Yama/Yima/Jamsh>d, King of Paradise

by Helmut Humbach (Mainz)

At the beginning of my Ga^tha^ studies, I was convinced that the Pahlavi translation of the Ga^tha^s in most cases is useless, but I changed my mind in the course of time. One of the aims of the present paper is to adduce the Pahlav> and other native tradition to elucidate the Yima stanza of Zarathushtra's Ga^tha^s (Y32,7), thereby replacing my former attempts to decipher it. With a few minor exceptions the post-Avestic sources are collected since long by Arthur Christensen.[1] Just add the Pahlavi Rivayat (PhlRiv)[2], which is accessible now in Williams's modern edition[3]. For an exhaustive discussion, including that of the Avesta fragments inserted in the Pahlavi translation of V2,5 and V2,19, which are treated too superficially by Christensen, [4], see the new edition of the Zamya^d Yasht published in cooperation with Pallan Ichaporia.[5]

1. OP. Yama, Av. Yima, MP. Jam%e^d

The the early history of the Iranians as described in the Avesta, in the Middle Persian Pahlavi literature, and in Firdousi's New Persian Book of the Kings (Ša^hna^meh) falls into two, the mythical period from the beginning up to the loss of paradise, and the legendary period of the Kayanids, or Kavi rulers, up to Kavi Vi%ta^spa, the protector of prophet Zarathushtra.The figures of the first or mythical period are:

Gaiio^ Mar&tan 'mortal life', the first man, Pahlav> *Gayo^mard*, New Persian *Kayu^marth*,
Hao%iia°ha, the first ruler, Phl.NP. *Ho^%ang*
Taxmo^ Urupi, Phl. *Taxmo^rub* (wrongly read *Taxmo^raz*), NP. *Tahmu^rath,* and finally
Yima (Yima x%ae^ta), the king of the paradisiacal Golden Age of the Iranians, Phl. *Jam (Jam%e^d),* NP. *Jam%>d ("Jamsheed").* He is indirectly attested as early as in the Old Persian period. *Yamak%edda*, an Iranian proper name of a human individual, is found on one of the Elamite clay tablets unearthed in Persepolis[6].

The reconsrtructed pre-form of *Yima (Yima X%ae^ta)* is *Yama (Yama x%aita).* The enlargment *x%ae^ta   x%aita* is an attribute which means as much as 'brilliant or majestic.[7] Whereas the reconstructed stem vowel *a* of *Yama* was palatalized into *i* in the Avestic occurrences of the name, it was preserved in Old Persian, Pahlavi, and New Persian.

In the Younger Avesta, Yima is described as the king of the Paradise of the Golden Age of mankind, 'who got out from the Dae^vas, both energy and fervor, both sheep and cattle, both satiety and reputation; (and) under whose rule both kinds of undiminishing nourishment were

---

[1] Arthur Christensen, *Les types du premier homme et du premier roi dans l'histoire le´gendaire des Iraniens*, pt. 2, *Yim* (Leiden 1934).

[2] Missing in Christensen, pt. 2, p. 28f.

[3] A. V. Williams: *The Pahlavi Riva^yat accompanying the Da^desta^n > De^n>g.* 2 parts. Copenhagen 1990.

[4] Christensen, pt. 2, p. 20f.

[5] Helmut Humbach and Pallan Ichaporia: *Zamya^d Yasht.* Wiesbaden 1998, p. 106 f.

[6] Ilya Gershevitch, 'Amber at Persepolis', in: *Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata,* vol. 2 (Roma 1969) pp. 167-251, see p. 245.

[7] In quite the same way the phrase Av. *huuar& x%ae^ta~* 'bright Sun' has been contracted to one single word Phl. *hwar(x)%e^d*, NP. *xur%>d ,* which simply mean 'Sun'. As for *x%ae^ta-* 'majestic, bright' cf. Man.Sogd. *x%y]/#x%y]* 'lord' which possibly is a loan-word, Ilya Gershevitch, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian* (Oxford 1954) ©269, with foot-note on p. 43. The Sogdian word survived as the title of the rulers of Fargha^na (Ibn Khurda^dbih 40) and Samarqand (Muqaddass> 279) in the early Muslim period.

available for consummation, both cattle and men were imperishable, both water and plants were not drying up, there was neither frost nor heat, neither old age nor death, nor envy produced by the dae^vas.' Yet this paradisiacal rule was lost owing to a "lie" sin committed by Yima, as a result of which the Royal Glory (Khvarenah, *xμar&nah*) withdrew from him. Yasht 19,33.34 *hiia² h>m ae^m drao[&m va^cim a°hai}>m ci¤n¥ma^ne paiti.barata* 'when Yima had added the lie, the untrue word, to his account, the Royal Glory flew away from him and evil enterted into the world'.[8] Yima fled, and finally he was (killed and) dissected by a person Spityura *Spitiiura)* by name[9] who seems to have offered the pieces of Yima's body to the De^vs (demons).

In this traditional picture, Yima represents the fourth generation of mankind but his nature shows some affinity to that of a primal man of the Adam ('man') type who lost immortality by violating the divine law. As a matter of fact, Yima shares several characteristics not only with *Gaiio^ Mar&tan* but also with *Ma$iia* 'man', another type of primal man in the Old Iranian mythology.[10] Thus it is not unlikely that, in remote times, Yima may even have played the part of a third type of primal man as well.

The mythical figure of Yama/Yima was inherited by the Iranians from the Proto-Aryan period. It is closely related to that of the Indian Yama, the first mortal in Rigvedic mythology, who, after his death, became the ruler of the underworld.[11] His name means as much as 'twin', which suggests that, in remote times, his bearer may have been understood as a hermaphrodite combining virility and feminity, thereby being able to procreate progeny without a partner. Yet in both Indian and Iranian tradition the conception of Yima's hermaphroditism is superimposed by the conception of Yima forming a primary twin couple with his sister (Phl. *Jamag*, OInd. *Yam>*). In the Indian tradition of the Rigveda, this twin couple is faced with the duty of procreating progeny, a duty provided by divine law but the inevitable way of fulfilling this duty is to commit incest. It is this incest which in the Indian myth is the deadly sin by which Yama and mankind lost immortality. The matter is different in Iranian tradition inasmuch as the Iranian theory ó hardly the general Iranian practice of the Iranians ó cultivated the idea of the next-of-kin marriage not being a sin but a religious merit.[12]

The problem of procreation of mankind has exercised Iranian minds again and again. According to one passage of the Pahlavi encyclopaedia Bundahishn, Jam (Yima), after having lost immortality, married a female demon (she-de^w) and gave his sister Jamag in marriage to a male demon (he-de^w), a marriage from which noxious animals such as the the ape and the

---

[8] With this translation I try to improve the one given in *Zamya^d Yasht,* pp. 37 f. and 110 f. It seems to me now that *cinma^ne* 'to strive' is corrupted from *cima^ne* 'to heap up, to be heaped up, to account for, to be accounted for'. Cf. Yasht 10,32 *paiti no^ zao}râ v>sa°μha ... h@m h>% cima^ne bara°μha n> h>% dasuua garo^.nma^ne* 'approach our libations, ... collect them for consumption (Ilyap. 89) or retribution, deposit them for yourself (HH) in Paradise.'

[9] Yt. 19,46 *az<imca daha^k&m spitiiur&mca yimo^.k&r&³t&m.* Yima's violent death is mentioned in V2,19 frgm.1 *u-%a^n haza^rag sar be^ kirre^n>d az a^n gya^g payda^g: "paoiriiehe pascae^ta haza°ro^.z‹i›mahe }{ar&so^ ſas yimo^ k&r&nao²"*

'and that he was dissected by them at the end of the first millenium, is evident from the following (Avesta) passage: "thereafter the end of the first millenium arrived[9], Yima ....[9]". According to the Avesta Yima was dissected by Spitiiura, see Yt19,46 *az<imca daha^k&m spitiiur&mca yimo^.k&r&³t&m.*

[10] Unfortunately the name of Ma%ya is preserved in the Pahlavi literature only, but, with regard of its internal *%* there is no doubt about its Avestan origin. *Ma$ya* is also mirrored by the Old Persian *Martiya*, a proper name of the Adam type.

[11] Another Rigvedic figure of primal man is *Manu/ManusÕ*, to which English *man* is etymologically related.Õ

[12] Next-of-kin marriage ... German high nobility

bear arose.[13] Yet, contrary to this improper solution, another Bundahishn passage (35,4) attributes to Jam and his sister Jamag the first next-of-kin marriage in Iranian history, saying that 'from Jam and his sister Jamag a pair *(juxtag)* of man and woman was born, and they became wife and husband together'.[14] This Bundahi%n tradition is paralleled by similar passages of the other Pahlavi literature.

Zarathushtra's allusions to Yima, the twin, show a much higher level. In his view, Yima is the first human being in which the two primeval spirits manifested themselves, the antagonistic 'twins, who have been told to be the two kinds of dreams, of thoughts, of words, and the two kinds of actions, the better and the evil one. The ambivalence of his nature is alluded to by Zarathushtra in his Yasna 32,7:

$$ae^\%@m\ ae^na°h@m\quad v{>}uua°hu\%o^sra^uu{>}\ yimasc{>}²$$
$$y\&^\ ma\$ii\&^³g\ cix\%nu\%o^\quad ahma^k\&^³g\ ga^u\%\ baga^\ x\mu a^r\&mno^$$

2. Yima's offence

32,7 just of an ae^nah

45,1 du%.sasti% fllowed by the call to the listeners to chase to expell the primeval evil spirit

45.2 the two spirits

Whereas the Persian dialect of the Iranian languages has preserved the stem vowel *a* of Proto-Iranian *Yama (Yama x%aita)* up to its New Persian development *Jam%>d ("Jamsheed")* as codified by Firdousi, the Avesta has *Yima (Yima x%ae^ta)*. It is worth mentioning that the palatalization *a ž i* is a typical post-Ga^thic (= Young Avestic) feature. This, however, due to the obvious popularity of the legendary person, has found entrance in the textual transmission of the Ga^thic (= Old Avestic) occurrence of the name in Yasna 32,7, a stanza which alludes to both the merits and the guilt of Yima. The correct original Old Avestic form *Y&^ma* is only preserved as the common adjective *y&^ma* 'twin' in Yasna 30,3, the famous passage on the two primeval spirits who have become known 'as two dreams, two thoughts and two words, the two actions, the better and the evil one'.[15] Neither the tradition nor modern scholarship realised the close relationship between the conception of the two spirits and the double-faced figure of Yima:

According to Yasht 19,33.34 the sin of Yima consisted of a *draoga.* We are used to render this word with 'lie' but in the given context it certainly has the same connotation as its Old Persian equivalent *drauga* in Dareius's Behistun inscription. There the word is used of Gauma^ta's unjustified claim to the throne, and similarly . The Old Persian word the entering of claim to the thorne means as much as ' '""*a^a² hiia² h>m ae^m drao[&m va^cim a°hai}>m ci¤n¥ma^ne paiti.barata* 'but (at the very moment) when Yima he had added the lie, the untrue word, to his account, the Royal Glory flew away from him'

According to Ya%ta 19, Yima's sin was a "lie", Avestan *draoga (drao[a). ,* which , as we can derive from Old Persian *drauga* The Gatha stanza Yasna 32,7 already mentioned above, aludes to both Yima's sin and his merits:

two sins or sin plus merit?

---

[13] Bundahi%n 14B,1.
[14] ib. 35,4.
[15]

From Yasna 45,1 we can infer that Yima's sin consisted of a kind of blasphemy. This agrees

Da^desta^n > De^n>g 38,19-20 speaks of Jam as having been deceived by the Druj, the personified lie:[16]

ka az druj fre^f>hist / u-% az o^hrmazd bandag>h be o^ abardom xwada^y>h a^rzu^ge^n>d / u-% abar da^m-da^da^r>h-> xwe^%[17] guft

'when (Jam) was deceived by the Druj / and was, thereby, made eager for supreme sovereignty instead of the service of Ohrmazd; / he spoke about himself as having created the creatures/creations'[18]

PhlRiv31a10 *u-% guft ku^ a^b man da^d / zam>g man da^d / urwar man da^d / xwar%e^d man da^d / ma^h man da^d / star man da^d / ud asma^n man da^d / go^spand man da^d / mardo^m man da^d / ha^mo^ye^n dahi%n > ge^t>g man da^d / ud pad a^n dro^-go^wi%n>h / a^-% xwarrah ud xwada^y>h az-i% appa^r bu^d / u-% tan be^ o^ wi%o^bi%n > dast > de^wa^n mad*

'and (Jam) said: 'I created the waters, / I created the earth, / I created the plants, / I created the sun, / I created the moon, / I created the stars, / and I created the heavens, / I created the beneficent animal, / I created nabkind, / I created all the creations of the material world / ... and through that false speech *(dro^-go^wi%n>h = Av. drao[&m va^cim)*, his glory and lordship were taken away from him, and his body fell into destruction at the hands of the de^vs.'

A slight variation of the second half is found in Yima's confession in PhlRiv31c7 *u-m harw da^m ud dahi%n > me^no^g ud ge^t>g guft ku^ man da^d / pad a^n dro^ >-m guft / man xwarrah ud xwada^y>h az-i‹m› appa^r bu^d / u-m tan be o^ wi%o^bi%n > dast > de^wa^n mad*

'and I said that I (had) created all the creatures and creations of the spiritual and material worlds'. / For those lies *(dro^ = Av. drao[a-)* which I uttered, glory and lordship were taken away from me, / and my body fell into destruction at the hands of the demons[19].

Yt19,33-34 *ye°´he x%a}ra^]a / no^i² aot&m â°ha no^i² gar&m&m / no^i² zauruua â°ha no^i² m&r&i}iiu% / no^i² arasko^ dae^uuo^.da^to^ / par‹o^› ana^druxto^i² / para ahma^² ya² h>m ae^m / draog&m va^cim a°hai}>m / cinma^ne (*cima^ne) paiti.barata // a^a² ya² h>m ae^m / draog&m va^cim a°hai}>m / cinma^ne (*cima^ne) paiti.barata / vae^n&mn&m ahma² haca xµar&no^ / m&r&[ahe k&hrpa fra§usa²*

'(Yima) under whose reign / there was neither cold nor heat, / neither old age nor death,/ nor the envy created by the dae^vas, / owing to not-lying[20] / before he added[21] the lying,

---

[16] Da^desta^n > De^n>g ed. Anklesaria 38,19-20; trsl. West 39,16 (Pahlavi Texts II, p. 127)

[17] mss. *u-% da^m-da^da^r>h abar xwe^%*

[18] West 'and about his administration (*da^da^r>h*) it is said'

[19] Pahlavi Riva^yat ed. Williams, 31c,5f.

[20] Everybody has seen that there is something wrong with the transmitted *para anadruxtoi²* 'before his not-lying'. The author of the passage was blamed recently for his lack of logic but the alleged problem of logic is actually a problem of textual criticism, the text obviously being corrupt. Thus Prof. Gershevitch proposed to correct *para ana^druxto^i²* into *para a^druxto^i²* 'before his lie' but he gave no reason for the intrusion of the prefix *an-*. In my opinion it is not the prefix *an-* which is wrong but rather the adverb *para* 'before' which is due

untrue speech to his *account'.[22] // But when he had added the lying, untrue speech to his *account, the (Royal) Glory, in the shape of a bird, flew away from him visibly.

As already pointed out previously,[23] Avestic *drao[a-* 'lie' here certainly has the connotation of 'rebellion by a wrong claimant to the throne'. The same is well attested with Old Persian *drauga-* in the Behistun inscription where this it is used by Darius in reference to the wrong Bardiya who challenged Darius's rigtht of succession to Cambyses.

Hybris

On the one hand Yima appears to be a benefactor of post-paradisiacal mankind, on the other hand he is blamed for his attempt at usurping God's throne. Yima was the prototype of mankind in which both good and evil are inseparably linked with each other until the time of the Renovation of the world. The determinant factor of his fall is what the poets of the ancient Greeks call hybris, an excess of ambition ultimately bringing about the transgressor's ruin.

The idea of Hy<bris is more clearly expressed in Firdusi's description of the vent which led to the catastrophy: As for this cf. Firdausi Book 4, 66ff. (ed. Mohl):[24]

66ff. *gara^nma^y>ka^n-ra^ ze-la%kar be-xwa^nd / ce ma^yeh soxan p>% >%a^n bera^nad / cun>n guft ba^ sa^l-xwurde maha^n / ke juz xw>%tan-ra^ na-da^nam jeha^n / hunar dar jeha^n az man a^mad pad>d / cu man na^mwar taxt-e %a^h> na-d>d*

'He summoned all the chiefs, and what a wealth of words he used! "The world is mine, I founded its properties. / The royal throne hath seen no king like me."'

75ff. *geraidu^n ke da^n>d ke man kardam >n / ma-ra^ xwa^nd ba^yad jeha^n a^far>n / cu >n gufteh %ud farr-e yazda^n az vay / gusast? ... /*

So now that ye perceive what I have done / All hail me as the maker of the world." ... When this was said, God's Grace departed from him.

83 *jam%>d bar t>re-gu^n ga%t ru^z / ham> ka^st a^n farr -> g>t> furu^z*

'Day darkened to Jam%>d, he lost the Grace that lighteneth the world

189f. *siyah ga%t rux%ande ru^z-e saf>d / gusastand paywand ba^ jam%>d / bar-u^ t>reh %ud farrah-ye >zad> / be-kaz<z<> gera^y>d u na^-bexrad>*

'the bright day gloomed / and men renounced Jam%>d / who when his Grace was darkened / turned to folly and perverseness.'

Iam%o[25], *x%ae^ta-* 'majestic' seems to have been a royal title.[26] Old Persian[27].

---

to erroneous anticipation of the following *para ahma^²*. It either is to be deleted or to be corrected into *par‹o^›* 'owing to'.

[21] *paiti.barata* 'he accepted' or 'he reproduced': the false speech was insinuated to him by the Druj. In RV. 8,20,9 *pra´ti vo ... s´a´rdha^ya ma×ruta^ya bharadhvam havya×* the med. of *pra´ti bhrÔ* does not favor the translation 'present your offerings to the host of Maruts'. Perhaps better 'go for, fetch'.

[22] *cinma^ne^* is erroneous wrong for **cima^ne^*. The error is influenced by A3,7 *ae^uuahe ha^t@m cinma^n¤ah¥e ya² a$ahe vahi%tahe* 'to strive for the? one among the existing, for best truth' here the transmitted form *cinma^nahe* is corrupted from original *cinma^ne* under the influence of the context.

[23] Humbach-Ichaporia, *Zamya^d Yasht*, p. 109

[24] The English translation mainly follows that by A. G. and E. Warner).

[25] *Iam%o*, carrying a sword and a spear and having a falcon sitting on his hand is depicted on the reverse side of a coin issued by the Kusha^na king Huvi%ka. The coin is published by Robert Göbl, *System und Chronologie der Münzprägung des Ku%a^nreiches* (Wien 1984), p. 41, pl. 127 and pl. 171. A copy with a most useful drawing has been made easily accessible by Frantz Grenet, 'Notes sur le Pantheon Iranien des Kouchans' in: *Studia Iranica* 13 (1984) pp. 253-258. The inscription reads *Iam%o* which is an abbreviation of *Iam%‹e^d›o* rather than of **Iam‹o› ‹%›ao*, comparing Kafirian *Imra^* as Grenet wants. See also Gherardo Gnoli, 'On Kushan and Avestan Yima', in: L. De Meyer et E. Haerinck (edd.): *Archaeologica Iranica and Orientalia, Miscellanea in Honorem Louis Vanden Berghe* (Gent 1989), pp. 919-923.

3. Yima and the slaughtering of animals

In the first line of the Ga^tha^ stanza Y32,8, Zarathushtra blames Yima for having committed one of the many crimes which are characteristic of the deceitful:

ae^%@m ae^na°h@m v>uua°hu%o^ sra^uu> yimasc>²
'particularly (or: even) Yima son of Vivahvant became notorious for one of such crimes'.

In the second line of the stanza, the prophet speaks of Yima as having caused men to eat meat in order to satisfy them:

*y&^ ma$ii&^³g cix%nu%o^ ahma^k&^³g ga^u% baga^ xμa^r&mno^*

Its first half is usually translated as:
'(Yima) who wished to satisfy men, our (people) ....'
Yet one must also consider the alternative:
'(Yima) who wished to satisfy (us), men, (and) our (cattle) ....'
which, admittedly, must count with an unexpected idea and an extreme succinctness of style both of which seem inacceptable at first glance but which are supported by the Pahlavi translation (PhlT.) and by the passage from De^nkard 9 (Dk. 9) discussed below. The Yima legend was, at any rate, well-known to the prophet's listeners.

The second half of the second line, the phrase *ga^u% baga^ xμa^r&mno^*, is enigmatic but scholars are certainly right when interpreting it as an allusion to Yima's having introduced meat-eating in paradise. This was not possible without slaughtering animals but the question is left open to discussion whether this was considered as a sin or a merit. Following the general tendency, I counted it as a sinful action in previous publications, as did Prof. Gershevitch too who, assuming a much twisted word-order, understood the line as a plea for mercy uttered by Yima at court in the dock:

*y&^ ma$ii&^³g cix%nu%o^ ahma^k&^³g ga^u% baga^ xμa^r&mno^*
'O God, the desirer to satisfy our men (is) the (top?) food constituting ox'[28].

Yet, the Zoroastrian tradition which has been disregarded too much by scholars, points to Yima's action having been more often considered as a merit than a sin. In such an interpretation, the two lines from *ae^%@m ae^na°h@m* to *ga^u% baga^ xμa^r&mno^* form a contrast, unspokenly alluding to Yima's contradictory character. Thus the line in question is rendered by PhlT. as

ke^ o^ mardo^ma^n ca^%>d amaga^n go^%t pad bazi%n xware^d
'(Yima) who taught men: "eat the meat of our (animals) according to apportionment"'
which is explained by the gloss:

a^me^zag mardo^ma^n se^nag-masa^y ba^za^-masa^y
the side-dish of men (being as much) as a lapful (or) an armful.

V6,20

V21,1 *nama^z o^ to^ ¤ke^¥ pad da^sr be baxt ¤e^ste^?¥ ¤pad se^nag masa^y ud ba^zag masa^y¥ o^ ¤o^y¥ pahlom ahlaw ¤o^y-iz¥ azla^nu^dag ahlaw*

---

[26] Sogd. *x%y]/#x%y]* 'lord' with irregular *]*, perhaps borrowed from Persian according to Ilya Gershevitch: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian* (Oxford 1954), © 269.

[27] Old Persian *Yama X%ae^ta* occurs in Elamite garb only as proper name of a living person XXXXXXX.

[28] Ilya Gershevitch, 'Yima's Beef-Plea', in: G. Gnoli and E. Lanciotti (eds.): *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dicata* (Roma 1987), pp 487-499, see pp. 490- 492.

Dk, vol. 14, p.92

MhD Bulsara, pp. 176-77

Y29,7   t&^m a^zu^to^i% ahuro^ m@}r&m ta%a² a$a^ hazao%o^
          mazdâ gauuo^i x%uu>d&mca^ huuo^ uru%ae^ibiio^ sp&³to^ sa^snaiia^
          a^n > abzo^n>g>h pad ma^nsr ohrmazd o^ o^y ta^%>da^r ke^ pad ahla^y>h
hamdo^%i%n>h ¤ku^ a^n mizd > az ma^nsr payda^g o^ o^y dahe^nd ke^ ka^r ud kirbag
kune^d/kard?¥
          ohrmazd go^spand wax%e^n>d ¤ku^-% be^ abza^ye^n>d¥ o^ xwarda^ra^n
¤ku^ pad payma^n xware^d¥ > o^y abzo^n>g ¤ohrmazd¥ a^mo^xt ¤pad se^nag-masa^y pad
ba^zag-masa^y¥

          tat mahattamatvamÕ sva^m> ma^mÕthr>yamÕ aghatÕayat pu³yena saha
samÕghatÕita^ya ¤kila tamÕ prasa^damÕ yamÕ avista^va^ksamÕbhavamÕ tasmai dadau
yena ka^ryamÕ pu³yamÕ ca krÔtamÕ asti¥
          maha^jn^a^n> gopas´u^n vika^s´ayati bhoktrÔbhyahÕ mahatta^mÔ
sus´iksÕitebhyahÕ ¤kila yaihÕ (*ye) "s>nahÕ masa^e ba^ja^eya masa^e" kriya^
japayajn^avidhe/pas´uyajn^avidhe mahatta^mÕ a^s´iksÕita^ a^ste¥

Bharucha note 127: *japayajn^a* or *pas´uyajn^a* cannot be the proper signification of the
Pahlavi *se^nag-masa^y ba^za^-masa^y,* which phrase occurs in the Da^desta^n > De^n>g as a
technical expression for 'the share taken from, the income of a property as his recompense by
an appointed manager of a deceased person's property.'

A more circumstantial treatment of the Avesta text of the Yima lines in Y32,8 is
concealed in a corrupt Pahlavi passage found in Book 9 of the De^nkard[29]. Unlike the PhlT.
which renders Av. *cix%nu%o^* 'wished to satisfy' by the erroneous etymology *ca^%>d* 'he
thought', a previous copy of the Dk. must have had the much more correct *hu%nu^dag
(hw%nwtk¢)* 'satisfied, contented' which is corrupted in our manuscripts into
hw%wt#/ANŠWTA = mardo^m 'man, mankind', a corruption which made the passage
unintelligible:

*Ud a^n > wiwangha^na^n jam / a^-% sna^ye^n>d mardom u-% %na^ye^n>d go^spand
huda^hag / e^do^n pad go^wi%n, zardux%t, ka-% guft o^ mardo^m / "a%ma^ pad go^spand
*hu%nu^dag-e^d / ku a%ma^ pad bazi%n xwe^% go^^%t xware^d *hu%nu^dag-e^d / ma^ a^z
ra^y ud ma^ ari%k ra^y apayma^n go^%t xware^d / pad bazi%n go^%t sagr bawi%n"*

'Jam, son of Vivanghan satisfied mankind and satisfied the beneficent cattle, / O
Zardux%t, when he adressed men with the following speech: / "be satisfied with your cattle; /
i.e. eat your own meat according to apportionment (= in the quantity apportioned to you), /
and be satisfied (therewith); / do not eat meat immodestly out of greed or out of envy; / with
the meat apportioned (to you) you must be satiated."

It is evident that the Ga^tha^ line was understood by the Pahlavi scholars as an
admonition by Yima to be moderate in consuming meat in order to 'satisfy' their lifestock
(i.e. to save it), and making ample use of the side-dishes instead. The same idea can be hidden
in the enigmatic *ga^u% baga^ xµa^r&mno^* if one takes it as a direct speech expressing a
statement made, or a decree issued by Yima.[30]

Phl. *go^%t* suggests rendering Av. *ga^u%* as 'meat'. If Phl. *pad bazi%n* 'by
apportionment' is correct, OAv. *baga^* does not mean 'god' but must be from the same stem
as YAv. *ba[a^* 'portion'. If Phl. *xware^d* 'eat' is, at least, appropriately correct, the attribution

---

[29] De^nkard 9,31,12, Sanjana Vol. 17, text, p. 102, line 12ff.; Madan p. 838 line 2ff.);

[30] In Sanskrit, but not in the Avesta, the direct speech would be concluded with the ptcl. *iti.*

of *xμa^r&mno^* to the root *xμar* 'to eat, take' is inevitable but the current analysis of the word as a participle of a pres. *xμa^ra-* must be abandoned. *xμa^r&mno^* rather is gen.sg. of a masc. noun *xμa^r&man- (xμa^raman-),* derived from Proto Iranian *xμa^ra-* 'meal' (cf. Oss. *xor, xwar* 'bread'[31]) in the same way as *airiiaman-* 'clan' and Oss. *limän* 'guest' are derived from *airiia-* 'Aryan', and also Greek *daitymo^n* m. 'participant in a meal' from *daitys* 'meal'.[32]

On this base the following renderings of the line *y&^ ma$ii&^³g cix%nu%o^ ahma^k&^³g ga^u% baga^ xμa^r&mno^* are possible:

First half *y&^ ma$ii&^³g cix%nu%o^ ahma^k&^³g,* two alternatives:

1. '(Yima) who wished to satisfy men, our (people), (by issuing the decree)', or:

2. '(Yima) who wished to satisfy (us), men, (and) our (animals), (by issuing the decree)':

Second half *ga^u% baga^ xμa^r&mno^,* three alternatives:^

1. "meat is a <u>share due to </u>the company-at-meal";

2. "meat is a <u>share due to </u>the participant-in-a-meal";

3. "meat is an <u>(integral) part</u> of a (complete) meal".

These three alternatives do not differ in principle. The third of them appears to be disproved by the masc. gender of *xμa^raman-* '(complete) meal' but it is strongly supported by the Pahlavi tradition (PhlT. and Dk.)

In PhlRiv31b1-3 Yima is even described as trying to prevent men from slaughtering the animal:

zardux%t e^n-iz purs>d az ohrmazd / ku^ jam pad ge^ha^n ne^k>h ce^ weh kard / ohrmazd guft ku^ a^n > ka de^wa^n be o^ mardo^ma^n guft ku^ go^spand be^ o^zane^d / ... mardo^ma^n guft ku^ / fOD [33] *pad dastwar>h > jam be kune^m / u-%a^n kard / ud jam pad ne^ o^zadan > mardo^ma^n go^spand / ... aba^g de^wa^n e^do^n pa^hika^rd / fZY-%* [34] *de^w‹a^n› be e^raxt he^nd / u-% margo^mand ud pa^difra^ho^mand kard he^nd*

'Zardux%t asked this also of Ohrmazd: / What did Jam do best of the world? / Ohrmazd said: / That which was when the demons said to men: / "Kill the beneficent animal ...." / 'Men replied: "Let us act without the permission of Jam", / and they did, / and so Jam battled with the demons for men not to kill the beneficent animal so that the demon(s) were condemned by him and (men) were made by him mortal and punishable'[35].

It is only in the gloss to the Pahlavi translation of Yasna 9,1 where eating meat is described as a crime with desastrous consequences:

Y9,1PhlT. *Ha^d, a^-% tan pad fra^ro^n>h amarg kard e^ste^d / ud ne^ e^do^n ciyo^n awe%a^n ke^ go^%t > jam ju^d / u-%a^n andar tan marg kard e^ste^d*

'the body of (Ho^m) was made immortal on account of his honesty, / and not (treated) in the way of those who devoured the meat of Yima[36] / so that death was produced in their bodies'[37]

---

[31] Ilya Gershevitch, loc.cit. in note 9.

[32] The gen.sg.m. *xμa^r&mno^* is formed from *x μa^r&man-* is formed like the gen.sg. *airiiam(a)nas-ca* from *airiiaman-*(vs. the gen.sg.n. *ca%m&^³g* from *ca%man-*).

[33] *OD = ta^* ~is read **LA = ne^* ~by Williams.

[34] *ZY-% = >-%* ~is read **AYK-% = ~ku^-%* ~by Williams.

[35] Williams: 'that is, he fought the demons / and they were made mortal and punishable', perhaps by mistake.

[36] The idea of cannibalism is disproved by the use of *go^%t* 'meat' which cannot refer to Yima's dead body.

[37] The translation 'so that (lit. and) in them the bodies were made immortal' (thus after Bartholomae's German in *Altir.Wb.* 1866f.), is grammatically correct but it makes no sense, neither in its details (they were made immortal *in* their bodies) nor as a whole (the *devourers* of meat were made immortal). Something must be wrong here. That was already seen by the famous medieval Parsi scholar Neriosangh who completely refashiond the

This version of the legend expressedly blames Yima for having taught people to slaughter animals, thus giving way to death and destruction the logical consequence of which was the loss of paradise and immortality. [38] Yet the classical sin committed by Yima is his lie.

Logically the men of paradise should have become mortal at the very moment of Yima's downfall but there must have been another version according to which men lost immortality by eating pieces of Yima's flesh ¤offered them by Spityura¥. This version is seems to be alluded to by the Pahlavi gloss to Yasna 9,1: *ha^d, a^-% tan pad fra^ro^n>h amarg kard e^ste^d / ud ne^ e^do^n ciyo^n awe%a^n ke^ go^%t > Jam ju^d / u-%a^n andar tan ‹m›arg*[39] *kard e^ste^d* is does not seem to be the only version of the loss of immortalityere the Yima myth

4. The paradisiacal nourishment

Paradisiacal nourishment is promised to the pious worshipper of the Frauua$is in Yt13,50 *ya² he^ a°ha² xµairii@n ‹xµar&}&m›* [40] *ajiiamn&m yauuae^ca yauuae^ta^tae^ca* 'so that undiminishing nourishment will be available for him for ever'. In Yt15,16 and Y9,4 it is explicitely Yima's paradise in which men are said to enjoy that kind of nourishment:

In Yt15,16 Yima requests Vaiiu: *ya² bauua^ni xµar&na°µhast&m‹o^› za^tan@m / huuar&dar&s‹o^›* [41] *ma$iia^n@m / ya² k&r&nauua^ni ma^uuo^iia x%a}ra^]a / amar&§a³ta pasu v>ra / a°h&^u%&mne a^pa uruuaire / xµairii@n xµar&}&m ajiiamn&m* 'that I may become the most glorious of beings, / the sunlike one among men, / that I may make cattle and men to be imperishable (immortal) under my rule, / waters and plants not to dry up, / undiminishing nourishment to be available for consumption'.

In Y9,4 Yima's request has been heard: *yo^ yimo^ x%ae^to^ huu@}{o^ / xµar&na°µhast&mo^ za^tan@m / huuar&.dar&so^ ma$iia^n@m / ya² k&r&nao² ai°˘he x%a}ra^]a / amar‹§›a³ta pasu v>ra / a°hao%&mne a^pa uruuaire / xµairii@n xµar&}&m ajiiamn&m* 'majestic Yima of good herds, / the most glorious of beings, / the sunlike among

---

gloss in question in his Sanskrit version of the Pahlavi [37]. By the use of the verb *ju^dan* 'to devour', the "Dae^vic" equivalent of the "Ahurian" *xwardan* 'to eat', the consumption of Yima's meat is qualified as sinful which contradicts the idea that men became immortal by having partaken of the meat offered them by Yima.

The solution of the problem is very simple. The transmitted repetition *amarg kard e^ste^d... amarg kard e^ste^d* 'was made immortal ... was made immortal' is corrupted by perseveration from *amarg kard e^ste^d ... *marg kard e^ste^d* 'was made immortal... death was produced'. The corruption has completely distorted the meaning of the gloss.

[38] Firdausi places the beginning of slaughtering animals in the era of Zohak to whom Iblis/Ahriman served as his cook, but strangely enough this particular subject is inserted in the chapter on Jam%>d.

4.149-153 *kil>d-> xwari%-xa^ne-y> pa^d%a^h / bed-u^ da^d dastu^r-e farma^n-rawa^^ / fara^wa^n ne bu^d a^n zama^n parwari% / ke kihtar bad ku%tan>ha^ xwari% / juz az rustan>ha^ na-xwurdand c>z / zohr juz zam>n sar bar a^ward n>z / juz az rustan>ha^ na-xwurdand c>z / zohr juz zam>n sar bar a^ward n>z / pas a^harman > badkuni% ra^y kard / be dil ku%tan ja^nwar ja^y kard / zahrgu^ne az murgh u-z caa^rpa^y / xwure% kard wa yakyak bia^ward be ja^y*

'the monarch's faithful minister gave to Iblis the royal kitchen's key ./ Foods then were few, / men did not kill to eat / but lived on vegetals of all earth's produce / So evil-doing Ahriman designed / to slaughter animals for food, / and served both bird and beasts.'

[39] ‹m›arg corrected from mss. *amarg,* which is due to thoughtless perseveration ogt the preceding *amarg.* See Humbach-Ichaporia, *Zamya^d Yasht,* p. 108, where, however, we followed Bartholomae's intwerpretation of the passage as referring to given by Bartholomae, Altitranisches Wörterbuch , col. 1866 f.

[40] *xµar&}&m* is transmitted in numerous manuscripts but it is left out in ms. F1 etc. for which reason it has not been put in the text by Geldner.

[41] *xµar&na°µhast&m‹o^› ... huuar&dar&s‹o^›,* mss. *xµar&na°µhast&m&m ... huuar&dar&s&m.*

the mortals, / who made cattle and men to be imperishable (immortal) under his rule, / waters and plants not to dry up, / undiminishing nourishment to be available for consumption.

In the three passages quoted the singular *xμar&}&m ajiiamn&m* 'undiminishing nourishment' is used but, as contrasted therewith, a corresponding passage of the Zamya^d Ya%t shows the dual *uiie xμar&}e ajiiamne* 'both kinds of undiminishing nourishment': Yt19,32 *ye° ̉he x%a}ra^]a xμairii‹e a^›st‹&m›* [42] / *uiie xμar&}e ajiiamne / amar&§a³ta pasu v>ra / a°hao%&mne a^pa uruuaire* 'under whose rule both kinds of undiminishing nourishment were available for consumption, cattle and men were imperishable(immortal), waters and plants did not dry up.'

There can be no doubt <u>that</u> these two kinds of nourishment are *hauruuata^t* 'bodily integrity' (Phl. *xorda^d*) and *am&r&tata^t* 'immortality' (Phl. *amurda^d*) both of which are mentioned as heavenly nourishments (*xμar&}a-*) as early as in the Ga^tha^s. Metaphors of this type are inherited. Everybody will remember Sanskrit *amrÔta* 'heavenly nourishment', and Middle Persian *ano^%* 'elixir, antidote' (from Av. *anao%a-* 'immortal'), but even closer related is the Greek couple *nektar* and *ambrosia* of which *nektar*, 'overcoming death', denotes the drink, *ambrosia*, 'immortality', the food of the immortal gods.

In the Zarathushtrian Yasna ritual *hauruuata^t* and *am&r&tata^t* metaphorically denote the liquid and the solid vegetal parts of the offering. The couple is enlarged by *ga^u% hudâ* 'the beneficent ox/cow' e.g. in Y3,1 *xμar&}&m miiazd&m a^iiese ye%ti hauruuata am&r&ta^ta ga^u% hudâ* . In the present-day ritual of the Parsis, *ga^u% hudâ* consists of butter but originally it consisted of fresh meat. That means that, in terms of the Yima legend, the meat offering was introduced by Yima which certainly was considered as one of his merits.

> *a² ta^ mainiiu^ paouruiie^ ya^ y&^ma^ xμaf&na^ asruua^t&m*
> *manahica^ vacahica^ §iiao}ano^i h> vahiio^ ak&mca^*

these are the two spirits (existing) in the beginning, twins who have been heard of as the two dreams, the two thoughts and the two words; the two actions they are, the better and the evil one[43]

From Yasna 32,7 we learn

An allusion to the nature of Yima's sin is found in the famous Ga^tha^ stanza Yasna 45,1 in which Yima's sin is alluded to more plainly. The stanza-ends:

> *no^i² daibit>m du%.sasti% ahu^m m&r@%iia^²*
> *aka^ varana^ dr&guuâ hizμuua^ a^uu&r&to*

may the deceitful blasphemer not destroy the world for a second time
by his evil choice, with his tongue, through preference being given to him'

Previous translators erroneously took together *daibit>m ... ahu^m* as 'second life', taking this as a term of Zarathushtrian eschatology unattested elsewhere, but the passage rather

---

[42] *xμairii‹e a^›st‹&m›,* Geldner with F1 etc. *xμairiia³tu astu.*

[43] Cf. also MP. *joma^y* 'twin' from **yama-a^vya-* 'twin-egg'.

speaks of this life or world, with reference to Yima, the 'blasphemer' par excellence, who destroyed the world for the first time.[44]

5. The Avesta fragments in V2,5PhlT and V2,19PhlT

Two fragments are taken from the lost Avesta original of the passage of De^nkard Book 9 which describes the public discussion with men and dae^uuas, arranged by Yima in order to annihilate the bad influence of the latter. According to the De^nkard, Yima put questions to the dae^uuas such as 'who has created the world, who will destroy it', and by means of his religious declarations he overcame their deceit and restored mankind to immortal existence.[45]

V2,5 frgm. 1. *ud e^n ku^ weh-de^n bu^d az a^n gya^g payda^g: "mru^i]i ta² m@}{&m ae^mci² yo^ dae^uu‹o^›,[46]"* 'that (Yima) was of good religion is evident from the Avesta passage "voice that thought/idea, you there, you dae^uua".'[47]

V2,19 frgm. 2. *xwada^y e^n da^m se^ haza^r sa^l me^no^y e^sti%n da^%t, / se^ haza^r ge^t>y e^sti%n apadya^rag, / ud se^ haza^r sa^l padya^rag da^m madan ta^ de^n madan, / se^ haza^r sa^l az de^n madan ta^ tan > pase^n / az a^n gya^g payda^g: "cuua³t&m zruua^n&m mainiiaua sti% a$aoni da^ta as?"* 'for 3000 years God kept this creation existing in the spiritual state, / 3000 years existing in the material state without adversary; / then the counter-creation should come for 3000 years till the coming of the Religion, / 3000 (will pass) from the coming of the Religion till the final body, / as is evident from the following (Avesta) passage: "For how long time the truthful existence was fixed?"'

Two fragments deal with the loss of paradise owing to Yima's lie:

V2,5 frgm. 4 *jam ud kayus har do^ axwa^n da^d e^sta^d he^nd; wina^hga^r>h > xwe^% ra^y o^%o^mand bu^d he^nd; jam ra^y az a^n gya^g payda^g: "m‹o›%u[48] ta² paiti ak&r&nao² ao%a°µha² huua hizuua"; kayus ra^y az a^n gya^g payda^g: "ahmi dim paiti fra°h&r&za² ahmi ho^ bauua² ao%a°µhâ"*

'Jam and Kayus (Kauui Usan) had been given both lives (i.e. material life and spiritual life). By their own sinfulness they became mortal; as for Jam this is evident from the (Avesta) passage "with his own tongue (Yima) made it (paradise) mortal again immediately"; as for Kayus it is evident from the Avesta passage: "In that moment (Ohrmazd) released him again, in that moment he became mortal"[49].'

V2,5 frgm. 3. *e^n ku^-% dax%ag a^n ‹>› mardo^hma^n andar tan kard e^^sta^d az a^n gya^g payda^g: "abar&%nauua pascae^ta asa^ra ma$iia^kae^ibiio^"* 'that (Yima) produced a sign in the bodies of men is evident from the Avesta passage "thereafter (= after Yima's fall) men, (being) without back and without head".' This fragment recalls Y9,1PhlT. *u-%a^n andar tan marg kard e^ste^d* 'so that death was produced in their bodies'.

Yima's violent death is mentioned in V2,19 frgm.1 *u-%a^n haza^rag sar be^ kirre^n>d az a^n gya^g payda^g: "paoiriiehe pascae^ta haza°ro^.z‹i›mahe }{ar&so^ fas yimo^ k&r&nao²"*

---

[44] The noun *du%.sasti%* 'blasphemer' also occurs in Yasna 32,9 which immediately follows the explicit mentioning of Yima's sinfulness in 32,8.

[45] De^nkard III 227, 6-9 (Sanjana vol. VI, p. 280, trsl. p. 368; Madan vol. I, p. 193; J. de Menasce, *Le troisie`me livre du De^nkart* (Paris 1973) p. 239 f. (nr. 227).

[46] *dae^uu‹o^›*, ed. *dae^uua*.

[47] supposing that *ae^m* 'iste' is used contemptuously to address a person.

[48] *m‹o›%u*, ed. *mu%u*.

[49] As for the legend of Kauui Usan see Darmesteter, *Avesta,* vol. 3, pp. 37-39.

'and that he was dissected by them at the end of the first millenium, is evident from the following (Avesta) passage: "thereafter the end of the first millenium arrived[50], Yima ....[51]". According to the Avesta Yima was dissected by Spitiiura, see Yt19,46 *az<imca daha^k&m spitiiur&mca yimo^.k&r&³t&m*.

V2,5 frgm. 2 is a quotation from the Frauuard>n Ya%t (Yt13,130) according to which Yima, the sinner, enjoys eternal life: *e^n ku^ ahlaw bu^d az-a^n gya^g payda^g: "yimahe v>uua°hanahe a$aono^ frauua$>m yazamaide ¤su^rahe pouru.v@}{ahe¥"* jam > *w>wa°hana^n ahlaw frawahr yaze^m* 'that he was truthful is evident from the following (Avesta) passage "we worship the Frauua$i of truthful Yima, the son of Viuuahuua³t"'.

The discrepancy between the sin and the merits ascribed to Yima is resolved in a scholastic way by the tale of Yima's confession and the forgiveness granted him by God as found in PhlRiv31 extracts of which have already been quoted above:

PhlRiv31c8 *ka jam pad e^n e^we^nag guft bu^d a^-% pet>t>g>h ud abax%>h be (o^) mar a^mad ud ohrmazd ud amahraspanda^n ud aba^r>g yazada^n be a^murz>d ud az aba^xtar ne^mag be o^ hame^staga^n>h uds xwada^y>h > hame^staga^n mad* 'when Jam had spoken in this manner, then confession and contrition came into his account, and he was forgiven by Ohrmazd, and the Amahraspands, and the other Yazats, and he came from the northern direction (= Hell) to the state of Limbo and to the lordship of Limbo.'

6. Yima on a Kusha^na coin

Two short Sogdian fragments referring to Yima, originating from the Manichaean Book of the Giants, were published by W. B. Henning and recently discussed in a larger context by P. O. Skjærvø[52]. One of them runs *mzyx #x%#wn ... wm#t* ~'great kingship ... was', *‹p›us#k parw sarw w#st* ~'he placed the diadem on his head'; the other one runs *prywnd jmnw ymyh̲ prw #fcmbd wm#t* ~'at that time Yama was on the world' which, as Henning says, "appears to describe the election of Yama to the sovereignty over the world".

Of greater interest in the present context is a gold coin issued by the Kusha^na king Huvi%ka (mid-second cent. C.E.).[53] On its reverse, a male person in royal habit is depicted, wearing a diademe with knotted bands. The pictorial representation is accompanied by the inscription *iam%o* which certainly is an abbreviation of *iam%‹e^d›o*, the Bactrian form of the name of Jam%e^d.[54] Iam%o is distinguished by three symbols of royalty, a spear with a flag, a sword with decorated hilt, and a falcon sitting on his right hand. By his sword *Iam%o* is obviously characterized as a great warrior, by the falcon as a great hunter, perhaps the inventor of huntsmanship, whereas the spear applies to both.

---

[50] 'arrived', lit. 'was', if *as* is incorrect for *a^s*.

[51] *k&r&nao²* 'he produced, constructed' is misunderstood by PhlT. as *kirre^n>d* 'was dissected', or perhaps inversely?

[52] Walter B. Henning, 'The Book of the Giants' in *BSOAS* XI,1 (1943/1946), pp. 52-74. P. Oktor Skjærvø, 'Iranian Epic and the Manichean Book of the Giants. Irano-Manichaica III' in *Zsigmond Telegdi Memorial Volume = Act.Or.Hung.* 48 (1995) pp. 186-223.

[53] The coin has been published by Robert Göbl, *System und Chronologie der Münzprägung des Ku%a^nreiches* (Wien 1984), p. 41, pl. 127 and pl. 171. A copy with a most useful facsimile has been made easily accessible by Frantz Grenet, 'Notes sur le Pantheon Iranien des Kouchans' in: *Studia Iranica* 13 (1984) pp. 253-258.

[54] I do not follow Grenet who takes *Iam%o* as an abbreviation of *Iam‹o› ‹%›ao*, comparing Kafirian *Imra^* as Grenet wants. See also Gherardo Gnoli, 'On Kushan and Avestan Yima', in: L. De Meyer et E. Haerinck (edd.): *Archaeologica Iranica and Orientalia, Miscellanea in Honorem Louis Vanden Berghe* (Gent 1989), pp. 919-923. Note also the frequent Kusha^na coin inscription *nana %ao* which shows no tendency to abbreviation, excepting perhaps corrupted inscriptions.

Unfortunately, the Iam%o of the Kusha^na coin neither carries an ox-goad *(su{ra^)* nor a horse-whip *(a%tra^)*, the two symbols of royalty with which Yima was invested by Ahura Mazda according Vide^vda^d 2,6.[55] The other way round, nothing is mentioned in the Zoroastrian tradition of Yima's huntsmanship suggested by the coin unless we take it as the pictorial representation of the introducton of meat eating by Yima.

The appearance of Jam%e^d on the reverse of a Kusha^na coin, i.e., at a place which is traditionally reserved for divinities, has amazed scholars but it is perhaps explainable by assuming that the primeval king was understood as an immortalized human being, as a demigod such as the Greek Herakles, who never had suffered the downfall suffered by Yima and described in the sources quoted above.[56]

---

[55] Av. *a%tra^-* clearly means 'whip', particularly 'horse-whip', but Av. *su{ra^-* which, unlike the *a%tra^-*, is of solid gold is much more problematic. Many different explanations of the word have been offered. The PhlT. renders it as *su^rago^mand* 'holed' (perhaps understood as 'making holes'), deriving the word from Phl. *su^rag* 'hole'. This is a horrible etymology which, however, seems to preserve some truth: H. W. Bailey's rendering of *su{ra^-* as 'ox-goad' (in: *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books,* Oxford 1943, pp. 219-222) is justified by comparing Shughni *su^rv   subra* 'tick infesting cattle' (G. Morgenstierne, *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group,* Wiesbaden 1971, p 75.

[56] As for the falcon, Grenet compares Yasht 19,35 where the Xvar&nah, the Royal Glory, is described as leaving Yima in the shape of a falcon. Yet, that would mean that Iam%o who is virtually ranked as a divine hero here, would be depicted on the coin at the very moment of his downfall which is hardly believable.