā and «گرفه» karfa-hā in their plural form. Occasionally the «ه» h is found also in the plural, e.g. «ندوه» andīh-hā.

The Arabic plural nouns are again pluralized in some cases: «احواله» ahval-hā.

The «ح» hamza/reduced y at the end of some words is used for the kasra-yi izāfa, e.g. in «مانائدة» mānanda-yi, «کرفه» karfa-hā-yi, and occasionally as the second person singular verb ending -ī, as in «نهاده» nāhadā-yi (= «شکرده»). However, this ending -ī is also written «ای» in some cases, as in «ناکارده».

The third person plural copula «قدو» -and is sometimes written adjoined as in «قوماند» mardum-and, but is sometimes found detached as in «قومانذ» qaum-and.

The «الف» alif of the third person singular copula «است» ast is missing in some instances, e.g. «جِلگاهست» rāst-ast, «نیکست» nīk-ast, «جیگاه» jaygāh-ast and so on.

To form the compounds of the preposition «از» az with the pronouns like «ایشان» īšān, «او» ū, «آن» īn, and so on, the «الف» alif of the pronoun is omitted as in «ازیشان» azīšān, «ازو» azū, «ازین» azīn.

Short vowels and tashdīd are not written.

Note: The microfilm that I have of manuscript N (T.30) contains the old and new lists of contents (01-4a), plus the second part of the manuscript, namely the works written in Zoroastrian Persian.

Contents of the first part of the manuscript which is written in Pazand, has been re-written here from Dhabhar’s catalogue (1923’c’: 118-119).149

O = OXFORD, BODLEIAN [Bodl.Or. 719] (896 A.Y.)

Cat. Sachau, Ed. and Ethé, Hermann: Catalogue of the Persian, Turkish, Hindūstānī, and Pashtū Manuscripts i n the Bodleian Library, I, pp. 112-113, No. 1950 [Bodl. Or. 719]; also Unvālā, J.M.: Collection of Colophons of Manuscripts Bearing on Zoroastrianism in some Libraries of Europe, p. 120.

Contents:
1. 1b-29a. Ardāyī-Vīrāf-i naṯr.

Beginning:

اردای ویراف نثر

Colophon (fol. 29a):

سپاس دارم ایزدی را که ما را بیافرید...

تمامت کتاب وغیرشانه از تاریخ دوم مردادماه قدم سنه 896 تمتم تم

Date. 896 A.Y./1527 A.D.

149 Mrs. Shermaz Cama and Mr. Raham Aša helped me to obtain the microfilms of both N (T.30) and N² (F.44) manuscripts. I give my thanks to them and to the librarians of the Meherji Rana Library as well.
Scribe. Not named.

Description. 25.8x10.3cm., 29 folios, 13 lines, fine nasta’īq, a few names are written in coloured ink, the folios are not numbered. However, there is a Latin number on every fifth folio on the recto side of the folio (5, 10, 15 etc.).

Orthography. The orthography of manuscript O is mainly like manuscript N, but with small differences.

The letter «پ» p is often written as «ب» b and occasionally as «پ» p; the letter «ج» j as «چ» ķ and occasionally as «ج» j; the letter «ژ» ţ often as «ژ» ţ but sometimes as «ژ» z; and the letter «گ» g as written as «گ» k. «ا» ā sometimes written as «ا» a and sometimes as «ا» ā. Vowels and tašdīd are not written.

The preposition «ب» ba is sometimes adjoined as in «بژوژی» ba-ruzī, but it is sometimes detached as in «بی جایگاهها» ba jaygāh-hā.

Some words are found in two forms. For example «گروطن» garūtāmn and «گروطن» garūtānm, «زفان» zafān and «زفان» zabān.

Note: Manuscript O is copied word by word from the manuscript N, and almost all the mistakes in O are entirely the same as in N. Even their colophons, that is 896 A.Y./1527 A.D., are the same. Thus, manuscript O was probably not necessary for the text editing process. However, since some words are not clearly readable due to the paper putrefying or to the quality of the microfilm, manuscript O was useful to supply unclear words in some cases.\(^{150}\)

NH = NAVSARI, DASTUR MEHERJI RANA (901 A.Y.)


The manuscript NH is mentioned in Hodivala’s study Studies in Parsi History. Thus, it is marked with the code NH here. Manuscript NH has been copied from the manuscript N in 901 A.Y./1532 A.D. Hodivala is the only one who has mentioned this manuscript. The single specification of this manuscript which Hodivala gives is that it contains both the Ardāy-Vērāf Nāma and a section called Pursīš u pāsux. He states that the manuscript was kept in Meherji Rana Library in Navsari at that time, but he gives no number or code of it (Hodivala 1920: 301-302). However, there is no such manuscript in the Meherji Rana Library Catalogue, which was written by Dhabhar in 1923, so it seems that it must have been lost.

U = BELONGING TO E.M.R. UNVĀLĀ [M] (927+928 A.Y.)


Dhabhar has profited from several manuscripts to edit both Saddar Natr and Saddar Bundehesh. Manuscript U is among the manuscripts used by

\(^{150}\) Mr. Homayoun Katouzian ordered the microfilm O (Bodl.Or.719) for me from the Bodleian Library, and sent it as a gift to me. I give my very best thanks to him.
Dhabhar and is marked by the code M. Dhabhar writes that this manuscript belongs to Ervad Maneckji Rustamji Unvâlã, and it was copied word by word from Shapur Āsā’s manuscript in 927 A.Y./1558 A.D. in Navsari. He adds that the colophon date for the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma, which is part of this manuscript, is 928 A.Y./1559 A.D. This manuscript has 191 folios of 23 lines each, but since the last folio is missing, the scribe’s name is unknown (Dhabhar 1909: xx). This is all the available information about this manuscript. There is no trace of it nowadays, because it is not known to whom Rustamji Unvâlã gave his library or what he did with this manuscript.

K = BELONGING TO KAIKHUSRO J. JAMASP ASA (954 A.Y.)


Manuscript K is one of the other manuscripts that were used by Dhabhar to edit Saddar Natr and Saddar Bundehesh. This manuscript belonged to Dastur Kaikhusro Jamaspji Jamasp Asa. According to Dhabhar, this manuscript has strong resemblance to the Yazd manuscript (Shapur Āsā’s manuscript) and was rewritten by Ervad Behram b. Kekobad b. Hamajyâr b. Padam b. Kâmâ in Navsari in the year 954 A.Y./1585 A.D. This manuscript consists of 106 folios but is lacking several folios (Dhabhar 1909: xxi). The fate of this manuscript is also unknown.

B = BOMBAY, MULLA FIRUZ [105(352)] (1040 A.Y.)

Cat. Dhabhar: Descriptive Catalogue of some Manuscripts bearing on Zoroastrianism and Pertaining to the Different Collections in the Mulla Feroze Library, No. 105 (352); also Rehatsek: Catalogue Raisonné of the Arabic, Hindostani, Persian and Turkish MSS. In the Mulla Firuz Library, No. VIII.2; also Dhabhar: The K.R. cama Oriental Institute Catalogue, No. 240.

Contents:
1. “Commentary on Ashem Vohu.
2. Explanation of the Khorshed Nyâish (from dusmatâchâ upto Urvaesî-jasî).
3. Ahunvars to be recited, and number of Barsam twigs to be used, in various Yasna ceremonies.
4. When is Bareshnum said to be ‘durust’ (firm) and when ‘shikaste’ (viti- ated.)?
5. Length of the different gâhs.
6. Minokherad (in prose) ff. 5 to 10.
7. 21 nasks described, ff. 10-13.
9. Seven wonderful things invented by Jamshed in Pars.
11. The planets
12. Ahunvar and 101 names of God with explanation and a long commentary on the Ahunvar, dilating on the unity and the compassion of Ahura Mazda and on good and bad deeds (ff. 23-39).

13. Description of the Fire-temple Adar-Gushid of Noshirvan -visit of Abulkher Amary to the Fire-temple- his interview with Ramesh-ārām, the custodian of the Temple description of the Farrokh-Nāch with had been written by Yunān Dastur for Noshirvan (ff. 39-46).

14. Khalif Māmūn’s intention of destroying Noshirvan’s palace at Madāin – his visit to the palace on seeing which he withdrew his resolve- the Khalif’s visit to the marguzan (tomb) of Noshirvan (ff. 46-49).

15. Meaning of khshnaothra-āshem-fravar/g407n/g413 with the gāhs-Bāj-i Ormazd-Yathā ahu vairyo zaotā-Yenghē hātām and Yasnemeha (in verse, ff. 49-50).


17. Letter brought by Kamdin Khambaiti from Iran to the Dasturs and Behdins of India, among whom are mentioned Rana Hoshang [Jesang], Maneck Changa, etc. Letter written by Giv Asfandyar Giv and completed on day Tir, month Bahman, A.Y. 896 (ff. 68-69).

18. Shāyast nā shāyast or Sadder Bundehesh (ff. 69-115).


23. Patet Irani (ff. 200-205)

**Date:** on day Asman, month Tir, A.Y. 1040, with the additional remarks that the owner was Mobed Kaus Dastur Rustom [see Rehatsek, VIII.2].

**Scribe:** Completed by Herbad Khorshed bin Asfandyar bin Rustnm bin Khorshed.

**Description:** 10.2"x7.3". Strongly bound in brown leather; country made paper; ff. 205 (marked in Arabic numerals), written 17 ll. to the page; perforated by worms” (Dhabhar 1923’a’: 71-72).

**Note:** Since, I have never seen manuscript B, the table of contents of that manuscript is given according to the Mulla Firuz’s Library Catalogue (Dhabhar 1923’a’: 71-72). The table of contents was not recorded accurately in Rehatsek’s catalogue (1873) where the manuscript was presented for the first time.

**P = PARIS, BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, Suppl. Pers. 47 (954 A.Y.)**


---

151 The transcription of names in Dhabhar’s list of contents is retained.

Contents:
1. 1a-3a. Blank.
2. 1a-4b. [Ašam vuhû]. In Parsig charcters and commentary in the Zoroastrian Persian.
3. 4b-6a. [Xûršid-Nyäyiš]. In Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian.
4. 6b-6-b. [Barašnûm-i nân]. In Zoroastrian Persian.
5. 6b-10b. [Mînû-Xirad, rîvâyat-i dîgar]. In Zoroastrian Persian.
6. 10b-12b. [Bîst ū yak nask-i Avistâ]. In Zoroastrian Persian.
9. 14a-19b. [Blank].
   Beginning:
   كتاب اردای ویرافخامه. سپاس دارم ایزدی را که من را پیامبرید...
   Colophon (fol. 44a):
   تمامت الكتب وبرافخانه از تاريخ نخستين خوردادماه قدم رسيد
15. 54a-55a. [Nâmâ-yi zarduštiyân-i Êrân ba dastûrân-i hindûstân]. In Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian.
16. 55b-89a. [Ṣad dar-i Bundahiš]. In Zoroastrian Persian.
19. 96b-105a. [چاند فسل az šâyist va nîşâyist]. In Zoroastrian Persian.
21. 117b-122a. [Qavânîn-i dînî, az bâbî 74 tá bâb-i 91]. In Zoroastrian Persian.
22. 122b. [Blank].
23. 123a- 126a. [Qavânîn-i dînî]. In the Pazand, Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian.
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25. 127a-158b [missing].
26. 159a-159b. [Pāḍafrāh-i margarzān]. In the Pazand, Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian.
27. 159b-160a. [Šustan-i nasā]. In the Pazand.
28. 160b-163b. [Rivâyat]. In the Pazand and Zoroastrian Persian.
29. 163b-168a. [Gāhanbār]. In the Pazand, from the Yasna.
30. 168a-169b. [Gāhanbār]. In the Pazand, from Vīdēvdād.
32. 181b-208a. [Quvān-i dān]. In the Pazand.

Date. 954 A.Y./1585 A.D.152
Description. 25.2x14.6cm., 208 folios (fol. 127a-158b missing), 21 lines, Indian nasta’iq; very damaged manuscript which was repaired in most folios, names of people, angels and cosmic phenomena in colour; recto sides with Latin numbers and verso sides with Gujarati numbers, both in the top corner.
Orthography. The letter “پ” is generally written “پ”, but sometimes “پ”, e.g. “پادشاہ” pādsāh; “چ” ĉ is generally written as “چ” j and occasionally as “چ” ĉ; the letter “ز” z always as “ز” ż and the letter “گ” g is always as “گ” k, “ا” ā sometimes as “ا” a and sometimes as “آ” ā. Vowels and taṣdīd are not written.
Kasra-yi izāfa is sometimes written as “ی”, for example “چاه سیاه” čāh-i siyāhī is written “چاه سیاه” čāhī siyāhī.
The prefix “ب” is in general written separately, e.g. “ب یشتد” ba-yāštand.
The word “میگژیدند” migazīdand is written “میگژیدند” migazīdand.
Note: According to Unvālā’s writings, Anquetil calls manuscript P ‘the Old Rivāyet’. Unvālā himself writes that this manuscript was probably copied in the year 954 A.Y./1585 A.D. from the manuscript which Shapur Kāmās had carried from Iran in 866 A.Y. [correctly: 896] (Unvālā 1940: 18).153

BC = BOMBAY, CAMA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE [R.III.65] (104-?]
A.Y.)
Contents:
“Ardai Virāf Nāme (Persian)
This MS. is imperfect, as many folios are missing. There are in all 48 folios (unnumbered) but the first 2 folios are lost, then after 2 folios, one more

152 It seems that this manuscript is a copy made in 954 A.Y./1585 A.D. from the copy of the Ardaš-Virāf Nāma which was brought by Kama Asa from Persia (Unvālā 1940: 18).
153 I give my thanks to Mr. Nasser Pakdaman, who ordered the microfilm P (S.P.47) for me from the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris.
is lost, and then again, after 25 more folios, 2 folios are lost and of the remaining 16 folios portions of the last two are torn away.

**Date:** on day Depdin, month Dae, A.Y. 104-(? portion torn off).

**Scribe:** Completed by Herbad Khorshehd bin Asfandyar bin Rustam bin Khorshehd

**Description:** 11"x6.4". Loose folios; damaged by damp and worms; ll. 15 to the page; country made paper” (Dhabhar 1923‘b’: 149-150).

**Note:** The manuscript BC is an incomplete manuscript of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* which is just presented in the Cama’s Institute Catalogue. Dhabhar has described this manuscript with the details given above.

N² = NAVSARI, DASTUR MEHERJI RANA [F.44] (1248 A.Y.)

**Cat.** Dhabhar: Descriptive Catalogue of all Manuscripts in the First Dastur Meherji Rana Library Navsari, pp.25-26, No. F.44; also Dhabhar: Saddar Natr and Saddar Bundehesh, pp. xx-xxi (MS. U).

**Contents:**

**Beginning:**

```
کتاب اردایویرایف نثر نوشته شده اما بعد از این کویند که چون شاوه اردشیر یابیکان...
```

**Colophon (63):**

```
تمت الخبر كتاب ویرایفانه نثر بروز مبارک خورشید ایزد بهم خجسته خرداد امشاعفند سال اور یکهزار و دوصد و چهل و هشت از شهر بهزادگر شهریار. کتاب و مالک این كتاب کمترین ایرچدستور سهراهیجی بن دستور کاسیجی الملقب بن دستوران دستور مهرچی رانا ساکن قصبه نوسارتی این را در شهر مشی نوشته شد. از کتابی که این را نقل کرده آن اصل كتاب در کتابخانه ملافروز در سال یکهزار و چهل بهزادگر دی نوشته است. از این كتاب نقل کردهم. و این ویرایفانه در سال هشتصد و نود و شش بهزادگری از ایران اورده بود. همچون در این كتاب نوشته است.

بیژمان بهکام بیاد. تم تم تم تم.
```

**Date and place.** 1248 A.Y./1879 A.D in Mombay (Bombay).

**Scribe.** یراج دستور سهراهیجی ابن-ی دستور کاویشی المولاکباب به داستوران-ی داستور-ی مهیجی ران.

**Description:** “Half-bound; pp. 113+63 marked in Arabic numerals, written 12 ll. to page. 8"x6"’” (Dhabhar 1923‘c’: 26).

**Orthography.** The letter «» p is generally written «» b, but sometimes «» p, e.g. pursud; «» j is generally written «» j and occasionally «» c; the letter «» z always «» ẓ; and the letter «» k, «» ā sometimes as «» a and sometimes as «» ā. Taṣdīd is never written. But in some cases kasra is marked, for example «» kishandand.

---

154 *Ithoter* is a Gujarati word which means 78 questions. The *Ithoter* was the last letter written to the Parsis by the Iranian Zoroastrians, and sent to them in the year 1142 A.Y./1773 A.D. The text body of this letter was edited and published by Vitalone in 1996.
Some words are written in colour.

In some cases, the second person singular copula in the perfect verb form is written with both "" and "". For example "" is written "". The prefix "" is mostly written separately.

"" is sometimes used for kasra-yi ızāfb, for example "". Two dots are sometimes put under "" in the combination "".

The sign "" is found at the beginning of almost every episode of manuscript N². The sign "", is also put at the end of many episodes. Furthermore, there is a blank space of the size of a word or even more to indicate either the end or the beginning of an episode. However, this does not apply for all episodes. Another feature of this manuscript is to give the correct form of some words that are not written correctly in manuscript N. For example, the word "" is written "" the first time it occurs in manuscript N, but it is written correctly in manuscript N².

Note: According to Dhabhar’s catalogue (1923’c’: 25-26) manuscript F.44, contains two works: the Ithoter and the Ardāy Վիրա ske Nām (113-63 pages). But in my microfilm of this manuscript there is only the Ardāy Վիրա ske Nām, which has now been numbered from page 1 (not folio) ending on page 63.

The manuscript N² is a copy of the manuscript B (= Bombay 105(352)).

M = MÜNCHEN, STAATSBIBLIOTHEK, Zend 73‘H28’, No date


Contents:
1. 1. 1b-91b. Վիրա ske-i maṇtūr, Վիրա ske nāma dar naṭr-i nāqīš.

   Titles 1 and 2 (fol. 1a):

   155 A part at the beginning of the text of 10 lines is rewritten in a different penmanship form the rest of the original text in folio 1a. This part is written in smaller characters than the handwriting of the text body. These ten lines which occupy about half a page of folio 1a consist of about four pages of the original text body equal to the lines 3 to 17 in the edited text. Four couplets from the Տահրīma by Firdausī are also written at the end of this part, some word of which are either written mistakenly or unreadable in microfilm. With the same order as in the manuscript, these four couplets are edited and mentioned in the 23rd footnote.
Date. Not given.
Scribe. Not named.

Description. 20.5x13.5cm., 91 folios, from 1b to 22b 7 lines on every page, from 23a to 91b 8 lines on every page; clear but rough and thick nasta’īq (except 18a, 64a, 83b and 85b which are narrow); a few words are in colour; missing a folio between 88 and 89 (numbering does not show that a folio is missing); damaged folios are particularly 9, 16, 17, 20, 91 and some other folios, where the script has not been repaired; English numbers have later been written on the each folio.

Orthography. The letter «پ» p is generally written «ب» b, but occasionally «پ» p; «چ» j is mostly written «چ» j and few times «چ» c; the letter «ژ» z generally «ژ» z but sometimes «ژ» z; and the letter «گ» g is always written «گ» k. «ب» ā is sometimes written as «ب» a and sometimes as «ب» ā. Sometimes «ب» ā is written in the middle of words, for example «روان» ravan which is written «روآن».

There are three dots under the letter «س» s in manuscript M. This caused Haug and West to add a letter «پ» p before «س» s and mistakenly read words like «ساختمان» sāxtan as «ساخته» pasāxtan.

Vowels and tašdīd are not written.

A few words are written in an unusual form, for example «دزخ» dīţax and «عذاب» azāţāb.157

BC² = Bombay, CAMA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE [R.III.102], No date


The manuscript BC² is presented with the code (R.III.102), and entitled “Some Fragments” in Dhabhar’s Catalogue (Dhabhar 1923b: 150).

This manuscript contains some imperfect fragments of the following works:

Contents:
1. “The end of the Bustan of Saadi (ff. 4)
2. Ardaí Viraf nāmehe (Persian) incomplete (ff. 6)
3. An incomplete Persian divān (ff. 24)
4. Forms of petitions – incomplete (ff. 8)
5. Book of medical recipes in Persian verse – incomplete (ff. 49)
6. (a) Risaleh Mulla Ali Kusji (ff. 2) and Hisāb-i Ahal-i Hind (Indian Arithmetic) (ff. 2)
7. Conjugation of Persian verbs–with explanation in Hindi- (ff. 36)

156 The colophon date of the manuscript M is unknown due to a missing last folio.
157 Mr. Mehdi Este’dadi Shad ordered the microfilm M (Zend’73’H28) from Staatsbibliothek in Münichen; my sincere thanks to him.
10. A fragment of the Pandnāmeh of Saadi and verses composed by Edal Daru on Atash Behram, etc.
11. A fragment of the Khordeh-Avesta in Gujarati with Gujarati translation—containing the last karde of the larger Sarosh Yasht, smaller Hom Yasht, Vanant Yasht and Hävan Gāh (incomplete) (ff. 175 to 182, marked in Gujarati numerals, written 15 ll. to the page).

Date: Not given.159
Scribe: Not named.
Description: Not available.
Note: Since all works in verse in this manuscript are marked with the word ‘verse’, the fragment of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma should be in prose.

There is no mention of the date when this manuscript was written or the name of scribe. There is no indication of this miscellany neither in the Cama or the Mulla Firuz Library Catalogues.160

L = LONDON, BRITISH MUSEUM, No.830.


Contents:
1. 0a-51a. Dāstān-i Vīrāf-Nāma va qiṣṣa-yi šāh Ardašīr-i Bābakān-i Anūšīrvān.
   Title 1 (fol. 0a):
   اغاز داستان وبراف وقصه شاهی اردشیر
   Title 2 (fol. 1b):
   اغاز داستان وبرافخانه وقصه شاه اردشیر باکان انوشیروان
   Beginning:
   جون اردشير باکان بادشاهی بنست نود باشما را بکشت و...

Colophon (fol. 51a):161

158 The transcription of names in Dhabhar’s list of contents is retained.
159 It is not known on the basis of which mother manuscript the manuscript BC was copied. Part of its colophon has disappeared (104-).
160 The Mulla Firuz Library and the Oriental Institute Library are, in fact, the same library.
161 This manuscript is registered as manuscript 830 (MS.830) in the India Office library Catalogue. The numbering of the folios is from 1 to 50. But in the same catalogue, there is another manuscript with the same number in column 1520, namely the Śad dar. The numbering of the folios of the Śad dar begins from 51 to 155, that is, exactly following the folios of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma. This indicates that both these manuscripts may have been the same at first, and that they were probably separated into two parts while being catalogued.
2. 51b-1551. Sad dar.

**Date.** Not given.

**Scribe.** Not named.

**Description.** 20x12.5cm., 155 folios, 11 lines to the page. The text is written in fine nasta’līq, however sometimes the letter »ب« n at the end of the words is not attached to the rest of the word. Besides, some words are written in nasta’līq-i šikasta (broken nasta’līq), headings are written in coloured ink, and the folios are not numbered. However, there is a Latin number on every fifth folio on the recto side of the folio (5, 10, 15 etc.).

**Orthography.** »ب« is normally written »ب« but sometimes »ب«. »ج« is generally written »ج« but in some cases »ج«; »چ« is usually written »چ« but in some cases »چ« e.g. »چهار«; »ژ« is always written »ژ«.

Two dots are sometimes put under »ب« in the combination »بی«. *Kasra-i izāfa* is sometimes written »ی« and in some cases »ی«.

*Zamma* is often written, especially on »ب« and »ب b, e.g. »و« ū and »و būd«.

Prefix »ب می-« is sometimes separated but in some cases joined to the next word.

The letter »ب« representing a short -a at the end of a word is mostly omitted before the plural ending, e.g. »جاه« jāma-hā has been written »جاه«.

The »ب« of »ب است« ast is mostly omitted, e.g. »ب معروف است« ma’rūf ast is written »ب معروف«.

Some words are found in two forms, e.g: »بول« and »پل« for *pul* ‘bridge’; and one in three forms: »شبانِرژ« šabān-rūz, »شبانِرژ« šabān-rūz and »شبانه« šabān-e rūz.

The dots have not put in correctly in certain cases and at times some words have too many or too few dots, e.g: »ب جایگاه« jāygāh has been written as »ب جایگاه« jāygāh and »ب پیرش« jazašn as »ب پیرش« parašn.

Some nouns and pronouns have two different forms, e.g. »ب ایشان« and »ب ایشان« and »ب شاهسرام« and »ب شاهسرام«.

Some words are recorded incorrectly, e.g. »ب گزارش« guzāriš for »ب گزارش« guzāriš, »ب گذرماهی« garmāpa and »ب عزاب« azāb.

Some words are written in an unusual form, e.g. »ب دوزخ« dūžax.¹⁶²

**Special characteristics of the texts**

Due to the words it contains, many of which are compounds and old verbs, and due to the variation in grammatical structures the Zoroastrian Persian version of the *Ārdāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, belongs to the most important and oldest New Persian texts. The following examples of words, verbs and grammatical

¹⁶² Mr. Mehrdad Fallahzadeh provided the microfilm L (No.830) from the British Museum Library and brought it for me. Thanks to him.
structures indicate that the text was written in the fourth or fifth A.H./tenth or eleventh A.D. centuries. The examples below have been selected from manuscript N, which is the basic manuscript, and the number of the folios refers to this manuscript.

Old Zoroastrian Persian words and compounds found in the text are:

- idin (139a), humat, hūxt, hāvarst(139b), fīrast, sidīgar, tīg-i ustura (140a), anān, šahānshāh (140b), dīn-dūst, āsvān, pādān, āviča, durvandān (141b), firīstagan, pāy-μuζ (142b), šahferm, ispāhān, šahānšāh, jādāngūy, kišt-uzar (143b), šamūnesh, šūm-maniš (147b), bih-afzūnī (148b).

Old verbs encountered are:

- girāmī-kardan, ārizū-dādan, dar-gardan, bāz-bar-āmādan (142b), tūšā-būdan (143a), gūr, bāz-gūrāstan, viṣa-kardan, bāg-dāstan, šāh-gūzāstan, āb-tāxtan, dar-āvīxtan, šīkanjaa-bar-nahādan (146b), ba-ziyān-avardan, mūy ba šāna-kardan, bar šahr šudan, fāriyād-dāstan (147b), dast bāz-madāstan (148a).

The structure of the following sentences is particularly interesting:

- az yād bāz-kardan, durvandān (148b).

Among the verb forms, the past tense with the suffixed -t can be observed in its ordinary usages of indicating unrealized counterfactual actions or habitual actions in the past. It also occasionally occurs in manuscript N for single actions, like the simple past tense, as in the following three examples:

- biyāmādī va marā namāz burdī (line 101),
There are a few passages in which bā occurs where one would have expected ba “to” as in the following examples:

«i’tiqād bā yakī āvaram (line 11),
«čūn bā Ān ānih-i pūl šudam (line 169),
«hōjān-ādārī gamerī bā xāna-yi xwīs šavad (lines 188-189),
«vā bā mardumān xiyānat kam karda-and (lines 465-466),
«vā digar-bāra bā gūfī nagūzārand ki šumā muzd va karfā kunūd (lines 928-929).

The method used in the editing of the text

The editing of the text is based on a critical method. The present text has been edited on the basis of manuscript N. This text has been compared with manuscripts P, N² and M, and the different readings are mentioned in footnotes. Since manuscript O is a copy from manuscript N and even has the same date in the colophon, it has been used just for reading doubtful words. Manuscript L was used for a specific purpose. All the headings of the episodes are written according to that manuscript, since it is the only manuscript that has a division into episodes with headings. In addition to this, manuscript L in addition to the other ones was frequently referred to for the reading of some badly written words and other uncertain readings.

However the critical method was not employed mechanically. Some scribes confirm that they had directly or indirectly copied their manuscript from manuscript N. It seems, though, as if all manuscripts of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma have been copied from manuscript N, except manuscript L, something which was explained separately. The reason for this is that all the other manuscripts have a number of mistakes already found in manuscript N. Moreover, there are blank spaces in manuscript N, some of which are found in the same place in all these manuscripts, too. If all the wrong words of the text were the same in all manuscripts and all blank spaces were exactly the same, it would be unnecessary to use the other manuscripts to edit the text. Since, according to the rule ‘eliminatio codicum descriptorum’ (elimination of derivative manuscripts) (Timpanaro 2005: 47), i.e. if one is sure that one or several manuscripts have been copied from an original manuscript, the edition should just rely on that original one. The copied manuscripts are of

163 Sincere thanks to Mrs. Judith Josephson for drawing my attention to this matter.
no extra value. However, this is not true in this case, since all the manuscripts of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* are not exactly the same word for word.

However, even if we could be certain that all later manuscripts have been copied from manuscript N, it will be possible to find more original forms of words in other manuscripts as well. This might be due to the knowledge of the scribe who sometimes emendates a word while copying the text, and thus is not merely making a copy from the original manuscript. Additionally, perhaps the scribe had already copied the same manuscript from a better and more correct manuscript earlier and was therefore aware of defects and mistakes in the present manuscript which he decided to correct (Umüdsālār 2005-2006: 192-193). For these reasons, use has been made of all the available manuscripts to edit the text.

When there were two or more variants for a single word or term, according to ‘difficilior lectio potior’ (the most difficult alternative is the most correct) (Beal 2008: 120), the most difficult alternative was selected and given in the text body, and the other variants were moved to a footnote. For example, the word «پریخته» *parhiṣṭa* is more difficult than the word «پریخته» *pahṛīṣṭa*, thus given in the text body. Yet, not every word is selected just because it is the most difficult alternative. For example, there is a word in manuscript N, which is recorded as «نیادا-اومند» *nayḍā-ūmand* the first time it occurs (140a). The correct form of the word is «پتیار-اومند» *patiyrā-ūmand* which is written in manuscript N² and in the very manuscript N the second time it occurs (140b).

On the other hand, in spite of the antiquity of manuscript N, some words and terms found there are not the original and ancient ones. In this instance, following the rule ‘utrum in alterum abiturum erat?’ (What has been changed into what else?) (Beal 2008: 427), the more ancient variant is selected in the text body. For example, the word «گژدوم [گژدوم]» *kaḏum [gaḏum]* is found in the four manuscripts NN²MO, but this very same word is recorded as «گژدوم» *gaḏum* in manuscript P. This latter form was given in the text.

Some words are found in both an ancient and more recent form in manuscript N or in the other manuscripts. For example, the words «گوسند» *gūspand* and «گوسند» *gūsand*, «خورسند» *xūrsand* and «خورسند» *xwarsand*, «ژفان» *zafān* and «ژفان» *zabān*, «پیل» *pīl* and «پیل» *pul*. In these cases, the ancient variants of the words are chosen for the text, and the more recent variants have been changed into the ancient variants as well.

Likewise, whenever a word contains a mistake in the manuscript, it has been corrected in the text and the incorrect form was given in a footnote. One example is the word «تفرقه» *tafaffuqī*, which is written «تفرقه» *tafarruqī* in all manuscripts except in manuscript L. This word has been recorded as «نامی» *nāmī* in manuscript L. While editing, the correct form of the word, «تفرقه» *tafaffuqī*, was recorded in the text and the other forms were moved to a footnote. Fortunately, there are few of these words in the text.
Thus, perhaps the editing method used in this thesis could be described as a mixing of the critical and eclectic methods.

As was explained in the section above on manuscripts, there is no consequent way of writing compound words, like adding a prefix to the word, adding a suffix, forming a plural noun, and so on. That is, the compound words are every now and then adjoined or apart. The writing of compound forms of the words is here based on the principle of separate writing, so this method has been applied as the standard method in the edition.

In the present thesis, the four Persian letters "پ"، "چ"، "ژ" and "گ" are written in their modern forms. The general orthography is also changed according to the most recent rules provided for Modern Persian, e.g. separation of the prefix "می" from the stem of the verb and of the plural suffix "ها" -hā from the noun, except in the case of kasra-yi izāfa after a word ending in -ah, which is written with a "ی" hamza. Furthermore, the majhūl vowels (ē and ə) are transcribed with their Modern Persian counterparts (ī and ā). Vocalisation in the edited text is added by the editor.

The letter "ی" is occasionally written for the kasra-yi izāfa, for example: "جیژ" instead of "جیز"، "جیژ" and "جیژ" instead of "جیژ"، "جیژ". They have kept with this form in the edited text.

The editor is responsible for the punctuation of the text. Additions by the editor are marked by square brackets, [ ], whereas explanations of words and terms are put between brackets ( ) in the translation. < > is added around pleonastic words.
Manuscript O was copied from manuscript N word by word; even the colophon date was copied. But it is not known when this copy was done.

Manuscript NH is lost.

Manuscript L has no colophon date, but due to its simple language, it seems to be the last version reproduced from the Arđāy-Vīṟāf Nāma.

It seems that this manuscript is a copy made in 954 A.Y./1585 A.D. from the copy of the Arđāy-Vīṟāf Nāma which was brought by Kama Asa from Persia (Unvālā 1940: 18).

The colophon date of manuscript M is unknown due to the loss of the last folio.
بسم الله
ارواه و رست
سباس و دام ایزدی راکب کرده مانند پناک
نواست و خوانم و در جناب مادر لرگی کردی جناب
ارزش اکنن در جن مبارکی بنشت نوردی کردی
مصنوعی در روزبیست بنشت و پنجا به رسمان خالی الر
آمیدها اردکستران درمبان کردن ناشی در توره
نوحه خانگی هست کردن رست و رست کردن زبان
علیکت دوختن دربی کردن به رضایت از بین دیوام
کربمان انجی از رحم و اعتماد دلی اور کردن این محسومه رحمانی

Manuscript O (Bodl.Or.719), folio 1b.
Manuscript P (S.P.47), folio 41a.
بیایید از مکان شبکه پیام‌رسانی یا پیام‌رسانی شما دسترسی پیدا نمایید
رها شوید در پیام‌رسانی و جهان را راه‌اندازی نمایید
خالی کرده و آرمیده شده و فضای آن را پر کنید
که درمان به وسیله عفونت‌های خودش را تبریز داشته و
که نمی‌دانند درست و راست که ابرهای مغزی
بپیچیدم رازهای کمی وراثت از جهان را
اکر

Manuscript L (No.830), folio 1b.
In the name of God the compassionate, the merciful, the righteous, the creator

ARDĀY-VĪRĀF NĀMA

I give thanks to God who created us as [139a] he willed and he wills, and peace upon the prophet.

And then;

Thus they say that when Ardašīr Bābakān became king, he killed ninety kings, and some say he killed ninety-six kings, and he emptied the world of enemies and made [it] a tranquil place. And he summoned before him all the dastūrs and mūbads who were [active] at that time and said “Show me clearly the true and correct religion which almighty God revealed to Zarathustra the high ranking and [which] he made current in the world, so that I may destroy false religions and disputes and bring about faith in one [religion]!”

And he [Ardašīr] sent somebody to all the provinces. In every place where there was a learned man or a dastūr he summoned them all to his court. A crowd of forty thousand men were gathered at the court. Then he spoke and said: “Choose those who are the wisest among them!”

They selected the four thousand wisest of them and informed the king of kings and he ordered: “Exercise prudence a second time!–Choose again among them those who are most expert in discernment and who know by heart a large amount of the Afiṣṭā (Avesta) and Zand!”

Four hundred men who knew by heart the largest quantities of the Avesta and Zand emerged. Once again and with precaution they selected forty men who knew by heart the whole of the Avesta. Among these forty men, there were seven men who had not committed any sinful deed from the beginning of their lives until the age they had now reached. And they were exceedingly
cultured and virtuous in thoughts, words, and deeds, and they were all attached to God.

Then all seven of these men were brought to King Ardašīr.

Afterwards, the king stated: “It is necessary for me to dispel these suspicions and doubts about the religion, and all people will adhere to the religion of Ohrmazd and Zarathustra; and all disputes about the religion must be dispelled so that it will be clear to me and to all the learned and wise men which religion [this] is, and these suspicions and doubts will disappear from [our] religion.”

Then they replied: “No one is able to provide this information except the one who has not committed a sinful deed from the beginning of his eighth year to the age he has now reached, and this man is Vīrāf, because there is no one more virtuous, with a more enlightened mind, and more truthful than he. And thus it is necessary to choose him for this serious affair. And we six others will perform suitable worship and charms that have been prescribed by [our] religion for this purpose, so that the Glorious God will reveal all matters to Vīrāf and Vīrāf will inform us of them, so that everyone will be free of doubt about Ohrmazd’s and Zarathustra’s religion.

And Vīrāf agreed to this matter.

And King Ardašīr was pleased with these words.

And then they said: “This matter cannot be carried out correctly unless they go up to the sacred fire.” And then they rose with determination and went away.

After that, those six men, who were dāstūrs, performed their ceremonies on one side of the fire-temple and on the other sides, the other forty men together with those forty thousand dāstūrs who had come to the court, all performed their ceremonies.

And Vīrāf washed his head and body [ceremonially] and put on white clothes and perfumed himself with sweet scent, and he stood before the fire and repented of all [his] sins.

Vīrāf had seven sisters, and when they were informed of the news, all seven came and they wept and cried saying: “We are seven veiled heads at home, and as for our brother, we have no one beside him, and we place all our hope in him. Now you [139b] will send him to the Other World, and we do not know whether we will see his face again or not. And you will make us orphans. We have been separated from our father and mother and you want to separate us from our brother, too. We shall not permit this, because we have only one brother. Choose someone else and set [our] brother free to us!”

When the dāstūrs heard these remarks, they said: “Do not be worried and mistrustful, because we will return him [to you] safe and healthy in seven days.” Then they swore an oath, and the seven sisters became satisfied and turned back.
Then the King of Kings, Ardašīr, and his horsemen clothed in armor kept guard around the fire-temple, in order to prevent a heretic or a hypocrite from doing a hidden thing to Vīrāf that would cause harm to him and so that no one could commit an evil deed during the worship ceremonies which would render the charms void.

Afterwards they placed a bed in the center of the fire-temple and spread clean bedding on it. Then they seated Vīrāf on the throne and put a face-veil on him. Those forty thousand men began to celebrate the worship and they prepared some consecrated bread and put some wine upon the consecrated bread.

When they finished the ceremony they gave one cup of that wine to Vīrāf as [the sign] of good thought, that is, of a pure and true belief and intention, and they gave him the second cup as [the sign of] good word, that is, of sincere speech and true word and they gave him the third cup as [the sign of] good deed, that is, a praiseworthy act.

After that, when Vīrāf had drunk the three cups of wine, he laid down there and fell asleep.

They continued the worship ceremonies during seven days and nights while those six dāstūrs sat by Vīrāf’s bed. Those other thirty-three men who had been selected performed ceremonies around the throne. Meanwhile, those three hundred and sixty other men who had been selected earlier performed ceremonies around them and thirty-six thousand men performed ceremonies around them inside the dome of the fire-temple. Meanwhile the King of Kings, clothed in armor and seated on [his] horse, and his troops, were continually circulating outside the dome and did not even allow passage to the wind. In every place where worshippers were seated in clusters, a group of soldiers with drawn swords and clothed in armor stood watching to keep them in their proper places and no one was allowed to mix with anyone else. Infantry-men in armor stood around where Vīrāf’s bed was, so that no one but those six dāstūrs were free to go near the throne. From time to time, the King of Kings himself went in and came out and guarded the fire-temple.

They watched over Vīrāf’s body this intensely for seven days and nights.

Finally, after seven days and nights Vīrāf moved again and became revived and sat up.

When the people and the dāstūrs saw that Vīrāf had awakened, they were happy and glad, they experienced peace and stood up to show reverence and said: “You are welcome, o Ardā-y-Vīrāf, and that means when looking back that he is heavenly righteous”. How did you come back and how did you escape and what did you see? Tell us so that also we may know the conditions of the Other World.”
[The First Episode]

Description of How Ardāy-Vīrāf Returns from Heaven and his Report

Ardāy-Vīrāf said: First, bring me something to eat because, I ate nothing during these seven days and nights and my body has become weakened. Afterwards, ask me whatever you wish and I will inform you.

The dastūrs prepared some consecrated bread immediately. Ardāy-Vīrāf recited the vāj slowly. He ate a little and gave thanks to God. Then, he said: “Now fetch a knowledgeable scribe [140a] and I shall reveal everything I saw; and you must send copies all over the world so that the matters of heavenly paradise and heaven and hell will be clear to everyone. Thus they may know the value of good deeds and they may avoid evil deeds.

Then they brought a knowledgeable scribe and he sat down in the presence of Ardāy-Vīrāf.

[…] I drank and fell asleep.

Some time passed. I saw Surūš-ašū (Surūš the truthful) as he approached and he showed me reverence and greeted me and said, “Ardāy-Vīrāf, you are welcome as you come from that contentious world to this luminous world, but it was not yet time for you to come to this world.”

I showed him respect and said, “I have been sent as a messenger from that world. For this reason all the dastūrs and all the pious men held a meeting and the King of Kings sent me on this important [mission] to obtain information about this world.”

When I said these words, Surūš the truthful took me by the hand and said: “Indeed, your intention and thought are pure, right, and true. Ascend one step.” I ascended one step. And he said to me again, “Your speaking is true and you have not told lies. Ascend another step.” I ascended another step. Then for the third time he said: “All your deeds are good and sincere, you have done no evil and due to it you have reached this level which no one has ever reached. Ascend another step.” As I ascended another step, I reached the Činvad-pūl (Chinvad Bridge) and I saw [that] the bridge was like a tree with many branches and there were branches that seemed as thin as a sharp edge.

[The Second Episode]

Description of how Ardāy-Vīrāf saw a spirit which had departed the body

Then as I was watching, I saw in that place a man’s spirit that had recently departed [his] body and was seated by the bed of the dead body and was saying these words, “May he be happy whose [own] goodness has become
beneficent for people”. For during the days he was there that spirit had experienced more rest, comfort and happiness than he had during all his time in the world. At dawn following the third night I saw that spirit coming and on the road he was following I imagined that he was walking through basil and blossoms. The odor of the basil was so sweet smelling that, as long as I have been in the world, I have never heard of a sweeter odor.

When I came nearer to the Chinvad Bridge, there came a zephyr from the paradise of olives that was more delightful than the odor of musk and ambergris. I looked through the zephyr, and never as long as I have been in the world had I seen a more beautiful apparition, with prominent breasts and ringlets reaching her feet. And the more I looked at her, she seemed more beautiful in my eyes, so that every limb that I looked upon I could not and should not take my eyes away from it as would befit. And the more I looked the more she appealed to me. And the more I looked the more she appealed to me. And when the spirit saw that figure, she smiled at him. Then the spirit asked her, “Who are you for I have never seen a more beautiful, a more lovely and a more faultless face than yours?” The face replied: “I am your good deeds, which you have done in the world. You were of good intention, good words and good deeds, and you observed the pure religion. I am your good deeds. I am so beautiful in your sight because you have done charitable acts when you were in the world. You have respected water and fire, and through your effort you have not harmed [them] and you have destroyed the xrafstar (noxious creatures). And you have benefitted righteous men and whoever had come from a foreign land [140b] and also those who were living in the land. And you gave foreigners room in your own place and were hospitable towards them and treated them well. As much as possible you have been diligent about doing charitable acts and you have succeeded. I was beautiful and you have made me more beautiful, I was illuminated, and you have made me more illuminated. I was higher than all the spirits; you have made me superior and greater so that people in the world will perform deeds and charitable acts, Each day I will become more beautiful and illuminated because of you.” Then she embraced him and laughed with him. And then, in one step, with the good that he had thought he ascended to the star station. And at the second step, because of the good deeds he had done, he went to the sun station and finally, at his fourth step, he went to garūmn (paradise).

[The Third Episode]

Description of seeing the Amšāspandān (Holy Immortals)

Then Surūš the truthful took me by the hand and led me onto the Chinvad Bridge. When I looked, I saw Mihr-īzad standing there. Surūš the truthful put his hand on the bridge and stopped. When I saw the Holy Immortals I
wished to greet them. They greeted me first and said: “O, Ardāy-Vīrāf, you are welcome, though your time has not yet come.”

And I said: “Greeting and salutation be upon you. I have been sent from that world by the mūbadhs, the dastūrs, the pure religious and the King of Kings, so that I can reveal to them the conditions of this world.”

As I said these words I saw the man’s spirit that had [just] arrived there, and I saw that the bridge turned over to that side which was twenty-seven meters in width. I saw how the spirit passed bravely over the bridge and I also crossed the bridge after him.

[The Fourth Episode]

Description of how Ardāy-Vīrāf saw the virtuous and chaste spirits

And Surūš the truthful had taken me by the hand. When I reached the other side of the bridge I saw a luminosity before which my eye was dazzled. When I looked, I saw the spirits of past generations appear before us, and happily and smilingly to inquire about me, and they asked me in a pleasant way: “How did you escape from that wicked world; for in that world there is no comfort without suffering? Everything is nostalgia, sadness and sorrow. There is no pleasure that is not followed by more sadness in the world, which is the source of the grief and misfortunes of the virtuous. And since you have come here, do not worry, and be happy, because never again will pain reach you, you will be comfortable with no affliction and you will be in good health without any plague, eat well and be joyful because here is always happiness and cheerfulness; there is no evil here.”

Then, while those spirits were speaking and making me [feel] hopeful and my heart light, I saw Bahman amšaspand (Bahman the Holy Immortal) who came and took me by the hand and said: “Come and I will show you the golden throne which has been called the empyrean or celestial throne!”

[The Fifth Episode]

The description of seeing Bahman the Holy Immortal

And he brought me up, and I saw a throne that I am not capable of describing. And I saw the spirit of that man standing there and the Holy Immortals were doing a ring dance with joined hands, and I saw the spirits of that man’s relatives; they were all joyful as if a stranger had returned to his home and his relatives rejoiced on that account. Afterwards, Bahman the Holy Immortal took the spirit by the hand and led him to his place, and those spirits of past generations went along with him, and they were happy as he sat on his throne.

Then Surūš the truthful [141a] took me by hand and said: “Behold, the empyrean and the celestial throne. Do reverence!”
I did reverence. I saw that all was luminosity; my eye was dazzled.

[The Sixth Episode]

**The Description of Seeing Hamīstagān (Limbo)**

Then Surūš the truthful took me by the hand, turned and led [me] back to the Chinvd Bridge again. There I saw that in the middle of the Chinvd Bridge many people had gathered as a crowd. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people and why are they gathered here, what are they doing and why are they being kept here?” Surūš the truthful said: “Call this place limbo because these people are here and will remain continuously standing and will not be able to sit down until the resurrection of the final body. And they are superior people whose virtues and sins are equal. When you go back to that world, say to people that although their good deeds are few, they [should] strive to do [them]. Because if the good deeds of this group had been a little more than their sins, even as little as a single eyelash, their spirits would have reached paradise and would not have come here, where they must stand up in this way, and the cold and the heat will affect them until the time of the resurrection of the final body. Otherwise, no other suffering is [inflicted] on them.”

[The Seventh Episode]

**The Description of Seeing the Sītāra-pāya (Star-Station)**

And from there he brought me back to the Star-station. I saw some souls who radiated light like the stars. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What is this place, and who are these people, and why have they been kept here?” Then Surūš the truthful said: “These are the souls of those persons who have not become nau-zūd and they have not performed gūt-xarīd. They had the ability and they had [received] the command, but they did not strive to attain the reward. But because they did not become nau-zūd, their souls have been detained here and they are not capable of rising higher than this.”

[The Eight Episode]

**The Description of Seeing the Māh-pāya (Moon-Station)**

Then, Surūš the truthful took me by the hand and led me to the Moon-station. I saw many people who had gathered there. I said: “What is this place and who are these people?” Surūš the truthful answered: “This is called the paradise that is well-known as the Moon-station. These people have not performed nau-zūdī although they have exercised all the other virtues. They have remained in this place because they have not recited the Gāthās and have not performed the worship. The souls of these people are as luminous as the moon, and they are living in comfort and pleasure.”
[The Ninth Episode]

The Description of Seeing Xūršid-pāya (Sun-Station)
Afterwards, I left that place along with Surūš the truthful, and I saw a place the luminosity of which caused my eyes to be dazzled. And I saw people who were seated there and each one of them was seated on a golden throne. I asked: “What is that place, and who are these people; you could imagine each of them to be a king because of the houses, the thrones, and the articles of luxury?” Surūš the truthful said: “This place is the Sun-station, and these are people who committed few sins in that world, besides having done nau-zūdi and exercised many virtues. They have purified their souls in this manner, and because of this they have become worthy of all goodness.”

[The Tenth Episode]

The Description of Seeing the Place of worship
Then Surūš the truthful led me yet higher. I looked and saw luminosity everywhere, so much so that I could not see anything due to the luminosity. Surūš the truthful said to me: “This is the place for worshiping Ohrmazd. Pay homage to Ohrmazd!” I worshiped properly and according to my ability, and I lost my sense and my reason because of the majesty and luminosity of that place.

[The Eleventh Episode]

The Description of Nourishing by the Spring Oil
After that, I heard a voice saying: “Do not trouble him much, because he has come from that world of distress and affliction. He has suffered so much on the way, and has experienced much dread. Rather give him food!” While I looked, they brought a cup and poured some oil in the cup, and said: “This is called spring oil.” When I drank it, I found its flavor such that I had never drunk anything as delicious as that in the world, and still I feel its taste and delectation. And I know that as long as I live that pleasure will not leave my palate. And they said: “Every person who is in paradise is there because of his good thoughts, good words and good deeds, and this is his place, and he will be fed by this meal at first. And also women who are god-fearing, obedient to their husbands, and religious will be nourished by that same meal, and will be seated at this same place and station.

[The Twelfth Episode]

The Description of Urdibihīšt the Holy Immortal
And then while I was looking, I saw Urdibihīšt the Holy Immortal who was
coming near me. I made an effort to greet him, but he greeted me first, and said: “You are welcome, Ardāy-Vīrāf, although it was not yet time for you to come. And you have irritated me a little, because you have placed wet logs on the fire. And the Most High God has entrusted the fire to me, and whosoever does wrong to it in that world, I will be irritated with that person in this world.” When I heard these words fromurdībihīšt the Holy Immortal, I replied: “The Holy Immortals are not idle talkers. I know truly that I have never put wet logs on the fire, and that I always only put seven-year-old logs on the fire. I do not understand how it could be that you tell me, ‘You have put wet logs on the fire.’” When he heard those words, he took my hand and said: “Come and I will show you the seven-year-old logs you have put on the fire.” And I followed him. I saw a whirlpool with much water standing in it. He said: “That is what has leaked out of the seven-year-old logs you have put on the fire. Be aware that one-year-old logs may be very much drier than the seven-year-old logs, because, whenever more than one year has passed, the log will absorb moisture again and get wet. And you should tell these words to the people.”

[The Thirteenth Episode]

The Description of Seeing Garūtmān (Paradise) and the Place of Ohrmazd

Then Surūš the truthful and urdībihīšt the Holy Immortal took me by the hand and led me to Paradise. When I saw that place, I was astounded and powerless. I imagined that it was made of ruby. It shone like the sun, but was perhaps brighter and more beautiful than the light of the sun and the moon. It was as if that light shone on one side and radiated light from that side. And I asked Surūš the truthful: “What is this place, and of what precious stone has it been made?” Surūš the truthful replied: “This jewel is a diamond, pure and [like] a pendant.” When I went a short distance, the light became brighter and brighter and however much I looked, I could see nothing due to the luminosity. I heard a voice saying: “You are welcome, o Ardāy-Vīrāf, from that contentious, troubled world to this pure world.”

Surūš the truthful and urdībihīšt the Holy Immortal were told to take Vīrāf’s hand and show him the place of the righteous and that of the sinners and the reward for virtues and the punishment for sinners. And then they took my hand and led me to each place.

[The Fourteenth Episode]

The Description of Seeing the Souls of the Munificent and the Generous

In the first place I reached, I saw souls all dressed in garments and clothes of
gold and silver brocade, [and they were] all seated on thrones with crowns on their heads [142a] and their faces radiated luminosity in wide circles. They were all laughing and playing joyfully. When I saw them I became very happy and I was amazed by their merriment. And I asked Surūš the truthful and Urūbihišt the Holy Immortal: “What people are they?” They replied: “These are the souls of the munificent ones who have been generous to their relatives and to worthy men in that world. And what they had, they did not deny the virtuous and the chaste. And they were always hospitable, and donated clothes to the poor and to the orphans, and fed the hungry. Now, consequently, their souls receive exactly the greatness and exaltation and enjoy the goodness and luminosity that you see.”

Those souls appeared good in my sight and I said: “I wish my soul would be able to reach to this place.”

[The Fifteenth Episode]

The Description of Seeing the Souls that have done nau-zūdī

Then when I had passed that place, I saw below them a people who wore multicolored clothes of light, so that in the world I had never seen the likes of such beautiful clothes. And all shone like the moon and the sun in their places, and they were all happy together. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people?” Surūš the truthful answered: “These are the people who have done nau-zūdī in that world, and worshiped water and fire, and attained their places and positions. Thus now in this manner they are so happy because they have attained to their places.” When I saw them, because of the happiness of that place where they were rejoicing, I desired to stay with them. Surūš the truthful said: “It is not your time to stop in this place, because many people are waiting to hear from you, and you must return to that world again to inform them, so that they will [adhere] to the good religion of the dīn-i bih-i mazdayasnān (pure religion of the Mazda-worshipers) and be without doubts.”

[The Sixteenth Episode]

The Description of Seeing the Place of the Kings

When I had passed that place, I saw a crowd dressed in new garments, coming and going anywhere they desired just like the angels, and they had no need to walk but proceeded with their feet in the air. They were covered with pearls and jewels from head to foot, and a feeling of their awe and statesmanship emerged from there. I was surprised by their gloriousness and esteem. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people, because of whose dignity and magnificence I felt a fear come into my heart.” Surūš the truthful replied: “These are the souls of the kings who were just and fair. Because their commands were obligatory for every one in that world, so also in this
world they are the kings of paradise. They come and go wherever they desire, and there is nothing better than their souls, because as long as they were in that world, they were just and held back injustice and oppression from the common people at all times. And they have their share and part in every good deed that has been done in the seven climes of the earth. Consequently, their souls are as honorable and glorious as you see.” And in my sight they were very good indeed and glorious and splendid. And I showed reverence to them and declared: “O happy is the king who was just, so that his soul will reach such a splendid and glorious rank and position”.

[The Seventeen Episode]

The Description of the Position of the dastūrs and the mūbads

When I passed beyond that place, I ascended to a place where I saw a crowd who were all seated and each one had four cushions, and the Holy Immortals [142b] strewed [good things] upon them at every moment. And they reflected glory and magnificence. And when Surūš the truthful approached them, all of them stood up, and Surūš the truthful soothed them and honored them and said: “Is there any wish which has not been fulfilled? [If not] tell me so that I [can] request it of Ohrmazd and he will grant you these wishes.” They prostrated themselves and said: “Whatever we need has been provided, and we are all the time in the midst of comfort and ease, the gifts of God, and these are due to your glory and magnificence.” Then I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people with such splendor and fortune, that one would imagine that each one is a Holy Immortal, seated on his throne in dignity and majesty?” and Surūš the truthful said: “These are the souls of the dastūrs, the mūbads, the [spiritual] masters, and the judges for whom I was the intercessor, so that Ohrmazd the creator worked his generosity for them. He has granted them this dwelling-place with such honor, glory and luminosity. Every judge and authority who judges justly in that world, and takes circumstances into consideration and gives due respect to kindness and tenderness, I shall be his intercessor and provider of fees. And each authority who judges according to bribe or bias, I will be his enemy in this world. And God has entrusted them to me.” I prayed and passed beyond that place.

[The Eighteenth Episode]

Seeing the Position of Women who obeyed their Husbands

I arrived at a place and saw the souls of some women who were dressed in gold brocade garments, with all their robes studded with pearls, rubies and other precious stones. On each woman’s head a bejeweled crown had been placed. And they were all enwrapped in long gowns and sables inlaid with jewels and pearls. And they were walking gracefully, coquetishly playing and laughing in paradise. When I saw how nice those women were, each one
better than the other, and how they came towards me [{?}], with all the gold, silver and precious stones and the playful friendliness they showed each other in that they placed an arm around each other’s neck [thus exhibiting] the enjoyment and pleasure they had together, I felt a fear that I would lose my reason and wisdom. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these women that the Most High God has held to be worthy of all this beneficence?” Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal replied: “These are the souls of the women who obeyed their husbands in that world and did not reject their husbands’ command and have held their husbands’ hearts as their own and have not abandoned their husbands’ bed, and have not preferred another man to their husbands. And they have honored fire and water as far as possible. And they have fulfilled all the religious duties that were their responsibility. For the sin of menstruation and the terror of the sepulcher they have prayed davāzdah humāst ābān. And they have been content with what God has granted their husbands. And they have done housekeeping. And they have not been double-minded and keepers of separate purses, and their husbands have been pleased with them. Thus now their souls are as joyful and pure as you see. And whatever they need, the Most High God has granted them. Consequently, they are so cheerful because they have preserved themselves from all sins. “When I saw how good they were, I was glad and said a prayer for them and then passed beyond that place.

[The Nineteenth Episode]

The Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at the Place of People who have performed the Worship

Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal took my hand and led me to each place. We arrived at a place [143a] in which, when I looked, I saw the souls above the sky, in the very uppermost part of Paradise, who had been seated above everyone else, and all the Holy Immortals were seated in front of them. I saw that their place was such that sweet basil and royal basil of different colors grew there. They had on golden and silver garments of silk. And I saw running streams and [heard] songbirds. They were seated in the midst of fortune and comfort. The spring oil was put in front of them, and they were [full of] merriment and joy. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people so full of merriment and joy?” Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal said: “These are the souls of those persons who have commissioned worship in that world. And they have done prayers for hamā-dīn and davāzdah humāst ābān. And, they have commanded gūī-xarīd and zinda-ravān, [and] others similar to those they have commissioned. They have performed worship on their own and they have been hīrbaḥs. They have recognized the Holy Immortals and have revered them. And now the Holy Immortals are sitting before them and encouraging them with soft words, and holding them dear, as you see. And day after day the souls of
these people become more luminous, purer and more respected, and whatever good deeds and virtues people perform they will be hamāzūr (i.e. their partners).

[The Twentieth Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of Heroes**

When I passed beyond that place, I saw a crowd from whose faces glory and splendor radiated, and they displayed dignity and majesty. All of them were dressed in military uniforms, of gold and silver brocade. And golden and silver weapons had been placed near them and they were playing a game of war. And they looked very mirthful, jolly, and dignified to my eyes. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal: “Who are these people with such splendor and majesty?” They replied: “They are those persons who protected Iran against its enemies. Lest perhaps the enemy would cause damage to the country, they constantly endured physical toil. Now they enjoy the comfort and ease that you see.” Those souls were very excellent in my view, because of their comfort.

[The Twenty-first Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of those who have killed xrafstarān** (noxious insects)

And when we had passed beyond them, I saw other people who were seated in their places. There were gardens, orchards and fruit trees and sweetly singing birds. I saw streams with running water in which there were rubies and pearls instead of sand and pebbles. And gold and silver fish were swimming in those streams. And at the edge of the streams stood musicians composing songs for the birds and other melodies. And another group was dancing the dance of Dast-band in front of them. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal: “Who are these people to whom the Most High God has granted so much comfort, fortune and joyfulness?” They said: “These are the people who have killed noxious creatures and other insects and many beasts in that world. They were continuously diligent in killing noxious insects. Now, they have been promoted to this rank which you see.” When I saw how cheerful they were, I said: “I should be constantly occupied with killing noxious insects and perhaps my soul could attain to such a place of rank which would be so honorable.”

[The Twenty-second Episode]

**Arriving at and Seeing the Place of Farmers**

Then we passed beyond that place and went up to another place. I saw lands
with a thousand herbs and more flourishing than the land with sweet basil, where the fragrance of musk, ambergris and camphor came from those trees, and there were citron, sour orange, lemon and jasmine trees as well as various other fruit trees. And I saw women who were all dressed in multi-colored painted garments with golden crowns on their heads, and they were standing in front of those people. And there were musicians standing around them. I saw them and I was surprised and I said: “Each group that I see is more beautiful and happier than the others.” I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people who are so honored and live in such comfort and blessing.” Surūš the truthful answered: “These people were the farmers who sowed and tilled in that world and made the earth flourish, and planted all kinds of trees, and cultivated corn and barley. Now they are being remunerated in this place. And the women standing in front of them are the spirits of the earth who have made the earth flourish. And Ohrmazd the creator has placed the earth under the protection of Isfandārmad amšaspand (Isfandārmad the Holy Immortal). They have made the earth flourish, have been righteous, and have not committed treason. Therefore, Isfandārmad the Holy Immortal has held them in esteem for their goodness just as you see.” When I saw those people, I prayed to Isfandārmad the Holy Immortal and said: “Blessed is he who cares for you and you are his supporter, so that you bestow these thrones on him.”

[The Twenty-third Episode]

Arrival at the Place of the Shepherds

Afterwards we passed beyond that place. I saw another crowd for whom thrones had been arranged and royal garments had been spread about. I imagined that those places, mansions, and houses had each been built of a different color and material, one was made of ruby, another of pearl, one of emerald, one of diamond, and one of crystal. And a throne had been placed in each house, and each individual was seated separately on a throne in accordance with his own wish or desire. And before each of them a horse was standing with a bejeweled and golden saddle. And they had thrust their heads forward with pride and were elevated because of their virtues. And when I saw those people, I was astonished by such respect and majesty. And their pride was pleasing to me. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal “Who are these people who have such pride and dignity?” Surūš the truthful said, “They are persons who were shepherds in that world and have kept sheep, and who did not allow them to run short of water and grass to eat. They protected them against the thief, the wolf, and the bandit, and from the cold and the heat. And they have shared their milk and oil charitably with mendicants and deserving poor men. And as much as they were able they strove to act righteously and not to betray people. They honored every stranger they met in the desert and gave him food. Now their souls are
in the peace and comfort that you see. But, O Ardāy-Vīrāf, I advise you that you should say to people that it is not possible to experience comfort in both worlds. And that world is a place of hirelings, and as long as they do not suffer hardship and do not finish their work, they will not be able to attain this comfort and be worthy to seek a reward, nor could they gain such comfort in this world. [144a] And one may ask for one’s reward when one accomplishes one’s duty. If they do not work and do not suffer pain, then they should not covet rewards. How, then, is greed? Think for yourself and suppose that someone who has lived in peace and comfort for fifty years, then one day he meets with misfortune either through tyrants or of his own doing. He will forget those fifty years of ease. He will weep and moan over that one day of difficulty that has happened to him, and the fifty years of abundance will be bitter to him due to that small difficulty. And no comfort will remain with him. And due to that suffering of only one day he will feel that he has suffered difficulties all his life. After [experiencing] both good and bad, know that in the end things should be better. Now, these people were shepherds and you should consider how much trouble they put up with in that world? In the unpopulated desert where these people lived alone they have continually had fear in their hearts because of the thief, the bandit and the wolf. And on the nights when it was snowing and it was so cold that it was impossible to put one’s head outside the hole, they protected [their] sheep from wolves and other dangers, and they have taken that suffering upon themselves. Consequently now those difficulties have come to an end, and they have achieved the happiness and comfort that you see. Then why should people be proud of that length of their lives and for some few days of comfort mixed with suffering, and for this pain give up their lives? And then, finally, all must be given up and be eternally punished, because there is no comfort in that world unless there has been difficulty either before or after that. Now [take] for example the pleasure of eating bread, unless one has suffered the pain of hunger one cannot appreciate that pleasure. And again [take] the pleasure of resting the body; unless one has previously suffered the pain of hard work one cannot appreciate that pleasure. It is like this with all the comforts of the world. All pleasures are mixed with pain, and all will be there for you, and many other sorrows as well will be added to yours. For example, you must have a horse so that you will not need to walk. When you acquire the horse, you will need someone to take care of the horse, to bring [it] water and give [it] barley and fodder. And when you are responsible for someone, you will be worried about how to feed and dress him. And you will always be involved with him. For example, someone wishes for a child from the Most High God, and the Most High God grants him the child. He will always be filled with worries, because it must have bread and other things. And when the child grows up, he will be worried about books and his education. And he will always be afraid [saying], “I am afraid that he will become ill or die, or else he will suffer from something. And if he dies, that
will [cause] so much sorrow that the parents will never get over it, and they will not be happy even for a day.” And this is the way of the world. And no one will be satisfied with what he has. This is the way of the world. And the more a person accumulates, the more he must have. For example, if someone has a fortune, he will be always worried about it, and he will be afraid that the tyrant king will take it away from him, and he is afraid that the thief will steal it from him, and he is afraid that the talebearer will tell tales about his fortune. He continuously hides it in this small hole or that one, and he spends his lifetime in so much fear and fright. And in the end it must be left where it is, or it must be given as daily bread to needy men and be taken away from husband and wife. He will suffer for [his] wealth in that world, and will be in pain and torment in this world. Therefore, Vīrāf, you should admonish people to look to the end and to be discerning about matters of the world.” And he said these words and we left that crowd of people.

[The Twenty-fourth Episode]

The Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at the Place of the Husbandmen

We ascended to another place. I saw a crowd of people clothed in beautiful garments, and the spirits of water and fire, and the spirits of the earth and plants and herbs and trees stood before them. And the former were inclining on brocade pillows like kings. Musk and ambergris were being burnt before them. And the gods were rejoicing in front of them and were encouraging them to play together. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people who are of such high rank that the Holy Immortals take such pains with them, and heed their wishes?” Surūš the truthful said: “They are the people who in that world were the husbandmen of villages, and cultivated the land, and laid out gardens and kitchen-gardens, they commissioned the digging of irrigation canals and built many houses and edifices, and they have furthered the construction of buildings. Now all the spirits and the fire are satisfied with them and are standing in front of them. They have respected the gods in that world and the gods reward them in this world.” They were very honorable in my view.

[The Twenty-fifth Episode]

Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at the Place of the Jādagūyān (Intercessors)

Then we left that place and arrived at another place. I saw a crowd of people who were shining like the sun and the moon. Because of the brightness of their faces that place was such that I thought it was the sun. They were dressed in clothes of light. And they were coming and going in the air [and] they were amusing themselves just like birds in flight. I supposed that they were all fifteen years old, and I saw that there was not a trace of grief in their
hearts. But all of them were busy with their own interests, and were cheerful, joyful and pleased. And I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who are these people whose shining light has made me happy, because each one is shining like the sun and the moon?” Surūš the truthful said: “These are the people who in that world were intercessors for the poor and the needy and the ṭads (religious leaders), and they were the hīrbs and the dastūrs, and they have established Ādarān and fires. And they have collected relief funds from people for strangers, afflicted men, infants and orphans and have sent it to them. Now they have attained the luminosity and high position which you see.” When I looked upon that happiness and that light from that place, the many sweet basils, each of which had a different color and fragrance, and I saw the flowing streams like rose-water and houses each built of different jewels, and I saw the high multi-colored illuminated palaces, I became so eager and desirous of that place, that I said [to myself] “I will stay in this place”, because it was extremely grand and splendid in my heart, and I did not wish to come away from there. Then, Surūš the truthful and Urdibihist the Holy Immortal took me by the hand and led me from that place.

[The Twenty-sixth Episode]

The Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at the Bridge and Observing the Condition of the Inhabitants of Hell and Sinners

And we reached a place where I saw a river with dark and fetid water as black as oil. The water was as deep as nine lances. And at the bottom of the water I saw that the souls were crossing the river with difficulty. Many of the souls had been submerged in the middle of the river and were asking the other souls to give them protection, but no one heeded their cries for help. There were many souls who were groaning and clamoring and crying out like someone who has been bitten by a viper, that he could not cross there and that he had been forcibly thrown in. And many passed over even more abjectly. When I saw such things, and the terror, dread and fear, and the groaning and weeping, I wished to give them protection. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdibihist the Holy Immortal: “Who are these people who are crossing over the river with such difficulty? And what is this black water?” Surūš the truthful said: “This river has been accumulated from the tears of people’s eyes that have been shed after their deaths. And the more anyone weeps, mourns and laments for the dead, the more difficult it will be for him [the deceased]. These that you see who have become submerged and ask for protection but whom no one helps are those people who in that world have lamented, wept and mourned much. Consequently, the souls of their children are punished here. Therefore, when you go [back] to that world, tell people, ‘If you have pity on these souls and you do not wish for them to suffer pain and not be captives in this punishment because of your deeds, then they should do charitable deeds for the sake their souls and celebrate consecrated
bread, so that their souls will find comfort, and they should not lament and mourn because they [the souls] will suffer distress.’”

[The Twenty-seventh Episode]

Arrival at and Sighting of the Condemned Soul on the Bridge

Then Surūr the truthful and Urdibihīšt the Holy Immortal led me onto the Chinvad Bridge. I saw a soul whose life had left its body [recently] and was seated beside the body and was saying these words: “Woe is to me, what shall I do and where shall I go and who may I ask to assist me, who will come to my rescue because I am helpless and without support or shelter? And I have no companion with me. I am all alone and without a guide.” And he was saying these words and was looking at the body and was mourning and wailing. On the first night he suffered more pain and difficulty than he had ever experienced in the world. And Āhirman and the daemons were struggling at that very place to lead him into Hell. And he was afraid of them just like the sheep fears the wolf. That soul suffered more pain and torture in those three nights and days than the inhabitants of hell have in a period of one thousand years. And after three nights and days, at dawn I saw that soul reach the Chinvad Bridge, unlucky, having suffered much pain, dread, blows, fear, torture, and difficulties. I felt a wind that blew on him from the middle of Hell, called vāxtar (north) wind. No one had ever experienced such a fetid and unpleasant wind; in fact the Holy Immortals left that place because of the stench of that wind. And in the middle of that wind, I saw a figure and statue, black as tar. And its fangs stuck out [and it had] long claws and red eyes, and smoke was coming out of his mouth. And when the soul saw the figure that was so ugly, disagreeable and horrible, he wanted to run away from him. But the figure shouted saying: “You cannot run away from me.”

The soul said: “Who are you who are so ugly and horrible and black that I have never seen an ugliness that is uglier and more horrible than you?” It said: “I am your acts and your deeds. And because you have been ill-intentioned, of evil deed and unfaithful to your promises, thus I am those evil deeds of yours.”

The soul said: “Why you are so ugly, horrible and black?”

It said: “Because while people in that [145b] world were busy working and doing virtuous deeds and striving to make provisions so that in this world they would be saved from the tortures of hell, you meanwhile were trying legally or illegally to accumulate wealth, which now should not be called “wealth” (māl) but “snake” (mār). And that wheat (gandum) you acquired to sell at a profit should now be called “scorpion” (gažduhm). And others have taken [your] wealth and wheat, and the snakes and scorpions are hanging on to your self, your liver, and they will sting you until the resurrection of the final body, you will not be relieved of their stings for an hour. O
what an unfortunate man you were! For as long as you were in that world, you were the kind of person who would close the doors of your home when strangers arrived, and you would not even set out two pieces of bread for him. And whenever you saw people who commissioned the celebration of the liturgy and they themselves worshiped, you said to them: ‘Today I must be superior (tafavvuqī) to others, for how can I know what will come tomorrow?’ Now, all of that has been lost and eternal punishment has come. You were unlucky in becoming immersed in the world. And you saw others who were young like you and who died. They had had that ambition in their hearts until they were taken to the tomb of the dead and you were afraid and [even] felt a little panic. Then you forgot everything again and you became busy with worldly matters. It is like sheep when a wolf has seized one and taken it away; as long as the wolf is visible, the other sheep look out for him, but when the wolf is out of sight, they become busy grazing again. Now all is gone and you are left here in the hands of Āhirman and the daemons. And for this you will have more torture from the daemons. As long as people in the world are occupied with evil actions every day I will become uglier and more dreadful and will inflict more torture.” And he held him by the neck. And the Chinvad Bridge turned to the side that was like a razor blade. And when he set his foot on the bridge, it was so hard that you would have thought it was a razor and a sword. And, when he had gone a short distance, he fell upside down into hell. When I saw that, I had pity on him.

[The Twenty-eighth Episode]

Arrival at the Position and Place of the Inhabitants of Hell

Then Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal took me by the hand [and] followed that wicked soul. When we had gone a few steps, there [came] a more chilly, unpleasant, and fetid wind than any description of stench that I have ever heard of in the world. When we went farther ahead, I saw such darkness that one could have been grasped it with one’s hand. And I felt such fetid odors that I fainted every time I inhaled. I saw a place like a black well from which thick smoke came out. I saw that it was so narrow that one could only enter with difficulty. And I saw the inhabitants of hell, each one seated in a cave in the dark and the darkness of the place was so dense that each person could imagine that he was imprisoned there alone, and that no one except him was so afflicted. They were tortured and sad and shouted loudly. However, not one [of them] came to the help of [any] of the others, because there was darkness all around them and there was no way to come out. It was like a well where each one was punished and tortured in this manner. Each newly arrived soul who came into that place supposed that the place was a mountain, because they [snakes and scorpions] were all asleep one [on top of] the other. And the wicked soul was thrown into the
center. And the one stung him, and the other one tore him to pieces and bit him just as a wolf eats bones.

[The Twenty-ninth Episode]

Arrival at the Place of the Sodomites

Afterwards, Surūṣ the truthful and Urdībīhišt the Holy Immortal led me with ease [146a] into that dark place. When I looked I saw souls whose bodies were like the body of a snake and heads like the head of men, and they were walking in hell in this manner. I asked Surūṣ the truthful and Urdībīhišt the Holy Immortal: “Whose souls are these who are like a snake?” Surūṣ the truthful said: “These are the souls of sodomites and debauchees who have indulged in sodomy and debauchery in that world. Now, their souls are snake-like.”

[The Thirtieth Episode]

Arrival at and Sight of a Woman who did not care properly for her menses

And we left that place and we reached another place. I saw the soul of a woman who held a bowl full of the blood and feces in her hands. And she was beaten with a stick and was frightened and out of fear she was eating it. And, when she had eaten [it] up, they filled [the bowl] again and frightened her once more until she ate it again. Then I asked Surūṣ the truthful: “What sin has this woman committed?” Surūṣ the truthful said: “In that world this woman was not careful at the time of her menses, and she did not tend to herself, and approached water and fire and has spread the uncleanliness of menstruation. Now, she is a captive of this severe torment, dread and fear.”

[The Thirty-first Episode]

Arrival at the Place of the Soul of a Man who killed a Righteous Man

We passed that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who had been hung up by one leg. And, they were flaying the skin of his head with a knife, and he was shouting and crying. And, they were flaying him in that manner and he was shouting and crying for help. And I asked Surūṣ the truthful and Urdībīhišt the Holy Immortal: “What sin has this man committed?” Surūṣ the truthful said: “This man is the one who has killed a righteous man. Now, they are demanding retribution from him.”
[The Thirty-second Episode]

Arrival at the Place of a Man who had Sexual Intercourse with a Woman during her menses

We passed beyond that place and arrived at another place. I saw the soul of a man who had been thrown down and they were filling his mouth with the menstrual blood of women and the man begged for protection. And I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin has this man committed?” Surūš the truthful said: “He has had sexual intercourse with a woman during her menses. Now he is being punished for it.”

[The Thirty-third Episode]

The Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at the Place of People who did not fasten the kuštī (sacred girdle)

We passed that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who shouted and said: “I am dying of hunger. For God’s sake give me bread and water.” And he was tearing the skin and flesh of his body and eating [them]. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin has this man committed?” Surūš the truthful said: “These are the people who in that world did not tie the kuštī (sacred girdle) and they were the ones who went running about with one shoe and they have eaten bread, water and fruits while speaking [and] they did not recite the vāj and Xwardād amšāspand (Xwardād the Holy Immortal) and Murdād amšāspand (Murdād the Holy Immortal) were offended by them. Now they are being punished in that they are dying of hunger and thirst.”

[The Thirty-fourth Episode]

Arrival at the Place of a Woman who was a Prostitute

And we passed beyond that place. We went up to another place. I saw the soul of a woman who was suspended by her breasts, and snakes, scorpions, and other vermin were swiftly biting and tearing her, and she was crying for help. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal: “What sin did this woman commit?” They replied: “This woman left her husband and become a prostitute in that world. Now she is being punished in this sign.”

[The Thirty-fifth Episode]

Arrival at the Place of People who were sinful

And after that, we passed beyond that place and reached another place. I saw a crowd of people who were being torn [apart] and eaten by vermin, biting insects, wolves, lions, snakes and scorpions. I asked Surūš the truthful
[146b] and Urðibihīšt the Holy Immortal: “What sin did these people commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “They are the people who in that world did not tie the sacred girdle and they are those who have walked about with one boot on and those who made water standing up. Now all of them are being punished in the same way.”

[The Thirty-sixth Episode]

**The Arrival of Ardā at the Place of a Woman who did not obey the commands of her Husband**

And we passed that place and we went on to another place. I saw the soul of a woman who was suspended upside down and her tongue had been pulled out at the nape [of her neck]. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this woman commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This woman talked back to her husband, and did not obey her husband’s command and whatever her husband said she answered him insolently. She despised her husband, and cursed her husband. She is being submitted to the punishment that you see.”

[The Thirty-seventh Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of a Man who shortweighted the items he sold**

We passed that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who went with a bucket and weighed soil and vermin and ate them. And each time he ate less they beat him with a stick so that he would eat again. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “In that world, this man kept his weight and balance two times less and his [bushel] basket two times less than [stipulated] by law. The milk he sold to others was mixed with water. Now they are subjecting him to this punishment because of the many things that he stole from people through deception and lies.

[The Thirty-eighth Episode]

**The Arrival of Ardā at the Place of the Tyrant Kings**

Then we passed that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who had been suspended. And seventy daemons were standing [there], each one holding a viper in his hand and beating him [with it]. The vipers were biting and tearing away the flesh from his limbs. He was shrieking. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “In that world this man was a cruel king and an oppressor. He engaged in extortion against the people. And his people suffered because of him. He wounded, beat, and tortured his people. Now he is receiving this punishment that you see.”
[The Thirty-ninth Episode]

**The arrival of Ardā at the Place of the Talebearer**

And we passed beyond there and arrived at another place. I saw the soul of a man whose tongue had fallen out of his mouth. And snakes and scorpions were suspended to his tongue and pulling it and eating it. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This man was a talebearer in that world and embroiled people in quarrels and caused warfare and hostility between people. Now they are giving him his punishment.”

[The Fortieth Episode]

**The Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at the Place of the one who killed Animals**

And we passed beyond there and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man whose limbs were being dismembered and he was shouting. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This is the soul of one who unjustly killed many quadrupeds and animals in that world.”

[The Forty-first Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of a Man who accumulated Wealth and Riches but did not use it for Religion**

When we passed beyond that place and reached another place I saw the soul of a man who was being tortured from head to foot. And a thousand daemons were guarding him. And each moment they submitted him to a new [form of] torture. And, under the [pressure of] the torture he was shouting and crying out. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Who is this man whose punishment is so harsh?” [147a] Surūš the truthful said: “He was a miserly-minded individual during his lifetime, and he accumulated a great deal of wealth and riches, but he did not use it for himself nor did he give to others, nor distribute it for worshiping the gods nor did he divide it among virtuous and worthy men. He accumulated it, piled it up and saved it. Now others have taken his wealth and [only] this punishment and torture remain for this ill-fated one.” I commiserated very much with his soul because he was tormented in this world and the next.

[The Forty-second Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of Idlers**

And then we passed beyond that place and arrived at another place. I saw the
soul of a man whose whole body was in hell except for one foot which was outside. And the vermin were not inflicting bites on that one foot. I asked Surūš the truthful: “Whose soul is this?” Surūš the truthful: “This is the soul of a man whose name was Davānūš. He was so lazy that he had never done a good deed except for his one foot; it once kicked some grass in front of a sheep. Now as a reward for that his one foot is outside of hell, and all the rest of his body is in hell and the vermin are eating [it].

[The Forty-third Episode]

Arrival at the Place of Liars

And we passed beyond that place and we reached another place. I saw the soul of a man whose tongue had been pulled out of his mouth, and a stone had been placed under it, and they were pounding on top of his tongue with another very large stone. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This is the soul of a liar. And because of the lies this man used to tell many people were caused anguish and many people experienced injury.”

[The Forty-fourth Episode]

Arrival at the Place of a Woman who injured the Fetus and then aborted it

Then we left there and went on to another place. I saw the soul of a woman who was digging in a mountain with her breasts. Every hour a millstone was rolled over her breasts, and her breasts were being crushed to pieces, and the woman was crying out. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībīšt the Holy Immortal: “What sin did this woman commit?” they replied: “This woman injured the fetus and then aborted it.”

[The Forty-fifth Episode]

Arrival at the Place of one who has given Evidence Falsely

Then we passed beyond that place. We reached another place. I saw the soul of a man whose limbs were being eaten by worms. I asked Surūš the truthful: What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This man has given false witness, and because of it the wealth of the virtuous has become the daily sustenance of the unworthy. His fortune has been taken away by others, but this miserable one has been left to undergo this punishment.”
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[The Forty-sixth Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of a Man who accumulated Prohibited Wealth**

We passed beyond that place and arrived at another place. I saw the soul of a man who was eating the brain of a corpse. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This man amassed prohibited possessions and wealth. Now he has left the riches and wealth in [their] place and he is being punished here; he is alone, helpless and forlorn.”

[The Forty-seventh Episode]

**The Arrival of Ardā at the Place of the Hypocrite**

Then we passed beyond that place and arrived at another place. I saw a crowd of people whose bodies were putrefied, and their faces had turned yellow and there were worms in their limbs, and the worms came out of their limbs. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urđībihišt the Holy Immortal: “Who are these people who have become like this?” They said: “These are the souls of heretics and hypocrites who have held something in their hearts but have orally declared something else. And they have deceived people, and caused them to turn away from the way of the dīn-i bih-i mazdayasnān (pure religion of the Mazda-worshipers) to other beliefs and they have made manifest bad faiths and religions in the world.” Thus they spoke and we passed from that place.

[The Forty-eighth Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of one who killed Dogs**

We reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who was being torn apart by a dog, and piece after piece was thrown in front of him, and all the members of his body were being dismembered one from the other, and he was shouting and crying. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This is the soul of a man who killed beavers, sheepdogs and watchdogs. He did not feed his dog nor did he take good care of him. Now he is undergoing the punishment that you see.”

[The Forty-ninth Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of a Woman who did not properly dispose of her nails and hair**

And afterwards we left that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a woman who was surrounded by guardians. They had grasped her by the hair and were pulling her in the ice and snow and beating her with a stick. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urđībihišt the Holy Immortal: “What sin did
"What sin did this woman commit?" They said: “This woman combed her hair over the fire and threw [strands] into the fire and did not properly dispose of her nails. And she sat over the fire whilst having no underwear.”

[The Fiftieth Episode]

Arrival at the Place of the female Witches
And then we left that place and we reached another place. I saw a woman who was cutting off the flesh of her body with a knife and eating [it]. I asked Šūrūš the truthful: “What sin did this woman commit?” Šūrūš the truthful said: “This woman practiced magic and taught witchcraft. She herself would do it and she told others to do it for her. She was occupied with this.”

[The Fifty-first Episode]

Arrival at the Place of a Man who did not properly dispose of filth
And then we passed by that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who was being given human blood, flesh and excrement to eat. I asked Šūrūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Šūrūš the truthful said: “This man did not take proper care with excrement, corpses, filth, hair, and nails in that world; a little was left which fell into the water and the fire. His body was unclean and dirty, and he did not undergo the baršnūm (the major purification ritual) and in that way he died unclean.”

[The Fifty-second Episode]

The Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at another Place
And then we passed beyond that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who was eating the flesh and skin of people, and he was shouting and crying. I asked Šūrūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Šūrūš the truthful said: “This man took back the wages of hired laborers, and stole people’s profits.”

[The Fifty-third Episode]

Arrival at the Place of a man who committed Adultery with someone else’s wife
Then we left that place and went on to another place. I saw a man who was carrying a mountain on his back and walked in pain. He tried to stop, but they frightened him so that he went on walking laboriously and with pain. I asked Šūrūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Šūrūš the truthful said: “This man committed adultery with other people’s wives; he seduced other people’s wives.”
[The Fifty-fourth Episode]

**The Arrival of Ardāy-Vīrāf at the Place of the People who went to the Bathhouse in a state of defilement**

And then we left that place and reached another place. I saw a crowd of people all of whom were sitting in ice and frozen up to their necks; a bowl full of human blood and human hair had been placed in front of each one. And they were beaten until they ate it. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did these people commit?” Surūš the truthful said: [148a] “These people went to the bath-house as unbelievers. And Isfandārmad the Holy Immortal and the god of fire and water were injured by them because they have defiled their souls.”

[The Fifty-fifth Episode]

**Arrival at the Place of a Man who has seized People’s Land**

Then we went past that place and we reached another place. I saw the soul of a man upon whose back a mountain had been placed, and he was shouting and crying beneath the mountain. I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “He imposed a heavy tax on people’s land and devised new ones, so that people became refugees in their native villages and homes and fell into poverty. Because of the heavy tax they were not able to stay on their own lands.

[The Fifty-sixth Episode]

**Ardāy-Vīrāf’s Arrival at the Place of a Man who stole the Land of the People**

Then we passed beyond that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man who was digging a mountain with his nails. And guardians were standing beside him and they were beating him with vipers, and he was shouting. I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībīhišt the Holy Immortal: “What sin did this man commit?” They replied: “He has tampered with the boundaries of people’s land and added to the boundaries of his own land. As long as that land remains there they will punish him in this way over and over again.

[The Fifty-seventh Episode]

**Ardāy-Vīrāf’s Arrival at the Place of the Man who broke his Promise and Contract**

And then we passed beyond that place and reached another place. I saw the soul of a man the flesh of whose body was being scratched by an iron comb just like hair being combed by a comb, and he was crying and lamenting.
And, I asked Surūš the truthful: “What sin did this man commit?” Surūš the truthful said: “This man untruthfully made a promise, treaty and promised protection and then broke his promise.”

[The Fifty-eighth Episode]

The Arrival of Ardā at the Place of people who committed breach of contract

And then we left that place and reached another place. I saw souls who were being struck with arrows and stones. And I asked Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal: “What sin did these people commit?” They said: “They have all committed breach of contract, either with coreligionists or with unbelievers. They thought that it would not be a sin to commit breach of contract with unbelievers. They did not know that it is the same to commit breach of contract with coreligionists or with unbelievers. Thus until now they have been undergoing this kind of punishment.”

[The Fifty-ninth Episode]

Ardā-Vīrāf’s Arrival back at the Luminous Paradise

And then Surūš the truthful and Urdībihišt the Holy Immortal brought me out of that dark and narrow place and led me to gurūmān (Paradise).

[The Sixtieth Episode]

Ardā-Vīrāf’s Arrival at the Audience-hall of the Most High God

And when I reached that place, I saw the glory and increasing magnificence of Ohrmazd the Creator. And however much I tried to pay homage to the glory and splendor of God, I remained stupefied and incapable; I could not say a word. I heard a voice [saying]: “O Ardā-Vīrāf, turn back and go to your own city, because some people are anxious about you. For seven days and nights no one has rested, and they are listening to hear what message you will bring. Whatever you have seen, tell the whole truth! Be careful not to tell lies, because I see you in person!”

And when I heard that voice, I prostrated myself and then, because of the luminosity, I could not see anything more.

And then I heard again the voice which was saying: “O Ardā-Vīrāf, tell the people that there is [only] one right way in the world, and every other way except that one lead one astray! And tell people that they should never turn their backs on religion, not when wealth and gifts are plentiful and not when they are in affliction and pain! They should not turn their back to the religion and constantly [148b] keep the faith and true intention and be of good thought and good deed. And they should keep their hearts steadfast and undoubting in the religion of Ohrmazd of Good Increase and the
prophethood of Zarathustra Sfântamân; and that is beneficence. And, say to others: “Do not forget the pure religion of the Mazda-worshipers in this world and in that world, and don’t refrain from it! Tomorrow repentance is of no benefit and you will not be born again to exercise virtue in order to gain rewards. And wake up from your sleep of neglect!”

These were the conditions as demonstrated by the Most High God.

May God keep us from all misfortunes and punishments, and maintain us in the good and pure religion of the Mazda-worshipers. May He keep the evil of Ahîrmân away from me and may He preserve us from being ashamed among people. May the magic of Ahîrmân and the accursed Daemons not come in our way, because the good and evil of this world will come to an end. If it were good and if it were bad, it will not last, and sorrow and repentance will not be profitable in the Other World.

I am penitent and regretful, ajaś and axaś, of all the sins that I have committed intentionally or unintentionally.

The book of [Ardāy]-Vīrāf Nāma was finished on the second day of Murdād-māh-i qādīm in the year of 896 [A.Y. = 1527 A.D.].

* * *

[It was finished auspiciously and in prosperity, the editing of the Zoroastrian Persian version in prose of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma, far away from the motherland and the father house, in Uppsala in Sweden, on Thursday, the day of Ohrmazd of Farvardîn, the Naurūz (new day) of the first day of the spring of the year 1377 Yazdgirdî, equal to Solar year 1387 and March twentieth of 2008 A.D.

The text was edited according to manuscript N (T.30), belonging to Meherji Rana Library, in Navsari in India, and collated with manuscript P (S.P.47), belonging to Bibliothèque Nationale, in Paris in France, N² (F.44), belonging to Meherji Rana Library, in Navsari in India, M (Z.73‘H.28‘), belonging to the Staatsbibliothek, in München in Germany, O (Bodl.Or.719), belonging to Bodleian Library, in Oxford in England, and L (No.830), belonging to British Museum Library, in London in England.

The edited text was produced with the assistance of my professors, Mrs. Carina Jahani and Mr. Bo Utas. It is my hope that it will be useful for others.

Uppsala, Dariush Kargar, son of Yahyâ and Khadija]
VII. Commentary

The following notes have been written to elucidate three topics; firstly, to explain the usage of variant words and terms in different manuscripts, and the reason for selecting a special word or term in an edited text; secondly, to explain the names that have been mentioned in the text; and, finally, to explain some words and terms used in the text.

The numbers at the beginning of each note refers to the number(s) of the line(s) in the Zoroastrian Persian edited text. Since the basis of this research is the Zoroastrian Persian version and its edited text, the notes and explanations refer to this text.

1. In the N manuscript, which is the original manuscript for this edition, the first line of the text is written on folio 138b. After the first line and at the beginning of the next folio (139a) a pale shadow of some words in the middle of the page can be observed. Probably, judging from the position of these words, they are an invocation of God’s name. If this invocation is really a heading, it may be written in coloured ink, because it is hardly visible in the microfilm. In some other the Zoroastrian Persian texts in this same N manuscript the invocation is found as "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِيمِ الْمَجْنُوْنِ " "بَنَامِ الْبَارِئِ الْمِجْنُوْنِ الْكَرِي..."
merciful”, which is an Arabic invocation of the name of God. However, some equivalents for these two longer invocations are also found in Parsig. For example, one can refer to the heading of Rivāyat-i Hāmīt-i Āswahištān, at the beginning of the book: pad nām ī dādār ī weh ī azbōnī ī kirbakkar which means “In the name of the good, bountiful, beneficent Creator” (REA 1980: I.1). With regard to this matter Goldziher (1909: 666-668 → Shaked 1995: XII.153-154) has written that the Arabic invocation bismillah-i raḥmān-ī raḥīm has its origin in Jewish and Christians sources. Contrary to this, Gignoux (1979: 159-163) believes that the Arabic invocation bismillah-i raḥmān-ī raḥīm originates from the same Iranian-Parsig pad nām ī yazdān (Shaked 1995: XII.159-163).

It is not possible to use the the basic manuscript N (the archetype) to establish the original reading of the “invocation of God’s name” because it is not readable. On the other hand, it is not also possible to follow the reading of a majority of the manuscripts, because among these six manuscripts, the heading in five cases is readable; but among them there are not even two similar invocations. Due to this, we assume that it is possible that the “invocation of God’s name” in the text of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma of manuscript N may be the same as in most texts of this manuscript “In the name of merciful, beneficent, compassionate, righteous God”, this invocation is preferred in the present edition.

2. The name of the work is not mentioned at the beginning of the text in manuscript N, but in the old list of contents (without page number on folio 06a) of this same manuscript, “Ardāy-Vīrāf” is given as one of the works. In the new list of contents of this manuscript, following that ancient list in the microfilm, a different name of the work is given, namely: kai- fīyyat-i ardā-vīrā vā zartušt piš-ī dādār īrāmād ham-pursī šud az avval tā rastxīz-i kai- fīyyat-i dīn “How Ardā-Vīrā and Zarathustra discussed the religion from the beginning of the creation to the resurrection in front of the righteous Ohrmazd” (3a). In fact, this is a mixture of the name of two works “The Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma” and “Zarathustra visits Ohrmazd”.

3. Several works of Zoroastrian Persian literature begin with this same formulation; for example Jāṃsp-Nāma (MS. 276: 1b) and Ulāmāy-i islām ba dīgar raviš “The learned men of Islam, by another method” (MS.S.P.1022: 53b).

4. In all manuscripts there is an expression dar bar-i paigām. Mu‘īn (1946: 58) has emended that to a new expression durūd bar paigāmbar “greeting to the prophet”. He has done his editing ac-

164 There are various versions of Jāṃsp-Nāma in different languages. The narration in this case is a Zoroastrian Persian version of which several manuscripts exist in different libraries, among them there is manuscript number 276 in National Consultative Assembly (Majlis-i șūrā-yi Millī) (I‘tīsāmī 1933: 2.92).
cording to the introduction of manuscript M (= H28), which was published by Haug and West, and has changed this expression to “درود بر پیامبر ما” “/g941/g1006/g920/g947/g937» durūd bar paḵāmar-i mā “greeting to our prophet”. But, attention must be paid to the fact that the word «/g938/g937/m/g407» in this expression belongs to the next sentence, the beginning of which is «/g938/g913/amā ba’d, where the first word has been written as «/g910/g995/amā» instead of «/g910/g995/g909/amā».

5. It is surprising to find the expression «/g938/g913/g910/g995/g909/m/g407» at the beginning of a Zoroastrian Persian work. This expression is not found in any other Zoroastrian Persian work, whereas it is very common right after the introduction in a great number of Iranian-Islamic works.

6. Ardašīr son of Bābak (the first Ardašīr) is the first Sasanid king who ruled between 224 and 240 A.D. and died in 242 A.D. (Wiesehöfer 1996: 316).

6-7. According to the text the ninety kings who were killed by Ardašīr were the same as the kings appointed to rule over Iran by Alexander, as mentioned in the Bundahišn: “Then, in this millennium, appeared Artakshāsp [Ardašīr] son of Pābak; he killed those petty-rulers, organised the empire, promoted the Revelation of Mazdā-worship, and established many religious usages which went down to his dynasty” (IraBd 1956: XXXIII.15). Tansar’s letter has confirmed this as well (Mīnāvī 1975: 48; Boyce 1968’c’: 29): “Ardašīr seized him together with ninety other descendants of kings enthroned by Alexander. Some he put to death by the sword, others through captivity”. 166 Farzānī Bahram, the author of Šarīstān-i cāhār-čaman recalls the sovereignty of these ninety kings as well “[Alexander] divided Iran and he turned ninety persons of those in command, who were called Pādshāh (king) and in Arabic Mulūk-ul-tawāyif, into rulers and commanders” (Modi 1932’b’: 100).

8. »/g941/g1006/g920/g947/g937« dast/g460r “authority”, pl. »/g997/g909/g941/g1006/g920/g947/g937« (dast/g460r/g407n), (Parsig: dastwar). dastūr is a Zoroastrian spiritual authority who has the authorization to judge and to pronounce religious jurisprudence. Dēnkard

8. »/g193/g89/g128/g204/g139/g127/g89/m/g448/mowbad«, pl. »/g997/g909/g193/g89/g127/g93/g89/g127/g76/g196/g90/g192/g93/g89/g129/g89/g128/g168/g191/g89/g124/g204/g191/g89/g124/g203/g123/g79/g90/g187/g128/g167/g193« (Modi 1932’b’: 99).
Nowadays, Zoroastrians call all spiritual authorities of Zoroastrianism mūbad (Üišdari 1992: 208).

8-28. The theme of this part and a section of the fourth book of Dēnkard are similar: Here Ardašīr Bābakān, guided by his minister Tūsar/Tansar, decided to gather all the dispersed teachings of the Avesta from every part of the country to his court. After him, Šapūr I (reign: 270-272 A.D.) son of Ardašīr, ordered various books of different sciences, that were dispersed to be collected and attached to the Avesta, and to make two copies of the whole work. After him, Šapūr II (reign: 309-379 A.D.) son of Hūrmizd, called together all learned-men of the country to argue and do research [about various matters]. Then, he proclaimed that the knowledge about religion is already perfected, so no ill-religion [it seems that he means diverging branches of Zoroastrianism] will be accepted afterwards (DkM 1911: 412-413).°

9. «dīn» means “the religious canon of Zoroastrianism” in this line and several other lines as well, for example, 25, 26, 27, 28.

10. »Zārtušt« (Avestan: Zarašt-, Parsig: Zar-tušt/Zardušt/Zardu[x]st, Greek: Zoroaster) is the name of the prophet of Zoroastrianism. This name has several different forms in New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian, among them: »Zardušt, «Zartušt, «Zardhušt, »Zartušt-i and «Zarātušt. This name is given as Zartušt in line 10, and as Zaratušt in lines 26, 35 and 925.

10. »'alīya« is an incorrect spelling of the word «'alī« “high ranking”. The original translator or the copyist of the text has probably written this word «'alī» in the original manuscript, since 'alī, with vowelization like «fā’iil), is a masculine form of this adjective meaning high-ranking: «Zartušt-i 'alīy “the high-ranking Zarathustra”. But a later scribe, very likely due to his little knowledge of the Arabic language, has supposed that 'alīy is a synonym of 'alīya, so he wrote the word in this form, although 'alīya is the feminine form of this adjective.° While editing the introduction of the M (H28) manuscript, Mu’in has changed the adjective to «'alay-hi-s-salām “Peace be upon to him”.

15. »šāhān šāh «the king of kings”. This word is written as MLKAn MLKMr (huzwārišn) in the Parsig texts, but read šāhān šāh. It also appears written in contracted form as šāhānsāh (in lines 15 and 161) and »šahanšāh (in manuscript N², in the footnotes 66 and 1135).

17. »Aivist« is the name of the sacred book of the Zoroastrians called the Avesta. There is no indication of the original name of the Avestan language, and the word “Avesta” is never mentioned in the Avestan texts either. It is mentioned as abestāg in Parsig, and as «Aivist and »Aivistāq abistāq

168 This is the same function that Ardašīr son of Bābak has according to the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma.

169 Thanks to Mr. ‘Ali Muhaddis for mentioning this point to me.
in Arabic, as well as in several different forms in New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian, among them: «Avistā, »Vistā, »Afistā and »Bistāh (Tafazzulī 1997: 35).

17. »zand it is equal to Zand in Parsig. The word zand means “commentary”. In Zoroastrianism, zand means translating the Avesta into Parsig, which often provides a commentary as well. It might have been translated into the Parsig language in Sasanid times, probably due to the fact that the Avestan language had been forgotten. Today, the only available sections of the Zand of Avesta are Yasna, Vispard, Widewdād, Xwurdag Abestāg, Ḥerbedestān, Neyrangestān and Aogmādačā.

22. »pahrxta is equal to pahrxtąg in Parsig, which conveys two meanings; firstly, it means “educated” and is used in the 21st line with this meaning. Another meaning of the underlying verb is “to avoid, to refrain from”, used in the negative form, that is »na- pahrxta, in 602nd line and all other lines in the text.

22. »manišn is equal to menišnįg in Parsig, which means “thought”. »göwišnįg (Parsig: kunišnįg) means “word”. »kunišnįg (Parsig: kunišnįg) means “deed”.

26. »Ürmazd, (Parsig: Ūrmazd, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: »hürmazd, »hurmuz), is one of the two incipient spirits of the world, called » (Avestan spəntō. maįnu-) (Yasna XLV.2) and the creator of all goodness of the world and of the cosmos. He, who is the symbol of the light and luminosity, always fights against evil and darkness, which are the symbols of Ahriman (the Devil). On Resurrection Day, at the end of the 12 thousand years lifetime of the world, the combat will come to its end by the victory of Ohrmazd and all goodness.

26. »din-i Ürmazd, means the rules established by Ohrmazd in Zoroastrianism, i.e. “the religious canon of Zoroastrianism”.

29-31. » kas in xabar bāz natavānad dādan illā ān ki az avval-i ʿumr-i hašt-sālagī tā ba-daän vaqt ki raśīda bāšad ḫīq gunāh nakarda bāšad v in mard viřāf ast “No one is able to provide this information except the one who has not committed a sinful deed from the beginning of his eighth year to the age he has now reached. And this man is Viřāf”. It is likely that the text is lacking some parts here. According to the text thus far, Ardašir’s motive of gathering those forty thousand men is to collect religious sayings to distinguish between pure and false, and as a result, cause diversities in Zoroastrianism to disappear. But there is no sign of sending anyone to the Other World. The final six selected ones just mention a suitable man who will bring information, whereas there is no word formerly about sending anyone who is able to bring information.

33. »yazišn “worship”. In manuscripts NPMO, it is written yazišn and yazišn-hā in most cases throughout the manuscript, and only in a few
cases yazīš and yazīš-hā. But in N² there is a total mixture of the forms yazīš / yazīš-hā and yazīšn / yazīšn-hā. Variants of this word have not been given in the footnotes in order to avoid too much repetition.

33. yazīš is equal to yazīšn in Parsig. This word means “worship” and “praise”. It is used in verb form as yazīš-sāxtan “making yazīš” (in 41 and several other lines), yazīš-kardan “performing/doing yazīš” (57 and other lines) and yazīšn-farmūdan “saying yazīšn” (384 and other lines).

yazīš is a kind of worshipping ceremony, performed in front of the holy fire in the fire-temple. During the ceremony, all of the 72 Yasna are recited by two mūbadhs (priests).

yazīšn is a general name for all worshipping rites.

33. Nairang (Parsig: nīrang) means “charm”, “incantation” and “spell”. This is the name of some stanzas of the Avesta, uttered as powerful words either to have an impact for healing or to break the power of the demons in Zoroastrianism. The word nairang means “ritual/ceremony” in Parsig as well as in Zoroastrian Persian (Boyce 1991: 284-285).

38. For dargāh-i ādarān. The Parsis write ādar and āzarān (orthographically ādar and ādarān). This word has perhaps been in an orthographical form as āzarān in the original manuscript written in Iran. In Zoroastrianism, there are three kinds of fire, which by the order of importance are: Ātaš Bahrām (the fire of Bahrām), Ātaš Ādarān (the fire of Ādarān) and Ātaš Dādgāh (the fire of Dādgāh). To light Ātaš Ādarān, four kinds of home fires are used, and it is a much simpler ceremony to worship this fire than the Ātaš Bahrām (Modi 1932’a’: 154-155, 162-163; Boyce 1968’b’: 52). Dargāh-i ādarān means “the court or the threshold of Ādarān”, which is, in fact, the same as “the fire place for the fire of Ādarān”.

40. Ātašgāh. The meaning of this word is either “the stony brazier in which they kindle the holy fire” or “fire-temple”.

44. Pataft (Avestan: paitita-, Parsig: pātīt, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: pataft or pītīt, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: pataft or pītīt, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: pītīt, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: pītīt), means “confession” and “penitence” and is written taubat in the Šaddar Nafr (SDN 1909: LXV.1). A Zoroastrian person confesses his sins in front of a dastūr to purify his spirit. During the pītīt ceremony, a pītīt stanza must be read. There are four kinds of pītīt-nāmag in the Zoroastrian literature in Parsig and Pazand: pītīt i pāšimānth (confession for penitence) or pītīt i Ādurbād, xwād pītīt (confession for the self), pītīt i ʾerānī (Iranian confession), pītīt i widaragān (confession for the dead) or pītīt i rawānīg (confession for the spirit) (Widengren 1965: 265-267). All these pītīt-nāmags originate from the Avesta 681. In the Parsig version, Vīrāf’s sisters asks the priests not to send their brother to the Other World. Although in the Zoroastrian Persian version it is the dastūrs, who reply to Vīrāf’s sisters, it does not seem that the sisters are talking to the dastūrs, since the sisters three times use a sg. second per-
son form of the verb in their statements to the person spoken to: «aknuš šuma ā rā ba-dān jahān xwāhī firistād “now you will send him to the Other World”, and » va mā rā yasīr bixwāhī kardan “and you will make us unprotected (yasīr)” and az pidar va mādar judā šudīm va az barādar niz-imān judā xwāhī kardan “we have become separated from our parents and now you will also be separate us from our brother”. Due to this, it seems that they are talking to the king Ardašir. It is true that the sisters use the plural pronoun «šuma “you” three times in their statements, but it must be considered that they are talking to the king and therefore may not be permitted to address him by the sg. pronoun «tū. In the poetic version of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma, versified by Zartušt Bahram Pajdü, Vīrāf’s sisters directly beg the king, not the dastūr, to refrain from sending their brother to the Other World (Zartušt Bahrām Pajdı 1964: vv. 535-540). Haug and West hold it probable that this same prose version of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma may be the original source for Zartušt Bahram Pajdü’s versification (Haug and West 1872: xix). If so, there must be a mistake on the part of the scribes not to mention the name of the king in connection with the sisters’ statements.

49. «yasīr. This word is not mentioned in any of the dictionaries. However, in the Persian dialect of Hamadan one whose mother has died is called yasīr. This word is generally an adjunct to the word «yatīm (fatherless/orphan): thus yatīm-yasīr means one who has lost both his father and mother, that is, one who has no one to protect him. In view of Vīrāf’s sister’s statement, it seems that in this context the word yasīr means ‘lacking a protector’.

55-58. The king and the army guard the fire-temple in order to prevent any heretic or hypocrite to throw something damaging at Vīrāf. This same theme can be found in dāstān-i paydā-kardan-i kiyūmart (gayūmart) “The myth of how Kiyūmart (Gayūmart) was found”. Ohrmazd creates the body of Gayūmart at the top of the Alburz Mountain. Then he makes seven Holy Amšīspandān “Immortals” (six Immortals plus Surūs or six Immortals plus Vahrām (Bahram)?) watch it carefully, lest Ahīman gain control over it and do something wrong or cause any damage to it which would destroy it (MS.S.P.1191: 138b-139b).

56. «ašmūq or «ašmūg (Parsig: ahlāmūy), means “heretic” or “atheist” in Zoroastrianism.

57. «mumāfiq means “hypocrite”, “a person whose words and thoughts are not as the same as that which he pretends”.

58. «izāfa. The letter «i is used to indicate the presence of an izāfa.

60. «rūy-band, “face-veil” or “mask of the mouth”. This word is a translated from the Parsig word padām which is written in Persian «بند». That is a kind of textile that Zoroastrian priests cover their mouth
and nose with to prevent the holy fire from being polluted by their breath while worshipping (Baqiri 1985: 146-153).

The word *panām* is written under the word *rūy-band* in the N² manuscript.

61. **«سی‌هی‌که‌واره» sī-hakē “one third”. It is written as *sī-hakē* in the NPO manuscripts. *sī-hakē* is a kind of wine that is condensed into one third, i.e. two thirds of which has evaporated and only one third of which is remaining. Compound words with this word as one element are **«سی‌هی‌که‌واره» sī-hakē-xwār (one who drinks this kind of wine), **«سی‌هی‌که‌واره» sī-hakē-xwārah (habitually drunken with this kind of wine) and **«سی‌هی‌که‌واره» sī-hakē-fūrūs (wine-seller, especially of this kind of wine). Another name for this kind of wine is **«شَرَاب» sharāb-i mottalāt (Mu‘in 1984: 3.1980).

Since, during the *Yasna* ceremony, the **«درَون» (bread) and butter were used as symbols of the world of animals, Haug and West have read **«سی» sī (three) as **«پِی» pīya (fat) which they assumed was placed upon one of those *drōn*-breads. They thus supposed that this was a part of the *Yasna* worshipping ceremony and omitted the word **«سی‌هی‌که‌واره» sī-hakē (one) (Haug-West 1872: xvii).

61. **«دَرَون» (Avestan: draonah-, Parsig: drōn) or rather **«فرِنْدَان» nān-i *dārūn* is a kind of sanctified bread made from wheat flour in a round shape with nine cutting lines on the surface. The ceremony in which it plays a role is also known by the same name, i.e. *dārūn*.

61. **«یاشتَان» yaštan (Parsig: yaštān) means “to pray”, “to worship” “to consecrate”.

61. **«دَرَون یاشتَان» darūn-yaštān “worshipping the sanctified bread”. **«یاشتَان درَون» yašt-i *dārūn* is the ceremony of praying and thanksgiving to the gods, while *Yasna*: ḥā 8, is being sung (Boyce and Kotwal 1971: 56).

Obviously it was a custom in pre-Zoroastrian Iran to say prayers for milk and bread. According to the *Wiẓādagīhā i Zādspram* (The selections of Zād-spram) when Zarathustra was a child, his father provided a bowl of milk and asked a celebrated priest called Dūrisraw to say prayers for it (*WZad* 1993: XII.2).

63. **«هماتِمانیشَن» humat-manišna. *humat* (Parsig: humat) means “good thought”, that is, one of the three fundamental principles of Zoroastrianism. *manišna* (Parsig: menišnīg) is a form of **«منیش» maniš “thought”. Thus, *humat-manišna* means “having good thought”. This word is used as **«منیش» maniš in line 22 and as *manišna* in lines 63 and 254.

64. **«هوخت گویشَن» hūxt-gūvišna. *hūxt* (Parsig: hūxt), means “good word”, that is, one of the three fundamental principles of Zoroastrianism. *gūvišna* (Parsig: gūvišnī) means “speeking”. Thus, *hūxt-gūvišna* means “speeking good words”. This word is used as **«گویش» gūvišn in line 22, as gūvišna in line 64 and as **«گویش» gūvišna in line 254.

63-66. As has been indicated in the text, there is a connection between the drinking of the three bowls of wine and good thought, good word and good deed, which is also mentioned in lines 108-113. This connection will be con-
continued by ascending three steps towards heaven in the Other World. However, this connection is not specific for Ardāy-Virāf and his journey. In Bahman Punjīyih’s Rivāyat there is a story called Ḥikāyat dar bāb-i xwār-dan-i may-ī ĥalāl va Ĥaram ba qā’idi-yi dīn “The Anecdote about Drinking Religiously Permissible Wine or Prohibited Wine”. It recommends people to drink three bowls of wine with a mind set on good thought in order for good deed to multiply in the body. It also gives the advice to drink three bowls with a mind set on good thought, good word and good deed to overcome the demons (Unvālā 1922: 1.270-271).

66. » /hūvaršt varzišn/ huvaršt (Parsig: hūwaršt), means “good deed”, that is, one of the fundamental principles of Zoroastrianism, too. varzišn (Parsig: warzišn), means “to put into practice”. Thus, hūvaršt-varzišn means “doing good deeds”. » /kūnišn/ kūnišn (Parsig: kūnišn) also means “deed”. This meaning is expressed with » /nik-kūnišna/ nik-kūnišna in line 22, as varzišn in line 66 and as » /nik-kūnišna/ nik-kūnišna in line 255.

It is necessary to point out that humat-manišna, hūxt-gūvišna and hūvaršt-varzišn, are used instead of the three phrases » /nik-manišna/ nik-manišna, » /nik-gūvišna/ nik-gūvišna and » /nik-kūnišna/ nik-kūnišna.

69-73. At the beginning of the text, it is said that forty thousand people have come together in the court. However, all the people who say praise and keep guard around Virāf are altogether 36,400 persons, even counting Virāf himself, and not forty thousand men. Haug and West suppose that a sentence related to 3600 remaining persons must be missing in the text (Haug and West 1872: 18).

71. » /tūrast/ tūrast is a Parsig word means 300. It was used in the late Parsig language, in the inscription of Mil i rādkar in Tabaristān, in the year 1020 A.D. (Herzfeld 1932: 145). According to Lazard’s research, in New Persian texts tūrast has been used in this same meaning, that is 300, in the Šāhnāma by Firdawṣī (Wolf 1965: 254) in the Garšāsp-Nāma by Asadī Ṭūsī (Yaḡmā’ī’s edition 1938: 485), in the Kitāb al-mudxal ilā ’ilm-i aḥkām-i nujūm by Abū-Nasr-i Qumī, in the Raʾżat-ul-munajjīmīn by Šahmardān ibn Aḥ-Zaḥār, and in the Umm al-Kitāb edited by Ivanow (Lazard 1995’a’: 23). This word, in addition to the works noted by Lazard, has been used in two other texts as well, that is in this very same Ardāy-Virāf Nāma and in the Šaddar Bundahīs (1909: XXXV.21).

73. » /gunba/gumbad/ “dome”. gunba/gumbad is an old form of the word » /gunbad/ gunbad. However, among all manuscripts, it is recorded as gunba/gumbad only in manuscript O.

75. » /va ba har jāyī ki īn yazīšn-kunān nišasta būdand, ba har qaunī, jamā’-aṭī šāṃsūr-kāšīda va silāḥ-pūšīda īstāda būdand tā gūrū-hā hama har jāygaḥ-i xwīštan bāşand va hīc kas badān ḏīgar nayāmīzand “And in every place where worshippers were seated according to each category, a group of
soldiers with drawn swords and clothed in armor stood watching to keep the categories in their proper places and no one was allowed to mix with anyone else”. That every person should remain in his position and is not to be mixed with other social classes is a very old thought in Iran, even originating in the legendary epoch. The social classes were confused by the order of Žahhāk during his reign. After his victory over Žahhāk (aždahāg or azdahāg) Frēdōn ordered a restitution of the social classes into its first order, that is to the same order as in Jamšīd’s time. In the Šāhnāma, Frēdōn’s order is described in this way:

They must not be in the same position, both the soldier and the artisan.
One is a craftsman and the other one is a mace-bearer,
A duty is clear, fitting each man.
It causes a disturbance all over the earth when one does the other one’s duty (Firdausī 1987: 1.453-455).

86. In all manuscripts, this name is written Ardāy-Vīrāf and Ardā-Vīrāf. Before his journey to the Other World, the name of this character is mentioned sixteen times as Vīrāf in the text170. But, according to all the Zoroastrian Persian manuscripts, at the end of the introduction, when Vīrāf wakes up after returning back from “the Other World”, all priests and authorities call him “...Ardāy-Vīrāf, va bā hāz-bihišt kī bī bihištī ašū bāsad ... Ardāy-Vīrāf, and that means when looking back that he is heavenly righteous”.

Ardāy-Vīrāf is what Vīrāf was called by Surūš the righteous (1st episode), by the Holy Immortals (3rd episode) and by Urdibihist the Holy Immortal (12th episode), while they see Vīrāf, at the beginning of his journey to the Other World. Finally, Ohrmazd (60th episode) calls him by this name when he gives Vīrāf the message to be brought to the present world. Besides the title of the book, mentioned at the beginning, the name of this character is given as “Ardāy-Vīrāf” ten times in the introduction. All these cases occur after his return from his journey to the Other World. Thus, the orthographic form of the name “Ardāy-Vīrāf” of this name is used in this edition for all occurrences of the name after Vīrāf’s return from the Other World, as well as in other cases mentioned above.

The name of this character is mentioned in 20 cases in headings of the episodes (34 % of the headings), in the L manuscript. Out of them 13 cases

170 In the Other World Ohrmazd and the Holy Immortal address this character as “Vīrāf” three times.
(65%) are in the form “Ardây-Vîrâf” (episodes number 1, 4, 24, 25, 26, 33, 40, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60), and seven cases (35%) in the form “Ardâ” (episodes number 2, 19, 36, 38, 39, 47, 58).

86-87. This sentence is clearer in the London Manuscript (L): »و اردائى: «And Ardây-Vîrâf means paradisical righteous” (MS.L: 6a).

89. «درس» dar (Parsig: darag), means episode. This word is used for segmentation, corresponding to “chapter/episode” in Zoroastrian Persian works, for example: the Šaddar Bundâhiš and the Šaddar Naṭr. This word is changed into «ب» bāb that is, its translation into Arabic in Islamic-Iranian literature, for example in the Qābūs-Nāma by Kay-Khusrau Iskandar (written in 1082), in the Marzbân-Nâma by Sa’d-uddîn Varâvînî (written in 1210-1225) and in Gulistân by Sa’dî (written in 1258). The episodes are here numbered to make reference between the texts easier while comparing the Zoroastrian Persian and Parsig versions. In the Zoroastrian Persian version the episodes are originally not numbered.

90. The headings of all the episodes from the London manuscript (L) are given, because this is the only manuscript that has segmented the text. Thus all headings in this edited version correspond to this manuscript.

92. »ب» bar is written without variants in all manuscripts. Vîrâf’s statement makes it clear that bar hear means “body”. Haug and West translated bar as “this one” (Haug and West 1872: xviii), to indicate that Vîrâf means himself. Mu’in translates the word as «پهلو و شکم» pahlû va šīkam “side and stomach” (Mu’in 1946: 64). Bahâr translates it as «تان» tan (body) and explains that the word bar may also mean tan (body) in New Persian (Stein-gass 1947: 166; Bahâr 1996: 338). In Gignoux’s translation, the word is translated as “poitrine” five times (1.10, 48.2, 62.1, 65.1 and 67.2) (Gignoux 1984: 270), /گامی/ translates it as »ب» sīna (poitrine) following Gignoux (Amûzgâr 1993: 54). However, Vîrâf means his whole body with the word bar.

94. «واج» vâj (Parsig: wâž, wâj or bâj, is written «واج» vâj, «واژ» vâž, «باج» bâj, «ب» bâz and «ب» bâz in Zoroastrian Persian and New Persian) “utterance”. Here vâj means the prayer of eating. «واج نان» vâj-i nân is the prayer said before eating food, after which the food is eaten in silence. After eating and washing hands and mouth, «واج پادان غذا» vâj-i pâyân-i ġazâ “the prayer when eating is finished” is said (Kotwal and Boyd 1991: 19-20, 79-81, 95-97, 133).

Due to the different spellings of the word, it is written either as (vâj, in lines 94, 95) or as (vâž, in line 686). In the Paris manuscript P, this word is found as vâž when it first occurs in the first episode, then as vâj.

96. «نسخه» nûxsat. This word might possibly be an inverted form of the word «نسخه» nûxsat, which in Arabic is written «نسخة” “copy”. It does not appear correct to use the form nûxsat in Persian. Anyhow, since it is written
nuxsat in manuscripts N and M, it has probably been a common mistake amongst the scribes and writers at the time when the text was written.

99. Haug and West have made a copy and published this much of the text from manuscript M (H28) (Haug-West 1872: Lxxxiv-Lxxvii). After them, Mu‘īn has also edited and published that same amount of text (Mu‘īn 1946: 58-64).

99. The Knowledgeable scribe sits in front of Vīraṅ when he begins to explain the events of his journey. There is an interval between this part and the beginning of the next part, that is the part where Vīraṅ explains about his presence in the Other World, which begins with a half sentence. The two parts are not connected naturally. There is one or a few blank lines between the 93rd and 94th lines in all the Zoroastrian Persian manuscripts. It is clear that they all have missed one or several sentences.

101. »/g91/g1005/g942/g947« Sur/š (Avestan: sraoša-, Parsig: srōš). Sur/š is the god of obedience of Ohrmazd’s words. He is sometimes considered as one of the six or seven Holy Immortals. Along with Mihr and Rašn, he judges the deeds of people in the other world (MX 1985: I.118-119). As Ohrmazd is the keeper of the spirit, Sur/š is the preserver of the body. He pays a visit to people three times every night in order for them not to be annoyed by demons (IraBd 1956: XXVI.49). He helps the spirits of the dead to arrive at the Chinvad Bridge (idem: XXVI.50). Nyberg supposes that the role of Mihr has diminished in Zoroastrianism, and instead of this Sur/š plays a more distinguished and outstanding role. In this way, a lot of ancient important characteristics of Mihr are manifested in Sur/š. Thus, this Sur/š is none but Mihr, who has clothed himself in Sur/š’s disguise (Nyberg 1937: 73).

101. »/g1006/g951/g909/g756« is the Pazand form of the word and a Zoroastrian Persian title for Sur/š.

114. »/g990/g801/g937/g1006/g1000/g1012/g809« /g254/g431nvad-puhl (Parsig: ēṃwad puhl or ēṃwar puhl) “the Chinvad Bridge” (Tafaẓzuli 1969: 121) is the name of a bridge in Zoroastrianism, placed from the summit of dāǐti (Avestan: dāīty-) in the middle of the world stretching to the Alburz mountains. The spirits of the dead pass across that bridge in the morning of the fourth day after death. The bridge becomes wide for the righteous and a beautiful girl as the symbol of the righteousness of the dead transfers them safely across the bridge to Paradise. When the vicious are passing, the bridge changes into a sharp razor blade and an ugly woman as the symbol of the wickedness of the dead pulls them off the bridge and throws them into Hell.

Windengren supposes that the thought of a bridge across which the spirits pass is of Iranian origin. However, there are also such conceptions, although slightly different, in northern religions, which means that the concept of a bridge must be essentially an Indo-Germanic idea. The influence of Chinwad Bridge is so extensive that it has even influenced Islamic eschatology (Windengren 1961: 176).
114. The word »pīl« is mentioned in the two forms »pūl« and »pūl« in manuscripts NPN²MO, but the number of »pūl« forms is larger than »pūl« in all of them. This word is mentioned in the »pūl« form in manuscript L. Since the »pūl« form is closer to the Parsig orthographic form: »pūhl«, this form has been preserved in the present text. Only the first case of diverging orthographies of »pūl« and »pūl« is pointed out in a footnote.

114-115. This part of the text describing Chinivad Bridge, is strange, because, the bridge is described there as trunk of a tree with many sides, whereas it is clear that the trunk of a tree has a cylindrical form and therefore no sides.

115-116. »šaving razor«. ustura and the verbs from which it is derived, »usturdan «, are Persian forms of »usturag« which is a Parsig word. »šaving razor« is a kind of shaving razor.

121. »May he be happy whose [own] goodness has become goodness for people«. This a translated phrase of the Avesta that has been extracted from Yasna (XLIII.1): Uštâ ahmî yahmî, uštâ kahmî ēît.

This phrase has been written in manuscripts PMO as »xunak bād ān kas rā ki az nîkî-ī vay mardumān rā nîkî buvad “May he be happy whose [own] goodness has become goodness for people”, This a translated phrase of the Avesta that has been extracted from Yasna (XLIII.1): Uštâ ahmî yahmî, uštâ kahmî ēît.

This phrase has been written in manuscripts PMO as »xunak bād ān kas rā ki az nîkî-ī vay mardumān rā nîkî buvad va ānînîkî yak isparm bûy “may he be happy whose [own] goodness has become goodness for people, just like the scent of the sweet basil”171. While editing the text, the final part of this sentence “just like the scent of the sweet basil” has been omitted and moved to the footnotes in consideration of the Avestan phrase.

122-124. In the chapter III, beliefs about the first three nights after the death according to Zoroastrianism have been expounded, especially in consideration of the text Hādōxt Nask.

128-129. »the paradise of olives«. jînāyat-i zaytûn “the paradise of olives”. The first word of the phrase is written as »jînāyat (paradise), «jînāyat (pollution), «jînāyat (treachery) and »jînib (side). This phrase was probably originally written as »jînāt-zîtûn (the paradise of olive trees) or »jînîb-zîtûn (side of the olive trees) which could indicate a sweet fragrance perceived from where the olive trees are. However, »zîtûn (olive) has no specific value in the Zoroastrian culture.

130-133. This picture, presenting the beauty of the girl who is the symbol of the good deeds, reminds us of the same picture in Ābûn-yašt that de-

171 In manuscripts NN² this sentence reads follows: »xunak bād ān kas rā ki az nîkî-ī vay mardumān rā nîkî buvad va ānînîkî yak isparm bûy.

147
scribes the Ardāvī sūra Anāhītā (Ābān-Yašt: XVI.64; XIX.78).172 There are some pictures that depict Anāhītā’s beauty on Sasanians jugs in the National Museum in Teheran and the Hermitage in Leningrad (Ringbom 1958: 162, 168-169).

من أن كردار نیکوی توام، نیکوی توام من به چشم تو باشم، أن که آنگاه 137-140. » /g1002/g913 /g1006/g919 /g994/g952/g809 /g1002/g913 /g998/g995 /g1002/g815 /g997/g897 /g943/g909 ... /g997/g897 /g998/g995/g997/g897 /g1002/g815 /g997/g897 /g748/g994/g920/g947/g909 /g1001/g910/g819 /g815/g821/g937/g942/g815 /g748/g821/g937/g1006/g913 /g822/g920/g1012/g819 /g941/g937 /g1002«

»/g407n kird/g407r-i n/g431k/g460-yi tu-am, n/g431k/g460-tar az /g407n ki man ba /g254ašm-i tu bi-astam, /g407n ki /g407n-g/g407h ki dar g/g431t/g431 b/g460d/g431, kard/g431 “I am your good deeds. That which you made when you were in the world [is] more beautiful than what I am in your sight”. Perhaps, there is a word missing in this part. The beautiful girl seems to be saying to the man’s spirit: “When you were in the world, you did many good deeds that were more beautiful than the way I appear to you now”. Maybe this is the original structure of this sentence from ancient times.

141. »/g1006/g951/g909« aš/g460 (Parsig: ahlaw) righteous; »/g1006/g951/g909 /g937/g942/g995« mard-i aš/g460 is “a priest who performs religious rites of Zoroastrianism”, for example the ceremony of »/g997/g909/g942/g920/g948/g979/g942/g935« xrafstar, pl. » /g997/g909/g942/g920/g948/g979/g942/g935« (xrafstr/g407n), is a Parsig word. xrafstar is a word applied in general for all dangerous and rapacious animals created by Ahriman. Snakes, otters, scorpions, alligators, turtles and toads are considered as xrafstran, according to the Dēnkard (DKM 1911: IX.811), whereas, the Šaddar Natr, considers snakes, scorpions, flies, ants and rats (SDN 1909: XLIII.2) as the group of xrafstran.

152. The sky is divided in two different ways in Zoroastrian literature. According to the Pahlavi Rivyat, there are three celestial positions between the earth and the sky: the star-station, the moon-station and the sun-station. After that, there is the sky (heaven) where gar/g448dm/g407n “the home of worship” is situated, and that is Ohrmazd’s place. There are 34 thousand farsangs (unit of length equal to 6 kilometers) of distance between each of them (PRDd 1990: XLVI.7). The second division is mentioned in the Bundahišn, according to which there are six grades in the sky. Then, after these six grades, there is Ohrmazd’s place, in an eternal light (IraBd 1956: III.7). Considering the narrations of the text, it appears that the basis of the division in the Ardāvī-Vīrāf Nāma is as same as that of the Pahlavi Rivyat.

154. »/g938/g1000/g802/g947/g910/g952/g995/g909« amš/g407sfand (Avestan: am/g1015ša.sp/g1015nta -, Parsig: amahraspand. It is written » /g938/g1000/g980/g947/g910/g952/g995/g909« amš/g407spand and »/g938/g1000/g909« amš/g407sfand). The amš/g407spand are six assistants of

172 See also Geldner 1886-1896; Westergaard 1852-54: I.165-166; Wolff 1924: 174-175.
Ohrmazd: Wahman (Bahman), Ardwahišt, Šahrēwar, Spandarmad, Hōrdād and Amurdād. Ohrmazd has created these Holy Immortals of his essence and each one of them carries one of the qualities of Ohrmazd. While creating, Ohrmazd profits from the aid of these Holy Immortals. In addition to this, the six Holy Immortals along with Ohrmazd himself patronize the seven great creations: the sky, the water, the earth, the plants, the quadrupeds, the human beings and the fire.

156. »/g942/g1004/g995« Mihr (Avestan: mithra- (Mithra), Parsig: mihr). Mihr is one of the Pre-Zoroastrian gods in Iran. In Zoroastrianism, Mihr is the god of agreement, friendship and love, and the enemy of falsehood (lies) and broken agreements. In Zoroastrianism Mihr is described as the owner of broad pastures, having a thousand ears and ten thousands eyes and watching the entire world. Mihr is the king of all territories and wherever he sets his foot justice will appear. Mihr alongside with Rašn and Surūš is the god who judges the deeds of people in the Other World (MX 1985: I.118-119). One of the Mihr’s other functions is to move around his mace above Hell in order for the dwellers in Hell not to be tormented more than what they deserve (MS.S.P.1191: 139b). In Mihr Yasht the importance of Mihr in Zoroastrianism can be clearly seen:

Said Ahura Mazdāh to Zarathuštra the Spitamid:
‘When I created grass-land magnate Mithra,
O Spitamid, I made him such in worthiness to be worshipped
and prayed to as myself, Ahura Mazdāh’ (Yašt X ‘Mihir Yašt’ 1959: I.1).

165. » /g944/g819 « gaz is an ancient measurement unit in Iran. One of the most ancient works in which this unit, equal to 24 fingers, is mentioned is Tārīx-i Qum (History of Qum) written by Hasan Šaybānī Qumī (in 988 A.D.). One gaz is equivalent to one meter according to a regulation of the year 1925 in Iran (Mu’tin 1984: 3.3300). Instead of gaz, «/g941/g909» araš is used in manuscript N². araš is a measurement unit that stretches from the elbow to the finger tips.

The width of Chinnad Bridge is mentioned as 27 nays in the Dādestān i Dēnī (Dd 1998: XX.3). According to the Mēnō i Xrad, the width of the Bridge is one farsang (6 kilometers) (MX 1985: II.123). In the Dēnkard, this width is equal to nine nayza (a short spear), and each nayza is equal to three nays, and a nay is equal to a tīr (DkM 1911: IX.809).

165. » /g942/g1012/g991/g937« dilīr-vār. «/g942/g1012/g991/g937» dilīr (Parsig: dilēr) means “brave”. It is probable that «/g941/g909/g1005/g942/g1012/g991/g937» guzaštān-i dilīr-vār az pūl (passing the bridge bravely).

I saw how the spirit passed bravely over the bridge and I also crossed the bridge after him

181. »/g998/g920/g951/g940/g819/g758/g989/g1006/g801 /g943/g909 /g941/g909/g1005/g942/g1012/g991/g937«. » /g942/g1012/g991/g937« dilīr (Parsig: dilēr) means “brave”. It is probable that "گنگشن دیلیر او پول" guzaštān-i dilīr-vār az pūl (passing the bridge bravely).

I saw how the spirit passed bravely over the bridge and I also crossed the bridge after him

Bahman (Avestan: vohu.manah-, Parsig: wahuman or wahman, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: «/g998/g1003/g1005» Vahman, «/g998/g1006/g1003/g1005» Vahmān and «/g998/g1003/g1005» Bahman. Bahman, the first Holy Immortal, is more intimate with Ohrmazd than the others. His functions are to take care of quadrupeds and to lead the spirits of the righteous to the threshold of
peds and to lead the spirits of the righteous to the threshold of Ohrmazd (Ir-aBd 1956: XXVI.14).

182. «گرُسی» kursī “stool/chair/throne”. This kursī must be a stool of gold, because, Bahman says to Virāf that this is the place, the garūmān is called «غَا‌ہ-بِزِرین» “the golden place” and «عرش و گِرُسی» ‘ارَشَ وَ کُرُسِی “the empyrean and the throne”. The gold reminds us of the empyrean and the throne of gold in the royal courts of the Sasanid kings. “The king [Xusraw Anōšarawān] ordered that a golden stool be given to him [Sayf ibn Ĥi Ya-<br>zon] to sit down”. This stool is mentioned in a description of Xusraw Anōšarwān’s court (Ašm‘ī → Shaked 1995: VII. 80). In this connection, it is necessary to mention the inscriptions of Tang-i Sarvak in ancient Elymais (south western Iran) in which an Aramaic phrase n’syh kwrsy’ “he who takes/hold the stool” is repeated several times (Henning 1952 → Shaked 1995: VII.80). The connection between what Virāf describes as kursī in garūmān, the place of Ohrmazd, and the “holder of a stool” of the inscription of Tang-i Sarvak will appear more clearly if we know that to sit on a special stool has been accompanied with some ritual ceremonies (Bivar and Shaked 1964: 287ff).

182. ‘ارَشَ وَ کُرُسِی “the empyrean and the throne” are men-<br>tioned in 13th and 59th episodes. These two words are used for «گُرُسُمان/گُرُسُمان» garūmān/garūmān, that is garōdmān in the Parsig and garōdōmāna- in Avestan. The translator has changed the garūmān, which is the highest station in Heaven and the place of Ohrmazd’s light in Zoroas-trianism, into ‘ارَشَ وَ کُرُسِی that has a very important place in the Muslim faith, perhaps because it was well-known to the masses, both the Muslims and Zoroastrians at the time of the translation.

Muqaddasī has contemplated the various interpretations and paraphrases of ‘ارَشَ and kursī by different groups of Muslims. He declares that ‘ارَشَ has been described as the throne of God in the Quran: “and they, the eight angels, carry thy God’s throne upon their shoulders on that Day [the resurrection day]” (Quran 1988: 69.17). Muqaddasī says as well, while defining kursī, that kursī is equal to ‘ارَشَ according to some [Muslim] traditions; as a pearl in a flat landscape. Many Muslims believe that kursī means just knowledge, and they rely on the Quran that states “his [God’s] throne spreads over all the skies and the grounds” (Quran 1988: 2.255) (Muqaddasī 1995: 1-3.245-248)173.

‘ارَشَ وَ کُرُسِی, have been used repeatedly in Iranian mystical (Sufi) literature, especially in the works of Farīd-al-Dīn Āṭṭār. For example, it can be found in the Ilāhī-Nāma:

"که ای دارای عرش و فرش و گرُسی / چو تو دانانی از ما پَرْسِی"

173 Muṭahhar ibn-i Ṭahīr-i Muqaddasī composed his book Al-Bād’-va-l-Tārīkh in Arabic in the year 965 A.D. in the Bust area of Sīstān. The text that is used here was translated into Persian by Muḥammad-Riżā Šaft‘al Kadkārī (1995).
“O Lord of the Empyrean, the Earth and the Firmament, 
since Thou art wiser than we, why dost Thou ask?” (ʿAṭṭār 1976: 151).

It seems that before they used the expression ʿarš va kursī for the Parsig word garōdmān in the Zoroastrian Persian texts, they had used the term ayvān-i yazdān for garōdmān. In a letter from a dihqān (countryman) to Xusrāu I it is written: «و بهشت آن سرای، رسیدن است به ایوان یزدان نزد یکی از فرشته‌گان» “and Paradise in the Other World is that you can come to God’s court, in the presence of one of the angels” (MS.D43: 36a). In this section the ayvān-i yazdān, located in paradise, corresponds to garōdmān, which is the place of Ohrmazd’s light.

187. dastband. That is the name of a folk dance in the territory of Iran since Elamite times. In a picture painted on an earthenware surface, from the fourth millennium B.C., found in the Sialk hills in Kāšān (figure 2), a group of people (it is not clear if they are men or women) are performing this folk dance of dasta-band or dast-band (Ghirshman 1938: I.P.L.LXXV). The dancers are standing side by side holding hands in this painting. Since there are some signs of the sun and some aquatic birds in the space between the dancers, it is supposed that they may have performed this kind of dance in the plain or meadows to worship the god of the sun, the god of illumination and warmth who rubs off the darkness and terrors of the night from the human heart. In the Ardāy-Vrāf Nāma, a group of people is also performing this kind of folk dance in front of musicians and on a riverside in a garden (lines 420-422). Another example of this kind of folk dance, is found in Čašma-ʿAlī and preserved in the Louvre Museum (figure 3), where all the dancers are women (Zukāʾ 1965: 47-48).

197. Ḵᵛāhšīstān (Parsig: Ḵᵛāhšīstān, in the Zoroastrian Persian and New Persian Ḵᵛāhšīstān, Ḵᵛāhšīstān and Ḵᵛāhšīstān), “Limbo”. It is the intermediate space between the earth and the station of the stars, a place similar to this world and the place of those whose good deeds and sins are equal.

According to manuscripts NPN²MO, it is written hamistān in the text, whereas, in the Zoroastrian Persian texts hamistagān is also used. Because this heading is only given in manuscript L and there is no other manuscript variant, it has been kept in the orthographic form found in this manuscript.
Figure 2. Painting from the Sialk in Kāšān (Ghirshman 1938: I.PL.LXXV)

Figure 3. Painting from the Čašma-‘Alī (Žukā’ 1965: 48)

203. "پس‌نورد" (Parsig: tan ī pasēn) means “final body”, i.e. the body which every creature receives at the resurrection at the end of the twelve thousand years of the world. After the resurrection the body will remain in that form forever.

216. "گیت‌خربی" (Parsig: gešg-xrīd) means to acquire the rewards in the Other World of the worship that one has performed in this
world. It is clearly explained in the Šaddar Bundahiš that “the meaning of giti-xarid is to acquire the Other World in this world” (ŠDB 1909: XLII.4).

216. «nauzūd» (Parsig: nög-zād) is a young person, who joins the believers group in the «nauzūdī» ceremony, after which he will be regarded as an adult.

217. In manuscript P «muzd» instead of «mužd» is recorded. mužd is a dialect variant of the word. However, it is possible that mužd was the form of the word in ancient manuscripts (Khāliq-Mutlaq 2005: 436).

225. «nauzūdī» (Parsig: nauzūdīh, New Persian and the Zoroastrian Persian: nauzūdti, nauzūdī and nauzūdti) is a young person, who joins the believers’ group after which he will be regarded as an adult. They wear the holy waist-belt (kust/kušt) during a religious ceremony when they are 15 years old (ŠnŠ 1969: XIII.2). The Parsis in India call this nauzūdī festival naojote.

226. «gāhān» (Avestan: gādā, Parsig: gāhān) means “hymn”. gāhān, is the oldest relic section of the Avesta which remains until the present time. It has been attributed to Zarathustra himself.

228-237. It seems that the tenth episode should take place after the fifth episode, because, the theme of this episode follows logically on the fourth (lines 167-183) and the fifth (lines 184-195). In episodes 4 and 5, firstly Surūš and then Bahman lead Vīrāf watching and worshipping the garūmān or gāh-i zarrīn “the golden place”, which is the same as ‘arš va kūrsī “empyrean and the throne”.

239. «namāz-gāh “place of worship”. namāz, in New Persian it means to bow down in reverence. In the text namāz-gāh means “place of worship” (garūmān) (the worthy of paradise) or the place of the light of Ohrmazd. Formerly in the text, «‘arš va kūrsī “empyrean and the (celestial) throne” signifies the place where one should worship Ohrmazd. «hān, ‘arš va kūrsī namāz bar “Behold, the empyrean and the celestial throne. Do reverence!” said Surūš the truthful to Ardāy-Vīrāf in lines 191-192.

242. «namaz-gāh-i ārmazd, namāz bar “Pay homages in front of Ohrmazd!” This sentence is quoted in a disordered manner in all manuscripts. But, in view of the heading of this chapter in the London manuscript (L), it seems that it is Surūš the truthful who in reply to Vīrāf’s question says to him, “Here is the place of worshipping Ohrmazd, bow down!” The text has been edited according to this interpretation.

246. «ruaγan-i midiyūzarm “midiyūzarm oil”. midiyūzarm (Avestan: miδiyūzarm, Parsig: mēdyūzarm) “mid-spring/mid-greening(?)”, is a name of one of the festivals «gāhanbār» (Parsig: gāhānbar). The gāhanbārs are six festivals celebrated during the year
(Boyce 2001: 254-256). mīdiyūzarm is the first festival of the year in the Zoroastrian calendar, equivalent to mid-spring (the 5th of May). According to the Dādestān ī Dēnīg, the reason for raūgan-i mīdiyūzarm is that the best food comes from the products of cattle. Among the products of cattle, milk is the best, and amongst milk products butter/oil is the best, and among the butters/oils the best is that which is obtained in the second month of the year, when Mihr is in the constellation of Taurus, and that month is called Zar-miyā in Zoroastrianism. Thus, the butter/oil produced in this month is a paradisical food, which is the best food in the world (Dd 1998: XXX.13).

According to the Pahlavi Rivāyat Ohrmazd orders the spirit to be fed with “mares’ milk, cream and butter and sweet wine, or butter which is made in spring [raūgan-i mīdiyūzarm]. First give him the spring butter” (PRDd 1990: XXIII.17). In addition, in the Mēnō ī Xrad, the food given to the spirit is raūgan-i mīdiyūzarm “spring oil”, which is the best food in the world (MX 1985: I.152, 156).

The paradisical food is called « anōš» in the Parsig version of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma and the Zand of Widēvdād. Widengren follows these texts and believes that spring butter or oil is a kind of food of immortality (Widengren 1965: 104). But, anōš is a mixture that the Sōšyans “saviour” will provide after resurrection and will give to all people to be immortal. Thus, the word anōš is in my opinion wrongly used instead of raūgan-i mīdiyūzarm “spring oil” for the paradisical food in the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma and in the Zand of Widēvdād. Anōš, is a mixture of immortality, and there is no need for a spirit to get any foodstuff of immortality in Paradise. It is the body which must be immortal by eating anōš on resurrection day (Gaybī 2003: 389-390).

258-275. This passage shows the importance of the matter of setting fire to wet wood, appropriating a whole chapter of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma to this subject (12th episode). Thus, in Zoroastrianism, it is a sin to set fire to wet wood. This is also alluded to in brief in the Parsig version (AWN 1872: X.4-8) when Ardāy-Virāf protests to Ādur-yazd because he has called him “wet wood” (Parsig: xwēd-ēzm). To show the importance of the matter, one can also point to a proverb in New Persian which is currently used: » cī hūzn-i tarē ba tu furīxta-am? (Have I sold you any wet wood?). The meaning of the proverb is “What evil have I done to you? In what way have I hurt you?” (Ṭarvat-Inzābī-nažād 1998: 898). This idea probably originated in ancient Persian culture, when trees were respected and no one was permitted to cut and burn a live tree. Therefore, it was a sin to set wet wood on fire.

260. » Ardēbihišt (Avestan: arēta.vahišta-, Parsig: ardwarehista). Ohrmazd created Ardēbihišt, the Holy Immortal, from his own wisdom. Ardēbihišt is the first Holy Immortal who praises Ohrmazd. To take care of

175 Signs of this tradition can be seen in some part of Iran now (‘Anāšīrī 1995: 60-62).
the fire is the most important function of Urdībihīšt in the world. Anyone who offends the fire and treats the fire with disrespect will be Urdībihīšt’s enemy.

264-265. When Ohrmazd intends to send the fire to the world, the fire disagreed and said that people would not have a behavior befitting it. Finally, Ohrmazd got Urdībihīšt assigned to protect the fire, and then the fire accepted to be sent to the world (PRDd 1990: XLVI.30-33; SDB 1909: XVIII). Urdībihīšt, the Holy Immortal, points to this same matter in the text.

293. »saxavatān. This word is constructed as a nominalised adjective formed from »saxavat with the plural ending. This is not a common way of nominalising this word, and the form saxavatmandān (as it is also found in Modern New Persian) would have been expected.

309. »mazdayasn (Parsig: mazydn) “Mazdeans”, “Mazda-worshippers” and “Mazdayasnians”, i.e. Mazda-worshippers who practise Zoroastrianism. The sg. form of this word is »mazdayasn, Parsig: mazdešn, which means “adhering to Zoroastrianism”.

325. »xwarra (Avestan: xvaranah-, Parsig: xvarrah, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: »xwarra, »farra and »farr. xwarra is one of Ohrmazd’s creations and a heavenly power. Three kinds of xwarra are mentioned in Avestan texts: »xwarra-yi nāgirīftānī “a non-acquired xwarra”, which is related to the Mūbads (the Zoroastrian priests). »xwarra-yi kiyānī (the kingly khwarra), which is related to the kings. This xwarra appears in various forms, such as a hawk, a gazelle and fire, and gives the one who has gained it great power. »xwarra-yi āzādagan (the freemen’s xwarra), is only available to Iranians, and non-Iranians are not able to acquire this kind of xwarra. In later texts, farr is used in different senses such as chance, fortune and wealth (Mīrāxraīy 1987: 98-99).

325-326. »xwarraûmandi (Parsig: xwarrahûmandi). Manuscripts NPMOL record this word as »xourahûmandi, but manuscripts PN³ write it »xourahûmandi. Anyway, »xourahûmandi xwarraûmandi is the correct form of the word in Zoroastrian Persian if the Parsig form is taken into consideration.

340-341. »nišastagān didam har yak dar čahār bālīš “I saw people seated each one on four cushions”. The Sasanian kings used to sit on several cushions and put some at their back, to recline. This can be seen in the iconography of a Sasanian bowl (Ghrishman 1962: 218, fig. 259) and on some bezels as well (idem: 242, figs. 296, 267), where such intaligos are engraved (Shaked 1995: VII.77-78). The kings’ method of
using cushions while sitting has also survived in post-Islamic times. The Chronicles of Harāt (written about 1320 A.D.) write in this way about one of the kings: «imrīz ki pādšāh-ī ālam dar čahār bāliš-i buland-i text-i sulṭāni, farādīn-vār nišasta ast “Today, while the king of the world is seated on four cushions of the kingly throne like Fīrūz Ťān (Harawī 1943: 165).»

342. varj (Parsig: warc) means “worth”, “merit” and “rank”.

347-365. In the last five pages after the text is finished in manuscript N (the basic manuscript), a short part of the text is re-written on folio 151a. This part is equivalent to lines 347-365 in our edited version and it is marked by an asterisk (*) at its beginning and end. The differences between this part and the way it appears in the text as found in all manuscripts are indicated by the means of the sign N* in the footnotes.

Re-writing a text, partly or totally, has some previous records in both the Parsig and the Zoroastrian Persian manuscripts. The part Rōz ī Ohrmazd māh ī farwardīn “the Ohrmazd day of Farwardīn” is re-written first on pages 73-78, then for the second time on pages 112-117 of the M.U.29 manuscript in Parsig (Nawābī 1976 → M.U.29:1). Some parts of a text have been re-written in another section of this manuscript, too. For example, pages 27-28 are re-written on pages 33-34, and pages 95-96 on pages 98-100 (Mazdāpūr 1999: 282, 153).

350. »radān, sg. form of the word is »rad, (Avestan: ratu-, Parsig: rad), pl. radān. This word is translated as “chief” and “master” (MacKenzie 1990: 70). According to the Šayest nē-Šayest, it seems that rad is a spiritual authority in Zoroastrianism who deals with judgment (Šī Š 1969: XIII.29), because a person confesses his sins in front of a rad, then the rad will judge him and his acts (Kotwal 1969: 49).

365. The meaning of this sentence va man ba jānībi mīkardand “and they led me to a side” and the another variant wo man ba jānībi mīkardand “and they led me to a place” is not clear to the editor.

364-365. «cūn man an zanān rā didam ba-dān nikī, yak az digar bihtar, va man ba jānībi mīkardand “When I saw those women with that beauty, one better than the other, and they brought me to the side”. The last phrase, that is wo man ba jānībi mīkardand has been recorded as va man ba jā-yī mīkardand “they took me to a certain place” in manuscripts N*PM and as va man ba jā-yī mīkardand “they led me to a place” in manuscript O.

375. daštān-gunāh “menstruation sin” is when a woman comes near to the fire in her first three days of menstruating, which is a sinful act and thus called “menstruation sin”.

375. tars-i astūdān “fright of the grave”. The ceremony of tars-i astūdān means that the relatives of a dead person say prayers for three
days beside his/her bed or at the place where he/she has died (Üşıdarfı 1992: 215).

375. « استدان» (Parsig: astodan) “ossuary” is a square cavity excavated in rocks of mountains, where they put the bones of the dead and then cover upon the hole.

375. دوزاده هماست (davâzdah-humâst) “twelve-humâst”. humâst is a ceremony of saying prayers performed for the sake of the quick or the dead. Four kinds of humâst are mentioned in the Nûrangistân: one-humâst, two-humâst, ten-humâst and twelve-humâst. davâzdah-humâst (twelve-humâst) is a recitation of the Yasna and the Widêvdûd during 264 days in paying homage to 22 gods (Râsid-Muhaşsil 1990: 93-94). According to the Şadder Natr, only women should perform this religious duty of davâzdah-humâst (twelve humâst) (ŞDN 1909: LXVIII).

395. « همادين» (Parsig: hamâdûn). According to the Sâyest nê-Shâyest (SnS 1969: XVII.4), it seems that hamâdûn is the name of all prayers done in the first three days after someone’s death (Kotwal 1969: 109).

396. زندراو خان “whose soul is alive” is devotion accompanied by a special ritual ceremony that every Zoroastrian should do in his/her lifetime to prevent any damage to his/her soul (ŞDN 1909: LVIII).

397. هرّباد (Parsig: hêrbdûn, pl. هرّبادان) “teacher”. hêrbdûn is a Zoroastrian religious leader who also fulfills his duty as a teacher. It is mentioned in the Şadder Bundahiš that the parents nourish the body of the child but it is the hêrbdûn that feeds his soul (ŞDN 1909: XXIX.12).

397. The word هکنون “now” is mentioned after the verbal form باهند “they have been” in manuscripts NPN² but as هکن in manuscript M. The meaning of the sentence under consideration indicates that the word hêrbdûn here must be a mistake by the copyist. For this reason, this word is taken to the footnotes and instead هک ki has been inserted to complete the sentence.

401. همازور (hamâzûr) is a brazier in which aloeswood and other fragrant substances are burnt. In addition to this, hamâzûr are persons who recite verses of the Avesta in chorus and promise to do good deeds (Sûruşîyan 1977: 185). Here hamâzûr means to join in getting rewards of good deeds.

410. ایرانشهر (Iran-shahr) is the name for all territory of Iran in the Sassanian period. The Iranian Bundahišn or the Great Bundahišn is the most ancient text in which the word Iran-shahr is used to denote Iran (IraBD 1956: XXXIII.1-26).

423. هپنکی and in N² هپنکی. Both manuscripts are, in my opinion, wrong, since both adjectives have negative connotations. Ardây-Virâf asks about the happiness and prosperity of a nation and therefore one would expect a positive adjective. It might be هپنکی ahuvânagî a
word that means «أَهوُشَانَة» ąhīvaśāna “sincere”. However, this is just a surmise.

425. «حَشَرَاتٍ /حَشَرَاتٍ “insects”. This word is found in the form hašarāt in manuscripts NN²MO, but in the form «حَشَرَاتٍ hašarāt just in manuscript P. In some Zoroastrian Persian manuscripts, for example, in numerous texts in manuscript MS.S.P.47, the short Persian vowels ą, i and u are sometimes represented by the letters alif, ya and vāv (“plene writing”). Accordingly the first «الْفِ “alif in “حَشَرَاتٍ is possibly an orthographic representation of (short) ą.

443. «اِسْفَانْدَرَمَد (Avestan: spəntā.ārmaiti-, Parsig: spandarmad, New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian: «ispandārmāz, ispanārmād and «ispandārmad. Isfandārmad is Ohrmazd’s daughter and she is the mother of all creatures. Her function is to take care of the earth.

462. «گیسپَنَد “sheep” is written gūspond in manuscripts N²MO, and by both «گیسپند gūspond and «گوسپند gūspond in manuscript P, and as «گوسپند gūspond in manuscript N. Since the form gūspond (with majhul pronunciation) is identical with the Parsig form gōspond, this form is used in the text and the other form gūspond is moved to the footnote.

516. kaduxūdā (Parsig: kadag-xwadāy) “husbandmen”. In today’s New Persian kaduxūdā means someone who takes care of the affairs of a village, i.e. headman for a village. But kadag-xwadāy in Parsig and kaduxūdā in the Zoroastrian Persian means lord, king or husbandman. Firdausī says:

کوُمروث شد یکهند کنگانی
نخستین به کوه اندرون ساخت جایی

Kayūmarth became king (kadag-xwadāy) of the world,
first he made himself a place in the mountain (Muʿīn 1984: 3.2921).

521-522. This phrase is recorded as «تا ایشان با یکدیگر باید میگردند tā īsān bā yakdīgar bāz mīgardidānd “until they came back with each other”, in manuscripts NPMO. However, it is written, «تا ایشان با یکدیگر باید میگردند tā īsān bā yakdīgar bāzī mīkardand “Until they were playing with each other”, in manuscript N². Because this latter form of the phrase fits the meaning of the main sentence better, it is used in the text and the first form is moved to a footnote.

518. «اوُروُر irvar is a Parsig word (urwar) meaning “plant”. The orthographic form «اوُروُر (plene writing) instead of «اورور urwar or irvar. «اوُروُر has been used in the text and the other form moved to the footnotes.

532. «جَادُنیُوْیِن jādangyūn, sg. «جَادُنُوْیِن jādangū (Parsig: jādag-gōwān) means “defender”. The jādangū collects everything that is given to Mūbads and Dastūrs in the fire temple and give it to the poor (SDN 1909: XXII.1-3).

542. «ادَرَان و اَتاشان ādarān va ātašān. There are three kinds of fire in Zoroastrianism and in order of importance they are «آتش بهرام ātaš-i Bah-
rām, ātaš-i Ādaran and ātaš-i Dādgāh. Here the expression va ātašān seems to denote the fires of Bahram and Dādgāh.

The reason why ātaš-i Ādaran is mentioned separately may be that it is the fire under consideration in this part, since Virāf was travelling to the Other World from the Ādaran fire-temple (line 38).

552-574. rūd-i ašk-i sūgvārān “the river of the mourners’ tears” is the first chapter in which the situation in Hell is mentioned without reference to a specific place in Hell. According to the text, all spirits should pass across the river. Everybody either passes with difficulty or drowns in this river depending on how much he has wept for the dead. There is no complete picture of the river in the text. This river is not placed in Hell according to the text, but it must necessarily be somewhere between Paradise and Hell, and spirits have to pass across it. However, as it is said in the text, Hell is placed under Chinval Bridge and in the vicinity of Paradise.

There is no other recalling of the mourners’ ‘river of tears’ anywhere in other mythological texts or other Iranian Zoroastrians sources, than what is found here in Arday-Virāf Nāma. However, resistance against mourning and lamenting is praised in Avesta:

I eulogize the act and the good-nature
I eulogize the good-nature and the act
For resistance against the darkness
For resistance against mourning and lamenting (Yasna: LXXI.17).\textsuperscript{176}

In Mēnō ī Xrad the land of mourning and weeping is seen as an afflicted land (MX 1985: V.1-13). For this reason, the ērānwēz lands (Avestan: Airyanem.zaējō-), that is where people do not mourn and weep, is called a better land (idem: 24-29, 43). A great deal of ancient Iranian documents have eulogized happiness in contrast to weeping and crying, which are disgraceful and prohibited acts.\textsuperscript{177} In the Tažkīrat ul-Aulīyāʾ, one of the most famous works of Sufism, there is a clear description of the Iranian lamentation in post-Islamic times and of the Zoroastrians’ avoidance of mourning and weeping:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{It is told that when Ābdullāh hit by a misfortune (i.e. lost a beloved one), people gathered to share his grief. A gabr (a Zoroastrian) had come there, too. And he said to Ābdullāh: ‘When one encoun-}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{176} See also Geldner 1886-1896; Westergaard 1852-54: 1.123-124; Wolff 1924: 101.

\textsuperscript{177} See the careful and profound research by Bīzān Gaybī (1994) about lamentation in ancient Iranian culture until the first centuries A.H. and about how it was widespread after that time.

\textsuperscript{178} It refers to Ābdullāh Mubārak, one of the great Sufis from Marv, who lived in the second century A.H./8th-9th A.D. (Gaybī 1994: 28).
ters a misfortune, he who is a wise man does in the first day what he will do three days later’. ‘Abdullāh said: ‘Write his statement down, because it is a wise saying.’” (‘Attār 1905: 1.185-186; Ġaybī 1994: 28). This saying both indicates three days’ time of lamentation among Iranians and clearly shows the prohibition and reprobation of lamentation among Zoroastrians (Ġaybī: idem).

In Saddar Natr, there is a description of this ‘river of tears’ as well: “The tears will change into a river at the Chinvad Bridge” (SDN 1909: LXXXI.VI.2). However, this description does not help us understand the issue of this river.

In many of the myths of the ancient world there is a river in the Other World, situated in hell. According to Akkadian, Sumerian, Assyrian and Indian myths, a river, or even some large rivers are flowing in the underground world. According to Scandinavian myths, there is a large river in hell called Gjöll, which flows between the world of the living and dead (Snorres Edda 1978: I.3, 48). A bridge of gold, constructed over this river, is called Gjallarbrú and a person by the name of Modgunn is the guardian there (Snorres Edda 1978: I.48). According to Greek myths there are four rivers in Hell, One of these four rivers is called Kokytos (Κοκυτός) which means the ‘river of the teardrops’ (Schlapbach 1999: 6.638).

To prohibit people from crying for their dead, is a concept found among other peoples and religions as well.179

ای وای بر من. جه کنم و کجا شوم و که را به پاری درخواهم که به قریمان. 579-580. » /g998/g995 /g942/g913 /g821/g909/g1005 /g821/g909 . /g993/g937/g910/g1011/g942/g979 /g1002/g913 /g1002/g815 ... /g1002/g913 /g909/g941 /g1002/g815 /g1005 /g993/g1006/g951 /g910/g928/g815 /g1005 /g994/g1000/g815 /g1002/g809«

ای وای بر من. جه کنم و کجا شوم و که را به پاری درخواهم که به قریمان. 579-580. » /g998/g995 /g942/g913 /g821/g909/g1005 /g821/g909 . /g993/g937/g910/g1011/g942/g979 /g1002/g913 /g1002/g815 ... /g1001/g938/g999/g910/g996/g913 /g990/g1012/g991/g937 /g822/g913 /g822/g948/g815 /g910/g1004/g1000/g919/g993/g909«

To prohibit people from crying for their dead, is a concept found among other peoples and religions as well.179

The theme of these sentences is compatible to a part of the 46th Yasna, the first paragraph, where it says:

[To] which piece of land shall I [go to] graze [my cattle]
Where shall I go to graze [them]?
They keep [me] away from [their] family and tribe.
The community which I wish to join does not satisfy me
Nor [do] the deceitful tyrants of the land.
How shall I satisfy Thee, O Wise Ahura? (Yasna: XLVI.1).180

179 For information on the tradition to weep for the dead among adherents of different religions, including Armenians, Mandaeans, Muslims and Copts, and the prohibition of this tradition by religious leaders, the reader may refer to Meier (1973).
Just the first line of this part of Yasna 46 is mentioned in the Parsig version (XVII.5) of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma. Gignoux believes that the form mentioned in the Parsig version is a free citation of this same passage in the Yasna (Gignoux 1984: 171).

589. واختر (Parsig: abāxtar). واختر, abāxtar, wāxtar and axtar, means “north” in Iranian mythology, the winter place (IraBd 1956: XXVIII.3).

606. گژدهم (Parsig: gazdum or gazdumb, New Persian: kaţdum). gazdum is recorded as a variant of kaţdum (Mu’in 1984: 3.3313). It seems that this variant is more ancient than kaţdum. gazdum may be a dialectical form of the word.

608. گژیان “sting”. This word is written گژیان (گژیان) in manuscript P, which is pointed out in a footnote. It is possible that gazidan is a dialectal form of the word or even a more ancient form of it. However, this form of the word is not recorded in any dictionary.

612. تفافعی (exalting oneself/superiority/ascendancy). This word is written تفافعی ‘distinction’, in all manuscripts except manuscript L, in which there is an obvious mistake. The word tafaffuq would not give a sensible meaning: “Today, I must be distinct to others, for how can I know what will come tomorrow?” but with taffaruq instead of taffaruq the meaning will be reasonable. “Today, I must be superior to others, for how can I know what will come tomorrow?”

This word is written as نامی in manuscript L, which is meaningless in this context. Thus, it has been emended in the edition with respect to the sense of the sentence.

619. اهرمان (Parsig: Ahriman (Nyberg 1974: II.11) or Ahreman (MacKenzie 1990: 7), in some Parsig texts mentioned as gan[n]āg mēnōg, is one of the two incipient spirits of the world, in Avestan called ائگره مینو انگریمان. aŋrō mainyu-, which means a warlike spirit (Yasna XLV: 2). He is the symbol of ugliness, wickedness, falsehood and darkness, and his place is in Hell. Ahrīman, who is the leader of all demons, fights permanently against Ohrmazd in a combat that will result in Ohrmazd’s victory at the end of the world.

The Pazand and New Persian form of the word is Āharman, Ahraman and Ahriman (Nyberg 1974: II.11).

This name is found in manuscripts NPN²MO in two forms: اهرمان Āhriman and اهرامن Āhraman or Āhirman. It is written اهرامن Āhriman in manuscript L. Firdauš used the forms Āhirman and Ahraman in the Šāhnāma (Khāligi-Muţlaq 1986: 253) as well. Since the form Ahraman is found in the basic manuscript, namely N, it is the form retained in the edited text and the other forms are moved to the footnotes.

Some researchers of the religious history, among them S. Hartman (Hartman 1976: 1-8) and G. Widengren (Widengren 1969: 440-455), believe
that the conception of Satan as an evil power in Judaism and Christianism is
directly influenced by the Iranian Ahriman.

635. The letter /g821/ is used to indicate the presence of an /g1842/g407fa.

643. /g254 in /g407n ki gurg ustuxand xwarad “… As a wolf eats bone…” The Parsig version has dog instead of wolf, which seems to be more proper.

648. It is written /g918/g980/g955 /g997/g910/g1012/g935/g943/g1005/g937 /g941/g937 “As a wolf eats bone…”. The Parsig version has dog instead of wolf, which seems to be more proper.

648-649. It is written /g997/g897/g910/g1003 /g941/g937 “[they] were walking in hell in this manner”, which is in accordance with the meaning of the whole sentence. Thus, the sentence is edited in this way.

649-650. In all manuscripts, this sentence is written in this form /g997/g909/g1005/g941 /g998/g1011/g909 /g1001/g937/g1006/g913 /g941/g910/g995 /g910/g913 /g997/g910/g952/g1011/g909 /g997/g909/g1005/g941 /g997/g1006/g1000/g815/g909 “[they] were walking in hell in this manner”, which is in accordance with the meaning of the whole sentence. Thus, the sentence is edited in this way.

651-652. In all manuscripts, this sentence is written in this form /g918/g947/g909 /g1001/g937/g1006/g913 /g941/g910/g995 /g910/g913 /g997/g910/g952/g1011/g909 “Now, their souls have been snake-like” is found in this form, whereas it seems that the verb /g918/g947/g909 /g1001/g937/g1006/g913 “are” at the end of the sentence is enough and that, the participle /g1001/g937/g1006/g913 “have been” is superfluous. Thus, it is omitted in the edited version.

679. /g822/g920/g948/g815/g757 “kust/g431, (Parsig: kustūg “holy waistband”). kustū is a kind of belt, woven of 72 strings spun of sheep’s wool. Zoroastrians wear it as a holy waistband after they are 15 years old.

In the edition it is written /g822/g920/g952/g815 “kust/g431 following manuscripts NPN²MO. This heading is found only in manuscript L, and since /g822/g920/g948/g815/g757 “kust/g431 is used in Zoroastrian Persian as well, it is in the edition kept in this orthographic form.

Concerning the importance of wearing the holy waistband kustū it is written “Whoever wears the kustū has gone away from realm of the Devil (Ahriman) and come into Ohrmazd’s realm” (SDN 1909: X. 5).

It seems that fastening the kustū (holy waistband) was current in Iran even before Zarathustra. According to The Reign of Jamšīd, Surūš asks Jamšīd to fasten the kustū (MS.S.P.38: 116). It is also mentioned in the Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspram that Amšāspand Bahman (Bahman the Holy Immortal) led Zarathustra, when he was fifteen years old, to put on the kustū (WZad 1993: XIII.2).

684-685; 704. The Zoroastrians made much fuss about walking with one shoe only. The same prohibition can be found in Islam as well. For example,
it is recommended that if someone’s shoelace is torn, one should take the 
other shoe off until the first shoe also is fixed (Goldziher 1896: 50). It is not 
yet clear why the Zoroastrians prohibited walking about with one shoe only. 
However, it seems that there is an Arabic expression for this act, that is » /g821/g943/g759 
/g997/g910/g964/g1012/g952/g991/g909« ziyyu l-šay/g1810/g407n 
“Satan’s clothing fashion”, which seems to fit nicely with the Zoroastrian concept (Shaked 1995,: XII.151-152).

686. »/g937/g909/g937/g942/g935« xurd/g407d 
(Avestan: haurvat/g407t, Parsig: hord/g407d). xurd/g407d is the 
guardian for the water, and thus also for cultivation of the earth.

686. »/g937/g909/g937/g942/g995/g909« amurd/g407d 
(Avestan: am/g1015r/g1015t/g407t, Parsig: amurd/g407d). amurd/g407d is 
the symbol for immortality, the guardian of the plants.

695. » /g822/g802/g947/g1005/g941/g997/g937/g942/g815« r/g460sp/g431-kardan. In Parsig r/g460sp/g431 means “whore”, and 
r/g460sp/g431h, means “whoredom” (MacKenzie 1990: 72). The corresponding 
verb is » /g822/g802/g947/g1005/g941/g821/g942/g819/g997/g937/g942/g815« 
r/g460sp/g431-gar/g431-kardan in New Persian. However, this 
verb is found in the form of r/g460sp/g431-kardan both in the present text and in the 
Saddar Natr (LXVIII), and in Zoroastrian Persian as well.

697-705. The sins mentioned in this episode are mentioned previously, in 
the thirty-third episode, as well (678-688), but the punishment for the sins 
vary in the different episodes.

704-705. Possibly the Zoroastrian reason for the prohibition to urinate 
while standing is that this causes too much pollution to the earth. This same 
prohibition occurs in Islam, and it is also mentioned in Jewish writings. It 
seems that the reason for this prohibition in Islam and Judaism is to avoid 
the risk of self-pollution by urine (Shaked 1995: XII.152).

718. »/g944/g1012/g980/g983« qaf/g431z was a unit of measuring weight and volume of grain 
(wheat and barley) and cereals (peas and beans). The volume of qaf/g431z 
was varying in different areas and cities.-qafiz was also a unit of yardstick. It is 
mentioned in the Rīsāla-yi mu’arrab/g407t that the word qafiz is an Arabicized form of kafiz (Dihxdā 1963: 84.384-385).

737. »/g998/g1004/g819/g811/g909« ažgahan (Parsig: ajgahān and ašgahān, New Persian and 
Zoroastrian Persian: » /g997/g910/g815/g811/g909« ažk/g407n, »/g997/g910/g1004/g815/g811/g909« ažkah/g407n, 
»/g997/g910/g1004/g819/g811/g909« ažgah/g407n, 
»/g998/g1004/g815/g811/g909« ažkahan and » /g998/g1004/g819/g811/g909« ažgahan) means “lazy”. This word is used as 
an adjective for Dawānūs/Dawānus, in the Parsig version of the Ardāy-Wīrāf Nāma (AWN 1872: XXXII.1).
812-820. The dog is the most valuable animal in Zoroastrianism. According to Herodotus “the Magians kill with their own hands every creature, save only dogs and men” (Herodotus 1920: I.140). According to Bundahišn, the dog is known as a cherished animal and it annihilates the demons (drūj; Parsig: druš) and pains (IraBed 1956: XXIV.51). According to Šaddar Našr, whenever someone eats bread, he should put aside three morsels of that bread to feed the dogs. People are also prohibited from beating and molesting dogs (ŠDN 1909: XXXI.1-4).

In the early days of Islam, dogs were permitted even in the mosque. However, later on, perhaps Muslims felt that they should be different somehow from Zoroastrians and therefore they changed this viewpoint (Goldziher 1900: 284ff.).

818. »/g822/g999/g910/g995 /g818/g947« sag-i m/g407n/g431. This term is copied from the Parsig form sag i mān-bānān. Bahar has translated it as «سگ خانهبانان» sag-i xāna-bānān “the guardian dog of the house” (Bahār 1996: 333).

In manuscript N «سگ» sagī “a dog” is written instead of sag-i mānī. Thus mānī is omitted there. The whole phrase sag-i mānī is also omitted in manuscript N². It seems as if the scribe has found it out of place when copying sagī of manuscript N without any adjective, thus he has decided to omit it.

«ي» in the end of «سگ» sagī can be the kasra-yi izāfa.

824. »/g997/g910/g999/g910/g913« rūzbānān is the plural form of the word «رؤژبانان» rūzbān, which means “guardian” and “executioner”.

842. «هیچر» hīxr is a Parsig word (hīxr) meaning “excrement” and “impure matter”. This word is written «حشر» haštar in manuscripts NN²O, «خسر» xasr in manuscript P, and then «هیچر» hīxr at the margin of folio 85a. It seems that the scribes did not know the meaning of the word. This word is edited as hīxr in accordance with the Parsig version. The closest form to this one is that of manuscript M. The other forms are only found in the footnote.

844. »/g993/g1006/g1000/g951/g942/g913« baršn/g460m “the major purification ritual” (Parsig: baršnūm) is the most important purification ritual to clean the body in Zoroastrianism. During the ceremony, all body limbs are washed one by one three times, under the care of a mībād (priest) and in conformity with religious rules. After this, the ablated person should spend nine days in a room all by himself. During this time, he is washed in a simpler manner three times more.

867. »/g942/g936/g1012/g1003« hixr is a Parsig word (hixr) meaning “excrement” and “impure matter”.
Thus they did not allow the Zoroastrians to use the baths of Muslims (Choksy 1997: 128). However, it is possible that this episode has been added later, in the times of Arab Muslim sovereignty. In Parsig texts concerning religious matters of this period, among them Rivāyat-i Hēmāt-i Āsawahištān (I.1, IV.1-2), a new expression «agdēn» is applied instead of «jud-dēn», which means Zoroastrian converts to Islam.

867. «jud-dēn» is a non-Zoroastrian person, and even in some cases an irreligious and a heathen.

883-894. In manuscript M the part in the lines 883-894 that is marked by two asterisks is missing. In view of the character of the handwriting of the document, it seems that just one folio of this manuscript is missing.

925. «Sfantam-gn» (Avestan: spitm-, Parsig: spitmgn), that is the name of Zarathustra’s eighth ancestor, and his family name is Sfantamg-. -gn is a derivational suffix indicting relation in Parsig, as in zar-rn and pā-pagān. This name is recorded in the forms «Sfantam-gn», «Sfantam-gn» and «Sfantam-gn» in New Persian and Zoroastrian Persian.

930. Following the sentence «āvīza means “clean, pure, pure as gold”. This word is found in the Zoroastrian Persian version (MS.S.P.1191: 91a) of “The Fifteen Arts of Mūbads”. āvīza is written «āvīza» in line 284. 931. «xudvand mā rā az hama-yi balā-ha va ‘ażāb-ha nigāh dārad “May God keep us from all misfortunes
and punishments”. This is the last sentence of manuscript M. Since, there are only few lines following this sentence in other manuscripts, manuscript M lacks only one folio.

931-937. Sometimes in Zoroastrian-Iranian works; a part of a text is chosen to be added to the end part of another text, if their themes are similar. The part found at the end of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma has the same structure as the Zoroastrian petīt-nāmag. Another petīt-nāmag, more or less with the same form and theme, following the 100th episode, is mentioned at the ending part of the Ṣaddar Bundahiš as well (ŠDB: 177).

Adding a part of a work to the ending part of another one is not restricted to the Zoroastrian Persian version of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma. It is observed also in the Ohmazd pad harwispāgāhīn, where the ending part of the Nīrangistān is added (Aša 2002b: 44, 55, 73). The above-mentioned ending part is found in the sixth book of the Dīnkard as well (idem: 25).

The influence of this same style can also be seen in the addition of some traditions and verses to the beginnings and endings of Iranian Islamic texts.

936. »ajāš and »axaš. These two words seem to be misspellings of the Parsig word of »abaxš, which means “repentant, regretful”. Since this word is found both as ajāš and axaš in other Zoroastrian Persian texts as well, for example in the petīt ī ērānī (Iranian confession) (T.30=N: 239b-241a), it has been kept as it stands in this text. The doubling could originate from the loss of the b and a consequent uncertainty about this word. This word is recorded as »afāxš in the Ṣaddar Bundahiš, and as »avāxš in a variant copy (ŠDB 1909: LX.3). In the conclusion of the petīt ī paštāmānīh (confession for penitence), which is known as petīt ī Ādurābād, it reads as follows: az hān vināhīhā abaxš, paštām ī petīt ī ērānī “I regret and repent of [my] sins and I am penitent” (Aša 2002a: 291). In pataftam “and I have committed intentionally”. In the Zoroastrian Persian versions of Pataš-Nāma, this verb is in most editions found in the form »bi pataftam or »bi patatam in the last sentence of the text. In any case, the form of va pataftam, which is found in Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma is also grammatically correct.

937. »patat, pataft or »patat is, like baršnūm, the symbol of cleaning the body to purify the spirit symbolically.

938. Murdād māh-i qadīm “the ancient month of Murdād”. Iranian months have been in use in the Iranian calendar since the solar year was made official in 1925. However, there were generally two kinds of chronometry for the Iranian calendar earlier: the first is called Jalālī and the other one was the Qadīm “ancient”. For example, they wrote the month of Farvardīn twice in calendars; firstly as Farvardīn-i Jalālī “Jalālī’s Farvardīn” in a sub-column of the Jalālī months and secondly as Farvardīn-i qadīm “Ancient Farvardīn” in a sub-column of ancient months. The ancient months were adopted based on the Ancient Iranian Calendar, which was current before Malik-šāh (1073-1092) of the Saljūq dynasty. However, in
spite of the introduction of the Jalālī Calendar (introduced in 1078) which was current after Malik-šāh, the ancient calendar was in use as well. Zoroastrians of Iran and India (the Parsis) even use it currently. Even Muslims in some parts of Iran still use this calendar. The ancient months made up an incomplete year where every month had 30 days and there were totally 360 days in a year. To complete the year, five days called «پنج‌ده‌انه دوزده» *panja-yi duzdida* (the lost five days) “epagomenæ” were added to the end of the final month of the year (Taqīzāda 1977: 4-5).

938. The name of the work is given as the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* at the beginning of the text besides in manuscripts N, P, N² and O. For this reason, while editing the text, the word ‘Ardāy’ was added to ‘Vīrāf Nāma’ at the ending line and written in square brackets: *[Ardāy]-Vīrāf Nāma*. 
VIII. The Zoroastrian Persian Version in Comparison with the Parsig Version

The Zoroastrian Persian and Parsig versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* are of the same origin, and they are, on the whole, similar in content. This does not mean that they are similar word for word. Furthermore, they differ considerably in some passages.

Haug and West note the differences between the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* versions in the preface, and in their view the original story probably lacked a preface. Furthermore, because there is no written date for either of the two versions, later authors attributed the text of the preface to later Zoroastrians clerics, whose intention was to solve problems of Zoroastrianism in ritual and belief (Haug-West 1872: Lxxiii). In comparing the Zoroastrian Persian and Parsig versions of the texts, it will be shown that in some places the differences between the two texts are not fewer than the differences between the prefaces.181

The content of the two texts of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* are sometimes similar, sometimes the resemblance is smaller and sometimes they are entirely different from each other. The similarity of the two versions can be divided into four degrees:

- Almost total similarity
- Compressed expression of a subject in one version and expanding the same subject in the other version
- Different sequences of passages and chapters in the two versions
- Lacking passages and chapters in one version

As mentioned in the chapter on previous research, in previous studies of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, mention has generally been made of similarities and differences between the different versions of this text. Furthermore, several thorough comparisons of various versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* have been made. At first, Haug and West compared some segments of various versions of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, especially some parts of the H28 manuscripts (Zoroastrian Persian), with the Parsig version (1872). Then, after them, the complete text of the versified version of Zartušt Bahrām was com-

---

181 In the Parsig version, according to the divisions of Dastur Jamaspji Asa, there is no distinct ‘introduction’. Since the ‘introduction’ consists of a part of the text that prepares the way for entering the main text, the first and the second chapters and pieces 1-7th of the 3rd chapter may be considered as the introduction in Parsig version.
pared twice with the Parsig version. The first comparison was done by ‘Afifī (1964) and the second one by Āmūzgār (1983). Ġaybī has also made a comparison of some parts of the Zoroastrian Persian version with the versified version of Zartušt Bahrām and the Parsig version (2001).

The Parsig language dates back to a time before the Zoroastrian Persian version, which means that the Parsig version must be of an earlier origin than the Zoroastrian Persian version. Nevertheless, this research is mainly concerned with the Zoroastrian Persian version, and the Zoroastrian Persian version is also presented in a text edition in this work. Therefore, the Zoroastrian Persian version is the basis of the comparison and the Parsig version will be compared to that version.

For the purpose of comparing the two versions, the divisions of the Zoroastrian Persian text found in the London manuscript and the divisions of the Parsig text edited by Dastur Hoshangji Jamaspji Asa have been followed. The London manuscript is the only manuscript of the Zoroastrian Persian version which has been divided into parts, viz. one preface and sixty episodes. The Parsig version was for the first time divided into chapters when it was edited by Dastur Jamaspji Asa, and then into a hundred chapters. Later researchers have, more or less, accepted and profited of his divisions.182

While comparing these two versions, first the two prefaces are compared. This comparison will be more extensive and more detailed than the comparison of the other chapters. There are two reasons for doing this; first, although the prefaces of these two versions obviously have a common origin and are similar in their style of describing the circumstances, the narration differs considerably between them. Secondly, there is a time discrepancy in the two versions, which means that Ardāy’s journey takes place in different historical periods in the Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian versions.

After comparing the prefaces, all Zoroastrian Persian episodes will successively be studied and compared to the Parsig version for contents and orders of events. If there is any difference between the Zoroastrian Persian and Parsig versions, this will be indicated. It will be also indicated when a passage or a full chapter is found in only one of the two versions.

182 To compare these two versions, the text edition made in this work has been used for the Zoroastrian Persian version, and for the Parsig version the text edited by Jamaspji Asa has been employed. In addition to the edited text by Jamaspji Asa, other editions and translations of the Parsig version have been used as well. These are: The Pahlavi Codices K 20 & K 20b, fols. 2r-29r; The Pahlavi Codices K 26, fols. 8r-56v; Le Livre d’Ardā Virāz, Ph. Gignoux 1984; Ardā Virāz Nāma, F. Vahman 1986; Ardā Virāf Nāma, Translation in Persian by R. ‘Afifī (1993); Ardā Virāz Nāma, Ph. Gignoux, traduit en persan par Ž. Āmūzgār (1993); Ardā-Vīrah Nāma, Translation in Persian by M. Bahār (1996).
Comparison of the Introductions

The introduction of the Zoroastrian Persian version corresponds to the first and second chapters and sections 1-7 of the third chapter of the Parsig version.\(^{183}\)

In both versions, the introduction has similar contents.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** The Zoroastrian faith is facing a period of weakness and the masses are uncertain about their religious beliefs. Ardašīr-i Bābakān asks the Zoroastrian priests to reveal to him the right and true religion, so that he may destroy all other religions.

Forty thousand wise persons and authorities come together in Ardašīr’s court from every place of Iran by his order. Ardašīr tells them that he wants to eliminate all hesitation and doubt about the Zoroastrian faith. After a long process, they select Vīrāf for this mission. Without any conditions, Vīrāf accepts the duty, which consists of a journey to the Other World. Then Vīrāf goes together with others to the Ādarān fire-temple. He performs his ablutions there, dresses in white, perfumes himself and repents in front of the fire.

Vīrāf has seven sisters who come weeping to request that their brother should not be sent to the Other World. The Zoroastrian priests promise that Vīrāf will return. The sisters accept and go back home. Vīrāf is laid up on a throne by priests. The priests perform religious ceremonies and then they make Vīrāf drink three bowls of wine. Vīrāf drinks the wine and falls asleep. Vīrāf is asleep for seven days and nights. During this time, forty thousand wise men as well as Ardašīr, the king, and his soldiers keep guard around the fire-temple to prevent any damage to that religious ceremony. Vīrāf wakes up after seven days. People and authorities make merry and ask him to let them know what has happened to him.

**Parsig:** The weakness and uncertainty of Zoroastrianism is attributed to Alexander’s attack, when *Avesta* was burned and the priests killed. Thenceforth, Ādurbād Ī Māraspandān appears and submits himself to ordeals to prove the truth of his religion. In spite of this, the masses are still hesitant.

There is no mention of any king’s name in this version. The authorities come together in the Ādur Ī Farnbay fire-temple and, after discussing the problem, they decide to send someone to the Other World to get information whether the good deeds of religion that people do are profitable to the gods or to the demons. Then they call on the people and select seven men among them, and they in their turn select Vīrāf, who according to this version is known as “Weh-šāpūr”, in a selection process in two stages. The name “Weh-šāpūr” is not mentioned in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

\(^{183}\) The part that is called ‘introduction’ by Haug and West, is the same as the first, second and third chapters of the Parsig version. Whereas the text divisions in this thesis follow the London manuscript (L), in which the introduction covers the first and second chapter and sections 1-7 of the third chapter of the Parsig version.
Virāf wishes to test if the choice of him is correct by throwing a javelin; it is not clearly known what the significance of this test was. After three times of throwing the javelin, Virāf is again selected.

Virāf’s seven sisters are his wives, too. They are among God’s worshippers and know the religious texts by heart. The seven sisters converse with the mōbadān (priests) and stay by Virāf’s side after the decision of the priests.

Virāf tells the priests that he must first eat something and make his last will known, and after that they can make him drink wine and mang (henbane). Then he eats something and the authorities make him drink three bowls of wine and mang. Virāf drinks all three bowls, says his prayer while he is conscious and then falls asleep. There is no word of eating and drinking mang in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

The dastūrān (authorities), mōbadān (priests) and sisters are busy reading the Avesta and watching Virāf during his sleep.

Virāf’s soul ascends to the top of the Mount Dāīfīg and comes back to his body after seven days and nights and Virāf wakes up. In the Zoroastrian Persian version there is no word of Virāf ascending to the top of the Mount Dāīfīg and returning to his body.

While returning, as Virāf sees dastūrs (authorities) and hērbads (priests/teachers), he goes towards them and shows his reverence and gives them the greetings of Ōhrmazd, Zardušt, Srōš, Ādur-yazd (the god of fire), xwarrah ī dēn (the glory of Religion) and the other virtuous ones of the Other World. The sisters are happy because of Virāf’s return, too. No such greetings are mentioned in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

Comparison of subsequent episodes in both versions

1. The first episode of the Zoroastrian Persian version corresponds to sections 8-14 of the third chapter and the sections 1-4 of the fourth chapter of the Parsig version.184

   Zoroastrian Persian: Virāf eats a little food and says his prayers. Then, he asks for a scribe to write his travel report to be sent all over the world.

   Virāf sees Surūš a few hours after he has fallen asleep and tells him that he has been sent by the king and the dastūrs (authorities) to report. Then together with Surūš he goes to the Chinvad Bridge and describes it.

   Parsig: Virāf eats some food and drinks water and wine, and then asks for a scribe.

---

184 In order to help the reader not to confuse the different versions with each other, two different words are here used: ‘episode’ for the Zoroastrian Persian version and ‘chapter’ for the Parsig version.
He sees Srōš and Ādur-yazd (the god of fire) and tells them that he is “a messenger”. Then he visits Chinvad Bridge, but he does not describe it.

2. The second episode corresponds to sections 5-14 of the fourth chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian**: This episode consists of a description of a virtuous man who says a prayer while passing the Chinvad Bridge. This spirit is mentioned only in the third singular person form.

**Parsig**: The virtuous spirit is mentioned both as a single individual and in the plural. The virtuous man says a Gathic prayer in the Avestan language.\(^{185}\)

3. The third episode corresponds to the fifth chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian**: Vīrāf, while visiting Mihr-yazd and the \(amšāspan-dān\) (Holy Immortals) on Chinvad Bridge, tells them that he has been sent by the \(mābads\) (priests), the \(dastūrs\) (authorities), the faithful and the king of kings to report to them about the Other World. Vīrāf says these same words to Surūš in the first episode of the Zoroastrian Persian version. A virtuous man arrives at Chinvad Bridge, which is 27 \(gaz\) (27 meters) wide. The Bridge turns the wide side up, and the virtuous man and Vīrāf following him pass it.

**Parsig**: Chinvad Bridge becomes as wide as 9 lances.

The following circumstances are mentioned in the Parsig version but not in the Zoroastrian Persian version:

- Vīrāf sees Rašn with a golden balance in her hand measuring good and evil deeds.

Srōš and Ādur-yazd say that they will show the merriment, as well as the light and fragrance of Paradise to Vīrāf, besides the darkness, narrowness, laboriousness and wickedness of Hell.

4. The fourth episode is not mentioned in the Parsig version, but its statement that is leading Vīrāf to Ohrmazd’s place were cited in sections 1-3 of chapter 10 of the Parsig version.

5. The fifth episode is not mentioned in the Parsig version.

6. The sixth episode corresponds to the sixth chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian**: Vīrāf was led to \(hamīstagān\) (limbo), the place of those for whom the virtues and sins are equal.

7. The seventh episode corresponds to the the seventh chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian**: Vīrāf was led to the \(sitā-ra-pāya\) (star-station), the place of those who have not done nau-zūdī and gīyi-xarīd (see commentary).

---

\(^{185}\) The Gathic statement of the virtuous man runs: \(Uštā ahmāi yahmāi, uštā kahmāi ēcit.\)
**Parsig:** The sins of the residents of the star-station are, not to have done their prayers, not to have read the Gāhān, not to have married their close relatives xwēdōdah (kin-marriage) and not to have ruled or been leaders.

8. The eighth episode corresponds to the eight chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Vīrāf was been led to the māh-pāya (moon-station), the place of those who have not done the Gāhān prayers and not done nau-zūdī and gūī-xarīd.

**Parsig:** The other sin of the residents of the moon-station is that they have not married their close relatives xwēdōdah (kin-marriage).

9. The ninth episode corresponds to the ninth chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Vīrāf was been led to the xūršīd-pāya (sun-station), the place of those who have done all the good deeds except nau-zūdī.

**Parsig:** The sun-station is the place of the virtuous kings.

10. The tenth episode does not exist in the Parsig version. But its main subject corresponds to the first–third section of chapter eleven of the Parsig version.

The main subject of this episode, ascending to garūmān (Paradise) to bow down to Ohrmazd, is similar to the second section of the fifth episode of the Zoroastrian Persian version.

11. The eleventh episode corresponds to the first-third sections of the tenth chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** A voice tells the souls not to trouble Vīrāf by asking him questions. Instead of this, they should feed him with some aliments. So Vīrāf is given a bowl of raugan-i midiyūzarm (spring oil) which is the most delicious nutriment that Vīrāf has ever eaten, and that is the food for all heavenly fellows and obedient and god-fearing women.

**Parsig:** Vīrāf was given anš (immortality syrup) to drink.

12. The twelfth episode corresponds to the fourth–eighth sections of the tenth chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** The holy immortal Urdibihīšt reproaches Vīrāf for setting wet logs on fire and recommends Vīrāf to advise the people of the world to be careful while setting logs on fire, perhaps the logs may be wet. The last sentence is not mentioned in the Parsig version.

**Parsig:** The holy immortal is here called Ādur-yazd (the god of fire).

13. The 13th episode corresponds to chapter 11 of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** The description of garūmān (Paradise), which, according to what Surūš says, is made of pure diamond does not exist in the Parsig version.

In that version the voice that gives the order to show the place of righteous and evil doings to Vīrāf is the voice of Ohrmazd.

**Parsig:** There is no mention of garūmān, but it is called the place of Ohrmazd and of the amšāspandān (Holy Immortals), the faravahr (celestial
body) of Zarathustra, Wištāsp the king, Jāmāsp, Isadwaštār ī zarduštān (son of Zarathustra) and the other religion leaders in the ninth section.

Gignoux supposes that it is a repetition when these names are mentioned in the same chapter for the second time. Since the names of Gayōmart and Faršōstar are missing in the first list, without doubt one of the later collectors of the work added these two names to complete the list according to his desire (Gignoux 1984: 164). Neither the list of heroes nor that of the gods is found in the Zoroastrian Persian text.

14. The 14th episode corresponds to chapter 12 of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Virāf sees the spirits of the ṛādān (munificent), all shining and playing cheerfully. They are those who have acted benevolently and made donations to poor and orphans.

**Parsig:** The spirits of the ṛādān are the believers of religion and the doers of religious duties, who are honored by Ohrmazd.

In the tenth piece of the twelfth chapter, a description is given of the spirits of virtuous rulers and kings on golden chariots and wheeled vehicles. This is similar to the 20th episode of the Zoroastrian Persian version, where mention is made of the spirits of men of armour.

15-16. The 15th and 16th episodes have no corresponding chapters in the Parsig version.

17. The subject of the 17th episode is the reward for righteous judgment and the punishment for unjust judgment.

The theme of punishment for unjust judgment is also repeated in the 79th and 91st chapters of the Parsig version.

18. The 18th episode corresponds to chapter 13 of the Parsig version, but is longer than that one.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Virāf sees women in beautiful dresses, who have been obedient to their husbands and loving towards them and have respected water and fire.

**Parsig:** These women are the women of good thoughts, good words, and good deeds who have respected water, fire, the land, plants, cows and sheep and Ohrmazd’s other creatures. In addition to this, they have satisfied the wishes of the divinities of the spiritual world and the divinities of the physical world, and they have gained respect and satisfaction from their husband and their guardians as well.

19. The 19th episode corresponds to the first-third sections of chapter 14 of the Parsig version, but is longer than that one.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Seeing the spirits of the hērbadān (priests/teachers), who themselves have performed their worship and already have a more superior position than the other spirits in Paradise, they keep company with the amšāspandān and eat spring oil.

**Parsig:** This group is called yazīṅgarān (worshippers) and mansarbarān (religious leaders), but in this version there is no word of them having per-
formed their worship themselves, keeping company with the holy immortals, or eating spring oil.

20. The 20th episode corresponds to the fourth–fifth sections of chapter 14 of the Parsig version but is longer than that one.

Zoroastrian Persian: Here the spirits that have curtailed the power of the enemies of Irān-šahr and have been in trouble all the time are vested in military garments and are given golden and silvery weapons.

Parsig: Vīrāf sees spirits with valuable bejeweled weapons sitting in a kingly manner on chariots and wheeled vehicles (gardīnæh), but there is no word about protecting Irān-šahr against enemies.

However, in the 10th section of chapter 12 of the Parsig version, it is written that the spirits of fair rulers and kings are seated on golden chariots and wheeled vehicles. This is similar to a section of the 20th episode in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

21. The 21st episode corresponds to the sixth–seventh sections of chapter 14 of the Parsig version but is longer than that one.

Zoroastrian Persian: The spirit of those who have killed xrafstarān (noxious creatures) and black wild beasts are now in gardens and orchards dancing joyfully.

Parsig: Here it is written that since xrafstarān have been killed by these persons, the splendor of the water, fire, plants and productivity of the ground has become more brilliant.

22. The 22nd episode corresponds to the eighth–ninth sections of chapter 14 of the Parsig version but is longer than that one.

Zoroastrian Persian: Here the spirit of farmers (barzīgarān) have been given the greatest happiness by the amšaspand (holy immortal) Isfandārmad in the most beautiful garden, and Isfandārmad reveals herself to them as pretty women who are at their service.

Parsig: There is no description of the place where the farmers (wāstārtaryōštān) spend their afterlife, but the celestial bodies of the water and the ground and the plants and the sheep are at the farmers’ service.

In the tenth section of chapter 14 of the Parsig version, Vīrāf sees the spirit of the craftsmen sitting in a luminous place. This piece is not found in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

23. The content of 23rd episode corresponds to sections 1-14 of chapter 86 of the Parsig version but is longer than that one.

Zoroastrian Persian: This episode is the longest part of the Zoroastrian Persian version. Almost one third of the beginning of the text describes the spirits of the shepherds and their rewards. However more than two thirds of the text, a substantial amount of text, is about the philosophy of life, the difficulties of the world, and how to conduct one’s life by struggling against greed, avidity and wickedness.

Parsig: The contents of the Parsig version are similar to that of the Zoroastrian Persian version but are not as detailed as the latter text.
24. The 24th episode corresponds to sections 4-7 of chapter 15 of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Here the husbandmen (kadādā), who have cultivated the world are celestial bodies, and the water and fire and ground and plants and trees are at their service in the Other World.

**Parsig:** The celestial bodies (faravahr) of the righteous and of water and plants are in the service of husbandmen (kadag-xwadāyān) and countrymen (dahigān).

In the 18th section of the 15th chapter of the Parsig version, Vīrāf sees the spirits of teachers and scholars who are rejoicing. This does not exist in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

25. The 25th episode corresponds to the 9th section of the 15th chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Vīrāf sees the place of the intercessors and describes it extensively.

**Parsig:** The place of the intercessors is described in a single piece (XV.9). The description of the excellent world of the chaste is found in a single piece, too (XV.10), but no such description exists in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

26. The 26th episode corresponds to the 16th chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Vīrāf arrives at a river which has been created by the tears of mourners and which the dead souls cannot pass through. Some dead souls are also submerged in this river.

**Parsig:** There are no souls submerged in the river. The mourning is described in the 57th chapter, but there it is only the women who mourn and weep.

27. The 27th episode corresponds to the 17th chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** The spirits of all evil-doing persons is described as a single one, in the third person singular. The Chinval Bridge is described as a razor or a sword. The spirit says a prayer, the theme of which is non-religious; it does not address Ohrmazd and there is no mention of Ohrmazd in that phrase.

**Parsig:** The evil-doers’ spirits are referred to both as a single unit in the third person singular and as a plural concept (in the third person plural). No description of Chinval Bridge exists here. The spirit of the evil-doing persons says a Gathic prayer, which is shorter and is cited in Avestan.\(^{186}\)

28. The 28th episode corresponds to the 18th chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** This is a description of the punishments of those who are captured in Hell.

**Parsig:** When three days and nights have passed, a spirit says: “Nine thousand years have passed upon me but I am not yet released”. These same

---

\(^{186}\) The Gathic formulation of the evil-doers’ prayer is: \textit{Uštā ahmāi yahmāi, uštā kahmāi ěit.}
words are repeated in the 54th chapter as well. This passage is not found in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

29. The 29th episode corresponds to the 19th chapter of the Parsig version. Here the spirits of sodomites that have been changed into snake-men and are being punished are described. The outward appearance of these spirits is different in the two versions.

30. The 30th episode corresponds to the 20th chapter of the Parsig version.

31. The 31st episode corresponds to the 21st chapter of the Parsig version but is longer than that one. In this episode, the spirit who has killed a righteous man in the world is described.

32. The 32nd episode corresponds to the 22nd chapter of the Parsig version. 

Zoroastrian Persian: Here the spirit of a man who has had sexual intercourse with a woman in her menstruation time is described.

Parsig: The measure of punishment for each time of intercourse is given. There is also another punishment for this sin, namely that the wrongdoer should cook and eat his most merited child.

33. The 33rd episode corresponds to the 23rd chapter of the Parsig version.

Zoroastrian Persian: Here the spirit that has not said any prayer while drinking water or eating vegetables and has not put on the sacred girdle and has walked around with only one shoe on is being punished. The punishment for the latter two sins is repeated in 35th episode as well.

Parsig: Only the sin of not saying prayer while drinking water and eating vegetables is mentioned here.

34. The 34th episode is about whoredom and corresponds to the 24th chapter of the Parsig version. It is repeated in the 81st Parsig chapter.

35. The 35th episode corresponds to the 25th chapter of the Parsig version. 

Zoroastrian Persian: Here, again, the spirits that have not fastened the sacred girdle and have walked with one odd shoe on as well as those who have urinated while standing are punished.

Parsig: These spirits have, according to the Parsig version, also committed “other evil-doings”.

36. The 36th episode corresponds to the 26th chapter of the Parsig version. 

37. The 37th episode corresponds to the 27th chapter of the Parsig version. 

Zoroastrian Persian: In this part, the spirit is described that has committed trade with false weights, cheating and mixing water in milk.

Parsig: These spirits mix water in wine. The sin of trade with false weights is repeated in the 67th and 80th chapters of the Parsig version, too.

38. The 38th episode corresponds to the 28th chapter of the Parsig version but is longer than that one. Here spirits of tyrant kings in the present world are being punished.

39. The 39th episode corresponds to the 29th chapter of the Parsig version. 

Zoroastrian Persian: Here the spirit of a man who has committed slander is being punished.
**Parsig:** This sin is repeated in the 66th chapter, too. But there, both a man and a woman who have committed slander are mentioned.

40. The 40th episode corresponds to the 30th chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** The spirit of one who has killed many quadrupeds cruelly is punished.

**Parsig:** This sin is repeated in the 74th chapter as well.

41. The 41st episode corresponds to the 31st chapter of the Parsig version. This chapter is twice as long in the Zoroastrian Persian version as in the Parsig version.

The spirit of one who has accumulated wealth but has neither used it himself nor has made any donations to others is described here.

42. The 42nd episode corresponds to the 32nd chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** The spirit of a man called Danus, whose single good deed was that he once with one foot threw some grass in front of a sheep that was tied far from its food is portrayed in such a way that one foot is shown to be outside of Hell.

**Parsig:** This man is called Dawâinus and has thrown grass in front of a cow.

43. The 43rd episode corresponds to the 33rd chapter of the Parsig version.

This subject is about the punishment of liars and is repeated in the 90th chapter.

44-46. The 44th-46th episodes correspond to the 44th-46th chapters of the Parsig version.

47. The 47th episode corresponds to the 47th chapter of the Parsig version but is longer than that one.

The spirit of people who were hypocrites and have deceived the masses and caused them to convert from Mazdâ-worship to other religions is being punished here.

48. The 48th episode corresponds to the 48th chapter of the Parsig version.

49. The 49th episode corresponds to the 34th chapter of the Parsig version.

The spirit of a woman who has shown disrespect to the fire is being punished. There are different manners of disrespect to the fire in the two versions.

50. The 50th episode corresponds to the 35th chapter of the Parsig version.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** The spirit of a woman who has conjured magic and caused others to do the same thing is described.

**Parsig:** There is no word about causing others to do magic. Practicing magic by women is repeated in 81st chapter.

51-52. The 51-52nd episodes correspond to the 38th-39th chapters of the Parsig version.

53. The 53rd episode and the 40th chapter of the Parsig version are identical as regards the manner of punishment.

**Zoroastrian Persian:** Here, a man who deprived other people of their women is now carrying a mountain on his back.
Parsig: A man who has told lies and untrue words about others carries a mountain on his back.

This sin is repeated in the 60th chapter, the 71st chapter (in addition to the sin of sodomy) and the 88th chapter of the Parsig version.

54. The 54th episode is not found in the Parsig version, but it is similar to a part of the 72nd chapter of the Parsig version.

Zoroastrian Persian: The people who have taken their bath in the manner of the followers of other religions and have caused Isfandārmad and the Celestial soul (mēnōg) of water and of fire to be displeased with them are being punished.

Parsig: According to the 72nd chapter, women who have not cared for their menstruation caused Isfandārmad and water and fire to be disturbed.

55. The 55th episode corresponds to the 49th chapter of the Parsig version.

Zoroastrian Persian: The spirit of a man who has extracted heavy taxes (xarāj-i garān) on people’s land and caused them to become refugees from their native home is being punished by getting a mountain on his back.

Parsig: Here several men who have committed this sin are mentioned as eating the filth and the corpse of others for their punishment. In addition to this, the demons also throw stones at them. Every spirit carries a large amount of these stones on his back.

56-58. The 56th-58th episodes correspond to the 50th-52nd chapters of the Parsig version.

59. The 59th episode corresponds to the 1st section of the 101st chapter of the Parsig version.

Zoroastrian Persian: Surūš and Urdibihīš lead Vīrāf from the dark and gloomy Hell into the glorious Paradise (Garūtmān).

Parsig: Vīrāf is led by Srōš and Ādur-yazd.

60. The 60th episode corresponds to the 2nd-12th sections of the 101st chapter of the Parsig version.

Zoroastrian Persian: The voice of Ohrmazd tells Vīrāf to come back to the world and tell the full truth of what he has seen and not to tell any lies, because Ohrmazd sees him. Then he advises him to tell people not to hesitate in the religion of Zarathustra and to be faithful, whether in wealth or poverty, and to do good deeds.

In the continuation of the text, repentance of sins, worshipping Ohrmazd and the religion, and cursing of the Demons and Ahriman are described. This part does not exist in the Parsig version.

Parsig: Ohrmazd does not warn Vīrāf of telling lies. He asks Vīrāf to tell what he has seen to people truthfully and inform them that the ancient religion and all other ways are misleading ways. The true religion is the very one that was revealed to you by Zarathustra on his part and was propagated by Wištāsp. This part does not exist in the Zoroastrian Persian version of the text.
Viraf then bows in front of Ohrmazd. He says that thereafter he is taken back to his own bed by Srōš. This part does not exist in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

Out of the Zoroastrian Persian version that includes an introduction and 60 episodes, three episodes are lacking in the Parsig version: 5, 15 and 16. The Zoroastrian Persian version thus comes to an end at the 60th episode. But the Parsig version has other chapters as well. Out of all the chapters of the Parsig version, altogether 101 chapters, the following do not exist in the Zoroastrian Persian version: 36-37, 41-43, 53-56, 58-59, 61-65, 68-70, 73, 75-78, 82-85, 87, 89, and 92-100, that is 39 chapters altogether. The subject of 38 of these 39 chapters is descriptions of punishments, and the subject of the one remaining chapter of the Parsig version (LXVIII) is a description both of the punishment of a woman and of the reward of a man.

General Review

A general review of the contents of the Zoroastrian Persian and Parsig versions reveals the following main characteristics of and differences between the two versions:

- The Parsig version is more voluminous than the Zoroastrian Persian version.
- The Parsig version is more religious than the Zoroastrian Persian version, because it contains more guidelines, particularly in its extra chapters. The subjects of these chapters are totally religious. However, not only these extra chapters have stronger religious contents.
- In the Parsig version, the sins and due to them, the punishments of women are more often treated than the sins and punishments of men. Many of these sins are about “disloyalty to the husband” and a few sins are concerned with “carelessness to infants” and other life matters.
- In the Parsig version, unlawful sexual relation between a man and women of others has been mentioned more than other sins (four times: in the 40th, 60th, 71st and 88th chapters).
- In the Parsig version, again and again, the pictures and descriptions of the Hell are brought forth. It describes Hell, once in chapter 18 and again in the 53rd and 54th chapters. It seems as if the two latter descriptions are indeed a mixed version of one account and as a result of this unskillful mixing the same picture of Hell appears twice.\(^{187}\) It must be considered as an important point that the 53rd and 54th chapters of the Parsig version are not found in the Zoroastrian Persian version. It can be also supposed that

the picture of Hell in the Parsig version was procured by mixing some
to pictures of Hell taken from Ardashīr-Virāḫ’s travel report and various other
Zoroastrian texts, and as a result of this, there is some repetition of sins
and their punishment. However, these repeated passages are different in
details.
• Only one matter has been repeated twice in the Zoroastrian Persian
version, that is the sin of not having fastened the sacred girdle and walk-
ing while putting on one shoe.
• Virāf is frightened by the cries of those in Hell in the 53rd chapter of
the Parsig version, and begs Srōš and Ādur-yazd not to lead him into
Hell, but they assure him that he will not face any danger there. This
chapter only occurs in the Parsig version. However, there is no word of
Virāf being frightened of Hell anywhere in the Zoroastrian Persian ver-
sion.
• Apart from the description of Paradise, a total of 20 types of rewards
(pādafrah), are mentioned in the Zoroastrian Persian version. Among
these there are 17 rewards for “people”, 2 rewards for “men” and one for
“women”. Totally 11 rewards are mentioned in the Parsig version. There
are 7 rewards for “people”, 3 rewards for “a man” in singular form and
one reward for “women”.

Apart from the description of Hell, there are 31 cases of punishments
in the Zoroastrian Persian version; 19 punishments for “a man” in singu-
lar form, 6 punishments for “a woman” in singular form and 6 punish-
ments for “people” in general. A total of no less than 81 punishments are
described in the Parsig version; 31 punishments for “a man” in singular
form, 20 punishments for “a woman” in singular form, 19 punishments
for “people” in general, 7 punishments for “a women” in plural form, 4
punishments for “a man and a woman” both in singular form. In one of
these four cases, the woman is punished, but the man gets a reward.

Thus, the volume of subject matters about Paradise is much larger
than the volume of subject matters about Hell in the Zoroastrian Persian
version, a case which is completely reversed in the Parsig version. From
this we see the most important characteristics of the Zoroastrian Persian
version and the most important differences between the two versions.
Since the Parsig version is more religious, perhaps the differences be-
tween rewards and punishments in the two versions is more important
than their different historical settings (according to their introductions,
one is set in Ardašīr-i Bābakān’s time and the other one later than Ādur-
bād-i Māraspandān’s time).
• Virāf’s guides are Surūš and the Holy Immortal Urdibihīšt in the Zo-
roastrian Persian version, and they are Srōš and Ādur-yazd in the Parsig
version.

We can say that the reason why Urdibihīšt amšāspand’s name is found
in the Zoroastrian Persian version instead of Ādur-yazd’s name, is per-
haps because Urdībihišt amšāspand is so closely related to the fire as if they are one and the same being. According to the Šaddar Naṭr, Ohrmazd has chosen Fire as the Other World’s king, but according to the Šaddar Bundahiš, Ohrmazd has chosen Urdībihišt amšāspand as the Other World’s king (ŠDN 1909: XVIII.3; ŠDB 1909: LIV.34).

- Some of the names of persons, places and books in both the Zoroastrian Persian and the Parsig version are the same, but some names are found just in one of the two versions. The names only mentioned in the Zoroastrian Persian version are as follows: ādarān, mīdiyūzarm, urvar. The number of names mentioned only in the Parsig version are more numerous, namely: aleksandar, aštād, ērān, ādur-yazd, ādur ī farbay, ādurbād ī māraspadān, gayōmard, kav-wištāsp, rašn, frašōstar, wāy, wahrām, wēh-šābu[h]r, jāmāsp, isadwāstar, hrōmāyīg, muzrāyīg, diz ī nibišt, staxr, dēn-kard, dāitti.
IX. Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma: from a shamanistic epic into a Zoroastrian narration

The Iranian myths have been transformed and have changed into a new religious form twice due to religious transformations of the society. The first time, the Indian and the Iranian gods of pre-Zoroastrianism were transformed into a Zoroastrian form to survive.

The Iranians and the Indians were very close to each other when it came to their languages and religion. The language of the Avesta is so close to the language of the Vedas that the discoveries of Rasmus Rask in the year 1826 about the relationships between the Avestan language and Sanskrit was one of the first steps towards exploring the Avestan grammar, which was later for the first time described in detail by Williams Jackson in 1892 (Jackson 1892: xv). The ancient Iranian religion was closely related to the contemporary Indian religion in the pre-Zoroastrian times (Widengren 1965: 7-8). Furthermore, traces of the same distinct social classes of ancient India can also be found in ancient Iran (Dumézil 1958: 7-8; Benveniste 1969: 279-292).

Dumézil concluded from a research about the significant pre-Vedic gods, whose names have been mentioned in Younger Avesta as well, that these gods were common to the Iranians and the Indians. Proving his view, he presented the Boghazkoi treaty document which is a cuneiform inscription in the Hittite language. According to this inscription from the 14th century B.C., the Aryan king, Matiwaza mentioned five gods: these are Mitrá, Váruṇa, Índra, and the two Nāsatyas (Dumézil 1952: 5-39). However, the names and the functions of these gods in the Avesta are not the same as those of the Iranian pre-Zoroastrian gods.

The above-mentioned gods of Zoroastrianism became divided into two groups: gods and demons: Ahura Mazdāh and Mithra have taken the place of Váruṇa and Mitrá of the Indo-Iranian religion in the group of the gods, but Índra and Náhaïtya (Índra and the two Nāsatyas in the Vedic tradition) are placed in the group of the demons (ibid.). In this manner, the ancient Iranian and the pre-Zoroastrian myths were changed into a different form and were melded into a perfect Zoroastrian synthesis as found in the Avesta (Hinnells 1973: 20).

When Zoroastrianism was accepted in the Iranian society, in addition to the gods and religious tenets of the society, a number of the myths and epics
with their heroes from the pre-Zoroastrianism epoch were converted into Zoroastrian form and color. Every nation that accepts a new religion will in the course of time re-interpret some of its mores and traditions or even some of its old beliefs and incorporate them into this new religion with a new appearance. Sometimes they attribute old moral values to the great characters of the new religion to give these characters more validity and popularity. Moreover, they sometimes try to make the heroes or religious champions of their ancient times survive either with the same name and particularity or sometimes in a new form and appearance (Mujtaba’i 2000: 27).

For the first time, Pierre de Menasce, while doing research into the type of the Wahrām-yazd (=God Bahrām), 188 has described this kind of transformations of the pre-Zoroastrian mythic and epic personages of Iran into Zoroastrian types (de Menasce 1948: 5-18). 189 Garšasp is such a type from this gallery of mythic personalities. Garšasp, in Avesta Karšaspā-, carries the family name of Sāma-. 190 According to some parts of the ancient narrations that are left here and there Garšasp has been characterized with the function of a saviour. However, in Zoroastrianism, besides a bleaching of his character, his function as a saviour has also been committed to the three saviours in Zoroastrianism. However, some shadows of his saviour’s function remain (Sarkārāti 1999’b: 256-261).

The second transformation in myths occurred after the time when Iranians were conquered by the Arab Muslims in the Sasanid epoch. A mixing with Semitic myths is one of the most distinguished characteristics of the Iranian myths of this period. If the myths deeply founded in the society are to remain in a community which has accepted a new religion with new rituals, they must change their appearance somewhat (Ṣaddiṣqiyan 1997: 287). In this perspective, the Iranians try to adapt their myths to the isrā’iḥiyāt (Semitic myths) to make them survive. Knowing about the need for such adaptations, Bīrūnī introduces the reason for them on the part of the Iranians. There was a growing competition between the Iranians and the Arabs concerning which people was more noble or higher. The Arabs attributed themselves to Ibrāhim (Abraham) who was a forefather in Islam, but the Iranians wished to compete with them (Bīrūnī 1984: 177). 191 In other words, the Iranians

---

188 De Menasce has specially profited from two texts for his study, the first one in Parsig (MS.S.P. 2045) and the other one in Zoroastrian Persian (M55).

189 Dragon-killing was one of the most important functions of the pre-Zoroastrian gods, but dragon-killing has been intentionally avoided as an attribute of the gods both in Avesta and in the other Zoroastrian works (Sarkārāti 1999’a: 105-106). See also Wikander’s studies concerning this issue (Wikander 1941: 133).

190 The name of this personality is mentioned in two forms in Parsig works. It has been written in the form of Sām (MX 1985: XXVI.49; LXI.4, 20) in the Mēnō ī Xrad, and in the form of Kersasp (PRDd 1990: XVIII.1-36) in the Pahlavi Rivāyat. It has also been recorded in the form of Garšasp (SDB 1909: XX.1-66) in Zoroastrian Persian works.

191 This part was not included in the manuscripts that Sachau profited from in order to edit Āṯār-al-baqiya. Thus, the translation in Persian by Akbar Dānā-Sirišt has been used here.
wished both to make their own myths (legends) survive and to indicate their faith in the unique God through relating their mythic personages to the Semitic legends. In this manner, a large number of Iranian myths were adapted to their Semitics models. For example, Kiy/g460mar/g2542 (Gay/g448mard) was adapted to Adam (Târîx-i sîstân 1935: 2), Jamš/g431d was known as Solomon (Ibn-i Nâdîm 1871: 309) and Tahmûra/Tahmûra ( Parsig: Tahmurit; Av.: Taxmô-urupa-) was known as Noah (Mas`ûdî 1964: 1.123).

Many of the narrations and epics of the Iranian-Zoroastrian myths were adapted to Semitic myths and narrations during this process, and thus they changed in appearance, form or theme. For example, Rustam became one of the prophet’s Noah children (Tâjârib ul-`umam 1994: 59), Fârîdûn was equated with Nimrod (Dînâvarî 1911: 7) and Manûçîhr was presented as one of the children of Isaac, the son of Abraham (Ṭabarî 1879-1881: 1.433).

Since the myths, the epics and the narrations were rarely recorded in writing during the period before the Indo-Iranian religion changed into Zoroastrianism, the transformation of their themes and forms into the myths and Zoroastrian religious narrations must have happened more easily than at the period of transformation of the Zoroastrian legends into Islamic form. During this second transition, many of the Iranian myths and narrations as well as the history of various epochs had been recorded in writing in the form of epics and myths, e.g. in the Avesta, the Xwadây-Nâmâgs, the Pahlavânîg (Parthian/Pahlavi) and the Parsig works during early Islamic times.

Unfortunately, there are not many original accounts of pre-Zoroastrian Iranian works that may show to what extent texts have been changed by being restructured in Zoroastrian times. This is, of course, due to the fact that there are very few such accounts from pre-Zoroastrian times at hand in different languages, including in Zoroastrian Persian. However, some few scattered short specimens of pre-Zoroastrian works are to be found here and there. In comparing these with what has been rewritten in the Zoroastrian period, the elimination of earlier themes on the basis of Zoroastrian philosophy can be discovered in accounts where we both have a pre-Zoroastrian and a later Zoroastrian version. The previously mentioned example of Wahrâm-yazd belongs to the obvious examples of this.

Among the transformed Iranian narratives, Ardây-Vîrâf’s journey report is a special case, because it has changed in form and theme both due to the conversion of the Iranian society from its ancient religion (Indo-Iranian) into Zoroastrianism and then after the change of religion in Iran from Zoroastrianism to Islam.

192 The domain of adaptation was even extended to the names of places, in such a manner that one of Anâhîd’s (the goddess of the water) probable temples was changed into the Bibi-Šahrîhânû shrine. According to popular legends of the Shiites, she is Yazgird’s daughter, the latest king of Sasanids, and the wife of Imam Ḫusayn, the third religious leader of the Shiites (Boyce 1967: 36-38).
Most of the scholars who have studied the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, believe that it belongs to the most ancient Iranian works, whether its present form originates in the Sasanid period or later. Tavadia (1956: 117) finds the marks influences of the Magians of Acheamenids times on both the Zoroastrian and the genuine Iranian customs throughout the text of this work. Widengren (1961: 13) is of the opinion that the text has been written in the Sasanid period, but many topics are certainly more ancient. Boyce (1968‘a’: 48) believes that the work originates from very old days; because the name of Wirāz was mentioned already in the *Avesta*. Tafazzulī (1991: 733) also believes that the main core of the subject of the book belongs to Avestan times. Boyce and Grenet (1991: 430) are of the opinion that “the belief that the stars were nearer to the earth than the moon or sun marks the antiquity of the story”. However, the main reason why the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* must be seen as an ancient narration is the use of the name of Wirāz (Vīrāf), who is mentioned in the *Fravardin Yašt*, the 13th Yašt of *Avesta*.

According to some pieces of evidence from the *Fravardin Yašt* itself, this text must have been created in either pre-Achaemenid times or in the early days of this royal dynasty (Christensen 1928: 34-35, 44-45). In this Yašt there is recorded a list of characters who are eulogized for the sake of their good essence. Wirāz (Vīrāf) is one of these:

> We eulogize the essence of the pure religion of Wirāz. (*Fravardin Yašt: XXV. 101*).\(^{194}\)

The mention in the second part of the *Fravardin Yašt* of the heroes of Mazdaism from Gayōmart to Saōšyānt occurs in a series of 7 groups. In verses 96-110 one finds the names of the first apostles of Zoroastrianism and its first champions, most of them belonging to the cycle of king Wištāspa (Duchesne-Guillemin 1962: 38; Boyce 2001: 200).

It is necessary to take into consideration that these names were sacred, popular and famous or had a social place in the pre-Zoroastrian Iranian society, and have been transformed and incorporated into Zoroastrianism. Some of them, e.g. Miθra, Wahrām and Garšāp have previously been mentioned. Wirāz (Vīrāf) could also be among them. The personality of Wirāz (Vīrāf) must be such a popular and important name that the authors and composers, while composing the *Fravardin Yašt*, were not able to renounce him. It was even necessary to praise him. The reason for such importance and popularity was nothing but Vīrāf’s journey to the Other World. There is nothing else very important in the story except that journey. Some other issues, such as the diversification of Zoroastrian beliefs, the shaky faith of the masses, and the virtuousness or innocence of Vīrāf are matters, which have been men-

---

\(^{193}\) Refer also to Henning 1942: 230.

\(^{194}\) See also Geldner 1886-1896; Westergaard 1852-54: I.238; Wolff 1924: 244; Lommel 1927: 125.
tioned in the introduction of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, as if they are important issues, but certainly they are minor topics.

With respect to the antiquity of Vīrāf’s personality, his journey to the Other World can be reviewed from a new point of view. This present version can be considered as a transformed form of the story. The issue of a journey to the Other World is here on the basis of the Zoroastrian Persian version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* believed to be a pre-Zoroastrian shamanistic concept, and it is therefore likely that Vīrāf was not initially a pure and innocent Zoroastrian but an Iranian shaman who travelled to the Other World, who saw the places of pleasures and the joyful ones on the one hand and the places of torment and the unfortunate ones on the other hand, places later renamed Paradise and Hell. Then, after coming back, he recounted what he had seen there. But, the original philosophy behind this journey and the main reasons for reporting it are questions that may be answered in a totally convincing way only by having in hand the original and the authentic version of the story, which we do not have, at least at present. In other words, there is nothing available to give a total understanding of Vīrāf’s aim of travelling to the Other World. Thus, it is not clearly known if his motif for travelling to the Other World was a religious passion or if the report of his journey was an epical narrative.195

As a piece of evidence for recognizing Vīrāf as a Shaman, one can point to the similarities of his situation and that of the Shamans. Eliade believes that the central part of Shamanism is established in an ecstasy experience. Shamanism is a path to knowledge that will be possible through a person who experiences visiting the spirits in ecstasy. The Shaman thus specializes in journeys to the Other World in ecstasy. The spirit of a Shaman will stroll about; ascending to the sky and descending into the underworld, or every other place where mighty spirits are reposed (Eliade 1964: 5, 50f). Nyberg has presented a very precise and full study about the diverse rites of Shamanism among different tribes from central Asia to the north of Europe. Some of these rites that will be mentioned below are very important for verifying the hypothesis of Vīrāf’s Shamanism. Among the various means used by the Shamans in different tribes in order to facilitate their journey and to put them in touch with the spirits are the use of distilled wine and narcotic (opiate) liquids, which induce a hypnotic state in the Shaman. The purpose of this state is to get the answers of his own or others’ questions and to finally be able to report to the spectators of his journey to the Other World (Nyberg 1937: 187-193).196 All these rituals are compatible with the ceremonies performed to achieve Vīrāf’s journey. That is not surprising, since the ascension to heaven was one of the Ancient Iranian traditions in central Asia,

---

195 Bīžan Gaybī believes that the Zoroastrian Persian version was originally a secular-epic narration (Gaybī 2001: 8).

196 This, however, does not mean that Zarathustra was also a Shaman.
where Zoroastrianism both arose and developed in its early stages. This is a tradition which is still continued by the Shamans in Russia (Siberia and Central Asia) (Daryāyī 2001: 4). All these facts make up some clear evidence for Virāf being a Shaman.

The fact that the name of Wirāz (Virāf) was mentioned in Fravardin Yašt, means that the first religious men, who produced the Fravardin Yašt, were acquainted with Virāf’s journey report. Since there is no mention of Virāf’s journey in the Fravardin Yašt, it is not possible to know the exact circumstances of the pre-Zoroastrianism version of the story and how it has been transformed into a religious-Zoroastrian account. In other words, it is not possible to find out what has been added to or omitted from the pre-Zoroastrian version in comparison with what has been left to present times. Thus, the only way forward in order to elucidate the matter is to consider what has been added to the earliest versions of the account. These added parts will indicate what direction the text has taken, and thus how it has deviated from the main subject. This is possible only through gaining access to a version which is more intact. Here it will be argued that the Zoroastrian Persian version and to a more limited extent the Pazand version are more intact and can make this argument possible.

Concerning the introduction of the text, Haug and West believe that the original story most probably did not have one (Haug-West 1872: Lxxiii). According to this view, first an introduction to the text and the historical

---

197 Gignoux points to the anthropologic similarities between the two cultures of ancient Iran and Siberia in a study about Shamanism in Iran (Gignoux 1979: 41-79).
198 There is a couplet in the Zoroastrian Persian version of the Mēnō i Xrad, which has been versified by Darāb Hurmazdyār Sanjāna in the year 1046 Yazdegdari/1677 A.D. According to that couplet, Virāf’s time precedes Guštasp’s period (MS.S.P.38: 17b). This couplet pronounces to Guštasp:

\[
\text{Ba mēnu tu Guštasp šādān šavē / čū Virāf ān jāyi xwad bingarī “Oh Guštasp, you will be cheerful in Paradise/ when you see your place there, like Virāf.” This couplet reveals clearly that Virāf’s journey is seen to have occurred before Guštasp’s journey to the other world.}
\]

Guštasp was contemporary with Zarathustra and his most significant defender. Darāb Hurmazdyār has either quoted this couplet from another place or added it to the text later on or he has profited from another source than the presently available version of the Parsig text to in his versification of the Mēnō i Xrad. However, this couplet assumes that Virāf has visited the other world earlier than Guštasp. The time of Virāf should thus have preceded that of Guštasp and Zarathustra. This will here be taken as evidence that the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma was originally an ancient text related to the times prior to Zarathustra. Thus the conclusion drawn is that it was a secular pre-Zoroastrian account that later was changed into a religious-Zoroastrian account.

It must be said that the poem versified by Darāb Hurmazdyār has some other parts in addition to the above-mentioned couplet which are not found in the Mēnō i Xrad in Parsig. Among them, there is a section related to Zarathustra’s knowledge of medicine, which was edited and published by the author of this study (Kārgar 2008: 307-324).
199 Since this study is concentrated to the Zoroastrian Persian version, here neither the transformations nor the differences between the Pazand and the Parsig and the Zoroastrian Persian versions have been studied in detail. Only relevant cases of these differences are noted.
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personages of the introduction must have been added, then they have changed due to the historic situation of each new epoch. According to the introduction of the Pazand version, Vīrāf’s journey took place in the time of Guštāspa\textsuperscript{200} (Antia 1909: 358).\textsuperscript{201} But according to Zoroastrian Persian version, the journey happened in Ardašīr Bābakān’s time. Vīrāf travelled to the Other World later than Ādurbad Ī Māraspandān, according to the Parsig version, that is in the Sasanid era.

According to the Zoroastrian Persian version, Vīrāf’s journey takes place in the time of Ardašīr Bābakān. However, according to what has been said in the introduction, there is no need to send a messenger to the Other World at that time. In other words, the causes for sending Vīrāf to the Other World in the Zoroastrian Persian version do not seem reasonable. In fact, the aim of Vīrāf’s journey projected to the time of Ardašīr is just to support the codification the \textit{Avesta} by Ardašīr, and to disprove the value of other Zoroastrian schools by a confirmation of his act through a superhuman force from the Other World.

There is no indication in the journey report about the dismissal of the various schools of Zoroastrianism other than the understanding of the religion which Ardašīr established as the only correct one. In fact, Vīrāf neither asks Ohrmazd or the \textit{amsāspandān} (Holy Immortals) any question about the subject which in the introduction is presented as the central aim of his journey nor is any message given to him in the Other World regarding this matter. In the Parsig version Vīrāf’s journey, which is described as having occurred at a time after Ādurbad Ī Māraspandān, seems to be a useless and an unreasonable journey as well. According to the introduction of that version, Vīrāf was sent to the Other World to find out whether the gods or the demons benefit from the praises which the masses do in religious duties. But according to the story, Vīrāf neither asks any question about that matter in the Other World nor does he bring any message back with himself to resolve this issue. Ohrmazd merely says to Vīrāf at the end of his journey that there is only one way of righteousness, that is the way of the first teachers of the Mazdean religion (\textit{pōryvōktēših}), and the other ways are all misleading.

In the introduction to the Pazand version it is stated that Vīrāf’s journey took place immediately after the death of Zarathustra, in the times of Guštāsp’s reign. It seems that this date is more plausible than the date mentioned in the introductions to the Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian versions. It seems more necessary that such a travel should take place in the

\textsuperscript{200} It is surprising that this name has been written in the form of Guštāspa in the Pazand account. This name should have been recorded in the form of Witāsp in the Pazand, which is certainly a re-written text of the Parsig version.

\textsuperscript{201} According to the Sanskrit version, Vīrāf’s journey occurred in the time of Guštāspo (Haug-West 1872: Lxxviii). Bharucha believes that both the Sanskrit and the old Gujarati versions are translated from the Pazand version (Bharucha 1920: II).
times of Guštāsp, that is after the prophet passed away, since all over the world, the first crisis in most religions takes place at such a time.

Social movements and revolutionary events just after the death of the leaders and founders of a new state or ideology are manifold throughout history. Such a crisis causes the beginning of division, unfaithfulness among the believers and restraint of the primary development and growth of either a religious or a socio-political movement, and it often follows after the disenchantment of the adherents in the earlier beliefs. Zoroastrianism could hardly have been an exception from this general rule. Additionally, it must be taken into consideration that the religious canons and social law codes of Zarathustra’s religion had not been written down yet at the time of his death, especially those parts that are mentioned as paradigms in Widēwdad. Thus, the religious leaders and the priests could not yet profit from such texts to solve the religious and social issues arisen in the absence of Zarathustra. The Zoroastrian leaders could therefore only find one solution as the best remedy after the death of Zarathustra, when this situation arose, and that was to call for an answer from the Other World, a way that was not available to everyone. The best way known to them of achieving this aim was to profit from the pre-Zoroastrian Iranian story of Vīrā’s journey to the Other World. So, they changed Vīrā’s journey report, which was ready and available, into a journey to the territories of Ohrmazd undertaken by the most virtuous Zoroastrian of the time.

However, the changes and transformations in Vīrā’s story could not have taken place at a single instant. It is clear in the various versions of the work that many changes have occurred during the re-writing and translating the Ardāy-Vīrā Nāma into different languages in different times. The changes in the text from a pre-Zoroastrian to a Zoroastrian version have been kept until the tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. (Gignoux 1969: 998-1004). Every new change has caused Vīrā’s story to be more and more devoid of its pre-Zoroastrian meaning. The differences between the various versions of the same story provided in different times give evidence to that. For example, there are important differences between the themes of the Zoroastrian Persian prose version and the Zoroastrian Persian version versified by Zaratušt Bahrām (1964), and that one is also different from the Zoroastrian Persian version versified by Anūšīrvān Kirmānī (Unvālā 1922: II.331-342). Also the Parsig and Pazand versions fit this picture. These diversities are greater than what could be supposed as mistakes or interferences done by the scribes. This same matter indicates that, in fact, the Ardāy-Vīrā Nāma has been re-written on several occasions while copied or translated in the course of time. Just for this reason, the re-written text has deviated more and more from its pre-Zoroastrian origin.

It may be supposed that the differences of versions are due to an oral tradition. That is to say that since some of the religious men, believers and
followers have learned these texts by heart, then while retelling (transferring) the account to the next generation, or while writing and re-writing it, these differences in the Parsig, Pazand and Zoroastrian Persian versions have come into being due to carelessness, something which is very common in oral traditions. The oral traditions cannot be denied, however, they have gone hand in hand with written traditions. For example, in Iran according to a thousand year old habit, some Muslims still learn precisely by heart the Quran, numerous other Islamic holy texts and some long devotional prayers. However, this is not in opposition to the written tradition, which nowadays has changed into the printing technology.

Something similar can have happened to the oral and written Zoroastrians texts. Even a very small change could not be acceptable in a text like the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, while learning it by heart, which is one of the most important religious prescriptions. If this has occurred, it would be an insignificant mistake and limited to the replacement of a maximum of a few words. However, it is impossible that the name of a king be exchanged from Guštāsp to Ardašīr in an oral version, or that the name of a king significant for Zoroastrianism as Ardašīr is left out totally. Likewise, it is not reasonable that the main subject of the story, that is the reason for Vīrāf’s journey to the Other World, will be transferred into a new story in each new version, where even a number of new reasons are added and intermingled.

Also another important point must be kept in mind. In the copying tradition of the East, the scribes used to compare a newly written manuscript with the original text after the manuscript was copied.202 If either a word or a sentence was omitted by the scribe, it was added in the margin of the manuscript. If any other mistake had happened while the text was rewritten, that would also be noted in the margin. Apart from this, many of the manuscript owners and even many readers of these manuscripts have written in the margin of the book the meaning of a word, a parallel expression or some other additional information. It could then happen that these notes in the margin were later added to the actual text, because some scribe supposed that they were notations of something neglected by the previous scribe.203 This would still give a coherent text if the scribe was initiated in the matter, but when the scribe was just a copyist and had no special knowledge about the subject of the book he was copying, which happened very often, there was often no relation between the subject of the text and what was later added to it. The

202 In Iran, this is known as *'arz-dādan* which means ‘to compare’.
203 An example of this has occurred in *Kitāb al-Šaykana fi al-Ṭibb* by Abū-Rayḥān Bīrūnī. The main text of the book is written by Šayx Aḥmad Bayhaqī, and then Abū-Rayḥān Bīrūnī has written a commentary for the drugs in the margin of that work. The scribe then mixed together the marginal notes of Abū-Rayḥān and the main text of Šayx Aḥmad to form the body text of the book. Muhammad ibn-i Masʿūd Ḡaznavī later obtained a copy of the book and noted in the margin that it had been mixed up (Zaryāb 1991: twelve-thirteen). Note that in this case the marginal notes were added to the book itself, and were written by someone as Bīrūnī who was more knowledgeable than the writer of the text, that is Šayx Aḥmad Bayhaqī.
presence of two couplets of Šāhnāma by Firdausī in the Pazand version of the Ardāvīrōf Nāma represents an example of the addition of something likely to have been written in the margin of a manuscript.\textsuperscript{204}

Tavadia says that the Pazand account is more ancient than the other narrations since the text is more cohesive and logical than the other versions (Tavadia 1956: 118). According to this and considering that no work has ever been written directly in Pazand, there must have existed another version different from this present Parsig version, a version which is the mother of the Pazand account and from which the Pazand version has been transcribed into Avestan characters.

Meanwhile, one question is how ancient the introduction of the Zoroastrian Persian version is? Unfortunately, it may never be known if the source of Shapur Āsā’s manuscript was the first manuscript of the Zoroastrian Persian version or if it was a copy. However, the original text from which the translation into Zoroastrian Persian was done was undoubtedly in the Parsig language. The differences between the Zoroastrian Persian version and the present-Parsig version make it likely that there was still another ancient version, different from the present Parsig account. Thus, it must be concluded that there have been three Parsig versions of the Ardāvīrōf Nāma. The Pazand version has been copied from the first one, then the Zoroastrian Persian version was translated from the second one, and the third one is the Parsig version available today.

The Ideological Changes of the Text

Now, how and why has Vīrāf’s journey report changed?

The transformation of the personages and their functions from pre-Zoroastrian ideas into Zoroastrianism and from Zoroastrianism into Islam has been discussed above, and some examples of this were given as well. The Ardāvīrōf Nāma is about as close as we can come at present to a single text which exists in various ancient and new versions and which may reveal the nature of these changes, since versions of this work from different times and in different languages are at our disposal.

The Zoroastrian priests try to get an answer from the Other World in order to prevail over the critical situation that occurred after the death of Zarathustra. The pre-Zoroastrian (Indo-Iranian) report of Vīrāf’s journey to the Other World was already at their disposal, and in addition to this, no one was able to stand up against the inspired answer from the Other World. Thus, it was necessary to change Vīrāf’s journey report from a pre-

\textsuperscript{204} It is an interesting point that these two verses have been written in a handwriting other than the scribe’s handwriting in one of the manuscripts of the Ardāvīrōf Nāma, that is in M (H28) manuscript, on the very first page where the title of the work has been recorded.
Zoroastrian document into a religious Zoroastrian account. This is an ideological change, the trace of which may be found in the later manuscripts of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*.

This ideological change means a kind of religious censorship. When the priests could neither make nor wish a particular work to disappear from the literacy scene, they changed it in an ideological manner. They had to do this if they needed the work to remain. In such cases they tried either to overlook or to make pale the previous essential idea of the work. Thus, they sometimes tried to keep the vital principle of the work, but that which was related to the main idea and the principal teachings of the work would be deleted (Šaf’ī Kadkanī 2008: 177). Changing the names of the personages, either promotion or demotion of the religious personalities’ position, are all some of the most significant examples of ideological changes of a work. Sometimes, they even exchange the name of the work to lessen its importance.

However, the story does not end there. Other examples of these transformations are a number of ideological terms which were changed when the society changed. The replacement of names in addition to the attribution of someone’s sayings to others due to ideological tendencies are some of these cases (Šaf’ī Kadkanī 2004: 95). In this manner, the ideological transformation has turned variant readings in the various manuscripts into hiding places for historical facts. In other words, these variants are like battlefields of different ideologies (Ibid: 106).

However, these ideological changes are not only noticeable in the variants of an original manuscript. When a text was translated into other languages, the ideological transformations were also abundant. In a case like the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*, the translator is actually much freer than the scribe to change the text. Thus, many of the ancient religious manuscripts have not disappeared due to natural events like floods, fire accidents etc., but the ideological administrators of the society have removed them knowingly and intentionally in order that no one may find out about the ideological transformations in these works (Ibid: 107).

---

205 One of the works where the title has been changed while translating is a Karrāmī text from the Islamic period. The original title was *Qisas al-qur‘ān* (Tales from the Qur’an), and it was written in the scientific language of the time, that is in Arabic, in the year 467 A.H./1074 A.D. However, the title was changed to *Qisas al-anbiyā‘* (Stories of the prophets) when the text was translated into Persian three centuries later (Šaf’ī Kadkanī 2008: 180).

206 “It is not easy to find the central points or the ideological battlefields within a text. For example, eliminating or adding a couplet may occur in every manuscript, but it might not be possible for an ordinary reader to understand why this couplet is eliminated or added” (Šaf’ī Kadkanī 2004: 96).

207 The point that the ideological transformation of a work is different from the changes caused by the scribes must be considered. Due to the cultural and linguistic changes in the society, sometimes the scribes have changed words and expressions, due to the ‘aural’ or ‘oral’ difficulties in these texts to people’s understanding (Šaf’ī Kadkanī 2004: 96). (I am grateful to Mr. Nādir Mutallabī Kāšānī who has put both Šaf’ī Kadkanī’s studies at my disposal.)
The ideological transformation of a work does not occur all at once but during various phases and in a process of repeated re-writings. In his studies on the Munajjat or Ilahi-nama of ‘Abdu’llah Anšarī, Bo Utas writes that altogether the various sources of the text of Munajjat differ greatly from each other in contents, in arrangement and in wording. He holds that “these texts have, no doubt, grown and changed incessantly during the centuries” (Utas 2008: 71-72). The conditions may have been the same regarding the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma. Additionally, the ideological transformation of the subject of this work has occurred not only while it was being re-written but also at the time of translation.

Although the ideological changes have caused the Zoroastrian Persian version to deviate from its original form, there are two characteristics in this text that distinguish it from other versions of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma. Firstly, a few very ancient passages in this version do not seem to differ very much from what could have been produced in a pre-Zoroastrian society, and secondly, this version is freer of later additions than the other versions. These two characteristics are very important and two conclusions may be drawn in the light of them. The first one is that the Zoroastrian Persian version was originally a pre-Zoroastrian (Indo-Iranian) narrative and the second one is that the Zoroastrian Persian version is the most ancient version of this work at our disposal.

The transformation of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma from an pre-Zoroastrian Iranian text into a religious-Zoroastrian account is not so astonishing. Using pre-Zoroastrian elements by Zoroastrians has a long past record. More than one thousand years ago, Bīrūnī writes that “the ancient Magians existed already before the time of Zoroaster, but now there is no pure, unmixed portion of them who do not practice the religion of Zoroaster. In fact, they belong now either to the Zoroastrians or to the Šamsiyya (sun-worshipers). Still, they have some ancient traditions and institutes, which they trace back to their original creed; but in reality those things have been derived from the laws of the sun-worshipers and the ancient people of Ḥarrān” (Bīrūnī 1879: 314).

In the following argument reference will be made to many passages of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma story where changes and transformations occur. The presence of these passages in one of the Zoroastrian Persian or Parsig ver-

---

208 Although the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma in its Parsig version has been the subject of multiple changes and transformations, more so than the other versions, and has been converted into a religious-Zoroastrian form, the Zoroastrian Persian version has also experienced ideological changes in a few cases. An example is the last episode, the sixtieth, in which some parts of a Zoroastrian Peti-namag (confession) has been added. This has been explained in the commentary.

209 This above-mentioned quotation of Bīrūnī was translated by Sachau from the original text (Bīrūnī 1878: 318). The Persian translator of same work, Ağā-al-bāghiyya, has translated the term “Šamsiyya” into “the Religion of Mihr” (Mithraism) (Bīrūnī 1984: 507). See also two works on “Šamsiyya”: (Jackson 1899: 140-143; Mouton 1913: 226-253).
sions and the absence of them in other versions clearly indicates in what manner the Vīrāf’s report has deviated as a result of ideological changes from its original Iranian pre-Zoroastrian (Indo-Iranian) account and changed into a religious-Zoroastrian text.  

Meanwhile, it must be kept in mind that in the comparison between the two versions, it is only the additions that may be seen as Zoroastrian phenomena that are of interest in this argument. For example, the lance ordeal, which was Vīrāf’s suggestion for the final choice of a suitable person for the journey to the Other World, is not an interesting addition, since this motive is not known as a Zoroastrian phenomenon.

The parts of the Zoroastrian Persian version that will be mentioned here, have been extracted from the edited text as in the present thesis. Thus the numbering of the lines follows this edition. The numbering of the chapters and the paragraphs in the Parsig version follow the edition and transcription by Gignoux (1984).

- According to the Zoroastrian Persian version King Ardašīr calls all the authorities and scholars from all over the country to find out which one is the true version of the Zoroastrian religion (lines 8-13). The king has decided to send someone to the Other World to find the answer to his question. This points to the king’s power as the most high-ranking authority of decision in the country. But, according to the Parsig version it is the mūbadān (the Zoroastrian priests) who decide to send someone to the Other World (I.14-15). Replacing the king by the Zoroastrian priests as the high authorities for making decisions is one of the changes that demonstrates that the text becomes religious during later periods.

- According to the Zoroastrian Persian version the Zoroastrian priests make Vīrāf drink the wine of sīh-yakī. The wine of sīh-yakī has no religious connotation. However, according to the Parsig version, Zoroastrian priests make Vīrāf drink the may u mang ī Wīštāspān (wine and henbane) (II.15-16). These drinks are well known in Zoroastrian texts.

- To wash Vīrāf ceremoniously the priests choose a place of thirty paces away from the fire in the Parsig version (II.11), which is obviously one of the Zoroastrian additions. One of the obligations of Zoroastrianism for cleanliness is that every person who does this ceremonial washing should carry it out on a place thirty paces from the fire or every other sacred thing (Shaked 1995: XI.25). In the Zoroastrian Persian version there is no such choice of place.

---

210 A number of these passages have also been studied in the chapter “The Zoroastrian Persian version in comparison with the Parsig version” of this work. But these passages are here compared with each other in a different way and with a different purpose.

211 It is an astonishing point that there is no mentioning of this in the introduction. Only from the reply given to the king it is clear that he wishes to send someone to the other world.

212 Refer either to the paragraphs 83-87 of chapter four of book seven in the Dēnkard or to chapter 47 of the Pahlavi Rivāyat about this topic (Gignoux 1984: 152).
According to the Zoroastrian Persian version, the seven sisters of Vīrāf come along to prevent him from being sent to the Other World after hearing the story (lines 45-51). But, in the Parsig account, these women are not only the Vīrāf’s sisters but they are his wives too (II.1). This transformation of Vīrāf’s sisters into his wives and sisters might have occurred during Sasanid times when the Zoroastrian priests particularly recommended the act of *xwēdōdah* ‘same kin-marriage’. Another example of the *xwēdōdah* custom is a change that can be seen is Wištāsp’s (Guštāsp’s) story. In *Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspram*, Hutōs (Avestan: *hutaposā*) is Wištāsp’s wife. But she is both his wife and sister according to *Ayādgār ī Zarērān*. Besides, the name of Hutōs is mentioned four times in the *Avesta*, but there is no mention that she is the sister of Wištāsp (Gaybī 2003: 378-388).

In the Parsig version, Vīrāf’s sisters/wives are among the Zoroastrian believers, since they know the *Avesta* by heart. They are also worshippers (II.2). However, nowhere in the Zoroastrian Persian version is there any indication that Vīrāf’s sisters are among the Zoroastrian believers.

In the Zoroastrian Persian version, Surūš says to Vīrāf that he should advise the people of the world to try to do good deeds more than evil deeds, even if the surplus of good deeds eventually is not bigger than the size a human eyelash, so that their spirits may be sent to Paradise instead

---

213 Still, according to the *Tārīḵ al-rusul wa’l-mulūḵ* by Ṭabarī, Hutōs is just the wife of Guštāsp (1881-1882: II.678) and there is no indication that she is Guštāsp’s sister as well. Ṭabarī has recorded the name of “Hutōs” with the form of ختوس. De Goeje, the editor of *Tārīḵ al-rusul wa’l-mulūḵ* has identified this name as that same “Hutōs”, and has explained this in a footnote to the edited text.

214 It is an interesting point that according to an Iranian ancient story (a summary of which has been mentioned by Athenæus, a Greek writer of the second century A.D; quoted from Chares of Mitylene) Hutōs is Zarēr’s wife and the latter is Guštāsp’s brother. According to Athenæus, Guštāsp (whose name is Hystaspes in Athenæus’ story), the king of Media, had a brother whose name was Zariadres. This Zariadres dreams about Hutōs (Odatis in Athenæus’ history), the daughter of Omartes, the king of Marathi, and he falls in love with her. Likewise, Hutōs dreams about Zariadres, and she falls in love with him as well. After some adventures these two marry each other (Boyce 1955: 463-477).
of being captured in Limbo (lines 205-208). However, in the Parsig version, Surūš and Ādur-yazd tell Vīrāf that everyone whose good deeds are more than his evil deeds to the extent of three srōš-čarnām will be in Paradise (VI.5). Vahman interprets this word “srōš-čarnām” as the “name of a grade of sin and its punishment” (Vahman 1986: 274). This grade of sin must be a Zoroastrian standard that has been added to the text later, probably in Sassanid times or earlier.

- Ohrmazd declares to Vīrāf that he should advise the people that the right path in the world is just one and every other way is misleading (lines 920-922) in the Zoroastrian Persian version. In the Parsig version, Ohrmazd tells Vīrāf that he should convey to the Māzdānān, ‘the Mazda-worshippers’, that there is only one way of righteousnees, that is the way of the first teachers of the Mazdean religion (pōryōtkēshīh), and the other ways are all misleading. (Cl.7). The differences between these two texts indicate clearly that the first account is in accordance with the principles of human morality that invites to the truth and prohibits wicked ways. But in the second account, Ohrmazd just talks to the Mazda-worshippers, which here means the Zoroastrians. Additionally, here the previous religion of the Iranians and all other religions as well are disproved of. Thus the Zoroastrian Persian version is an account which still represents a less religious theme, whereas the Parsig version is entirely and obviously a religious account of Zoroastrianism.

- According to the twenty-seventh episode in the Zoroastrian Persian version one of the captives in Hell complains that he has no relatives or friends and has no one to help him (lines 579-581). This person talks to nobody in particular. This complaint and entreaty has in the Parsig version been replaced by a Gathic prayer, which this captive prays to Ohrmazd (XVII.5). Ohrmazd as the addressee of the captive in the Parsig version is a Zoroastrian addition to the text. It is not acceptable in any way that a Zoroastrian scribe or translator might neglect the name of Ohrmazd in a religious document and therefore it is obvious that the name of Ohrmazd has never been found in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

- The names of Viraf’s guides are mentioned as Surūš and Urdibihīšt the Holy Immortal in the Zoroastrian Persian version, but they are Surūš and Ādur-yazd in the Parsig version. This has been discussed in the commentary. However, it seems probable that the differences between the names of these guides in the Parsig version and Zartušt Bahram’s narrative in verse, as well as the Zoroastrian Persian version, from which it has been versified (Haug-West 1872: xix) is attributed to both the epical tendency of the Zoroastrian Persian version and the religious trend of the Parsig version (Ğaybî 2001: 11).

- According to the Parsig version, one of the sins that causes the spirits to be kept either in the Star-Station or in the Moon-Station and not to be
led to Paradise is because they have not done the *xwēdōdah* (kin-
marrage) (VII.4; VIII.3). A woman who has violated the kin-marriage is
being punished in Hell (LXXXVI.3). On the other hand, it is stated that
the spirits who have done kin-marriage are reposing in Paradise (XII.8).
There are no words of kin-marriage in the Zoroastrian Persian version.
Encouraging kin-marriage and regarding it as a sin to refuse this form of
marriage are all standards of Zoroastrian culture especially in Sassanid
times, which have been added to the Parsig version but are absent in the
Zoroastrian Persian version.

- At the end of the Zoroastrian Persian version, Ohrmazd tells Vīrāf to
return to the world to recount what he has witnessed to the people. In ad-
dition, he (Ohrmazd) recommends Vīrāf to tell the truth and no lies, for
Ohrmazd watches him (lines 915-917). However, Vīrāf is not alerted to
not telling the lies in the Parsig version (Cl.3-4). The reason for this could
be that he is described as a virtuous and a holy Zoroastrian there. This
elimination of this warning from the Parsig version obviously points to
this being a religious text.

- The name of Wīštasp (Guštasp) is mentioned three times in the Parsig
version (XI.2; XI.9; Cl.9). But, there is no mention of this name in the
Zoroastrian Persian version. Thus, the name of Wīštasp, the most signifi-
cant defender of Zarathustra, must have been added to the Parsig version
later on in the process of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* being changed into a re-
ligious-Zoroastrian text.

- Vīrāf mentioned the name of Zarū[x]št (Zarathustra) six times in the
Parsig version (I.1; III.6; XI.2; XI.9; XII.5; Cl.9), but the name of Zarūstuš
(Zarathustra) is only mentioned in the introduction of the Zoroastrian
Persian version (lines: 10 (two times), 26, 35), and this name, in form of
Zarātušt (Zarathustra), is repeated in the last episode (line: 925). Thus,
the name of Zarathustra is neglected in four episodes of the Zoroastrian
Persian version where it is found in the Parsig version. This is most for-
tunate for the argument. Neglecting the name of Zarathustra is never ac-
ceptable or reasonable, not even one time in a Zoroastrian oral account.
Maybe it can be acceptable that the name of Zarathustra has been added
somewhere in a Zoroastrian text either by mistake or perhaps due to
strong faith. But, it is not reasonable at all that either the translator or the
scribe copying or translating a religious-Zoroastrian account neglects the
name of Zarathustra, the prophet, the greatest and the most important per-
sonality of Zoroastrianism. The non-existence of this name in these four
places where the Zoroastrian Persian version in other details corresponds
to the Parsig version indicates that the name has not existed there in the
original mother-text of the Zoroastrian Persian version.

---

215 In addition to this, the name of “Wīštasp” has been mentioned as a relative adjective and
with the form of *wīštāspān* ‘of wīštasp’ (II.15).
In the Parsig version, a number of Zoroastrian holy persons are mentioned. Firstly, after returning back from the Other World, Vīrāf greets the dastūrān (the authorities) and the hērbedān (teachers-priests) from Ohrmazd, Zarathustra, Sūrūš the righteous and Ādur-yazd in Paradise (III.6). Secondly, he tells about the excellent and illustrious places of Ohrmazd, the Holy Immortals, Zardušť-i Spitāmān, Kay-Wištāsp, Jāmāsp and Isadwāstar, the son of Zarathustra (XI.2), and thirdly, he talks about the essence of Gayōmard, Zarathustra, Kay-Wištāsp, Frašōstar, Jāmāsp and the others in the same chapter (XI.9). Gignoux is correct when he states that the third list is a repetition of the second one, but without the names of Gayōmard and Frašōstar. They are not in the list of the second subsection of the eleventh chapter, so they have been added to the text by a compiler (Gignoux 1984: 164). Anyhow, not just this third list has been added to the text. In fact, none of these three lists containing the name of these great and important personalities of Zoroastrianism are found in the Zoroastrian Persian version. The reason that there were no such lists in the first authentic and original version of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma is that it was not a Zoroastrian text. Thus, they who were involved in re-writing the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma have added the above-mentioned names to make it a more religious-Zoroastrian text.

The punishments of Hell do not exceed certain pains and torments in the Parsig version (Muʿīn 1946: 43). However, the number of pains and torments are even less in the Zoroastrian Persian version. This indicates that ideas of various torments had not yet been formed in the time when the Zoroastrian Persian version was created. Thus, this same matter attests that the Zoroastrian Persian version is more ancient than the Parsig version.

The descriptions of Paradise are not very elaborate in the Parsig version (ibid.), and the pictures of Paradise in the Zoroastrian Persian version are of a similar simple nature. But the portraits of happiness in the Zoroastrian Persian version are of a more pristine nature than in the Parsig version. This also attests to the antiquity of the Zoroastrian Persian version.

‘The river of tears’ is mentioned both in the Zoroastrian Persian version (lines: 552-574) and the Parsig version (XVI.1-7), as already discussed in the commentary. It is not impossible that “in this case, some topics have been taken from the ancient epics and have been admixed with new concepts” (Ḡaybī 1994: 6). It seems as if this part may be one of the very authentic parts of the text. For, if this river existed in the Zoroastrian cosmogony, it should appear in other Zoroastrian works as well, which is not the case.

\[216\] Differences between the names have been considered in the commentary.
Reciting the Gāhān is one of the most important good deeds in Zoroastrianism. According to the Zand version of Widēwdād (Codex TD\textsuperscript{2} 1979: 611), not reciting the Gāhān is one of the signs of an ahlomōy (heretic). The value and importance of reciting the Gāhān is mentioned five times in the Parsig version, once as a vital rite (II.17), twice as a mortal sin if not done, equivalent to rejecting kin-marriage and not praying (VII.4, VIII.3), and twice again as a great good deed, equal to kin-marriage, the reward of which is going to Paradise (IV.13, XII.5). However, in the Zoroastrian Persian version the importance of reciting the Gāhān is only mentioned once (lines 225-226), when the spirits have not been led to Paradise due to either not reciting the Gāhān and not doing nauzūdī and not praying.

There is no mention of dancing in Paradise in the Parsig version. That is not very surprising. In spite of putting special emphasis on the necessity of happiness, there is neither a description of dancing nor even a word about the various kinds of dance in any of the Zoroastrian texts. However, in the Zoroastrian Persian version a kind of dancing known as Dast-band is mentioned twice as occurring in Paradise. In lines 421-422, a crowd of people who are performing the dance of Dast-band in Paradise are described. More important than that, in line 187, the Holy Immortals and one of the heavenly spirits are performing the dance of Dast-band. According to pictures on earthenware discovered in Sialk of Kāshān in Iran, and as well in Čašma-ʿAlī of the fourth millennium B.C., the dance of Dast-band/Dasta-band is a kind of very ancient dance in Iran.\textsuperscript{217} This matter attests both to the antiquity of the Zoroastrian Persian version and to the passages related to the dance of Dast-band, which are absent in the Parsig version.

According to the Zoroastrian Persian version, Virāf visits the places of the priests (the nineteenth episode), the warriors (the twentieth episode) and the farmers (the twenty-second episode) in Paradise. These are the very groups that constitute the Indo-Iranian social classes (Dumézil 1958: 7-8; Benveniste 1969: 279-292). However, the artisans have also been added to these three other classes in the Parsig version (XIV.10). This addition obviously indicates a newer structure of the Iranian social classes of the period when the Parsig version was formed. The artisan class did not exist in the society in which the Zoroastrian Persian version came into being. Benveniste also, in his studies about the social structure of Indo-Iranian society, accepted the presence of the artisans only with doubt. Therefore he put the name of this class in both the Iranian and the Indian societies in brackets (Ibid: 279). Thus, the Zoroastrian Persian ver-

\textsuperscript{217} The dance of Dast-Band and the related earthenware illustrations have been discussed in the commentary.
sion is dependent on a pre-Zoroastrian Iranian society, and is more an-
cient than the Parsig version.

- The spirits of the teachers and scholars in Paradise are mentioned in
the fifteenth chapter of the Parsig version (XV.8), which indicates a
newer social structure. There is no mention of these two groups in the Zo-
roastrian Persian version.

- The Parsis (the Zoroastrians in India) believed in the entire message of
the Aṛḍāy-Vīrāf Nāma until a century ago. Especially the parts related to
women’s affairs and the sins committed by women were in the center of
their appreciation, so that they used to weep and mourn when listening to
them (Haug-West 1872: Lv). The sins of the women are especially em-
phasized among all the sins mentioned in the Parsig version (Tavadia
1956: 120). Additionally, according to this version the number of
women’s sins is higher and their punishment more severe than those of
men. The opposite is true for the Zoroastrian Persian version. The subject
discussed is not only that women are guilty more than men. According to
the Parsig version, women are not only guilty but also they are sin-
makers, while it is not so in the Zoroastrian Persian version.

- The number of rewards in the Zoroastrian Persian version is higher
than in the Parsig version, and likewise the number of punishments in the
Zoroastrian Persian version is lower than in the Parsig version.

- There are 39 extra chapters in the Parsig version, of which there are no
traces in the Zoroastrian Persian version. Although a number of these are
new re-written versions of already existing chapters, the subject of all
these 39 chapters is Zoroastrian religious regulations and the punishment
in hell for disobeying them. The absence of these chapters in the Zoroas-
trian Persian version plainly indicates that these chapters have been added
later on to the Aṛḍāy-Vīrāf Nāma by the Zoroastrians’ religious-men.

The above-mentioned evidence indicates that during the transformation of
the text of the Aṛḍāy-Vīrāf Nāma, the matter was not just the replacement of
the gods, the myths and the pre-Zoroastrian (Indo-Iranian) narratives with
their Zoroastrian counterparts, which was also proposed at the beginning of
the chapter. The replacement also included ideological changes of the Aṛḍāy-
Vīrāf Nāma text. All these changes were done to achieve a religious goal.
Thus, the primitive form of the composer’s reflections on Vīrāf’s journey
was rubbed off and replaced by a religious-Zoroastrian concept. This had not
yet been accomplished with the text on which the Zoroastrian Persian ver-
sion was based. The ideological transformations of the text have moved even

218 It can be claimed that there is no such anti-feminist point of view in all the rest of the
Iranian pre-Islamic literature as in the Parsig version of the Aṛḍāy-Vīrāf Nāma. Furthermore,
although in its present form the Aṛḍāy-Vīrāf Nāma is among the Zoroastrian works, one can-
not find such an anti-feminist view in the Zoroastrian religion.
The differences between the Zoroastrian Persian version and the Parsig version indicate that, although the central part of both versions is the same, they are different from a philosophic viewpoint. This different point of view can be explained in brief as follows:

- In the Zoroastrian Persian version, the King is in the center of the supremacy (authority), and either he himself or his name has an omnipotent presence in the narration. This attests to the antiquity of the Zoroastrian Persian version in relation to the Parsig version. The Zoroastrian priests are also present in this narrative, but they don’t play a distinguished part here. But in the Parsig version the Zoroastrian priests are powerful individuals, and their crucial role in society is demonstrated many times. Furthermore, the king is totally absent as a figure in the Parsig version, and there is not even any mention of a king.
- The happiness of the Other World is more than its pain in the Zoroastrian Persian version.
- Hell occupies less space in the Zoroastrian Persian version; it is described in less detail and depicted as a less dreadful place as well.
- There are many more deeds which are important in Zoroastrianism and have the character of religious rules in the Parsig version than in the Zoroastrian Persian version. For this reason, the Parsig version has the nature of a religious-Zoroastrian account, while the Zoroastrian Persian version is more of an epic-Zoroastrian account.
- A number of names of the great personalities in Zoroastrianism which have been mentioned in the Parsig version are absent in the Zoroastrian Persian version.
- The number of rewards is much more in the Zoroastrian Persian version, but the number of punishments is less than in the Parsig version.
- The women are not guiltier than the men in the Zoroastrian Persian version, thus they are not punished more than the men.

The above-mentioned topics indicate that surely some Parsig versions of the Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma have existed in Iran from one of which the Zoroastrian Persian version was translated. Those versions were obviously different from the present Parsig version and much closer to the original version of this account. It is safe to assume that this original version lacked some of the religious-Zoroastrian narrations and themes present in the current Parsig version. If the Zoroastrian Persian version was newer than the Parsig version, it should have contained all religious parameters and themes directly or
indirectly related to Zoroastrian regulations which are present in the Parsig version.\footnote{In this connection, it is surprising that there are no known traces in Iran of any manuscript in the original language, that is in Parsig, of a valuable and important work like the \textit{Ardāy-\textit{Vīrāf Nāma}}, a book which is a venerated book of the Zoroastrians. The versions versified by Zartušt Bahrām and Nišārvān Kirmānī are the only manuscripts of the \textit{Ardāy-\textit{Vīrāf Nāma} found in Iran.}}
X. Appendix: Davānūs

The forty-second episode of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in the Zoroastrian Persian version is about a man called Davānūs whom Ardāy-Vīrāf visits in the Other World. Davānūs has been called a lazy man, who has not done any good in his lifetime due to his laziness. For this reason, the whole of his body except one foot is in Hell and the reptiles (*xrōfstarān*) are eating his body. The reason for this is that once in his lifetime, it so happened that Davānūs with that foot pushed some grass towards a sheep, which was fastened far from the grass. Due to this single good deed, that same foot is out of Hell and is not tormented by the *xrōfstarān*. This story is also mentioned in chapter 32 of the Parsig version of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*.

A slightly different version of the story of Davānūs is recorded in a few other works besides the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*.

The Davānūs account is, with certain differences, also told in a quote from the Sipand Nask, which is one of the lost Nasks of Avesta, in the Šāyest Nē-Šāyest (ŠnŠ 1969: XII.29). The essential difference in the Sipand Nask is that instead of Ardāy-Vīrāf, it is Zarathustra who visits Davānūs in the Other World. The Sipand Nask version, meanwhile, represents a more complete form of the narration, because there Davānūs’ sovereignty and his rule over thirty-three countries is mentioned, and also that he had never done a good deed.

The same quotation from the Sipand Nask in the Šāyest Nē-Šāyest, is found in the Šaddar Natr as well, but there is a difference there worth mentioning. There is no mention of the name of Davānūs in the Šaddar Natr, but only an account of a king who is in Hell. However, the Šaddar Natr version is more complete than the Šāyest Nē-Šāyest version. According to the Šaddar Natr, Davānūs ruled for many years. He committed much cruelty, injustice and tyranny. But one day while hunting he arrived in a place where he saw a sheep which was tied up (ŠDN 1909: IV.3-11).

---

220 Katāyūn Mazdāpūr, while presenting another rendering of this name in a different manuscript of the Šāyest Nē-Šāyest, holds that probably the name of *Davānūs* can be read *Yūnis* as well (Mazdāpūr 1990: 172-173). The name Davānūs in Zoroastrian Persian, is found in the form of *Yūnis* in manuscripts NPMO and as *Danis* in manuscripts N²L, which can have many different phonetic forms, such as *Danis* / *Danus* / *Dunas* / *Dinis* / *Dunis*.

221 There are more minor differences: according to the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in Zoroastrian Persian and the Sipand Nask versions, one of the feet of Davānūs is standing out of Hell, but according to the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* in Parsig and the Šaddar Natr, it is specified that it is his right foot which is standing out of Hell; Davānūs throws the grass towards a sheep according
In order to get a full picture of Davānūs’ story we need to combine the two versions of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* and the *Ṣaddar Naṭr* on Davānūs. The result of this combination is as follows:

“And then we passed beyond that place and arrived at another place. I saw the soul of a man whose whole body was in hell except for one foot which was outside. And the vermin were not inflicting bites on that one foot. I asked Surūš-ašū: ‘Whose soul is this?’ Surūš-ašū said: ‘This is the soul of a man whose name was Davānūs. [He had been a king and he had ruled over thirty three countries and he had ruled for many years ([SDN 1909: IV.5]).] And he was so lazy that he had never done a good deed. [But he had done much cruelty, injustice and tyranny. It so happened that one day, he was going hunting. He arrived in a place, where he saw that a sheep was tied up. There was some grass far away, and that sheep was hungry. And it was trying to eat the grass, but did not gain access to that grass. This same king had thrown the grass near to the sheep with his foot ([SDN 1909: IV.6-10]).] Now, as a reward for that, his one foot is outside of hell, and all the rest of his body is in hell and the vermin are eating [it]’” (*Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*: 42nd episode).

Apart from these above-mentioned works, the name of Davānūs is also mentioned in two other places, namely in *Yasna* 31, verse 10 (*Yasna* XXXI 1878: 351) and in the ninth book of *Dēnkard* (*DkM* 1911: II.833).

The true identity of Davānūs has been unknown from the time when Pope’s translation of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* was published (1816) to this day, whether in the translation of the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* or in research done about this work and about both *Yasna* 31 and *Dēnkard*. It has not been decided yet what the correct form of the name is, neither to what language or culture it originally belongs. Moreover, no one has discovered what personality, mythical or historical, Davānūs was.

It can be said in general that the researchers have had a wide range of opinions regarding this name, either in the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma* or in other texts: some have neglected it and some have supposed that it is a name and tried to find out its origin, furthermore, some have got it, not as a name but as a word or a form of a verb and have translated it thus.

Here are some examples of research about this name that could be taken generally as a mirror of all researchers’ work on this topic.

---

222 The word šahr “city”, that means both “city” and “country” in Parsig and Zoroastrian Persian.

223 The last sentence can also be found in the *Ardāy-Virāf Nāma*, but with a different structure.
Pope (1816: 71-73), has omitted the name of Davânūs in his translation of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma.

Jamaspji Asa, who was the first person to edit the Parsig version of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma, has noted that the name Davânūs is mentioned in manuscripts H6 and K20 in the form of दनवन्, and in the form of दनवन् in manuscript H9, which has later been changed into the form of दनवन्. He adds that, since the letter द also reads as ठ, kh [x], h, and the letter l also reads as l, r, ā, ū, v, n, it follows theoretically that the name can be read in 6x3x6x6 forms, that is, in totally 648 different forms (Jamaspji Asa 1872: 63). He also supposes that possibly Davânūs is a Greek name (ibid.: 175).

Haug, who refers to a note by Jamaspji Asa about ‘laziness’, also points to the Greek origin of the name of Davânūs or Danāvōs in his translation from the Parsig version of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma into English, and he has written its Greek form as (Δαναός = Danaos). After that, we find his transcription and English translation of the Sipand Nask recitation on Davânūs (ibid.).

Later, in a glossary of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma, West and Haug introduce Davânūs as the governor of thirty-three countries and add that the reading of the name is uncertain (West and Haug 1874: II.237).

Barthélemy, in his French translation of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma (1887: 55, 167, 174), has transcribed this name as Davāns. He has also mentioned some similar narrations of the story to that found in the Parsig version of the Sipand Nask, Yasna 31, verse 10, the Sād Bd. (which must be understood as Sadar Bundahiš)224 and the fourth episode of the Sadar Natr. He has also given a translation of the 29th section of the 12th chapter of the Sipand Nask (Şāyest Nē-Şāyest) in French after West’s translation.

Barthélemy has also pointed to the resemblances between the Davânūs story and the theme of the 60th chapter of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma in the Parsig version. In this chapter, Ardāy-Virāf sees a man in Hell who is placed in a boiler pot to cook, but his right foot is out of the boiler pot. Srōš and Ādur-yazd explain to Virāf that this is because this man has killed a great number of xraftarān (the reptiles) by the means of his right foot in the world. Barthélemy has compared the man’s persecution in the boiling pot to a part of Proserpine dans les Grenouilles [Proserpine in Frogs/The Frogs] by Aristophanes (about 446-386 B.C.), and as well to the Son d’Enfer [Song of Hell] by Raoul de Houdan, the French author of 12th century225 (Barthélemy 1887: 167, 174).

Concerning this name, Dastur Kaikhusru Jamaspji Jamasp Asa in a new edition of the Parsig version of the Ardāy-Virāf Nāma (1902: 37) transcribes it as Davāns, referring to the Yasna 31, verse 10, and translates it as a “a

224 If Sād Bd. is indeed Sadar Bundahiš, this information is not correct since here is no mention of Davânūs in this work.
225 Barthélemy has written the 13th century.
cheat; a hypocrite”. Then, he points to the two versions of the *Sipand Nask* and the *Saddar Natr* and translates a concise story of this ‘Davāns’ told in the *Saddar Natr* into English. He believes that “the story of the lazy Davāns” told in the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, is directly taken from the *Sipand Nask*” (ibid: iii).

In Maddox translation of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, (1904: 39-40), like in that of Pope, this name is omitted.

Vahman has the name of Dawānūs as “deceitful” in the glossary that he has provided for the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* (1977:19), and to explain this, he has written that Dawānūs was the name of a tyrant and wicked governor (ibid: 71). Surely, the *Saddar Natr* has been his source.

In his translation of this work into Persian, Bahār states that Davānūs is similar to a name of Greek origin; however there is no certain knowledge of such a personality (Bahār 1983: 286, re-print 1996: 332).

Gignoux, in his translation into French (1984: 181), has written this name as *Davān* and has mentioned its Avestan form davās- and writes that this form of *dw’nws* can be a word of the Greek origin, plus -os. The readings Davāns or Davānos are suggested by Gignoux, but he also adds that this reading is still uncertain. He further notes that the name may have a historical background and has symbolized a lazy person.

Vahman, in his English translation of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* (1986: 263), writes that this is an unidentified name, which according to the legends, refers to a tyrant ruler who neglected his religious duties.

‘Affī, in translating the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma* into Persian (1993: 46), has written this name as *Dawān* and has transcribed it Dawānūs (ibid: 193) but there is no explanation of it.

Besides in the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, the *Sipand Nask* (Šāvest Nē-Šāvest) and the *Saddar Natr*, the name Davānūs is mentioned both in *Avesta: Yasna 31*, and *Dēnkard* as well.

In Haug’s translation (1878:351), which is the Zand (= Parsig) version of *Yasna* 31, he translates the name as “hypocrite”. Then, in an explanatory footnote, he writes the Avestan form of the name as davās. He also indicates that the name has been mentioned in the *Sipand Nask* and the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, and transcribes it as Davānūs, the form of the name in the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*.

In his translation from the *Sipand Nask* (1880: 350), West transcribes the name as Davāns and in a footnote he explains that this name is the same davās of Avestan which could be translated as “hypocrite”.

Peshotan Sanjana, in his translation of *Dēnkard* (1922: XVII. 95), has translated this name two times, at first to *dūṃmīnishnīh* “hypocrisy” and the

---

226 The first publication of the *Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma*, translated by Rahīm ‘Affī, took place in 1963. Unfortunately, I have not had access to it.
227 See also *DkM* 1911: II.833.
second time to dāvānsīhā-ich “hypocratically”. He comments about the translation of this word that “[t]he dāvānsīhāch of the text evidently represents the davāschnia of the Avesta Yas. XXXI, 10c; and the Pazand dāvānsīhāch in its Pahlavi” (ibid: 72, f.5).

Humbach, in his translation from Yasna 31 into the German (1959: I.91), has read the name davāscinā and seems to translate it as “gute Erinnerung”.

Kotwal has transcribed the name Davāns in his translation (1969: 37) from the Sipand Nask in (the Šayest Nē-Šayest).

Insler has read the name davāscinā in his translation of Yasna 31 (1975: 39, 185), and translated it as “friendship”.

While translating Yasna 31 (1988: I.115; III.67), Kellens and Pirart have read the name davāscinā and avoided translating it.

Mazdāpūr, while translating the Sipand Nask (1990: 162), has transcribed the name as Davānsū.

Humbach in his translation into English (1991: I.128, II.67), has supposed that the name is a derived form of dauuqs, which means “shouting”, and has read the word davāscinā in the text and translated it to “shout”. However, in spite of all that, the reference of the name Davānsū is still unknown.

The keys to a correct understanding of the name Davānsū are to be deduced from his life story in the Ardhā-Virāf Nāma, the Sipand Nask and the Ṣaddar Naṭr, and one could profit from them to explore this personality. They are as follows:

- The name of Davānsū and his sovereignty
- The number of the countries dominated by Davānsū
- Davānsū’ tyranny
- The laziness of Davānsū and his not doing any good deed
- Davānsū in Hell
- Doing a single good deed

The name of Davānsū and his sovereignty

Hoshangji Jamaspji Asa (1872: 63) states that the name of Davānsū can be read in 648 forms in the Parsig. Following him, Gignoux (1984: 181) has also pointed to the different orthographies of this word in Parsig. Thus, the name of Davānsū can be taken as a misspelled form of a similar name.

Fortunately, in one of the books written about the history of Iran, though only once, the name of داونوس Dāvnūs is mentioned. Abū al-Ḥasan Masʿūdī (dead 346 A.H / 957 A.D.) in his book مروج الذهب و معادن الجوهر Murūj al-żahab va maʿādin al-jawhar, writes in a chapter related to the kings of Babylon, Nabataeans and so forth (known as Chaldeans): "ثم ملك بعده موسی سنه، و قیل: أقل من ذلك، ثم ملك بعده داونوس، إحدى و ثلاثين سنه، و قیل أكثر من ذلك، ثم ملك بعده كسرى جوس، عشرین سنه. "Then a king after him, Maʿūsā, [ruled] for one year, and it has been said that he ruled] even less. After him,
one year, and it has been said that [he ruled] even less. After him, Davānūs [ruled] for thirty-one years, and it has been said that [he ruled] even more. After him, Kasrjūs [ruled] for twenty years.” (Masʿūdī 1964: 1.217).

Here, it appears that the name Davānūs is the same name Davānūs where the place of the two letters «ا» (alif) and «و» (vāv) have changed places. This is neither surprising nor unusual in manuscripts in Arabic script.

In another book about Iran’s history composed earlier than Masʿūdī’s work, we find the correct form of the name for the king, in a chapter with a similar account of kings. Ahmad ibn-i abī-Yaqūb, well-known as Yaqqūbī (dead 292 A.H/904 A.D), has written in his book Taʾrīx al-Yaʾqūbī in a chapter about the kings of Babylon:


Thus, the name of Dāryūš is recorded as Davānūs with several erroneous changes in the word. It occurred for the first time in Parsig in the form of Dawānūs and in the Zoroastrian Persian texts in the form of Davānūs, and for the second time in the form of Dāwnūs in the Murūj al-zahab va maʿādin al-jawhar. However the form of Dāwnūs is much closer to Dāryūş. The letter «و» has changed to the letter «ء», the letter «ئ» has changed to the letter «اء», which means that the two dots have changed into one and moved to a position above the letter, and the dots of the letter «ش» have been omitted and this letter has been like «ش».

In this context it is necessary to mention that anyone who has some knowledge about the Persian/Arabic characters, and is aware of the mistakes involved in the transcription of these names, can easily recognize the errors and correct them. However, this matter is not directly related to this discussion.

228 It is worth mentioning in this history, that Davānūs/Dārīūš and the other Achaemenian’s king ruling over Babylon and considering among the dynasties of Babylonian kings. However, this matter is not directly related to this discussion.
that may happen in manuscripts, especially while re-writing unknown names, will not find the change of the name Dāryūš to Dāwnūš strange at all.

Another work that seems to mention Davānūš is the love poem Vāmiq and ‘Adhrā composed by ‘Unṣurī (c.970-c.1040 AD).229 There the name occurs in the form of Vadānūš, and he is a man who has sold ‘Adhrā, the main female character of the story (Hägg-Utas 2003: 175). However, the compiler of Burhān-ī Qāṭī mentions Davānūš, Danvāš and Dayānūš as variants of this name (Tabrīzī 1983: 2.820). Another verse ascribed to this poem mentions a robber by name of Dayānūš (ibid.) One of these forms, namely Davānūš, seems to be identical with the Parsig form Davānūš, the difference being found just in the last letter «ش» “š”. Probably, the names Vadānūš/ Davānūš also refer to Dāryūš, used in that form by ‘Unṣurī, since the original name was forgotten among the Iranians, and then, for the same reason, the scribes introduced other variants in the manuscripts. This conclusion is supported by the fact that, in the same poem of Vāmiq and ‘Adhrā, we find that ‘Unṣurī has used the name of Dāryūš in the form Dārā, which is the form of Dāryūš that is later well-known among the Iranians (Hägg-Utas 2003: 176, 242, 245).

It is not surprising that Davānūš has been written for Dāryūš or Darius in the Parsig version in view of Hoshangji Jamasprī Asa’s remark (1872: 63) that the name Davānūš can be read in 648 ways in Parsig. Haug has also recorded this name in the two forms Davānūš and Danvāš in his translation of the Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma (Parsig version) into English. This means that this name has been recorded at least in two different forms in the Parsig version.

The number of countries dominated by Davānūš

The number of countries ruled by Davānūš/Dāryūš are thirty-three according to the Sipand Nask and the Ṣaddar Naţr. It must be said that is not easy to determine the exact number of the countries ruled by Dāryūš. The number of the countries varies between 31 in the Xerxes inscription (XPh), 29 in the inscription on the king’s tomb at Naqš-i Rustam (DNA), 27 in one of the Susa inscriptions (DSe), 24 in one of the four inscriptions placed on the south façade of the Persepolis terrace (DPe), and 23 in the Behistun inscription (DB) and one of the versions of the Susa foundation charter (DSaa) (Briant 2002: 172-173).231

---

229 I give my best thanks to professor Bo Utas for referring me to this source.
230 This is very probable that was a form of the name was been written mistakenly by the scrivener. Maybe the scrivener has recorded the letter “v” before “d”; so Davānūš has changed to Vadānūš.
231 The name of the subject countries of Darius are mentioned in five columns in the French text of Briant’s book, which displays the name of these countries in five inscriptions. But, the
On the other hand, according to the Naqš-i Rustam inscription, Dāryūš himself has declared: “If now thou shalt think that ‘How many are the countries which King Darius held?’ look at the sculptures [of those], who bear the throne” (ibid: 178).

On the basis of this statement, the number of representatives of countries in the inscriptions on the king’s tomb at Naqš-i Rustam and Persepolis, who are found as throne bearers, numbers 30 all in all. However, the number of these representatives is 28 above the southern gate of the Hall of One Hundred Columns in Persepolis.

Regarding the discrepancy between the number of subject countries and peoples of Dāryūš, an important point must be taken into consideration, namely: “it must thus be recognized that neither the lists nor the representations constitute administrative catalogues yielding a realistic image of the imperial realm. It was not administrative districts that the Great Kings wanted to represent. The word used in the inscriptions is dahyu- “people”. The Kings did not intend to give a list that was either complete or exact. The inscribed lists are nothing but a selection of subject countries” (ibid: 177).

There is no mention of the number of the countries dominated by Da-vānts/ Dāryūš, neither in Ya’qūbī’s nor in Mas‘ūdī’s narrations. However, both of them have mentioned the years of his reign as 31 years, a point of view that is not accurately compatible with the historic evidences. Dāryūš ruled for 36 years, from the year 522 to 486 B.C. (Wiesehöfer 1996: 313). Ya’qūbī (1964: 1.69) and Mas‘ūdī (1964: 1.217) records the years of Dāryūš’s reign as 31, although Mas‘ūdī states that “it has been said that [he ruled] even more” (Mas‘ūdī 1964: 1.217). Is it possible that one of the historians who, according to Mas‘ūdī, holds that the years of Dāryūš’s reign were more than 31, is referring to the 36 years that he actually ruled?

Unfortunately, in none of the historical works written after Islam on the subject of Iran’s ancient history, we find exact records of the numbers of years that the kings of Iran ruled in pre-Islamic periods. In this connection, Abū-ma‘ṣar Balkhī (dead 886 A.D.) says, “The records of the reign of the kings of Iran are very confusing and incorrect, even if there was a continuation from the establishment to the decline of their rule” (Abū-ma‘ṣar Balkhī → Iṣṭahānī 1961: 14). He also adds that Iranians are in disagreement about the length of each king’s rule, as well. For example, some believe that Kay-Qubād ruled for 120 years, whereas some are of the opinion that his rule was even less than 10 years (ibid: 15).

name of the mentioned countries are recorded in six columns in the English translation of this work. The French text has missed the column that displays the Xerxes’ inscription.

232 The word dahyu- is translated in French with “people” (1996: 189) by Briant, and with “people” (2002: 177) by its English translator. However, Kent has translated dahyu- with “land, province and district” (Kent 1953: 190).

233 The phrase “the decline of their rule” means the end of Sasanians times and the beginning of the Islamic period in Iran.
This obscurity when it comes to the length of the rule of the Iranian Kings in Iranian historical works goes back to the early centuries of Islamic times in Iran. Ḥāmza Iṣfahānī (dead 961 A.D.) came across this problem while composing his history book. He writes that “the record of the sovereignty of the Kings of Iran, on the whole, is an incorrect and confused matter, because during the first 150 years [after the Arab attack], while translating from a language into another, it changed from a simple numbering into a code character”234 (Iṣfahānī 1961: 13-14). Abū-ма-šar Balkhī also wrote that “most of the years in the history are confused and incorrect, because when the historic events of a nation that has lived for many years are either narrated from one book to another or translated into another language, some mistakes, both additions and deductions, normally occur (ibid: 14).

Finally, it is important to remember that the number 33 is a holy and symbolic number in Zoroastrian literature. The numbers of the gods are 33 according to the Yasna (Hät I.1-23); Yōšt asks 33 questions from axt ī jādūg, according to the Mādyan ī Yōšt ī Friyān (Haug-West 1872: 241-266); there are 33 roads to Paradise in the Ṣaddar Naṭr (1909: LXXIX.6-9); and Anūšir-vān Kirmānī, in his poem of the Kitāb-i vasf-i amšaspandān, has also described 33 Holy Immortals (Unvālā 1922: II.164-192). Therefore, when the Davānuš story was re-written or copied, the number of the countries dominated by Davānuš/Dāryūs changed from 23, 24, 27, 29 or 31, to 33.

Davānuš’ tyranny

Cambyses (Old Persian: Kabūjīya; Greek: Kambyses), the second king of the Achaemenian dynasty, appointed a Magian called Patizeithes235 to take care of his house in his absence while he travelled to Egypt. Cambyses had a brother called Smerdis (Old Persian: Bardiya-, Greek Smerdis)236 who was put to death by Cambyses, because he was anxious that this brother may gain royal power.237 However, no one was aware of this assassination. Cambyses journey to Egypt and his absence in Iran lasted for a long time. Patizeithes had a brother who was also a Magian and looked very much like Smerdis, and accidentally bore the same name as Smerdis, too. Thus Patizeithes brought his brother and placed him on the royal throne in March of the year

---

234 『تواریختهم کلها مدخوله غیرمحقحه، ولنها نفت بعد ما به خمسین سنه من لسان ای لسان، و من خط مثنیه رقم و رومنک』

235 There is no indication to any Patizeithes in the Behistun inscription. Diakonov holds that “a good number of proofs indicate that Patizeithes is a Persian title not a name” (Diakonov 1978: 613).

236 This name is mentioned in the Behistun inscription (DB and DBb) as Gaumāta- (Kent 1953: 182), in Herodotus’ narration (1963: Book III.29) as Smerdis and in Clésiä’s narration (1947: 10) as Sphendadatès.

237 The view in different sources vary regarding the time, the place and the manner of how Smerdis, the brother of Cambyses, was murdered.
216 B.C. and announced that he was the same Smerdis, Cambyses' brother. Hearing this, Cambyses departed for Susa (Šūš) to regain his sovereignty, but he died on the way. When he was dying, he begged the great ones of Persia not to allow the sovereignty to fall into Median hands again (Herodotus 1963: Book III.61-65).

Seven months after the reign of Smerdis, Darius (Old Persian: Dārayavāus, Greek: Dareios), the son of Hystaspes (Old Persian: Vištaspas, Greek: Hystaspes) and the governor of Pārs/Persis, who had come to Susa accompanied by his six comrades, attacked the royal palace in September 29 of the year 522 B.C. They killed Patizeithes and his brother, and they cut off their heads. Then, five persons of them ran out of the palace to let the people know that this Smerdis was a false one. Outside the palace they killed every Magian that came in their way. The Persians, as well, resolved to follow Darius and his comrades' example. They slew all the Magians they could find, and if nightfall had not stopped them, they would not have left one Magian alive (ibid: III.70-79). Afterwards, they celebrated a great festival on the memorial day of this event every year, which they called the ‘Massacre of the Magians’ (μαγοφονία = magofonia). This was the greatest state festival of the Persians, and during this day no Magians dared to come out of their houses (ibid: III.79).

Smerdis ruled for seven months, and during this time he accomplished many great things. Among them, he proclaimed all his subjects free from service in arms and from tribute for three years. After his death all the inhabitants of Asia except the Persians mourned him238 (ibid: III.67).239

In view of the massacre of the Magians which was ordered by Darius/Davānū’s order and under his supervision, it can be supposed that from a Magian viewpoint such a king “has never done a good deed, but has also committed much tyranny, injustice and cruelty” (ΣDN 1909: IV.6).

238 Four narrations of the Smerdis event are available to us; the Behistun inscription (DB, DDb), and the accounts of Herodotus (1963: Book III.61-79), Ctésias (1947: La Perse.10-13) and Iustinus (1935: I.10), the latter founded on an account by G. Pompeius Trogus (1st century BC), in its turn founded on an account by Dinon (c. 360-340 BC). Here only Herodotus’ narration has been used because it is more detailed than the others. For a comparison of these four versions, the reader is referred to Tārīḵ-i mād (The History of the Medians) by Diakonov (1978: 391-400) and to From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire by Briant (2002: 97-114).

239 In consideration of the Herodotus report and the Behistun inscription, on the subject of the situation of some people of the society who were the followers of Smerdis and the sections who were against him, Diakonov writes that: “It should not be exaggerated and supposed that Guamātu- had been a revolutionary and that he fought for the freedom of the Medians […] he called himself a Persian and a Achaemenian and therefore he did not intend to bring back the previous independence to the Medians […] he had taken his authority through a courtly coup-d’état and was destroyed through another coup-d’état” (Diakonov 1978: 397, 399).
The laziness of Davānūs and his not doing any good deed

In the heading of the story about Davānūs in the Zoroastrian Persian version of the Ardā-Vīrāf Nāma, Davānūs is characterized by an adjective ažgahan, which means “lazy”. In the Parsīg version of the Ardā-Vīrāf Nāma, Davānūs is also called Davānūs i ajgahān “the lazy Davānūs”. With regard to the theme of this episode it seems that the laziness of Davānūs does not mean indolence but to be lazy in doing good deeds, according to both the Zoroastrian Persian and Parsīg versions. There is no word of the laziness of Davānūs in the Sipand Nāsk and the Šadder Natr versions, where he is instead characterized as cruel and unjust. It appears that the word «ažghān» and «kāhīlī “laziness”, both in the heading and in the text body of the Zoroastrian Persian version, and the word ajgahān in the Parsīg version of the Ardā-Vīrāf Nāma replace the epithet of unjust and cruel in these two texts. It means that the authors of the Parsīg and Zoroastrian Persian versions of the Ardā-Vīrāf Nāma have been led to renounce “the injustice and the tyranny” of the king and instead of that they have characterized the king as a lazy person. This change could have taken place already at a time when the dynasty of Davānūs/Darius was still ruling, and out of fear the authors of these texts may well have changed the cruelty of Davānūs into laziness as the reason why he did not do any good deeds. This appears plausible considering the fact that there is no indication of reasons for the laziness the Davānūs, nor for the manner of his laziness in any of these two versions of the Ardā-Vīrāf Nāma.

Davānūs in Hell

Vīrāf, in the Ardā-Vīrāf Nāma, and Zarathustra, in the Sipand Nāsk and the Šadder Natr, visit Davānūs in Hell. First of all, it can be said that this indicates that the Davānūs story has been famous to such an extent that it has utilized in different texts. Also, the fact that he is in Hell is clear evidence of his being guilty, or, in other words, that he did not do any good deed. Thus, naturally, everyone who travels to the Other World will see Davānūs in his special situation, with most of his body in Hell while one foot is outside Hell.

Doing a single good deed

The only point that is unclear in Davānūs’ story is his single good deed: throwing a bundle of grass in front of a hungry sheep/cow. Is this act a general symbol of a good deed? Is it a symbol for a good deed done by a king
who has never elsewhere done any virtuous deed? Unfortunately, there are no clues in the narrations to the answer to these questions. The original single good deed has been forgotten on account of narrating the story symbolically.

Conclusion

Smerdis is the most important and the most well-known personality among the antagonists and rivals who were punished by Darius; he was dethroned and killed. The Magians are also the most significant suppressed group in Darius’ period. Thus, the Magians are the group of people in Iranian territories, who would have a most reason to describe Darius/Davānūs as a cruel, unjust and tyrannical person.

The Magians performed all religious ceremonies as priests (men of religion) in ancient Iran. They still retained their influence after Zoroastrianism became widespread. Messina writes that the Magi themselves were the only true heirs of Zoroaster who faithfully transmitted his doctrines (Messina → Zaehner 1961: 161). Besides, they made themselves indispensable at all kinds of religious ceremonies, whether Zoroastrian or otherwise (ibid: 162-163). The influence of the Magi was so widespread that they enjoyed a monopoly of religious affairs not only in their native Media but also in Persis and the whole western half of the Achaemenian Empire (ibid: 161). In addition to this, the Magi were considered to be philosophers, and they were the teachers of the Achaemenian kings (ibid: 164). However, they belonged to the Median tribes and they could not uphold their former position after the Medians were defeated by the Achaemenians.

By piecing together the story of Davānūs with the account of Darius and Smerdis as well as that of the massacre of the Magians, we find that the most logical conclusion, which, of course, contains a certain amount of speculation, is the one presented below. Unfortunately a big part of this jig-saw puzzle is still missing. Therefore, the picture formed by these pieces necessarily differs from the picture that would emerge if we had more details.

In their precarious situation the Magians tried to refrain from recalling the memories of Smerdis murder and after that the massacre of the Magians, in order to protect their social position and safeguard their own and their people’s interests. Since the Achaemenians ruled over the country more than 150 years after Darius (until the death of Darius III in 330 B.C.), it was not possible to retell this story in public for fear of the government officials. It would not even be possible to retell the incident in family gatherings or circles of friends without omitting some parts of the story which may be dangerous. The result of this would naturally be that details, names and essential elements of the story were forgotten and that some details lost their original meaning. On the other hand, it is possible that some parts of the incident
were retold symbolically, because both the narrator and the audiences knew the symbols. Possibly, the good deed in Davânûs’ story is among the symbols whose origin has been forgotten. However, there were traces in the memories of the Magians that became paler during the times, a trace which was recorded finally in the Davânûs story.

The story of Davânûs must have been created after the death of Darius. Furthermore, it seems that the incoherent versions we have at our disposal are from a time when there was no remembrance of Darius, Smerdis and his brother, and of the murder of the Magians.

Possibly, we can never find out clearly how comprehensive the Davânûs story was from the beginning. Anyhow, it is likely that it was more voluminous that what is left to us. The most important evidence to support this view is the three versions that supply three different forms of the story. These are differences that may have come about due to the fear of punishment. Fear may have caused the elimination of the name Davânûs in the Saddar Nafr version and also the elimination of any mention of Davânûs’ sovereignty in the Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma. This same vigilance may have caused the removal of any reference to the cruelty, injustice and the tyranny of Davânûs in the Sipand Nask version.²⁴⁰ In other words, the self-censorship, in ways that are familiar in its various forms in our time, closed the road to the Davânûs / Darius story being written down in a complete form in the old world.

The Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma narration, in which there is no mentioning of Davânûs’ sovereignty and where only his laziness is mentioned, and the narrative of the Saddar Nafr, where the name of Davânûs is not mentioned, show to what extent this story has changed. It is thus impossible to get an image of the origin of this historical event by just looking at one account of the story.

It is not important when the Davânûs story has been incorporated into the Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma or in which work it was originally found. What is important is that narrators and scribes have included this text and that they have regarded religious works as the most appropriate place for this text to be preserved. One of these works is Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma.

Finally, perhaps the most important point in Davânûs story is that the image of Davânûs/Darius and the account of his life have been placed not in this world but in the Other World. Exposing Davânûs in the Other World was perhaps a way to conceal the true identity of the story of Davânûs/Darius, at least at first impression, and in this way diminish the danger for the rewriters, scribes, the holders of the manuscripts and all those who took part in transmitting the story.

²⁴⁰Thus, the claim by Kaikhusru Jamaspji Jamasp Asa that the Davânûs story of the Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma has been directly cited from the Sipand Nask (K. Jamaspji Asa 1902: iii) cannot be accepted. If that was the case, the Davânûs story in the different versions of the Ardây-Vîrâf Nâma should also have contained the important points of Sipand Nask, the sovereignty of Davânûs and his ruling over thirty-three countries.
Can it indeed not be considered as a great success for those who guarded and transmitted the Davānūs/Darius story that the true identity of this person has now been rediscovered?
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KNRb → Naqš-i Rajab → Daryāyī 2001

KNRm → Naqš-i Rustam → Gignoux 1991


KSM → Sar Mashad → Gignoux 1991


* M.U.29 → *Mazdāpūr* 1378/1999  
Minū-xirād (in verse) → Dārāb Hurmazdyār Sanjāna → MS. S.P.38  
Minū-xirād (in verse) → Marzbān Rāvarī → MS. S.P.1191
میرفخرایی، مهدی (1366/1987): یافتنی‌ذ در ادبیتی، معیسی‌یا متعلق‌یا توافق‌یا نهایی‌یا تنوین‌یا، تهران.
میرفخرایی، مهدی (1371/1992): برضی‌یه حیدری ناسک، عیسی‌یا متعلق‌یا معیی‌یا توافق‌یا نهایی‌یا تنوین‌یا، تهران.
مودی، جی. ای. (1923): "دو مینیاتورهایی در مراسم تشییع در عربی سنتی، تهران.
مودی، جی. ای. (1924): مقدمه به ناصره‌ی، صفحات 1-162. — منسوب به 1924
مودی، جی. ای. (1931): "چند نکته از یک پیامدهای قدیمی از منابع پزشکی، تهران.
مودی، جی. ای. (1932: 'a): "دراب هرمزی‌ارسی ریفیات، چند نکته از تلاش برای پاسخگویی به این مطلب"، مجله سالنگارسی، NUM. 23، صفحات 109-238.
موئل، مریان (1963): قربانی، میت و کونسولوگی در لیشترایان قدیمی، مسئله زرتشتی و سنت زرتشتی، پرسه‌های کشورهای اصلی، پاریس.
مولتون، جیمز هاپ (1913): Early Zoroastrianism، ویلیامز و نوریج، لندن.
محمدرضا پرستویی (1335/1956): فرهنگ‌یا نام‌بندی، نازاری‌یا مسابقه‌یا کی‌یا خیل‌یا، تهران، 7 جلد.
محمدرضا، محمد (1374/1995): تاریخ و فرهنگ‌یا در داور‌یا از سنگ‌یا به زبان‌یا عربی، تهران، 6 جلد.
محمدرضا، محمد (1380/2001): تاریخ و فرهنگ‌یا در داور‌یا از سنگ‌یا به زبان‌یا عربی، تهران، 6 جلد.
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MX 1895 = Mēnū-i Xrad → The Dīnā-i Mainū-i Khraṭ → Sanjana 1895
MX 1985 = Mēnū-i Xrad → Mīnū-yi xrad → Tafaẓẓūlī 1985

Nawābī 1976 → MS. M.U.29

Nyberg, H.S. 1937: Iran’s former religioners, Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrrels bokförlag, Stockholm.


Panoussi, Estiphan 2536(1356)/1978: Taʿṭīr-i farhang va jahānbīnī-yi īrānī bar Aflāṭūn (The Influence of Persian Culture and World View upon Plato), Anjuman-i sāhanāhā-yi falsafa-yi Īrān, Tihrān.


Politeia → Plato 1942
PRDd → Pahlavi Rivāyat → Williams 1990
Quran 1988 → The Holy Qur'ān 1988
Rāz-i yazdānī → MS.301
REA = Rivāyat ī Ėmēd ī Ašwahištān → Safa-Isfehani 1980
Rehatsek, Edward 1873: Catalogue Raisonné of the Arabic, Hindostani, Persian and Turkish MSS. in the Mulla Firuz Library, Managing Committee of the Mulla Firuz Library, Bombay.
Rosenberg, Frédéric 1909: Notices de Littérature Parsie, Imprimerie de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences, St-Pétersbourg, I-II.
Sachau 1889 → Ethé 1889
Şaddar Bundahiş ī Şaddar Bundehesh ī Dhabhar 1909


Sanjana, Darab Dastur Peshotan 1922: The Dēnkard, the Original Pahlavi Text of the First Part of Book IX, with its Transliteration in Roman Characters, Translations into English and Gujarati with Annotations, and a Glossary of Select Words, British India Press, 19 vols., vol. XVII.


Saugand-Nâma → Aša 2002


ȘDB 1909 → Şaddar Bundehesh → Dhabhar 1909
ȘDN 1909 → Şaddar Natr → Dhabhar 1909


Sipand Nask → ŠnŠ 1969


Snorres Edda 1978 → Collinder 1987

Snøs 1969 = Š/yest N/g413-Š/g407yest /g314


Taqīzāda, Ḥasan 2536(1356)/1977: “Naurūz”, Maqālāt-i Taqī-zāda, zīr-i nazar-i Īraj Afsār, Intišārāt-i šuḵīfān, Tihrān, vol. 9, pp. 3-14. [This article was first published in 1327/1948].

Tattavi → Sayyid ʿAbdurrahshīd of Tattah 1875


Unvāla, Jamshedji Maneckji 1940: Collection of Colophons of Manuscripts Bearing on Zoroastrianism in some Libraries of Europe, Funds and Properties of the Parsi Punchayet, Bombay.


*Vishtâsp Yasht → Dhabhar* 1927 → Zand-i Khârtak Avistâk
*Vishtâsp-Yasht → Westergaard* 1852-1854 → Zendavesta


_Wd = Widêwdâd → Geldner 1896_

_Wd = → Vendidâd → Dastoor Hoshang Jamasp 1907_


_WgD = Wizîrgard ê Dênîg → Sanjana 1848_


Widengren, Geo 1965: *Die Religionen Iran*, W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart.


_Widêwdâd → Geldner 1896_

_Widêwdâd (Zand version) → Codex TD² 1979_


\[ Wy = Wīštāsp Yašt \rightarrow Vishtāsp-Yašt \]

\[ WZad = Wizīdagīhā i Zāḥspārm \rightarrow Gignoux et Tafazzoli 1993 \rightarrow Anthologie de Zāḥspārm \]

\[ Khulāṣa-ya Dīn (in verse) \rightarrow Kholāṣeh-ya Dīn \rightarrow Pāḥlan 1924 \]


\[ Yasn → Geldner 1886 \]

\[ Yasn XXXI 1878 → Haug 1878 \]

\[ Yašt → Geldner 1889 \]

\[ Yt. X 1959 → Gershevitch 1959 \]

\[ Yt. XV 1927 → Lommel 1927 \]


\[ ZK 1927 → Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk → Dhabhar 1927 \]


\[ ZWY = Zand i Wahman Yasn → Cereti 1995b’ \]
هیبت و سیاست: 327
همادین: 395
همآوا: 401
هم‌آوا: 401
هم‌آوا: 333
هم‌شیله: 401
هم‌شیله: 188
همچنان: 401
همچو: 227
هم‌میانه: 900
هم‌میانه: 384
هم‌میانه: 305
هم‌میانه: 305
هم‌سیستم‌ها: 401
هم‌سیستم‌ها: 197
هم‌سیستم‌ها: 64
هم‌سیستم‌ها: 66
هم‌سیستم‌ها: 557
هم‌سیستم‌ها: 561
هول و ترس و بیم: 933
نوزود بودن: 216
نوزودی: 225
نوزودی کردن: 225
تهره‌یخته: 822
تهره‌یخته: 654
نیازکارند: 33
نیازمندان: 50
نیمزد داردند: 642-643
نیک کرتشنه: 255
نیک کرد: 254
نیک مشننه: 254
نیک پهریخان: 843
نیک داشتن: 374-373
نیمول: 433
واج: 94
واج گرفتن: 94
واج گفتن: 95
واختر: 589
واژ: 868
واژ داشتن: 686
واژ کردن: 342
واژ [از کسی] تاییدن: 342
وقت پام: 124-123
وان: 758
ویرا: 31
ویرا: 99
ویله: 558
ویله و زاری و فریاد کردن: 558
هفت کشوه زمین: 333
موزه: 685
موقط: 753
موی به شتاده کردن: 827
مهر و دروج: 896
مهر و دروج کردن: 896
میانه: 90
مینوئن نظام داشتن: 529-528
میتروشنتر: 31
مینوی آب: 518
مینوی آب و آتش: 518
مینوی روشن: 906
مینوی زمین: 442
ناسبیار: 618
ناخوشتر: 590
ناسبیاس: 854
ناسبیاسی کردن با زن کسان: 854
نثار کردن: 342-341
نحست: 96
نسا: 842
نسای: 798
نسخه: 122
نشستگان: 340
نفت: 554
نماز بردن: 101
نماز کردن: 243
نمارگاه: 239
نمانده: 344
نمانده آمدن: 344
نوی: 886
نوزود: 216
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>مصوبه</th>
<th>شماره</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>کیش</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گار</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گودرک</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گاه و جای به دست آوردن</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گاه‌نامه</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گرامی کردن</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گرامی داشتن</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گران</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گران‌پایه</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گرد آمدن</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گرد بر گرد</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گردبای</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گروتان</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گروثامن</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گرویاندن</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گز</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گزد</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گزدم</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گزهم</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گؤیدن</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گندهای ناخوش</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گنده‌تیر</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گنوه‌کا</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گوسپندن</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گوش به [کسی] داشتن</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گورشن</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
شفاعت خواه: 354
شکجه برت‌هاد: 753
شکجه نهادن: 732
شکه و گمان افتادن از دین: 28
شکه و گمان برخاستن از دین: 25
شوم مشه: 756
شوه را بگناشتن: 659
شهمه: 66
طاوعت‌دان: 256
طرف‌ناکی: 423
طرفه: 459
عجب ماندن: 297
عذاب دادن: 696
عذاب گذردن: 570
عذاب و غم و فریاد داشتن: 637
عرش: 182
عرش و کرسي: 182
عرت داشتن: 466
عزم کردن: 39
عوض باز دادن: 441
غره بودن: 488
غلام‌بگان: 645
غلام‌بارگی: 651
غم داشتن: 176
غم‌های اول: 507
غم‌های دوم: 508
فر: 404
فراز رسیدن: 164-163
فراز نهادن: 610
فرچه: 362
فرداول: 612
روشی از روی [کسی] تافتن: 405–404
روغن میدوزرم: 246
روی بند: 60
روی بند فروریزشتن: 60
رها کردن: 51
رویه: 721
ریم: 840
ریمن: 844
ریمن کردن: 869
زاری و موهی بر خویش کردن: 582
زخم و ضرب زدن: 732
زراتشتش: 26
زراتشش سفنتمان: 925
زرایش: 295
زرایش: 400
زرفت: 360
زرشت: 10
زرشتش علیه: 10
زفان: 709
زند: 17
زندت روان: 396
زیادت: 505
زیان خواستن: 557
سبارده: 443
سباس داشتن: 3
سباهانه: 522
سپریایه: 150
سخوانی: 293
سپیدگر: 111
سر به بستر باز نهادن: 67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>کلمه</th>
<th>شماره</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نزدیک‌سای:</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیگر سوی:</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیگر‌شان:</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیگرگنده:</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین به:</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین به آمیزه‌های ایجادیستن:</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین به مازدیستن:</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین دوست:</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیو:</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیوان به لعنت:</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رادان:</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راست گردیدن:</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راستی به جای آوردن:</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رامش پذیرفته:</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راه دادن:</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راهداران:</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رخسار همیشه:</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ریزان:</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رستاخیز:</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رستاخیز تیپ پسین:</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رست:</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رقاصی کردن:</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رنگ بر تن خویش:</td>
<td>486-485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رنگ نمودن:</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رنگ رنگ:</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روا کردن:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روان خویش ریمن کردن:</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روزبانان:</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روسیه:</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روسیه کردن:</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نزدیک‌سای:</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نزدیک‌سای:</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیگر سوی:</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیگر‌شان:</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین به:</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین به آمیزه‌های ایجادیستن:</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین به مازدیستن:</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دین دوست:</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیو:</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیوان به لعنت:</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رادان:</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راست گردیدن:</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راستی به جای آوردن:</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رامش پذیرفته:</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راه دادن:</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>راهداران:</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رخسار همیشه:</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ریزان:</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رستاخیز:</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رستاخیز تیپ پسین:</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رست:</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رقاصی کردن:</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رنگ بر تن خویش:</td>
<td>486-485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رنگ نمودن:</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رنگ رنگ:</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روا کردن:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روان خویش ریمن کردن:</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روزبانان:</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روسیه:</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روسیه کردن:</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عنوان</td>
<td>صفحه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خوشه و ورجه افزایش: 911</td>
<td>f. 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خوشه‌مندی: 427</td>
<td>حد زمین: 885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خوش خور: 178</td>
<td>حد زمین مردمان دزدیدن: 885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خیره گرداندیدن: 231</td>
<td>حشارت: 660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>داداه: 351</td>
<td>دلتا: 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دادار اورمیه: 351</td>
<td>خاک و خرفتار پیمودن: 718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دار و درخت: 440</td>
<td>خانه خانه: 453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>داوران: 350</td>
<td>درهم اسب کردن: 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دبیر: 95</td>
<td>خدمت کردن: 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دخمه: 615</td>
<td>خراج گران: 877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ددان: 425</td>
<td>خراج نهادن: 877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در پر داشتن: 20-19</td>
<td>خرافتار: 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در جایی دردوبند: 331</td>
<td>خرائط: 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>درپوشیدن: 43</td>
<td>خرید کردن: 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دُرُج: 1070</td>
<td>خخل رسیدن: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>درخواست: 345</td>
<td>خنددن‌زنان: 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در خوش اندیشته کردن: 473</td>
<td>خُنْکا: 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در دل چری داشتن: 808</td>
<td>خوار داشتن: 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در رنگ افتادن: 779</td>
<td>خوار گذاشتن: 843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در رنگ‌آمیزی خدنده: 135</td>
<td>خورد کردن: 784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در سر گرفتار بودن: 498</td>
<td>خورد و توتناهی: 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در عذاب ماندن: 761</td>
<td>خورسنده: 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در غم چهارشنبه افتادن: 500</td>
<td>خورشنده: 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در گردن بودن: 374</td>
<td>خورشیدپایه: 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در گردن‌پرده‌ای: 164</td>
<td>خوسل: 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>در میان افکنند: 642</td>
<td>خورشیدپرده‌ای: 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>درگاه: 13</td>
<td>خورشیدنی: 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>درگذشتن: 309</td>
<td>خورشیده و ورجه: 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دروج: 896</td>
<td>خورشیده و ورجه از [کسی] تابیدن: 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دروغزن: 778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
به پای ایران: 661
به پیام فرستادن: 105
به پیام و سنج زدن: 898
به خورد دادن: 840
به خوشی برخی گرفت: 363
به روى درافتان: 918
به ره کردان: 758
به زور در [جای] افتکران: 660
به زیان اوردن: 781
به شانه آهنین گوشت خاریدن: 890

بهشت سترنیاپ: 316
به فریاد در رسیدن: 580
به کارن بزرگ: 666
به [کسی] گرد آمدند: 824
بهمن امشاسفند: 181
به یاری در خواستن: 580
به یک پای موزه رفتند: 865

به یار و بی کس
به آهوت: 136
بیدادگر: 475
بیدادی: 748
بی گمان: 35

بی گمان بودن: 319
بی گمان شدن: 35
بیم بردن: 249
بیم در دل افتادن: 327

پاداش: 289
پاداشان: 290
پاداشاها: 722
پاداشاها کردان: 640
پاداشاها گداردن: 677

پی amendments بالاتر بهشت: 387
پی amendments: 668
پی amendments و فریاد داشتن: 668
پی amendments بایدیت: 335
پی amendments بدانند: 272
پی amendments بدعت فرآیند: 876
پی amendments بر آتش به آوردند: 263
پی amendments بر پلیدی مورد: 845
پی amendments بر تن خوشی گرفتند: 486
پی amendments بر سر آب و آتش شدند: 661
پی amendments بر سر آتش نشستند: 828
پی amendments بر سر شوهر کس گزیدن: 372
پی amendments بر گمان: 11
پی amendments بر یزد کردان ایستادند: 61
پی amendments برآمد: 18
پی amendments برزگری: 430
پی amendments برشنو: 844
پی amendments برشنو کردان: 844
پی amendments بستن: 671
پی amendments بسته شوهر بزیدن: 372
پی amendments بالای اشوان: 175
پی amendments ببط: 280
پی amendments ببن افتکران: 526
پی amendments بنواختن: 343
پی amendments بوارخ: 43
پی amendments ببیوی خوش بر خوشی کردان: 931
پی amendments به آویزه: 925
پی amendments به پادشاهی نشستند: 6
پی amendments به پای ایستادن: 435
امیدار امشاسفنده: 686
امشاسفندان: 154
انبوه شدن: 13
انبوه شده: 18
اندر: 156
اندر رنگ رفتن: 856
اندر زرد: 468
اندک مایه: 95
اندوه وردن: 52
awa: 744
اورموز: 26
اورموز باعفوزنی: 925
اوروز: 518
ایدین: 6
ایران شهر: 410
با زن خفقت: 672
با زن دشتان خفقت: 672
با زن گرد آمدن: 676
با پادهفرش: 395
باژ آیستادن: 5495
باژ بینی: 86
باژ جنین: 83
باژ خوردن: 251
باژ داشتن: 332
باژ زردی/باژ زاریدن: 83
باژ گردایدن: 198
باژ گردنیدن: 419
باژ ننشستن: 83
باژ نمودن: 10
باژ کرکشت: 567
باژ کلکان: 296

آخشن: 936
اردا: 118
اردا وریاف: 94
اردا ویراف: 86
اردیبهشت امشاسفنده: 259
ارژانتی: 237
ارژانتیان: 300
ارژانتی داشتن: 445
ارژانتی شدن: 237
f. (= footnote) 239
f. 660
از بر داشتن: 18
از جهان بر کندن: 11
از راه برد: 859
از فرمان [کسی] بیرون آمدن: 371
از کام شدن: 253
از داد باز شدن: 476
از داد باز کردن: 927
f. 608
اژکنن: 763
اسب: 406
اسبانه: 126
اسبانه: 1116
استوان: 926
f. 1116
اسفندان: 443
اسفنارم: 86
اسفون: 168
آستان: 17
Index of old words, terms and verbs of the text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>آبادان داشتن</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آبادان کردن</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آب تاختن</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آب تاختن از پایه</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آخترشدن</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آویزه</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آویچه کردن</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آدران</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آزموندن</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آرزویه کردنی</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آشکارا کردن</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آشنایی</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آتشکده</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آهنگ</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آب</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آتش</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Each word has a number which indicates the line number of its first occurrence in the edited text.
** The verbs are not written in the index as they are used in the text body, but in their infinitive forms. For example, «نیشتن» na-yaštand is recorded as «یشتن» yaštan.
*** Some words in this index have different forms that belong to various manuscripts, which are explained in footnotes. For example, the word «چینون» činvad is written as «چینور» činvar and «چینود» činvad as well.
اختیار کتابخانه موزه‌ی برمانتا، در شهر لندن در انگلستان، تصحیح شده است.
متن تصحیح شده همراه با فصل‌های دیگر این رساله، که با راهنمایی و یاری استادانم بانو کاریتا چهانی و جناب بو اوتاس نوشته شده، منتشر خواهد شد. امید که به کار دیگران بیاورید.

[اوپسالا-داریوش کارگر، فرزنده یحیی و خدیجه]
تمام اثرات[M.73۷۵H.۲۸۷۷] در اختیار دست نوشته‌ی [۳۰۰] N، و با مقابله با دست نوشته‌ی (۴۷۳۹) P در اختیار کتابخانه‌ی مهرچی رانا، در شهر نوسیاری در هند، و با مقابله با دست نوشته‌ی (۴۴۳۹) F در اختیار کتابخانه‌ی مهرچی رانا، در شهر پاریس، دست نوشته‌ی (۳۰۰۰۰) M در اختیار کتابخانه‌ی شهر، در شهر مونیخ در آلمان، دست نوشته‌ی O (Bodl.Or.۷۱۹) در اختیار کتابخانه‌ی بولیانی، در شهر آکسفورد در انگلستان، و دست نوشته‌ی (۸۳۰۰) L، در.

استوان و بی‌گمان‌‌ی دارند؛ و آن نیکی، و دیگران را به‌گوی که به‌نیای جهان
و آن جهان، دین به مازدا‌سیان، از باد بار مکنید و دست بار
مدارید، چه که خدا پیشینی سود ندارد. و دیگر باهرا گئی نگذارند که
شما مزرد و کرده کنید و از خواب غفلت بیدار شوید.

۳۳۱ احوال، چنین ۳۳۲ نموده ۳۳۱ آمد، از خدای تعالی.

خداوند ما را از همه بلایا و عذابها نگاه دارد. ۳۳۳ و دین به‌آویزه
مکان‌سیان را بر ما همان دارد، و ۳۳۴ بی‌گمانی آهراً من دور کناد.
و شریم مردان و سحر آهراً و دیوان به لعن، در راه ما مباد. چه، این
نیکی و بید این جهان به سر آید. اگر نیک بژود و اگر به بی‌بنا. و بدان جهان
اندوه خوردن و پیشینی، به کار ۳۳۵‌سود ندارد.
از جمله که خدا ۳۳۶[و] به نادانسته است، آجش و ۳۳۷آمشه و
پیشینی و پخشیده.

۱۱۱۷ برگ ۱۱۶ روى و ازه‌های‌«استوان و بی‌گمان» آسیب دیده و تنها «استوا» در آن
پیداست.

۱۱۱۸ پیشام: - جهان و آن جهان و + NPN²MO ۱۱۱۹
+ نیکتند. بر پایه فعل بعدی، «مادرید» به «مکانی» تصحیح قیاسی شد.
۱۱۲۰ نیکتند: + نیکتند. بر پایه فعل بعدی، «مادرید» به «مکانی» تصحیح قیاسی شد.
۱۱۲۱ + NPN²MO ۱۱۲۲
+ که
۱۱۲۳ + نیکتند. بر پایه فعل بعدی، «مادرید» به «مکانی» تصحیح قیاسی شد.
۱۱۲۴ + نیکتند. بر پایه فعل بعدی، «مادرید» به «مکانی» تصحیح قیاسی شد.
۱۱۲۵ Az از اینجا به بعد را ندارد
۱۱۲۶ - آویزه
+ NPN²PO ۱۱۲۷
+ از
۱۱۲۸ بی‌گمانی
۱۱۲۹ آهراً
+ ۱۱۳۰ - پیشام
+ NPN²MO ۱۱۳۱
+ N۲[و]
۱۱۳۳ پیشام: - پیشام
+ N۲[و] نیکتند. بر پایه فعل بعدی، «مادرید» به «مکانی» تصحیح قیاسی شد.
+ N۲[و]
بودم و چیزی نتوانستم گفت. آوازی آمدی که: «ای اردای ویراف» برگرد و بر شهر خویشتن شو. که چند مردم از بهر تو در رنجند هفت شبان روز است که هیچ کس نیایصد هم، و گوش می‌دارند تا چه پیغام خواهی بردن. هر چه دیده همه راست کوی. نگر تا دروغ‌های، چه چن توَ‌نّا من می‌بینم. و من چون آوازٌ، شنیدم، به روى درافتادم. و بعد از روشنی، هیچ چیزی دیگر نمی‌دم. و » پس دیگرباره آواز آمددی که گفتی: «ای اردای ویراف» مردمان را به گویی راو راست اندر جهان یکی است، و هر چه جز آن است همه گمراهی است. و مردم را به گویی که، هن آنگاه که مال و ممت بسیار باشد، و هن آنگاه که در محنت و رنج باشند، پشت بر دین په یکند و پیوسته [b148b] اعتقاد و نیت راست دارند و نیکو نیت و نیکو کردار باشند، و دل در دین اورمزدّه بافندگان، و پیغام‌بری زرافشتی سفتمان...
و ارديبهشت امشاسفند۷۷ پرسيدم كه: اين مردمان۷۸ چه كنها كرده‌اند؟
کشفتند: اين جمله، مهر و ۱۹۹۸ دور ۱۹۸۲ کرده‌اند، چه با هم‌دينان، و چه با
ديگر كسان. پنادشتان که قول و پيمان كه با چندينان به دروغ کنی، گناه
نخواهد بود. ندادنستاني كه مهر و ۱۹۸۲ دور ۱۹۸۶ چه با اشوان ۱۹۸۹ و
چه با دروننان، هر دو پيسان است. تا اكنون لاجرم در اين گذاب مانده-
اند۷۸ من
[در پنجم و نهم]
رسيدن ارداي وياراف باز به مينوي روشن
و پس سروش اشرو و ۱۹۹۹ ارديبهشت امشاسفند، مرا از آن جاي تنگ و تاريك
بيرون آوردن و به گروهان پردن.
[در ششم]
رسيدن ارداي وياراف به بارگاه ايزد تعالي
و چون آنجا رسيدم، خوره و وزر افزايش دادار اورمژد۹۳ را ديدم و
چندانک كوشيدم در خوره۹۴ و فر يزدان نماز برم، متحرر و عاجز بمانده

روانها:
NPN² ۱۰۷۵
- M ۱۰۷۶
N² ۱۰۷۷
- و ارديبهشت امشاسفند
N² ۱۰۷۸
- مرد
- P ۱۰۷۹
- درج: L ۱۰۸۰
- M ۱۰۸۱
- و
Kسانی:
PN² ۱۰۸۲
- P ۱۰۸۳
- و
- درج: L ۱۰۸۴
+ "کرده‌اند"، اما بعد خط زده شده است.
N ۱۰۸۵
- M ۱۰۸۶
- باشوان
- P ۱۰۸۷
- و
- ماندندان
- P ۱۰۸۸
- و
- ن ۱۰۸۹
- و
- NPN²MO ۱۰۹۰
- M ۱۰۹۱
- و
- NPN²MO ۱۰۹۲
- M ۱۰۹۳
- خرگ
- M ۱۰۹۴
او را به مار افیعی، می‌زندند. واو فریاد می‌داشت. من از سروش اشو و
ارضی بهشت امشاسفتند پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه کنار کرده است؟» گفتند که:
«حدود زمین مردمان بخود را ۱۰۵۶ است و در ۱۰۵۸ حذف زمین خویشتن گرفته است.
تا آن زمین بر چای باشد، او را نو پادافرا به‌دین سان تمایند.»

[در پنجاه و هفتم]

روسیدن اردا ویراف به مقام مردی که عهد و پیمان شکسته است
و پس از آن جا درگذشت و به ۱۰۵۷ چایگاهی فراز رسیدم ۱۰۵۷. روان مردی را
دیدم که به شانه‌آهنین، گوشت ۱۰۵۷ اندام او را می‌خاریدند. همچنان که
مویی، که به شانه‌ای کنن، او فریاد و زارتی می‌کرد، و از سروش
شوش پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه کنار کرده است؟» سروش اشو گفت که: «این
مرد عهد و پیمان و ۱۰۵۷ زنیار به دروع کرده است، و قول بر خویشتین بنه-
ایستاده است.»

[در پنجاه و هفتم]

روسیدن اردا به مقام مردمنی که مهر و دروج ۱۰۵۷ کرده‌اند
و از آن جا درگذشت. به چایگاهی دیگر ۱۰۵۷ فراز رسیدم ۱۰۵۷. روان
ها به ۱۰۵۷ دیدم که ایشان را به تیر و سنگ می‌زندند. و ۱۰۵۷ من از سروش اشو
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بين دو ستاره از ميانه در پنجاه و ششم تا اينجا را ندارد.
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با می‌خوردند. از سروش اشو پرسیدم، که: "این قوم چه کننه کرده‌اند؟" سروش اشو گفت: [۱۴۸a] "این قوم به گرماهای شده‌اند، چون چنینون معنی‌داره، امشدیفند ۱۱۴۲ و می‌نیو آب و آتش از ایشان بی‌پایه‌ده است، که روان خویشتن را ریمین بکرده‌اند.
[در بنجاه و نجوم]

رستیدن به مقام مردی که زمین مردمان برده است
پس از آنجا درگذشته‌ام، به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدم. روان مردی را دیدم که کوهی در یکی نهاده بودند، و یا در زیر آن کوه بانگ و فریاد می‌دادند. من از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: "این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟" سروش اشو گفت: "زمین مردان را خارج گرانته‌ده است، و بدعه‌ها نو فراز نهاده است تا مردمان از په و په دوده‌های آواره شده‌اند و به درویشی افتاده‌اند. به سبب خراز گران، به جایگاه خویشتن نبایست شدین.
[در بنجاه و نشان]

رسیدن اردای ویراف به مقام مردی که زمین مردمان دزدیده است
و از آنجا درگذشته‌ام و به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدم. روان برده را دیدم که کوهی به ناخن می‌کشد، و مؤگل بر سرش استاده‌وده، و

M: نپن²MO نپن²MO + N²

- رستیدن به مقام مردی که زمین مردمان برده است

- ب ciné ییوه "پرسیدم" در آغاز برگ ۸۷ آمده و بقیه‌ای صفحه سفید است. اما نقب سرافشان، بدون افتادگی، در برگ ۸۷ یافته است. در برگ ۸۷b. واژه "پرسیدم" دوباره به تکرار یافته است.

M: N² - امشدیفند

N²: مس از آنجا درگذشتیم و به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدم.

- RA

N²: بر

M: RA - N²

- نپن²MO

M: N² - RA

- به و دوده، اما بعد روي از خشک شده شده و بالایش نوشته‌اند. "ده دو"، اما بعد روي "دو" خط خشک شده شده و بالایی آن نوشته‌اند: "بهد" - N²: مس

- RA

P: پس

- N²

P: بجاایی

- P

870

880
رسیدن به مقام مردمی که با زن کسان ناسپاسی گردیده است

سرود اشوه پرپسیدم که: این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟ سروش اشوه گفت:

«این مرد، مارد از مزدوران باز گرفته است، و بهره مردمان بپرده است.»

[در بناه و سیوم]

رسیدن به مقام مردي که با زن کسان ناسپاسی گردیده است

پس از آنچه درگننستیم. به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسدیم. مردم را دیدم که

گویی در ۱۳۱۲ پشت گرفته بود و اندر رنگ می‌رفت. و جهاد کردن که باز ایستد،

سهمش می‌دادند تا ۱۳۱۲ همچنان به ۱۳۱۳ رنگ و دشواری می‌رفت. من از سروش

اشوه پرپسیدم که: این مرد؟ چه گناه کرده است؟ سروش اشوه گفت: این مرد با زن مردمان ناسپاسی کرده است، و زن مردمان از راه بهبرده است.

[در بناه و چهارم]

رسیدن اردا و اروراف به مقام مردمی که بهگمراه پلید رفته است

و پس از آنچه درگننستیم. به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسدیم. قومی مردم را دیدم همه در میان یخ. افسردگی تا به کردن در نشسته‌ها و هر یکی طاسی

پر از خون و موز مردم پیش ایشان بهداشت بودند. و چوبشان مزدند تا

بی‌درده است م: پرده است

N²: ناسپاسی کرده

M: نماد

N²: بهبرده

P: بجای دیگر رسدیم

NPN²: بجای دیگر فراز شدید

N²: در

N²: تا

P: مورد

N²: در

P: + را

N²: بهبرده

M: با زن مردمان از راه بپرده است و ناسپاسی کرده

[در نهایت و نه]

رسیدن اردا و اروراف به مقام مردمی که بهگمراه پلید رفته است

بجای دیگر رسدیم

NPN²: بجای دیگر فراز شدید

N²: در

N²: تا

P: مورد

N²: در

P: + را

N²: بهبرده

M: با زن مردمان از راه بپرده است و ناسپاسی کرده

[در نهایت و نه]

رسیدن اردا و اروراف به مقام مردمی که بهگمراه پلید رفته است

بجای دیگر رسدیم

NPN²: بجای دیگر فراز شدید

N²: در

N²: تا

P: مورد

N²: در

P: + را

N²: بهبرده

M: با زن مردمان از راه بپرده است و ناسپاسی کرده

[در نهایت و نه]
رسیدن به مقام مردی که ریمنی نیکو نه پرهیخته است
و پس از آن‌جا درگنشتیم ۱۱۱ به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسدیم روان مردی را دیدم که خون و گوشت و ریم مردان به خورش میدادند. از سروش اش پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه‌گاه کرده است؟» سروش اش و گفت: «این مرد، در جهان، هیچ‌یک و نسا و ریم و موی و ناخن، نیکو نه پرهیخته است، و خواز گذاشته است تا در آب و آتش افتاده است ۱۱۷ و تن دیپ و ریه سیم، و برنشین نکرده است، و همچنان بر پلیدی بوده‌است ۱۲۰».

[در پنجاه و دومین]

رسیدن اردی و پیشاف به مقام دگر
و از آن‌جا درگنشتیم و ۲۲ به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسدیم ۲۲۲ روان مردی را دیدم که گوشت و پوست مردان می‌خورد و بانگ و ۲۲۴ فریاد می‌داشت. از این جمله دو بار پشت سر هم آمد است: «و جادویی کرده است و جادویی کرده»

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>اسم</th>
<th>نتیجه</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>پنکر نه پرهیخته است</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>پس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N²M</td>
<td>رسیدن به مقام مردی که ریمنی نیکو نه پرهیخته است</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N²M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>بجایی</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N²</td>
<td>- دیگر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N²O</td>
<td>حشرت P خسر L Hجر M هشتر. اما بعد روز آن خط خورده دند</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N²O</td>
<td>حشرت N²O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>نکر پرهیخته</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>- و</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N²</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>بجایی دیگر رسیدیم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N²M</td>
<td>رسیدن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>- و</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

حساسیت نوشته است: همچنین.
سک را نان تدله است، و سک را نیکو نداشته است. اکنون بدين عذاب
مانده است که تو می‌بینی.
[در چهل و هفتم]

رسيدم به مقام زنی که می‌وز و ناخن نیکو نهپریخته است
و پس از آن‌جا درگنشتیم. به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسيدم. روان زنی را
ديدم که روزبانان به گرد آمد به بوندن، و گیسوی او را كرفته بوندن، و
در میان بخ و بر از او می‌کشیدند، و چوبش می‌زنند. از سروش اشقو
ارديبهشت امشاسفند پرسيدم که: "این زن چه گنده کرده است؟" گفتند
که: "این زن بر آتش می‌وز به شانه کرده است و در آتش ریخته، و می‌وز
و ناخن، نیکو نهپریخته است. و بر سر آتش، به زیبرجامه نشسته
است.
[در بینجاه]

رسيدم به مقام زنی جادوگر
و پس از آن‌جا درگنشتیم و به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسيدم. زنی را دیدم
که گوشت از انداز خویشتیم به کارد می‌برید و می‌خورد. از سروش اشقو
پرسيدم که: "این زن چه گنده کرده است؟" سروش اشقو کفتند: "این زن

۵۸
رسیدن اردا به مقام مرد منافق

پس از آنچه درگشتشم و به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدمی. قومی مردم را دیدیم که همه اندامشان پوسته بودند، و رخساره زرد شده بودند، و کرم در اندام ایشان بود. و از اندامشان کرم بیرون می‌آمدند. من از سروش اشوهور و باردهشان مشناسند. پرسیدم که: «این قوم کیستند که بر این صفت شده‌اند؟» گفتند که: «این روان آشموغان و منافقان است، که در دل چیزی داشته‌اند و به زبان چیزی دیگر می‌گفتند.» و مردم [147b] را فریب می‌دادند، و از راه دین به مازدیسن به دیگر اعتقادات می‌پرداختند، و کیشها و مذهب‌ها، های بدر در جهان آشکارا می‌کرده‌اند. این به گفتند و از آنچه درگشتشم.

رسیدن به مقام کسی که سگان کشته است

به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدم. روای مردی را دیدم که سگ او را می‌درید و پاره پاره را در پیش او می‌افکنند. و همه اندامشان از یکدیگر جدا می‌کردن، و یک یا دو فریاد می‌داشتند. من از سروش اشوپرسیدم که: «این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟» سروش اشو کفت: «این روان آن مرد است که سگ‌آبی و سگ‌شبانی و سگ‌مانی را کشت» است، و

PNN²MO

- رسیدن اردا به مقام مرد منافق

N²

- رسنیدن به مقام کسی که سگان کشته است

M

- بجایی دیگر رسیدم

P

- نکشت
کنانه کرده است؟» گفتند که: «این زن کودک به زیان آروده است و بیفکنده است.»

[در جهلم و بینجم]

رسیدن به مقام کسی که گواهی دروغ داده است

پس از آنجا درگذشتیم و به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدیم. روان مردی را دیدیم که کرم اندازه می‌خورد. از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟» سروش اشو گفت: «این مرد گواهی به دروغ داده است، و بدان سبب خواسته بهان روزی نارازانیان شده است. و خواسته، دیگران به‌ردند و عذاب بر این بدبخت بماند».

[در جهلم و ششم]

رسیدن به مقام مردی که مال حرام گرد کرده

از آنجا درگذشتیم. به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدیم. روان مردی را دیدیم که مغازه‌نای می‌خورد. از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟» سروش اشو گفت: «این مرد مال و خواسته حرام اندوخته است. اکنون آن مال و خواسته به جایگاه رها کرد و بر این گذاشته بر پادافراه می‌گذارد، تنها و بی پار و بی کس مانده است.

N۹۵۵ N۹۵۶ N۹۵۷ N۹۵۸ N۹۵۹ N۹۶۰ N۹۶۱ N۹۶۲ N۹۶۳ N۹۶۴ N۹۶۵ N۹۶۶ N۹۶۷ N۹۶۸ N۹۶۹ N۹۷۰
بر آن پاداشی، آن یدیک پای او از دوزخ بیرون است و دیگر همه تن یدیک یا در دوزخ است و خرفستر می‌خورد.

[در جهل و سیومن]

رسیدن به مقام دروغگویان

و پس از آن جا درک‌شستیم و یکی از چاگاهی یدیک فراز رسیدیم. روان مرده را دیدم که زبانش از دهان بیرون کشیده بودند و سنگی زیر نهاده بودند، و سنگی سخت بزرگ از بالا بر سر زبانش می‌زدند. از سروش ایش یا پرسیدن که یا این مرد چه کرده است؟ سروش ایش گفت که: «این روان دروغ‌زن بوده است و [آن] دروغ‌ها که این مرد گفت، بسیار مرمد در رنگ افتاده و زبان‌ها به مردم رسیدی.»

[در جهل و چهارم]

رسیدن به مقام زنی که کودک به زبان آورده و گشته بود

پس از آن جا درک‌شستیم. به چاگاهی یدیک فراز رسیدیم. روان زنی را دیدم که به پستان کوه می‌کند. و هر ساعت آسیاب سنگ بر سر پستان وی می‌گردانید. یک‌دیگر پستان او را خورد می‌کرد و آن زن فریاد می‌داشت. من از سروش ایش و اردبیهشت امشاسفن یدیک پرسیدم که: «این زن چه
سرودن به مقام ازگنگین

و پس از آنچه درگذشتیم و به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدیم، روان مردی را دیدیم که همه تن از در دو زونت بود و یک پای یا از دو زونت برون بود. و خرفس سنتران بر آن یک پای یا هر چه گزندی نمی‌کردند. از سروش اش یا پرسیدم که: «این روان کیست؟» سروش اش گفت: «این روان مردی است که نام او دوانس» بود و چنان کامل بود که مرکز هیچ کار نیکی نمی‌کرد. آن یک پای او، یک بار پاره‌ای علف پیش کوسپنده انداده است. اکنون

۵۴
رسیدن اردای ویرای به مقام کمی که حیوانات گشته است

و پس از آن‌جا درگذشتیم و به جایگاهی می‌گریزیم روان مردی را دیدم که اندام وی را از یکدیگر جدا می‌کردند، و او فریاد می‌داشت. از سروش اشش پرسیدم که: این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟ سروش اشش گفت: این روان آن کس است که در آن جهان چهارپایان و حیوانات بسیار گشت‌کرده است به بیدادی.

[در چهل و یکم]

رسیدن به مقام مردی که مال و خواسته گردیده و صرف دین نکرده

چهار از آن‌جا درگذشتیم و به جایگاهی به یکدیگر فراز پرسیدیم، روان مردی را دیدم که سر تا پای او شکنجه برنهاده‌اند، و هزار دیو بر وی موگل بودند، و هر ساعت از نو شکنجه‌ی دیگرگونه می‌کردند، و او زیر آن شکنجه بانگ و فریاد می‌داشت. می‌دانستند. از سروش اشش پرسیدم که: این مرد کیست کش پا آفریده بر این

[در چهل و یکم]

آویخته بودند، و می‌کشیدند و می‌خوردند. من از سروش اشش و ارپیده‌شت
امشاسفند ۷۱ پرسیدم که: این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟ سروش اشش گفت:
«این مرد در آن جهان غن‌زاری کرده است و مردمان را بر هم افکنده است [که]
با یکدیگر چنگ و عداوت کرده‌اند ۱۹۱. اکنون عذاب میدهندش ۱۹۱.»
[در چهل]

رسیدن اردای ویراف به مقام کمی که حیوانات گشت‌کرده است

و پس از آن‌جا درگذشتیم و به جایگاهی می‌گریزیم روان مردی را دیدم که اندام وی را از یکدیگر جدا می‌کردند، و او فریاد می‌داشت. از سروش اشش پرسیدم که: این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟ سروش اشش گفت: این روان آن کس است که در آن جهان چهارپایان و حیوانات بسیار گشت‌کرده است به بیدادی.

[در چهل و یکم]

رسیدن به مقام مردی که مال و خواسته گردیده و صرف دین نکرده

چهار از آن‌جا درگذشتیم و به جایگاهی به یکدیگر فراز پرسیدیم، روان مردی را دیدم که سر تا پای او شکنجه برنهاده‌اند، و هزار دیو بر وی موگل بودند، و هر ساعت از نو شکنجه‌ی دیگرگونه می‌کردند، و او زیر آن شکنجه بانگ و فریاد می‌داشت. می‌دانستند. از سروش اشش پرسیدم که: این مرد کیست کش پا آفریده بر این

[در چهل و یکم]
رسيندن اردا به مقام پايزادگان ظالم

پس از آنچه درگنگشتیم، به چاپگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدم. روان مردی را نکته می‌گیریم که در دست داشته و بر یکی می‌زندند. و آن مردان دندان‌های کوتوله و گوشت از اندام وی بپرندند، و او فریاد می‌داشت. از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه گناه کرد است؟» سروش اشو گفت: «این مرد بر آن جهان ناپاداشتگان ظالم بوده است و بیدادگر. و چیزی از مردم به زور بستنند. و مردم از این مرد و ضربه، راز خرم و ضربه‌های دیگر و شکنجه نهادی. اکنون در این عذاب مانده است که تو می‌بینی.»

[در سی و هشتم]

رسيندن اردا به مقام روان غمگان

و از آنچه درگنگشتیم، به چاپگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدم. روان مردی را نکته می‌گیریم که زفانش از دهان پایون افتاده بود، و مار و گردیدن در زفانش.

--

N²: /g123/g128/g176/g204/g187
M: /g128/g179/g123/g90/g107/g128/g101/ /g193/g170/g54/g184/g160/g57/g187 /g196/g175 /g185/g124/g203/g123... /g53/g127/g90/g187 /g202/g176/g203 /g128/g197 /g193 /g44/g124/g191/g123/g194/g93 /g195/g123/g90/g102/g136/g203/g89
P: /g196/g203/g193/g127 /g193/g123 /g44/g193/g129/g89/g128/g101 /g193 /g178/g192/g135/g196/g102/g139/g89/g123 /g186/g175 890/g130/g204/g168/g51/g171 /g193 891/g201/g193/g127 /g193/g123 /g44892/g100/g135/g89 /g196/g102/g139/g89/g123 /g186/g175 893 . /g193
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رسیدن اردا به مقام زنی که فرمان شوهر نبرده بود
و از آنجا درگذشتیم. به چیزی دیگر فراز رسیدیم. روان زنی را دیدم که
سرنگون درآویخته بودند و زنانه از پس سر بیرون آورده بودند. از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: «این زن چه گناه کرده است؟» سروش اشو گفت: «این زن جواب شوهر پای داده است، و فرمان شوهر تندرست است، و هرچه شوهر به گفتی ناهنجاری در چیزی به، جواب شوهر پای دادی. شوهر را خوار داشتی، و شوهر را تندرست نفرین کردی. در این عذاب افتاده است که می‌بینی.»

رسیدن به مقام آن مرد که به سنگ کم چیز فروخته و از آنجا درگذشتیم و به چیزی دیگر فراز رسیدیم. روان مردی را دیدم که به فقیز، خاک و خرافستر می‌پیمود و می‌خورد. و هرگاه که کمتر

---

**M**: مبهم‌ند  
**B**: بجایی فراز  
**Z**: زنانه  
**PN**: بجایی فراز  
**M**: مبهم‌ند  
**N**: فقیز

---

**NPN²MO**: فرمان شوهر نبرده بود  
**C**: کسانی

---

**M**: مبهم‌ند  
**B**: بجایی فراز  
**Z**: زنانه  
**PN**: بجایی فراز
امشاآفسند ۸۰۴ اکنون عذاب می‌گذارند که از گرمسنگی و تشنجی می‌ماند.»

[در سی و چهارم]

رسیدن به مقام زنی که روسیه کرده ۸۵۶ و از آنجا درگذشته‌تری به جایگاه ۸۵۶ دیگر فراز رسیدیم. روان زنی را دیدم که به پستان بیاواخته بودند و مار و گژدهم و دیگر خرفسانتره ۸۵۶ و ۸۵۸ او به شتاف می‌گذیدند و می‌دریدند و او فریاد می‌کرد. از سروش اشوه و اردن‌هشائتش امشاآفسند پرسبیم که: این زن چه گناه کرده است؟ گفتند: این

زن در آن جهن شوهر را بگذارسته است و روسیه کرده است. اکنون بدن تشان ۸۷۷ عذاب مشه‌دیدن شد.»

[در سی و هفم]

رسیدن به مقام مردمی که گنه‌کار بوده‌اند ۸۴ۡ و پس از آن جایگاه درگذشته‌تری و جایگاه ۸۴۲ دیگر فراز رسیدیم. قومی مردم ۸۴۴ دی‌ری به خرفسانتره و گژنگان و گرگ و پره و مار و گژدهم ۸۴۶ ایشان را می‌دریدند و می‌خورندند. من از سروش اشوه [۱۴۶۸] و اردن‌هشائتش امشاآفسند پرسبیم که: این قوم چه گناه کرده‌اند؟ ۸۶۴ سروش

| ۸۵۴ | بیاژرداند |
| ۸۵۵ | NPN²MO |
| ۸۵۶ | P |
| ۸۵۷ | - |
| ۸۵۸ | N²MO |
| ۸۵۹ | - |
| ۸۶۰ | P |
| ۸۶۱ | - |
| ۸۶۲ | NPN²MO |
| ۸۶۳ | P |
| ۸۶۴ | - |
| ۸۶۵ | N² |
| ۸۶۶ | P |
| ۸۶۷ | - |
| ۸۶۸ | N²MO |
| ۸۶۹ | - |
رسیدن به مقام مردمی که با زن دشتان خفته

از آن جا درگذشتیم. به جایگاهی فراز رسیدم. چون مردم را دیدم که بیفکنده بودند و از خون دشتان زنان در دهان وی می‌افتدند، و او زینهار می‌خواست. و از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟» سروش اشو گفت: «با زن دشتان خفته است و گردد آمده است. اکنون پادافرگاه می‌گذرد.»

رسیدن ارداي ویراف به مقام مردمی که کستی نیسته‌اند

و از آن جا درگذشتیم. به جایگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدم. چون مردم را دیدم که بهانگ می‌داشتند و می‌گفتند که: «از گرسنگی جانم برم، از بهر خدا مرا نان و آب دهد.» و گوشت و پوست از اندام خویشتن می‌گند و می‌خورد و من از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: «این مرد چه گناه کرده است؟» سروش اشو گفت: «این قوم آن کسانند که در آن جهان کشتی نداشتند، و کسان بودند که به یک پای موزه رفته‌اند، و چون نان و آب و میوه خورده‌اند، سخن می‌گفتند و [و] وارث نداشتند، و خرداد امشاسبند و امرداد ۴۸۵

رسیدن به مقام مردمی که با زن دشتان خفته

NPN²MO ۸۳۱

+ N ۸۳۲

+ بچایی ۸۳۳

+ و ۸۳۴

PN² ۸۳۵

زنیهار

N ۸۳۶

کفته P با زدن دشتان کفته NPM ۸۳۷

+ NPM ۸۳۸

+ NPM²MO ۸۳۹

+ بچایی فراز ۸۴۰

+ دیدم ۸۴۱

N² ۸۴۲

N²MO ۸۴۳

+ N²MO ۸۴۴

+ N²MO²MO ۸۴۵

+ N²MO²MO ۸۴۶

+ بچایی فراز ۸۴۷

+ دیدم ۸۴۸

NN ۸۴۹

+ NN² ۸۵۰

+ این آن قوم آنکسانند ۸۵۱

+ نداشتند M ۸۵۲

+ نداشتند ۸۵۳

+ مرداد ۸۵۴
رسیدن به مقام رواني که مرد اشو گشتئ
از آنجا درگنشستیم و به چاپگاهی دیگر باز رسیدم. روان مردی را دیدم که او را به یک پای آویخته بودند. به کار دو پوست از سر او باز می‌کردند و فریاد و زاری می‌کرد. و ایشان را بر آن صفت پوست از او می‌گردند و آهنگ و فریاد می‌داشت. و از سروش اشو و اردیبهشت امشاسفند پرسردم که: ‘این مرد چه گنده کرده است؟’ سروش اشو گفت: «این مرد آن کس است که مرد اشو گشتئ است. اکنون قصاص می‌گند.»
آن‌جا می‌آمده، پنداشتی که هر چیزگاه ۲ کوهی است، از بس‌که بر سر یکی دیگر خفته بودن، و روان درون‌دان در میان افکنه بودند، و یکی نیش به وی درمی‌داد، و یکی می‌درید و می‌گردید، همچنان که گرگ استخوان خورده.

[در بیست و تهم]

رسيدن به مقام قلابوارگان

و پس سروش اشو و اردبیشتی امشاصتند مرا به آسانی [۱۴۶۹] در آن چاپگاه تاریک در اردن. چون نگاه کردم، روانها دیدم که تن یادمان چون تن مار بود و سر چون سر مردم، و در دوزخ به این صفت می‌رفتند. از سروش اشتو اردبیشتی امشاصتند پرنسیم که: این روان کیستند که با مار هستند؟ سروش اشتو گفت: این روان قلابوارگان و مواجراً است که بدن جهان قلاببارگی و مواجراً کرده‌اند. اکنون روان ایشان با مار یادمان است.»

[در سیام]

رسيدن و دیدن زنی که دشتان نیکو نمپریخته بود.

و از آنجا درگنگنشتیم، و چاپگاهی دیگر فراز رسيدبی. روان زنی را دیدم که طاسی پر از خون و پلیدی مردم در دست داشت، و چوبش می‌زنده و سهمش

طاسی پر از خون و پلیدی مردم در دست داشت، و چوبش می‌زنده و سهمش

- پس
- خوراک
- می‌گذرد
- نیکو
- نپن‌مو
- رسيدن به مقام قلابوارگان

- فر می‌کند
- در
- نیکو
- نپن‌مو
- در دوزخیان صفت

- رسيدن به مقام قلابوارگان

- امشاصتند
- نپن‌مو
- نپن‌مو

- بوهدانه. تصمیم قیاسی شده است.

- «بوهدانه»
که یک ساعت از گذشته‌ن‌ای باز آمده، که تو بودی، تا در آن جهان بودی. بر آن صفت بودی که اگر غیرشها رسیدی، تو در خانه را از پس به‌ستی، و دو تا نان پیش وی فراز نباید نهادن. و کسانی دیدی که ایشان را پیش می‌فرمودند و پیش می‌کردن، تو بر ایشان می‌گفتی که: مرا امروز نتفوقی باید، من چه دانم که فرداروز چه خواهد بود؟ اکنون آن‌ها همه از دست رفت و عذاب جاودانه آمد. از بیدختی که بودی، غرق شدی به دنیای و، دیگران را میدیدی که هم‌چون تو جوان بودند و به‌می‌ردند، و آن حسرت در دل ایشان بود تا او را به دخمه بردن، ترسی و بیمی اندکمایه ترا در دل بود. پس دیگرباره از پاد بام کردی، و به کار دنیایی مشغول شدی. مانندگِ گوسپندی گرگ وی را در رَباید و بَرِّید. تا گرگ پیدار باشد، گوسپندان از دنیال و نگاه کنند، و چون گرگ نایب‌دادار شود، دیگرباره به چراکرد مشغول شوند. اکنون این‌همه رفت و تو۷۷۶ این‌جا در دست آهورم و دیوان بماندی، و از این ترا رنگ بیشتر خواهد رسید از همه دیوانا، تا در جهان مردمان به بدکارداری مشغول باشند، من هر روز رزش‌کنن و سهمگینتر باشم و عذاب بیشتر نمایم و دست به گردان او به کرد. و چینود پول بر آن پهلو گردد که مانند دنیا بی‌سره‌بود، و او چون پای بر پول نهاد، چنان سخت

۷۱۱ P: کزین
۷۱۲ NPM: غربی‌ها
۷۱۳ خان
۷۱۴ N۲: خانها از
۷۱۵ به‌رهیادی
۷۱۶ N۲: فرودوند
۷۱۷ + D
۷۷۸ N۲PMO: تفریقی L نامی
۷۱۹ M: جه من
۷۸۰ PM2M: همچون
۷۸۱ NPM: کوسنلی
۷۸۲ NPM: کوسنپان
۷۸۳ M و تو و تو
۷۸۴ NPM2M: آهورم
۷۸۵ N۲M: به‌کرد
بدر به آن زشتی و منکری و سهمه‌نکه، می‌خواست که از وی بگریزد.

و هیکل بانگ کرد و گفت: "تو از من نتوانی‌گریخت!"

روان گفت: "تو کیستی بر این زشتی و سهمه‌نکه و سیاهی، چه من هرگز
از تو زشتی و سهمک‌نکه؟" گفت: "من فعل و کردار توام، و چون بدنیت و بدنیت و بدقول بودی، من آن
کردارهای توام!"

روان گفت: "چرا چنین زشت و سهمگین و سیاهی؟"

گفت که: "از بهر آنک یک مارم بر آن [145b] جهان به کار و کرده
کردن مشغول بودند و کوشیدند تا خویشتند را توشهای سازند و برگیرند که
بدين جهان ایشان را از عذاب دوزی از برهاند، و یک همه در آن کوشیدی که
تا، از حلال یا حرام مالی گرد آوریدی، که اکنون مال، نمی‌باید خوانند،
مار می‌باید خواند، و یک آن گندم که تو اندوختی، که به سود بار فروشی،
اکنون گردهم می‌باید خواند، و آن مال و گندم، دیگر کسان بردند، و مار
و گردهم در جان تو، جگر تو آویزد، که تا رستخیز بن پسین می‌گرند،

کردارهای M:

۵۵۹

۷۵۸

۷۵۷

۷۵۶

۷۵۵

۷۵۴

۷۵۳

سهمگین‌تر

سهمه‌نکه

S

M

ی: NPN²M

۷۶۰

۷۵۹

۷۵۸

۷۵۷

۷۵۶

۷۵۵

۷۵۴

۷۵۳

S

M

ی: NPN²M

۷۶۰

۷۵۹

۷۵۸

۷۵۷

۷۵۶

۷۵۵

۷۵۴

۷۵۳

S

M

ی: NPN²M
هیچ همراه ندارم. تنها کسی بی دلیل بمناده‌ام» و این سخن می‌گفت و در تن نگاه می‌کرد و زاری و مویه بر خوششتن می‌کرد. و شب اول چندان رنج و دشواری بی‌رسید، که تا در جهان بود نرسیده بود. و آذرمن و دیوان می‌کوشیدند که خود او را همان جا به دوزخ بردند. و او از ایشان چنان می‌ترسید که کوسفند از گرگ ترسد. و آن روان را در آن سه شب ان چنان رنج و عذاب بر وی رسید که بر دوزخیان مدت هزار سال نیاید. و بعد از آن سه شبان روز، وقت بام، آن روان را دیدم که به سر چینود پول رسید سیاه، و شتاب و بیم و خن و ترس بسیاری کشیده و رنج‌ها برده. و بادی دیدم که از نیمه دوزخ پیش او پاژ آمد، که واختیر خوانند. که هرگز آن چنان گنده‌تر و ناخوشی‌تر باد، کس نشینیده بود، چنانک امشاسبندان از گنگ آن باد از آنجا برفتند. و میان آن باد صورتی و هیکی دیدم. سیاه چون قطران. و دندانها از پیش بیامده و چنگال‌ها دراز و چشم‌های سرخ، و دود از دهان وی می‌آمد. و چون روان، این صورت را

بایكس \(P\) 735
م:  + در

NPN \(P\) 736
- در

NPN \(P\) 737
- اهم‌من

NP \(P\) 738
اهم‌من

کوسفند \(P\) 739
M
- از

NN \(P\) 740
+ و

M 741
- و

NPN \(P\) 742
- ام

NPM \(P\) 743
- ام

NW \(P\) 744
- اواختر

NPM \(P\) 745
- آی

ن‌اخوشی‌تر \(P\) 746
M
- بوذد

M 747
- از

N 748
+ و

M 749
- و

ن‌کلبای M 750
- جنگالها

ن‌کلبای M 751
- جنگالها

جنگالها. بعد از آن نیز به اندام‌هایی یک وازه، فضای خالی هست.
رسيدين و ديدين روان دوزخی به سر پول

پس سروش اشو و از ارتباط دور رساندن مرا با سر قیمت بول آوردند. روی دیدم که جانش از تیپ تارامده بود و هم چنین یک بی‌پالین تن نشسته بود و این سخن می‌گفت که: "ای وای بر من. چه کمک و کجا شوی و که را به یاری درخواهم که به فریادم دررسد؟" هیچ پشت و پناه و یارم نیست، و

[در بیست و هفتم]

۵۷۵

۵۸۰
[در بیست و ششم]

رسیدن ارداز ویراف به سر پول و حال دوزخیان و گنگکاران دیدن

و به جای‌گاهی فراز رسیدم. رودی دیدم و آبی تار و گنده، مانندی نفت سیاه. و چندانی آب بود که نیزه بالا در‌او و یک قدر آن آب، روان‌ها دیدم که به دشواری از آن رود می‌گذشتند. [454] بسیار روان‌ها بود که در میان رود غرق شده‌بودند، و از روان‌های دیگر زینه‌زار می‌خواستند. و هیچ‌کس به فریاد ایشان تمی‌رسیدند. و بسیار روان‌ها بود که ویله و زاری و فریاد می‌کرده‌اند، چنان‌که کسی را مار افعی بگزد، که آن‌جا نتواند گذشت، و به زور او را 4 ری در آن‌جا افکنند. و بسیاری 7 تا 8 کس بود که خوارتر می‌گذشتند. من بچون چنان دیدم و آن‌ها هول و ترس و بیم و فریاد و ناله و زاری‌کردن، زینه‌زارخواستن بر ایشان بهبخشود 9 از سروش‌اشو و ازدیبه‌نشت امشاسفند 17 پرسیدم که: این چه قوم‌اند که به این دشواری از این رود می‌گذرند 20 و این آب سیاه چیست؟ سروش اشو گفت: این رود از آب‌چشمه مردمان گرد برآمده است که از پس مُردگان بریزند، و هر کمی که از پس مُردگان زاری و شیون و گریه بیشتر کنند، او 16 یا را 16 رود

NPN²MO 696

N²M 697

N²MO 698

M 699

N 700

M 701

N 702

M 703

N²MO 704

N²M 705

M 706

N²M 707

M 708

N²M 709

N²M 710

NM 711

M 712

N²M 713

M 714

N²M 715
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در مصرف آمدن و می‌شدن (و) همچون، رمگان پرندگان، بازی می‌کردن. همه، پدنشاتمی که پا‌زده سالانه، و از هیچ گونه اندازه در دل ایشان ندیدم. همه به کار خویش مشغول‌اند، و خرّم و شادمان و طریباق بودند. و از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: این چه قوماند که از نور تابنگی ایشان من شادمان شد، که هر یکی چون آفتات و ماهتاب می‌تافتند؟ سروش اشو گفت: این آن قوماند که در آن جهان گاردگویی درویشان و ارزانیان و زدان و هیردان و دستوران و آدران و آتشان کرده‌اند. و از بره آن گربه و دردمان و کودکان و پیتیمان. چیزی از مردم خواسته‌اند و به ایشان رسانیده‌اند. اکنون بر این روشانی و بلندی رسیده‌اند که تو می‌بینی؟ چون از آن چاکهها، بر آن خوش‌سایر آن روشانی، به آن شاهسرا (و) گونگون، که هر یکی یوپ و رنگی دیگر داشتندی، و آبهای روان چون کلاب دیدم، و خانه‌هایی که هر یکی از جواهری دیگر ساخته بودند، و کوشههای منشی و بلند و روشان دیدم، چنان مشتاق و آرزومانی آن چاکه‌ها شد، که گفتند: هم این چاکه‌ها باز آریستم. و بر دل من سخت و عظیم و نیکوی بود، و نمی‌خواستم از آن‌جا آمدن. پس سروش اشو و اردهبهشت امشاسفند دست من گرفتند و از آن‌جا برند.
در بیست و هفتم

رسیدن اردای ویرایش به مقام جادگردیان

پس از آن جا درگذشتیم، به جایگاه دیگر فراز رسیدیم. قومی مردم بود که همچون آثار و ماهیت می‌تفانند. از روشنی روز، ایشان آن جایگاه چنان بود که پدیدشکی که آثار است، و جام‌هایی از نور پوشیده بودند. و به هوا

بودند. و می‌شکل و عنبر از پیش ایشان می‌سوختند. و میانوان پیش ایشان خویند می‌کردند و ایشان را دل خوشی‌های می‌دادند تا ایشان با یکدیگر بزرگ‌پیش‌دادند. از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: این چه قوم‌اند که‌ان همه مرتبه دارد. که امشاسبندان این همه تک‌کافداه به‌ان ایشان می‌کنند و در ایشان نگاه میدارند؟ سروش اشو گفت: این آن قوم‌اند که در آن جهان کنخدا می‌میردند، و زمین‌ها آبادان کردند، و با‌ها و پوستان‌ها بنا افکت‌زاده‌های و کاری‌ها بیرون آوردند، و سرا و خانه‌ها کردند، و عمارت کردند دوست داشته‌اند. اکنون همه میانوان و آتش از ایشان خشوندند، و همه پیش ایشان ایستادند. و ایشان در آن جهان میانون نگاه داشته‌اند. میانون بدن جهان ایشان را پدیدان یا میدهند به چشم من آن قوم سخت نیکو آمدند.

[در بیست و هفتم]

م‌، - /g193

N²M۶۷۷ - /g201/g89/g123/g127/g89 /g189/g124/g204/g135/g127 /g189/g90/g203/g194/g180/g191/g123/g90/g109 /g185/g90/g172/g187 /g196/g93 /g165/g89/g128/g203/g193

NN² MO ۶۷۸

N²M۶۷۷ - /g128/g176/g203/g123
است. و هر کس را چیزی زیادی می‌شود، زیادت می‌باشد. مثلاً اگر کسی را خواسته‌ای ۱۴۵ بیوئ این ۱۴۶ پیوسته در غم گرفتار باشد و از پادشاه نظام می‌ترسد که از وی بستاند، و از دیده ۱۴۷ می‌ترسد که از او ۱۴۸ بیوئد و از مرد غم‌ز ۱۴۹ می‌ترسد که بدان خواسته‌گر مزایا کند. پیوسته بدن روزن و بدان روزن می‌گریزند. و عمر خوش‌بندان ترس و [۱۴۴ب] بیم به سر ۱۵۰ می‌برد. و عاقبت به جایگاه رها ۱۴۱ باید کردن، یا به روزنی به ناراندیان، و به اداری شوهر و زن شود. او در آن جهان از جهت‌خواسته در زمین باشد، و در آن جهان در رنج و عذاب افتقد پس ویرای، تو این اندرزها با مردمان بگوی طعاّقت نگاه کنند و این کار جهان شناسند. ۱۵۲ و این سخن به کفته و از آن قوم درگذشته. }

[در بیست و چهارم]

رسیدن اردای ویرای به مقام کدخداگان

چایگاهی ۱۵۶ فراز رسیدیم. قومی مردم ۱۵۷ دیدم که جامه‌های نیکو پوشیده‌اند و مینوی آب و آتش و مینوی زمرد و اورور و نبات و شجر پیش اشان ایستاده بودند. و این، پادشاه‌واه بر بالش زربافت ۱۵۸ نشسته‌اند.
از یاد باز شود. بر آن سختی یک روزه که بدو رسمیه شود، فریاد و زاری بی‌گری و آن نمی‌شود بنجاست بدو تئش شود. از آن انگیزه زحمت، 1 و 7 هیچ راحت با وی نمانده باشد. و بر 18 آن انگیزه رنگ، 9 یک روزه، پندراد که همه عمر خود رنگ، 11 برده است. و پی این نیک و به، بدانک علاقه می‌باشد که بهتر باشد. اکنون این قوم شبان بوده‌اند، و تو نگاه کن که در آن جهان چه رنگ برده باشند، از بیابان‌های بی‌مردم، که این قوم تنها در آنجا، بیوسته چه ترس در دل اشیان بوده است، 1. از بیم درد و 11. از بیم 14 راه‌دار و گرگ. و شبها که بر فارسیه است، و سرمای چنین بوده است که سر از سوراخ بیرون نشایست، 11 کردن. این قوم در میان برف بوده‌اند. و کوسمیدان 18 را از گرگ و دگر 11. آفت‌ها نگاه داشته‌اند، و آن رنگ بر 22. تن خوشی گرفته‌اند. لاجرم اکنون آن رنگ‌ها درگشت، و بر این شادی و خرمی رسیده‌اند که تو می‌بینی، پس چه باید مردم را بر آن مايه عمر خویش عرفه بوده، و آن روزی چند راحت، با رنگ آمیخته، و به رنگ 22 زندگانی خویش کم کردن؟ و پس عاقبت، همه به چای رهاکردن، و عذاب 22.
تقدیری باشد. از دزد و گرگ و راهدار و سرما و گرما نگاه داشته‌اند. و شیر و روشند کوشیدن، کوشیدن در رضایت به جای آورده‌اند و یا مردمان خیانت کم کرده‌اند. و هر غربی که در بیابان با ایشان، رسیده، عزت داشته‌اند و خورشیدشان داده‌اند. اکنون روان ایشان در این راحت و آسانی رسته‌ای است که تو می‌بینی. ولیکن ای و ویارف، تو را، اندرز می‌کنی. تو این سخن باید که مردمان را بگویی که در هر دو جهان، تن‌آسان تشاه بودن‌۱۰۰ و آن جهان جایگاه مزدوران است، تا رنگ نبرند و کار تمام نکنند، در این جهان بدين۱۴۴۷ راحت نتوانند۱۹۵[آ] رضيف. و مورد آن- گاه شاهزاد خواستن، که کار تمام بکنند. چون کار نکنند و رنگ نبرند،۱۴۸- مطم مزد نباید داشتن. پس طعم چون۹۹۸ باشد؟ نیو در خویشتن اندیشه کن هک اگر یک تن، پنجاه۱۰۰۰ سال که جانش در راحت و آسانی باشد، پس اگر روزی او را رنگ نبودن، یا ۱۸۹ از نیروگران یا از خویش، او را آن راحت پنچه ساله

---

**N²:** + از دزد و کرک و دزد و راهدار و + از

**N²:** داشته‌اند

**M:** + از

**N²:** داشته‌اند

**N²:** نکاوشند

**N²:** + از

**N²:** نکاوشند

**N²:** کام. بر پایه‌ی دنباله‌ی جمله، تصویری قیاسی شد

**N²:** بهین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.

**N²:** بین دو ستاره، یا شاید در میکروفلیم نیامده است. از N² نقل شد.
پس از آن چگونه نهاده بود و جامعه‌ای ملک‌کرده بود، پندارشتمی که آن جایگاه‌ها و همه کوشک‌ها و خانه‌ها، خانه‌ای از زنگی و جنسی دیگر کرده‌اند. یکی از یاقوت و یکی از مروری و یکی از زبردست و یکی از مام و یکی از بلور و هر خانه‌ای دیگر چنین نهاده بودند، و قوم قوم، جدا جدا، بر آن تحت‌الاختیار دو بودند و چون با کام خویش و مراد خویش، و مراد خویش مسن شده بودند. یکی از زرین و مرند و خیال، در پیش ایشن ایستاده، و ایسناد از تکنیک سر در پیش افکنه بودند و [از] نکی خویش مسن شده بودند. یکی از چنین نهاده بودند و چون آن قوم را را دیدم، بر آن خرمت و حشمت عجب بیانم، و آن تکنیک ایشن از مرا، بشرح اندازه و عرض اندازه، از سروش اشمو و ارتبه‌های امکان‌افزاری به‌طوری‌که: «این چه قومانبا این کرتشمه و تکنیکی سروش اشمو گفت: «این آن کسانند که در آن جهان شبانی کرده‌اند، و گوبسپند داشته‌اند، و نگذاشت‌اند» که ایشن را از آب و علف...
رسیدن به مقام و دیدن برزیگران

پس از آن‌جا درکتشیم و به گاگاهی دیگر فراز رسیدنیم. زمین‌ها دیدم، هزار سبزهٔ ۳۶۰ و خرم‌تیر در آن، زمین و شاشه‌بری‌هایی که بی‌میل و عنصر و کافی‌اند از آن درخت‌تان می‌آمد و درخت‌تان تُرِن و نارنج و نیمول و سَن‌ن و دیگر میوه‌های گوناگون و زنان را دیدم، همه با ۱۷۱ جامه‌ها ی مُثقل ۱۴۴ رنگی، و نتایج‌های زرین بر سر نهاده، و پیش آن قوم به پای ایستاده بودند. و گرد بر گرد ایشان مطربان ایستاده. من ایشان را بیدم، عجب بماند و گفتند: «۱۱۱ هر قوم را که می‌پیام، از قومی دیگر نیکوترا و خرم‌تیر.» از سروش اشوع رسیدم که: «این چه قوم‌اند به این بزرگ‌گوای و ناز و نعمت؟» سروش اشوع گفت: «این قوم برزیگران بوده‌اند که در آن جهان کشت و ۷۷۰ وزر کرده‌اند، و جهان آبادان داشت‌اند، و دار و درخت نشان‌هادند، و غلبه و جو چشته‌اند. اکنون بر آن که چشته‌اند، بر این چا عوض باز داده‌اند. و زنان که پیش ایشان ایستاده‌اند، مینوی ۱۸۳ زمین‌اند و زمین را آبادان کرده‌اند. و دادار اورمی‌زد، ۱۸۷ زمین به اسفندرامد مشاسفند سیاره‌های ایست. و چون ۱۸۹ زمین آبادان داشته‌اند، و راستی به چایگاه آورده‌اند. و خیانت نکرده‌اند. لاجر مشاسفند اسفندرامد ایشان را بر این نیکویی ارزانی ۱۶۱ داشته‌اند که تو می‌بینی.»

[در بیست و دوم]

NPN²MO ۵۴۵
NO ۵۴۶
: - سبز ۵۴۷
: - پا ۵۴۸
: + M ۵۴۹
NNO ۵۵۰
: - دیدم ۵۵۱
: + NM ۵۵۲
: - و ۵۵۳
: - داشتند ۵۵۴
NPN² ۵۵۵
: - نشان‌هادند ۵۵۶
MO ۵۵۷
: - مینو ۵۵۸
:M ۵۵۹
:M ۵۶۰
NPMO ۵۶۱
: - داشته است ۵۶۲
اکنون بدين راحت و آسانی رسیدنداى كه تو مي بيني، مرا آن روانيها سخت نيکه به چشم آمد از بهر تن آسانى او.
[در پیست و یکم]

رسیدن به مقام كسامى كه خرفستر كُشتهاند

پس چون از ايشان درگذشتيم، قومى دیگر را دیدم که بر چاپگاه خویش نشسته بودند، و باغها و پوستنها بود و درختان میوهدار و مرغان خوش- آوان، و جویى ها دیدم كه آپ در وى روان شده. به جای ریگ و سنج، در ان جویىها یاقوت و مرورارد بودى. و ماهیان زرين و سیمین در آن جویىها باز مگردیدند، و مطببان بر كنار جویىها ايستاده بودند و آوازهى مرگان ساخته و نواهى اكرشيمى، و قومى دیگر، در پيش ايشان، دستبند گرفته و رقاصى مىکردنى، از سروش اشو و ارذبست امشاسفند پرسيدم که: اين چه قوماند که اين همه آسانى و آهوناىى و طرناىگى ايزد تعالي به ايشان داده است؟ گفتند که: اين آن قوماند كه در اين جهان خرفستر و حشرات و ددان بسيار كُشتهانى، پيوسته به كُشتهن خرفستر تخشاى بوهد... اند. اكشن بدين درجه، رسيدانى كه تو مى بينى، من چون ايشان را ديدم كه آن خرخمرىها مىکردنى، گفتيم که: پيوسته به خرفستركُشتهن مشغول بودم تا روان من بر اين [143] كاهپاىى رسد و پيزگوار بود.«

---

NPN²MO.531 - رسیدن به مقام كسامى که خرفستر كُشتهاند
PN²532 - درگذشتیم
D: ديدم 533
M: بودند 534

از اين پس، اين چند وازه آمده است: «دیدم كه آپ در وى»، اما بعد روى آنها خط كشيده شده است.
M: دريدن 535
- مشابهند 536
- 537
- به 538
- 539
- 540
- 541
- 542
- 543
- 544

M: بودهانى تا روانيان بر زى پاىى رسيدى و پيزگوارى 545

برين كاه و پاىى رسيدانى و پيزگوارى
آبان ۶۱ پشت‌های گیتی خرید و زنده روان [و] مانندی این فرموده‌اند. همه به دست خویش پژشی کرده‌اند و هری‌دان بوده‌اند [كه]۶۱ امشاسبند پیش ایشان پشت‌های گام‌ها امتشابهه و دل ایشان را باز می‌دهند و چنین گرامی می‌پذیرند که تو می‌بینی. و روز به روز این روان‌های۶۱ این قوم روش‌شتر و پاک‌پذیر و زیبگوارت باشند. و هرچه مردم کار و کرده کنند، ایشان همازور باشند.»

[در پیستم]

رسیدن به مقام پهلوانان۶۸

چون از آنجا درگذشت، قومی را دیدم با فر۶۱ و شکوه، و روشنی از روی ایشان می‌پنه و سهم و سیاستی از ایشان می‌آمد. همه جام‌های اسپاه‌های۶۱ پوشیده‌دارند۷۷، همه زربیات و سیب‌بات و سلاح‌های زرین و سبیان در پیش ایشان نهاده بود۶۴ و ایشان با یکی‌گر سلاح‌پذیر می‌کردند. و خندان‌زنان و سخت‌نشان۷۷ با هیئت به چشم من آمدند. از سروش اش و ارتبه‌یشت امشاسبند پرسیدم که: «این چه قوم‌اند با این فر و شکوه؟» فکریم: «این آن کسانند که ایران‌شور را۷۷ از دشت‌تان نگاه داشته‌اند که دشمنی۷۷ بر ایشان مضرت‌رساند۶۵ و پیوسته تن در رنج داشته‌اند.
شادماند، از آن که همه کتاب‌ها خویشتن را نگاه داشته‌اند و چون من بیدم از آن نیکویی ایشان، سخت خرم شدم و دعا‌یادم و از آن‌جا درگذشتیم. 

[در نوزدهم]

رسیدن اردا به مقام مردمی که یزشن فرموده‌اند

سروش اشو و اردیبهشت امشاسفند دست من گرفتند و هر چاکامی می‌بردند. جایگاهی فراز [از] رسیدم. چون نگاه کردم روان‌هایی ۱۰۰ دیدم که بر آسمان، بر بالاتر بالاتر بهشت، بر بالای همه کس نشسته بودند، و همه امشاسفندان پیش ایشان نشسته بودند. ۰ ۰ جایگاه ایشان چنان. ۰۰ دیدم که ریحان [و] شاهسفرما گوناگون رسته بودند و جامه‌های زرین و سیمین و ابریشمیان افکنده بودند. ۰۰ آب‌های ۰۰ روان و مرگان خوش‌آواز دیدم، و ایشان در میان آن ناز و نعمت‌ها نشسته بودند و روحانی مدیوژرم در پیش ایشان نهاده بود. ۰۰ ایشان ۰۰ نشاط ۰۰ و طرب می‌کردند. من ۰۰ از سروش اشو پرسیم که: «این چه قوماند با این همه نشاط و طرب؟» سروش اشو و اردیبهشت امشاسفند ۱۰۰ گفتند که: «این روان آن کسانند که ایشان در آن جهان یزشن‌ها فرموده‌اند. و چون همادین و دوازده هماست


۴۹۷ کتاب‌ها N
۴۹۸ + پس من
۴۹۹ PNM
۵۰۰ NPN²M
۵۰۱ NPN² + M
۵۰۲ روانها
۵۰۳ + M
۵۰۴ حاجتان
۵۰۵ N
۵۰۶ M
۵۰۷ آبها
۵۰۸ + و
۵۰۹ NPM
۵۱۰ NPN²MO
۵۱۱ - میکردن من
۵۱۲ - امشاسفند
۵۱۳ NN²
زنن در بهشت خرامان می‌رفتند. چون من از زنان را دیدم بدان نیکی یک از دیگر بهتر و من به جانبی می‌کردن. و گذر را و سهم و جواهر و بازی و طرخ که ایشان با یکدیگر می‌کردن. و دست به گردن یکدیگر به کردند. بودند. و طرب و نشاط که به فعالی می‌کردند، بیم از آن بود که عقل و هوش از من برود. از سروش اشو پرستیدم که: "این زنان کیستند که این تعلیق این همه نیکی به ایشان ارزانی داشته است؟" سروش اشو و ارتبه‌های امشاسفند گفتند که: "این روان آن زنان که در آن جهان طاعت شوهران داشته‌اند، و از فرمان شوهران خویشتنت بیرون نیامده‌اند، و دل شوهران خویشت داشته‌اند، و بستر شوهر خویش بهبودگیرانه. و بر سر شوهر خویش‌کسی تغییر‌گیرانه، و چندان‌کا نوانته‌اند، آب و آتش نیکی داشته‌اند. و یْشت و پیِشن که ایشان را در گردن بوده است، فریضه آن را کردند. چون دشتان گاه و ترس استودان، و دوازده همای آبان یْشت‌هاند، و با شوهران، آنشی خدای داده بود، خورسنند بوده‌اند. و کدیابی‌ی کردند. و دودلی و دوکیسه‌ی نکردند. و شوهران از ایشان خشنود بوده‌اند. و اکنون روان‌های ایشان چنین شادامانه و پاک‌زه. که تو می‌بینی و هرچه ایشان را می‌باید، ایزد تعالی باده است، تا لاجر، چنین

479. N× Ra
480. M>P Yکا از یکدیگر
481. NPM Oبجای
482. N2 که
483. M - و
484. M یکدیگر
485. M یکدیگر
486. M2 بکره
487. N2 می‌شامند
488. N2 + بنوشی
489. M چندان
490. M - و
491. M کرده
492. M آی‌ن
493. NPN انجه
494. N2 بودند
495. N2 در کیسه
496. N2 بودند
بده‌م؛ ۲۸۰ تا دادار اورمژد به ۱۷۷ ایشان ۵۸۴ این همه کرمات کرده ۵۹۴ است، و ایشان را بدن بزرگواری ۳۱۹ و ۳۱۸ بلند و روشنی، جایگاه داده است. هر داوری و دستوری که در آن جهان داوری راست ۳۱۸ ۵۳۷ شد، و شرط ۵۳۸ شفقت و مهرابی او جایگاه ۵۳۹ آورده. ۵۲۷ شفاعت خواه و پای‌مردو ۵۳۷ وی من باشم، و هر دستوری که داوری به میل و ۵۳۸ رشوت ۵۲۷ کن، در این جهان خصمه می‌باشد. و ۵۳۸ ایزد ایشان را به من سبره است.» از نمای بردم و از آن جایگاه ۵۲۷ درگنشتم. ۵۷۳ [در جدیدم]

دیدن مقام زنانی که فرمان شوهر برده‌اند ۵۸۳

به جایگاه‌های رستم و روان‌هایی دیدم از زنان، همه جامه‌ی زریفت، که همه حلقه پر از مراری و یاقوت به و هر یک تاجی مرصع بر سر نهاده بودند. و فرجی‌ها و سمور پر از جواهر و مراری، به خویشتن فراز گرفته بودند. و کرمشهٔ کنان و بازی کنان و خنده-

۵۶۶ M: بوده‌اند
  ۵۶۷ P: یا
  ۵۶۸ D: +
  ۵۶۹ N²: کرماه

۵۶۰ Nx: بزرگواری
  ۵۶۱ N²PN: و
  ۵۶۲ + و ایشائنا
  ۵۶۳ +NN: یک
  ۵۶۴ +N: نجا
  ۵۶۵ +NP: و

۵۶۶ Nx: شفاعت و خواه و پای و مزد
  ۵۶۷ N²: و
  ۵۶۸ D: رشوب
  ۵۶۹ N²: که

۵۷۰ PN²M: انجا

۴۷۰ من نمای برده‌م و از آن چا درگنشتم

۴۷۲ - دیدن مقام زنانی که فرمان شوهران برده‌اند

۴۷۳ N²PMO: ۵۷۲ + و
  ۴۷۴ N: بود
  ۴۷۵ + و
  ۴۷۶ N²PM: ۴۷۶ + و
  ۴۷۷ D: تاج
  ۴۷۸ N: ۴۷۸
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چون از آنجا درگذشت، به چیزگاهی فراز رسیدم، همه نشستگان دیدم، هر یک در چهار بالش، و امشافندان [142] هر ساعت بر ایشان نثار می‌کردند. و خورش و ورژ از ایشان می‌تابید. و سروش اشو چون نزدیک ایشان رسید، ایشان را همه بر پای بودند. و سروش اشو ایشان را بنواخت، و گرامی کرد و گفت: «هیچ آرزه هست که باز نمانده» آید. گوشید تا من از اورمزد درخواهم، تا آن آرزوها به شما دهد. ایشان سجده کردند. و گفتند: «هرچه ما را می‌باید، همه هست، و پیوسته در میان ناز و نعمت و آسانی ایم، و همه از خورش و ورژ تو است.» پس من از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: «این چه قومی، و این ورژ و خورش، که پنتاری هر یک امشافندی- اند. بر گاه خوشی، با حیبت و باشکوه» و سروش اشو گفت که: «این روان دستوران و موبدان و ردان و داورانند» [445]. [446] شفیع ایشان
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ایشان را رفتند، حاجت ایشان نبود.

پر از مروراید و جواهر بود، و سهمی و سیاستی از آن جا می‌آمد. و از خوُرَه‌
امندی، و ارگمندی ایشان عجب بماند. از سروش اشو پرسردیم: «این چه
قوماند، که از هیبت و سیاست، مرا بیمی در دل افتاد؟» سروش اشو گفت که:

این روان‌ پادشاهان‌ند که ایشان عادل و داده‌بوده‌اند. از آن سبب کی
در آن جهنم، فرمانشان روا بود بر همه کس، و هم در این جهان پادشاه
بهشتند. و هر چاگاهی که ایشان را مراد است، می‌آیند و
می‌روند و از روان ایشان هیچ به نیست. چه، تا ایشان که در آن
دربوده‌اند، همه روزه عادل بودند و بیداد و ظلم از مردمان باز داشتند. و
هر کره‌هی که در هفت کشور، زمین کرده‌اند، ایشان هنضیب و همبهره بوده‌
اند. لاجرم، روان ایشان بدين ارگمندی و نیکویی است که تو می‌بینی و به
چشم من سخت نیکو و باشکوه و باهویت آمدند. و ایشان را نامز بردم و گفتیم:
صفت دیدن روان‌هایی که نوزودی کرده‌اند

پس چون از آن‌جا درگذشتند۴،۱ در زیر ایشان قومی دیدم دیگر، که جام‌ها از
نور پوشیده رنگ رنگ، که هر‌گز۴،۱۳ من در جهان بدان نیکویی جامه ندیدم، و
همه بر گاه خوشی، چون ماه و خورشید می‌افتدند، و همه با یک‌گذر خرمش
می‌کردند. از سروش اشو پرپیدم که: این چه قوم‌اند؟ سروش اشو گفت:«این
مردمانِ‌یند۴،۱۴ که در آن جهان نوزودی کرده‌اند، و آب و آتش به ییشته‌‌هند۴،۱۵
و گاه و چای خوشی۴،۱۶ به دست آوردند. اکنون چون به گاه خوشی
رسیدند، بدين‌سال شادمانند.» چون۴،۱۷ ایشان را دیدم از خوشی آن چاپیا
که نشاط می‌کردند، خواستم که نزدیک ایشان باشم. سروش اشو گفت: ترا
وقت آن۴،۱۸ نیست که به این‌جا بارستی، که بسیار کس گریش به تو می‌دارند،
و ترا بار به آن‌جا بارستی، و آگاهی بار به ایشان بردن، تا ایشان
بر دین به مازدیستان، و ۴،۱۸ بی‌گمان باشند.»

[در پانزدهم]

صفت دیدن مقام پادشاهان

چون از آن‌جا۴،۲۰ درگذشتند، قومی دیدم جام‌هاي نو پوشیده، و ۴،۲۴ هر
چاپیا که۴،۲۴ خواستندی، آمدنی و ۴۳ شدندی هم‌چون فرش‌گان، که
صفت دیدن روان رادان و سخاوتان

۱۸۸ اول جایگاه فراز رسیدم، روان‌هایی دیدم همه با جامه‌ها و لباس‌های زربتافت و سیب‌پاش، همه بر تختها نشسته و تاجها بر سر نهاده [۱۴۲] و نور از روی ایشان، روش‌ناپی به دورجانی‌های می‌افکنند. همه خندان و بازی گران و شادان بودند. چون ایشان را ۵–۴ میدم، سخت خرم شدم، و عجب بمانند از طرح نشاط ایشان. و ۴–۴ از سروش اشو و ادبهی‌هشت امشاسبند پر‌سیدم که: «این کدام مردم‌اند؟» ایشان گفتند: «این روان رادانند که در آن جهان با خویشان و ارزشانی نیکی کرده‌اند. و جیزی که ایشان را بود، از نیکان و پرهیز کرده‌اند دریغ نداشتند. و ۴–۴ پیوسته مهمانی کرده‌اند. و مسکن‌آن و یتیمان را جامه‌داده‌اند، و گردنگان را ۴–۱ سیر کرده‌اند. اکنون، لاحمر، روان‌های ایشان بدنی ۴–۴ بزرگواری و بلند و نیکویی و روش‌ی جام‌که تو می‌بینی.»

مرا آن روان‌ها سخت نیکو به چشم آمد و گفت: «کاشکی روان من بدين جایگاه رسیدی.»

۲۹۰ پادافرده ۳۸۰ کنادران بدو نمايند ۳۱۴ و پس ایشان دست من گرفتند و هر جایگاهی می‌برند.

[در جهاردهم]

۲۹۵ صفت دیدن روان رادان و سخاوتان

۱۸۸ اول جایگاه فراز رسیدم، روان‌هایی دیدم همه با جامه‌ها و لباس‌های زربتافت و سیب‌پاش، همه بر تختها نشسته و تاجها بر سر نهاده [۱۴۲] و نور از روی ایشان، روش‌ناپی به دورجانی‌های می‌افکنند. همه خندان و بازی گران و شادان بودند. چون ایشان را ۵–۴ میدم، سخت خرم شدم، و عجب بمانند از طرح نشاط ایشان. و ۴–۴ از سروش اشو و ادبهی‌هشت امشاسبند پر‌سیدم که: «این کدام مردم‌اند؟» ایشان گفتند: «این روان رادانند که در آن جهان با خویشان و ارزشانی نیکی کرده‌اند. و جیزی که ایشان را بود، از نیکان و پرهیز کرده‌اند دریغ نداشتند. و ۴–۴ پیوسته مهمانی کرده‌اند. و مسکن‌آن و یتیمان را جامه‌داده‌اند، و گردنگان را ۴–۱ سیر کرده‌اند. اکنون، لاحمر، روان‌های ایشان بدنی ۴–۴ بزرگواری و بلند و نیکویی و روش‌ی جام‌که تو می‌بینی.»

مرا آن روان‌ها سخت نیکو به چشم آمد و گفت: «کاشکی روان من بدين جایگاه رسیدی.»

۳۰۰
صفت دیدن گروشمان و جای اورمزد

پس سروش اشو و اردبیله‌شتن امشاسفند دست م‌ن گرفته‌د و مرا به گروشمان بردن. چون آن چایگاه دیدم، متحتر و عؤجر بماند، چنان پنداشت‌م‌ن که از یاقوت کرده‌اند. به روشنا خورشید می‌مانند، بلکه روشن‌تر و نیک‌تر از روشنی خورشید و ماه‌بود. چنان پنداشتن‌م‌ن که آن روشن‌آی‌بی بر آن سوى تائفه‌ای است و روشنی از آن سوى می‌دهد. و از سروش اشو پرسیدم که: "این چه چایگاه است و از کدام گوهرا است؟" سروش اشو گفت: «این گوهرا، الاماس است، پاک‌ازه و آویچه گره‌ی کرد.»، چون پاره‌ای دیگر برفتم، روشن‌آی‌بی پیشر و تابندن‌ر، و چنان که نگاه می‌کردم، هیچ چیز نمی‌دیدم از روشنی. آوازی شنیدم که گفتند: «درست آمدی ای ارداد ویراف، از آن جهان پتباره اومدن رنجور.»، بر ۳۹۱ این جهان پاک‌ازه، و سروش اشو و اردبیله‌شتن امشاسفند را گفتند که دست ویراف گیرند و چایگاه ۴۴۴ اشوان و درودن‌ان بدو نما‌ند، و پاداشن‌کرده و

[در سیزدهم]
صفت ارديبهشت امتشافند

و ۲۲۰ پس، چون نگاه کردیم ۳۱۴ ارديبهشت ۳۱۶ امتشافند را دیدمی که نزدیک من می‌آمدی. و من جهت کردیم تا بر وی سلام کنم. او پیشتر بر من سلام کردیم و گفتی: «درست آمده‌ای ارداو ویراگ ۳۱۷ اگر چه هنوز وقت آمدن تو نیود. و من اندکمایه از تو آزدهام، از بهر آنکه هیزم ر بر آتش نهاده‌ای و آتش را ایزد تعالی به من سپرده است. و هر چه بدان جهان بدی‌ها با وی کنند ۳۰۷ من به این جهان از آن کس بیازارم.» چون من از ارديبهشت امتشافند این سخن شنیدم. ۳۰۷ گفتی: «امتشافندان کم و بیش نگویند. من به درستی می‌دانم که هرگز هیزم ر بر آتش نهاده‌ام. و پیوسته آنچه ۳۰۷ بر آتش نهادم، هیمه‌هی هفت ساله بوده است. اکنون تو ۳۰۷ مرا می‌گرید که هیزم ر بر آتش نهاده‌ای. ندانم این چه گونه است. ۳۰۷ چون این سخن بشنید، دست من گرفت و گفت: «ببا که هیزم هفت ساله ۳۰۷ که در آتش نهاده‌ای به تو نماهم.» و من با او برقتیم، گردابی دیدم بسیار آپ در آنجا ایستاده. گفت: «این آن است که از هیزم هفت ساله ۳۰۷ بیامده است که تو بر آتش نهاده‌ای. ۳۰۷ بانک هیزم یک ساله بسیار خشکتر باشد که آن هفت ساله ۳۰۸، ۳۰۷ چه هرگاه که بیش
صفت رونگ میدیوزرم خوردند

پس آواری شنیدم که گفتنی: «بپیار رنجش منمایید، که خود آشفته و رنجبر است، که از آن جهان بیامده است [141] و بپیار رنجد راه بدو رستیه است. و بپیار بیم برده است. لیکن خورشندش دهید!» هون نگاه کردمی، جامی آوردندی و قدری رونگ در آن جام کرده و گفتنی: «این رونگ میدیوزرم خوانند.» هن باز خوردن، طعامی دیدمی که هرگز من بدان خوشی هیچ چیز در آن جهان نخوردهم. و هنوز طعم لذت آن در دهن مانده است. و دانم که تا زنده باشم، آن خوشی از کام من به نشود. و گفتنی: «هر کس که بهشتی باشد، بدان نیک منشنه و نیک گوشنه و نیک کوشاش» بوده باشد، او را این جایگاه بوده، و اول چیزی، این خورشندش دهدن. و زنان را نیز، که ترسکار و طاعتدار شوره و دین دوست بوده، همچنین خورشندشان ۶۰ دهدن و بدين گاه و پایه ۵۱ نشانند.»

[در پایه هم]
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پس از آن جاگاه، من با سرش اشو برختم، و جایگاه دیدم که از روشنی آن جاگاه چشم من خیز می‌گردانید. و مردمانی دیدم که آن‌جا نشسته بودند. هر یک بر تختی زیرین پرستید که: «آن چه چاپگاه است، و این چه قوماند، که هر یک پندازی که پادشاهانه اند به این خانه‌ها و این گاه‌ها و چهطمود؟ سرش اشو گفت که: «این خورشیدپایه است. و این مردمانی‌اند که در گنگی کنامه کرداند، و جز از نوزودی، بسیار کره‌ها کردندند، و روان خوششتن بدن سان پاکیزه کردانیدند و با این همه نیکی ارزانی شدندند.»

صفت دیدن نمازگاه
پس دیگر باره سرش اشو مرا بر بالاتر برده. و نگاه کردم. همه جاگاه، روشن دیدم. چنانک از روشنی هیچ چیز نمی‌توانستم دیدن.
ایستادن، و سرما و گرمای بر ایشان تأثیر کند. و اگر نه، هیچ رنگی
دیگرشان نیست.
[در هشتم]

صفت دیدن سترپایه
و از آن چا مرا باز به سترپایه آورد. روانهای ۱۷۷ دیدم مانند ستاره روشنایی
می‌دادند. از سروش اشو پرستیدم که: «این چه جایگاه است، و این چه
مردماند. و چرا اینجا باز داشته‌اند؟» پس سروش اشو گفت که: «این آن
روانهای ۱۷۸ آن کسانند که نوزود نبوده‌اند، و گیتی خرید نه‌ی‌شته‌اند. و دست-
گاه داشتهند، و ایشان را فرمان بود، و جهادن نبود که بدان مزدیا ۱۷۹ بیابند.
لیکن ۲۰ آن نوزود نبوده‌اند، ۲۳۰ روانهای ایشان در اینجا باز بمانده است، و
بپلیر از این نیم‌تانند شدن.
[در هشتم]

صفت دیدن ماهی‌ایه
پس سروش اشو دست من بکرفت ۲۳۱ و بر ماهی‌ای به‌د. قومی بسیار دیدم که
در آن چا انبوه شده بود. گفت: «این ۲۳۲ چه جایگاه است و این چه قوم‌اند؟»
سروش اشو گفت: «این بهشت‌خوانند که به ماهی‌ای معرف است. این قوم
نوزودی نکرده‌اند، و اگر نه ۲۲۰ همه کرفه‌های ۲۳۷ دیگر کرده‌اند. از بهر آن اینجا

---

گر: P²NMO
نو: N²M
نگشته: P²NMO
رونهایی: رونهایی
کرفه‌های: کرفه‌های
مؤلف: M
موزدا: M
و: P²NMO
بعد: P²NMO
وان: P²NMO
و: P²NMO
کرفه‌های: کرفه‌های
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صفت دیدن همیستگان

پس سروش اشто دست من بگرفتی و پاز گردانیدی تا گذر در پیش چینود پول
آورد. در میان چینود پول قومی را دیدم بسیار گرد آمد و انبوه
من از سروش اشتو پرسیدم که: این چه قوماند، و اینجا چرا جمعاند، و چه
میکند، و چرا ایشان را؟ اینجا باز داشته‌اند؟ سروش اشتو گفت: اینجا را
همیستگان خوان، که این قوم اینجا باشدند، و پیوسته بر پای آیستاده
باشند، و به‌تورانند نشستن، تا رستاخیز تن پسن، و آبر این.
مردمان آن
که ایشان را کره و گنده هر گاه یک یکسان بوده است. و چون با آن چهان
زاوی، مردمان را بگیری که، اگرچه کره را ۱۱ اندک مایه باشد، جهند کند تا
بکند. که اگر این قوم را چندانی کره، که به سنگ یک تار می‌وزه چشم
کره بیشتر از گنده کرده بودندی، روشنایی به بهشت رسیده ۲۲ بودی، و این-
جا نمانده بودی ۲۳. که تا رستاخیز ۲۴ تن پسن هم‌چنین بر پای می‌باشد.

[۲۰۹] O

[۳۰۰] N²

[۳۰۱] NPN²MO

[۳۰۲] N² به اندازه‌ی یکی دو وازه سفید مانده است.

[۳۰۳] N² به اندازه‌ی دو-سه وازه سفید مانده است.

[۳۰۴] ابتا

[۳۰۵] را همیستگان

[۳۰۶] L همیستگان

[۳۰۷] N²: این

[۳۰۸] مردمان

[۳۰۹] را

[۳۱۰] N²: هر دو

[۳۱۱] Kرله

[۳۱۲] M رسیدن

[۳۱۳] N² نامنی

[۳۱۴] و + نیم‌تیمین
کفتنی ۵۷۷: «بیا که گاه زرتین به تو نمایم که آن را عرش و ۷۷۸ کرسي خوانند ۵۷۷.»

[در بنجم]

صفت دیدن بهمن امشاسفند ۷۸۰ و مرا ۷۸۱ بر بالا بردی. و تختی دیدم که ۷۸۲ وصف ۷۸۳ نتوانم ۷۸۴ کردن. و روان آن ۷۸۵ مورد را دیدم آن‌جا ایستاده و [بیا] امشاسفندان دست‌بند ۷۸۶ گرفته. و روان‌های خویش‌خوانان آن مورد را دیدم، همه خریم می‌کردن، همچنانکه غربیی که به خانه خویش شود. و خویش‌خوانان او شادی کنند بر آن موجب پس ۷۸۷ بهمن امشاسفند ۷۸۸ دست آن روان بگرفتی و به گاه خویش برده ۷۸۹. و آن روان‌های کشتنگان با وی می‌رفتند، و همچنان ۷۸۹۵ شادی می‌کردن تا او به گاه خویش بنشست.

پس سروش [۱۴۱] اش دست من بگرفت و کفتنی: «هان ۷۷۹، عرش و ۷۸۸ کرسي، نامز بر!»
زنان به پرسیدندم. و به پرسیدن، خوش گفتند که: "چون رستگار
از آن جهان پیش‌تر بوده‌اید، که هیچ راحت بر رنج ۲۰۸ در آن جهان نیست؟
همه ۲۰۴ تنگدلی ۲۰۳ و غم و اندوه است، و هیچ خرمش نباشد که بیش دزدی
در پس او نباشد. تو گویی که چشم‌های اندوه‌هایست و بلای ۲۰۷ اشنوان. و این
که چون بدرین چای آمده، هیچ غم مدار و دل ۲۰۱ شاد دار، که ۲۰۰ دیگری هیچ
رنجی به تو نرسد، که ۲۰۸ همه ۲۰۵ راحت بینی بی محبت، و همه ۲۰۷ تن درستی
بینی بی آفت. خوش خور و شادمان باش، که پیوسته ۲۰۷ اینجا خوشی و
خرمش ۲۰۷ بود و هیچ بینی و
پس چون آن روانها سخن می‌گفتند و مرا امید می‌دادند و دل من خرمش بار
می‌کردند ۲۰۷، پس بهم امشاسبند را دیدم که بیماری و دست من بگرفتی و

NPO ۲۵۲
+ و
+ N۲ ۲۵۳
و M ۲۵۴
N ۲۵۵
+ و
+ O ۲۵۶
Rاستی
M ۲۵۷
حاشیه برگ پاره شده، اما اثر دو وازده «جهان پیش‌تر» برجا مانده است.
M ۲۵۸
رنجی
M ۲۵۹
گرفتن
M ۲۶۰
تکی‌دیل
M ۲۶۱
بین دو ستاره: شادی و خنده زبان پرسیدن و گفتند خوش و
M ۲۶۲
دزدی از پیش دزدم
L
M ۲۶۳
دردی
O ۲۶۴
چشم
M ۲۶۵
غم مدا
L
M ۲۶۶
که
NPN۲ ۲۶۷
رنجی
M ۲۶۸
دوی پیشت
M ۲۶۹
هم
M ۲۷۰
+ و
+ M ۲۷۱
پیشین
M ۲۷۲
خوش‌خور
M ۲۷۳
پیوست
N۲ ۲۷۴
خوش خرمی
M ۲۷۵
بدی
N۲M ۲۷۶
کردن.
و ۲۳۰ من گفتیم: «سلام و جهان دنیا و موبان و دستوران و پاک‌کردن دینان و شاهان، شاهنشاه ۲۳۳ فرستاده است مرا ۲۳۴، که تا احوال این جهان معلوم کنم ایشان را.»
چون ۲۳۵ من این سخن بگفتیم، روان آن مرد را ۲۳۶ بیدم که آنجا فراز رسید. و پول دیدم که در گردید و بر آن پله‌ی ۲۳۷ گردید که ۲۳۸ بیست و هفت ۲۳۹ گره‌ی پهنایش بود. آن روان، دلربار و بر آن پول دیدم که بگذشت، و ۲۴۰ من نیز هم ۲۴۱ در پی او به پول بگذشتند.
[در چهارم]
صفت دیدن اردای ویراف روان‌های اشوان پاکان ۲۴۴ و ۲۴۵ سروش اشو ۲۴۶ دست من گرفته بود. چون با آن ۲۴۷ یکن پول شدم.
روشن‌ای دیدم که چشم ۲۴۸ بدان روش‌ای خیره بماند. چون نگاه کردیم، روان‌های گذشته‌اند دیدم که پیش ما ۲۴۹ باب آمدند و ۲۵۰ «شادی کن و خنده».

---

۲۳۰ - M
۲۳۱ - AN
۲۳۲ - شاهنشاه
۲۳۳ - M
۲۳۴ - AN
۲۳۵ - N²MO
۲۳۶ - NPN²
۲۳۷ - O
۲۳۸ - B
۲۳۹ - N²
۲۴۰ - M
۲۴۱ - D
۲۴۲ - H
۲۴۳ - N²M
۲۴۴ - NPN²MO
۲۴۵ - N²
۲۴۶ - M
۲۴۷ - N²AN
۲۴۸ - D + O
۲۴۹ - N²PM
۲۵۰ - M
۲۵۱ - NPN²MO
گردن او بکردن ۲۲۱ به وی می‌خندید. و ۲۲۱ به یک گام، بدان ۲۲۲ نیکی که انیشیده بود ۲۲۴ بر سترایه رفت. و دریم گام، از جهت آن نیکی که ۲۲۷ گفت، بود. به مادیابیه رفت. و ۲۲۸ به سیوم گام، از جهت آن نیکی که ۲۲۹ کرد. بود. به خورشیدیابیه رفت. و پس ۲۲۱ به چهارم گام، به گروطنان ۲۲۲ رفت.

[در سیو]

صفت دیدن امشاسفندان ۲۲۷

و ۲۲۱ پس سروع امشدست من بکرفسی و به سر چینود ۲۲۳ پول برد. چون که ۲۲۴ نگاه کرد. مهرایزاد را دیدم آن چا ایستاده. ۲۲۷ سروع امشدست نادر پول زده و ایستاد ۲۲۵. چون من امشاسفندان را ۲۲۷ دیدم، سلام خواستم کردن ایشان را. ایشان ۲۲۸ نخست برم سلام کردن و گفتند: «درست آمدی تو ای ۲۲۹ اردا ویراف. که هنوز وقت آمدن تو نست.»

۲۰۹ M: آنرا
۲۱۰ F: کرد
۲۱۱ N²: متن بین دو ستاره بدين صورت آمده است: «از سبب نجات بکردن او با وی می- خندیدن»

۲۱۲ NPMO:
- و
۲۱۳ P: پرانت
۲۱۴ F: بودند
۲۱۵ M: - که
۲۱۶ M: - و
۲۱۷ M: - که
۲۱۸ M: - پس

گروطنان. پس از این. در متن N، به شکل «گروطنان» نوشته شده است. بر پایه ی همان تصمیم شد. M: کروممان

۲۲۰ NPN²MO: - صف دیدن امشاسفندان
۲۲۱ F: - و
۲۲۲ N²: بر سر
۲۲۳ F: - چند
۲۲۴ M: - که

۲۲۵ M: «ابستادن ده» اما بعد روی «ن» خط کشیده شده است.

۲۲۶ MO: ایستاده
۲۲۷ M: - را
۲۲۸ M: ایشان

۲۲۹ P: - آی - توا
کردن نیکو نیت و راست گفتار و نیکو کردار بودی، و دین پاکیذه داشتیم. من آن کردار نیکویی توام، نیکوکتر از آن که من به چشم تو به‌استم، آن‌که آن‌گاه چه در گیتی بودی. آب و آتش را نیکو داشتی تو به جهت و نیازداری، و خرفسنت گشتی و مرد اشنو را نیکو داشتی و هر که از شهری غربی آمدی بودند [1401] و هم آن که در شهر نشسته، بودند، و غربیان را، در شهر خویش گلای کردنی و مهمانی‌بانی گردنی داشتی. و از کرفه‌های آن، نوایی کردنی جهت کردنی و به جای آوردنی، من نیکو بودم، توام نیکوکتر کردنی، من روشن بودم. توام روشن‌تر کردنی، من از همه روانها بالاتر بودم تو مرا بالاتر و پزشک‌ها کردنی. تا در جهان مردمان کار و کرده کشته‌، من هر روز نیکوکتر و روشن‌تر باشم از سبیب ترا، دست به...
همی راه در میان اسرم‌ها و شکوه‌ها می‌آید. و برى آن اسرم‌ها چنان خوش‌بودی بوده گفت تا من در گفتی بوده‌ام، از آن خوش‌تر بوى نشینیده بودم.

چون در نزدیک چینورد پول رسیدم، بادی می‌آمدی از جنانت زیتون، که از بوى مشک و عنبر خوش‌تر بود. من در میان آن باد نگاه کردی، صورتی دیدی که هرگز تا ن در گفتی بوده‌ام، از آن نیکوتر ندیدم. پستانها در بر و گیسوی‌ها در پای چنایان. و هرچند که بیشتر در وی نگاه می‌کردم، به چشم من نیکوتر بود. چنانک هر اندامی که چشم برزمی‌افکند، چشم از آنتم نمی‌توانستن و شایست گرفتن. و هرچند که بیشتر می‌زیدم، مرا بیشتر می‌پایست. و این روان چون آن صورت را بیدید، آن صورت در روی او بخندید. پس آن روان، آن را پرسید که: «تو کیستی که هرگز از تو نیکوتر و پاکی‌هر و بی آهوتی از تو صورت ندیدم؟» و آن صورت گواب داد که: «من آن کردار نیکوی توام، که بدان جهان...»

- اسرم‌ها: O
- اسرمبای: O
- اسرم‌ها: M
- بود: M
- N۲
- چند: M
- رسید: M

- خیانت: M
- و از جانب: O

- حاشیه‌ی برد بریده شده و از «بود» فقط، «ده» باقی مانده است.

- P
- NPO
- - در کیتی

- می‌پسندم
- برمی‌افکندم
- نمی‌توانستم
- - O
- - را
- - N۲M
- - P
- - O
- - - M

- M
- حاشیه‌ی برد بریده شده و از «آن صورت» تنها «ت» باقی مانده است.
همه نیکی است و نیک است و بد نکرده‌ای۱۴۵ که بدين درجه رسیده‌ای۱۴۶ به‌همراه کس۱۴۷ نرسیده است، گامی دیگر بر بالا نه! چون من گامی دیگر بر بالا نهادم، به جای نورد پول را۱۴۸ و دیدم پول را از رختی که بسیار پله‌ها داشتی و پله‌ها بود که چنان باریک بود که نیکی است.»

[در دولت]

صفت دیدن اردا، روانی را که از تن بر آمده بود۱۵۴ و پس چون تغای کردند۱۵۶، روان مردمی۱۵۷ دیدم [در] آن جایگاه، که چنان از تن به بر فرته و به باlein تنن شسته بود و این سخن می‌گفت که: «مُنچک باد آن کس را که از نیکی وی، مردمان را نیکی بود.» که در آن سه روز که آن جایگاه بود، چنان راحت و آسانی۱۵۰ و خوشبینی بدان روان رسیده بود که در مدت آن که در گیتنی بود، نرسیده بود و شب سنگین، وقتی بام، آن روان را دیدم که می‌آمد، و در آن راه که از می‌آمد، چنان پناشانست که

**جدول**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>نکرده</th>
<th>نکرده‌ای</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نکرده‌ای</td>
<td>نکرده‌ای</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رسم‌داده‌ای</td>
<td>+ و</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نماد</td>
<td>نماد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیدم</td>
<td>دیدم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>پیش دسته: به چنین پیش نرسیده و بل را دیدم</td>
<td>بین دسته: به چنین نرسیده و بل را دیدم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مانند</td>
<td>مانند</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صفت دیدن اردا روانی را که از تن برآمده بود</td>
<td>صفت دیدن اردا روانی را که از تن برآمده بود</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ممکن</td>
<td>ممکن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>کرده</td>
<td>کرده</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نماد</td>
<td>نماد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>پیش دسته: تصحیح قیاسی شد</td>
<td>پیش دسته: تصحیح قیاسی شد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آنجای‌که</td>
<td>آنجای‌که</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جانش. اما بعد روه «نش» خط کشیده و بالای آن، «ن» نوشته شده است.</td>
<td>جانش. اما بعد روه «نش» خط کشیده و بالای آن، «ن» نوشته شده است.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>پس به</td>
<td>پس به</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نماد</td>
<td>نماد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>این</td>
<td>این</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ممکن</td>
<td>ممکن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آسان</td>
<td>آسان</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
پس دیبیری دانا بیاورند و [او] در پیش ارداویراف بنشتست.

[... ] بإن خوردم، در خواب شدم.

ساعتی بگذشت. سروش اش رو دیدم که بیامدی و مرا نماز بردیه.
سال کردی و کفتی: "درست آمیدی ای ارداویراف، آن گیتی پیتاره اومند. بدين گیتی روشن. و هنوز وقت آمدن تو نبود که به این جهان آمد-
ای" ۱۲۴.

پس وی را خدمت کردیم و کفتیم: "مرا به پیغام فرستاده‌اند از آن جهان. و همه دستوران و پاکیزگان دیدند سبب گرد آمدند. و
شاهنشاه مرا بدنی مهم فرستاده، تا آگاهی از این جهان بپرم" ۱۲۵.
چون این سنن کفتیم، سروش اش دست من بگرفتی و کفتی: "ترا نیت و
اندیشه پاکیزه راست و راستی، یک گام بر بالا نه!" من گامی بر بالا
نهادم. دیگر بار کفتی: "ترا گفتار راست است و دروغ نگفتیهای، یک گام
دیگر بر بالا نه!" من دیگریار گامی بر بالا نهادم. سدیگر کفتی: "ترا کردار

۱۲۴ P + : که NPN²MO
۱۲۵ + : که NPN²MO ارداویراف
۱۲۶ ارداویراف: N²MO
۱۲۷ N²MO: نیاز اومند
۱۲۸ N²MO: آمیدی ویراف
۱۲۹ نیاز اومند: P
۱۳۰ - پس
۱۳۱ - وی را
۱۳۲ - نباید
۱۳۳ N²: پاکیزگان
۱۳۴ + : پنیکو
۱۳۵ فرستاده:
۱۳۶ P: پنیک
۱۳۷ P: به برم
۱۳۸ N²: بگرفت و کفت
۱۳۹ +: O
۱۴۰ N²: راستی است
۱۴۱ N²: مرا بگفت
۱۴۲ N²: نگفتیه
۱۴۳ N²: NPMO
۱۴۴ N²: NMO
بعد از هفت شب شبان، ویراف باز جنیبی و باز زردی و باز نشست.

و مردمان و دستوران چون بیدند که ویراف از خواب درآمده، در تاریکی کردند و شاد شدند و رامش پذیرفتند و بر پای ایستادند و ۱۷ نماز بردن و گفتند: "شاد آمدن اردای ویراف، و به بازبینی آن باشد که بهشتی اشتو باشد. ۹۰۴ چگونه آمی، و چون رستی، و چه دیدی؟ ما را باز گوی تا ما نیز احوال آن جهان بداییم.

[در نخست]

صفت بازآمدن اردای ویراف از مینو و گزارش آن

ارداویراف گفت: «اول چیزی بیاورید ۱۰۳۲ تا من بخورم، که هفت شبان روز است که تا این ب، هیچ چیز نیافتته است و سست شدهام. بعد از آن هرچه خواهید پرسرد ۱۰۳۳ نما شما را معلوم کنم».

۱۰۳۴ دستوران ساعتی درونی ۱۰۳۵ به پیشند. اردایویراف واج گرفت و چیزی اندک ماية بخورد و واج بگفت. پس گفت: 'این زمان دیری ۱۰۳۶ دانا را بیاورید [۱۴۰] تا مرهچه من دیدهام بگویم، و نخست ۱۰۳۷ آن در جهان بفرستید، تا همه کس را کار مینو و بهشت و دوزخ معلوم شود، و قیمتِ نیکی کردن بدایند، و از بیدکردند دور باشند.»

---

PP: برآمد

NNQO: ۱۰۷

پژوهش

NN: ۱۰۸

یک یک

P: به تصحیح قیاسی شده است.

N: گزارش

NP: صفت بازآمدن اردای ویراف به مینو و گزارش آن

N: بیاوری

P: پرسرد

F: نمونه

O: درون

N: ۱۱۷

W: وز

N: نه

M: بکفت

R: دستوری

N: نخست

O: نسخه

NM: ۱۲۲

- و
بگذریده بودند، از گرد بر گرد تخت یزشین می‌کردند. و آن تیرست و شصت مرد یک پیشتاز بگذریده بودند. گرد بر گرد ایشان یزشین می‌کردند. و آن
سی ورش شزمار مرد. گرد بر گرد آتش‌گاه گنبذ یزشین می‌کردند. و شاهنشاه سلاح پوشیده و بر اساس نشسته، با سپاه از بیرون گنبذ می-
گردیدند. و با داده آنجا راه نمی‌دادند. و به هر جایی که این یزشین کنان
نشسته بودند، به هر قومی، جماعتی شمشیر کشیده و سلاح پوشیده
ایستاده بودند تا گروه‌ها همه بر جایگاه خویشتن باشند و هیچ کس بدان دیگر
نیامیدند. و آن جایگاه که تخت ویراف بود، از گرد بر گرد تخت،
پایان‌گان با سلاح ایستاده بودند و هیچ کس دیگر را، به جز آن شش دستور، به
نزدیک تخت رها نمی‌کردند. چون یک شاهنشاه در آمده، از آن‌جا بیرون
آمده و گرد بر گرد آتش‌گاه نگاه می‌داشتند. و بر این سختی، کالبد
ویراف‌ها نگاه می‌داشتند. تا هفت شبان روز برآمد.

کتابخانه ملی ایران
تیرست و شصت

\[ 
\begin{align*}
\text{تیرست شصت: } & M^{83} \\
\text{تیرست و شست: } & N^2 \text{M}^{84} \\
\text{ینام: } & N^2 + P^{85} \\
\text{سی شش هزار: } & NN^3 \text{MO}^{86} \\
\text{کنید: } & \text{NPN}^3 \text{M}^{87} \\
\text{شاهنشاه: } & M^{88} \\
\text{پوشید: } & P^{89} \\
\text{نسبت: } & \text{NPO}^{90} \\
\text{کنید: } & \text{NPN}^3 \text{M}^{91} \\
\text{کنیدی بکرودند: } & N^2 + O^{92} \\
\text{در: } & O^{93} \\
\text{نیامی نمی‌کنند: } & \text{PNO}^{94} \\
\text{چای: } & \text{PN}^2 \text{O}^{95} \\
\text{و سلاح پوشیده: } & N^2 \text{O}^{96} \\
\text{+ و نمی‌کنند: } & \text{NM}^{97} \\
\text{ینامی زند: } & NN^3 \text{N}^{98} \\
\text{ویراف: } & N^{99} + P^{100} \\
\text{زور: } & \text{M}^{101} \\
\text{در آمده: } & \text{M}^{102} \\
\text{سخت: } & \text{So}^{103} \\
\text{ویراف: } & N^{104} \\
\text{میدابشی شستند: } & \text{M}^{105}
\end{align*}
\]
پس شاهنشاهی اردشیر با سواران سلاح دربوشید، و آرزوی برد گردید.
اقتضاه نگاه میداشت، تا نه که آشمش‌های، منافقین، پنهان چیزی بر ویران نکند که وا لای رسید و چیزی بیدی در میان یزدان کند که آن نیز به باطل شود.

پس در میان یزدان که تخت بهداشته و جام‌های یک‌پاکیزه پرآفکندن و ویران را بر آن تخت نشانند و رو، برید و بری فرو گذاشتن. و آن چهل هزار متر بر یزدان‌کردن استادن. و درونی پیش‌شنتند و قدری سه‌یکی بر آن درون نهادند.

چون نمای به‌پیش‌شند، یک قدم شربت به ویران دادن به هم‌میشته، یعنی که از اعتقاد و نتیج خالص راست و یکی دیگر به هوخت گوش‌شته، بدو دادن، یعنی از قولي صادق و گوشش راست و یک قدحی دیگر به هوشش و زرشکی بدو دادن، یعنی کرداری پستنیده.

بعد از آن و ویران چون این سه قدم خوزه بود سب به بستر همان‌جا باز نهاد و به خوابی شد.

و هفت شب‌های یکان همچنان یزدان می‌کردند و آن شش دستور به بالین و ویران نشسته بودند. و آن سی و سه مرد دیگر که

______________________________
N² شاهنشاه
M دربوشیده
- MO و
NPMO رسند
+ P
N² 71

در زیر (روی وید)، با خطي ریز نوشته است: «پنام».

N² 72

سی یکی NPO قدحی می سنگی

NPM خاص

PM

قدح

M

به‌شورت

PM

هورشته

L

زرشتی

M

حاشیه‌ی برک بریده شده و بین دو ستاره را ندارد

M

NPM

دستور

PM

به‌شورت

M

روزشته

L

نظام مانده که خوانا نیست.

M

روزشته

NPM

N²
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و ویراف سر و تن بشست، و جامه سفید دربوشیده، و بوي خوش بر خويشتن كرد، و پيش آتش بيستاد و از هما گنادها پنفت بکرد.

و ویراف را هفت خواهر بودند. و چون آن خبر بدانستند، هر هفت بیامدند و زاري و گریه كردند و گفتند كه: «ما هفت سرپوشيده در خانهایم، و برادر، خود به جز اين نداريم، و اميد ما همه بدور است.» اکنون شما او را [139ب] بدان جهان خواهی فرستاد. و ما ندانيم كه ديگر، روی او باز بپينيم یا نه. و ما را پير بخواهی كردن. از پدر و مادر جدا شديم و از برادر نيزمان جدا خواهی كرد. ما نگذاريم. چه ما [را] همين یک برادر است.»

شما کس یک دیگر پرگزیند و اين برادر به ما رها كنيد.

دستوران چون اين سخن یبشيدند گفتند: «شما هيه اندهو مبريد و مينديشيد.» كه ما را یک هفت روز ديرگ، و ویراف را تزدست با شما سپاريم.»

و سوگند بخورند. و خواهران خورسنند شندن و بازگردند.

\[N^2O\]
بعد از آن، شاه فرموود که: «مرا می‌باشد که این شکّ و گمان از دین برخیزد و مردمان، همه بر دین اورمزد و زرتشت باشند و گفتگوی از دین برخیزد. چنانک مرا و همه عالی‌میان و دانایان را۳۷ روشان شود که دین کدام است و این شکّ و گمان از دین بیفتند.»

بعد از آن، ایشان پاسخ دادند که: «کس این خبر باین نتواند دادن، الا آن کس که از اول عمر هشت سالگی تا بدان وقت که رسیده باشد، هیچ گناه نکرده باشد، و این مرد، ویراف است، که از او پاکیزه‌تر و مینویشتر و راست‌گوی‌تر کس نیست. و این قصه، اختیار بر او باید کرد. و ما شبش‌گانه دیگر، یزدی‌نشنا و نیرنگ‌ها که در دین۳۸ از بیر این کار گفت‌ه است، به جای آوریم، تا ایزد گزگ‌جل احوال‌ها به ویران‌نماید، و ویراف ما را از آن خبر دهد. تا همه کس به دین اورمزد و زرتشت۳۹ بی‌گمان شوند»

و ویراف این کار در خویشتن پذیرفت.
و شاه اردشیر آن سخن را۴۰ خوش آمد.
و پس گفتند: «این کار راست نگردید. البته به درگاه آدران شوند.» و پس برخاستند و عزم کردند و۴۱ برفتند.

بعد از آن، آن۴۲ شش مرد که دستوران بودند، از یک سوی آتش‌گاه پذیرش‌ها ساختند، و آن چهل، دیگر سوی‌ها، با چهل هزار مرد دستوران که به درگاه آمده بودند، همه پذیرش‌ها ساختند.

اضفه شده: «دستوران».

*P* ۲۹
پاک شده و خوافان نیست
*MO* ۳۰
*N²MO*
*NO* ۳۱
*کفتگوی\ +* ۳۲
*NPM*
*P* ۳۳

این وازهم پاک شده. اما در حاشیه، با اشاره به چای‌وازهم پاک‌شده، با خطی دیگر،

*P* ۳۴
*-\ آسب دیده و پاک شده\* ۳۵
*NO* ۳۶
*آوردن\* ۳۷
*که* ۳۸
*N²MO* ۳۹

*P* ۴۰
*-\ و* ۴۱
*MO* ۴۲
*P* ۴۳
*که* ۴۴
*N²* ۴۵
و کس به‌فرستاد به همه ولایت‌ها، هر یک چایگاه که دانائی و یا دستوری بود، همه را به درگاه خود خواند. چهل‌هزار مرد بر درگاهان ۱۷ انبوه شد ۱۳. پس بفرمود و گفت: «آن‌هایی که از این ۱۹ دانائرد، باز یک‌پنده.»

چهارهزار دانائر از آن جمله برگزیدن و شاهانشاه را خبر کردند. و [شاهانشاه] گفت: «دیگر بار احتیاط بکنید. دیگر نوبت، از آن جمله، قومی که به اتفاق ۲۱ عاقلتر، و آقستا و ژند بیشتر از ژند داشتند، دیگر پاره احتیاط کردند. در میان ایشان چهل مرد برگزیدن که ایشان آقستا جمله در ژن داشتند، دیگر. در میان آن چهل کس، هفت مرد بودند که از اول عمر تا به ژن آن روزگار که ایشان رسیده بودند، بر ایشان هیچ گناه یبدا نیامده بود، و به غایت عظیم په‌ریخته ژن بودند، و یاکره دل در متشین و گوشین و کوشش، و دول در ایزد بسته بودند.

بعد از آن، هر هفت بعث ژنیک شاه ارزشیر بردنده.
به نام ایزد بخشاینده بخشایش گر مهربان دادگر

اردای ویرافنامه

سپاس دارم ایزدی را که ما را بیافرید، چنانکه (a) خواست و خواهد. و در[وود] بر پیغام[بر]؛

اما بعد:

ایدون گویند که چون شاه اردشير باباک به پادشاهی بنشست، نُود پادشاه بگشت، و بعضی گویند نُود و شش پادشاه بگشت، و جهان را از دشمنان خالی کرد و آرمیده گردانید. و دستوران و موبانی که در آن زمانه بودند، همه را پیش خویشتن. خواند و گفت که: «دن راست و درست که ایزد تعالی به زرنشت عليه گفت و زرنشت در گنبد روا کرد، مرا باز نمایند، تا من این کيشاها و گفتگوی‌ها ۱۰ از جهان بر کنم و اعتقاد با یکی آورم».

1. ناخوانا. به پاداشت‌ها نگاه شود. 
2. این از خوانده بخشاینده مهربان دادگر.
3. بنام ایزد بخشاینده بخشایش گر مهربان دادگر.
4. بنام ایزد بخشاینده بخشایشکر مهربان.
5. ل. N
6. اردای ویرافنامه. 
7. م. N
8. ویرافمنامه. م. N
9. شده. 
10. او و «ویراف منثور» در بالای سمت چپ برگ a. و «ویرافنامه در نثر ناقص»، در
11. وسط همان صفحه: «اردای ویراف نثر» L. 
12. افزایشی باز ویرافنامه و قصه شاه اردشير در برگ 1a. و «افزایشی باز ویرافنامه و قصه شاه اردشير باباک انوشیروان» در برگ 1b.
13. جناگاه O.
14. P
15. Mo.
16. ما.
17. چون + PN.
18. + NMO.
19. + R.
20. N.
21. موبانی.
22. زمان.
23. خویش.
24. N.
25. PN.
26. و.
27. M.
28. کتفکوبهها O. کتفکوبهها
29. M.
30. ن.
31. آرم.
ارداوی ویرایش نامه
[روایت فارسی نویسی]

تصحیح داریوش کاگر