

Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag: Some Critical Remarks

Bijan Gheiby

Bielefeld

I

Upon reading the Pahlavī text *Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag* (hitherto *AWN*), one is struck by a curious distortion in the arrangement of the part that concerns Wīrāz's journey into hell. Already in their introductory essays to the first edition of the work, Haug and West were puzzled with the repeated description of hell in two different places in the text.¹ But before discussing the problem, let us remind ourselves of Wīrāz's itinerary. The whole text of *AWN* could be outlined in the following manner.

Introduction

Cause of the journey 1

Preparation, departure, return 2-3

Journey's report

Paradise

The blessed soul meets his Dēn 4

Crossing the Činwad Bridge 5

Purgatory 6

Ascending the ladder and visiting the three stages of the lower heaven 7-9

The first confrontation with Ohrmazd 11

Description of the higher heaven 12-15

Inferno

River of tears 16

Return to the Činwad Bridge. The wicked soul meets his Dēn 17

Entering hell and its description 18

Description of various infernal punishments 19-52

Entering hell and its description 53-54

Description of various infernal punishments 55-99

Ahrīman appears 100

Back to heaven; the second confrontation with Ohrmazd; return; conclusion 101.

Oddly enough, during his sojourn in the world beyond, Wīrāz visits hell two times. One may even be led to believe that he visits a different hell each time. However, a comparison of the two accounts of the inferno in *AWN*, that is the accounts given in Chs. 18-52, and in Chs. 53-99, force the conclusion that these hells are identical.² The text of *AWN* has Pāzand, Sanskrit, and Old Gujarātī versions that closely resemble its Pahlavī telling; and also New Persian renditions that differ considerably from the Pahlavī version.³ One of the differences between the Persian text and the Pahlavī account is that in the Persian text the inferno is described more succinctly. For example, a versified version of *AWN*, composed by Zartosht Bahrām Pazhdū in the 16th century,⁴ contains only the following chapters of the Pahlavī version: 18, 19-35, 39, 41, 44-49, 51-52. In other words, it covers only the first account of inferno of the Pahlavī text.⁵

The account of hell in the Pahlavī version of the *AWN* begins quite abruptly with no introduction. Wīrāz who has just entered hell witnesses the soul of a man subjected to a peculiar punishment. The instrument of his torment is a snake that creeps into his rectum, and moves its way up to exit through his mouth (Ch. 19). This, we are told, is the soul of a man who committed sodomy, and his punishment is designed to reflect his sin. It seems somewhat odd that the very first chapter pertaining to hell in the text should begin with the account of the punishment for homosexuality rather than with a passage that concerns the punishment of more important violations of the religious code. For instance, sins such as not believing in God or apostasy to name but two. It is not until Ch. 55, namely the second account of the inferno that Wīrāz gives us first a list of the punishments that the souls of the wicked should expect to suffer, as well as a

general list of sins that bring about these infernal sufferings. It is in the chapter that follows that we hear about sinners who did not believe in God and religion for the first time.

Although homosexuality (*Kīn-marz*), was a great sin in Zoroastrianism,⁶ it was not as great a sin as the sin of not believing in God and religion (*pad yazdān ud dēn nakktrā*). As such, it is odd that the whole section on hell should begin with the account of the punishment for homosexuality. Chapters 55 and 56 that do concern the punishments of graver sins would have been far better suited to be placed where Chapter 19 is presently found in the text. The fact remains however, that the description of the punishment for homosexuality, i.e., Ch. 19, begins the account of the inferno almost deliberately. Interestingly enough, a list of various sins, found in Ch. 36 of *Mēnōg ī xrad*, also begins with homosexuality. According to Ch. 9 of *Sad-dar Nusr*, there is no greater sin than homosexuality in Zoroastrianism. Given these facts, and in the light of the treatment of homosexuality in other Zoroastrian texts, it should no longer be strange that the account of hell in *AWN* should begin by Ch. 19 that concerns the punishment of a homosexual. It may very well be that certain groups of Zoroastrian priests felt a greater revulsion towards homosexuality than did others. The first account of hell in *AWN*, the one that begins with Ch. 19, might have been developed in these circles. These two accounts of Wīrāz's infernal journey must have been available to the unknown compiler of *AWN* who may have simply copied the two, one after the other, in his redaction of the text. However, under the influence of books such as *Mēnōg ī xrad*, *Sad-dar* and probably also his own convictions, he must have placed the account of hell that begins with the description of the punishment for homosexuality first, while assigning the more complete and sound description of the place to a latter position in the text. In so doing, this scribe provides not only an awkward and bizarre description of inferno in *AWN*, but he also manages to create two hells out of one.

II

The reason for sending Wīrāz to the world of the dead is, according to the Persian variant, the wish of Ardašīr, the King of Kings, and the founder of the Sasanian dynasty. He summons all the priests of his realm to the court and tells them:

Make known to me the true and correct religion which Almighty God revealed to Zoroaster (peace be upon him), and [that which] Zoroaster made current in the

world, so that I may abolish all tenets and disputes from the world, and place confidence in only one [religion] ... It is necessary that I should dispel these suspicions and doubts from the religion, and all men should be of the religion of Ohrmazd and Zoroaster.⁷

Then he asks the priests to choose the most pious from among their ranks, so that God may reveal to him the Truths that the King seeks. The priests choose Wīrāz, who is then taken to a fire temple and given an intoxicating concoction that makes him fall into a deep state of spiritual trance, during which he undergoes his supernatural journey. While Wīrāz lies unconscious for seven days and nights in the fire temple where he was made to imbibe the sacred drink, he is surrounded by priests who chant the Holy Word and by soldiers with drawn swords. Outside the temple, the King and his troops, clothed in full armor and on horseback, surround the temple so that no evil may disrupt the ceremony.

In contrast to the Persian variant, the introduction to the Pahlavī version of *AWN* makes no mention of King Ardašīr. Instead, we have the worn-out account of Alexander's invasion of Iran, followed by the fictitious tale of his burning of the *Avesta* and *Zand*, followed by the report of his murder of the priests and the pious. This, the Pahlavī text tells us, resulted in the subsequent appearance of sectarian beliefs as well as skepticism within Zoroastrianism that is indicated in the following statement that was made sometime during the Sasanian era⁸ by some loyal priests in the following manner (*AWN* 1:25-27):

The people who exist in this age shall know whether these *yazišn* and *drōn* and *āfrīngān* and *ntrang* and *pādyābth* and *yōjdahrth*⁹ which we bring into operation, attain unto God or unto demons, and come to the relief of our souls or not.

I believe that the Persian variant of *AWN* is not descended from the Pahlavī original,¹⁰ but rather belongs to a separate line of tradition. Judging from its introduction¹¹ this separate tradition must have been more heroic with traces of the early Sasanian times. By contrast, the Pahlavī text belongs to a tradition that was probably a dogmatic priestly one with late Sasanian coloring.¹²

III

To help Wīrāz fall into a state of spiritual transition, the Persian variant tells us that he is given wine (*may*) to drink. However, according to the Pahlavī

version, he is offered a mixture of wine and a drug called "the Wištāspian narcotic" (*may ud mang ī wištāspān*). Using narcotics for attaining visionary experiences was well-known in ancient Iran¹³ and was, according to Pahlavī source, practiced not only by Zarathustra, but also by his patron King Wištāsp (whence the "Wištāspian narcotic"). According to *Zand ī Wahman Yasn* (3:5), Ohrmazd offers Zarathustra the Wisdom of Omniscience in the shape of a drink of water (*āb*). The prophet drinks it and spends seven vision-filled days and nights in the realm of the Divine Wisdom. In another instance, Ohrmazd asks Ardwašt to mix narcotics with wine (*mang andar may kun*); the concoction is offered to Wištāsp who drinks it. He becomes unconscious and his soul journeys to heaven and receives revelations. This is related in the *Pahlavī Rivāyat* (47:15),¹⁴ and is traceable to a passage in the *Dēnkard* (7:4:85). According to the *Dēnkard* account however, Wištāsp is offered yet another combination of drugs, namely *hōm ud mang*. The reference to *hōm* in this account indicates that the narrative may be based on a lost Avestan original.¹⁵ Widengren has found these different ways and different combinations of drugs that were used to induce spiritual visions in ancient Iran as an indication of "verschiedene Tendenzen der Sassanidenzeit."¹⁶ It seems that these different tendencies to which Widengren refers have also contributed to the formation of the different versions of *AWN*.

IV

Another important feature of the story of Ardā Wirāz concerns his wife/sisters. According to the Persian variant of the story (*PAWN* 534):

bud ardā rā ba gēt haft xvāhar

be.juz ardā na.būdī šān barādar

Ardā had [only] seven sisters [and]

they had no other brother but him.

When these sisters are informed of their brother's imminent journey, they grow anxious for his safety, lest he might not be able to return. Spurred on by these concerns, they go to the King and beseech him in these words (*PAWN* 537):

ke šāhā mā be gēt haft xvārtm

be.juz ardā barādar xvad na.dārtm

O King! We are seven sisters in the world. We have no brother but Ardā.

In the Pahlavī version these passages are rendered differently (*AWN* 2:1-2):

*Wīrāz rāy haft xwah būd hēnd ud awēšān
har haft xwahān Wīrāz čiyōn zan būd hēnd*

Wīrāz had seven sisters and all those seven sisters were as wives of Wīrāz.

They go to the priests and say (*AWN* 2:9-10):

*amā haft xwah hēm ud ōy ēk brād
ud har haft xwah ōy brād zan hēm*

We are seven sisters and he is an only brother; and we are, all seven sisters, as wives of that brother.

The sisters of Wīrāz go to the King in the Persian variant,¹⁷ but in the Pahlavī version it is the priests whom the sisters visit with their entreaty. The change of motifs from King to priests further supports the idea that the Persian account stems from a more secular/epic origin, while the Pahlavī version is based on a priestly tradition.¹⁸ Haug and West explain the sentence according to which Wīrāz's sisters were also his wives as follows:

This incident appears to be introduced, merely as an illustration of the extraordinary piety of Vīrāf, in obeying the precepts of his religion with regard to *khvaētvadatha*, or "next-of-kin marriage"; it also indicates that the tale was written before the ancient practice of marriage between brothers and sisters was discontinued. The later Pāzand and Persian MSS. obscure the meaning by omitting this sentence.¹⁹

I believe that the absence of this sentence in the later Pāzand and Persian MSS. may be explained differently. That is, the omission of this sentence in the Pāzand and New Persian variants may very well be due to the circumstance that this variant belongs to a time prior to the institution of the incestuous marriage in Zoroastrianism. That is, a period before the practice was propagated by the Sasanian priesthood and not necessarily to a time after it was discontinued. The expression *xwēddōdah* occurs four times in the Pahlavī version of *AWN*. In Chs. 7 and 8 we encounter the blessed souls of those who although never practiced incestuous unions (*xwēddōdah nē kard/warzīd*), attained heaven through other good works. It is in Ch. 12 that we come upon the blessed souls of the pious who

reside in the Paradise because of practicing incestuous marriage (*xwēdōdahān rūrān*).²⁰

At the time when Persian variants of *AWN* were first written down, or perhaps at the time of their composition sometime after the 15th or 16th centuries, incestuous marriages had already ceased to be practiced by Zoroastrians. Further, the term *xwēdōdah* had already become linguistically and culturally so ambiguous that it was no longer necessary to delete it from the Persian variants of Pahlavī texts. Interestingly enough, this word does appear in the traditional Zoroastrian literature of the same period.²¹ We even find it in a short dictionary of religious terminology, where it is defined as "matrimonial union with relatives" (*bā xwēdān vaštāt kardān*).²²

Let us now go back and reconsider the statement of Wirāz's sisters, "*har haft xwah ōy brād zan hēm*." This statement is quite similar to another one uttered by King Wištāsp, in a passage in *Ayādgar I Zarērān* (*AZ* 68):

*agar hamāg pus ud brād ud wāspuhragān I man
kay wištāsp sōh ud ān-iz hutōs I-m xwah ud zan
kē az pus tā duxt sth azēš zād ēstōd ...*

If all of the sons and brothers and princes
who are borne of I, King Wištāsp, and Hutōs,
who is my sister and wife, and who has bore me
thirty offspring, [both] sons and daughters...

I am inclined to regard the words: *I-m xwah ud zan* or at least *xwah ud*, in the *AZ*²³ as well as in the statements of Wirāz's sisters in the *AWN* to be later interpolations.²⁴ I see in these interpolations the clear influence of the Zoroastrian priesthood of the Sasanian and early Muslim periods that tries to impose incestuous marriages upon men of some remote past.²⁵

V

In the course of his spiritual journey Wirāz comes upon the soul of a man who is being tormented (Ch. 41). Upon inquiring about the sin for which the man is punished, the guiding angels inform him that (*AWN*):

ēn rūrān I ōy druwand mardōm kē ō garmābag

*ī was šud hēnd u-šān hixr ud nasā ō āb ud ātaxš
ud zamīg burd ud ahlaw andar šud ud druwand
bērōn āmad hēnd*

Haug and West seem to be the only scholars who brought the real sense of this complicated sentence to light. They understand the *ī* and the *-šān* in the subordinate clause at the beginning of the sentence to be a relative pronoun and an enclitic attributive pronoun respectively; while taking the main clause to be a nominal sentence. Having made these assumptions, they translate the sentence as:

This is the soul of that wicked man who was at the warm baths which many have frequented, and he carried their bodily refuse and dead matter to water and fire and earth; and the pious went in, and came out wicked.²⁶

Here, the Persian variant of the text is more precise. It substitutes a noun for the *was* of the Pahlavī text ('Afīfī, p.89). The very title of the chapter reveals this: '*ādāb-e kasānī ke be garmāba-ye juddīnān mīravand* "Torment of those who go to the baths of non-Zoroastrians." The idea is reiterated in the text as:

be garmāba šudandī bā batardīn

They went to bath with those of evil religion.

Here, the terms *juddīn* and *batardīn* denote non-Zoroastrians, and I expect that they actually refer to Muslims.

According to the Pahlavī version, or at least the way that Haug and West interpret that version, going to the public bath was a sin for Zoroastrians because the multitude of bathers in public baths polluted the sacred elements of water, earth, and fire. They polluted the water because they bathed together in the large pool of hot water, called *khazīna* in Persian, that functioned as a collective bathtub in public baths. They polluted the earth because they sat or stretched out on the floor to be rubbed down, washed, or shaven with the filth poured down unto the earth. And they polluted the fire because it was used unceremoniously to heat the bath water, and all kinds of things were thrown in the fire to keep it burning. All of this violated the strictures of the Zoroastrian standards of purity. Therefore, as far as pious Zoroastrians were concerned, frequenting such bathhouses would result in pollution rather than purification. Whereas the Zoroastrian prohibitions against polluting the elements made it difficult for the Persian Zoroastrians of the early Islamic era to patronize the numerous public

baths, Muslim Iranians who did not have to observe stringent purification rites, freely frequented these establishments.

This is the impression that one forms from Ch.19 of *Rivāyat ī Ēmēd ī Āsawahištān*.²⁷ There, Ēmēd, the great Zoroastrian Priest of the 10th century declares that the bathhouse of the Muslims (*agdēnān*) is polluted and Zoroastrians (*wēhdēnān*) may not lawfully enter it. Then he adds the following: "If there is an absolute need for the Zoroastrians to have a bath, they should arrange for one themselves" (19:8). This statement implies that at least at the time when Ēmēd composed his interdiction, Zoroastrians did not have their own bathhouses, and probably relied on the numerous Muslim establishments for hygiene. Ēmēd adds: "Because the bath house is not something that Muslims have introduced. They adopted it from the forerunners (*pešēnīgān*)."²⁸ I understand that by the term "forerunners," Ēmēd means Iranians before their conversion to Islam. He concludes his statement with these words (*REA* 19:9-10):

At the time of the good rule [that is under the Sasanians], establishing bathhouses near fire temples and *gāhānbār* houses [i.e., places for certain religious ceremonies], was a common practice. It is a religious declaration that he who wants to worship deities, must go to the bathhouse first and wash himself ... so that he could proceed with his worship of the deities in a cleaner, better smelling state.

This is quite illuminating because it implies that Zoroastrian bathhouses were originally establishments with some religious purpose that concerned ceremonial purification rites. By contrast, Muslim bathhouses were merely gathering places for washing, relaxing, and socializing. Therefore, those Zoroastrians who went to Muslim baths had to go through strict purification procedures in this world, and suffer infernal punishment in the next.²⁸

VI

There is still a small but important difference between the Pahlavī and the Persian versions of *AWN* that should be mentioned.²⁹ The angels who guide Wīrāz during his journey are, according to the Pahlavī version, Srōš and Ādur. In the Persian version they are Srōš and Ardwašīst. This is another evidence of the different religious and mythological tendencies at work in this text.

VII

Although we could be reasonably certain of the order of the beginning chapters of the inferno part of *AWN* (that is, Chs. 55-56), the latter chapters of this section show an annoying disarrangement. As far as the nature of the sins and their manner of punishment are concerned, there are similarities not only in both accounts of inferno, but also within each account. One may even be tempted to group those chapters that depict similar sins together.³⁰ For example:

Those who contaminated fire, water, and earth 34, 37, 38, 41, 58

Wives who mistreated their husbands 26, 62, 63, 69, 70, 82, 83, 85

Those who mistreated domestic animals 30, 48, 74, 75, 77

Women who practiced witchcraft 35, 81.

Upon careful reflection however, all attempt at introducing a classificatory order into hell seems superfluous. According to the first chapter of the *Bundahišn*, all of Ahrīman's creations are essentially *adādestān*, which Zaehner aptly translates as "without method."³¹ A reflection of this characteristic is seen in the shape of hell. Ahrīman's hell, unlike Ohrmazd's heaven, is neither planned nor methodically constructed.³² Ohrmazd's heaven has as many as four different stations, every one of which belongs to certain classes of blessed souls. When after crossing the Činwad Bridge, pious souls enter heaven, Vahman comes to receive and guide them to the places already reserved for their blissful future. By contrast, Ahrīman's hell is only a vast and deep pit of darkness, into which the wicked souls fall from the Činwad Bridge. In other words, there is no orderly admission to hell. The wicked souls do not *enter* it; they *fall into* it. Once in hell, these souls haphazardly occupy space regardless of the type of sin that they have committed. Although attempts to impose some logical order upon the account(s) of hell in *AWN* may be laudable, given what hell seems to be in Zoroastrianism, such attempts are not advisable. It may be wiser to leave hell to its inherent chaos.

VIII

Here I would like to draw the readers' attention to a displacement in Ch. 99 of *AWN*. The first sentence reads:

*u[-m] anī-z was dīd ruwān ī druwandān mardān
ud zanān +ī andar dušox ī sahmgīn ī bīmgīn ī rēšgīn*

*I purr anāgih I was dard I tārtg I pādīfrāh I
gōnag gōnag hamē barēnd*³³

And I also saw as many souls of wicked men
and women; who ever suffered terrible, frightening,
hurtful, harmful, painful, dark, hellish torment and
punishments of various kinds.

This should be transferred to the end of the chapter not only to bring the chapter to a close, but also in order to frame the whole account of hell. As Ch. 56 deals with those who denied God and Religion (*pad yazdān ud dēn nakkīrā būd hēnd*), Ch. 99 deals with those who were disobedient to kings and hostile to their armies and troops (*andar xwadāyān aburd framān būd hēnd ud andar spāh ud gund I xwadāyān dušman būd hēnd*), and using the well-known God/King dyad, this arrangement is more suitable for ending this part of the book.

Notes

1. M. Haug and E. W. West, *The Book of Ardā-Vīrāz*, London, 1872 (reprint Amsterdam, 1971), pp. lxxv f. See also Ph. Gignoux, *Le livre d'Ardā Vīrāz*, Paris, 1984, p. 16.
2. The superlative adjective *tārtom* "the darkest" in Ch. 54 of *AWN* and *zofūyom* "the deepest" of *Zand ī Wahman Yasn* (7:26) are of no significance. They merely describe the darkness and depth of hell emphatically.
3. For a description of all these see Haug and West, *op. cit.*, pp. iii ff.
4. Edited by R. 'Afīfī, Mashhad University Press, 1343/1964.
5. The anonymous prose version that Pazhdū relates he has versified ('Afīfī, *op. cit.*, pp. 401 ff.) is possibly the one contained in manuscript H28. Not only do they seem to have the same introduction but also the arrangement of the chapters of hell is similar if not the same in both of these. See Haug and West, *op. cit.*, p. xix.
6. On homosexuality in Iran and related subjects see my articles in part 4 of *Khorde Maqālāt*, Bielefeld, 1997, and the upcoming part 5 of the same series.
7. See Haug and West, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxxiv ff. for the Persian text extracted from MS. H28 (needs correction), and pp. xv ff. for the English translation.
8. The Pahlavī version of *AWN* does not reveal the time of Ardā Wirāz. We only know that it was sometime after Alexander's invasion of Iran. However, an attempt is made to place Wirāz at the Sasanian time through the interpolation of the names of the celebrated Sasanid religious figures such as Adūrbād and Wehšāpūr (1:16, 35). As a matter of fact, some authorities identify Wirāz with Wehšāpūr (*AWN* 1:35).
9. Religious terms denoting different ceremonies and purification rites.
10. J. C. Tavadia has already described it as a "ziemlich freie und fast selbständige" version.

See his *Mittelpersische Sprache und Literatur der Zarathustrier*, Leipzig, 1956, p.118.

1. A Pāzand version (about it see Haug and West, *op. cit.*, pp. xi ff.) has still a different introduction which makes Wīrāz a contemporary of Wištāsp and Zarathustra. Tavadia (*ibid.*) calls attention to the importance of this Pāzand version of which he believes the origin to be older than that of the Pahlavī variant.
2. The traces of this dogmatism are also apparent in a sentence in the final chapter of the *AWN*: *če har pākth ud pādyābth ī ašmā kunēd ud dārēd ... hamāg man dānam* (101:23-25) which does not suit the otherwise sublime tone of Ohrmazd's words to Wīrāz. Structurally, it is also a most unfitting insertion.
3. On this subject see *Die Religionen des alten Iran* by H. S. Nyberg, Leipzig, 1938 (reprinted with a new introduction by the author, Osnabrück, 1966).
4. Edited by A. V. Williams, *The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg*, Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 60, Copenhagen, 1990.
5. For a detailed discussion see G. Widengren, *Die Religionen Irans*, Stuttgart, 1965, pp. 68 ff.
6. *Ibid.*, p.72
7. In the prose introduction of the Persian variant of *AWN* in codex H28 (Haug and West, *op. cit.*, p. Lxxxv) it seems as though the sisters talk only to the priests (they use the plural pronoun *šomā*). In the prose version as well as in the versified one, the priests speak to the sisters and calm them down and the King and his troops put on armor.
8. I am indebted to Dr. Omidsalar who, while editing the first draft of my article, drew my attention to this important point.
9. Haug and West, *op. cit.*, p.149.
20. And still once more in Ch. 86 which belongs to the second account of inferno and does not exist in the Persian version. There the soul of a woman suffers punishment because she had violated incest (*xwēddōdah wināhīd*).
21. See for example the *Dārāb Hormazyār's Rivāyat*, ed. E. M. R. Unvala, Bombay, 1922, vol.1, p.308.
22. Edited by Ed. Sachau in *Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademi der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Cl. Wien*, LXVII (1871), pp. 837 ff. The manuscript of the dictionary which is called *Farhang-e Revāyat-e Dini* is written in 1032 A.Y. (1655 AD) by Herbad Manučehr Dastur Borzu Qavām al-Din Kayqobād Hormozyār Sanjānā, most likely in India, and was acquired by Sir William Ouseley in Shiraz in 1811. See Sachau, *op. cit.*, p. 813.
23. B. Gheiby, *Ayādgār ī Zarērān*, Pahlavi Literature Series, Vol. 4, Nemudar Publication, Bielefeld, 1999, passage 68, p. 6.
24. For another example see *mādayān ī yōšt fryān*, 4:6, 13.
25. For more information about incest in ancient Iran and especially among Zoroastrians, see my *Khorde Maqālāt*, pt.1, Bielefeld, 1993, no.4.
26. If we follow the reading of MS. K20 and drop the *ī* after *garmābag*, and at the same

time take the word *was* to be an adverb, or even if we assume that the *I* functions as an *isāfa* in the passage, our sentence will not make much sense. It begs the question why it was a crime to frequent bathhouses. F. Vahman who has based his edition of *AWN* (Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, No. 53, 1986) on MS. K20, adopts the *I* from codices H6 and K26 in his transcription. However, in his translation he follows the reading of K20: "These are the souls of those wicked people who went often to the bath," Gignoux follows the same line in his translation: "C'est l'âme de ces méchants hommes qui sont allés souvent aux bain," These recent translators who consider the subject of the main sentence to be plural, are misled by the superfluous *hēnd* that ends the sentence. Gignoux is moreover perplexed by the word *mardōm*, and its alleged contribution to the ambiguity of the sentence (see his translation, p.185, n.1). In Pahlavī as well as in Early Persian *mardōm* may also be singular, and have the sense of *kas*. In this instance it has simply taken the place of *mard* in the beginning of the chapter (not quoted here).

27. See the edition of Nezhat Safa Isfahani, Harvard Iranian Series, Vol.2, 1980.
28. Some forty years ago, when I was still a small child living in Tehran, my mother, who generally, although not fanatically, followed the edicts of the *Vendīdād* and the *Sad-Dar*, never allowed us to go to *hammām-e 'umūmt* (public bath). This was chiefly because these baths had a *khazāne*, that is, a large pool of hot water that was used as a communal bathtub. She preferred to send us to the kind of bathhouses that were called *hammām-e numre*. These had private rooms with a shower in each room. They were called *hammām-e numre* because upon entering the bath one was given a number, and had to wait until one's number (*numre*) was called out. At that time one was assigned a private compartment with its own shower.
29. For a rather detailed comparison of both versions, see 'Afīfī's introduction to his edition of the Persian *AWN*, pp. xliii ff. His comparison, however, lacks precision.
30. The two lists, one of punishments and the other of sins in Ch.55 are too short and incomplete to be of any help in reconstructing the text. The enumeration of sins in Ch.36 of *Mēnōg ī xrad*, although much longer and more complete, has a different arrangement than that of *AWN*, except in the case of the first sin referred to above, and is also of little use. In his edition of *Mēnōg ī xrad* (London, 1871, p. 163), West writes: "Although the list of sins, which follows, commences with the most heinous, it is doubtful if the author intended to arrange the after part of the list, exactly in the order of atrocity of the sins."
31. R. C. Zaehner, *Zurvan, A Zoroastrian Dilemma*, Oxford, 1955 (reprinted with a new introduction by the author, New York, 1972), p.315.
32. In the late Pahlavī book *Dādestān ī Dēnīg* (9th century), an attempt is made to impose a plan upon hell. In the chapter dealing with the question no.32, hell is described as consisting of the following three districts (*wimand*). One is called *hammistagān ī druwandān*. In Zoroastrian literature *hammistagān* is purgatory. It is *misvan- gātav-* or "the place of the mixed" in the *Vidēvdāt* 19:36. *Dādestān ī Dēnīg* splits the purgatory

into two sections. One is for the wicked (*druwandān*) and belongs to hell, the other, which is referred to in the answer to question no.24 in *Dādestān ī Dēnīg*, is for the pious (*ahlawān*), and belongs to heaven. Both of these must be regarded as new interpretations. The next district of hell is *watom axwān*. This is called *acišta- aṇhav-* or "the worst place" in the *Avesta*, and is used as a means of referring to hell. The third district is known as *druzaskān*, which is a re-interpretation of *drujas-kanā-* or "the cave of the demons" in the *Vidēvdāt* 19:41.

33. There is a displacement within this sentence. The quotation above is restored.



ژوبشگاه علوم اشراقی و مطالعات قرآنی
 مرکز تحقیقات علوم اشراقی