

Textual performative variation in the Long Liturgy: the ceremonies of the last ten days of the year

Alberto Cantera
Freie Universität Berlin

Recent years have witnessed a profound change in our understanding of the Avestan texts. Extant Avestan texts are no longer considered as fragments of the Great Avesta that were preserved because of a secondary usage in Zoroastrian rituals, but instead as the texts recited in the complex Zoroastrian ritual system, and originally composed for this purpose.¹ However, past editions of the Avestan texts (including the most recent ones²) have not considered the ritual nature of these texts, and may have actually concealed it. The exegetical manuscripts have been the main source for establishing the texts, although these manuscripts are old secondary editions of the ritual texts presented in a way that as far as possible avoids redundancies and variation.³

1- For a summary of this change, see Cantera (2016) with further references.

2- The only exceptions are two works of a completely different nature: Jean Kellens' *Études aveistiques et mazdéennes*, and Ramiyar Karanjia's edition of the *Srōš Drōn* (Karanjia 2010). For an overview of other editions on the topic discussed here, which follow exactly the same pattern as Geldner's edition, s. Hintze (2014).

3- The degree of adaptation and simplification differs from one ceremony to another. Whereas the Yasna is reproduced in one specific variant, the Yasna ī Nōg-nāwar has minor differences between the liturgical and exegetical manuscripts; the Visperad ceremonies are, by contrast, presented in a very simplified way.

I have now launched at the Institute for Iranian Studies of the FU Berlin a project (*Corpus Avesticum Berolinense*⁴) that intends to re-edit all the Avestan texts. The main guidelines for this new edition have been presented in Cantera (2014). The aim is to present the Zoroastrian rituals as they are described in the liturgical manuscripts, with the latter ones (and not the exegetical ones) providing the basis of our text. Accordingly, the texts will be presented in their ritual arrangement, considering all the possible variations mentioned in the manuscripts, and also addressing the performative information available in them.

Moreover, we intend to represent the rituals in a historically coherent form. Despite the well-established antiquity of at least some of the most important ceremonies (Kellens 2012 ; Cantera 2014: 187 ff.) and the continued celebration of the ritual into modern times, a certain degree of variation is unavoidable; hence the need to choose a historical time and a concrete place as the framework for the edition. In my view, the Safavid dynasty in the region of Yazd-Kerman is the oldest period of time in which enough liturgical manuscripts are available for revealing the complexity of the Zoroastrian rituals. This is therefore our edition's chronological and geographical setting. A comparison with the only extant liturgical manuscript from the 13th century shows that the changes over the past centuries are minimal, apart from the abandoning of certain ceremonies.⁵ By contrast, the Nêrangeštân reveals some major differences regarding the Sassanian performances (e.g., the end of the animal sacrifice), despite the undeniable continuity shown by the detailed descriptions of the single major ceremonies in chapters 28 to 33.

This paper dedicated to the memory of Prof. Hans-Peter Schmidt continues a series of works (Cantera 2015, 2016) in which I try to analyse the text blocks of the rituals in Avestan language that change in function of their respective performative context. In fact, the information encapsulated in these minimal variations is essential to understand the internal structure of the rituals and provides the oldest first-hand data about their actual performance. Since the final arrangement of these rituals likely took place in the Achaemenid time and in Western Iran (as I am arguing somewhere else), this apparently uninteresting texts are fundamental data that should be incorporated to any history of the Achaemenid religious activity.

1. Definition of core and performative variation

One of the major issues of the new edition is the representation of the variation. There is variation between different ceremonies, rituals celebrated as part of different ceremonies, and even within the same rituals or ceremonies depending on the celebration's context, addressee, or goal. I classify the range of possibilities by distinguishing two fundamental types of variation, namely, core and performative. Performative variation depends not on the type of ceremony to be celebrated but on its performative context. By contrast, core variation is independent from the performative context. Core variations are textual differences between ceremonies that can be held within the same performative context (at the same time, in the same place, for the same addressee, etc.). Thus, as we shall see, during the five Gâhân-days different ceremonies can be celebrated at the same time of day and with similar functions. The differences between the three possible celebrations are what I call "core variation", and it reflects three different ceremonies: a Drôn Yašt, a Yasna, and a Visperad.

At the same time, the performance of these ceremonies during the Gâhân-days reveals certain differences

4- <http://ada.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/cab/>

5- This seems to be the case for Dô-Hômâšt, whose differences regarding the Visperad are still described in ms. 2000 (K7b), but never mentioned again.

regarding the celebration of the same ceremonies on other days: this is what I call performative variation. Performative variation involves textual differences between the performance of one and the same ceremony within different performative contexts (at different times, in different places, with different goals, or for different gods). The standard editions of the Avestan texts to some extent represent “core variation”, but not at all “performative variation”.

2. Performative variation: announcement and classification

The main options concerning performative variation in a specific performance are announced at the very beginning of the ceremony through the Frauuarāne.⁶ The latter consists of a short fixed part (*frauuarāne mazdaiiasnō zaraθuštriš vīdaēuuō ahura.ϑ kaēšō*) followed by the announcement of the performance’s main options:

1. The one of the five parts of the day in which the ceremony is held.
2. The presence or absence of the *raβθqm*-section⁷ that conditions whether or not all *ratu*- of time are recited in the litanies (s. below).
3. The *šnūman* or dedicatory indicating the addressee(s) of the ceremony.
4. The *wāž gīrišnīh*, which is different depending on the number and category of officiating priests.

The aspects of the performative variation that are not announced in the Frauuarāne are the date and certain paragraphs that mention ritual tools and objects, and therefore depend heavily on the ritual context.

The type of information encoded in performative variation is multifarious and fulfils different functions. Depending on the contents of the information provided, I divide the performative variation into three different groups:

1. Classificatory variation
2. Context-determined variation
3. Specifying variation

6- The function of the Frauuarāne as an announcement of the moveable parts at the beginning of the ceremony is clear, and confirmed by an analysis of the use of the Frauuarāne in the Drōn Yašt. This is the only ceremony that does not start with the Frauuarāne. It follows instead the āiiese yešti- section. Since the dedicatory has already been announced in DrYt1.10, it is not included again in the Frauuarāne, so the latter is comparable to the internal Frauuarānes of the Long Liturgy. For the structure, parts and function of the Frauuarāne, s. Cantera (2015)

7- The complete text is *raβθqm aiiaranqmca asñiiianqmca māhiianqmca yāiriianqmca sarədanqmca yōi hənti ašahe ratauuō yasnāica vahmāica xšnaōθrāica frasaštaiiaēca*

The different types of performative textual variation are summarized in this table:

classificatory	<i>raθβqm</i>	+ : LL (but YR)	
		- : minor (+ AG)	
	<i>wāž gīrišnīh</i>	<i>zaōtā</i> : minor	
		<i>yō zaōtā</i> : Dron i Nog-nāwar + YR	
		<i>zaōtā ... yō zaotā</i> : Yasna	
<i>yō zaōta ... yō</i> <i>ātrauuaxšō</i> : Vr etc			
context-determined	time	<i>asnīia- ratu</i>	list of the <i>asnīia- ratu-</i> (LL)
			genitive : <i>yōi hānti ašahe ratauuō hāuuanoiš raθβō</i> (Y3 & before <i>šnūman</i>)
	acc.: <i>hāuuanīm paiti ratūm</i> : end of <i>yazamaide</i> and <i>ahmiia zaōθre barəmanaēca...</i> <i>āiiese yešti</i> -section		
	<i>yāiriia- ratu-</i>	<i>yōi hānti ašahe ratauuō maiðiō.zarəmaiehe raθβō</i> : only LL	
		<i>šnūman raθβō bərazatō</i> : minor & LL	
	place	dedicatory fire	LL: +/- <i>āθrō. ahurahe. mazdā. puθrahe.</i> minor ceremonies: +/- <i>tauua</i>
objects	beginning of each litany section, except <i>yazamaide</i>		
specifying	<i>šnūman</i>		
	ceremonial <i>ratu-</i>		

2.1. Classificatory variation.

This kind of variation takes an interim position between “core variation” and “performative variation”, as it depends, at least partially, on the type of ceremony, and thus helps to classify the different ceremonies into major groups. However, it is at the same time closely linked to performative variation, as it also is governed by such aspects as the number of priests involved in each performance (a factor indissolubly connected with the type of ceremony) and the celebration in certain festivals. I include two elements in this category:

2.1.1. *vīspa- ratu-*

Zoroastrian rituals in the Avestan language can be divided into two categories: 1. Ceremonies celebrating the totality of the *ratu-* within a single ceremony; 2. Ceremonies celebrating a single *ratu-*. The former are the ones that merit being called *Visperad*, a designation that later became specific to a solemn celebration of the Long Liturgy. These ceremonies are characterized by a series of features:

1. The Frauuarāne includes the *raθβqm*-section after the mention of the particular *asñiia- ratu-* (Cantera 2015: 75 ff.). The Āfrīnagān ī Gāhānbār is an exception, as its Frauuarāne includes this section, but the celebration does not contain the other features of a *vīspa- ratu-* ceremony.
 2. The complete list of the *ratu-* of time is recited in the litanies (Cantera 2015: 76 ff.); if not, only the *ratu-* of the corresponding part of the day.⁸
 3. At the end of each section of the litanies there is an invocation to “all *ratu* of Order” (*vīspaēibiū ašahe ratubuiō-* in Y3.23, 4.25, 6.20, 7.23 and corresponding passages).
 4. There is also a mention of the “all greatest *ratu-*” in the *yazamaide*-section (*ratauuō vīspe mazišta* : Y6.16, 20 and corresponding passages of the litanies; see also Y71.21).
 5. The mention of the great *ratu* (*ratu- bərəzant*) appears before the šnūman together with the mention of all the types of time *ratu-* (*aiiara-, asñiia-, māhiia-, yāiriia-, sarəda-*), determined by the relative clause *yōi hañti ašahe ratauuō*⁹.
 6. They always include before the date a list that it is opened with the *dvanda ahuraēibiia miθraēibiia* and closed again by *Miθra*, as lord of the countries. In the middle are evoked: the stars, *Tištiriia* and the sun, emphasizing the connection between the time *ratu-*, *Miθra* and the astronomical calendar.
- All variants of the Long Liturgy, except the *Yasna ī Rapihwin*, belong to this group of ceremonies.

2.1.2. *wāž gīrišnih*

I have analysed the form, variation and function of the *wāž gīrišnih* in (Cantera 2106), where a classification of the different types is provided. This dialogued recitation of the Ahuna Vairiia takes different forms depending on the number and category of the priests participating in the ceremony, and this allows gathering the celebrations into different groups:

1. When only *zaōtā* is mentioned in the *wāž gīrišnih* (type 4): all minor ceremonies, with the exception of the *Drōn ī Nōg Nāwar*.
2. When only *yō zaōtā* is mentioned (type 1): *Drōn ī Nōg Nāwar*.
3. When *zaōtā* and *yō zaōtā* appear, as is the case in the *Yasna* and in the *Yasna ī Rapihwin*.
4. When *yō ātrauuaxšō* appears together with *yō zaōtā*, as is the case in the *Visperad* ceremony and more complex ceremonies from the installation of the auxiliary priest on¹⁰

However, observe that the number and function of the priests can vary not only depending on the type of ceremony is being held, but also on the performative context. Thus, the *wāž gīrišnih* of VrS32.41 reveals that the status of the auxiliary priests during the performance of the *Drōn ī Ātaxš* of a *Visperad* ceremony is different (e.g. VrS 32.41), when the *Visperad* is celebrated in a *Gāhānbār*. In the latter case, the *wāž gīrišnih* is of type 8 (*yō ātrauuaxšō... yō zaōtā*), whereas in other celebrations of the *Visperad* just the standard *wāž*

8- Recently, Jaime Martínez Porro has noticed that the *Vidēvd*-ad and *Vištāsp Yašt* ceremonies do not include the recitation of the *ratu-* of time in the two *Drōn*-ceremonies recited during their performances.

9- On the possible variations in this section see § 2.3.1.

10- The same number of *barsom*-twigs (33) also connects the ceremonies in this group.

gīrišnīh of the Yasna, type 7 (*zaōtā ... yō zaōtā*) is recited¹¹.

2.2. Context-determined variation.

The recited text is adapted to its performative context. The main adaptations concern (mostly) temporal and (rarely) local information, but the texts do sometimes reflect the ritual situation while mentioning the tools or objects used at that moment in the performance. They change, of course, depending on the type of ceremony, but also on the ritual moment within the same ceremony.

2.2.1. Time-information

One of the most frequent variable sections in each Zoroastrian ritual is the indication of the time when the ceremony is performed. Three indications are given, two of which are regular and one, exceptional. The regular ones are the part of the day or *asñūia- ratu-* and the indication of the date of the celebration (day and month). The exceptional one is the indication of the seasonal festival or *yāiriia- ratu-*¹².

2.2.1.1. The part of the day¹³ (*asñūia- ratu-*)

It is, indeed, the most frequently mentioned context-determined variation. It is always cited in the dative in the first Frauuarāne in each celebration, but in some of them it also appears in other positions, basically in the litanies of Drōn Yašt and its performances within and outside the Long Liturgy. It is always substituted in the ceremonies of intercalation through the corresponding marker, except in the first Frauuarāne. In the litanies, it might appear in dative, genitive or accusative:

1- Dative

The *asñūia- ratu-* of the performance is indicated at the start of each section in the litanies. After the indication *asñūiaēibiō ratubiō*,¹⁴ in the minor ceremonies (without the *raθβqm*-section in the Frauuarāne), only the corresponding *ratu* is mentioned in the dative with its corresponding extensions (e.g., *hāuuanē ašaōne ašahe raθβε āiiese yešti sāuuanhē vīsīāica ašaōne ašahe raθβε āiiese yešti mišrahe vouru.gaōiiaōtōiš hazayhrō.gaōšahe baēuuar.cašmanō aōxtō.nāmanō. yazatahe rāmanō x^vāstrahe*); in the others, the five *ratu-* are indicated, beginning with the time of the celebration, and then followed also by all the other *ratu-* of time.

11- This is indicated e.g. by ms. 2005 (fol.102v):

agar gāhānbār bawēd zōt yaθā [ahū] vairiō yō ātrauuxšō rāspīg [aθ]ā ratuš kardan hamrāspīg yaθā ahū vairiō yō zaōtā tā gyāg zōt aθā ratuš kardan agar šnūman dudīgar bawēd zōt yaθā ahū vairiō frā.mē mrū[te] rāspīg yaθā ahū vairiō yō zaōtā zōt aθā ratuš kardan

It is Gāhānbār, the zōt (says): *yaθā ahū vairiō yō ātrauuxšō* and the *rāspīg* makes *aθā ratuš*. The same *rāspīg* (continues): *yaθā ahū vairiō yō zaōtā* until the passage (where) the zōt makes *aθā ratuš*. If it is a different šnūman, then the zōt (says) *yaθā ahū vairiō frā.mē mrūte* and the *rāspīg* (says) *yaθā ahū vairiō yō zaōtā*, then the zōt makes *aθā ratuš*.

12- On the *asñūia- ratu-* and *yāiriia- ratu-* see (Kellens 1996: 75 ff.; Cantera 2017: 54 ff.; Panaino 2017).

13- There are five parts of the day: *ušahina-*, *hāuuan-*, *rapiθβina-*, *uzaiieirina-*, *aiβisrūθrima-*.

14- It is striking that the *asñūia- ratu-* are mentioned in plural immediately the mention of the *asñūia- ratu-* when the ceremony is celebrated. This is to be expected in the Long Liturgy, as all five *asñūia- ratu-* are recited, but not in all the other ceremonies (including the Yasna ī Rapihwin), in which only the corresponding *asñūia- ratu-* is mentioned. It should be noted that the shorter variant (Yasna ī Rapihwin, Drōn Yašt) has been mechanically extracted from the version of the Long Liturgy. However, it is too isolated for reaching definitive conclusions in this regard. I prefer not to refer to a Yasna-original for the minor variants, but from a common ritual pattern that is also applied in both the Long Liturgy and the minor ones.

2- Genitive

a. Exclusively in the Long Liturgy, a paragraph including the mention of the big *ratu* (*ratu- bərəzañt-*) and the collective designation of all types of *ratus* immediately precedes the *šnūman* and is closed by the expression *yōi həñti ašahe ratauuō* followed by *ratu-* in the genitive (e.g., *hāuuanoiš raθβō*) (see § 2.3.1). In the last ten days of the year, the *asñiia- ratu-* is substituted by the *yāiriia- ratu-* (s. below).

b. Only the *Srōš Drōn* of the Long Liturgy (but not other *Drōn Yašt* within or outside the Long Liturgy) begins with the indication of the part of the day before this ceremony's exclusive *šnūman*: *barəsmana paiti. bərəta haða. zaōθre hāuuanoiš raθβō*.

3- Accusative + *paiti ratūm*

a. The *yazamaide*-section is closed by a further mention of the corresponding part of the day, this time in the form “*x paiti ratum*”, including also the typical extensions of the *asñiia- ratu-*, but without mentioning the corresponding gods (e.g., *sāuuayhaēm višimca paiti ratūm*) (Y6.20, 59.29; similar is Y17.19). The same paragraph appears in the Long Liturgy at the end of the *ahmiia zaōθre barəsmanaēca... āiiese yešti*-section (Y2.18, 14.3).

b. Only in the celebrations of the *Gāhānbār*, the part of the day is mentioned at the end of the dedicatory to *ratu- bərəzañt*, again in the form “*x paiti ratum*”, and before the mention of the *yāiriia- ratu-* in the genitive (see § 2.3.1).

2.2.1.2. The seasonal festival (*yāiriia- ratu-*)

When a ceremony is held during the festivals of the *Gāhānbār*, the indication of the corresponding *yāiriia ratu-* appears on two occasions in the Long Liturgy and once in the minor ceremonies:

a. Common to both types of ceremonies is the mention of the *Gāhānbār* after the part of the day at the end of the dedicatory to the *ratu- bərəzañt-*, e.g., *yōi həñti ašahe ratauuō hāuuanoiš paiti ratūm maiðiō. zarəmaiehe raθβō* (see § 2.3.1).

b. Before the dedicatory, the mention of the daily *ratu* in the expression *yōi həñti ašahe ratauuō* is substituted by the mention of the *Gāhānbār* (e.g. Y1.17, 3.19, etc: *yōi həñti ašahe ratauuō maiðiō. zarəmaiehe raθβō*)¹⁵.

2.2.1.3. Date

After the part of the day, the most repeated variable is the date (day and month). It always appears after the mention of *Miθra* that follows the list of the time-*ratu-*, and before the fire in the litanies of the *Srōš Drōn*, *Hōmāšt* and *Āb-zōhr* (Y1.11, 2.11, 3.13, 4.16, 6.10, 7.13, 17.10, 22.13, 24.21, 59.10, 66.10).

2.2.2. Place-information

The only variation that concerns the place of celebration is the dedicatory to the fire that appears always in the opening *Frauarāne* and final *Āfrināmi* of the Long Liturgy. It varies depending on whether or not the ceremony is held in a Fire Temple. Its dedicatory is *āθrō ahurahe mazdā puθrahe tauua ātarš puθra ahurahe mazdā*, if the ceremony is held at the Fire temple. If not, then the initial *āθrō ahurahe mazdā puθrahe* is

15- In the intercalation ceremonies, the ceremony marker instead appears, e.g. in *Vidēvdād yōi həñti ašahe ratauuō dātahe haða. dātahe vīdaēuuahē zaraθuštrōiš raθβō*.

omitted. The latter is the usual mention of the fire in all further attestations within the Long Liturgy (e.g., Y3.13, 4.16, 6.10, 7.13 and corresponding passages). A similar variation appears in the minor ceremonies, depending on the presence or not of a fire. If a fire is present, then *tauua āθrō ahurahe mazdā puθra maṭ vīspaēibiō ātārabiō* is recited. If not, the pronoun *tauua* (or *θβqm* in accusative) is omitted. In the former case, the dedicatory to the fire is preceded by *tauua* or *θβqm*.

2.2.2. Ritual objects

The adaptation of the text to the performative ritual context could produce an almost infinite number of possible variations when it comes to mentioning the objects and offerings involved in the ritual. However, clear examples of this kind of variation are rather scarce. The most obvious ones concern the beginning of some sections of the litanies (*aiiese yešti*, *āuuāēḏaiiamahī* and *ašaiia dadqmī*). The main ritual objects and tools used in this part of the ceremony are mentioned at the beginning of each section of the litany, immediately before the list of the *ratu-* of time. The list appears in two variants: one for the *āuuāēḏaiiamahī*-section (Y4.1 and parallels) and another for the *aiiese yešti-* and *ašaiia dadqmī*-section (Y3.1, Y7.1-3 and parallels). A highly instructive comparison may be made between the elements included in the four different instances of the Drōn Yašt¹⁶: the independent celebration and the three instances during the Visperad ceremony (Srōš Drōn, Hōmāšt, Drōn ī ātaxš). The list as it appears at the beginning of the *āuuāēḏaiiamahī*-section is as follows:

Hōmāšt of the Paragrā	DrYt2.1	Y4.1	Y24.1-2	VrS33.1
<i>imq haomqasca</i>		<i>imq haomqasca</i>		
	<i>imq miiazdqasca</i>	<i>miiazdqasca</i>		<i>imq miiazdqasca</i>
<i>zaoθrāasca</i>				
<i>barəsmaca</i>		<i>barəsmaca</i>		
<i>gqmca hudāḡhəm</i>				
	<i>hauruuata. amərətāta.</i>		<i>gqm. jūuuiqm</i>	
	<i>apəmca</i>	<i>gqmca. hudāḡhəm.</i>	<i>uruuarqm. hadānaēpatqm</i>	
	<i>uruuarqmca</i>	<i>haōməmca. para. haōməmca</i>	<i>imā. zaoθrā. haomauuaitiš. gaomauuaitiš. hadānaēpatauuaitiš</i>	
	<i>aēsmaqasca. baōiḏīmca</i>		<i>apəmca. haomiiqm.</i>	<i>aēsmaqasca. baōiḏīmca</i>
<i>raθβqmca. ratufritīmca.</i>				
		<i>gāḡanqmca. sraōθrəm</i>	<i>aiiaḡhaēnaca hāuuana</i>	

16- Others could also be added, such as the Hōmāšt of the Paragrā.

The list as it appears in āiiese yešti and ašaiia dadāmi-sections is as follows:

DrYt2.1	Y3.1-31	Y22.1-3	VrS32.7
	<i>xvarəθəm miiazdəm</i>		
	<i>hauruuata aməratāta</i>		
	<i>gāuš. hudā</i>		
<i>apā uruuara</i>	<i>haoməmca para.haoməmca</i>	<i>iməm. haoməm</i>	<i>ātrəm</i>
	<i>aəsmq baōdi</i>		
	<i>haōmq</i>		
	<i>gqm jūuuiqm</i>		
	<i>huuarštā mqθrā</i>		
	<i>uruuarqm hadānaēpatqm</i>		
	<i>barəsma</i>	<i>apəmca haomiiqm.</i>	
	<i>humata hūxta huuaršta</i>	<i>asmanaca. hāuuani</i>	
		<i>aiiaṅhaēnaca. hāuuani</i>	
		<i>uruuarqm. barəsmanīm</i>	
		<i>ratufritimmarəθrəmca. varəzīmca daēnaiiā.</i>	
	<i>gāθanqmca sraōθrəm</i>		
	<i>huuarštā mqθrā</i>		
	<i>raθβqmca ratufritimca</i>		
		<i>aəsmqscā baoidimca</i>	
		<i>vīspaca vohu</i>	

A basic textual structure is obviously adapted in each instance to the specific ritual context. Nonetheless, this kind of variation has also been completely disregarded in the editions, as in the analysis of the Avestan texts, and even of the Zoroastrian rituals. However, it provides essential information for understanding the differences between differing celebrations of similar ceremonies. Furthermore, the here evidenced complexity of the relationship between text and ritual action excludes the possibility of a late adaptation of these texts for ritual usage. Their composition is intrinsically linked to ritual practice.

2.3. Specifying variation.

I distinguish two different types of specifying variation: the *šnūman* and the ceremony marker.

2.3.1. The dedicatory or *šnūman*.

Each ceremony can be held for different gods or set of gods. Their selection depends partly on the calendar day of the celebration, but also on the purpose of the ceremony. They are mentioned at the beginning and

at the end of the ceremony: in the initial Frauuarāne¹⁷ and in the final Āfrīnāmi. The situation is a bit more complex in the Long Liturgy: the first Frauuarāne always presents a Frauuarāne for the Fire, and only the second Frauuarāne the *šnūman*. The other Frauuarānes do not mention it, apart from the initial Frauuarāne of the Āb-zōhr at the end of the Long Liturgy in some variants celebrated during the last ten days of the year (s. below).

Besides framing the rituals, the *šnūman* appears as part of the litanies including the lists of the *ratu*. Each section (*āiiese yešti*, *āuuāēdaiiamahi*, *yazamaide*, *ašaiia daḍqmi*) of the Drōn Yašt (and its variants within and outside the Long liturgy) is closed by the recitation of the *šnūman*, followed in the Long Liturgy by the mention of the Frauuašis, all *ratu* and all *yazata*,¹⁸ whereas the mention of *vīspa-ratu-* in the Drōn Yašt is, as expected, omitted (DrYt.1.13-14 ≈ Y3.22-23, Y23.4, VrS32.39-40; DrYt2.16-17 ≈ Y4.24-25, Y24.33-34, VrS33.24-25; DrYt4.11-12 ≈ Y6.19-20, VrS35.31-32; DrYt5.11-12 ≈ Y7.22-23, VrS36.19-20). The same applies for the *ašaiia daḍqmi*-section of the Āb-zōhr.

The placing of the *šnūman* in the litanies is as follows:

	Drōn Yašt	Y3-8	Y22-27	VrS32-36	Āb-zōhr
<i>āiiese yešti</i> (<i>g. + xšnūmaiīe</i>)	1.9	Y3.1-22 Y3.20-21	Y.22-23-27	VrS32.33	
<i>āuuāēdaiiamahi</i> (<i>g. + xšnūmaiīe</i>)	2.17	Y4.23	Y24.28-323	VrS33.23	
<i>yazamaide</i> (<i>acc.</i>)	4.9	Y6.17-18	Y25.4-8	VrS35.29	
<i>ašaiia daḍqmi</i> (<i>g. + xšnūmaiīe</i>)	5.9	Y7.20-21		VrS36.28	Y66.17

A further peculiarity of the *šnūman* of the Long Liturgy, distinguishing it from other minor ceremonies, including litanies such as the Drōn Yašt, is the fact that only in the Long Liturgy does the *šnūman* appear always after the mention of the great *ratu* (*ratu- bərəzant*), together with the mention of all the types of time *ratu-* (*aiiara-*, *asniia-*, *māhiia-*, *yāiriia-*, *sarəḍa-*) determined by the relative clause *yōi hənti ašahe ratauuō*, the following variants (§ 2.1.1. feature 5):

1. Indication of the corresponding *ratu* of the day in the standard variant, e.g., Y3.19: *yōi hənti ašahe ratauuō hāuuānōiš raθβō*.¹⁹
2. Indication of the *daily ratu-* with the corresponding Gāhānbār in the ceremonies held during the Gāhānbār, e.g., the ceremonies held during the Gāhān-days have the following variant, as indicated in some Visperad manuscripts and in the Revāyat of Kāma Bohra among others (s. below): *yō hənti ašahe ratauuō hamaspaθmaēdaiie.he raθβō*.
3. The ceremony marker (in the case of the intercalation ceremonies), e.g., in the Widēwdād *yōi hənti ašahe ratauuō dātahe haḍa.dātahe vīdaēuuāhe zaraθuštrōiš raθβō*.

17- With the exception of the Drōn Yašt, where the first *šnūman* of the *āiiese yešti*-section appears before the first Frauuarāne.

18- The only exception is the *yazamaide*-section of the Hōmāšt after the *šnūman* of Y25.4-8.

19- The same expression appears without introducing the *šnūman* in Y1.17

The *šnūman* consists of different parts that may or may not be combined in most dedicatorys:²⁰

1. Ahura Mazdā and the Aməša (*ahurahe mazdā raēuuatō. xʷarənanjuhatō aməšanqm spəntanqm.*). It appears in almost all the dedicatorys with only a few exceptions, such as the dedicatory to Sraōša or to Miθra on the day of Miθra in the month of Miθra.
2. The gods of the corresponding daily *ratu*–: this section is mostly missing.
3. The actual god(s) of the dedicatory.
4. The *vīpaēšqm*– section: *vīspaēšqm yazatanqm ašaōnqm mainīiauuuanqm gaēθīanqm*. The version of this section in the accusative is not exactly the transposition in the accusative of the genitive version: *vīspəmca mainīiaōm yazatəm yazamaide vīspəmca gaēθīm yazatəm yazamaide* (Y25.4-8).
5. The *frauuašinqm*–section: *ašaunqm frauuašinqm uγranqm aiβiθūranqm paōiriō.ṭ kaēšanqm frauuašinqm nabānazdištanqm frauuašinqm*.

Element §3 is the centre of the dedicatory that cannot be omitted. It is very often accompanied by §1, and rarely not so (dedicatory for Srōš in the Vīdēvdād, celebration of the Mihragān, etc.). The mention of the patrons of the *ratu*– (§2) is quite rare. It appears in the dedicatory of Nōg-Nāwar, on every day Day (Day pad Ādur, Day pad Mihr, Day pad Dēn) and on the day Hōrdād of the Frawardīn-month.²¹ In most dedicatorys of Aməratāt (accompanied by their companions Fšaōnī Vaθβā, the Aspin and Gaōkərəna) the corresponding gods of the *ratu*– are also then recited. The patrons of all *ratu*s are allowed when mentioning Aməratāt in Sīrōza (S1.7; 2.7); by contrast, only *hāuuani*–, *rapiθβina*– and *uzaiieirina*– are permitted in the dedicatory of the Hamkār (Karanjia 2010: 225). The same applies to the dedicatory of the Aməša Spəntā (Karanjia 2010: 241), which is exceptionally followed by the dedicatory to the gods of the corresponding day and month.

The mention of the Frauuašis (§5) is much more frequent than the mention of the *yazata*– (§4). The latter are excluded e.g. from the celebration of the ten last days of the year, as stated in ms. 15.²² When a dedicatory is closed by § 5, a series of extensions appear at different places:

- In the *āiiese yešti*– and *ašaia dadqm*–sections, Y23.1-4 is recited at the end of the dedicatory, which of course occurs after the dedicatory of Y22, but also in the second Drōn of the Long Liturgy (VrS32.33 and VrS36.18), in the Āb-zōhr (Y67), and in the Drōn Yašt (DrYt.1.11; DrYt.5.10). This extension always follows the dedicatory to the Frauuašis when the *šnūman* ends with *aōtō.nāmānō yazatahe*, but not after *xšnaōθra yasnāica vahmāica xšnaōθrāica frasaštaiiēca*.

- After the accusative dedicatory in the *yazamaide*–section, when it is included in the series of litanies. It follows the Stōm of the Frauuašis (Y26), of course after the dedicatory of Y25.4-8, but also in the second Drōn (VrS35.30) and the Drōn Yašt (DrYt4.10-20). In fact, Y26 is simply an extended variant

20- I reproduce them in the genitive/dative version, but the same parts appear in the accusative one.

21- In this case, only from *hāuuani* to *uzaiieirina* is possible.

22- It says (ms. 15 fol. 137r): *in dah ruz har yazišn ke mikonand wisfešān (vīspaēšqm) rā nabāyad xʷandan* “During these ten days, in each ceremony they celebrate, it is permitted to recite the *vīspaēšqm*–section (of the dedicatory)”. This means that during the last ten days of the year the *frauuašis* cannot be accompanied by the *yazata* in the dedicatorys. According to Karanjia (2010: 181), this restriction is no longer applied in India.

of the accusative version of the *frauuašinqm*-section²³, when it is the object of *yazamaide*.

- During the last ten days of the year, when the *yazamaide*-section is not part of the series of litanies, as is the case in the *Āfrīnagān ī Gāhān* or in the extended opening of the *Ābzōhr* (see § 4.2), the dedicatory in the accusative is followed by the so-called *kardag yā vīsāda* (Yt13.49-52) that even mentions the 10 nights that the *Frauuaši* spend on earth during the *hamaspašmēdaiia*-festival and the ceremonies that have to be celebrated during these days (Hintze 2009: 113).

2.3.2. The ceremony markers

The mention of the *ratu*- of the day is substituted in the intercalation ceremonies by the corresponding ceremony marker (e.g., *dātāi hada.dātāi ...* for the *Vīdēvdād*) (Cantera 2013: 88). We know three ceremony markers, but only two of the three corresponding ceremonies are still attested in the manuscripts: the *Vīdēvdād* and the *Vištāsp Yašt*. The *Hādōxt* ceremony is lost. In these ceremonies, each mention of the part of the day when the ceremony is held (except in the list of the *asūia-ratu*- and in the first *Frauuarāne* of the celebration) is substituted by the ceremony marker, thus classifying these three ceremonies into a common group.

3. Performative variation in Avestan manuscripts

The manuscripts reflect the different types of variation in different ways and degrees. Core variation is quite well reproduced in the liturgical manuscripts, but not to the same degree in the exegetical ones. The former edit each type of liturgy separately, and usually in separate manuscripts. The following types of the Long Liturgy are presented independently in the manuscripts:

1. *Yasna ī Rapihwin*: it stands apart from other types of the Long Liturgy on different reasons and takes an interim position between it and the minor ceremonies. Thus, it is usually found in collective manuscripts. The oldest codex (manuscript 1 in the Vaziri Library, Yazd) contains it together with the *Frawardīn Yašt* and a *Visperad*. It also appears together with a *Visperad* manuscript by *Rōštam Guštāsp*.²⁴
2. *Yasna*²⁵
3. *Visperad*²⁶
4. *Vīdēvdād*²⁷
5. *Vištāsp Yašt*²⁸

All the ceremonies described separately in the manuscripts are also mentioned as such in the *Nērangestān*, except the *Vīdēvdād*. The opposite, however, is not true. A good number of ceremonies still mentioned in

23- Interestingly, the manuscripts marking a division before Y26 do so after *frauuašaiiō* and *staōmi* (mss. 100, 110, 120, 230, 235).

They consider *ašāunqm vajuhīš sūrā spəntā frauuašaiiō* as the final section of the preceding dedicatory. Karanjia (2010: 244) reproduces the end of the dedicatory of *Nōg-Nāwar* in the accusative as *ašāunqm vajuhīš sūrā spəntā frauuašaiiō yazamaide*, although this applies for the use of this *frauuašinqm*-section in the *Āfrīnagān*, but not in the Long liturgy or in the *Drōn Yašt*.

24- A copy is preserved in the Meherjirana Library, ms. F11 (Dhabhar 1923).

25- For a list of manuscripts s. (Hintze 2012; Cantera 2014: 404 f.).

26- For a list of manuscripts s. (Cantera 2014: 407 ff.; Martínez Porro 2014).

27- For a list of manuscripts s. (Andrés-Toledo and Cantera 2012; Cantera 2014: 409 ff.).

28- For a list of manuscripts s. (Martínez Porro 2013; Cantera 2014: 409 ff.).

the Nērangeštān are not described in the manuscripts.²⁹ Hence we may deduce that their celebration had already been abandoned before our manuscripts were produced. The Dō-Hōmāšt, for example, occupies a particular position: it is described only in the oldest known liturgical manuscript (ms. 2000 [K7b]), which contains a description of the standard Visperad, albeit mentioning the differences for the performance of a Dō-Hōmāšt ceremony.

The manuscripts are less explicit regarding the expression of the performative variation. They seem to assume that the officiating priests knew how these parts had to be adapted for each specific celebration or, more likely, the teaching of these skills was independent of the manuscripts, but an essential part of the priestly training. I shall now discuss how the manuscripts usually handle the main forms of performative variation.

3.1 Date

The manuscripts usually indicate solely the place where the day and month should be mentioned. Iranian manuscripts do so mostly in Pahlavi³⁰ or Persian. The exegetical manuscripts with a Pahlavi translation³¹ indicate by default the day of Ahura Mazdā and the month of the Frauuašis, the first day of the first month of the liturgical calendar³². However, the Sanskrit manuscripts, such as mss. 677 (S1) and 681, behave as liturgical manuscripts.

3.2. The *ratu* of the day (*asñiia-ratu-*) and of the seasonal festivals (*yāiriia-ratu-*)

In the manuscripts of the Yasna, the *ratu* of the day is always *hāuuani*, although the Yasna can be celebrated at any of the daily *ratu-*. In fact, the Yasna manuscripts always reproduce the Yasna ī Nōgnāwar (characterized mainly through the *šnūman ī nōg-nāwar*) and, according to the Nērangeštān, the first Yasna of the day, at *hāuuani*, must be the Yasna ī Nōg-nāwar, (s. N24.10): *yašt ī fradom šnūman ī xnōg-nāwar* “The first Yasna (of the day) has to be celebrated with the *šnūman* of Nōg-nāwar”. Hence, the persistence of the manuscripts on the mention of the *hāuuani-ratu-*.

In the Visperad manuscripts the indication corresponds by default to *hāuuani*, although it can be celebrated as well during other parts of the day. The manuscripts recording the variants of the Visperad ī Gāhānbār substitute the *asñiia-ratu-* through the *yairiia-ratu-* of the corresponding Gāhānbār³³ in the mention of the *ratu-* that precedes the *šnūman*. (Y3.19, 4.22, 7.19, 22.19, 24.27, VrS32.31, 33.22, 36.17, 36.27, Y66.17).

The intercalation ceremonies (Vīdēvdād and Vīštāp Yašt) mention the *ratu-* of the day only in the first Frauuarāne (Y0.1-3) and in the lists of the time *ratu*. The indication corresponds always to *ušahina-*, for this is the obligatory time for their celebration.

29- They are the following: Ēk-Hōmāšt, Hādōxt ī Ēk-hōmāšt, Dah-Hōmāšt, Dawāzdah-Hōmāšt, Bagān Yašt, and Visperad ī artōkartēn

30- It is usually just *rōz guftan* and *māh guftan* or *rōz ud māh guftan*, but sometimes we find more complex expressions: mss. 40, 2030, 2040, 2104, 2106, 4030a, 4055, 4060 *rōz ud māh ī-š andar eštēd guftan* (Y1.11).

31- The combined manuscripts combine both types of expression: the indication *rōz ud māh* of the liturgical ones and the first day of the first month like the exegetical ones.

32- A list of the names of days and months in the modern practice is provided by Karanjia (2010: 155 ff.).

33- The manuscripts usually mention *maidūō.zarəmaiehe*, but another *ratu* sometimes appears, e.g., ms. 2010 has a tendency to mention *aiiāθrimahe* (VrS33.22, 36.27). A frequent addition is *ayāb ān gāh ī bawēd* “or whatever *gāh* it is”.

Much more prone to indicate the different possible choices for the *asñiia- ratu-* are the manuscripts containing Drōn Yašt. Thus, Redard (2015: 197) mentions that in their description of the Drōn with the *šnūman ī hamkār* the mss. SP893 and R110 mention the five *asñiia- ratu-* as alternative.

3.3. The *šnūman*

The manuscripts of the Long Liturgy are quite reluctant to indicate the numerous possibilities of dedicatories. Mostly they indicate just one or two standard dedicatories (Cantera 2014: 222 f.), since it would be quite uneconomical to reproduce all possible dedicatories at each instance of the *šnūman* and even more to make a different manuscript for each variant of the Long Liturgy with a different dedicatory. By contrast, several manuscripts³⁴ of the Drōn reproduce lots of Drōn with different *šnūman* in a very abbreviated way, so that these manuscripts are basically collections of *šnūman* valid not only for the Drōn Yašt³⁵, but also for the Long Liturgy. Therefore, some Yasna manuscripts (like ms. 29) include at the end some Drōn Yašt with different dedicatories.

Usually, the Yasna manuscripts reproduce always the *šnūman ī nōg-nāwar*. They rarely mention the possibility of other dedicatories, but sometimes happens (e.g. ms. 5 in Y66.17). The Visperad manuscripts tend to indicate the Visperad of Gāhānbār or just to state that at place a *šnūman* has to be recited (*šnūman ān ī bawēd*). However, sometimes give several choices. Thus the ms. 2010 (fol. 40r & v, Yo.7) mentions the *šnūman* for the Gāhānbār, Srōš and Ardāfraward. As we have seen, in the case of the Visperad ī Gāhānbār, the concrete Gāhānbār is indicated at the end of the *yōi hānti*-formula preceding the *šnūman* (s. § 2) and again at the end of the *šnūman*. The manuscripts usually write *maidüō.zarəmaiehe*, but we find a broad variety, frequently followed by the indication *ayāb ān gāh kē bawēd*³⁶.

The manuscripts of Vidēvdād include the dedicatory either to Ahura Mazdā and the Aməša Spənta or to Sraoša (*sraošahe ašiehe taxmahe tanumqθrahe darši.draōš āhūiriiehe*)³⁷. It seems that these are the only two dedicatories that can be employed for a Vidēvdād celebration. The situation concerning the dedicatory of the Vištāsp Yašt is more complex. The oldest extant manuscripts (ms. 5010, 5020 [K4]) mention in the first Frauuarāne the dedicatory to Cistā and Daēnā (*ahurahe mazdā raēuuatō xvarənaŋuhatō aməšanqm spəntanqm razištaiiā cistaiiā mazdadātaiiā ašāōniā daēnaiiā vayhuiiā māzdaiiasnōiš*) extended with following text:

ka fradom yazēnd šnūman dēn. ašāōnqm pad abāriḡ bār har kunēnd šāyēd xšnūman wizārdan
If they celebrate the first ceremony of the day, then it is the dedicatory of Daēna with the section of the Frauuašis. At any other time, they may perform any dedicatory.

34- For example, following manuscripts listed by Redard (2015: 193), and others like G31 in the Meherjirana Library or the Indian manuscript of the collection of Farideh Motakef.

35- For the way the Drōn Yašt is abbreviated s. below.

36- We therefore find, for example, *aiiāθrimahe* (ms. 2010 in VrS33.22, 36.18, Y66.17; ms. 2007 in VrS36.28; ms. 2102 in VrS36.27), *maidüōišəmahe* (ms. 2007 in VrS33.23); *maidüāiriiehe* (ms. 2010 in VrS33.23, 2007 in VrS36.27; 2102 in VrS36.27); *maidüōišəmahe* (ms. 2007 in VrS33.23) and *paitišahiiehe* (ms. 2102 in VrS36.18). The actual dedicatory of the Visperad of the Gāhān-days with *hamaspaθmaēdaiiehe* does not appear in any manuscript, although it is mentioned by Kāma Bohra's Revāyat (s. below).

37- Note that this is none of the few dedicatories not including the mention of Ahura Mazdā and the Aməša Spənta.

In fact, at any instances of the dedicatory both manuscripts let it often open which dedicatory has to be performed. Hence we might deduce that the celebration of the Vištāsp Yašt is not limited to the celebration in the first part of the day.

Other manuscripts include a longer dedicatory to the Daēnā (mss. 5100 and 5120, the latter abbreviated):

*ahurahe mazdā raēuuatō xvarənanjuhatō aməšanqm spəntanqm
razištaiiā cistaiiā mazdadātaiiā ašaōniiā daēnaiiā vanhuiiā māzdaiiasnōiš
38mąθrahe spəntahe ašaōnō vərəziiyanhahe dātahe vīdaēuuaha dātahe zaraθuštrōiš darəγaiiā
upaiianaiiā daēnaiiā vanhuiiā māzdaiiasnōiš zarazdātōiš mąθrahe spəntahe uši.darəθram
daēnaiiā māzdaiiasnōiš vaēdīm mąθrahe spəntahe āsnahe.
xraθβō mazdadātahe gaōšō.srūtahe xraθβō mazdadātahe*

It follows a similar statement to the one we find in ms. 5010, 5020 (K4).

The ms. 5102 shows in the first Frauuarāne and in all other positions where a dedicatory is expected just the dedicatory to the Frauuaši:

*ahurahe mazdā raēuuatō xvarənanjuhatō aməšanqm spəntanqm
ašāunqm frauuašinqm uyranqm aiβiθūranqm paōiriiō.ṭkaēšanqm frauuašinqm
nabānazdištanqm frauuašinqm*

In sum, in the case of the Yasna only the dedicatory of Nōg-Nāwar appears, although there are many other possibilities. In the rest of ceremonies, the most recurrent dedicatories are mentioned in the manuscripts and often it is just indicated that a dedicatory must be recited in this passage. Some manuscripts offer several possibilities, especially in the case of the Visperad, but most of them are specific for a celebration with a specific dedicatory.

4. Synchronic variation in the Persian Revāyats: the example of the celebrations during the Gāhān-days

Since the manuscripts do not reflect performative variation (or do so very limitedly), we must look for alternative sources of information, in order to be able to describe accurately the texts recited in the performance of the rituals in Avestan language. Of great help is the Pahlavi version of the Nērangeštān. Nevertheless, it contains information that is not contemporary of the manuscripts, so that the risk of anachronical reconstructions is not insignificant. The most important source contemporary to the manuscripts are the Persian Revāyats, in which Iranian priests send information to their Indian colleagues. Many of the Revāyats were written also by the most famous scribes of Avestan liturgical manuscripts and were frequently sent with attached manuscripts, with both designed to answer the recurrent questions on ritual matters asked by the Parsees.³⁹

The Revāyats quite often include descriptions of complete rituals in the Avestan language. Nevertheless, the focus is completely different to the one in the manuscripts. Whereas the latter concentrate on core variations, and almost completely disregard performative variation, the Revāyats focus on the latter. They therefore reproduce the Avestan texts recited in the rituals in a stark, abbreviated version. The sections that

38- Si.29

39- For the relationship between the Revāyats and the manuscripts, s. Cantera (2014: 150 ff.).

are not abbreviated are mostly the passages in which there is performative variation. They give instructions on how to complete passages in which the manuscripts only provide an indication of performative variation. Thus, the Revāyats provide complementary information to the Avestan manuscripts for the celebration of the Zoroastrian rituals in the Avestan language that does not appear in the manuscripts. Accordingly, they should be taken as a fundamental tool for the edition of the Avestan texts in their performative context.

In what follows, I will be illustrating the importance of the Revāyats for extracting the relevant information for an edition that aims to describe accurately the rituals in Avestan language as they were performed at the time of the production of the manuscripts. I have chosen as exemplary case an answer to the question about the correct way to celebrate the Long Liturgy during the Gāhān-days in the Revāyat of Kāma Bohra. This is the longest of the extant individual Revāyats, and one of the most important for gathering information about the performance of rituals (Dhabhar 1925: 119 f.; Dhabhar 1932: 56 ff.).⁴⁰ Furthermore, it is closely linked to the production of manuscripts in Safavid Iran, yet at the same time older than all extant Avestan liturgical manuscripts, as it was written in 896 YE, around 100 years later than the oldest extant Iranian liturgical manuscript (except ms. 2000 [K7b]). The scribe of the Revāyat is Šahryār Erdešīr Ērac Ruštom, who wrote it with the collaboration (*hampursagīh*) of Gīw Isfandād, who died during the process. Both scribes also collaborated as well in the production of other famous manuscripts, namely, the original from which all Iranian Liturgical Vīdēvdād manuscripts derive and a copy of the Dēnkard (Cantera 2014: 110 ff.). Šahryār is also well-known as the scribe of the famous manuscript Pahlavi Vīdēvdād IM.⁴¹ The text of this Revāyat is written in New Persian in Avestan script.

Until recently, only one copy of this Revāyat was known, namely, ms. T30 in the Meherjirana Library (Dhabhar 1925: 119 f.). Nevertheless, in a recent trip to Iran I saw pictures of certain manuscripts belonging to Farideh Motakef. Among them, I have been able to identify one manuscript containing a copy of Kāma Bohra's Revāyat.⁴² To date, I have not been able to see the ms. T30 itself, but according to the description of T30 by Dhabhar, the recently discovered copy seems to include some additional texts. Martínez Porro (personal communication) ascribes this manuscript to the school of Bharuch on palaeographical and codicological grounds. Given that this school's activity seems to stop around 1720, this copy must be older.

The fifth question on this Revāyats deals with the most important celebrations of the liturgical year, the celebrations during the last five days of the year. These celebrations correspond to the *hamaspaθmaēdaiia*-festival. The Nērangestān designates (one of) the Wisperad celebrated during these days as Wisperad ī artō. kartēn (Kotwal and Kreyenbroek 2003: 79 note 217), The question runs as follows⁴³:

*qñ ki yazašni dar panji vahe yazašn gāθābiio cūn mi. bāiiat kardan barəsəm cūn bandant u xšnū.
maene cūn mi. kunant*

How should the *yazišn* be performed within the *gāθābiio*-days? How should they cut the *barsom*?
How should they perform the dedicatory?

40- Irene Fuertes is planning a complete edition of this Revāyat with a ritual commentary.

41- On this manuscript, see (Jamasp 1907: xxvi ff.; Andrés-Toledo and Cantera 2012: 235; Skjærvø 2014: 9 ff.).

42- In the meantime, the Institute for Iranian Studies of the FU Berlin has bought the collection from Farideh Motakef.

43- This text (not exactly as it was written in the Revāyat, but slightly more disordered) is also included in the collective Revāyat of Dārāb Hormazyār, and hence in Unvala's edition (Unvala 1922: 453-463). In Unvala's edition, the Persian text is in Persian characters.

The answer extends over around 26 folios. It contains the description of three ceremonies:

1. A short description of a Visperad ī Gāhānbār for the celebrations of the day of the Ahunauuaiti Gāθā with a *barsom* of 33 twigs (folio 7v.10 -11r.2).
2. A Yasna to be celebrated on the day of the Ahunauuaiti Gāθā with the dedicatory *gāθābiō* and a *barsom* of 21 twigs (folio 11r.3- 26v.13).
3. A Drōn Yašt for the same day with a *barsom* of only five twigs (26v.14-34v.9). Every day of the Gāhān-days ten Drōns must be celebrated, two in each *ratu* of the day, and a new *barsom* must be cut everyday (s. folio 32r.5-10).

The way these three ceremonies are described in this Revāyat is paradigmatic of how the Revāyats address the description of Avestan rituals. The three ceremonies are of different length, but the size of the description does not depend on the duration of the celebration, but on other criteria. Nevertheless, there is a common pattern in all the descriptions: the focus on the performative variation. The following table shows the different texts included in the description of each ceremony, indicating which kind of texts are included and the information they contain⁴⁴:

44- For the numbering system employed for the Drōn Yašt and its equivalences in the Yasna see Appendix 2.

		Visperad	Yasna	Drōn Yašt
Y0.0AhV	VAY	X		x
Y0.7	Frauar+šnū	X	X	
Y0.14-15	AV + YAV	10	3 & 4	3 & 4
Y1.1-8		abbreviated		
Vr1.1-9		abbreviated		
Y1.10-11	date (dat.) & fire	X	X	
Y2.1			abbreviated	
Y2.18	<i>paiti ratum</i>		X	
Y3.1-4			abbreviated	x
Y3.4	<i>asñiia- ratu-</i>		X	
Y3.13-14	date (dat.) & fire		X	
Y3.19	<i>yōi hanti...</i>		X	
Y3.20	<i>Šnūman</i>		abbreviated	x
Y3.24	Frauarāne		X	
Y3.25	WG		X	
Y4.1			X	
Y4.16	date (dat.) & fire		X	x
Y4.23	<i>Šnūman</i>			x
Y5.1			X	
Y6.17	<i>Šnūman</i>			x
Y7.1				abbreviated
Y7.13	date (dat.) & fire		X	x
Y7.20	<i>Šnūman</i>			x
Y9.1			abbreviated	
Y16.1			abbreviated	
Y8.3				abbreviated
Y8.4	WG			x
Y8.6				abbreviated
DrYt7.3	<i>afrīn.+ šnū</i>			x
DrYt7.4	<i>ahmāi raēsa.</i>			abbreviated
Y11.1			abbreviated	
Y16.1			X	
Y18.1			abbreviated	
Y19.1			abbreviated	
Y20.1			abbreviated	
Y21.1			abbreviated	
Y22.1		abbreviated		
Y22.13	date (dat.) & fire		X	
Y22.20			abbreviated	
Y22.23	<i>Šnūman</i>	X	X	
Y23.1-4	ext. <i>šnūman</i> 1		abbreviated	

Y24.1				
Y24.21	date (dat.) & fire		X	
Y24.28	Šnūman		X	
Y25.1-3			abbreviated	
Y25.4	Šnūman		X	
Y26	ext. šnūman 2		abbreviated	
Y26.11	WG		X	
Y27.1-9			abbreviated	
Y27.11	AV 3		X	
Y27.12	Frauar-šnū		X	
Y28.0				
Y61.1-5			abbreviated	
Y62.1	YAV		2	
Y62.11-13	Frauarāne		X	
Y66.1			X	
Y66.10	date (dat.) & fire		X	
Y66.17	Šnūman		X	
Y67.1			X	
Y67.18	ext. šnūman 1		X	
Y72.5	WG		X	
Y72.6	āfrīn.+ šnū		X	
Y72.9-10			abbreviated	

It is clear from this table that the description of the Visperad is shorter than the description of the other two ceremonies. In fact, it simply shows that the celebration is a Visperad ī Gāhānbār, and focuses on the particularities of this celebration regarding other Visperad ī Gāhānbār. The initial Frauarāne and the abbreviated text of Vr1 suffice to show the type of ceremony described here. Furthermore, it includes the date, as this is a peculiarity of all the ceremonies held during these days, where the date does not belong to a month.

The description of the other ceremonies is more complete, and clearly emphasizes the information on the performative variation: Frauarāne, šnūman, date, mentions of the corresponding *ratu* (as the usual *asīia-ratu* is frequently substituted by the *yāiriia-ratu*), and on some occasions the number of prayers to be recited (for the number of Ahuna Vairiia and Ašəm Vohu change in some performances). Furthermore, the Revāyat reproduces some abbreviated texts that serve as a guide: they indicate at which moments in the ceremony the texts containing performative variation should be recited. These texts serving as orientation points are quite often the beginning of some *hāitis*.

4.1. The Visperad ī gāhānbār⁴⁵

Although it is not explicitly mentioned in the answer of Kāma Bohra's Revāyat, the combined evidence of

45- It is a Visperad ceremony celebrated in one of the six Gāhānbārs and with the dedicatory to the "big Ratu" (*ratu- bərəzant-*), hence its designation as Visperad ī Raθβō bərəzat in the Nērangestān (N13.4).

the manuscripts and the Nērangeštān shows that two different Wisperad ceremonies can be celebrated during the Gāhān-days: 1. the Visperad ī Gāhānbār (according to its designation in the manuscripts) or Visperad ī Raθβō bərəzat (according to its designation in the Nērangeštān) specific for the *hamaspaθmaēdaiia*-festival⁴⁶; 2. a Wisperad ī artō.kartēn with the dedicatory to the Frauuaš is during the last five days of month of Spənta Ārmaiti and to the Gāθās and the Frauuaš is during the Gāhān-days. Nevertheless, Kāma Bohra's Revāyat does just describe the celebration of the first one, the specific variant of the Visperad ī Gāhānbār for the Gāhān-days. It is, indeed, defined as such in question 12 (folio 39). The fact that during the Gāhān-days the Visperad ī Gāhānbār of *hamaspaθmaēdaiia*- is celebrated is not banal, but it rather confirms that the Gāhān-days are as well considered as part of the *hamaspaθmaēdaiia*-festival that lasts thus ten days and not five like the rest of the Gāhānbār.⁴⁷

Since the ceremony described is just a specific variant of the Visperad ī Gāhānbār, the Revāyat records only the differences regarding other Visperad ī Gāhānbār: the dedicatory and the date. The dedicatory is indicated at the very beginning of the description that starts with the first Frauuarāne (Yo.7):

*raθβō bərəzatō yō ašahe raθβqm aiiaranam tā sarədanqmca raθβqm vīspe mazištanqm yō hənti
ašahe ratauuō hāuuanīm paiti ratūm hamaspaθmaēdaiie.he raθβō xšnaoθra.y.v.x.f.*

It is the standard *šnūman* of the Gāhānbār, with the mention of the corresponding Gāhānbār being variable (*hamaspaθmaēdaiia*- in this case). The manuscripts often mention the same dedicatory of the Visperad ī Gāhānbār in the descriptions of the Visperad, recording different Gāhānbār (s. § 3.3 and note 34). However, this is different to the *šnūman* recited in modern times in the celebrations of the Gāhānbār. According to Karanjia (2010: 217), the dedicatory includes just Ahura Mazdā and the Aməša Spənta. He mentions, however, a dedicatory recited by the Kadimi priests that is similar to the one described here, albeit slightly different: *raθβō bərəzatō yō ašahe raθβqm aiiaranam asūiiianqmca. māhiiianqmca. yāiriiianqmca. sarədanqmca raθβqm vīspe mazištanqm yō hənti ašahe hāuuanōiš raθβō*. It is identical to the typical mention of *ratu- bərəzant* in the standard Yasna that regularly precedes the *šnūman* (Y1.17, 3.19, etc.) (see § 2.2.1.2). The latter is surely responsible for this small changes in the performance by the Kadimi priests: most likely is simply a confusion. For the abandon of the mention of the “big Ratu” in other schools of modern Indian ritual practice other less mechanical reasons have to be found.

The recording of how to recite the date is of the greatest interest, as this indication is wholly absent from the known manuscripts for the celebrations of the Gāhān-days. It is a key point of the description of all three ceremonies in this Revāyat, since it is substantially different from the expression of the date at any other day of the year that always consists of the day and the month. This is, however, impossible for the five intercalary days, for they do not belong to any month. Besides the indication of the date for the Visperad (folio 10r.9 ff.), the different ways of indicating the date during the five days are recorded at the end of the description of the three ceremonies as follows (fol. 32 r ff.):

46- The only difference to the celebration at other Gāhānbār is the mention of the specific Gāhānbār at certain occasions (see § 2.2.1.2).

47- See the same assumption on other reasons by Hintze (2009: 115).

	<i>Āiiese</i>	<i>Yazamaide</i>
<i>rōz fradum</i>	<i>gāθābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō āiie.sē iiašti ahunuuaitiiā gāθiiā</i>	<i>gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaonīš yaz. ahunuuaitim gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratūm yaz.</i>
<i>rōz dum</i>	<i>gāθābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašaone.biiō āiie.sē iiašti uštāuuaitiiā gāθiiā</i>	<i>gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaonīš yaz. uštāuuaitim gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratūm yaz.</i>
<i>rōz səum</i>	<i>gāθābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašaonebiiō āiie.sē iiašte spəntāmainā uš gāθiiā.</i>	<i>gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaonīš y. spəntā. mainiiūm gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratūm y.</i>
<i>rōz. cihārum.</i>	<i>gāθābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašaone.biiō āiie.sē iiašti vōhūxšaθra gāθiiā vihištōištōiš.</i>	<i>gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaonīš y. vōhū. xšaθraqm gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratūm y.</i>
<i>rōz pañjum</i>	<i>gāθābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašao nebiiō āiie.sē yašti vihi<štōi>štōiš gāθiiā.</i>	<i>gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaonīš y. vihištōištōiš gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratūm y.</i>

Furthermore, the description of the Visperad records as well Yo.14, as the number of prayers might vary at this stage. The number of Ašəm Vohū is usually three, with four Ahuna Vairiia. According to the Revāyat of Kāma Bohra, three Ašəm Vohū and four Ahuna Vairiia are recited in the Yasna of the Gāhān-days (folio 13r.1-2), but ten times each in the Visperad ī Gāhānbār.⁴⁸ Only three manuscripts published in the Avestan Digital Archive - ADA (mss. 2101, 2106, 2230) prescribe the tenfold recitation of these prayers. They most likely describe Gāhānbār ceremonies. In fact, mss. 2010 by Frēdōn Marzbān (996 YE) and 2030 by Rōštam Gōštāsp (1086 YE) confirm almost two hundred years later the information contained in the Revāyat of Kāma Bohra that the tenfold recitation is specific to the Visperad ī Gāhānbār. Ms. 2030 reads as follows:

ašəm vohū 3 guftan yaθā ahū vairiiō 4 guftan pad har š iiaōθinanqm rāspīg ēsm ud bōy ēk tāg ō ātaxš nihišn agar ēzišn gāhānbār bawēd ašəm vohū 10 abāyēd guftan yaθā ahū vairiiō 10 guftan

He should recite 3 *ašəm vohū* and 4 *yaθā ahū vairiiō*. At each *š iiaōθinanqm*, the *rāspīg* should put a piece of wood and incense on the fire. If it is the liturgy of the Gāhānbār, then he should recite 10 *ašəm vohū* and 10 *yaθā ahū vairiiō*.

Thus, Kāma Bohra's Revāyat provides the basic information required for performing a Visperad ī Gāhānbār during the Gāhān-days, focusing on the particularities regarding other Visperad ī Gāhānbār, but also recalling certain essential features distinguishing this celebration from other Visperad performances.

4.2. The Yasna with the *šnūman gāθābiiō* (yazašn gāθābiiō) of the day of the *Ahunauuaiti Gāθā*

The description of the *yazišn gāθābiiō* is much more complete. The whole set of performative variations

48- It should be noted that the Vidēvdād manuscripts have a peculiar distribution: in Iran, they indicate the recitation of the same number of prayer in Yo.14 as in the standard Visperad; in India, however, the number is the same as in the Visperad ī Gāhānbār. We stated again an Indian innovation.

are indicated, whereby a reconstruction of the complete ceremony is possible based on this description. The Frauuarāne is included in its two different variants:

1. The Frauuarāne including *šnūman* and *wāž gīrišnūh* as it appears in Y0.7-14. It records the *šnūman gāθābiiō*
2. The Frauuarāne without *šnūman* as it appears in Y3.24⁴⁹

Furthermore, it contains two Frauuarānes at the beginning of the Āb-zōhr, but this is due to a peculiarity of this section of the Long Liturgy in its celebration during the ten final days of the year (s. below).

The *šnūman gāθābiiō* is mentioned in the genitive in all expected passages (Y22.23, 24.28, 25.4, 66.17 and 72.6), but always abbreviated, as the complete dedicatory has already been presented in the first Frauuarāne as follows:

ahurahe mazdā raeuuatō xarənaŋhatō aməšnqm spəntanqm gāθābiiō spəntabiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašaone.biiō ahunuuitiā gāθiā uštuuaitiā gāθiā spəntā.mainiā uš gāθiā vōhū.xšaθriā gāθiā vahištōištōiš gāθiā ašaonqm frauuašanqm uŋaranqm aiβiθūranqm paoiriō.dakaešnqm frauuašanqm nabānazdištanqm frauuašnqm xšnaoθra y. v. x.

As the *šnūman* in the accusative has not been given in full before, it is reproduced in its first attestation (Y25.4):

ahurəm mazdqm raeuuantəm xarwnaŋhantəm yaz: aməšāspəntā huxšaθrā hudāŋhō y: gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašōniš y. hunuuaitim gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y: spəntā.mainiā uš gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y. vōhū.xšaθraqm gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y. vahištōištīm gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y. ašaonqm vaŋuhiš sūrā spəntā frauuašiiō⁵⁰ (beginning of Y26)

Furthermore, the end of Y3.19 is recorded to draw attention to the fact that the dedicatory to *ratu- bərəzant* preceding each *šnūman* has the standard form (*yōi həntē ašahe ratauuō hāuuanōiš raθβō*) and not the variant of the celebration with the *šnūman* of the *gāhānbār* that replaces the indication of the *asñiia- ratu-* through the *yāiriia- ratu-* (see § 2.2.1.2), cf. Y3.19 in both ceremonies:

Visperad ī gāhānbār of the Gāhān-days	Yasna of the Gāhān-days
<i>āiiese yešti raθβō bərəzatō yō ašahe raθβqm aiiaranqmca asñiianqmca māhiianqmca yāiriianqmca sarədanqmca yōi hənti ašahe ratauuō hamaspaθmaēdaiiehe raθβō.</i>	<i>āiiese yešti raθβō bərəzatō yō ašahe raθβqm aiiaranqmca asñiianqmca māhiianqmca yāiriianqmca sarədanqmca yōi hənti ašahe ratauuō hāuuanōiš raθβō.</i>

The date is also mentioned whenever expected (Y1.10⁵¹, 4.16, 7.13, 22.13, 24.21 and 66.10). Strikingly, the expression of the date in the accusative (expected in Y6.10) is skipped in the Motakef manuscript. This

49- We would have expected it instead to include the first instance of this Frauuarāne (Y1.23).

50- This is the beginning of the extension of the dedicatory in accusative, Y26 (see § 2.3.19).

51- We miss Y3.13

omission is most likely a transmission error. It appears at the corresponding passage in the Drōn Yašt (s. below), and also in Unvala's edition. There, before the date in Y7.13, we find the date of the *yazamaide*-section (Y6.10-11):

miθrəm višpanqm daχ iiunqm daǰ hupaitim yaz. negāh ruz māh gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaoniš yaz. ahunuaitim gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum yaz. θβqm āθrəm ahurahe mazdā puθrəm ašauuanəm ašahe ratum yaz.

It continues with the date of Y7.13. In the Motakef manuscript, there is most likely just a *saut de même au même* between both *negāh ruz māh*.

The most interesting information contained in this description and, most probably the main reason for the inclusion of an exhaustive description of this liturgy in the Revāyat, is the account concerning the opening of the Āb-zōhr. The following text (fol. 22r.10 ff.) is inserted between Y62.10 (...*ašahe bəraja yaōždātq*) and Y62.11:

ašəm vōhū sē
frauuarāne mazdaiasno zaraθuštrəš vīdae.uuō ahurah dakešō hāuuanē .ašone ašahe raθβe y. v. x. f. sāuuanhē e višiiāica ašone ašahə raθβe y. v. x. f. ahurahe mazdā raeuuatō xarənanhəto aməšanqm spəntanqm gāθābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašaone.biiō ahunuaitiā gāθiiā uštūuaitiā gāθiiā spəntāmainiā uš gāθiiā vōhū.xšaθriā gāθiiā vahištōiš gāθiiā ašaonqm frauuašanq tā : nabānazdištanqm frauuašanqm frauuašanqm xšnaoθra y. v. x. f. zōt̄ yaθā ahū vairiō zaotā frāməē mrūtē rāspī yaθā ahū vairiō yō zaotā frāməē mrūtē zōt̄ aθāratuš kardan.
ahurəm mazdqm.raeuuanətam xarənanhəntəm y. aməšāspəntā huxšaθrā huđāhō y. gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašōniš y. hunuaitim gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y. spəntā.mainiā uš gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y. vōhū.xšaθraqm gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y. vihištōištim gāθqm ašaonim ašahe ratum y. ašānqm vanuhiš sūrā spəntā frauuašiiō y. (Yt13.49 ff) yā višā. dāuuaiēnte ham.apaθmaēdaēm paiti ratum āat̄ .aθar tā: (Yt13.52) vāxšō.buiiāt̄ nāstāiiō viāxanō yō nō bāt̄ frāiiāzāite gaomata zašta vaštarauuāite ašanāiš nəmanhə (Y62.11) ašəm vōhū sē aiβi gəraθamahe.apqm vanuhinqm frāitīmca paititīmca aibizarətīmca āiie. sē iiašti frauuarānē cūn pa yašt navišt tā ... (Y66.1)

The text to be recited between the end of Y62.10 and the opening of the Āb-zōhr (Y62.11 *aiβi.gəraθmahī apqm vanuhinqm frāitīmca paititīmca aibizarətīmca āiiese yešti*) and the following Frauuarāne (Y62.11) in the Yasna held during the Gāhān-days is similar to the beginning of the Āfrīnagān ī Gāhān or Ā2 in Geldner's edition. Most of the Yasna manuscripts consulted and many Visperad manuscripts confirm the information of Kāma Bohra's Revāyat. They prescribe the recitation of the Āfrīnagān not only for the Gāhān-days, but also for the Frawardīgān. In the latter case, the recitation involves the Āfrīnagān ī Frawardīgān, which that has not been edited by either Geldner or Westergaard.

Despite the identification (made by some manuscripts) of the text inserted in the Yasna of the last ten days of the year with the Āfrīnagān *gāθābiiō* and the Āfrīnagān ī Frawardīgān, the differences are so notable that they cannot be considered the same text. In fact, not only the omission of the initial eight Ahuna Vairiia, and of the closing sections (Ā2.6) and the adaptation of the *wāž girišnīh* to the one proper

of the Long Liturgy (from type 4 to type 7 or 8), but especially the omission of the proper *āfrīnāmi*-section (Ā2.6) exclude this possibility. From the structure, the text is rather a further example of the most simple type of *yazamaide*-ceremony, starting with a *Frauarāne* with the dedicatory in genitive and then repeating it in the accusative depending on *yazamaide*. This is the structure we state e.g. in the *Gāhs*. It seems that the *Āb-zōhr* is presented as included in a ceremony for the *Gāḡās* viz. the *Frauašis*, in a similar way to the framing of the complete Long Liturgy within a ceremony to the fire (Cantera 2015: 83 ff.)

Remarkably, the manuscripts of the *Visperad* reveal that although the *Revāyat* mentions only the possibility of a *Visperad* ī *Gāhānbār* together with the *Yasna* for the celebration during the five *Gāhān*-days, a celebration of the *Visperad* with the *šnūman* ī *gāhān* or the *šnūman* ī *frawardīgān* is also possible. A reconstruction of the exact textual flow is not easy without the information provided by *Kāma Bohra's Revāyat*, and we have experienced many difficulties while trying to index this section in the manuscripts for the *ADA*. However, with the assistance of this *Revāyat*, the additional text recited before the beginning of the *Āb-zōhr* during the last ten days of the year can be reconstructed as follows:

<i>Yasna</i>		<i>Visperad</i>	
<i>frawardīgān</i>	<i>Gāhān</i>	<i>Frawardīgān</i>	<i>Gāhān</i>
<i>frauarāne mazdaiiasnō zaraθuštriš vīdaēuuō ahura.ṭ kaēšō hāuuānē ašaōne ašahe raθβe yasnāica vahmāica xšnaōθrāica frasastaiiaēca sāuuānḡhē vīsiīaica ašaōne ašahe raθβe yasnāica vahmāica xšnaōθrāica frasastaiiaēca raθβqm aiiaranqmca asniianqmca māhiianqmca yāiriianqmca sarādanqmca y. v. x. f.</i>			
<i>ahurahe mazdā raeuuatō xarənanḡhatō aməšanqm spəntanqm.</i>			
	<i>gāḡābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašaone. biiō ahunuuaitiiā gāḡiiā uštuuaitiiā gāḡiiā spəntāmainiiō uš gāḡiiā vōhū.xšaθriiā gāḡiiā vahištōištōiš gāḡiiā</i>		<i>gāḡābiiō spəntābiiō ratuxšaθrābiiō ašaone. biiō ahunuuaitiiā gāḡiiā uštuuaitiiā gāḡiiā spəntāmainiiō uš gāḡiiā vōhū.xšaθriiā gāḡiiā vahištōištōiš gāḡiiā.</i>
<i>ašaonqm frauuāšanq uyranqm aiβiθūranqm paōiriiō.ṭ kaēšanqm frauuāšinqm nabānazdištanqm frauuāšinqm nabānazdištanqm frauuāšanqm frauuāšanqm xšnaoθra y. v. x. f.</i>			
<i>yaḡā ahū vairiiō zaōtā frā.mē mrūtē: ..aḡā ratuš...</i>	<i>yaḡā ahū vairiiō yō zaōtā frā.mē mrūtē.. aḡā ratuš</i>	<i>yaḡā ahū vairiiō yō ātrauuaxšō frā.mē mrūtē: ..aḡā ratuš...</i>	<i>yaḡā ahū vairiiō yō zaōtā frā.mē mrūtē... aḡā ratuš ... mraōtū.</i>
<i>ahurəm mazdqm raēuuāntəm xvarənanḡhanṭəm yazamaide: aməšā spəntā huxšaθrā hudāḡhō yazamaide</i>			

<p><i>gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaōnīš yazamaide ahunauuaitīm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide: uštatauaitīm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide spəntā.mainiiūm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide vohu.xšaθrqm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide vahištōištīm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide</i></p>		<p><i>gāθā spəntā ratuxšaθrā ašaōnīš yazamaide ahunauuaitīm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide: uštatauaitīm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide spəntā.mainiiūm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide vohu. xšaθrqm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide: vahištōištīm gāθqm ašaōnīm ašahe ratūm yazamaide</i></p>
<p><i>ašāunqm varjuhiš frauuašaiiō uyrā aiβiθūrā yā vīsāda ... (Yt13.49-52)</i></p>		

This text can be recited in four different variants depending on whether the ceremony is a Visperad or a Yasna (hence the different *wāž gīrišnīh*), and whether the celebration takes place during the Frawardīgān- or Gāhān-days. During the latter, the *šnūman* includes the section for the *gāθā* between the Aməšaš Spəntas and the Frauuašis. None of these four variants appears in any edition of the Avestan texts.

The inclusion in the Visperad manuscripts of this especial opening of the Ābzōhr is extremely important, because it confirms the persistence at their production time of the ceremony known in the Nērangeštān as Visperad ī Artō.kartēn. Combining the evidence of the Nērangeštān and the manuscripts, we can assume that it consisted on a Visperad ceremony with the dedicatory to the Frauuašis during the Frawardīgān days and to the Gāθā and the Farauuašis during the Gāhān-days and with the special opening of the Ābzōhr described here. Although I cannot discuss it at this place, it is very likely that the extant version of the Visperad is just the special Visperad ī artōkartēn to be celebrated during the last ten days of the year. Hence the presence of the adjective *arətō.kərəiθina-* qualifying *hamaspaθmaēdaiia-* in Vr1.2 and 2.2 (lacking in the parallel passage of the Yasna, Y1.9, 2.9). If this hypothesis is right, the complex ceremony described in Vr1.5-9 in which several Yašt are intercalated between the recitation of the Gāθās and the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti (Cantera 2009) could be the specific performance of a Visperad ī artōkartēn (viz. *arətō.kərəθna-*).

4.3 The Drōn Yašt

Kāma Bohra's Revāyat also prescribes the celebration during the five Gāhān-days of ten Drōn Yašt each day, two in each daily *ratu-* (fol. 32r.7 ff.). Its celebration is described in the Revāyat with more detail than required for a reconstruction of the ceremony. In contrast to what happens with the Long liturgy, where the manuscripts usually describe only a standard celebration, the Yasna ī Nōg-nāwar of the morning, many manuscripts gather different variants of the Drōn Yašt. The abbreviation schema established by Redard (2015) includes just the section corresponding to one *šnūman* in the genitive and to the *šnūman* in the accusative, and the paragraphs in which the list of objects is different in the Drōn Yašt and in other Drōn-ceremonies, such as Srōš Drōn, Hōmāšt, and Drōn ī Ātaxš. Furthermore, the manuscripts often include DrYt4.12 (≈

Y6.20) because of the differences with Y6.20: the mention of all *ratu-* (*vīspe ašahe ratauuō yazamaide*) and the greatest *ratu-* (*vīspe ašahe ratauuō yazamaide*) are omitted, as is to be expected in a non-*vīspa-* *ratu-* ceremony.

The account of the Drōn Yašt in Kāma Bohra's Revāyat is, indeed, longer than most of the accounts of the Drōn Yašt in the manuscripts. It includes the same elements as the standard manuscripts (except DrYt4.12 ≈ Y6.20), but also the date and the *šnūman* also in all sections, and not only in the *āiiese yešti-* and *yazamaide-* sections, as usual. The regular inclusion of the date is to be expected because of the focus on the description of the special celebration during the Gāhān-days and the particular way of indicating the date. The appearance of the *šnūman* in all the sections allows the scribe to remind, first, of the absence of the *ratu- bərəzant-* section before the *šnūman* in the non-*vīspa-* *ratu-* ceremonies and of the distribution of the extension to the dedicatory of the Frauuašis (see § 2.3.1).

In sum, Kāma Bohra's Revāyat includes some information on the celebration of the Yasna, the Visperad, and the Drōn Yašt during the Gāhān days that is not available elsewhere. It is only there that the particularities of the expression of the date for these days are described. Furthermore, it uses more details than the manuscripts and the Nērangestān to describe the use of the special dedicatories required during these days, mentioning a double possibility also unknown anywhere else: the celebration of the particular Visperad of the Gāhān-days or a special variety of the Visperad ī Gāhānbar. Moreover, it describes in detail the special beginning of the Ābzōhr in the last ten days of the year, enabling us to better understand the description of this passage in the manuscripts.

It should also be noted that the Revāyats include descriptions of some ceremonies that are comparable in detail to the description of the manuscripts. We must therefore conclude that the Persian Revāyats need to be taken into account together with the manuscripts for an edition of the texts of the Zoroastrian rituals in the Avestan language. A new edition of the Avestan texts designed to reproduce them in their original ritual context must consider not only core variations (as was the case, albeit in a limited manner, in the standard editions), but also the performative variation (including, as I said, classificatory, context-determined, and specifying variations). For this purpose (among others), the Revāyats are of extraordinary importance. Furthermore, despite their recent date, they might contain information that allows us not just to know some details about the performance of these rituals during the production time of the Revāyats and the manuscripts, but also many centuries before. Although diachronic changes of the performance are not only possible, but have as well been confirmed (Cantera 2014: 247 ff.), the system of performative variation was conceived at a date when Avestan was still a living language and this takes us up back to the Antiquity.

Appendix

1. Chart of performative variation in the Long Liturgy

			Srōš Drōn	Hōmāšt	Ātaxš Drōn
	Frauarāne + dedicatory to the fire + WG	Y0.1-3			
	Frauarāne with šnūman + WG	Y0.8-13			
<i>niuuāēdaiemi</i> <i>haṅkāraiemi</i>	<i>asñiia- ratu</i>	Y1.3-7			
	<i>Date</i>	Y1.11			
	Fire	Y1.12			
	<i>yōi ...⁴+ ratu</i>	Y1.17			
	Frauarāne	Y1.23			
<i>ahmiia zaōθre</i> <i>barāsmanaēca...</i> <i>āiiese yešti</i>	<i>asñiia- ratu</i>	Y2.3-7			
	<i>Date</i>	Y2.11			
	Fire	Y2.12			
	<i>paiti ratum</i>	Y2.18			
<i>āiiese yešti</i>	<i>ratu</i> <i>objects</i>	Y3.1	Y3.1	Y22.1	VrS32.7
	<i>asñiia- ratu-</i>		Y3.5-9	Y22.5-9	VrS32.9-13
	<i>Date</i>		Y3.13	Y22.13	VrS32.25
	Fire		Y3.14	Y22.14	VrS32.26
	<i>yōi ... + ratu</i>		Y3.19	Y22.19	VrS32.31
	<i>Šnūman</i>		Y3.20-21	Y.22.23-27	VrS32.33
	<i>Frauarāne + WG</i>		Y3.24-25	Y23.5	VrS32.41
<i>āuuāēdaiimahī</i>			Y4.1 ⁵	Y24.1-2	VrS33.1
	<i>asñiia- ratu</i>		Y4.8-12	Y24.13-17 ⁶	VrS33.8-12
	<i>Date</i>		Y4.16	Y24.21	VrS33.16
	Fire		Y4.17	Y24.22	VrS33.17
	<i>yōi ... + ratu</i>		Y4.22	Y24.27	VrS33.22
	<i>Šnūman</i>		Y4.23	Y24.28-32	VrS33.23
<i>yazamaide</i>	<i>asñiia- ratu-</i>		Y6.2-6		VrS35.2-6
	<i>Date</i>		Y6.10		VrS35.20
	Fire		Y6.11		VrS35.21
	<i>Šnūman</i>		Y6.17-18	Y25.4-8	VrS35.29
	<i>paiti ratum</i>		Y6.20		VrS35.32

	WG		Y6.21		VrS35.33
	<i>Objects</i>		Y7.1-2		VrS36.1
<i>ašaiia daδqmi</i>	<i>asñiia- ratu</i>		Y7.5-9		VrS36.3-7
	Date		Y7.13		VrS36.11
	Fire		Y7.14		VrS36.12
	<i>yōi ... + ratu</i>		Y7.19		VrS36.17
	<i>Šnūman</i>		Y7.20-21		VrS36.18
	WG				VrS36.23
	<i>yōi ... + ratu</i>				VrS36.27
	<i>Šnūman</i>				VrS36.28
	<i>Objects</i>		Y7.26		VrS36.33
	WG		Y7.28		VrS36.34
	WG	Y8.9			
	WG	VrS3.1			
	WG	VrS3.6, 7, 8,11, 12			
	Frauarāne + WG	Y11.16			
<i>āiiese yešti</i>	<i>paiti ratum</i>	Y14.3			
	Frauarane + WG	Y14.4-5			
	WG	VrS6.2, 3			
<i>yazamaide</i>	<i>asñiia- ratu</i>	Y17.2-6			
	Date	Y17.10			
	Fire	Y17.11			
	<i>paiti ratum</i>	Y17.19			
	WG	VrS8.5			
	WG	VrS10.0, 7			
	WG	VrS12.3			
	WG	VrS15.2			
	WG	VrS16.1, 4, 9			
	Frauarāne + WG	Y27.12			
	WG	VrS20.6			
	WG	VrS26.0, 7, 14			
	WG	Y57.1			
	WG	VrS30.0,12			
<i>yazamaide</i>	<i>asñiia- ratu</i>	Y59.2-6			
	Date	Y59.10			
	Fire	Y59.11			
	<i>paiti ratum</i>	Y59.29			

	WG	VrS37.2			
	[<i>Frauarāne</i> ⁷ + <i>šnūman</i> + WG + Āfrīnagān]				
	<i>Frauarāne</i> + WG	Y62.12			
	WG	VrS39.1,2			
	WG	VrS40.1,4,8,10,11			
<i>ašaiia daḍqmi</i>	<i>asñiia- ratu</i>	Y66.2-6			
	<i>yōi ... + ratu</i>	Y66.16			
	Date	Y66.10			
	Fire	Y66.11			
	<i>Frauarāne</i> + WG	Y68.23			
	WG	VrS43.1,2			
	<i>āfrīnāmi</i> + <i>šnūman</i>	Y72.6-7			
	<i>āfrīnāmi</i> + <i>šnūman</i>	Y72.8			

2. A new numbering of the Drōn Yašt

DrYt	Y
1.0 ⁸	
1.1	
1.2	≈ 3.1-2
	3.3-4
1.3	≈ 3.5-12
1.4 (date)	3.13
1.5	3.14
1.6	3.15
1.7	3.16
1.8	3.17
1.9	3.18
	3.19
1.10 (šnūman)	≈ 3.20-21
1.11	Y23.1-4
1.12	3.22
1.13	≈ 3.23

2.0 (frauarāne)	≈ 3.24-25
2.1	≈ Y4.1
2.2	4.2
2.3	≈ 4.3
2.4-7	4.4-7
2.8	≈ Y4.8-15
2.9 (date)	≈ 4.16
2.11-15	4.17-21
	4.22
2.15 (šnūman)	≈ 4.23
2.16	4.24
2.17	≈ 4.25
2.18	4.26
3.1-6	5.1-6
4.1	6.1
4.2	≈ 6.2-9
4.3 (date)	≈ 6.10
4.4-8	6.11-15
	6.16
4.9 (šnūman)	≈ 6.17-18
4.10	Y26
4.11	6.19
4.12	≈ 6.20
4.13	6.21
5.1	≈ 7.1-2
	7.3-4
5.2	≈ 7.5-12
5.3 (date)	≈ 7.13
5.4-8	7.14-18
	7.19
5.9 (šnūman)	≈ 7.20-21
5.10	Y23.1-4
5.11	7.22

5.12	≈ 7.23
5.13	7.24
5.14 ⁹	7.24
5.15 ¹⁰	7.25
5.16	7.25
5.17	≈ 7.26
5.18	Y7.28
6.1	8.1
6.2	
6.3	8.2
6.4	8.3
6.5 ¹¹	8.4
6.6	8.4
6.7	8.5
6.8	8.6
6.9	8.7
6.10	8.8
7.1 ¹²	
7.2	
7.3 (šnūman)	
7.4	Y72.9
7.5	Y72.10

Footnotes

1- Similar also to Y4.3.

2- Only the āiiese yešti-section of the Srōš Drōn twice contains the šnūman within a single section: 1. The expected one towards the end of the section (which is shared also by all the other variants of the Drōn Yašt); 2. An exceptional one at the beginning, together with the mention of the offerings (*xvarəθa-*, *haōma-* and *parahaōma-* and *aēsma-* and *baōdi-*). In the latter, each element is followed by the dedicatory to the corresponding god: food for Sraōša, haōma for the Frauuaši of Zaraθuštra, and wood for the fire. In other variants of the Drōn Yašt, the elements are also dedicated to certain gods (partially the same), but they do not necessarily have to be part of the dedicatory. In fact, the specificity of the Drōn Yašt is that the ceremony's dedicatory is extracted from the dedicatory of the single offerings, and this specific dedicatory applies only for the Srōš Drōn (Y3-8), but not for the rest of the Long Liturgy.

3- In the Visperad ceremonies, it corresponds to VrS13.42.

4- *yōi hənti ašahe ratauuō*

5- Y4.3 = Y4.1

6- In the Visperad = VrS13.29-23 (=Vr11.16)

7- In the celebrations of the last ten days of the year, another Frauuarāne with šnūman and wāž gīrišnīh followed by an Āfrīnaḡān appear at the beginning of the Āb-zōhr before the Frauuarāne Y 62.12.

8- xšnaōθra *ahurahe mazdā* + AV 3

9- Repetition of 5.14 (from θβōi staōtarascā on).

10- yaθā ahū vairiiō aθā ratuš ašāṭ cīṭ hacā (2x). According to Redard (2015: 198), only once in the Yasna, but this is incorrect.

11- Ašəm Vohū 3 + 4 & Ahuna Vairiia 2, as in the Yasna despite Redard (2015: 199).

12- ašəm. vohū. *vahištəm. astī.* (3x) + yaθā. *ahū. vairiiō.* (2x).

Bibliography

- Andrés-Toledo, M. A. and A. Cantera (2012). Manuscripts of the Widēwdād. *The transmission of the Avesta*. A. Cantera. Wiesbaden, Harrassoowitz: 208-242.
- Cantera, A. (2009). Die Staota Yesniia der textuellen ratu des Visparad. *Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran. Études indo-iraniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire*. É. Pirart and X. Tremblay. Wiesbaden, L. Reichelt: 17-26.
- Cantera, A. (2013). "Talking with god: The Zoroastrian ham.paršti or intercalation ceremonies." *Journal Asiatique* 301: 85-138.
- Cantera, A. (2014). *Vers une édition de la liturgie longue zoroastrienne: pensées et travaux préliminaires*. Paris, Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes.
- Cantera, A. (2015). The usage of the Frauuarāne in the Zoroastrian rituals. *Estudios Iranios y Turanios. aṭ ciṭ bā nāmō haomāi. Homenaje a Éric Pirart en su 65º aniversario*. A. Cantera and J. J. Ferrer-Losilla. Girona, Sociedad de Estudios Iranios y Turanios. 2: 71-98.
- Cantera, A. (2016). "A Substantial Change in the Approach to the Zoroastrian Long Liturgy. About J. Kellens's Études Avestiques et Mazdéennes." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 59: 139-185.
- Cantera, A. (2017). La liturgie longue en langue avestique dans l'Iran occidental. *Persian Religion in the Achaemenid Period / La religion perse à l'époque achéménide*. W. F. M. Henkelman and C. Redard. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 21-67.
- Cantera, A. (2016). "The taking of the wāz and the priestly college in the Zoroastrian Long Liturgy." *Journal Asiatique* 304(1): 47-63.
- Dhabhar, B. N. (1923). *Descriptive catalogue of some manuscripts bearing on Zoroastrianism and pertaining to the different collections in teh Mulla Feroze Library*. Bombay, The trustees of the Parsi Punchayet funds and properties.
- Dhabhar, B. N. (1925). *Descriptive catalogue of all manuscripts in the First Dastur Meherji Rana Library, Navsari*. Bombay, Commercial Printing Press of the Tata Publicity Corporation.
- Dhabhar, B. N. (1932). *The Persian Rivayats of Hormazyar Framarz and others. Their version with introduction and notes*. Bombay.
- Hintze, A. (2009). The Return of the Fravashis in the Avestan Calendar. *Literarische Stoffe und ihre Gestaltung in mitteliranischer Zeit. Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Werner Sundermann*. D. Durkin-Meisterernst, C. Reck and D. Weber. Wiesbaden, L. Reichert: 99-122.
- Hintze, A. (2012). Manuscripts of the Yasna and Yasna ī Rapithwin. *The transmission of the Avesta*. A. Cantera. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 244-278.
- Hintze, A. (2014). "Avestan Research 1991–2014. Part 1: Sources and Phonology." *Kratylos* 59: 1-52.
- Jamasp, H. (1907). *Vendidād. Avesta with the Pahlavi translation and commentary and glossarial index*. Bombay, Government Central Book Depot.
- Karanjia, R. (2010). *The Bāj-dharnā (Drōn Yasht), A Zoroastrian Ritual for Consecration and Commemoration*. Bombay, Cama Oriental Institute.
- Kellens, J. (1996). "Commentaire sur les premiers chapitres du Yasna." *Journal Asiatique* 284: 697-705.
- Kellens, J. (2006). Études avestiques et mazdéennes vol. 1. Le Ratauuō vīspe mazišta (Yasna 1.1 à 7.23 avec

- Visprad 1 et 2). Paris, Éditions de Boccard.
- Kellens, J. (2007). Études aveſtiques et mazdéennes vol. 2. Le Hōm Stōm et la zone des déclarations (Y7.24-Y15.4 avec les intercalations de Vr3 à 6). Paris, De Boccard.
- Kellens, J. (2010). Études aveſtiques et mazdéennes vol. 3. Le long préambule du sacrifice (Yasna 16 à 27, avec les intercalations de Visprad 7 à 12). Paris, De Boccard.
- Kellens, J. (2011). Études aveſtiques et mazdéennes vol. 4. L'acmé du sacrifice. Les parties récentes des Staota Yesniia (Y27.13-Y59) avec les intercalations de Visprad 13 à 24 et la Dahmā Āfriti (Y60-61). Paris, De Boccard.
- Kellens, J. (2012). Contre l'idée platonicienne d'Aveſta ou les Considérations revisitées. *The transmission of the Avesta*. A. Cantera. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 49-58.
- Kellens, J. and C. Rédard (2013). Études aveſtiques et mazdéennes vol. 5. La liquidation du sacrifice (Y62 à 72). Paris, De Boccard.
- Kotwal, F. M. and G. Kreyenbroek (2003). *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Volume III: Nērangestān, Fragard* 2. Paris, E. Peeters.
- Martínez Porro, J. (2013). "La ceremonia zoroáſtrica de Viſtāsp Yaſt y sus manuscritos." *Boletín de la Sociedad Española de Iranología* 2: 69-80.
- Martínez Porro, J. (2014). "Los manuscritos avéſticos de la ceremonia Visperad." *Estudios iránicos y turánicos* 1: 75-94.
- Panaino, A. (2017). "Aveſtan *aiiara-* and *asnīia* (Y.1,17; 2,17, etc.)." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 60: 303-330.
- Redard, C. (2015). Comparaison du Srōš Drōn avec le Drōn Yaſt. *Estudios Iranios y Turanios. Homenaje a Éric Pirart en su 65º aniversario*. A. Cantera and J. J. Ferrer Losilla. Girona, Sociedad de Estudios Iranios y Turanios: 191-208.
- Skjærvø, P. O. (2014). "Philological Gleanings from the Pahlavi Videvdad." *Iran Nameh* 29(2): 6-21.
- Unvala, E. M. R. (1922). *Dârâb Hormazyâr's Rivâyat*. Mazgaon, Bombay, British India Press.