



ISMEO
ASSOCIAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE
DI STUDI SUL MEDITERRANEO E L'ORIENTE

SERIE ORIENTALE ROMA

FONDATA NEL 1950 DA GIUSEPPE TUCCI

DIRETTA DAL 1979 DA GHERARDO GNOLI

Scientific Board:

Timothy H. Barrett, East Asian History, School of Or. and African Studies, London
Alessandro Bausi, Äthiopistik, Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg
Peter Kornicki, East Asian Studies, Cambridge University
Daniel Potts, Ancient Near Eastern Archaeology and History, Inst. for the Study
of the Ancient World, New York University

Editor: Adriano V. Rossi

NUOVA SERIE

Vol. 5

ROMA
ISMEO
2017

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI “L’ORIENTALE”
DIPARTIMENTO ASIA, AFRICA E MEDITERRANEO

ISMEO – ASSOCIAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE DI STUDI
SUL MEDITERRANEO E L’ORIENTE

STUDIA PHILOLOGICA IRANICA

GHERARDO GNOLI MEMORIAL VOLUME

Edited by Enrico Morano, Elio Provasi and Adriano V. Rossi



ROMA
SCIENZE E LETTERE
2017

This volume was published with a grant from the:

– PRIN 2009 Project (2009JHSEE7) “Sedi del potere, comunicazione politica e società nell’Iran achemenide: ricerche e studi archeologici ed epigrafici”, directed at L’Orientale University by Adriano V. Rossi;

– MIUR Project “Studi e ricerche sulle culture dell’Asia e dell’Africa: tradizione e continuità, rivitalizzazione e divulgazione”.

TUTTI I DIRITTI RISERVATI

ISBN 9788866871156

© 2017 Scienze e Lettere S.r.l.
Via Piave, 7 – 00187 Roma
Tel. 0039/06/4817656 – Fax 0039/06/48912574
e-mail: info@scienzelettere.com
www.scienzelettere.com

© ISMEO Associazione Internazionale di Studi sul Mediterraneo e l’Oriente, Roma
www.ismeo.eu

© Università degli Studi di Napoli L’Orientale, Napoli
www.unior.it

Layout by Beniamino Melasecchi



Gherardo Gnoli in a photo from the early 2010s.



Studia Philologica Iranica. Gherardo Gnoli Memorial Volume

EDITORIAL BOARD

†Richard N. Frye
Philippe Gignoux
Almut Hintze
Helmut Humbach
Jean Kellens
Gilbert Lazard
Maria Macuch
Rüdiger Schmitt
Martin Schwartz
Shaul Shaked
Nicholas Sims-Williams
Prods O. Skjærvø
Gernot L. Windfuhr
Ehsan Yarshater
Yutaka Yoshida



CONTENTS

<i>Preface by E. Morano, E. Provasi and A.V. Rossi</i>	ix
M. Alram, <i>Ein Schatzfund des Hunnen-Königs Mihirakula</i>	1
G. Asatrian, <i>Middle Iranian Lexical Archaisms in Armenian Dialects</i> ..	7
H.R. Baghbidi, <i>Three Etymological Notes</i>	17
C.G. Cereti, <i>A Short Note on MHDA 38</i>	23
J. Cheung, <i>On the Origin of the Terms “Afghan” & “Pashtun” (Again)</i>	31
C.A. Ciancaglini, <i>Phonology, Etymology and Transcription Issues of Middle Persian Final Sequences <lg> and <lk></i>	51
I. Colditz, <i>Another Fragment of the “Parable on the Female Hearer Xybr’”?</i>	63
M. Dandamayev, <i>Indian Soldiers in Achaemenid Babylonia</i>	79
A. de Jong, <i>The Women Who Witnessed Zoroaster’s Birth</i>	85
D. Durkin-Meisterernst, <i>Yima’s anādruxti-</i>	93
E. Filippone, <i>On the Meaning of Avestan nāuuia- and Pahlavi *nāydāg</i>	99
Ph. Gignoux, <i>Sur les noms de personnes et quelques particularités lin- guistiques d’une nouvelle collection privée de parchemins pehlevi</i>	139
R. Gyselen, <i>Formules moyen-perses et monogrammes sassanides</i>	147
A. Hintze, <i>The Advance of the Daēnā: The Vištāsp Yašt and an Obscure Word in the Hāddōxt Nask</i>	165
H. Humbach, <i>Zarathushtra and the Balance</i>	179
J. Josephson, <i>The Pahlavi Psalter as a Translation</i>	187
J. Kellens, <i>Les Gāthās dites de Zarathushtra</i>	199
G. Lazard, <i>Les racines de la langue persane</i>	207
P. Lecoq, <i>Le -a final en vieux perse</i>	217
C. Leurini, <i>The Virgins and the Bride: Matt. 25:1 in the Manichaean Middle Persian Fragment M36</i>	223
P.B. Lurje, <i>More on Sogdian Versification: Translated and Original Compositions</i>	243
M. Macuch, <i>A Legal Controversy from the Sasanian Period in a Late Pahlavi Rivāyat Text</i>	257
M. Maggi, <i>Annotations on the Book of Zambasta, IV: Ronald E. Em- merick’s Notes</i>	273

E. Morano, <i>The Jackals and the Elephant: A Manichaean Sogdian Tale in Manichaean Script. With an Appendix with Corrections to Previously Edited Fragments of Tales</i>	293
É. Pirart, <i>Les Soleils de l'Avesta</i>	299
A. Piras, <i>X^varənah- and the Garlands. Notes about the Avestan and Manichaean Yima</i>	311
E. Provasi, <i>Some Notes on Sogdian Phonology: Prothetic Aleph and Labialised Velars</i>	325
Ch. Reck, <i>Form and Emptiness: A Fragment of a Sogdian Version of the Heart Sutra?</i>	353
A.V. Rossi, <i>Ten Years of Achaemenid Philology: Old Persian & Achaemenid Elamite 2006-2016</i>	359
G. Scarcia, <i>Alla ricerca di un Ur-Farhād: Hercules patiens, magnetico signor dottore, scalpellino, feldmaresciallo mecenate?</i>	395
R. Schmitt, <i>Der Flußgott Oxos in der iranischen Anthroponymie</i>	413
M. Schwartz, <i>An Achaemenid Position, and Gathic Composition: OPers. *grasta-(pati-), OAv. grēhma-, and PIE √g^hres</i>	427
Sh. Shaked, <i>Zoroastrian Views on Suffering</i>	435
N. Sims-Williams, <i>The Name of the Kushan Goddess Oṃṃa</i>	449
P.O. Skjærvø, <i>Khotanese Land Purchase Deeds</i>	455
D. Weber, <i>Bemerkungen zu einigen Personennamen in den neuen Dokumenten aus Tabaristan</i>	469
G. Windfuhr, <i>The Enigmatic kurušag Ewe that Nursed Infant Zarathushtra, and the Precession of the Equinoxes</i>	477
E. Yarshater, <i>Tāti Dialects</i>	491
Y. Yoshida, <i>A Manichaean Middle Persian Fragment Preserved in the Kyōushooku Library, Osaka, Japan</i>	509
P. Zieme, <i>Ein altuigurisches Fragment zur manichäischen Ethik</i>	517
<i>Plates</i>	525

PREFACE

Gherardo Gnoli (Rome 1937 – Cagliari 2012) was one of the most distinguished scholars of pre-Islamic Iran. From 1965 to 1993 he was Professor of Iranian Philology at the Istituto Universitario Orientale of Naples (now L'Orientale University), of which he was also Rector from 1970 to 1978. Then, from 1993 to 2008 he was appointed Professor of the "Religious History of Iran and Central Asia" at the University of Rome La Sapienza, and Professor Emeritus since 2009. It was mainly due to Gherardo Gnoli's work and teaching that Iranian philology in Italy was able to grow into a distinct field of studies parallel to that of Persian studies. He was a member of many scientific academies. From 1979 to 1995, succeeding Giuseppe Tucci and Sabatino Moscati, he was President of the Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (IsMEO) and since 1995 of the Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente (IsIAO). As President of the IsMEO, he contributed significantly to the expansion of Italian research work in Asia (after 1995 also in Africa) by increasing both the size of the related disciplines and the geographical areas involved. He was also a founding member of the Societas Iranologica Europaea (SIE), and it is not mere coincidence that, as long as the IsIAO was active, the official seat of the Societas was located at the Institute.

As Rector of the Istituto Universitario Orientale, he was the main promoter of a far reaching reform which was destined to transform an antiquated institution devoted to the study of a few languages and cultures of modern Asia and Africa into a modern, highly specialised university, in which the cultures of Asia and Africa were studied in their historical premises and modern developments, as well as in their interactions with European cultures.

Already in 2003 a number of his pupils and friends offered to Gherardo a volume on the occasion of his 65th birthday. The scope of this volume was restricted to only one of the main fields of interest of the dedicatee, viz. pre-Islamic Iranian religions approached from a historical and philological point of view; consequently the volume appeared as Religious themes and texts of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia in the series "Beiträge zur Iranistik" of Reichelt Verlag directed by Nicholas Sims-Williams.

Approaching his seventy-fifth birthday, some friends insisted that the main Italian institutions in which Gherardo had been active should offer a volume of studies in his honour; and Gherardo, though somewhat reluctantly, admitted that

a volume connected with his name could be conceived only as a joint effort of L'Orientale University and IsIAO.

Major problems distracted the attention of Gherardo and his friends in the subsequent months, and during 2012 two sad events happened almost simultaneously, Gherardo's passing and the IsIAO dissolution by the Italian Berlusconi Government.

It was clear at this point that the projected volume should be realised. After the re-foundation of ISMEO as an International Association in 2012, it was decided that the new Association should join L'Orientale University in the project, that an international editorial board with fifteen leading Iranianists should be set up, and that the volume should be edited by Enrico Morano, Elio Provasi and Adriano V. Rossi, and the invitation to contribute should be circulated among senior colleagues and friends who had on occasions discussed with the dedicatee different questions of Iranian philology stricto sensu.

The present volume benefited from the collaboration and support of many people and institutions, above all L'Orientale University and ISMEO. We are deeply indebted to the colleagues and friends who readily accepted the invitation to join the editorial board of this volume; we profoundly miss the scheduled contributions by Werner Sundermann and Richard Frye; other colleagues, though unable to comply with our request for a contribution for different reasons, expressed their appreciation of the initiative. We are grateful to all colleagues who have contributed articles.

Enrico Morano
Elio Provasi
Adriano V. Rossi

A bibliography of the works (1961-2007) of Gherardo Gnoli has been published in *Bibliografia di Gherardo Gnoli pubblicata nella ricorrenza del suo 70^o compleanno il 6 dicembre 2007*, Roma, Aléxandros, 2007; all updates of the bibliography up to 2013 will be included in a second edition (in the press).

ELA FILIPPONE

Viterbo

On the Meaning of Avestan *nāuuīia-* and Pahlavi **nāydāg**

1. GHERARDO GNOLI made public in more than one occasion his idea on the meaning of Av. *nāuuīia-* (also *nāuuaiia-*)¹ and Pahl. <n'ywt'k'>, the second paralleling the former in the Pahl. translation of the Avesta. The main bibliographical references are GNOLI 1966, pp. 71 ff. and 1967, p. 15.

In particular, he contested the rather widespread opinion according to which the mentioned adjectives would mean “navigable,” as maintained in BARTHOLOMAE 1904, col. 1063 s.v. *nāvaya-* “schiffbar, Bezeichnung fließenden Wassers von grösserer Breite und Tiefe [Abl. aus **nāv-* (v. *nāv-* ‘Schiff’) ?],” and BARTHOLOMAE 1911, p. 257 (*nāyētāk* “schiffbar; a compound from **nāūja-* + **tāka-* “schiffbaren Lauf habend”).

With regard to *āpō nāvayā* in the *Mihr Yašt* (Yt 10.14), as well as all the other occurrences of this expression in the *Vendidad*, GNOLI suggested interpreting it as “acque canalizzate” instead of “navigable rivers,” proposed by GERSHEVITCH (1959, p. 81). As for the meaning of Pahl. <n'ywt'k'>, GNOLI (1967, p. 15) claimed that it was “[...] presso a poco ‘canale,’ ‘conduttura,’ ‘braccio di canale.’”

On this issue his position was fully in line with what had been repeated with emphasis by HERZFELD in different works,² but already anticipated by WEST in his translation of the *Dēnkard*,³ by DARMESTETER in his translation of *Vendidad*,⁴ and by JUNKER in his treatment of the *Frahang ī Pahlavīg*.⁵ According to HERZFELD, Av. *nāuuīia-* might only mean “leitungs-, röhrenwasser,”⁶ *afš nāuuīia* has to be understood as “irrigation ditch” everywhere in the Avesta,⁷ Pahl. <n'ywt'k'> simply means “pipe-conduit.”⁸ In 1962 a further contribution to the debate was made by ILYA GERSHEVITCH, who attributed to Av. *nāuuīia-* both the meaning of “navigable” and that of “running in channels.”⁹ The channel-theory has been embraced by many scholars,

* This paper is part of a research planned in the framework of various Projects on Achaemenid linguistics and epigraphy funded by the Italian Ministry for Education (MIUR) since 2005 (PRIN Projects: 2005105580, 2007ZKPPSM, 2009JHSEE7).

¹ In fact, the form *nāuuaiia-* is more frequently found than the (expected) *nāuuīia-*. On the *-aiia-* vs. *-iia-* suffix alternation see PANAINO 2004, p. 274 fn. 2 with references.

² See HERZFELD 1930, pp. 62-64; 1938, p. 324; 1947, p. 563 ff.

³ See, e.g., WEST 1892, p. 119 (“flowing in a channel (*nâēv-tāk*)”). See below, fn. 43 for a different behaviour in WEST 1880.

⁴ See DARMESTETER 1887.

⁵ See JUNKER 1912, p. 86.

⁶ HERZFELD 1938, p. 324 fn. 1.

⁷ HERZFELD 1947, p. 564.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 565.

⁹ GERSHEVITCH 1962, p. 173.

among which ERNST HERZFELD, HAROLD W. BAILEY,¹⁰ GHERARDO GNOLI, ANTONIO PANAINO, DAVOUD MONCHI-ZADEH¹¹ and others. However, it has not been universally accepted. Many have expressed their thinking on the matter with more or less elaborated comments or simply making their own lexical choices in text translations.

More recently two articles have been published on this specific issue. ANTONIO PANAINO (2004) has refashioned the arguments supporting the channel-theory,¹² PAUL WIDMER (2007) has suggested a new interpretation for Av. *nāuuiia-*, also challenging its current and never contested etymology.¹³

The result of this long debate is that nowadays several different interpretations are found of Av. *nāuuiia-* and/or Pahl. <n'ywt'k'>. They may be summarized as follows: (1) “navigable;” (2) “channelled, flowing in channel;” (3) “deep;”¹⁴ (4) “tumultuous;”¹⁵ (5) “unfordable;”¹⁶ (6) “in spate, flooding;”¹⁷ (7) “streaming, raging.”¹⁸

The whole question, involving Old, Middle and New Iranian terms which may be connected to each other in one way or another, is very controversial and difficult to solve. It does not make it easier that some terms used by scholars in their reasonings (in particular Engl. *channel*, It. *canale*, Germ. *Kanal*, etc.) are very general and polysemous terms, potentially referring to both natural and artificial water-courses¹⁹ and it is not always clear in which sense they have been used by single scholars. It is clear, in fact, only when scholars directly mention *artificial* ducts, emphasizing the antiquity of hydraulic works of canalization and drainage in the ancient Iranian world. But it is not always so. In what follows I will carry out an examination of the relevant textual and lexical documentation on the involved Iranian words. I dedicate it to the memory of GHERARDO GNOLI, a great scholar and a dear friend, as a token of deep esteem, affection and gratitude. To GHERARDO I owe much. All the Italian scholars of Iranian and Oriental studies owe much to him for his lifelong commitment to support younger colleagues and strengthen our common fields of study.

2. In his paper of 2007, PAUL WIDMER commented systematically all the Av. passages containing *nāuuiia-*,²⁰ to which he assigned the meaning of “streaming, raging,” and also quoted most of the Pahl. passages containing <n'ywt'k'>, the

¹⁰ BAILEY unpubl. I, pp. 76-77 “flowing in channel.”

¹¹ MONCHI-ZADEH 1975, p. 112 (the name of the river ‘Rōt Nāvātāk’ meaning “Kanal-Fluß”).

¹² See already PANAINO 1990, pp. 115-116.

¹³ See below, § 5.

¹⁴ First tentatively suggested by HENNING 1948, p. 309. For HENNING’s earlier views see below fn. 147.

¹⁵ Cf. BENVENISTE 1933, p. 236.

¹⁶ Cf. KREYENBROEK 1985, pp. 99-100 n. 4.⁶ See also below § 3.2.

¹⁷ SKJÆRVØ 2005a, p. 315, 2011b, p. 326.

¹⁸ WIDMER 2007.

¹⁹ All of them have inherited their broad semantic range from Lat. *canālis* “(1) a channel or conduit for supplying water [...]; also, a trough [...]; (2) an open drain or gutter [...] along the roof of a building; (3) the channel or bed of a river [...]” (GLARE 1982 p. 263). In English, the term *canal* is used unambiguously with reference to artificial products.

²⁰ WIDMER 2007, pp. 216-222.

equivalent of the Av. word.²¹ I will reintroduce all of them here with the view of enhancing, when possible, the interlinguistic connection between texts, though being aware of the fact that these texts are not homogeneous from a typological and chronological point of view and different levels of competence in the language used to produce them may be attributed to their authors. We are going to analyse, in fact, extracts from Av. texts, from parallel texts, with the Pahl. text being the (often word-by-word) translation of the Av. original and from Pahl. texts which quote, summarize or comment on Av. passages.

The problem with Pahl. <n'ywt'k'> is not confined to the semantic aspect; in fact, we are still groping for its pronunciation. In MACKENZIE 1986, p. 58, it is recorded as **nāydāg* “deep, unfordable, navigable,” with the asterisk marking, as usual in MACKENZIE’s Pahlavi dictionary, doubtful transcription or meaning (in this case, seemingly, doubtful transcription).²² Pāzand texts generally transmit it as *nāwaḍā*. The more usual Pahl. spelling seems to be <n'ywt'k'>, but actually several graphic variants alternate in the mss (apparently: <n'ywt'k'>, <n'wt'k'>, <n'pt'k'>, but also <'ywt'k'>, <'n'p'k'>, <'nt'k'>). And since the same spellings may in theory be used to record other Pahl. words,²³ we cannot even be sure that in a given passage one is entitled to transcribe as **nāydāg* graphic sequences like <'ywt'k'> or <'n'p'k'>. The instability of spelling, a phenomenon that occurs in association with our word in a much greater extent than is normally expected in the Pahl. manuscript tradition, though in a rather coherent way within any single manuscript, may be indicative of the fact that the word written <n'ywt'k'> or in one of the other ‘alternative’ spellings, whatever its actual pronunciation, was not a term rooted in the lexical repertoire of the authors of the Pahl. religious texts (translations or exegesis of the Avesta). Possibly, it was expressly created to render Av. *nāuuiia-* in translation and has always remained mentally associated to it (in Av. quotations or reminiscences), though in the course of time it might have suffered deterioration and loss of its phonetic substance, with possible subsequent reinterpretations. All this will make it harder to define the exact reading and meaning of <n'ywt'k'>. In what follows the transcription **nāydāg* will be used; it has to be considered, however, as a mere convention, to which no real phonetic value is to be attributed.

Notably, Av. *nāuuiia-* only occurs in collocation with *āp-* “water, river;” Pahl. **nāydāg* in collocation with *āb* “water, river”²⁴ and *rōd* “river.” It is not easy to establish each time which of the two senses *āp-* and *āb* convey; provisionally, I will adopt the non-committal solution “water/river.”

²¹ WIDMER 2007, pp. 221-222, fn. 10-11.

²² Cf. also FARAVAŠI 1967, p. 319 *nāvtāk* “navigable, navigable river [*qābel-e keštirāni, rud-e qābel-e keštirāni*];” ABRAMJAN 1965, p. 125 *nāvtāk* “navigable.” According to ZAEHNER 1955, p. 214, “*N'YWT'K* should perhaps be read as *nāy'tāk* with a light *u* as in *pā'χšāy* (P'TWXŠ'Y, normal spelling in Pahlavi) with the normal development *v > y*.”

²³ One example for all, <'ywt'k'> for *ēwtāg* “alone, single,” see below § 2.7.

²⁴ Words for ‘water’ are commonly used for ‘river’ in some Iranian (and not only Iranian) languages; see also FILIPPONE 2016, p. 31 fn. 27. According to MALLORY, ADAMS 2006, p. 126, the attested meaning of words for ‘water’ derived from IE **h₂ep-* “suggests an original ‘living water,’ i.e. ‘water on the move.’”

2.1. In the *Mihr Yašt* (Yt 10), the mythical land inhabited by the Aryan people, the first and best creation of Ahuramazda, is described as a land where tall, sheltering mountains provide ample pasture for cattle, where deep lakes stand with surging waves and where

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) <i>āpō nāvayā</i>
 <i>pərəθwiš xšaodāṇha θwaxšānte</i>
 <i>āiškatəm pourutəmča</i>
 <i>mourum hārōyum</i>
 <i>gaomča suxδəm</i>
 <i>xʷāirizəmča</i> (Yt 10.14)</p> | <p>“<i>nāuuiia</i>- waters/rivers²⁵
 rush, broad, with a swell
 towards Iškata and Parutia,
 Margu, Haraiva
 and Gava, Sogdiana
 and Chorasmia.”</p> |
|---|---|

As anticipated above, GERSHEVITCH’ interpretation of *āpō nāuuiiā* as “navigable waters” was strongly challenged by Gherardo GNOLI. When GERSHEVITCH (1962, p. 79) admitted that Av. *nāuuiia*-, besides meaning “navigable,” could also be used with reference to “waters running in channels,”²⁶ he did not mention the *Mihr Yašt* passage under discussion, and therefore we do not know in principle which was his last stance on this matter.²⁷ However, his statement (1962, p. 80) that “Av. *āpō nāvayā* is used in the sense of ‘channel waters’” permits us to interpret his thinking with a certain confidence, including the *āpō nāvayā* in the *Mihr Yašt* among the attestations of the alleged “channel waters.”

According to PANAINO (2004, pp. 281-282) in Yt 10.14 “le acque *nāuu(a)iiā*-non sono [...] evocate tanto per la loro navigabilità (in senso negativo), bensì per la loro positiva funzione, indispensabile per il nutrimento del bestiame e per l’irrigazione delle piante e dei campi, in un contesto in cui è la maestosità dello Airyana Vaējah [...] che deve essere pienamente celebrata.” That in this passage the function of water, vital element for the cosmic system, is highly exalted, is undeniable; the same thing happens in an impressive number of other Avestan or Zoroastrian passages. To my opinion, however, there is nothing in these lines which may be understood as an actual reference to structures built by humans (i.e., water canalization) for the “irrigazione delle piante e dei campi.” The only image which comes out from them is that of a mythical, mountainous environment, with the magnificently impressive energy of the primordial natural force.

This majestic scenery resembles that depicted in the *Farvardin Yašt* (Yt 13.9-10). Speaking to Zaratuštra, Ahuramazda reveals to be assisted by the Fravašis in maintaining the great and wide earth, bearing all the bodily world, with its high mountains rich in water, rich in pasture land, upon whom

²⁵ GERSHEVITCH 1959, p. 81 “navigable rivers” (see also p. 174, n. 14⁴); GNOLI 1966, p. 71, 1967, p. 15; PANAINO 2004, p. 282 “acque canalizzate;” DARMESTETER 1883, p. 123 “wide-flowing rivers;” MALANDRA 1983, p. 60 “wide irrigation waters;” SKJÆRVØ 2011a, p. 51 “flooding waters;” MENDOZA FORREST 2011, p. 14 “rivers in spate.”

²⁶ GERSHEVITCH 1962, p. 173.

²⁷ See also GNOLI, 1967, pp. 83-84 fn. 2.

(2) *paiti θraotō.stācō āpō taciṇti nāuuaiiā* (Yt 13.10)

“*nāuuia-* waters/rivers²⁸ flow flowing in streams”

and many sorts of plants grow up. We have again a description of a mythical land, the product of a divine creation.

Challenging the ‘channel-theory,’ ZAEHNER²⁹ points to a particular passage from a Pahl. hymn to the Creator (*Dādār šnāyēnīdārīh* “Hommage to the Creator”) contained in the Zand Xorda Avesta,³⁰ where the creation on the earth of the following entities are attributed to the Creator:

(3) *rōd ī *nāydāg, kōf ī buland ī purr-wāstar ī ābōmand ud gōhrōmand ud dārī wuzurg-tāk frāx-*šāg³¹ ud zoṇr-rēšag ātaxš-iz ī suxr ī sōzāg mardōm ī was-ēwē-nag ud gōspand ī panj-ēwēnag ī was-sardag*

“**nāydāg*-rivers,³² high mountains full of pasture, full of water and minerals, and trees with big branches, wide boughs and deep roots and also red and burning fire, men of many kinds and small cattle of five kinds and many species.”

Note that for the word transcribed as **nāydāg* by the editor both the mss used by DHABHAR transmit the spelling <’ywt’k>.³³

ZAEHNER’s remark³⁴ that the “creator can scarcely be credited with the creation of ‘canals’” has been rejected as an “osservazione [...] gratuita” by GNOLI 1966, p. 71, fn. 5 and as a “questione [...] mal posta” by PANAINO (2004, p. 283), who finds it to be not “impressionante che anche le acque incanalate nel loro letto o in percorsi artificiali siano state considerate nel corso del tempo come una benedizione del cielo,” since the Zoroastrian tradition has always attributed to Ahura-mazda all that is considered good on the world. This is an unquestionable fact. Furthermore, any human activities aimed at improving the overall conditions of the earth are felt as highly meritorious. However, there is something unclear in PANAINO’s statement: does he consider “le acque incanalate nel loro letto” and those “incanalate in percorsi artificiali” as equivalent concepts for which the same expression can be used? What are in fact “le acque incanalate nel loro letto” if not ‘natural’ river’s waters? Rivers do flow in (natural and open) channels! And what would mean “channelled rivers” if one just intends rivers flowing in their bed?

In fact, the arguments produced by scholars in support of their opinion on the meaning of Av. *nāuuia-* and Pahl. **nāydāg* (including the arguments produced in this paper) may not rarely be felt as shaky because of their circularity and indemonstrability. Nevertheless, I find it difficult not to agree with ZAEHNER, and not to

²⁸ MALANDRA 1971, p. 113 “channel waters” (see also p. 164 “translated in the light of GERSHEVITCH” remarks on OIr. **nāu-* ‘channel; boat’); KELLEN 1975, p. 36 *nāuuia-* “navigable;” SKJÆRVØ 2011b, p. 65 “waters ... in spate.”

²⁹ ZAEHNER 1955, p. 214 n. A.

³⁰ DHABHAR 1927, pp. 252-253; transcribed in ZAEHNER 1955, p. 217.

³¹ On the reading *frāx-*šāg* and translation “bough” see DHABHAR 1963, p. 441 n. 19.

³² DHABHAR 1963, p. 464 with fn. 4; ZAEHNER 1955, p. 198, 214 n. A “navigable rivers.”

³³ Cf. DHABHAR 1927, p. 404 (23.6).

³⁴ ZAEHNER 1955, p. 214 n. A.

consider at least ‘odd’ to open a list of divine creations on the earth with the mention of artificial channels.

The Pahl. Rivāyat accompanying the *Dādestān ī Dēnīg* contains one of the several descriptions of Kangdiz, the legendary, paradise-like stronghold of the Kayanians, located somewhere in East Iran. Kangdiz is here portrayed as a pleasant place surrounded by seven walls with silver palaces and golden pinnacles;

- (4) *u-š čahārdah kōf andar u-š haft rōd ī *nāydāg*³⁵ *andar u-š haft murw* [...] *andar* (Pahl. Riv./DD 49.7)³⁶

“and (there are) 14 mountains in it, and seven **nāydāg* rivers³⁷ in it, and seven meadows [...] in it.”

The description of this mythical place, with the combination of monumental buildings, urban structures and mountainous environmental elements within the city walls, points to an ideal microcosm and reproduces in the main the outline of the Aryan prototypical landscape. Another account of Kangdiz (but with no reference to mountains) is found in the *Ayādgar ī Jāmāspīg*. Notably, there the seven river flowing inside the blessed realm are qualified as “deep” (in Pārsi: *haft rōd bālā*).³⁸

2.2. The mythical formation of the cosmic hydrological system is repeatedly recalled in the *Bundahišn*. By the agency of Ohrmazd³⁹ the first two rivers, Arang and Weh, started flowing from the North (Alborz mountain), one going toward the east and one toward the west, encircled the earth, received the waters of other rivers and melt again into the Frāxwkard Sea, their original source. In particular, in one passage one reads that

- (5) *ka ān dō rōd be tazīd būd pas az ham bun-xānān ī awēšān haštah rōd ī *nāy-dāg*⁴⁰ *be tazīd pas abarīg ābīhā az ān *nāydāgān*⁴¹ *frāz tazīd hēnd* (Ir. Bd. 6.b.21)⁴²

“when those two rivers had flowed, then from the same sources as those, eighteen **nāydāg* rivers⁴³ flowed out, then other waters/rivers flowed out from those **nāydāg* ones.”

³⁵ <n’ywt’k>.

³⁶ WILLIAMS 1990 I, pp. 190-191, II p. 89.

³⁷ BOYCE 1984, p. 64 “navigable (?) rivers;” WILLIAMS 1990 II, p. 89 “*navigable rivers.” See also WILLIAMS 1990 I, p. 320 (*nāydāg* (or *nāwdāg*?) “navigable”).

³⁸ AGOSTINI 2013, p. 56 [(7.5)].

³⁹ Note the mss divergences on this point (Ir. Bd. 11.1; TD1, DH <tcyny> vs. TD2, K20, M51 <tcyt>), as pointed out by PAKZAD 2005, p. 146).

⁴⁰ <ywt’k> in TD1, TD2, DH; <n’wt’k> in K20, K20b, M51; cf. PAKZAD 2005, p. 99 fn. 181.

⁴¹ <ywt’k’n> in TD1, TD2, DH; <n’wt’k> in K20, K20b, M51; cf. PAKZAD 2005, p. 99 fn. 183.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁴³ JUSTI 1868, p. 10 “schiffbare Flüsse;” WEST 1880, p. 29; ANKLESARIA 1956, p. 77 “navigable rivers;” BAILEY unpubl. II, p. 29 “channelled rivers;” SKJÆRVØ 2005b, p. 198 “deep rivers.” Note that BAHĀR (1966, p. 308) erroneously quotes the forms <n’ywk’> (*nāyōg*) and (pl.) <n’ywk’n> (*nāyōgān*) “deep [*amiq*]” (seemingly, affected by Sogd. *n’ywk* “id.”).

Nothing in this passage authorizes one to think that the described phenomena were not the result of natural geological processes, though presented in a narrative context of mythic cosmology. It is well known that sources originate rivers, rivers may originate other rivers; they can either have a single stream of water or several streams connected with each other. But what is it that distinguishes **nāyḍāg* rivers from other rivers?

The emergence of the first two rivers, the subsequent eighteen rivers and all the others are also referred to in another passage of the *Bundahišn*. There,⁴⁴ the eighteen rivers are not qualified as **nāyḍāg*, but as *mādagwar* “principal” (*ān hašt-dah rōd mādagwar*). In the *Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspram*, the eighteen rivers are said to be ‘great’ (*hašt-dah rōd ī wuzurg*).⁴⁵ To know which are these rivers, suffice it to read their names as they are listed in the *Bundahišn*: according to the body of knowledge and beliefs of the Zoroastrian tradition, they are among the greatest and most distinguished rivers in the world.⁴⁶

Another possible occurrence of **nāyḍāg* in the *Bundahišn*, this time in collocation with *āb*, is in a passage dealing with a deed (or more probably a misdeed) attributed to the Turanian Frāšīāb, the arch-enemy of the Iranians in the Kayanid period, to which traditionally an ‘excellent ability in constructing channels’ is attributed:⁴⁷ in the Kayānsēh Sea he *spurd*⁴⁸ a thousand sources of water, the sources of the Zarrēnōmand (also said Hēdōmand) river and also

- (6) *u-š xān ī Wātaēnī rōd ud šaš āb ī *nāyḍāg*⁴⁹ *andar ham zrēh spurd ud mardōm nišastag bē kard* (Ir. Bd. 11a.32)⁵⁰

“he *spurd* the source of the Wātaēni river and six⁵¹ **nāyḍāg* waters/rivers⁵² in the same sea and made people settle (there).”

What one thinks Frāšīāb did in the Kayānsēh Sea is strictly correlated with the meaning one is ready to attribute to the verb *spurdan* in this specific context. The issue is intriguing because this same verb (or the prefixed verb *ōspurdan*) is used in other passages in the *Bundahišn* and other Pahl. texts as well, in connection with the (direct or indirect) involvement of this ambiguous figure⁵³ in the arrangement of the terrestrial

⁴⁴ Ir. Bd. 11.8 (PAKZAD 2005, p. 149), corresponding to Ind. Bd. 18 (BEHZĀDI 1989, p. 45).

⁴⁵ WZ 3.23; cf. GIGNOUX, TAFAZZOLI 1993, pp. 44, 45.

⁴⁶ Cf. Ir. Bd. 11.8 (PAKZAD 2005, pp. 149-150), corresponding to Ind. Bd. 18 (BEHZĀDI 1989, pp. 45-46).

⁴⁷ CHRISTENSEN 1932, p. 86; YARSHATER 1985, p. 574; GNOLI 1967, p. 11, etc.

⁴⁸ MARKWART 1938, p. 12 “übergab;” ANKLESARIA 1956, p. 111 “diverted;” GNOLI 1967, p. 14 “ha deviato.” See also GRENET 2002, p. 207 “il canalisa.”

⁴⁹ <n’ywt’k> in TD1, DH; <ywt’k> in TD2; <n’wt’k> in K20, M51 (cf. PAKZAD 2005, p. 157, fn. 134).

⁵⁰ PAKZAD 2005, pp. 156-157.

⁵¹ Seven according to Ind. Bd. 18.48 (BEHZĀDI 1989, p. 48).

⁵² WEST 1880, p. 82, ANKLESARIA 1956, p. 111 “navigable waters;” BAILEY unpubl. II, p. 39 “channelled waters;” MARKWART 1938, p. 12 “sieben schiffbare (oder die sieben zuerst laufenden) Flüße” (the two alternatives depending on the possible suggested readings ‘*nāwtāk*’ and ‘*naxwtāk*’).

⁵³ On the contradictory aspects of Frāšīāb’s roles and behaviour see MARKWART 1938, pp. 23 ff., YARSHATER 1985, p. 574; GNOLI 1967, pp. 10-11, etc.

waters. Scholars do not seem to agree on the matter. For the majority, *spurdan* could be understood as “to deviate, divert:” Frāsiāb ‘deviated’ springs, sources of rivers and rivers in the Kayānsēh Sea,⁵⁴ enlarging in this way the Hamun basin (GNOLI 1967, p. 11). But lexicographic repertoires usually give *spurdan* as “to tread, trample”⁵⁵ and BAILEY translated (*vi*)*spurd* in this passage as “made gush out.”⁵⁶ The whole matter deserves a deepening, which however has to be postponed to another occasion, since it would take us too far away. In any case, whatever one thinks of it, our investigation into the meaning of **nāyḏāg* receives no real contribution from this passage.

It is to be added that here even the reading **nāyḏāg* is challengeable. MONCHIZADEH (1975, p. 123) argues that, between the readings **nāyḏāg* and *ēwtāk* “alone, single,” one should prefer the second and consequently interpret this passage as follows: “Auch übergab er (leitete er nieder) in denselben See den Lauf von Zarrēnōmand [...] Und 7 einzelne (d.i., selbständige) Wasser übergab er (leitete er nieder) in denselben See.” The same position is held by GNOLI (1967, p. 17) and GRENET (2002, p. 207).⁵⁷

2.3. Other Zoroastrian texts may give further clues to understand some specific peculiarities of the *nāuuiia*/**nāyḏāg* waters/rivers.

In the Hymn to Tištrya, the God laments the fact that men did not worship him with duly sacrifices and for this reason he could not acquire

(7) <i>dasanqm aspanqm aojō</i>	“the strength of ten horses,
<i>dasanqm uštranqm aojō</i>	the strength of ten camels,
<i>dasanqm gauuqm aojō</i>	the strength of ten bulls,
<i>dasanq, gairinqm aojō</i>	the strength of ten mountains,
<i>dasanqm apqm nāuuiianqm aojō</i>	the strength of ten <i>nāuuiia</i> -waters
(Yt 8.24)	/rivers.” ⁵⁸

In the following stanza of the same hymn (Yt 8.25), we find Ahuramazda promising to worship Tištria and bestow on him in this way the strength of ten

⁵⁴ WEST 1880, p. 82 “conducted away;” ANKLESARIA 1956, p. 111 “diverted;” CHRISTENSEN 1932, p. 86; MARKWART 1938, p. 12 “übergeben;” GNOLI 1967, p. 10 “fece confluire,” p. 17 “fece sfociare;” WIDMER 2007, p. 222 “geleitet hatte;” etc. Cf. also s.v. **spar* “to hand over, entrust” in CHEUNG 2007, p. 351 (Pahl. *spurd* “conducted (away)”).

⁵⁵ Cf. MACKENZIE 1986, p. 76; NYBERG 1974, p. 179 “to trample (to death);” TAFAZZOLI 1969, p. 169 “to tread, to thrash [*separdan*, *pāymāl kardan*, *kuftan*].” See also BAHĀR 1966, p. 190 where it is assumed that this word usually means “to tread [*lagad kub kardan*],” but that in this case it would mean “to divert.”

⁵⁶ BAILEY unpub. II, p. 39. Similarly BEHZĀDI 1989, p. 104 (= Ind. Bd. 18.53, “trod [*pāymāl kard*]”); see also BAILEY unpubl. II, p. 38 “caused to burst out” (= Ir. Bd. 11a.12) and TAFAZZOLI 1985, p. 44 “trod [*pāymāl kard*]” (*Menōg ī Xrad* 27.41-44). Cf. also JUSTI 1868, pp. 29-30 (“er sprang in den See Kančava [...] und er sprang auch in die Seen (welche sind) die Quellen der Zarinmand [...] und er sprang in die Quelle des Flusses Vacaeni, in sieben schiffbare Gewässer, in den See selbst”).

⁵⁷ *šaš āb[ī] ēw-tāg* “six rivières *ēw-tāg* (“au cours uni”).

⁵⁸ BAILEY 1969, p. 93 “ten *nāvaya* (‘deep’) waters;” MALANDRA 1983, p. 146 “ten channel waters;” PANAINO 1990, pp. 50, 51 “ten channelled waters” (cf. also pp. 115-116); SKJÆRVØ 2011a, p. 57 “ten rivers in spate.” Cf. also HERZFELD 1947, p. 564 (“This is ‘mill-trenches,’ for water-power is not measured by the number of ships it carries, but of the mills it turns”).

stallions, camels, bulls, mountains and *nāuuiia-* waters/rivers. The same phrasing as Yt 8.24 is used.

It is self-evident that the *nāuuiia-* waters/rivers have to be considered as endowed with a very significant strength. And it is for this reason that SKJÆRVØ (2005, p. 315) assumed that in this specific context “navigable waters” was much less impressive than “rivers in spate” and PANAINO (2004, p. 282) stated that the *aojah-* of the “dieci “acque [...] ‘canalizzate’” was the “forza che risiede nella potenza con cui scorrono, spumeggianti (come in Yt. 10.14), una volta entrate nei rami fluviali che le conducono nelle terre degli Arii.” According to WIDMER (2007, p. 216), however, “Kanäle und insbesondere Bewässerungskanäle sind freilich in der Regel nicht so konzipiert, dass Wasser(massen) darin mit grosser physischer Gewalt (*aojah-*) durchfliessen sollen.” Admittedly, canals do not necessarily evoke the idea of strength and depth, as suggested by PANAINO: besides being built for field irrigation, they may also be planned to make rivers fordable, or to diminish the pressure of a watercourse, when necessary.

Elsewhere in the Zoroastrian literature, and always in connection with Tištria, we find the motive of the acquisition of strength in a measure which is equivalent to the strength of specific entities (namely, horses, camels, bulls, mountains and *nāuuiia-* waters/rivers) in number of ten. These passages may be taken as quotations from Yašt 8.24-25. A paraphrasis is in *Bundahišn*,⁵⁹ where, however, the ‘original’ ten *nāuuiia-* waters/rivers are simply referred to with the expression *dah rōd* “ten rivers,” without further specification.⁶⁰ Another one, with more details, is found in the *Wizīdagihā ī Zādspram*, where one may read as follows:

- (8) *be mad ō zōr ōwōn abar ō Tištar čand dah asp ī gušn dah uštar ī gušn dah gāw ī gušn dah kōf ka abganēnd ud dah rōd ī *nāydāg ka pad āgenēn frāz ānayēnd* (WZ 3.15)

“The strength came to Tištar as much as ten male horses, ten male camels, ten bulls, ten mountains when they throw them and ten **nāydāg* rivers⁶¹ when they lead them together.”

Also in this case, however, **nāydāg* has been emended by the editors GIGNOUX, TFAZZOLI (1993, p. 42) since it is transmitted as <’ywt’k> in all the mss.⁶²

A shorter list of the same type (including horse / camel / *nāuuiia-* water/river) also occurs in a (rather obscure) passage of the *Bahrām Yašt* (Yt 14.39), which I quote here with the translation of WIDMER (2007, p. 219):

⁵⁹ Ir. Bd. 6b.11 (PAKZAD 2005, p. 95).

⁶⁰ Consider that the equivalence of the strength of a (great) river with the strength of a horse or a camel is also stated elsewhere, e.g., in Yt 19 (*Zamyād Yašt*) § 68, with reference to the Haētumant River.

⁶¹ GIGNOUX, TFAZZOLI 1993, p. 43 “rivières navigables.” See also BAHĀR 1972, p. 194 *nāyōg* (see above fn. 43) “navigable [*nāvraw*, *qābel-e kaštirāni*].”

⁶² Cf. facsimile K 35 in GIGNOUX, TFAZZOLI 1993, p. 198, and note 23 to p. 198 at p. 325. In view of the final annotation (“when they lead them together”), however, I wonder whether such an emendation is correct: it could also be that the author of this passage actually meant ‘single-streamed’ (*ēwtāg*) rivers.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (9) <i>təm vašata kauua usa</i>
<i>yim aspō arša baraiti</i>
<i>yim uštrō vaḍairiš baraiti</i>
<i>yim āfs nāuuiia baraiti</i> | “die (Kraft) wird Kavi Usan mit sich führen
welche der Hengst trägt,
welche der brünstige Kamelhengst trägt,
welche das <i>nāuuiia</i> - Wasser trägt.” |
|--|--|

This Av. passage, inserted in a context (Yt 14.34-46) where the main topic is the powerful feather ritual connected with Vərəθraϥna, has been differently interpreted and translated.⁶³ Its obscurity is probably behind the fact that the Pahl. version is not a translation but a free rewriting of the Av. original, with several additions and changes. Even the hero Kavi Usan (corresponding to Kai Kāvus in the Pahlavi tradition) has been changed into Kay Khosrow.⁶⁴ The comparison between the two texts is extremely difficult; we may note, however, that instead of the *nāuuiia*- water/river, mentioned in the Av. text, we find “the water of the seas” (*āb ī zrēhān*) in the Pahl. version⁶⁵ and this is the only case, to my knowledge, where we do not find the usual parallelism Av. *nāuuiia*- = Pahl. **nāydāg*.

The concept of ‘strength’ connected with the *nāuuiia*- water/river is clearly associated to the pressure and quantity of water, conceived as abundant. The concept of ‘abundance’ induces clear metaphorical usages, such as that we find in the following blessing from the Pahl. *Āfrīnagān ī Wuzurgān*:

- (10) *was paywand bawēt čiyōn rōd ī *nāy-dāg*⁶⁶
“may you have as many offspring as a **nāydāg*-river.”⁶⁷

2.4. Because of the quantity and strength of water, *nāuuiia*-/**nāydāg* waters/river are dangerous to cross, and this regardless of the type of crossing (i.e., fording, crossing over a bridge or through a boat or ship) (WIDMER 2007, p. 219). Therefore, Čistā, seemingly a goddess of travel,⁶⁸ is addressed in the *Dēn Yašt* (Yt 16) with the following words:

- (11) *aθa nā āxšta. buiiqn*
yaθa nā buiiāt
huuāiiaonāḡhō paṇtānō
x^vāpaθana garaiiō
x^vātacina razura
hupərəθβe⁶⁹ āfs nāuiia (Yt 16.3)

⁶³ Cf. DARMESTETER 1883, pp. 241-242 “He carried the chariot of Kavi Usa; upon his wings runs the male horse, runs the burden-bearing camel, runs the water of the river;” MENDOZA FORREST 2011, p. 131 “Kavi Usan rode on him, he whom a stallion carries, he whom a rutting camel carries, he whom the river in spate carries.” MALANDRA (1983, p. 85) refrains from translating the passage.

⁶⁴ Cf. DHABHAR 1963, pp. 247-248.

⁶⁵ DHABHAR 1927, p. 132 (l. 5).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 221 (<n’pt’k>).

⁶⁷ Cf. DHABHAR 1963, p. 410, who differently translates: “Be widely connected (with the sea) like a navigable river.”

⁶⁸ KELLENS 1994, p. 281.

⁶⁹ WIDMER (2007, pp. 217-218) offers different possible explanations for Av. *hupərəθβiia*-.

“Thus may there be peace⁷⁰ so that the paths may be
easy for us to travel, the mountains easily passable,
the forest easy to pass, the *nāuuiia-* waters/ivers⁷¹
easy to cross.”

As observed by MENDOZA FORREST (2011, p. 111), the “confluence of deep rivers” and crossroads are among the most frightening places because they “were filled with magical potency and could be used by the agents of evil.” This fact would clearly emerge from one passage from the *Srōš Yašt* (Yt 11). Since Sraoša was the god “who protected the places prone to the influence of magic,” people were advised to pray to him when they were in the following situations:

- (12a) *masō vā āpō masō vā θβaēšō xšapō vā*
tqθriiia̎ aipi duuqnaraiia̎ apqm vā
**nāuuiianqm paiti pərətūš paθqm vā paiti*
vīcarənā (Yt 11/Av. 4)

“[...] on a great water/river, or in a great
danger, or in a dark, misty night, or on a
bridge over *nāuuiia-* waters/ivers⁷² or at the
crossroads.”

- (12b) *pad hān ī meh āb ayāb pad meh bīm ayāb pad*
*šab ī tāriḡ ka abar abr ayāb āb ī *nāyḏāg*⁷³
abar widarag ayāb pad hān ī rāhān <pad> jud-
rawišnīh (Yt 11/Pahl. 4)

“[...] on the great water/river, or in a great
fear, or in a dark night when there are clouds
overhead, or on a passage over **nāyḏāg*
waters/ivers⁷⁴ or at the crossroads.”

The dangerousness of the *nāuuiia-/*nāyḏāg* waters/ivers is also hinted at in a couple of passages of the *Vendidād*,⁷⁵ where it is stated that a dog in a state of weakness (more precisely, a senseless dog and a frightened pregnant dog) may run the risk of falling

- (13a) **maiye vā cāiti vā vaēmi vā urūdi vā apō vā*
nāuuiiā (Vd./Av. 13.37 = Vd./Av. 15.6)

⁷⁰ See KELLENS 1974, p. 44 fn. 1.

⁷¹ Simply “the rivers” in DARMESTETER 1883, p. 265. BENVENISTE, RENOU 1934, p. 60 “les rapids (?);” see also *ibid.* n. 3 (“*āš nāv(a)yā* non ‘eau navigable,’ mais désignation probable des fleuves tumultueux, comme peut-être v.p. *nāviyā*”).

⁷² DARMESTETER 1883, p. 161 “at the fords of a river;” KREYENBROEK 1985, p. 61 “unfordable waters” (see also pp. 99-100 n. 4.⁶); MENDOZA FORRESTER 2011, p. 111 “deep river.”

⁷³ DHABHAR 1927, p. 108 <n’ywt’k>.

⁷⁴ DHABHAR 1963, p. 200 “navigable rivers;” KREYENBROEK 1985, p. 63 “unfordable waters.”

⁷⁵ The following considerations are based on the edition of JAMASP 1907. I have not personally consulted any extant mss.

“in a hole or in a pit or in a crevasse or in an
urūd or in *nāuuiia-* waters/river”⁷⁶

(13b¹) *pad maγ ...??⁷⁷ čāh ayāb wēm ayāb rōd ayāb ō*
*āb ī *nāydāg*⁷⁸ (Vd./Pahl. 13.38)

“in a hole ??, a pit, or a crevasse,⁷⁹ or a river
or (a) **nāydāg* water(s)/river(s)”⁸⁰

(13b²) *pad maγ⁸¹ ayāb čāh ayāb wēm ayāb*
*rōdagdān*⁸² *ayāb ō āb ī *nāydāg* (Vd./Pahl. 15.6)

“in a hole, or a pit, or a crevasse, or a river (?),
or (a) **nāydāg* water(s)/river(s).”⁸³

It should be emphasized that the Av. passage quoted above presents some lexical difficulties; on details see KELLENS 1974, pp. 80 ff. and WIDMER 2007, p. 220. In particular, an agreed-upon interpretation of *urūd* is still wanting, notwithstanding KELLENS’ suggestion (“barrage”), which however does not appear to be definitive. Notably, the translator(s) into Pahlavi alternated the words *rōd* “river” and *rōdagdān* (exact meaning?⁸⁴ To my knowledge, otherwise unattested), resembling Av. *urūd* as far as sound is concerned, but most likely not connected to the latter from the etymological perspective and with a different semantic range.

⁷⁶ DARMESTETER 1887, pp. 160, 173 “canal;” CANNIZZARO 1990, p. 155 “in una corrente acqua corrente;” 1990, 168 “in un’acqua corrente;” KELLENS 1974, p. 83 *urūdi vā apō* ° “dans un barrage sur l’eau navigable.”

⁷⁷ MOAZAMI 2014, pp. 336, 337: *maγ *zohā* “*deep hole.” The reading *zohā* could be envisaged for some mss only; see JAMASP 1907, I p. 478 and fn. 38.9. Cf. also KAPADIA 1953, p. 413 (*mīzvān*).

⁷⁸ Mss K 1 and L 4 have both <’n’pt’k> (JAMASP 1907, I p. 478; see also *ibid.* fn. 38.10).

⁷⁹ Av. *vaēma-* “Felsspalt, Felsklufft” (BARTHOLOMAE 1904, col. 1326) is here rendered with Pahl. *wēm*, generally intended as “rock” (MACKENZIE s.v.); see also Parth. *wym*, Khot. *bīma-*, Arm. *vēm* (< Ir.) “rock.” Pahl. *wēm* occurs rarely; seemingly, in some of these rare occurrences it could also refer to something like a crevasse, ravine, precipice, as already suggested by EILERS 1988, pp. 333-334 n. 125. Doubts may also arise on the interpretation of *wēm* in PRDd 50.1 (WILLIAMS 1990 I, pp. 194-195; II, pp. 90, 241 [quoting Mirza’s comments]). In Vd. 13.38 *wēm* is translated “valley” in ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 290; “precipice” in MOAZAMI 2014, p. 337 (but here is given as “rock” in the Glossary, s.v.).

⁸⁰ ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 290 “navigable river;” DĀ’I AL-ESLĀM 2012, pp. 137, 144 “flowing water [*āb-e jāri*];” MOAZAMI 2014, p. 337 “*channel” (in contrast with *nāydāg* “deep, navigable” in the Glossary, p. 535). See also JAMASP 1907, II p. 169 s.v. *nāvtāk* “flowing or running (water) of a river or canal;” KAPADIA 1953, p. 25 <n’ywt’k>, <n’wt’k>, <n’pt’k> “flowing or running water; hence navigable or fordable water.”

⁸¹ Or *miγ*, a possible ‘dialectal’ pronunciation of Pahl. *maγ*? Cf. JAMASP 1907, I p. 509 (<myγ>) and fn. 6.5.

⁸² JAMASP 1907, I p. 509, fn. 6.7: ms. IM <lwtd’ n’>. MOAZAMI 2014, p. 358 *rōdagān* (probably a misprint; cf. *rōdagdān* “*river” in the Glossary, p. 542).

⁸³ See fn. 80 above; note however that here *āb ī *nāydāg* is translated “flowing water” by ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 309.

⁸⁴ MOAZAMI 2014, p. 542 (Glossary) “river.”

For the same reasons, bridging over the *nāuuiia-/*nāydāg* waters/river is considered a very praiseworthy deed, one of those one should accomplish in order to atone for a serious sin, as is, e.g., the murder of a water dog. In this case the sinner has to

- (14a) *biš hapta pəšauiō fraoirisiiōiṭ*
tarasca āpō nāuuiiatā
 (Vd./Av. 14.16)
 “build (?) fourteen bridges
 over *nāuuiia-* waters/river”⁸⁸

- (14b) *dō-haft puhl (rōd)⁸⁵ frōd ēd⁸⁶ wardēd (kū frāz ē*
*abganēd) tarist āb ī *nāydāg⁸⁷*
[katah ī ābdān pad dān] (Vd./Pahl. 14.16)
 “turn down (i.e. throw forward) fourteen⁸⁹
 bridges (river) over **nāydāg* waters/river⁹⁰
[water-holder channel pad dān (?)].”

Similarly, as a counterbalance to his sin, a man who consciously and voluntarily had released his semen in a menstruating woman, has to

- (15a) *θrisatəm frasciṇbananqm frasciṇbaiiōiṭ*
tarasca apō nāuuiiā (Vd./Av 18.74)
 “set up three hundred beams over *nāuuiia-*
 waters/river”⁹²

- (15b) *sīh pad frāz abganišnīh frāz abganēd*
*tarist āb ī *nāydāg⁹¹*
[kahas ī ābāndān pad dān] (Vd./Pahl. 18.74)
 “throw forwards thirty bridges (lit. throwing
 forwards)⁹³ over **nāydāg* waters/river⁹⁴ *[waterholder channel pad dān (?)]*.”

⁸⁵ JAMASP 1907, I p. 504, fn. 16.3 mentions the variant *wlt* (instead of *lwt*) in ms. MU. Cf. also ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 306 (*vart*).

⁸⁶ HNA is usually the heterogram for the demonstrative *ēd* “this;” for HNA “*ēd*” “used to form desiderative or intensive verbs” see KAPADIA 1953, p. 203.

⁸⁷ <n’wt’k>; cf. JAMASP 1907, I p. 504.

⁸⁸ DARMESTETER 1887, p. 171 “canals;” CANNIZZARO 1990, p. 163 “acque correnti.”

⁸⁹ Lit. ‘twice-seven.’

⁹⁰ ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 306 “navigable-water,” MOAZAMI 2014, p. 353 “navigable waters.”

⁹¹ *Variae lectiones* cf. JAMASP 1907, p. 605: <n’ywt’k>; fn 74.2: Sp <n’wt’k>, BU <nywt’k>, IM <n’wt’k>.

⁹² DARMESTETER 1887, p. 203 “canals;” CANNIZZARO 1990, p. 192 “acque scorrenti;” BARTHOLOMAE 1904, col. 1002 “fliessendem Wasser;” SKJÆRVØ 2005b, p. 145 “deep water.”

⁹³ Instead of *frāz*, MOAZAMI (2014, p. 426) reads *frasp* “beam” (see also *frasp* [pls] “beam, mast” in the Glossary). However, the reading *frāz* here is hardly disputable: Pahl. *frāz abganēd* is given as the counterpart of Av. *frasciṇbaiiōiṭ* (*fra-skamb-*) just as Pahl. *frāz abganišnīh* is the counterpart of Av. *frasciṇbananqm*.

⁹⁴ ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 369, MOAZAMI 2014, p. 427 “deep navigable waters.”

The last two passages from the Pahl. *Vendidād* are of particular interest: they have been mentioned over and over by the supporters of the channel-theory because of the glosses containing *kahas* “channel, sewer.”⁹⁵ It should be noted that these glosses are not completely clear; in fact, the sequence *pad dān* closing them has remained basically unexplained or not convincingly explained.⁹⁶

If bridging over the *nāuuiia*/**nāydāg* waters/rivers is held as a meritorious act, breaking bridges has to be considered definitely as a serious offence, as proved by a passage in the *Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag*. Among the souls of the wicked men gone to hell one finds those of men

(16) *kē-šān puhl ī rōd ī *nāydāg*⁹⁷ *kand* (AWN 55.3)

“who destroyed the bridges of the **nāydāg*⁹⁸ rivers.”

The conceptual link between *nāuuiia*/**nāydāg* waters/rivers and passages/bridges is so strong that to find the relevant expressions in collocation is not at all surprising. Words referring to them co-occur, but this time in coordination, in a list we find in the Pahl. Supplementary text to the *Šāyest-na-šāyest*:

(17) *zartōšttomīh ud xānīgān ud čašmag ud ābān ud
puhr ud rōdiz ī *nāydāg*⁹⁹ *ud nar ī ahlaw ud
nārīg ī ahlawēn* (Suppl. ŠnŠ 13.41)

“the supreme zartōštship, and wells, and springs, and
rivers, and bridges, and also the **nāydāg* rivers¹⁰⁰ and
the just men and the just women.”

Unfortunately, what this list would represent is unclear. Apparently – so it is expressly stated in the text – it would contain the nine ‘things’ (in fact the list contains only eight elements) to which any of the nine verses of the *Vahištōišti*

⁹⁵ A review of the occurrences of *kahas* in the sense of “canale artificiale costruito ai fini dell’irrigazione,” “corso d’acqua derivato da una sorgente, da un fiume o da un pozzo,” “conduttura messa in opera per portare l’acqua di una sorgente o di un fiume sui campi da irrigare” is in PAGLIARO 1938, pp. 77-79.

⁹⁶ Cf. ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 306 “watery conduit (PWN d’n) (with religious devotion);” p. 369 “water-bearing canals PWN d’n;” PAGLIARO 1938, p. 78 “conduttura di acqua da un fiume;” PANAINO 2004, p. 280 “canale di un contenitore d’acqua in un bacino;” MOAZAMI 2014, p. 353 “a water-holding channel to know;” p. 427 “channel containing water.”

⁹⁷ GIGNOUX 1984, p. 100 <n’ywt’k>; cf. *ibid.* fn. 3 (“Seul le ms. E donne la forme correcte”), but the spellings of the other mss are not given [GIGNOUX 1984 mentions 16 mss]. VAHMAN 1986, p. 148 <wt’k> (ms. K20); emended into *n’wt’k *ibid.* fn. 15. Cf. *ibid.* p. 149 **nāwdāg*.

⁹⁸ GIGNOUX 1984, p. 192 “rivières profondes;” see also s.v. n’ywt’k p. 254. VAHMAN 1986, p. 209 “*navigable rivers;” p. 270 (s.v. *nāwdāg*). See also VAHMAN 1977, p. 97 *nāydāg* “(of river) full of water [*porr āb*]; navigable [*qābel-e kaštirāni*].”

⁹⁹ <n’ywt’k>, see KOTWAL 1969, p. 21 of the handwritten appendix.

¹⁰⁰ KOTWAL 1969, p. 51 “deep rivers;” also s.v. *nāyudāg* “adj. for a river, usually rendered as ‘deep, navigable’.” See also TAVUSI 1986, p. 257 <n’ywt’k> “navigable [*qābel-e kaštirāni*];” MAZDĀPUR 2011, p. 189 “flowing in a *nāv* (?) [*nāvrow*].”

(Y 53), is dedicated. But the nine verses of Y 53 may be hardly associated with the elements mentioned in the list. This remains a puzzle.

What is certain is that the list does not contribute to a better understanding of the meaning of **nāyḍāg*. I wonder, however, whether *puhr* and *rōd* *ī* **nāyḍāg* here could not be considered as a reminiscence of other passages where they do not occur as discrete elements of a list, but as parts of a single phrase (‘bridge on a **nāyḍāg* river’) which has been split through the insertion of *ud* ‘and,’ a mark of seriation.

2.5. In the following two passages from *Dēnkard* 8, in a chapter summarizing the contents of the *Huspāram Nask*, one of the five strictly legal books of the Avesta, **nāyḍāg* occurs twice, qualifying *āb* and *rōd*, respectively:

(18) *abar sāmān ī āb*  *ud ān *nāyḍāg*¹⁰¹ (Dk. 8 37.38)

“About the limit¹⁰² of ¹⁰³ water/river and that **nāyḍāg*.”¹⁰⁴

(19) *abar paymānag ī mānišn ī mardōm az rōd ī *nāyḍāg*¹⁰⁵ (Dk. 8 37.42)

“About the distance of people’s dwelling place from a **nāyḍāg* river.”¹⁰⁶
(WIDMER 2007, p. 222 fn. 10)

Taken out of their originally larger contexts, these two occurrences of **nāyḍāg* are of a rather marginal interest for the identification of its meaning. In fact, the first would have been very interesting if the word written  would have been recognized since it could provide useful information for a typological confrontation (different types of waters/rivers), but this is not the case. From the second one learns that human dwellings should be kept at a certain (right) distance from a **nāyḍāg* river.

2.6. The chapters 48 and 49 of the *Nērangestān* contain a discussion of quality and quantity of liquid and solid offerings to the waters, both flowing (48) and stagnant (49.1-3), as part of the *Āb-zōhr*. It is also stated (49.8) that “stagnant water accepts (that) offering of which running water accepts half.” After the flowing (*frā-tat.carəta-* / (*frāz-*)*tazāg*) and stagnant (*armaēštaiia-* / *armēšt*) waters, the *nāuuiia-* / **nāyḍāg* water/river is dealt with in the following way:¹⁰⁷

¹⁰¹ < n’ywt’k >, see MADAN 1911, p. 753.

¹⁰² Pahl. *sāmān* means “limit, boundary,” though in some cases it could also be understood differently (“arrangement,” see KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK 1995, p. 20 fn. 5). WEST 1892, p. 119 “quality (*sāmān*).”

¹⁰³ WEST 1892, p. 119 “oozing out (*airīdō*).”

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* “which is flowing in a channel.”

¹⁰⁵ < ’ywt’k >, see MADAN 1911, p. 753.

¹⁰⁶ WEST 1892, p. 119 “river flowing in a channel.”

¹⁰⁷ Av. and Pahl. transcriptions are quoted according to KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK 2003, p. 220. Notably, the syntactic order in the Av. phrase is reproduced in the Pahl. translation.

(20a) *nāuuiaiiāi iθa āpe* (Nēr./Av. 49. 4)

“For the **nāuuia*-¹⁰⁸ water/river it is in such a way.”¹⁰⁹

(20b) *ka *nāydāg¹¹⁰ āb ēdōn* (Nēr./Pahl. 49. 4)

“In case of **nāydāg* water/river¹¹¹ it is in such a way.”¹¹²

(21a) *āaṭ nāuuiaiiāi auuaēzō aētaṇhā⁵ *frabərəta dāstra.masō paiti.barō*
(Nēr./Av. 49.5-6)

“(In case of)¹¹³ *nāuuia*- water/river, the *frabərətar* may without sin offer half as much of it.”

(21b) **nāydāg āb, awināh hān kē frabardār az nēmag-masāy frāz barēd [*ay sanjag ī frāz-baxtag ī pōst grīftan]* (Nēr./Pahl. 49.5-6)

“(In case of) **nāydāg* water/river, he who acts as a *frabardār* may without sin offer upward of half the quantity [i.e. for apportioning (he should) use the scales (that are made) of skin].”

The additional instructions contained in the Pahl. version of the last passage and quoted into brackets are repeated and reinforced in the Pahl. text some lines below:

(22) *ka *nāydāg āb dādestān sanjag ī frāz-baxtag ī pōst az ēn gyāg paydāg; pādyāb ā sanjag frāz nihādan* (Nēr./Pahl. 49.5-9)

“In case of **nāydāg* water/river, the rule (of using) scales for apportioning (that are made) of skin is evident from this place: for consecrated water, one should bring out the scales.”

The two extant mss transmitting the *Nērangestān* differ consistently in the way **nāydāg* is spelt in all its occurrences: <’nt’k> in TD, <’n’p’k> in HJ. For a sequence <’w’p’kyk>¹¹⁴ in both mss, the editors KOTWAL and KREYENBROEK have proposed to read **nāydāgīh*, a reading which is however very uncertain and open to question:

(23) *ka mähīgān hēnd āb pad *nāydāgīh nē āmār* (Nēr./Pahl. 49.11)

“If there are fish the water/river is not to be considered **nāydāg*.”

¹⁰⁸ KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK 2003, p. 221 “navigable;” see also p. 290 (Glossary).

¹⁰⁹ The Av. deictic adverb *iθa* has here a cataphoric function. Translating “similarly” KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK (2003, p. 221) attribute to it an anaphoric function.

¹¹⁰ Cf. KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK 2003, p. 220 fn. 1401, 1402, p. 222 fn. 1419.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 221 “deep.” See also p. 309 (Glossary) “deep, unfordable, navigable.”

¹¹² Translating “the same” KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK (2003, p. 221) attribute to *ēdōn* an anaphoric function. See fn. 110 above.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 221 “but.” In my opinion, the Av. discourse marker *āaṭ* has not been used here with an adversative value.

¹¹⁴ So *ibid.*, p. 222 fn. 1425. I wonder, however, in which way this sequence would differ from the sequence <’n’p’k>.

Even more debatable is the reading **nāyḍāg* proposed by KOTWAL and KREYENBROEK emending (Pāzand) *razq gqda* (in both the mss) in the following passage dealing with the Āb-zōhr ritual, which I quote according to the transcription and translation of the two editors, who also note that ‘deep water’ would presumably refer to ‘water from a stream:’

(24) *āb ī *nāyḍāg šāyēd hān kē bun ī xān *gandag* (Nēr./Pahl. 30.15)

“One may use deep water in case the (water) of the lower part of the house stinks.” (KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK 2003, pp. 136-137).

My only remark here is that *bun ī xān* would be better interpreted as “source” and that also **gandag* is a very uncertain reading.¹¹⁵

WIDMER (2007, p. 221) points out that in Nēr. 48-49 “[d]rei verschieden Arten Wasser werden [...] behandelt: *fratāt.carāt-* ‘laufend, fließend,’ *armaēšta-* ‘ruhig stehend’ und, mit letzterem in engerer Verbindung, *nāuuiia-*.” In fact, the alleged link of the *nāuuiia-* water with the stagnant water is absolutely questionable,¹¹⁶ as is proved by the fact that the only detail mentioned in the text (i.e., quantity of offerings accepted) equates the *nāuuiia-* water with the running water. Running and stagnant waters represent the most fundamental division of water ecosystems and are referred to in opposition in many other Zoroastrian texts as well;¹¹⁷ from Nēr. 48-49 we may deduce that the referent here qualified by *nāuuiia-* has something to do with the running water. WIDMER rightly observes that different types of water have been listed in other Mazdean texts, and never the *nāuuiia-/ *nāyḍāg* waters have found their place in these lists. In the *Bundahišn*,¹¹⁸ e.g., seventeen kinds (*sardag*) of water are listed: the first is dew (sitting upon vegetation), the second, the one flowing from the mountains, i.e. the rivers (*ān ī garān tazišn ast ī rōdīhā*), the third, the raining water, the fourth, the water of wells, the stagnant (*armēšt*) and other unspecified waters, the fifth, human and animal sperm, etc. (going on up to seventeen with different human and animal secretions, bodily liquids and liquids of the plants).¹¹⁹ Similarly, in the Yašt dedicated to Ahurānī (hidden in Y 68) different types of water and forms in which it appears are mentioned (Y 68.6);¹²⁰ again, no *nāuuiia-* water is mentioned. It is possible then that even in the case of the *Nērangestān*, Av. *āp-* and Pahl. *āb* have to be interpreted as “river, watercourse,” and not as “water.”

¹¹⁵ Mss <gwndk>, cf. KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK 2003, p. 136 n. 647.

¹¹⁶ I suppose that the interpretation given by WIDMER (and KOTWAL, KREYENBROEK as well) of Av. *iθa* and *āat* (see above fn. 110 and 112) is responsible for such an assumption.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Vd. 6.30, 39 (MOAZAMI 2014, pp. 174, 178); *Revāyat-e Āzur Farnbay* 38 (with *rawāg* instead of *tazāg*; cf. REZĀI BAGHBIDI 2005, p. 30), etc.

¹¹⁸ Ir. Bd. 11b (PAKZAD 2005, pp. 158-159); Ind. Bd. 18 (BEHZĀDI 1989, p. 48).

¹¹⁹ Interestingly, most of the elements of this list are introduced in the Pahl. translation of Y 38.3 (MALANDRA, ICHAPORIA 2013, pp. 55, 225-226) as an explanation for the seven epithets which provide the various names with which the waters are venerated (HINTZE 2007, pp. 227 ff.).

¹²⁰ Misprinted Y 82.6 in WIDMER 2007, p. 221.

2.7. *Rōd ī *Nāydāg* (the **Nāydāg* River) is attested in the *Bundahišn* as a hydronym (Ir. Bd. 29.5)¹²¹ and a toponym (Ir. Bd. 29.9).¹²² The usual and problematic graphic variance (n'yw° vs. 'yw°) permits alternative readings. GNOLI is prudent in his pronouncement (“fiume Nāvtāk, (Nāyōtāk or Ēvtāk),” 1967, p. 14) also because a river called Ēwtāg is attested in other Pahl. texts; GRENET, e.g., complains of the systematic emendation of Ēwtāg into **Nawtāg* “comme on le fait depuis Darmesteter” (2002, p. 207).

In a glossary of Pārsī words copied by Manucihr son of Burzō Sanjānā in 1023/1655, and edited by SACHAU (1871), a form نودا is quoted and explained as “name of a river [*nām-e rud*];”¹²³ a few lines below¹²⁴ the same form (this time vowelised with *zir* under *vāv*, i.e., *nāvidā*) is explained as “name of a river (which) is very deep and always full of water [*nām-e rud ast besiār camiγ ast va hamiše por bāšad*].”

As for the toponym Nautaka, the name of an East Iranian region transmitted in Greek by the historians of Alexandre and often related by scholars to Pahl. **nāy-dāg*,¹²⁵ GRENET (2002, pp. 209-212) has suggested interpreting it as “the nine watercourses” (<**nawa-tāka*>), a name well fitting the Sogdian area from the Zarafšān Mountains to the Iron Gates where it is still possible to trace nine rivers.¹²⁶

2.8. Pahl. **nāydāg* also occurs in the *Frahang ī pahlavīg* in a chapter dealing with “waters” (ch. III, *ābihā*). It is preceded by the ‘Arameogram’ ŠTMT’, unattested in other Pahl. texts and apparently paralleling <n'ywt'k'> (also in the variant <n'wt'k'> in one of the mss).¹²⁷ Before **nāydāg* and ŠTMT', one finds one after the other the graphic sequences <kt's> and <kyh>: the former is *kahas* “channel,” the latter is most likely an alternative spelling or a variant of *kahas*.¹²⁸ NYBERG, UTAS (1988, p. 64) have suggested recognizing here “an explanatory phrase: ‘a canal which [is] ŠTQT' is navigable;” such a proposal seems to me untenable. Scholars who believe that Pahl. **nāydāg* means ‘channel’¹²⁹ attribute the same meaning to ŠTMT',¹³⁰

¹²¹ **Nāydāg*: TD1, DH <n'ywt'k'>, TD2 <'ywt'k'>, K20 <n'wt'k'>; cf. PAKZAD 2005, p. 339 fn. 34.

¹²² **Nāydāg* TD1, DH <n'ywt'k'>; TD2 <'ywt'k'>; cf. PAKZAD 2005, p. 340 fn. 55.

¹²³ SACHAU 1871, p. 850, l. 7.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* l. 11.

¹²⁵ Cf. HERZFELD 1947, p. 565; PANAINO 2004, p. 279, fn. 45.

¹²⁶ A different proposal has been advanced by HARMATTA (1999, pp. 133-134), according to whom Nautaka would reflect the Ir. compound **Navātaka-* or **Navāθaka-* (“New Settlement;” cf. OIr. *nava-* ‘new’ and Av. *aθā-* ‘habitation, settlement”).

¹²⁷ Cf. JUNKER 1912, p. 50; NYBERG, UTAS 1988, pp. 42, 64.

¹²⁸ Cf. GEIGER 1912, p. 299; PAGLIARO 1938, p. 72; 'ORYĀN 1998, p. 65; see also NYBERG, UTAS 1988, p. 64 (“a secondary combination of two originally independent lemmas,” suggested as a possible explanation).

¹²⁹ JUNKER 1912, p. 86.

¹³⁰ For a different interpretation see EBELING 1941, p. 11 (“Ich wage daher 2 c zu lesen als n'ḥ!wt'k und darin das mittelp. Wort für „Kapitän“ zu sehen, vgl. neup. *nāḥudā*. Mit 2 v ist dann zusammen zu stellen syr. *'eštjāmā* „nauklerus“ aus akkad. *šatammu* „Direktor, Leiter“”).

but the Aramaic word underlying the Aramaeogram has not been identified (cf. HOFTIJZER, JONGERLING 1995, p. 1199, s.v. *štmh*). The sequence <n'ywt'k'> is accompanied by different Prs. glosses in the different *Frahang* mss: 1) *nāvdāne*, *ya'ni 'obur-e ābgāh ke dar ān miravad* ("nāvdāne, i.e., the passage of the water-place in which it goes"), 2) *nāvdān* ("gutter"), 3) *čāh* ("well") and 4) *ḵuy* ("water-course, stream"). The presence of the different Prs. glosses confirms that Pahl. **nāyḍāg* was not a deep-rooted word in the lexicon of Persian speaking people using Pahlavi for religious purposes, and that they connected it in an approximate way with water and watercourses.

2.9. Av. *nāuuiia-* and Pahl. **nāyḍāg* clearly differ in their morphology. Seemingly, both point to a base **nāu-*, but while the Av. word is an *-iia-* derivative, the Pahl. one apparently is a compound with *-tāk* (from *√tak-* "to flow"). According to HERZFELD (1947, p. 563), Av. "*nāviya*, a qualificative adj. like *ḵāniya* 'water in springs,' *čātiya* 'in wells,' *paršuviya* 'in canals,' *variya* 'in ponds, lakes,' means 'water in *nāv*,' and OIr. *nāv*, like NP. *nāv*, is 'every long hollow tube, pipe, water-canal,' especially 'canalis per quam aqua molam agens fluit,' the mill-ditch."¹³¹ One should say that, while an Av. **nāuu-* is unrecorded, we do have attestations of Pahl. *nāw* (or *nāb*), written <n'p'>.¹³² On this form PAGLIARO (1938, p. 81 fn. 1) noted: "Si osservi [...] che un m.p. *nāv* 'canale' non esiste, mentre esiste *nāp* il cui significato sembra essere quello di 'sorgente'." He pointed to the following passage from *Dēnkard* 8:

(25) *abar jōy ī nē hamēšag nāw*¹³³ *ka āb padiš widārdan ud ān-iz ī hamēšag nāw ka āb padiš abzūdan kāmēd* (Dk. 8 44.18)

"About a channel which is not always *nāw* when the water has to pass through it and also about that which is always *nāw* when one wants to increase the water therein."

and translated *jōy ī (nē) hamēšag nāw* as "canale a sorgente (non) continua." However, PAGLIARO's *nāw* "source," with no link with other Ir. words, sounds too much like an *ad hoc* solution. WEST (1892, p. 155), who had attributed to *nāēv* the meaning of "channel" (see above fn. 3), translated *jōy ī (nē) hamēšag* as "a ditch (*gōi*) which is (not) always a stream (*nāvō*)," but this translation is not at all satisfactory:

¹³¹ See also BAILEY unpubl. I, p. 77; GERSHEVITCH 1962, pp. 173-174 ("The natural inference is that OIr. *nāu-*, like NPers. *nāv*, denoted two distinct contrivances: (1) a ship; and (2) a channel presumably consisting, at least originally, of one or more hollowed-out tree-trunks. Only by attributing to OIr. *nāu-* also the second meaning do we obtain a convincing reason why Av. *āpō nāvayā* is used in the sense of 'channel waters'"). GERSHEVITCH (*apud* HALLOCK 1969, p. 53) also reconstructed an OP form **nāvaka-* to explain AE *numakaš*, "perhaps meaning 'a person concerned with the making, laying, or maintaining of channels'." This etymology is however very uncertain; for a recent discussion on the question see ROLLINGER, HENKELMANN 2009, p. 333.

¹³² See also Prs. *nāb*, § 6.

¹³³ <n'p'>; cf. MADAN 1911, p. 779.5 f.

what would it mean that a *jōy*,¹³⁴ here explicitly taken as an artificial watercourse (“ditch”), may be (or may not be) always a *nāw*, explicitly taken as a natural watercourse (“stream”)? In my opinion, what this passage proves is that Pahl. *jōy* and *nāw* are not synonyms and cannot be used interchangeably.

The expression *jōy ī (nē) hamēšag nāw* in the above passage of *Dēnkard* 8 finds a very close parallel in the *rōd ī hamēšag nāw* attested in *Dēnkard* 6:

- (26) *ud harw kirbag ī andar gehān pad awe dārišn šawišn ce ’on rōd ī hamēšag nāw*¹³⁵ (Dk. 6.141)

“Every good deed which may be held in the world by that (man) would proceed like a river which is always *nāw*.”

SHAKED (1979, pp. 56-57) had some hesitation in translating this passage; he signalled his doubts with a question mark (“a river which is always navigable (?)”).¹³⁶

A similar, though not identical expression is also found in *Vendidād* 5.4 S: *jōy hamēšag āb* is translated “stream of running water” by MOAZAMI 2014, pp. 126-127 (but a stream with stagnant water is hardly imaginable!) and “eternal water” by ANKLESARIA 1949, p. 96. Interestingly, in both the Dk. and the Vd. passage the concern is how to behave in order to contrast defilement caused by dead matter (in our specific cases, when dead matter reaches watercourses)! It is clear that in the three cases under discussion the reference is to watercourses always having or not having (abundance of) water. However, to attribute to *āb* and *nāw* the same meaning seems hazardous.

Further passages in Dk. 6 confirm that good deeds were metaphorically associated with water and may therefore be of some relevance in our investigation. Let us consider the following (Dk. 6.209):¹³⁷

- (27) *weh-dōst mard az hamāg ēn gēhān kirbag abar rasēd az hān ī xwad kunēd hammis*

“To a man who practises friendship of the good there come good deeds from the whole of this world, in addition to those which he performs himself.

pad-eš a ’ōn ul ēstēd ce ’ōn gabr ī āb abar wārēd ēd-ez az ane gyāg aweš rasēd

They gather in him in the manner of a cavity upon which water falls and to which water also comes from other places.

*weh-dušmanīh mard az hamāg ēn gēhān kirbag a ’ōn *nihang [bawēd] ce hān ī xwad kunēd a ’ōn az-eš be šawēd ud az abārīg gyāg a ’ōn aweš ne rasēd ce ’ōn cagād āb*

¹³⁴ Pahl. *jōy* “channel, stream” may be used with reference to both artificial and natural watercourses.

¹³⁵ Mss <n’p’>; cf. SHAKED 1979, p. 56.

¹³⁶ See also SHAKED 1979, p. 267: “For *nāw* cf. Av. *nāvaya-*, *AirWb*, 1064.”

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-83. See also Dk. 6.208 and E35b.

To a man who practises enmity of the good there accrue in this manner few few good deeds from the whole of this world, for those which he himself per forms depart from him and nothing comes to him from other places, in the same manner as water does with regard to a mountain top.”

The image is suggestive: good deeds performed by a good man attract other good deeds from the whole world and all together gather inside the man, just as water falling down from high places gathers in a cavity of the earth,¹³⁸ i.e. in a depression or valley. I wonder whether the *nāw*-water may have something to do with the impressive quantity of water (mostly formed from rain or snow) falling down from mountains into valleys, which may also be responsible of rivers' flooding.

2.10. In many occasions canals for irrigation, ditches, aqueducts and other structures built by humans are referred to in Av. and Pahl. texts. In these cases various terms are used, as Av. *vaidi-*,¹³⁹ Pahl. *jōy*, *kahas* and, occasionally, *nāy*.¹⁴⁰ Noteworthy is a passage from the *Dēnkard* (Dk. 8.44 ff.) where different kinds of canals are considered, and *nāy* is the word used for “canal.” Pahl. *nāy* means both “channel” and “flute.”¹⁴¹ It is also recorded in Manichaean Middle Persian with both these senses.¹⁴²

In NYBERG, UTAS 1988, p. 64 *nāw* and *nāy* are quoted as dialectal variants (NW *nāw* and SW *nāy*) of the word for “boat.” A strong link between the two forms has been suggested or given for granted by other scholars as well.¹⁴³ It is certainly possible that a lexical contamination has occurred and the existence of *nāy* may have conditioned the way *nāw* and its derivative **nāydāg* have been absorbed by New Persian speaking people of Zoroastrian faith. In my opinion, however, they were definitely two different words, with distinct contexts of use.

From *nāy* “channel,” *nāyīzag* has derived with the meaning of “(small) channel.”¹⁴⁴ This form is recorded in the Pahl. documentation.¹⁴⁵ Since in one of the *Bundahišn* mss, it has been spelt <n'wyck> instead of <n'yck>, some scholars have read it *nāwīzag* and explained it as a diminutive from *nāw* “channel.”¹⁴⁶

¹³⁸ On Pahl. *gabr* “womb; cavity, depression” see SHAKED 1979, p. 272 and HUTTER 1992, p. 33.

¹³⁹ Cf. *vaḍay-* : *vaidi-* “Wasserlauf, Bewässerungskanal” in BARTHOLOMAE 1904, col. 1344.

¹⁴⁰ See, e.g., Dk. 7.44.

¹⁴¹ In MACKENZIE 1986, p. 58 s.v. *nāy*, the sense “channel” has not been included.

¹⁴² Cf. n'y “pipe, drain; canal; flute” in DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2004, p. 238.

¹⁴³ Cf. HERZFELD 1938, p. 324 (“nāv röhren, kanäle [...], vgl. Tpārs. „nāy ē andar gaḡr ē zamīk, höhungen, röhren in den gründen der erde”).

¹⁴⁴ See also Prs. *nāyīce*, *nāyīze*, *nāyize* “reed, pipe, tube.” Note that Prs. *nāy* means “reed; flute;” as “channel” it is only used with reference to hollowed channels in the body (*nāy[-e golu]* “windpipe, trachea;” *nāy-e bini* “nostril,” etc.).

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Ir. Bd. 10.5 (PAKZAD 2005, pp. 140-141, four occurrences). See also *Little Sīh-rōzag* 10 (RAFFAELLI 2014, p. 97); in a similar passage one finds *jōy* (Ir. Bd. 24c.9, PAKZAD 2005, p. 269). It is not clear to me why MACKENZIE 1986 in his *Addenda and Corrigenda* deletes the article *nāyīzag* (“small reed, straw”), and substitutes it with *wēzag* (meaning?).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. HORN 1893, p. 229 no. 1024; BAILEY unpubl. I, p. 77, etc.

I think that a contamination between two distinct lexical bases may have occurred also in this case.

As for *kahas*, what has been stated about it by HERZFELD (1938, p. 224 n. 1), i.e., that it is the “P[ahlavi] ü[bersetzung] von aw. *nāwya*- ‘kanal,’ nicht ‘schiffbar,’” or by HENNING (1937, p. 91), i.e. that “Pahl. *kaθas* explains Av. *nāvaya*- ‘navigable,’” is absolutely untenable.¹⁴⁷ The link between *kahas* and the **nāyḍāg* river only rests on the two glosses in the *Vendidad* passages quoted above. Admittedly, it is no small thing. Glosses say a lot about a text and its author (or its transmitter) and deserve the greatest attention. But they cannot be adduced as conclusive and irrefutable proofs. Otherwise in a passage of the *Bundahišn*¹⁴⁸ one runs the risk to attribute to *gund* (“testicle”) the meaning of “mouth” (with the difficult additional task of finding a plausible etymology for it), as in BAILEY unpubl. I, p. 168 and ANKLESARIA 1956, p. 195, only because the graphic sequence <gwnd> was accompanied by the Pāzand gloss *dahān*.

2.11. HERZFELD (1947, p. 563) states that Av. “*nāviya* is never used of rivers, but only of water.” Such an assumption is highly challengeable, as the documentation analysed so far may prove sufficiently. Furthermore, if we consider the relevant Pahl. passages, we may easily ascertain that *āb* always parallels Av. *āp*- in the case of translated texts, while *rōd* is mostly expected with ‘independent’ texts. This may lead one to think that the sense of Pahl. *āb* in (at least most) of its occurrences in collocation with **nāyḍāg* is that of “river.”¹⁴⁹ Seemingly, the Av. and Pahl. adjectives *nāuuiia*- and **nāyḍāg* do not qualify a kind of water, but a kind of watercourse. The watercourses qualified by *nāuuiia*-/**nāyḍāg* are great, natural, stably full of water, deep, frightfully impressive and difficult to cross. Their mention never evokes plain agricultural contexts. In conclusion, they are quite the opposite of irrigation channels.

3. As is well known, Av. *nāuuiia*- has near cognates in Vedic and Old Persian.

3.1. Ved. *nāvyā*- is an adjective used in collocation with nouns referring to watercourses and recorded in dictionaries as “navigable, accessible by boat or ship;” the feminine *nāvyā* is used as a noun (“navigable river”).¹⁵⁰ The definition of its semantic range and etymology (a derivative from *nāu*- “boat, ship”) has been conditioned by the explanation given by Pāṇini,¹⁵¹ according to whom

¹⁴⁷ There is a blatant contradiction in HENNING’s general argument (“Pahl. *kaθas* explains Av. *nāvaya*- ‘navigable’ and *kaθasīk* (*kaθasīy*) translates Av. *paršuya*- [...] ‘channel-water’”). On the alleged semantic equivalence between *nāuuiia*- and *paršuiia*- see also PANAINO 2004, p. 281.

¹⁴⁸ Ir. Bd. 24d.10 (PAKZAD 2005, p. 270).

¹⁴⁹ See also above, fn. 24.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. MONIER-WILLIAMS 1899, p. 538a.

¹⁵¹ “-yá oder -ya hat nach *nau* die Bedeutung „damit zu durchschiffen“,” BÖHTLINGK 1887, p. 215.

nāvyā- qualifies watercourses that are so deep and wide that they can not be crossed by swimming or fording, but only by boating.¹⁵² To my knowledge, such an explanation has not generally been brought into question,¹⁵³ with few exceptions: SCHMID (1969, pp. 219-220) has pointed out that “die Schiffbarkeit der Ströme spielt überhaupt keine Rolle” in the contexts where Ved. *nāvyā-* occurs; WIDMER has extended to *nāvyā-* meaning and etymology he attributes to Av. *nāuuiia-* (2007, pp. 224-225).

3.2. Strangely enough, in the scholarly debate up to 1938, OP *nāviya-* and Av. *nāuuiia-* have generally been kept apart and rarely crossed, as also evidenced by the treatment of the two relevant articles in BARTHOLOMAE 1904, coll. 1064-1065, where Av. *nāvaya-* is given as “Schiffbar, Bezeichnung fließenden Wassers von grösserer Breite und Tiefe” and OP *nāviyā-* as “Schiffszeug, Flotte, Flottille.” In fact, proposals of a connection had been tentatively advanced. BENVENISTE, RENOU (1934, p. 60 and fn. 3), for instance, suggested interpreting Av. *āfs nāuuiia* in Yt 14.39 “non ‘eau navigable,’ mais désignation probable des fleuves tumultueux, comme peut-être v.p. *nāviyā*.”

OP *nāviya-* occurs only once in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions. It is found in connection with *ap-* “water,” probably also “river,” in a well known passage of the Bisotun inscription where the focus is Darius’ Tigris campaign against Nidintu-Bēl, who rose up in Babylon as the King of Babylon under the name of Nebuchadnezzar (III). I have recently commented on this specific passage and for this reason I will not enter into details, referring directly to FILIPPONE 2016 and confining myself to quoting the OP clause in column I, ll. 85-86, where *nāviya-* is found, in correspondance with the (Achaemenid) Elamite version col. I, l. 68 and (Achaemenid) Babylonian version l. 34:

(28) DB/OP i.85-86 <i>utā abiš nāviyā āha</i> “And the river was <i>nāviya-</i>.”	DB/AE i.68 <i>kudda A [ha?]ah</i> ^{AS}GIŠ-MÁ^{MES}-<i>na</i> “And the river was [or: (was) there] ^{AS}GIŠ-MÁ^{MES}-<i>na</i>.”	DB/AB 34 <i>Idiglat mali</i> “The Tigris was in flood.”
---	--	---

The content of the AB passage is very clear; that of the OP and AE ones is not. Its understanding is conditioned by the interpretation of OP *nāviya-* and AE ^{AS}GIŠ-MÁ^{MES}-*na*, the latter consisting of the logogram ^{AS}GIŠ.MÁ^{MES} “boat” (cf. the Akkadian logogram GIŠ-MÁ for *elippu* “boat,” with GIŠ for *išu* “wood, tree”) plus postposition *-na*, with its usual genitive-dative functions.

¹⁵² See KLAUS 1989, p. 17 (with references).

¹⁵³ See MAYRHOFER 1996, p. 39; TURNER 1966, p. 406 no. 7083.

Since the earliest studies of DB, *nāviya-* has been in a way or another associated by scholars to Ir. (and IE) **nāw-* “boat, ship.”¹⁵⁴ But it was KÖNIG (1938, pp.70-71) who first explained it as an adjectival derivative from **nāw-* with the meaning of “navigable” and in this way unified the fortunes of Av. *nāuuiia-* and OP *nāviya-* once and for all. Since many scholars felt that the sense “navigable” does not fit Darius’ narrative, the discussion shifted on the possible values which may be associated to the concept of ‘navigability’: positive (“crossable by boats”) vs. negative (“requiring a boat, uncrossable without a boat”). According to KENT,¹⁵⁵ saying that at that place the Tigris was ‘navigable’ (*nāviya-*) Darius would simply mean that the river could not be crossed by fording. He supported his view quoting a few passages of Greek authors, in particular Xenophon (*Anab.* 2.2.3), but also Herodotus (*Hist.* 1.189, 5.52), who qualified the Tigris and other rivers as νηυσπέρητος “navigable.” This has become more or less the current understanding: see lastly *nāviya-* “nur mittels Boot zu überqueren” in SCHMITT 2014, p. 220.

Other solutions have been advanced. Instead of a negative “not fordable,” UTAS suggested a positive “still crossable” (1966, p. 128), which in fact sounds quite unsuitable to the context.¹⁵⁶ Doubts on the current interpretation of OP *nāviya-* and Av. *nāuuiia-* as “fordable by boat” have been raised on more occasions by SKJÆRVØ who has suggested interpreting them as “in spate.”¹⁵⁷ WIDMER (2007) attributed to OP *nāviya-*, the same meaning “streaming, raging” he attributed to Av. *nāuuiia-* (and Ved. *nāvyā-*).

The supporters of the channel-theory for Av. *nāuuiia-* did not generally extend the meaning “channel” to OP *nāviya-*. According to GERSHEVITCH (1962, p. 173), OP *nāviya-* would differ from Av. *nāuuiia-* in that the latter “means not only ‘navigable,’ like its Old Persian counterpart [...] but is also applied to waters running in channels;” similarly PANAINO (2004, p. 278) asserts that unlike Av. *nāuuiia-*, OP *nāviya-* has probably the meaning of “navigable.”¹⁵⁸ The exception is HERZFELD, as confirmed by his comments on the DB passage containing *abiš nāviyā āha*, “[...] wo vom hochwasserstand des Tigris die rede ist und der strom und seine großen ‘kanäle’ gemeint sind” (1938, p. 324). According to him, the meaning of this passage would have been “and there was a canal, or were canals” (1947, p. 565), but he doesn’t offer a convincing explanation of the contribution of this information to the story plot.

The great variety of views has produced different interpretations of OP *nāviya-* in the DB passage under examination.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁴ Cf. RAWLINSON 1848, p. v, where *uta abiš nāviyā āha* is translated “et iis naves erant.” See also UTAS 1966, p. 127.

¹⁵⁵ KENT 1942, p. 271; 1943; see also 1953, p. 193.

¹⁵⁶ See FILIPPONE 2016, p. 33 fn. 33.

¹⁵⁷ See SKJÆRVØ 2011b, p. 326 (“the only thing Darius does not use to cross the Tigris is boats, but rather inflated hides, camels, and horses”).

¹⁵⁸ See also PANAINO 2004, p. 276 where *utā abiš nāviyā āha* is translated “e per quanto concerneva le acque, (il Tigri) era attraversabile (solo in barca).”

¹⁵⁹ KENT 1953, p. 120: “and on account of the waters (the Tigris) was unfordable;” SCHMITT 2009, p. 49: “und wegen der Wasser(massen) war (der Fluß nur) mittels Boot (zu überqueren,

Independently from the real events, in Darius' account the Tigris was described as it was in a condition such that its crossing should be perceived as an extremely difficult and dangerous act; we may imagine it with very high water, perhaps in a seasonal or occasional spate. The successful crossing would then appear as a heroic undertaking; after all, emphasizing the performance is a common rhetoric device complying with the rules of political discourse. As I have already pointed out, "[t]he context of usage of the only occurrence we have of OP *nāviya-* leaves us in an embarrassment of riches: when in spate, the river is high, full of running water, deep, rushing, unfordable, etc." (FILIPPONE 2016, p. 34). It is difficult to select among several theoretically possible senses, all of them suitable for the general context, the one which only pertains to OP *nāviya-*. The same probably applies to AE ^{AS}GIŠ-^{MEŠ}MÁ-na, that seems to be an *ad hoc* formation modelled upon the OP word and should be interpreted consequently.

Although cognate words in different languages, even when they are also 'equivalent' from a morphological point of view, can each develop (and do often develop) semantic specializations, in the case of Av. *nāuuiia-*, OP *nāviya-* and Ved. *nāvyā-*, the analysis of their occurrences and the identification of similar frozen collocations should lead us to believe that they also have to be considered as semantically equivalent.

4. I have suggested above (§ 2) that Pahl. **nāydāg* could have been perceived as a word extraneous to the common Middle Persian lexicon. A prove of this could be the fact that it has not been recorded in Manichaean or other Middle Persian varieties. No trace of it is found in Parthian as well.

A sure member of the lexical family of Av. *nāuuiia-* is the Sogd. adjective *n'ywk*, *n'ywq* "deep," from which the noun *n'ywk'wyy* "depth" also derives. But one could also mention here Sogd. *n'wn-* "river," once attested in the plural form *n'wnnt* in the Buddhist text *Dhyāna* (325); its meaning should be assured by the Chinese source text. According to BENVENISTE 1933, p. 236, "[s]i la fin est encore peu claire à cause des deux *n* susceptible d'être lu *z*, on reconnaît en tout cas une désignation métaphorique pareille à av. *āpō nāvayā* 'eaux torrentueuses, rapides d'un fleuve'." MACKENZIE 1976, p. 114 tentatively suggested interpreting it as a *-n*-adjectival stem and referred to Yaṣn. *nōw* "valley" (see below, § 6).

In Bactrian, the noun *nōio* is attested in one of the economic and legal documents published by SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000.¹⁶⁰ It clearly refers to a canal built by humans.¹⁶¹ BAILEY (1979, p. 193) suggests a connection of Khot. *naurā* "deep (?)" with Sogd. *n'ywk-* ("if from **nāvya-ka-*") and "Av. *nāvaya-* 'deep(?),' if not from *nāu-* 'boat,'" but his interpretation of *naurā* in its only occurrence is highly speculative.

nicht zu durchwateten);" LECOQ 1997, p. 193: "et les eaux étaient navigables;" BAE 2001, p. 110: "and the water was deep;" PIRART 2011, p. 157: "et les eaux (du Tigre) étaient grosses," etc.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, pp. 115-122; p. 209 (Glossary) "channel."

¹⁶¹ Cf. *νοιο νακανδο* "to dig a channel," SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, p. 121.

On Tocharian B *newiya* “canal” (one occurrence; uncertain meaning), Tocharian A *new-* “flood,” possibly a borrowing from Iranian, see ADAMS 2013, p. 363 and WIDMER 2007, p. 224.

5. If the meaning of Av. *nāuuia-*, OP *nāviya-* and Pahl. **nāydāg* is disputed, on their etymology there has been an almost unanimous agreement: they have been referred, as adjectival derivatives and a compound respectively, to IE **néh₂us*, the well known word for “boat” (possibly < “floater, swimmer”). All the repertoires of IE lexicon also mention them in this connection.¹⁶² There is sufficient evidence from different IE languages confirming the theory that the ‘floater-boat’ might originally have been a hollowed-out log.¹⁶³ But as hollowed-out logs have proved since antiquity to be useful tools for many different scopes, words belonging to the large family of Ir. **nāu-* have covered a large semantic range, with different senses acquired through metonymical and metaphorical associations (‘boat,’ ‘gutter,’ ‘aqueduct,’ ‘feeding trough,’ ‘hopper,’ ‘mill-race,’ ‘valley,’ etc.).¹⁶⁴ This fact permits to satisfy both the requirements of the supporters of the channel-theory and those of scholars attached to the concept of ‘navigability.’

On this etymology, a dissonant voice is that of PAUL WIDMER. According to him, from a phonological, morphological and semantic point of view, Av. *nāuuia-* and its cognates would be better explained as primary formations derived directly from an Ilr. root *nāy-* “to flow,” and thence meaning “streaming, raging,” rather than secondary derivatives from Ilr. *nāy-* “boat, ship.”¹⁶⁵ To the same verbal root he connects Prs. *nāv* “channel” and other Ir. words with close meanings, for which see below.

5.1. As far as Ir. **nāu-* “boat” is concerned, it may be worth noting that the connected Ir. words for ‘boat’ seem to have a dialectal connotation. In Middle Iranian, they are only documented in (Man.) Parthian (*n ’w*) and in Eastern languages (Sogd. *n ’w*, Khot. *no*, Khwar. *n ’wyk*).

As for New Iranian, Prs. *nāv* “boat, ship” has been cited by almost all scholars involved in the *nāuuia-* / **nāydāg* question.¹⁶⁶ In fact, the classical Prs. dictionaries quote, among the several senses of Prs. *nāv*, also that of “boat, small ship.” But to it one of the last positions in the list of senses is generally reserved and no attestations of *nāv* and its derivatives with the meaning of “boat” in literary Persian are provided in DEHXODĀ, s.v., or other major lexicographical sources.¹⁶⁷ NAFISI 1976, p. 3660) produces a separate entry for *nāv* “boat,” which is explained as a ‘Sanskrit

¹⁶² See lastly MALLORY, ADAMS 1997, p. 74; WODTKO, IRLINGER, SCHNEIDER 2008, p. 515.

¹⁶³ Cf. GERSHEVITCH 1962, p. 173; MALLORY, ADAMS 1997, p. 74.

¹⁶⁴ For the same phenomenon in Indo-Aryan, see TURNER 1966, p. 406 nos. 7081 and 7083.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. WIDMER 2007, pp. 225-226.

¹⁶⁶ See, e.g., GERSHEVITCH 1962, p. 173: “Two distinct meanings are attached to the Persian word *nāv*: (1) ‘boat,’ and (2) ‘canal, aqueduct.’”

¹⁶⁷ Notably, Prs. *nāxodā* (old variant *nāvxodā*) “captain” seems to have always been a word in current use.

loanword.’ Notably, LAZARD (1963, p. 78 and fn. 11) quotes *nāv* “bateau” among the “mots ou locutions plus ou moins rares fort intéressants” in the *Tārix-e Baihaqi* (11th c., Khorāsān). Even Ar. *nāvaq*, a Prs. loanword (< Prs. *nāve*) given by AS-BAGHI 1988, p. 258 as “Boot,” is in fact “a stone having a hole for water discharge [*sang-e surāx-dār-e ābriz*]” (cf. EMĀM-E ŠUŠTARI 1969, p. 660).

The situation changes with the Prs. dictionaries produced in the 20th c.¹⁶⁸ The reason is that *nāv* has been included among the new words approved by the Farhangestān in the thirties with the meaning of “warship;” besides *nāv*, in the same list of new words,¹⁶⁹ we find derivatives and compounds such as *nāvegān* “fleet,” *nāvče* “small warship,” *nāvbar* “navigator,” *nāvbari* “navigation,” *nāvbariye havāi* “aeronavigation,” *nāvtip* “squadron” and several other lexical items belonging to the military, nautical¹⁷⁰ or otherwise technical domains (such as *nāvdis* “syncline” [i.e. the wrinkles of the terrain having the form of a *nāv*]; *nāvpāyān* “scaphopods,” etc.). All the new entries are regularly marked with the label ‘*Farh*’ (=Farhangestān) in DEHXODĀ and MO‘IN’s dictionaries.

The only modern Ir. languages which have preserved the ‘boat’-sense are Ossetian and a few languages of North Iran; see below, § 6. No traces of *nāv* “boat” are found in languages and dialects of Central and Southern Iran, although boats made of hollowed-out logs have continued to be used in Iran until very recent times.¹⁷¹

In Old Iranian, the existence of Av. **nāuua-* “boat” might only be inferred by Av. *nauuāza-*, cognates to Ved. *nāvājā-*, Sogd. *nw’z*, MParth. and MPrs. *nāwāz* “helmsman, pilot.” Similarly, no sure attestation of OP **nāva-* “boat, ship” is found in the epigraphic documentation. In one of Darius’ inscriptions (Suez, DZc), **nāva* has been reconstructed by scholars¹⁷² in the passage (l. 11) *utā nāva ayantā hacā Mudrāyā tara imām yauviyām abi Pārsam* “and the ships went from Egypt through this canal towards Persia.” According to SCHMITT (2014, p. 220), this is “nach dem Kontext ohne plausible Alternative.”¹⁷³ In principle, such a statement could be challenged. However, in favour of a possible actual existence of **nāva-* in Old Persian (or in another Ir. language known by the officers in charge of the royal chancellery) speaks the AE rendering of OP *nāviya-*. Whatever the origin of OP *nāviya-*, the author of the AE calque, if ^{AS}GIŠ-^{MEŠ}MÁ-na is really a calque, ac-

¹⁶⁸ Cf. LAZARD 1990 (*nāv* “navire de guerre,” *nāvostovār* “officier marinier,” *nāvbān* “enseigne de vaisseau,” *nāvbar* “mil. navigateur,” *nāvbari* “pilotage, navigation,” *nāvtip* “escadre”); HAIM 1992 (*nāv* “1. boat (see *kešti*); 2. a canal, an aqueduct (syn. *ābrow*, *nahr*)”), etc.

¹⁶⁹ *Farhangestān-e Irān* 1940, pp. 80-81.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. also NURBAXŠ 2002, pp. 380-383.

¹⁷¹ GEORGE CURZON (1892, II p. 408) reported that “simple dug-outs” were the smaller craft for shore use in the Persian Gulf.

¹⁷² Reconstruction first suggested in TOLMAN 1908, p. 52 fn. 7, and accepted by all the subsequent editors of DZc (for which no photo is available).

¹⁷³ It must be said that for the only other OP passage in which apparently an allusion is made to sea crossing (DB v.24-25), SCHMITT 2009, p. 90, though with many doubts, accepts Hinz’ proposal to reconstruct the partially lost sequence [.]rx[.] *ja* as it was *draxtā*, the singular instrumental form from **draxta-* “boat” (< “tree”); cf. also SCHMITT 2014, p. 171.

knowledge in the OP sequence the word for ‘boat’ or believed to recognize it on the basis of a phonetic similarity. AE ^{AS}GIŠ-MÁ^{MEŠ}-*na* could support the thesis that OP *nāviya-* is related to a noun (equivalent to the name for boat, an object made of wood), and not to a verb, as advanced by WIDMER.

6. Outcomes of Ir. **nāu-* are largely documented in New and Modern Iranian. Let’s start with Prs. *nāv*. The list of senses provided in MO^{IN} s.v. *nāv* is the following: “1) anything long and hollowed-out; 2) a hollowed-out log through which water goes to the flue of a mill or from one place to another; 3) water pipes made of baked clay and joined one to the other, in which water flows; 4) stream, channel [*ju-ye āb, nahr*]; 5) valley through which water runs; 6) breach, hole [*raxne, surāx*]; 7) small boat made of a hollowed-out log; 8) boat, ship; 9) war ship (*Farh*); 10) mill hopper; 11) groove [*šiyār*] down the middle of a man’s back or the loins of a horse (*nāv-e kafal* “the space and the groove between the two buttocks;” *nāv-e gardan* “the hollow at the back of the neck”); 12) the groove in a wheat seed or a date-stone; 13) pot, small pot; 14) frying pan.” Notably, Prs. *nāv* has a variant form *nāb*, for which see MO^{IN} s.v.;¹⁷⁴ this could be considered as an old or a dialectal form.¹⁷⁵

Many *nāv*-derivatives and compounds are recorded in Persian. First of all *nāve*, whose semantic range partially tallies that of *nāv*. The list of senses provided in MO^{IN} s.v. *nāve* is the following: 1) a small *nāv*; 2) a kind of arrow (= *nāvak*); 3) mill hopper; 4) the groove down the middle of a man’s back; 5) the groove in a wheat seed or a date-stone; 6) any hollowed-out thing; 7) (masonry term) a hollowed-out log used for carrying clay; 8) wooden tray for kneading; 9) wooden vessel.” Other derivatives are *nāvče*, *nāvže*, diminutives of *nāv*, and *nāvak* meaning “1) small *nāv*; 2) a kind of small arrow which is put in a wooden or iron case, similar in shape to a *nāv*; 3) mill hopper; 4) the groove down the middle of a man’s back; 5) the groove in a wheat seed or a date-stone; 6) any hollowed-out thing” (MO^{IN} s.v.). Particularly worth noting is Prs. *nāvdān* “roof-gutter.” This is the name of a very important architectural element in the Iranian world, aimed at the preservation of buildings and their protection against rain, and commonly referred to in Prs. literature and proverbs.¹⁷⁶ The question with *nāvdān* is how to analyse it. Considering that the traditional drain disposing of rain water from the roof of a building simply consisted of a hollowed-out log and that the derivational element *-dān* generally conveys the meaning “holder or container,” in which sense the roof-gutter (simply made of a *nāv*) could be referred to as ‘the container of *nāv*’? In my

¹⁷⁴ See also DEHXODĀ, s.v. with mention of the traditional lexicographic works which record it.

¹⁷⁵ See above § 2.9. (Pahl. *nāv* or *nāb*). I have occasionally found Prs. *nāb* in in dialectal dictionary entries given as the Prs. equivalent of headwords, as in KIYĀN-E KULIVAND 2010, p. 1125, s.v. *nawo*.

¹⁷⁶ On the different kinds of Prs. *nāvdān* and the historical background of this part of building see SOLTANI 2011.

opinion, GERSHEVITCH' etymological proposal (< OIr. **nāu-tānu-*), the only available so far, is untenable.¹⁷⁷ The question remains open.

The list of senses provided in MO'IN s.v. *nāvdān* is the following: 1) the place in which *nāvs* (clay water passages [*mamarr-e sefālin-e āb*]) pass; 2) water passage [*mamarr-e āb*]; 3) roof-gutter (made of clay or tin-plate); 4) channel, stream [*juy, nahr*]; 5) mill-hopper; 6) mill-race."

Since MO'IN's dictionary, like other conventional dictionaries, provides multiple-sense entries without or with very few usage information, almost completely disregarding the diachronic, diatopic or other dimensions, it could be interesting to note, e.g., that Prs. *nāv*, *nāvdān* and *nāvak* are well documented in the *Šāhnāme* with the senses of "water channel," "roof-gutter" and "arrow," respectively;¹⁷⁸ that *nāvak* "arrow" does not belong to the lexicon of the Contemporary Persian of Iran and the same can be said of *nāv* "valley," which is not attested in classical literature as well; that *nāve* is common in Contemporary Persian of Iran with the sense of "hod"¹⁷⁹ (and with the same sense it has been attested in literary works by Asadi Tusi in his *Loyat-e Fors*, the oldest Prs. dictionary [11th c.]) but not with the other senses listed in dictionaries. In fact, most of the senses attributed to *nāv*, *nāve*, *nāvdān* etc. have a dialectal connotation. It emerges clearly from the following review, where Prs. *nāv*, *nāve*, *nāvdān* etc. are classified together with their cognates from other Ir. languages, according to semantic implications. The following groups of related senses may be identified:

(1) TROUGH (1) simple trough or vessel of different types (Prs. *nāv* "pot, small pot; frying pan;" Farāmarzāni *novdon* "vat;" Nāini *novaču* "small pot;" Iškašmi *nowá* "trough"); (2) different kinds of trough with specialized functions and used for various purposes: (2.1) trough for kneading or preparing different kind of foodstuff, like wine, butter, etc. (Gilaki *nob* "a vat made of a hollowed-out log for sour grape or grape stomping and preparing sour grape or grapejuice;"¹⁸⁰ Lārestāni *neva* "a clay vessel for producing fresh butter;"¹⁸¹ Yayn. *nowa* "a small wooden box for shaking grain in to clean it;" Šuyni *xāx(i) nēw* "place for preparing noodles, and storing the utensils for the preparation"); (2.2) trough for watering or feeding animals (cf. Gazi *nō*;¹⁸² Mimei, Jušqāni *now*;¹⁸² Taj. (dialect of

¹⁷⁷ "The obvious derivation of this noun is from an OIr. compound **nāu-tānu-*, in which **tānu-* will be a side form of Ved. *sthānū-* 'tree-trunk.' The literal meaning of the compound will have been 'channel-trunk, tree-trunk used as channel'" (GERSHEVITCH 1962, p. 80).

¹⁷⁸ See WOLFF 1935, pp. 801-802.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. NAJAFI 1999, 1400.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Armenian *naw* "boat, ship, etc." but also "winepress basin (of stone)" in the Canon Law. According to MARTIROSYAN (2009, p. 500) some (mainly E and SE) dialect forms, "referring to 'mill-race,' 'gutter,' 'tube,' 'basin or drain of a fountain,' 'trough' and the like [...]" should be regarded as recent cultural innovations taken from Persian. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that the meaning 'basin; trough' has been developed within Armenian, cf. the literary meaning 'winepress basin' attested in Canon Law."

¹⁸¹ ADIB-E TUSI 1964, p. 374.

¹⁸² ASATRIAN 2011, p. 587.

Vanj) *novažo* (“a trough or channel before the plank to which horses are tied in winter in traditional houses”); see also MOKRI 1970, p. 28, apparently Awromān area);¹⁸³ (2.3) hod, trough for carrying building materials (Prs. *nāve*, Sistāni *nāva*, Lori (Xorramābād) *nāwa*, Lakki *nowa*, Hamadāni *newve*, Damāvandi *nawa*, Kermāni *nāve* “wooden vessel with which building workers carry on their shoulders the mixture of clay and straw”); (3) other similarly shaped receptacles (cf. Yazdi *now* “beehive;”¹⁸⁴ Yayn. *nówa* “wicker cradle.”)¹⁸⁵

(2) BOAT (originally consisting of a hollowed-out tree-trunk): OP **nāva-* ?; MParth. *n'w*; Sogd. *n'w*, Khot. *no*, Khwar. *n'wyk*; Prs. *nāv* “boat, ship;”¹⁸⁶ Oss. (Digor) *naw* / (Iron) *nawæ*; Tāleši *nov*, Gilaki *nob*, *now*; Mazandārāni (Sāri) *nu*; Rāmsari *nāv*; Sangesari *nov*; Dilmi *now*¹⁸⁷ “boat;” Solemāniye Kurd. *nawe* “boat, ship.”

(3) CHANNEL OR CONDUIT FOR CONVEYING WATER (drainage or irrigation channel, in origin an open pipe consisting of a hollowed-out tree-trunk): Prs. *nāv*; dial. Taj. (Madaglašti) *nau*, (Isfara) *novča*, (Karategin) *novažo*; Afgh. Prs. *tarnāv* (“a big wooden channel placed over a channel [*juy*] with which fields are watered”); Sistāni *now* (“a structure for conveying a water channel over a river or a small valley; similar to a bridge on which water flows”), *nouvar* (“large irrigation channel”); Qāini *noubor* (“a channel dug underground, especially for qanats”); Lori *now*; Southern Kurd. (HAŽĀR 1990) *nōin*, *nāvkēš* (“a channel crossing a rice-field”); Sorani Kurd. *nāwkêš* (“small stream in a field”); Gilaki *nowkə* (“small channel; rainwater channel running around the house”), *nobin* (“small channel, a boundary between two fields; wood cylinder or hollowed-out log to move water from one place to another”), *nāb bə sar* (“channel [*nāv*] built to convey water from one side of a valley or a ditch to the other,” (Lāhijāni) *now* “clay water pipe;” Judeo-Tāti (Juhuri) *nov* (“water pipe”); Aftari *now* (“hollowed-out wood with which water is moved from one place to another”); Tāleši *nov* “joint,” *obi nov* “water pipe joint;” Qomi *nāve*, *nove* (“channel built over another channel to convey water from a field to another (generally consisting of a tree trunk)”; (Zoroastrian) Kermāni *nākeš* (“deep channels excavated in marshy land so that water may flow through them and the land becomes cultivable”), Kermāni, Bardesiri, Sirjāni *nā* “water-pipe, watercourse inside the qanat;” Manūjāni *nāudōn* (“hollowed-out tree-trunk used as channel”); Yazdi *now*; (Fārs) Zarqāni *nowbor* (“water channel similar to a *nāvdān*, made of stones and mortar, conveying water from a well to the field channel”); North Baškardi (Bešnū) *nox*, (Darzeh) *nūög* (“hollowed-tree-trunks used for irrigation purposes”); Bal. *tarnāwah* (“channel made of wood to take

¹⁸³ “L’abreuvoir rappellent le *naw-dān* est creusé dans un tronc de deux ou trois mètres de long, selon l’importance du cheptel. Il est posé sur un tréteau, de sorte que les animaux se rangent de part et de l’autre pour y boir” (*ibid.*).

¹⁸⁴ AFŠĀR 1989, p. 171.

¹⁸⁵ < Taj., according to XROMOV 1972, p. 175.

¹⁸⁶ See above, § 5.1.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. OMĀDI 2013, pp. 398-399.

irrigation water from one plot to another”);¹⁸⁸ Šuyni *nōw*; Yaṛnobi *noy*, *nóva*; Pšt. *nāvá* (“gutter, drain”), *nāvagəj* (“groove, narrow gutter, channel”), *tarnáv* (“chute, gutter for drainage of water; aqueduct; channel, groove”); Munji *nawárika* “drainage channel;” Šuyni *nōw*, Yazulāmi *naw*; Iškāšmi *now*; Sariqōli *nēw*, *nāw*, *naw* “channel,” *wanəw* “irrigation ditch;” Oss. *nūk* (Digor *nokæ*) “pipe,”¹⁸⁹ etc.:

(4) ROOF-GUTTER (drain which disposes of rain water from the roof of a building, originally consisting of a hollowed-out tree-trunk): Prs. *nāvdān*, Afgh. Prs. *nāva* or *nāvadān*, Taj. *nov*, *nova*, *novadon*, *tarnov*; dial. Taj. (Darvoz) *novardūn*; Hazaragi *nawdo*; Xorāsāni *nōde-šūr*;¹⁹⁰ Harzandi *novdun*; Tāleqāni *nau*, also *nāudan*, *nāčolūk*, *nāčulok* (“small gutter”); Tāleši *nāčilik*; Gilaki *nobdān*; Kelārdašti (Rudbārak) *nā*, Aftari *nālužen*; Šahrudi *no^wdon*; Naqusāni, Kohaki, Zendi *nowdān*; Gurāni Guraḡuyi *nāxwā(jila)*, Kolhari Kurd. *nāwxor(a)*, Gahwarai *nāxwā*;¹⁹¹ Yazdi *nowda*, *nowdun*; Judeo-Yazdi *now-dun*; Kermāni *nāvdun*, also *nāsār*; Farizandi *noudūn*; Tari, Kešei, Tāmei, Natanzi *nowdun*, Nāini *nowdon*; (Dialects of Fārs and SE Iran) Kāzeruni *nowdun*, Davāni *nā:da*, Birovakāni *nōdun*, Dādenjāni *nōdune*, Lori-ye Mamasani *nōdun*, etc. Bušehri *nowdun*, Daštēstāni *nowg* (also *nowgdun*); Lārestāni (Gerāši) *nowdu*, Rodāni *nowdon*; (Eastern Ir.) Yaṛn. *noydōn*, *naūdōn*; Parāči *nāx* roof-gutter, etc.¹⁹²

(5) A PART OF THE MILL (a channel for the water flowing to or from a water wheel (= mill-race) and/or a mill hopper): Prs. *nāv* “a hollowed-out log through which water goes to the flue of a mill or from one place to another; mill hopper;” Taj. *nov*, *nova*, dial. Taj. (Madaglašti) *nau i āsiāb* (“mill-race”), (Badaxšāni) *nā*, *nā i osiāb* “mill-race;” Gorāni (Kandulai) *nāwā* “mill-race;” Semnāni, Sorxei, *nāv*, Šahmirzādi *nu*, Lāsgerdi, Sangesāri *now* “mill-race; mill hopper;” Tāleqāni *nauka* “mill hopper;” Aftari *nālužen* “mill-race;” Southern Kurd. (HAZAR 1990) *nāw* “mill-race,” *nāwče* “mill hopper;” Kermānšāhi Kurd. *nāw* “mill-race;” Lakki *nawo* “mill hopper; the aperture in an oven to let air entry into the oven’s

¹⁸⁸ Only recorded in ELFENBEIN 1990, p. 151.

¹⁸⁹ On the basis of the Ossetic vocalism and the expected development of vowel groups (**āwa* > Digor *awæ* / Iron *wa*; **awa* > Digor *ū* / Iron *o*), ABAEV separates the Ir. words of the ‘boat’-line from those of the ‘channel’-line, referring these latter to the Ilr. root **naw-* “to move, to go forward;” cf. ABAEV 1973, pp. 162, 192–193. His argument, however, is not convincing, since he only gives his mind to the Oss. form, disregarding the other Ir. words for ‘channel,’ which he himself connects to Oss. *nūk*.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. MONCHI-ZADEH 1990, p. 132 no. 391.

¹⁹¹ I am very grateful to SALMĀN ‘ALIYĀRI BABOLGHĀNI, who has provided me with the proofs of his book *Ganjīne-ye guyešhā-ye irāni. Haft guyeš az hāšiye-ye Zāgros (gunehāyi az lori, kordi, lakki va gurāni)* [in press]. See also MOKRI 1970, p. 26 (“*naw-dān* [...]”, demi-cylindre de bois creusé dont l’extrémité forme un bec [...]. Afin que l’eau de pluie s’écoule facilement dans cette gouttière qui est droite, et s’avance à peu près à un mètre du toit, celui-ci est légèrement incliné. Aujourd’hui, le *naw-dān* peut être remplacé par une gouttière métallique et, surtout dans les villes, par des chantepleures fixées le long du mur à la base du toit”, apparently speaking of the Awromāni area).

¹⁹² See HASAN DUST 2011, p. 620 for other *nāvdān*-type words and other Ir. lexical items for ‘down-sput, gutter.’

cavity;" Yaḡn. *noḡ*, Sangleči *nəwōk*, Iškāšmi *nōw*, Yidya *nawoyo*, Munji *nowoyo*, Waxi *nīw*,¹⁹³ Oss. *kwyroḡy nūk* "mill-race," etc.

(6) TUBULAR SHAPED OBJECTS OF DIFFERENT TYPES: Khwar. *n'wycyk* "spindle rod;" Prs. *nāvak* "a small arrow; reed or anything similar, etc.; ploughshare;"¹⁹⁴ Afgh.Prs. *nāvayī* "a type of gun;" Taj. *novak* "arrow;" Dial. Taj. (Badaxšān) *novuk*, (Vanj) *nouk*, (Darvāz) *novuk*, *novak* "ploughshare;" Bal. *nāwakk* "arrowhead;"¹⁹⁵ Pšt. *nāva* "long barrelled gun,"¹⁹⁶ *nāvagə'j* "tubular leaves of several cereal grasses," *nāvák* "a kind of arrow; sting of wasp, bee;" Waxi *nowək* "ploughshare."

(7) VALLEY / DEPRESSION / GROOVE: Afgh.Prs. *nāva* "green valley," Kābuli *nāv* "mountain gorge;"¹⁹⁷ Hazaragi *nawā* "wide and long valley;" Tāleqāni *nāu* "valley, crevice at mountain foot;"¹⁹⁸ Naqusāni (Tafreš area) *now* "valley;" Lakki *nawo* "big mountain valley, valley through which a watercourse flows; groove in a seed or a date-stone; groove down the middle of a man's back (in the dialect spoken in the Western Lakki area); depression, depth;"¹⁹⁹ Kurmānji Kurd. *newal*²⁰⁰ "valley," *newalok* "dale, vale;" Solemāniye Kurd. *newī* (adjective and noun) "low, depressed, dip in mountain range, col;" Southern Kurd. (Hažār) *nawāl*, *nawāl*, *nīwāl* "small valley in the flank of a mountain," *newāl* "flood water [*silāb*] produced by the snow melting," *newalê kurk* "water collection place in mountain," *nēl* "damp and green place in the flank of the mountain; small valley in the flank of the mountain;" Bal. *nāwālag* ("alluvial terrace in a torrent bed");²⁰¹ Pšt. *nāw* "hollow, depression; valley," *nāvā* "valley; avalanche," *tarnāv* "mountain pass;" Yaḡn. *noḡ* (< Taj.) "valley, ravine," *nowe op* "a stream in a gorge;" Iškāšmi *now* "strait, narrows;" Ōrmuḡi *nāwa* "valley;" Parāči *nawča*, *nāwča* "quaternary valley, adjacent to a ternary valley; small valley, green valley,"²⁰² Šuḡni *nōw* "hollow, dell,"²⁰³ Yazḡulāmi *new* "narrow gorge," etc.

¹⁹³ Cf. STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999, pp. 252-253, where two possible alternative derivations (< **nāv*- "boat" or < **nav*- "to move," see fn. 189 above) are mentioned.

¹⁹⁴ JAMASP 1907, II p. 169 referred to Prs. *nāvak* "ploughshare" to explain the graphic sequences <n'pk> and <n'pyk> (in prepositional phrases headed by PWN/*pad*) in Vd. 5.51; cf. JAMASP 1907, I p. 192. See also ABRAMJAN 1965, p. 127 and FARAVAŠI 1967, p. 319. But, as already noted by KAPADIA 1953, p. 34 the meaning "ploughshare" "does not seem to be appropriate here." KAPADIA read instead '*vāchak*' and interpreted it as "offspring, young-one;" it should be noted however that this meaning does not seem to be appropriate here as well. A full understanding of the phrases PWN n'pk and PWN n'pyk has yet to be reached (cf. ANKLESARIA 1949, pp. 125-126 and MOAZAMI 2014, pp. 156-157).

¹⁹⁵ ELFENBEIN 1990, p. 110 (but not found in ELFENBEIN's *Anthology* and in any other Bal. lexicographical sources).

¹⁹⁶ Cf. BELLEW 1901, p. 163.

¹⁹⁷ SCARCIA 1965, p. XCIV.

¹⁹⁸ See also *now* "valley" in the dialect of Avarāzān in ADIB-E TUSI 1964, p. 374.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. KIYĀNI-E KULIVAND 2010, p. 1125.

²⁰⁰ See also ASATRIAN, LIVSHITS 1994, p. 95 ("'*nav/wāl* 'gorge, vallon, vallée'" (< **nāv-al*) (< **nāv*- + suffix -*al*). A different etymological connection has been advanced in CABOLOV 2010, p. 22.

²⁰¹ ELFENBEIN 1990, p. 110. Probably Eastern Balochi, since, apart from ELFENBEIN, it is only recorded in Eastern Bal. lexicographical sources (as *nawālay*).

²⁰² See KIEFFER 1980, pp. 237-238.

²⁰³ See also MORGENSTIERNE 1974, p. 50.

In connection with the ‘VALLEY’ group (no. 7), which mainly characterizes the northern band of the Iranian plateau, several toponyms may be mentioned which are in use throughout that area. These are: *Nāv*, the name of different villages in Ardabil Province, in Asālem District, Gilān, in Haviq rural District, Gilān, in Kurdistān; *Nāv-e Pāyin* and *Nāv-e Bālā* in Gilān; *Neva*, also *Nuva* in Māzandarān; *Nāvrud*, a place and a river in Asālem District, Gilān; *Tang-e Nāvdān*, a gorge in Čahār Mahāl and Baxtiāri Province, etc. Similarly, in Afghanistan one finds *Nāw* and *Nāwa* as the name of several villages (*Nāwa* in Kandahar Province, in Ghazni Province, in Daykundi Province, in Kabul Province, in Bāmyān Province), as the name of defiles (*Kowtal-e Nāwa* in Parwān Province); as the name of intermittent watercourses or streams (*Nāw-e Sang-e nawešta* and *Nāw-e Bāzār* in Ghōr Province, *Darra-e Nāwa* in Bāmyān Province and Bādghis Province, etc.), as the name of mountains (*Koh-e Nāwa* in Herāt Province, in Baghlān Province), and many others. For Tajikistan, a long list of toponyms consisting in or containing *Nov* or *Nova* are listed in XROMOV 1975, pp. 47-48. Toponyms and hydronyms which might be connected to this Ir. lexical set are widespread in Europe as well; on the antiquity of these European names the discussion is still open.²⁰⁴

From the semantic point of view, coherence and consistency characterize these different groups of cognate words. In fact, inter-domain connections may link words for ‘boat,’ ‘vessel,’ ‘channel,’ ‘drain pipe,’ ‘valley,’ etc. in many languages. A striking semantic parallelism with the above mentioned outcomes of Ir. **nāu-* is shown by Engl. *trough*, which is recorded in lexicographical works as follows: “1) a narrow open box-like vessel, made of wood, stone [...] to contain liquid, especially a drink-vessel for domestic animals, also a tank or vat used for washing, kneading, brewing and various other purposes; 2) an oblong vessel containing the water in which a grindstone runs [...]; 3) a small, primitive boat; 4) a channel, a pipe or trunk for conveying water; a conduit; a gutter; a gutter fixed under the eaves of a building; 5) a hollow or valley resembling a trough; (in geology) a basin-shaped depression (longer than broad); 6) the whole valley or strath; 7) a low point in a regular series of high and low points (peaks and troughs).”

7. At the end of the present review of the textual and lexical documentation concerning all the outcomes of Ir. **nāu-*, one has to admit that the main goal of this paper, i.e., to define the core meaning of Av. *nāuuiia-* and Pahl. **nāyḍāg*, has not yet been fully reached. In fact, the exact meaning of these two words still remains elusive. Who is not satisfied with the conclusions of both the ‘navigability’-theory supporters and the ‘channel’-theory ones may search for alternative solutions looking at the semantic range of the Ir. words included in the groups (1)-(7) listed above, at § 6. Tentatively, one might also point to a change direction like ‘valley where the flood produced by raining and snow-melting water flows’ >

²⁰⁴ Cf. HUBSCHMID 1952; SCHMID 1969; LE BOURDELLÈS 2009, pp. 43-44, etc.

‘flood produced by raining and snow-melting’ > ‘great amount of water,’²⁰⁵ but without any certainty. The only thing we can take for certain is that Av. *aš nāuuia* and the corresponding Pahl. frozen expression(s), with which primordial natural forces are referred to, had an extraordinary evocative power, touching off in people feelings and emotions which have their root in the collective heritage of symbols, myths and cultural representations of the Mazdean communities.

²⁰⁵ One hesitates to add here also the isolated form that ŠUKUROV et al. 1979, I p. 862, quote in their Tajik dictionary as *nov* “water; humidity” (accompanied by a line by Ferdowsi: *nayāmad hami ze asmān nāv-o-nam* “water-and-humidity did not come from the sky”). See also the meaning of Pahl. *nāw* in (26), § 2.9.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB = Achaemenid Babylonian; AE = Achaemenid Elamite; Afgh.Prs. = Persian of Afghanistan; Av. = Avestan; DB = Darius at Bisotun; Engl. = English; Germ. = German; IE = Indo-European; Ilr. = Indo-Iranian; Ind. = Indian; Ir. = Iranian; It. = Italian; Khot. = Khotanese; Khwar. = Khwarezmian; Kurd. = Kurdish; Lat. = Latin; MMPrs. = Manichaean Middle Persian; MParth. = Manichaean Parthian; OIr. = Old Iranian; OP = Old Persian; Oss. = Ossetian; Pahl. = Pahlavi; Prs. = Persian; Pšt. = Pašto; Sogd. = Sogdian; Taj. = Tajik; Ved. = Vedic; Yayn. = Yaʾnobi.

AWN = *Ardā Wīrāz Nāmāg*; Bd. = *Bundahišn*; Dk. = *Dēnkard*; Nēr. = *Nērangestān*; Pahl. Riv. /DD = Pahl. Rivāyat accompanying the *Dādestān ī Dēnīg*; Suppl. ŠnŠ = Supplementary text to the *Šāyest-na-šāyest*; Vd. = *Vendidad*; WZ = *Wizīdagihā ī Zādspram*

REFERENCES

- V.I. ABAEV: *Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*, t. II, L-R, Leningrad 1973.
- R. ABRAMJAN: *Pahlaveren-parskeren-hayeren-ṛuseren-angleseren-baṛaran / Pexlevijsko-persidsko-armjano-russko-anglijskij slovar'*. Erevan 1965.
- D.Q. ADAMS: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and greatly enlarged*. Rodopi, Amsterdam – New York 2013 (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10).
- M.A. ADIB-E TUSI: "Farhang-e loyāt-e bāzyāfte (mostadrak)." In: *Našrie-ye dāneškade-ye adabiāt-e Tabriz* 16/3 (1343/1964), pp. 362-387.
- D. AGOSTINI: *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg. Un texte eschatologique zoroastrien*. Roma 2013 (Biblica et Orientalia 50).
- I. AFŠĀR: *Vāženāme-ye yazdi*. Tehrān 1368/1989 (Selsele-ye matun-e va tahqiqāt az entešārāt-e jedāgāne-ye Farhang-e Irānzamin 35).
- J. AMOUZGAR, A. TAFAZZOLI: *Le cinquième livre du Dēnkard. Transcription, traduction et commentaire*. Paris 2000 (Studia iranica, Cahier 23).
- B.T. ANKLESARIA: *Pahlavi Vendidad (Zand-i jvīt-dēv-dāt). Transliteration and Translation in English*, ed. by D. D. KAPADIA. Bombay 1949.
- *Zand-Ākāsīh, Iranian or Greater Bundahišn. Transliteration and Translation in English*. Bombay 1956.
- G.S. ASATRIAN: *A Comparative Vocabulary of Central Iranian Dialects with Notes on Dialectology and Local Toponymy, and a Grammatical Essay*. Tehran 2011.
- G. ASATRIAN, V. LIVSHITS: "Origine du système consonantique de la langue kurde." In: *Acta Kurdica* 1 (1994), pp. 81-108.
- A. ASBAGHI: *Persische Lehnwörter im Arabischen*. Wiesbaden 1988.
- Ch.-H. BAE: *Comparative Studies of King Darius's Bisitun Inscription*. Harvard U. PhD Thesis, Cambridge, Mass. 2001.
- M. BAHĀR: *Vāženāme-ye Bondaheš*. Tehrān 1345/1966 (Vāženāmeḥā-ye pahlavi 1).
- *Vāženāme-ye gazidehā-ye Zādspram*. Tehrān 1351/1972 (Vāženāmeḥā-ye pahlavi 8).
- H.W. BAILEY: *Bundahišn (Linguistic Commentary Supplemented by Transliteration, Translation and Word-index)*, Parts I-II. unpubl. ms.
- "Iranian ropanak." In: *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani*, 2 voll., ed. G. BOLOGNESI et al. Brescia 1969, pp. 91-96.
- *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge 1979.

- C. BARTHOLOMAE: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, Strassburg 1904.
- “Mitteliranische Studien I.” In: *WZKM* 25 (1911), pp. 245-262.
- R. BEHZĀDI: *Bondaheš-e hendi. Matni-i be zabān-e pārsi-ye miāne (pahlavi-ye sāsāni)*. Tehrān 1368/1989.
- H.W. BELLEW: *A Dictionary of Pukkhṭo or Pukshṭo Language*. Lahore 1901.
- É. BENVENISTE: “Notes sur le fragment sogdien du *Buddhadhyānasamādhisāgarasūtra*” (avec la collaboration de P. DEMIÉVILLE). In: *JA* 223 (1933), pp. 193-245.
- É. BENVENISTE, L. RENOU: *Vṛtra et Vərəθraγna, études de mythologie indo-iranienne*. Paris 1934.
- O. BÖHTLINGK: *Panini's Grammatik*. Leipzig 1887 (repr. 1998).
- M. BOYCE: “On the Antiquity of Zoroastrian Apocalyptic.” In: *BSOAS* 47 (1984), pp. 57-75.
- P.L. CABOLOV: *Etimologičeskij kurdsckogo jazyka*, tom II. Moskva 2010.
- F.A. CANNIZZARO: *Vendidad. La legge di abiura dei demoni dell'Avesta zoroastriano*. Tradotto da F.A. CANNIZZARO. Con un saggio sulla storia dello zoroastrismo di A. PANAINO, Milano 1990.
- J. CHEUNG: *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden-Boston 2007 (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 2).
- A. CHRISTENSEN: *Les Kayanides*. Copenhagen 1932.
- G.N. CURZON: *Persia and the Persian Question*, 2 voll. London 1892.
- M.‘A. DĀ‘I AL-ESLĀM: *Vendīdād. Hesse-ye sevvom-e ketāb-e Avestā*, Tehrān 1391/2012.
- J. DARMESTETER: *The Zend-Avesta. Part II The Sīrōzahs, Yasts and Nyāis*. Oxford 1883 (SBE 23) [reprint Delhi 1993].
- *The Zend-Avesta. Part I The Vendīdād*. 1887 (SBE 4) [reprint Delhi 1992].
- A.A. DEHXODĀ: *Loyātnāme*. Tehrān 1325/1946 – 1360/1981.
- B.N. DHABHAR: *Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk*, Bombay 1927.
- *Translation of the Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk*. Bombay 1963.
- D. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout 2004 (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum. Dictionary of Manichaean texts. Vol III. Texts from Central Asia and China. Part 1).
- E. EBELING: *Das aramäisch-mittelpersische Glossar Frahang-i-Pahlavik im Lichte der asyriologischen Forschung*. Leipzig 1941 (MAOG XIV, 1).
- W. EILERS: *Der Name Demawend*. Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1988.
- J. ELFENBEIN: *An Anthology of Classical and Modern Balochi Literature*. Vol. II Glossary. Wiesbaden 1990.
- M.‘A. EMĀM-E ŠUŠTARI: *Farhang-e vāzehā-ye fārsi dar zabāne-e ‘arabi*. Tehrān 1347/1969.
- B. FARAVAŠĪ: *Farhang-e pahlavi*. Tehrān 1346/1967.
- Farhangestān-e Irān: Farhangestān-e Irān. Vāzehā-ye now ke tā pāyān-e sāl-e 1319 dar Farhangestān-e Irān pazirofte šode ast*, 7. Tehrān 1319/1940.
- E. FILIPPONE: “Goat-skins, Horses and Camels: How Did Darius’ Army Cross the Tigris?” In: *Des contrées avestiques à Mahabad, via Bisotun. Études offertes en hommage à Pierre Lecoq*, ed. C. REDARD. Neuchâtel 2016 (CPOR 2), pp. 25-60.
- B. GEIGER: “Anmerkungen zum ‚Frahang i Pahlavik‘.” In: *WZKM* 26 (1912), pp. 294-306.
- I. GERSHEVITCH: *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Cambridge 1959 [reprint 1967].
- “Outdoor terms in Iranian.” In: *A Locust’s leg. Studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh*, ed. B. W. HENNING, E. YARSHATER. London 1962, pp. 76-84.
- Ph. GIGNOUX: *Le livre d’Ardā Vīrāz. Transliteration, transcription et traduction du texte pehlevi*. Paris 1984 (Recherches sur les Civilisations, Cahier 14).

- Ph. GIGNOUX, A. TAFAZZOLI: *Anthologie de Zādspram. Édition critique de texte pehlevi*. Paris 1993 (Studia Iranica, Cahier 13).
- P.G.W. GLARE, ed.: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford 1982.
- G. GNOLI: "Airyō.Šayana." In: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 41/1 (1966), pp. 67-75.
— *Ricerche storiche sul Sīstān antico*. Roma 1967 (IsMEO Reports and Memoirs 10).
- F. GRENET: "Zoroastre au Badaxshān." In: *Studia iranica* 31/2 (2002), pp. 193-214.
- S. HAIM: *Farhang-e bozorg-e fārsi – englisi*. Tehrān 1371/1992.
- R.T. HALLOCK: *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*. Chicago 1969 (Oriental Institute Publications 92).
- J. HARMATTA: "Alexander the Great in Central Asia." In: *Acta Ant. Hung.* 39 (1999), pp. 126-136.
- M. HASAN DUST: *Farhang-e tatbiqi – mowzu'i-ye zabānhā va guyeshā-ye irāni-ye now*, 2 voll. Tehrān 1389/2011.
- HAŽĀR: *Farhang-e kordī-fārsi*. Tehrān 1369/1990.
- W. HENNING: "A List of Middle-Persian and Parthian Words." In: *BSOAS*, 9/1 (1937), pp. 79-92.
- W.B. HENNING: "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony." In: *BSOAS*, 12/2 (1948), pp. 306-318.
- E. HERZFELD: "Zarathustra, Teil V. Awestische Topographie." In: *AMI* 2 (1930), pp. 49-98.
— *Altperische Inschriften*. Berlin 1938.
— *Zoroaster and His World*, 2 voll. Princeton 1947 [reprint 1974].
- A. HINTZE: *A Zoroastrian Liturgy. The Worship in Seven Chapters (Yasna 35-41)*. Wiesbaden 2007 (Iranica 12).
- J. HOFTIJZER, K. JONGERLING: *Dictionary of the North – West Semitic Inscriptions*. Leiden-New York-Köln 1995.
- P. HORN: *Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie*. Strassburg 1893 (Sammlung indogermanischer Wörterbuch 4).
- J. HUBSCHMID: "Esp. nava, basque naba, frioul. nava. Mots d'origine pré-européenne ou gauloise?" In: *Revue internationale d'onomastique* 4 (1952), pp. 3-22.
- M. HUTTER: *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte*. Wiesbaden 1992 (Studies in Oriental Religions 21).
- D.H. JAMASP: *Vendidad. Avesta Text with Pahlavi Translation and Commentary and Glossarial Index in Two Volumes*. I. *The Texts*; II. *Glossarial Index*. Bombay 1907.
- H.F.J. JUNKER: *The Frahang ī pahlavīk*. Heidelberg 1912.
- F. JUSTI: *Der Bundeshesh, zum ersten Male herausgegeben, transcribiert, übersetzt, und mit Glossar versehen*. Leipzig 1868.
- D.D. KAPADIA: *Glossary of Pahlavi Vendidad*. Bombay 1953.
- J. KELLEN: *Fravardīn Yašt (1-70). Introduction, édition et glossaire*. Wiesbaden 1975 (Iranische Texte 6).
— *Le noms-racines de l'Avesta*. Wiesbaden 1974 (Beiträge zur Iranistik 7).
— "Dēn Yašt." In: *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. 7. Costa Mesa 1996, pp. 281-281 [available online at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/den-yast>].
- R. KENT: "Old Persian Studies." In: *JAOS* 62 (1942), pp. 266-277.
— "Addendum on Bh 1.86." In: *JAOS* 63 (1943), p. 67.
— *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. New Haven 1953 (2nd ed.).
- Ch.-M. KIEFFER: "Études parāčī. IV.d. Le lexique parāčī." In: *Studia iranica* 9 (1980), pp. 233-306.
- K. KLAUS: *Die Wasserfahrzeuge im vedischen Indien*. Mainz 1989 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse Jahrgang 1989, Nr. 13).

- F.W. KÖNIG: *Relief und Inschrift des Königs Dareios I am Felsen von Bagistan*. London 1938.
- F.M.P. KOTWAL: *The Supplementary Texts to the Šāyest nē šāyest*. København 1969 (Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser, 44,2).
- F. KOTWAL, Ph.G. KREYENBROEK: *The Hērbestān and Nērangestān*. Vol. II *Nērangestān, Fragard 1*. Paris 1995 (Studia Iranica, Cahier 16).
- *The Hērbestān and Nērangestān*. Vol. III *Nērangestān, Fragard 2*. Paris 2003 (Studia Iranica, Cahier 30).
- Ph.G. KREYENBROEK: *Sraoša in the Zoroastrian Tradition*. Leiden 1985 (Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina 28).
- G. LAZARD: *La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane*. Paris 1963.
- *Dictionnaire persan-français*. Leiden-Téhéran 1990.
- H. LE BOURDELLÉS: *Boulogne et Thérouanne au temps de César. Approche toponymique de la cité des Morins*. Villeneuve d'Ascq 2009.
- P. LECOQ: *Les inscriptions de la Perse Achéménide traduit du vieux perse, de l'élamite, du babylonien et de l'araméen présenté et annoté par Pierre Lecoq*. Paris 1997.
- D.N. MACKENZIE: *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*. Leiden 1976 (Acta Iranica 10).
- *A Coincise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London 1986 (1st ed. 1971).
- D.M. MADAN, ed.: *The Complete Text of the Pahlavi Dinkard*. 2 voll. Bombay 1911.
- W.W. MALANDRA: *The Fravaši Yašt: Introduction, Text Translation and Commentary*. PhD Diss. University of Pennsylvania 1971.
- *Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religion. Readings from the Avesta and Achaemenid Inscriptions*. Minneapolis 1983.
- W.W. MALANDRA, P. ICHAPORIA: *The Pahlavi Yasna of the Gāthās and Yasna Haptanḫāiti*. Wiesbaden 2013.
- J.P. MALLORY, D.Q. ADAMS: *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London 1997.
- *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. New York 2006.
- J. MARKWART: *Wehr und Arang. Untersuchungen zur mythischen und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Ostiran*. Leiden 1938.
- H.K. MARTIROSYAN: *Etymological Dictionary of Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston 2009 (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 8).
- M. MAYRHOFER: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, vol. II. Heidelberg 1996.
- K. MAZDĀPUR: *Šāyist nāšāyist. Matn-i be zabān-e fārsi-ye miāne (pahlavi-ye sāsāni)*. Tehrān 1390/2011 [1st ed. 1369].
- S.K. MENDOZA FORREST: *Witches, Whores and Sorcerers. The Concepts of Evil in Early Iran*. Forward and other contributions by O.P. SKJÆRVØ. Austin 2011.
- M. MOAZAMI: *Wrestling with the Demons of the Pahlavi Widēwdād. Transcription, Translation, and Commentary*. Leiden/Boston 2014 (Iran Studies 9).
- M. MO'IN: *Farhang-e fārsi (motavasset)*. 6 voll. Tehrān 1371/1992 (8th ed.).
- M. MOKRI: *Contribution scientifique aux études iraniennes*. Paris 1970.
- D. MONCHI-ZADEH: *Topographisch-historische Studien zum iranischen Nationalepos*. Wiesbaden 1975.
- *Wörter aus Xurāsān und ihre Herkunft*. Leiden 1990 (Acta Iranica 29).
- M. MONIER-WILLIAMS: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford 1899.
- G. MORGENSTIERNE: *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group*. Wiesbaden 1974 (Beiträge zur Iranistik 6).

- A.-A. NAFISI (Nāzam-al-Attebā): *Farhang-e Nafisi*. Tehrān 1976 (reprint, 1st ed. 1938-1955).
- A. NAJAFI: *Farhang-e fārsi-e ʿāmiāne*, 2 voll., Tehrān 1378/1999.
- H.S. NYBERG: *A Manual of Pahlavi II. Glossary*. Wiesbaden 1974.
- H.S. NYBERG, B. UTAS: *Frahang i pahlavīk*. Edited with translation, transcription and commentary from the posthumous papers of H. S. NYBERG by B. UTAS. Wiesbaden 1988.
- ʿA. ʾOMADI: *Dilmun pārsi – Dilmun pālavi*. Tehrān 1392/2013.
- S. ʾORYĀN: *Vāženāme-ye pahlavi-pāzand (farhang-e pahlavi)*. Tehrān 1377/1998.
- A. PAGLIARO: “Pahlavī katas ‘canale’ Gr. ΚΑΛΟΣ.” In: RSO 17 (1938), pp. 72-83.
- F. PAKZAD: *Bundahišn. Zoroastrische Kosmogonie und Kosmologie*. Band I: *Kritische Edition*. Tehran 1384/2005 (Ancient Iranian Studies Series 2).
- A. PANAINO: *Tīštrya*. Part I. *The Avestan Hymn to Sirius*. Roma 1990 (Is.M.E.O Serie Orientale Roma 68,1).
- “A proposito di acque ‘navigabili’ e ‘canalizzate.’ Una nota esplicativa su avestico nauu(a)īia-.” In: *La tutela e la valorizzazione dei manufatti di interesse storico in archeologia navale*, ed. S. LORUSSO. Bologna 2004, pp. 274-287.
- É. PIRART: “Anomalies grammaticales à Bisotūn.” In: *Grammatical Case in the Languages of the Middle East and Europe. Acts of the International Colloquium Variations, concurrence et evolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques Paris 2-4 April 2007*, ed. M. FRUYT, M. MAZoyer, D. PARDEE. Chicago 2011 (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 64), pp. 151-160.
- E.G. RAFFAELLI: *The Sīh-rōzag in Zoroastrianism. A Textual and Historico-Religious Analysis*. London and New York 2014.
- H. REZĀI BĀGHBIDI: *Revāyat-e Āzar Farnbay-e Farroxxādān*. Tehrān 1384/2005 (Majmūʿe-ye peḏuhešhā-ye Irān-e bāstān 1).
- R. ROLLINGER, W.F.M. HENKELMAN: “New Observations on “Greeks” in the Achaemenid Empire According to Cuneiform Texts from Babylonia and Persepolis.” In: *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l’empire achéménide*, ed. P. BRIANT, M. CHAUVEAU. Paris 2009 (Persika 14), pp. 331-351.
- E. SACHAU: “Neue Beiträge zur Kenntniss der zoroastrischen Literatur.” In: *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Phil.-Hist. Cl. 67 (1871), pp. 806-852.
- G. SCARCIA: *Šifat-Nāma-yi Darvīš Muḥammad Ḥān-i Ġāzī. Cronaca di una crociata musulmana contro i Kafīri di Laḡmān nell’anno 1582*. Manoscritto persiano-kābulī edito e tradotto, con introduzione e indice dei nomi da Gianroberto SCARCIA. Roma 1965 (IsMEO Serie orientale Roma 32).
- W.P. SCHMID: “Zum Flussnamen Nāva.” In: *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata III*, Roma 1969, pp. 217-222.
- R. SCHMITT: *Die altpersischen Inschriften der Achaimeniden. Editio minor mit deutscher Übersetzung*. Wiesbaden 2009.
- *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften*. Wiesbaden 2014.
- Sh. SHAKED: *The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages (Dēnkard VI) by Aturpāt-i Ēmētān*. Translated by Shaul SHAKED. Boulder, Colorado 1979 (Persian Heritage Series 34).
- N. SIMS-WILLIAMS: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents*, Studies in the Khalili Collection Volume III, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II, Vol. VI, The Nour Foundation in association with Azimuth Editions and Oxford University Press. 2000.
- P.O. SKJÆRVØ: “Review of SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000.” In: *JAOS* 125/2 (2005a), pp. 311-316.
- *An Introduction to Zoroastrianism*. Unpubl. 2005b [available at <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~iranian/Zoroastrianism/zorocomplete.pdf>].

- *The Spirit of Zoroastrianism*. Yale 2011a.
- “Review of SCHMITT 2009.” In: *OLZ* 106 (2011b), pp. 325-328.
- S. SOLTANI: “Nāvdān.” In: *Watarid 2nd International Conference Control and Management of Water in Arid and Semi-Arid Zones*, ed. by M.-F. COUREL, T. TASHPOLAT, M. TALEGHANI. Paris 2011, pp. 305-318.
- I.M. STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ: *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' vaxanskogo jazyka*. Sankt-Peterburg 1999.
- M.Š. ŠUKUROV et al.: *Farhangi zaboni tojikī (az asri X to ibtidoi asri XX)*. 2 voll. Moskva 1969.
- A. TAFAZZOLI: *Vāženāme-ye minu-ye xerad*. Tehrān 1348/1969 (*Vāženāme-ye pahlavi* 6). — *Minu-ye xerad*. Tehrān 1364/1985.
- M. TAVUSI: *Vāženāme-ye Šāyest našāyest*. Širāz 1345/1986.
- H.C. TOLMAN: *Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenidan Inscriptions Transliterated and Translated with Special Reference to Their Recent Re-examination*. New York 1908 (Vanderbilt Oriental Series, 6).
- R.L. TURNER: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London 1966.
- B. UTAS: “Old Persian Miscellanea.” In: *Orientalia Suecana* 14-15 (1966), pp. 118-140.
- F. VAHMAN: *Vāženāme-ye Artāy Wirāz Nāmag*. Tehrān 2535/1977 (*Vāženāme-hā-ye pahlavi* 9).
- *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag. The Iranian 'Divina Commedia.'* London and Malmo 1986 (Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series, 53).
- T. WAHBY, C.J. EDMONDS: *A Kurdish-English Dictionary*. Oxford 1966.
- E.W. WEST: *Pahlavi Texts*. Part I. *The Bundahis, Bahman Yast, and Shāyast lā-shāyast*. Oxford 1880 (SBE 5).
- *Pahlavi Texts*. Part IV. *Contents of the Nasks*. Oxford 1880 (SBE 5).
- P. WIDMER: “Zur Bedeutung von indoiranisch *nāūija-.” In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50 (2007), pp. 215-228.
- A.V. WILLIAMS: *The Pahlavi Revāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg*. Part I and II. Copenhagen 1990 (Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 60:2).
- D.S. WODTKO, B. IRSLINGER, C. SCHNEIDER: *Nomina in indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg 2008.
- F. WOLFF: *Glossar zu Firdosis Schahname*. Berlin 1935 (repr. 1965).
- E. YARSHATER: “Afrasiab.” In: *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. I. London, Boston and Henly 1985, pp. 570-576 [an updated version is available online at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/afrasiab-turanian-king>].
- A.L. XROMOV: *Jagnobskij jazyk*. Moskva 1972.
- *Očerki po toponimii i mikrotoponimii Tadžikistana*, vyp. 1. Dušanbe 1975.
- R.C. ZAEHNER: *Zurvan. A Zoroastrian Dilemma*. Oxford 1955.