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## Reviews

The standard editions of Avestan texts (mainly Westergaard and Geldner) have largely disregarded their ritual nature, with two main consequences:

1. The texts are often edited in a way that does not correctly represent their ritual nature, especially in the case of the Long Liturgy (LL).
2. Some rituals in Avestan were not included in the editions.

Concerning the first point, both editors proceed similarly. As to the LL, they based their editions on the exegetical manuscripts and not on the liturgical ones, and did not therefore represent these ceremonies as they are actually performed. By contrast, concerning the second point, their respective criteria differ. Geldner adopts a more restrictive position than Westergaard, editing solely the texts included in the manuscripts of the LL, the kernel of the texts included in the Iranian Khordeh Avestas, and the collection

---

1- This article is part of the project “Corpus Avešticum: eine text-kritische Edition der zoroaštrischen Rituale in avestischer Sprache” (CA 955/2-2), funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. The first version of this paper was presented in Salamanca in 2016. The current version was planned to be published in the volume Ritual Matters, conceived by Gunvor Lindström in 2018. However, the publication encountered several difficulties, so that, the paper is finally published here. Only minor changes and adjustments were made to the original paper of 2018. Two other related articles in this series are “Avestan texts in context: Fragments Westergaard 6 and 7 and the Paragnā” (Cantera 2020a) as well as “Avestan texts in context (3). On Aveštan uštā. baxteri and vaŋta.baxteri- (forthcoming).
of the Yašts as they appear in ms. F1. He excluded all the texts that do not appear in these three kinds of manuscripts, and even some of these were still excluded, such as the Vištāp Yašt, whose omission can only be explained through a disapproving evaluation of the quality of the transmission. A further criterion that seems to have been applied in Geldner's decision is the choice not to include any Avestan texts that do not appear in the manuscripts as a pure (sāde) Avestan text, hence the reason for not including the Hādōxt Nask 1 and 2 and the Nērangestān.

Westergaard also adopted fairly restrictive criteria and so excluded complete classes of manuscripts, such as those containing a series of Drōns. His aim was to avoid redundancies as far as possible. Thus, as the Drōn Yašt is very similar to Y3-8, it was left out of the edition. The same applies to the combinations of a Drōn Yašt and a Yašt (Kreyenbroek 2008; A. Cantera 2020b, 227 ff.). Nevertheless, Westergaard was more generous when considering the description of some rituals that do not belong to the kernel of the Khordeh Avesta but are to be found in miscellaneous manuscripts and in some Khordeh Avesta manuscripts and even liturgical manuscripts of the LL, too. They mostly consist of descriptions in Pahlavi of some minor rituals that also include the Avestan texts recited in them. Many of them bear the general title nērang (like the Nērang ī ātāxš ābrōxtan, the Nērang ī āb ī pādyād, etc.). As such, they are typologically similar to the liturgical manuscripts of the LL, but for the fact they describe much shorter ceremonies. Westergaard edited these texts only when the Avestan texts recited in these rituals were not to be found in other ceremonies included in his edition. Furthermore, he edited only the Avestan text without the Pahlavi description of the ceremony, so the texts are deprived of their ritual context and hence almost completely incomprehensible. Accordingly, they have received no attention at all, but for some detail or linguistic analysis. Notable exceptions are some works by F. Kotwal (1985; 2018). Now that the ritual nature of most Avestan texts has become evident (Cantera 2016), our perception of the importance of these small rituals has changed and there is increasing interest in them. Thus, I have analysed two fragments, namely, FrW 6 and 7 that are part of the ceremony that precedes the performance of the LL: the Paragnā (A. Cantera 2020a). This paper is the second of this series. C. Redard (2016) has also recently conducted a first analysis of FrW 10, a further text that deserved a careful reading regarding the possible existence of permanent fires when some Avestan texts were drafted.

This contribution is part of this endeavour. However, other elements also play an important role in my decision to deal with this text: the Nērang ī ātāxš ābrōxtan is probably the clearest and oldest evidence in the Avestan corpus of the existence of the concept of the “eternal fire”, which I understand to be one that fulfils the following requirements:

1. It is kept burning for a longer period than the duration of the ritual practices celebrated on or around it.
2. It is an object of veneration (it is the focus of cult and not just an instrument for worshipping other gods).
3. It is cared for through religious practices.

In the following, after a short introduction about the possible existence of the idea of the “eternal fire”

---

2- A comparative analysis of the texts included in each edition is provided in the introduction to the facsimile reprint of Westergaard’s edition by R. Schmitt (1993: VIII).

3- Boyce concludes that FrW 10, together with the texts that follow it in ms. K20 (Yt11, Y11.17-13.8 and Y29.6), could constitute the beginning of an auroral rite. I question her interpretation of the whole, but as it is the parallel section of Vi8, the text seems linked to the veneration of a permanent fire.
in other Avestan texts, I will discuss the specific text of the Nērang i ātāxš that does not appear in the Ātāxš Nīyāyišn and the possibility of a direct reference there to the ritual of awakening the sleeping fire. Furthermore, I will seek to trace the history of the ritual usage of this text, also analysing its modern use as described by Modi at the beginning of the 20th century, and in the two manuscripts known to me that contain this text, with the earlier dating back to the 13th century. Finally, I will analyse the possible original use of this text and present some general considerations about the appearance of the permanent fire in the Avestan texts and the role of fire and water in the LL.

The “eternal fire” in the Avestan texts

It is generally assumed that the Avestan texts describe only rituals that were performed in open-air structures, exactly as happens in India with Brahminic rituals. Indeed, evidence of the cult of a permanent fire preserved in a fire temple (which later became so extraordinarily important) seem to be missing or very rare in the Avestan texts. This has led to the conclusion that the concept of an “eternal fire” is not found in the Avestan texts. Nevertheless, an “eternal fire” does not necessarily require a fire temple (Staal et al. 1984, 76 ff.; A. Cantera 2019). A few Avestan texts do seem, indeed, to refer to an “eternal fire.” The evidence has been analysed recently by G. König (2015: 247 ff.). According to his analysis, Y 62 and V18 (especially V18.26-27) reveal the existence of a fire located in the houses of the people, used ritually for the performance of a Yasna, that burns continuously day and night, and which is fed and receives a ritual offering twice a day, in the morning and in the evening. Y62 (especially Y62.3 “you might burn in this house... for a long time until the powerful Frašō.karəti”) leaves, certainly, little doubt about the existence and ritual use of an “eternal fire” according to the use of the term described above. I have recently discussed again the same (and some additional) evidences and have come to only slightly different conclusions: there is a permanently burning fire in the houses of the people that was probably transported to the open-air sacrificial area and fed five times a day either there with greater performances or in the house with lesser rituals (A. Cantera 2019).

Y62 is recited as part of the LL towards the end of the ceremony as part of a longer fire ceremony that begins with the Fšūšō Mq̄r̄a. At this point, according to the ritual instructions of the manuscripts, the fire is fed a last time at the end of the Y62, but this time not with ēsm ud bōy “firewood and incense,” but with the dried residue of pressing the haōma. The text of the Ātāxš Nīyāyišn appears as a unit only in the lesser performances of the LL, but not in the greater ones. There, the first part (Y62.1-6) appears immediately after Y59 and is followed by a Drön Yašt for the fire and the Dahmā Āfrīti, and then the second part of the Ātāxš Nīyāyišn (Y62.7-10) is recited. However, in the lesser performances like the Yasna, both parts are recited together after the Dahmā Āfrīti and get the title of Ātāxš Nīyāyišn in the manuscripts. The fire receives homage (namāz) a last time at Y64.5, this time by the zōt, who approaches the fire only this time in the liturgy. Afterwards, the fire is never again addressed in the second person singular, but the corresponding pronoun is used from Y68.1 on for the ritual water, ahurani (A. Cantera 2019, 33 ff.).

Precisely this text is used in modern practice for feeding the fire five times a day, preceded and followed by the standard frame of all ceremonies and accompanied by the recitation of some Gāthic citations. The ceremony is designated as bōy dādan “the ceremony of giving aromatic wood (to the fire)” and the text (as recited in the Yasna and also in the bōy dādan-ceremony) is called Ātāxš Nīyāyišn in the manuscripts. In the modern practice, according to the description by Modi (1922, 233), the Ātāxš Nīyāyišn is recited once during each one of the five feedings of the fire in temples of lesser importance. By contrast, for the Wahrām-fires, the Ātāxš Nīyāyišn is recited a variable number of times depending on the part of the day during
which the ceremony is performed (hāvunic: 11; rapiššina: 9; uzaiieina- and aifįāsrįārima: 7; ušahina-: 6). Furthermore, when the ceremony is performed for a Wahrām-fire, the first Ātāxš Niyāyišn is substituted by an extended variation of the same text. This text is usually known as the Nērang i ātāxš, according to the title (Nirāng-ātāsh) given by Westergaard in his edition (Westergaard 1852-1854: 317); it is an abbreviated form of the title found in ms. K7: nērang i ātāxš abrōxtan. It is performed when the fire is dormant under the ashes and the flames are not visible. When they are visible, the Ātāxš Niyāyišn is recited.

The antiquity of the bōy dādan-ceremony, the maximum ritual exponent of the concept of the “eternal fire,” is linked to the issue of the antiquity of the idea of an “eternal fire.” As the Ātāxš Niyāyišn consists of Y62 extended with quotations from some Old Avestan texts, it could have been created at any time to satisfy the need for an Avestan text accompanying the new ritual practice that emerged with the concept of the “eternal fire.” Hence the importance of the Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan. In contrast to the Ātāxš Niyāyišn, the latter contains a text that is not known elsewhere: NērangĀtāxš 2. Moreover, if my understanding of it is correct, this text makes a direct reference to the ritual action performed during the bōy dādan-ceremony: the awakening of the fire. Thus, it could provide the only attestation of the performance of a bōy dādan-like ceremony at a time when it was still possible to correctly compose texts in Avestan.

The nērangīhā of K7 by Wahrom Srōšayār

The Nērang ātāxš has rarely been analysed and hardly ever included in the discussion about the “eternal fire” in Avestan texts. The only exception is the reproduction of the ceremony as described in K7 by F. Kotwal (1985), who translates and comments on the Middle Persian instructions accompanying the Avestan texts, but does not deal with the Avestan text itself. Only the Ātāxš Niyāyišn has received some attention, because Geldner only included the latter in his edition. The Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan, appears at the end of the oldest known liturgical manuscript, the Visperad written by Rōstam Mihrābān. This manuscript, however, has a unique condition. The combination of a liturgical manuscript with an exegetical one, separated solely by the description of three minor rituals, with one of them being the Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan.

The old part of the manuscript K7 is the oldest surviving Avestan manuscript. According to the colophon at the end of the Pahlavi Visperad (fol. 107r), it was written by Rōstam Mihrābān in the year 637 of the Pārsig era (1268/9 or 1288/9). After the liturgical Visperad, it follows a meta-ritual text in Middle Persian on the celebration of the Nōg-Nāwar ceremony. Then two additional meta-ritual texts appear: 1. the aforementioned Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan (folio 104v ff.) and the text Abaštāq āmaj bīšan (folio 106v ff.). The latter contains the text edited by Westergaard as “miscellaneous fragments” FrW1.1-2 (Westergaard 1852-1854: 331). As far as I know, it has never been noticed that this section contains another colophon that mentions the scribe. It appears between the instruction for the performance of the Nōg-Nāwar and the Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan. Most interestingly, it mentions the scribe of the original of Rōstam Mihrābān manuscript, at least for this middle section of nērang:

ēn nērangihā wahrom i srōšayār paččen nībišt kē-š ruwān- ahlawih bād
Wahrom, son of Srōšayār, -may his soul be immortal- has written the copy of these nērang.

---

4. It is very strange that Westergaard did not use K7 for his edition of FrW1.1-2, although he did so for the edition of the Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan, and the former directly follows the latter in the manuscript.
Accordingly, the instructions for the performance of the Nōg-Nāwar and perhaps also the Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan and the Abastāg Ḿāmag bridan were copied by Rōstām Mihrābān from a manuscript from Wahrom, son of Srōşāyār. This scribe, anterior to Rōstām Mihrābām, is not known from other manuscripts. However, he might be the brother of Mihrābān, son of Srōşāyār from Nişapur. He was the scribe from which Rōstām copied the Mādayān ī Yošt ī Fryān and the Ardā Wirāz Nāmag, according to the colophons found in M51 and K20.

Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan and Ātāxš Niyāyišn

The Ātāxš Niyāyišn performed during the Ṣoy Ḿādar-γeremony and the Nērang ātāxš, as edited by Westergaard on the basis of ms. K7, run almost completely parallel, as can be seen in following comparative table (differences in bold):5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan</th>
<th>Ātāxš Niyāyišn Iranian</th>
<th>Ātāxš Niyāyišn Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y33.12-14</td>
<td>xšnaôdra. ahurahe. mazdā.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nɔms. tē. ātarš. mazdā. ahurahe. hušā. mazišta. yazata.</td>
<td>nɔms. tē. ātarš. mazdā. ahurahe. hušā. mazišta. yazata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xšnaôdra. ahurahe. mazdā. AV3</td>
<td>AV 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frauuarāne with dedicatory āṭrō. ahurahe. mazdā. puṭra. tauwa. ātarš. puṭra. ahurahe. mazdā.</td>
<td>Frauuarāne with dedicatory tauwa. ātarš. puṭra. ahurahe. mazdā.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāz girišnih (WG)</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>AV 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā. ṣḥā. ātarom. gāraïemi. vaŋhōus. manayhō. zoaṅrābiiō.</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā. ṣḥā. ātarom. gāraïemi. vaŋhōus. uxahe. zoaṅrābiiō.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā. ṣḥā. ātarom. gāraïemi. vaŋhōus. šiiaōḏnahe. zoaṅrābiiō. sūkāi, manayhahe, sūkāi. vacayhahe. sūkāi. šiiaōḏnāi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5- The representation of the Indian and Iranian version of the Ātāxš Niyāyišn follows the basis edition by G. König in CAB.
6- The dedicatory to the fire is extended as in the Sirōza.
7- Westergaard and Modi (1922: 224) edit manayha, vacayha and šiiaōḏna, correct (in the case of Westergaard from manayhe, vacayhe and šiiaōḏnom. Cf. Y68.4). Av. šiiaōḏnahe is there the result of an attraction by the former endings, facilitated by the frequent confusion between –āi# and –ahe#. 
The following are the main differences between the two ceremonies:

1. The appearance in the Nērang ātāraš abrōxtan of a specific text that is not known elsewhere. This text is recited in modern practice only when the fire is still dormant and seems to include a direct reference to its “awakening.”

2. In the Ātāraš Niyāyišn, Y33.12-14 is recited either before the beginning of the ceremony (in India) or at its end (in Iran), whereas in the Nērang only Y33.11 and 12, with Y35.2 in between, are recited and, furthermore, after the gārāiemi-section, that is, after the fire is kindled and stoked to a blaze.

3. The dedicatory to the fire is extended in the Ātāraš Niyāyišn with the dedicatory to the fire in the Sirōza (S1.9), whereas this does not happen in the Nērang. In modern practice, the Wahrām-fire merits the dedicatory of the Sirōza only when it is burning with visible flames. As we will see, this explains why the extension is not used in the Nērang ātāraš abrōxtan, since the fire is kindled and stoked to a blaze only with the recitation of NērangĀtāraš 2.

---

8- It is the final correspondence of the initial Fraumarāne. In TITUS it is incorrectly completed as yasnəmca-vahəṃmcə hubarətmicə uštə. barətmicə vanτə. barətmicə > āfrīnəmi…as it has been taken as a correspondence of Y62.1.
NérandÁtaxš 2: the specific text of the Nérand i átaxš abróxtan

Because of its content and uniqueness, the specific text is the most attractive one in the entire ritual. The Avestan text was edited by Westergaard (1852-1854) (W) and is also mentioned by Modi (M) (1922: 224) in his description of the bôy dādan-ceremony. More recently, it has been presented by Kotwal (1985). Whereas Westergaard’s and Kotwal’s editions rely on ms. K7, Modi describes the modern use without referring to any manuscript. There are important divergences between both “versions”.

The text is found in two manuscripts: as already mentioned, between both Visperad versions (the liturgical and the exegetical ones) in ms. K7, and as a short and likely (fragmentary) description of the bôy dādan-ceremony in M49 (folio 49r & v) (Bartholomae 1915: 19). I propose the following edition of the text:


The text is parallel to Y68.3-4, a section of the ceremony to the waters, the Åb-zôhr. The similarities between the two texts once again highlight the parallelism between the ceremonies to the fire and the waters, as well as at the end of the LL and when celebrated independently:  

| yazamaide. ṣēā ahurâne ahurâhe vanjhsh  
mananjho zaôdrâbió.  
yazamaide. ṣēā ahurâne ahurâhe vanjhsh uxšâhe  
zaôdrâbió  
yazamaide. ṣēā ahurâne ahurâhe vanjhsh.  
šîuâoñnahe zaôdrâbió  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We sacrifice to you, o Ahurâni of Ahura, with the offerings of the good thought; we sacrifice to you, o Ahurâni of Ahura with the offerings of the good word; we sacrifice to you, o Ahurâni of Ahura, with the offerings of the good deed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| sûkâi mananjhe sûkâi vacanjhe sûkâi šîuâoñnahe  
hauanγhâi urune fradâvai gaêðâñm hauanγhâi  
asauuastanãm  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for the light for the thought, for the light for the word and for the light for the deed, for the good life for the soul and for the promotion of the living beings and for the good life of the best supporters of Order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9- I thank Götz König for referring me to the version in M49.  
10- šîuâoñnahe is probably the result of an attraction by the former endings, facilitated by the frequent confusion between –âi# and –âhe#. The original reading could have been *šîuâoñnai*.  
11- For the importance of this parallelism, see below the section corresponding to the ritual according to ms. K7 and the conclusions.
This parallelism between both passages is likely to be the source for the addition of *yazamaide* after *zaôdrâbiô* that we find in ms. M49 and Modi, but not in ms. K7 (and hence not in Westergaard either). Parallel to Y68.3-4, we would expect the fire to appear after the personal pronoun *δβα* in the vocative singular as *ātars* or even *ātarś.* However, the attested accusative singular is also possible as the object of *gāraïemi* and in apposition to *δβα.* Hence my correction of *ādrō* into the expected form *ātrom*, which is more difficult to account for *ādrō,* found in M49 and Modi. It is probably the result of the influence of Y36.1 *ahiiā δβα* *ādrō,* Moreover, Westergaard and Modi correct *mananjhe, vacanjhe,* and *šiiaōṇahe* into *mananjha, vacanţha,* and *šiiaōণa* on the basis of the comparison with Y68.4, as edited by Westergaard. However, Geldner already edited these forms in Y68.4 as *mananţhe, vacanjhe,* and *šiiaōṇahe,* in agreement with most of the best manuscripts.

A translation was not included in the “complete” translations of the Avestan texts (Darmesteter, Wolff), with the exception of Spiegel’s translation that frequently bucks the trend. He translates the text as follows (Spiegel 1863: 18):


Modi (1937: 224) also included a translation of this text in his description of the *bôy dâdan*-ceremony. As his translation is based on a quite different version of the text, I have included his normalised version here (instead of using his old-fashioned transcription):

ä. δβα. ădrō. gāraïemi. vanjős. mananjhō. zaôdrâbiô. yazamaide.
ä. δβα. ădrō. gāraïemi. vanjős. uŷâhe. zaôdrâbiô. yazamaide.
ä. δβα. ădrō. gāraïemi. vanjős. šiiaōṇahe. zaôdrâbiô. yazamaide.
sûkâi. mananjha. sûkâi. vacanţha. sûkâi. šiiaōṇa.

“I praise (Thee, O God) through my fire. We praise through the offerings of good thoughts. I praise (Thee, O God) through my fire. We praise through the offerings of good words. I praise (Thee, O God) through my fire. We praise through the offerings of good actions. For the enlightenment of (our) thoughts. For the enlightenment of (our) words. For the enlightenment of (our) deeds.”

According to Modi, the object of the verb *gāraïemi* is not the fire, but only *δβα,* which is identified with the (unmentioned) god Ahura Mazdâ, and *ădrō* is translated as “through fire” as if it were instrumental. The

---

12- Compare the use of ătars as a vocative in the dedicatory to the fire tauua.ătars...
13- The confusion is frequent, especially in the Iranian manuscripts.
14- Modi affirms that this is a reference for Y51.9 (*yqm xinîtâm rânôibîa ād ădrō suxrâ mazdâ*), probably because of *δβα* *ădrō,* but he writes: “The first two words from Yacna LI.9,” (Modi 1922: 237).
15- Among the manuscripts available in ADA, only the following contain *mananjha, vacanjha,* and *šiiaōṇa:* 110 (K11), 420, 450, 4503, 4510. All of them are Indian manuscripts and quite modern, with the exception of 110 (K11), which was copied in 1647, probably by Dârâb Hîrâ Candâ. This manuscript could be the origin of the spreading of the mistake.
16- He states the following about the Nêrang-î ātaxâ: “Dieses Gebet is nur in einer einzigen Hdschr. enthalten und scheint mir ein kürzerer Vertreter des vorhergehenden Gebetes [Ātaxâ Niyäyišn (my note)] zu sein.”
The keyword of this text is the verb *gāraïemi*. Modi translates it as “I praise” and derives it implicitly from the root *gar* “to praise.” However, this analysis is hardly possible, as this root builds only a nasal (*garan*, Ved. *grnáti*) and a passive (“*yāiriia*”) present (Kellens 1995: 19). A causative formation of this root is not known in other Indo-European languages (Rix 1998: 188). Furthermore, as the root ends with a laryngeal, the expected causative stem would instead be “*gāraïia*”. Therefore, either one of the following two alternatives is more likely: a derivation from the root *gar* “to be awake,” or from *gar* “to make warm, kindle”.

The root *gar* “to be awake” is well attested in Avestan and other Iranian languages. It builds a causative present both in Avestan and in Vedic (RV 1.124.10 *jārayanti* “awakening”) (Rix 1998: 218, Cheung 2007: 172). In all Avestan attestations (except Nērangātēxš 2), this verb is preceded by the preverb *frā*, and there is a clear distribution: if the preverb is directly attached to the verb the stem is *frāyāraïia*- with a repetition of the *r* of the preverb as well in the root (*V*18.23, *N*1.3*ē* *frāyāraïeiti*, *N*1.3 *frāyāraïaia*-), but when the preverb is absent or not attached directly to the verb, then the stem is *gāraïia*- (*N*1.2 *frā* ... *gāraïiōs*). The form *gāraïemi* in Nērangātēxš 2 is ascribed to this root by Bartholomae (1904: 511), Kotwal (1985: 369), Rix (1998: 218), and Cheung (2007: 172). Accordingly, we should translate the beginning of Nērangātēxš 2 as “I awaken you, fire, for the offerings of good thought. I awaken you, fire, for the offerings of the good word. I awaken you, fire, for the offerings of the good deed.” Thus, this stanza would be a performative text alluding directly to the ritual of the *bōy dādan* and the only Avestan attestation of the existence of the metaphor of the “sleeping fire” used for “awakening” a dormant fire. Thus, it would be the clearest and most direct attestation of the existence of a (permanent) fire that sleeps and is awakened several times during the day.

The verb could also derive from the root *gar* “to make warm” (Rix 1998: 196, Cheung 2007: 105). This root does not build an old causative in the Iranian languages, but it does so in other Indo-European languages such as Middle Irish (*guirit* “to warm”). Moreover, we find some causatives in New Iranian languages such as Awrom. *gurīy/guria*- “to boil [intr.]”. Especially interesting is the fact that some secondary causative formations have the meaning “to kindle fire, to make fire” (Cheung 2007: 105): *Nn. ginnāye/gīnn, Sīv. gārān, Tr. gīrān, Varz. digirmāye/digīrn, Oss. I. ñężaryn/ënzares, D. ñężarun/ënzastrand*. There are also other words derived from this root connected with fire and fire-making (Cheung 2007: 105): Pash. *nyarāy* “fireplace, hearth,” Sh. *nižor*, Khf., Rosh. *niẓūr*, Bart. *lažor* “live coal, charcoal,” Ygh. *ńkīr* “hearth.” Thus, it is at stake whether *gāraïemi* could simply mean “I kindle the fire” and the Nērangātēxš abrōxtan would not be a ceremony for “awaking the fire,” but for “kindling the fire,” and hence not necessarily connected to the idea of an “eternal fire.”

Although this possibility cannot be fully dismissed, some reasons point instead to the meaning “I awake” for *gāraïemi*. First, the absence of any sure verbal form of the root *gar* “to make warm” in Old Iranian and the fact there is no other causative form (comparable to *gāraïemi*) attested in old Indo-Iranian languages, that in contrast with the attestations of the causative verb “to awake” in Avestan and its appearance also in Vedic. Second, the causative forms of the root *gar* “to be warm” in other languages mean “to warm [trans.]”

---

17- Spiegel’s translation as “ergreife ich” is still more unlikely.
18- Corrected from *frāyāraïeiti*.
19- Any 2 *gāraïemi* would also belong here, if it is to be ascribed to this root.
(Middle Irish *guirit*, Kymrisch *gor*- and perhaps Albanian *n-xeh* (Rix 1998: 196) and not “to kindle.” Third, the use of the verb *frayráiaiiti* in V18.23 appears in a context closely related to the ceremony of feeding the fire, as is the case for *garaieimi* in the *Nērang i ātaš abrōxтан*.

It requires the performance of a ceremony similar to the modern *bōy dādan* (König 2015: 254). Afterwards (V18.23), Sraōša awakens the bird Parō.ārdār. The latter urges the pious men to awaken and fulfil their duties. The text that follows runs parallel to the last strophes of the *Ātaš Niyāyišn* and *Nērang i ātaš abrōxтан* (V18.26-27 is parallel to Y62.8-10) (König 2015: 255). Thus, the priest is awakened for the awakening of the fire. Furthermore, the Pahlavi translation of V14.7 mentions an instrument likely called “*astāmag-wigrāsišn*” “awakening ladle” (translating Av. *garamō.skarana*). The first element, *astāmag*, is exactly the term used in ms. K7 for designating the “ladle” with which the ashes are stirred precisely during the recitation of the *Nērang Ātaš*s 2; this tool probably gets its name from its ritual use in the ceremony for awakening the fire while stirring the ashes. The Pahlavi gloss in V14.7 explains as *ān kē ātašx az tanūr padiš āwarēnd* “the tool with which they remove the fire from an oven.” This probably refers to a ladle for stirring or transporting embers or coals, and the same interpretation is likely for Av. *garamō.skarana*-.. The ritual name was also applied for this kind of ladle even when used for non-ritual purposes. In any case, this designation would confirm that the action of stirring the ashes to rekindle the embers to burn again with a visible flame was designated metaphorically as “awakening the fire.” *Nērang Ātaš*s 2 uses the same metaphor.

It is therefore likely that *Nērang Ātaš*s 2 is a performative text recited during the ceremony explicitly for “awakening the fire” and the only attestation of the existence in the Avestan times of the metaphor of the “sleeping fire.” This metaphor, used for the fire within the fire temple when its flames are not visible, is very popular in modern phraseology, but not as frequent in the Middle Persian literature as one would think. Nevertheless, it already appears there. One of the best examples is the allegory comparing the fire attendant and the soul in the chapter of the Anthology of Zātspram on the soul (*ruwān*) (WZ 29.7-8):

```
ud spāhbed rwān ī xwađāy ud rāyēnīdār ī tan kē-š xwēš rad <ud> buništ padiš homānāg ō ātašx-waxēnīdār az gumbad pāk drīst pād nigerīn dāstān ud ātašx abrōxтан andar xwēskārih ud ān ī ka tan xuftarq rwān bērōnīhēd ast ka nazdīk ast ka dār bē šawēd xīrān nigerēd pad wigrādāgiqī hāngām abāz ō tan šawēd pād ān homānāqī qyōn ka ātašx xuft dar i gumbad bast ast ka nazdīk ast ka dār šawēd
```

The commander is the soul, lord and organizer of the body, that is, its own master and basis. Like the priest in charge of kindling the fire, whose duty it is to keep the chamber clean and tidy through observation and to kindle the fire. When the body sleeps, the soul departs and goes far and wide looking at things. At the time of awakening, it returns to the body. In this way, when the fire sleeps and the door of the fire chamber is closed, (the fire attendant) goes far and wide.

---

20- For a recent analysis of this text s. (König 2015: 253 ff.)
21- Obviously, *wigrās*- derives from the root *gar* “to awaken” to which *garaieimi* probably also belongs.
22- For this correction s. Kotwal (1985: 369). The manuscripts hat readings that are rather compatible with *astāmag-nigerīsh* (thus Andrés-Toledo (2016: 254-255)).
Nērang Ātaxš and Ātaxš Niyāyišn in modern times

According to Modi (1922: 233 ff.), the Nērang Ātaxš 2 is recited as part of the ceremony of bōy dādan, when celebrated with an Ātaxš Wahrām. He describes the complete ceremony as follows: before entering in the fire chamber, the priest unties the kūstī and then ties it up again and performs certain ablutions (the kūstī-pādyāb). He then recites the following prayers depending on the part of the day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>häuuani- “morning”</th>
<th>rapiδšina- “noon”</th>
<th>uzaieirina- “afternoon”</th>
<th>aiķisruδrina- “evening”</th>
<th>ušahina- “dawn”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Srōš Wāž</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāh 1</td>
<td>Gāh 2</td>
<td>Gāh 3</td>
<td>Gāh 4</td>
<td>Gāh 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ny 1 (Xwaršēd Niyāyišn)</td>
<td>Ny 2 (Mihr Niyāyišn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Srōš Yašt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Srōš Hādōxt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After entering the fire chamber, the priest places some pieces of frankincense on the fire and six pieces of sandalwood arranged in a special way: two pieces facing east, two facing south, and two facing west.23 He then washes the stone-slab on which the fire-vase stands. Afterwards, he again places some sandalwood or frankincense on the fire three times while reciting humata huuaršta (likely Y35.2). At this point, he walks around the fire vase with a ladle in his hand, stirring the ashes so the embers are exposed to the firewood placed on the fire, and the fire is rekindled. He makes eight stops on his way and returns to his initial position: W, NE, SE, E, SW, NW, N, S, and, eventually, again W. The priest recites the text of the Nērang Ātaxš 2 during this circling of the fire vase. The text is divided into nine parts and each one is recited at one position:24

---

23- That is, successively facing the three positions of the Sun during the day: eašt in the morning, south at noon and wešt in the afternoon.

24- The text here is reproduced according to Modi’s indications, but standardised in a different way. Rezania (2017: 273 f.) has analysed this section of the ceremony based on Modi’s description. In his description, Rezania organizes the movements into three series of three triangles based on a misunderstanding of Modi’s description of the text that the priest has to recite. Rezania describes and groups the texts as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y68.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rezania does not seem to have properly understood Modi’s indications. The priest does not recite these Avešian citations, but just the text of Nērang Ātaxš as described above. The latter does not show in any case the triple triangular structure assumed by Rezania. For its recitation, the text is divided into three sections with each one consisting of two parts and a fourth section with three parts. The textual structure does not fit the triadic organisation of the movements. Furthermore, it should be noted that the movements described by Modi do not seem to be that old, as indicated by the fact that even M4 (with the same text as Modi) describes the movements differently.
At the end of the recitation of NērangĀtaxš 2, the priest places some small pieces of sandalwood or frankincense on the fire and then recites the Ātaxš Niyāyišn. The number of Niyāyišn he recites and his position depend on the part of day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of the day</th>
<th>hāwuani-</th>
<th>rapiššina-</th>
<th>uzaiieirina-</th>
<th>ažisrūđrima-</th>
<th>ušahina-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the recitation of Y62.10 in the first Ātaxš Niyāyišn, the priest uses two ladles to draw two circles in the ashes and he repeats this during the recitation of the second Ātaxš Niyāyišn.

The textual flow accompanying the priest’s actions after entering the fire chamber is, according to Modi, as follows:

- humata hūxāa huuaršta (Y35.2)
- NērangĀtaxš 2
- Ātaxš Niyāyišn, repeated a different number of times in each part of the day.

According to Modi’s description, NērangĀtaxš 2 is not part of the Nērang ʼē ātaxš abrōxtan, but it is the text recited during the circling of the fire, and followed by the recitation of some Ātaxš Niyāyišn. However, in K7 (and accordingly in Westergaard's edition) this is part of the Nērang ʼē ātaxš abrōxtan. However, because of the similarity between the continuation of the Nērang ʼē Ātaxš after the NērangĀtaxš 2 and the Ātaxš Niyāyišn, this may be attributed to an inaccuracy in Modi’s description.

25. The position of the priest is clearly determined by the position of the sun. The priest is always looking at the fire in the direction where the Sun is visible; until noon the priest looks to the east and after noon to the west. At dawn, he looks in the direction from where the light of the sun will start being visible and, in the evening, in the direction from where the light of the sun is still visible. This establishes a clear link between fire and sun and the ceremony of feeding the fire with the continuity of the sun that is also stressed through the recitation of the Sun and Mīra Niyāyišn during the three parts of the day when the sun is visible.
The recitation of NêrangĀtaxš 2 during the bōy dādan-ceremony in ms. M49

Ms. M49 includes a description of the bōy dādan-ceremony when it is celebrated in an Ātaxš Wahrām. Unfortunately, it is incomplete, although the page of the manuscript is not damaged; for some unknown reason, the copy of the description of the ceremony was interrupted. The preserved part runs as follows:

| M49 49r-v | At the time of bōy dādan in the Ātaxš Varhrām they should do the following: the mobed who has taken the nābar, should perform the pādyāb-kosti ceremony. He puts firewood on the fire in the form of a throne and says the wāḡ. While saying humatanqm. hūxтанqm. huwarštanqm26 and yasnā he cleans the fire stone-slab (āduto) with pādyāb and (says) as in the Yazišn27 aūrō. ahurahe. mazdā. putra. tawua. āṭarš. putra. ahurahe. mazdā. xšnaoṛa. višuva. mraotī. aṣām. aṣām. vohi. He washes the fire stone-slab and puts the (fire) plate on it. Then, in the gāh hāvān, he looks to the east and takes the ladle with both hands and puts it on the plate and says this dībače: yātō. aūrō. gāraieu. Then he looks to the west and put the ladle on the plate (saying) vaŋhūs. mananjo. zaoṭrābiō. yaz. He looks to the south (saying) yātō. aūrō. gāraieu. Then looks to the north (saying) vaŋhūs. uxda. zaoṭrābīō. yātō. |

ba-vaqt-e buy dādan ātaḥš varhrām hamčenin āvayad kardan mobed-i ke nābar dāste bāšid pādyāb kosti karde be-hime šemš bar ātaḥš gozāstan be-mesl-e čauki (?) be-vāq goftan be-humat wa huvaršt wa yasn be-āb-e pādyāb ādišt rā pāk kardan be-mesl-e yazišn aūrō. ahurahe. mazdā. putra. tawua. āṭarš. putra. ahurahe. mazdā. xšnaoṛa. višuva. mraotī. aṣām. aṣām. vohi. švarhrē. mrm. aš. voh. He places the stone slab on the fire and says the wāḡ. He looks to the south (saying) vaŋhūs. mananjo. zaoṭrābiō. yaz. He looks to the south (saying) yātō. aūrō. gāraieu. Then looks to the north (saying) vaŋhūs. uxda. zaoṭrābiō. yātō.

The ritual cursus is very similar (despite some differences) to the ceremony described by Modi but has important differences when compared to the description found in ms. K7. The priest’s first action after entering the fire chamber is to offer some pieces of frankincense to the fire. Modi describes the special way of arranging the six pieces that constitute the māchi or “throne”. Ms. M49 uses the expression be-hime şemš bar ātaḥš gozāstan be-mesl-e čauki “He places firewood on the fire in the form of a čauki.” The latter is probably a Persian loanword from Gujarati ċauki “low square seat” and refers to the special arrangement of the six pieces of firewood that the Parsees refer to as māchi “throne.” The priest then takes the wāž and cleans the stone-slab while reciting Y35.2 and also recites a Frauuarāne28 with the same dedicatory to the fire used in the LL, when celebrated in a fire-temple.

26- It refers likely to Y35.2. The addition yasn is, however, puzzling (perhaps for yuθuνa?)
27- Standard designation of the Yasna. It refers to the first Frauuarāne of the LL.
28- M49 does not explicitly say that a Frauuarāne has to be recited. However, the combination of a dedicatory with the wāž girišnī in the same way as in the Yazišn refers clearly to the recitation of a Frauuarāne that is identical to Y0.1-3, but with the special wāž girišnī used when the ritual is performed by a single priest. This is confirmed by the mention of a Frauuarāne at this point in ms. K7.
The recitation of Nērang ē ātaxš abrōxtan 2 accompanies the stirring of the ashes on the plate, as in modern practice and also in ms. K7. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether the priest moves around the fire-altar, as in the modern usage described by Modi, or stays in one place and just looks successively in different directions. According to the description in ms. K7, the priest does not move, but the description in M49 is less clear. Although the expression ruy-e be-suy-e ... kardan could be understood in both ways, it more likely refers to the priest moving in different directions, as it would not be easy to look to the four cardinal points while putting the ladle on the plate to stir the embers without changing position regarding the fire altar. Thus, if he stays to the south of the fire altar, then it would be quite difficult to stir the ashes while looking to the south. This is, however, easy, if the priest changes his position regarding the altar each time. The positions and directions towards which the priest faces at hāuuani are likely to be the following:29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Looking to</th>
<th>Recited text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>yātō. āṭrō. gāraiemi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>vaŋhōu. maŋhō. zaoṭrābiū. yaz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>yātō. āṭrō. gāraiemi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As ms. M49 in contrast to Modi, the recitation of the Frauuarāne before the NērangĀtaxš 2, it is clear that the recitation of the NērangĀtaxš 2 is part of a longer ritual unit (the Nērang ē ātaxš abrōxtan) and not a preamble to the recitation of an Ātaxš Niyāšn, as posited by Modi. The description of the complete ceremony is likely to have been similar to the one contained in ms. K7, if the text of ms. M49 had been complete. The textual flow is as follows:

1. Pādyāb kustig
2. Wāž Girišnḥ
3. Y35-2
4. Frauuarāne with dedicatory to the Fire, Wāž Girišnḥ
5. Ašm Vohū
6. NērangĀtaxš 2

29- As the text is interrupted in the middle, we do not know when the remaining five sections of the text were recited and how the ceremony continued.
The recitation of the Nêrang i ātāxš abrōxtan according to ms. K7

The description of ms. K7 is by far the oldest, the most complete, and the one with more divergences with the two other versions. This text has been edited and translated by F. Kotwal (1985). It runs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nylng y ‘thš ‘plwhtn’</th>
<th>Nêrang for kindling²² the fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nhxst YDE PWN ʼp’ty’p’ krtn’ W AHL nɔmasy. tā. ātars. mazdā. ahurahe. OD yazata. ašm 3</td>
<td>First, he should wash his hands with pādyāb and then (he recites) nɔmasy. tā. ātars. mazdā. ahurahe. until yazata and three Ašām Vohū.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frauuarāne ME g’s YHSNN-yt āθrā. ahurahe. mazdā. puθra. tawua. ātars. puθra. ahurahe. mazdā. xšnaorā. OD LOYŠE w’c OHDWN-şnyh krtn’</td>
<td>(He recites) the Frauuarāne that includes the mention of the part of the day (with the dedicatory) āθrā. ahurahe. mazdā. puθra. tawua. ātars. puθra. ahurahe. mazdā. xšnaorā until the end. Then he performs the waž giršinōh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ašm 3</td>
<td>(He recites) three Ašām Vohū.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W MN tyh y hwlsyt BYN OBYDWN-tn’ W ‘twrg’s šwnš W dmykn YNSBN-tn W pwšt OL nymwlc W wḷ OL ʼp’hlt krtn’ ašm vohū. gwptn W 3 b’l dmykn OL ‘p’hlt dptn’ st’tm YNSBN-tn’ W pwšt OL ‘p’hlt krtn’</td>
<td>He enters (the chamber) from the side of the light of the sun³⁰ and washes the fire-stand. He takes a fan. He turns his back towards the south, faces the north and recites the Ašām Vohū. He waves the fan three times towards the north. He takes a ladle³² and turns his back to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aďša. āθrôm. gārāiemi. vanychō. mananjhō. zaošrabiiō. gwptn’vâr-i st’tm OL NPSĒ lwv krtn’ aďša. āθrôm. gārāiemi. vanychō. uxšahe. zaošrabiiō. gwptn W vâr ‘PWN³³ st’tm OL nymwlc krtn’ aďša. āθrôm. gārāiemi. vanychō. šiaoṣnahe. zaošrabiiō. gwptn’W vâr ‘PWN ’st’m OL lwv YATWN-t krtn’ sükā. mananjhahe. lwv’c štw krtn’sükā. vacanhahe. lwv YATWN-t sükā. šiaoṣnom. OL nymwlc krtn’</td>
<td>He recites aďša. āθrôm. gārāiemi. vanychō. mananjhō. zaošrabiiō, and stirs the ashes with the ladle in his own direction. He recites aďša. āθrôm. gārāiemi. vanychō. uxšahe. zaošrabiiō, and stirs the ashes with the ladle in the south direction. He recites aďša. āθrôm. gārāiemi. vanychō. šiaoṣnahe. zaošrabiiō, and stirs the ashes with the ladle in the east direction. At sükā. mananjhahe, he does so in the west direction.³⁴ At sükā. vacanhahe, he does so in the east direction. At sükā. šiaoṣnom, he does so in the south direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²²- The verb abrōxtan is not used just for re-kindling the fire, but also for awakening a dormant fire (s. WZ29.7).
³⁰- The expression az tēx i xwaršēd should be compared with GrBel 26.88: ʻōšām ân tēx i xwaršēd abar āyēd ka xwaršēd rōšānī paydāg w-š tan nē paydāg “Morning dawn is the bright of the Sun that comes up when the light of the Sun is visible, but the body of the Sun is not yet visible.” It is likely to be read as tēx (see Kotwal tēg, NP tēg) and seems to indicate the light of the sun when the sun’s orb is not visible. In the Bundahišn passage, az tēx i xwaršēd clearly indicates the eašt direction, and the same could be assumed for our passage. Accordingly, the priest should enter the fire-chamber in the morning from the eašt side. In the LL the zōt usually enters the yazĩngāh from the west side, at the place of the ātrawaxš, but in the Vidčevādī liturgy he makes it from the eašt, at the place of the aburdārān according to the information of the Iranian liturgical manuscripts.
³²- For the reading astām, s. Kotwal (1985: 369).
³³- Kotwal (1985: 369a) correctly understands Pázand var as Middle Persian war “covering for the fire, ashes” that is usually written with the heterogram <LWBSY>. Kotwal notes the appearance in the Pahlavi commentary to V5.51 of war i ātāxš wuhrām for ān i ātāxš ādureštar “the embers of the fire” that translates Av. ātriō. patti.irištā- (in mašmana ātriō. patti.irištām “a mixture of embers with cow’s urine”). For the ideogram see (Bartholomae 1915-53, Tavadia 1933: 49, Mirza 1967: 43). The following b is corrected in all attestations by Kotwal into pad. It is a New Persian spelling for b-astāmag. 
³⁴- Lit. “there where the lights are gone.”
The beginning of the ceremony differs from ms. M49. The Frauuarâne and the wâz ĝiriṣnih are recited by the priest before entering the fire chamber and the washing of the fire-altar. He then takes a fan and waves it three times near the fire facing north. The textual sequence is similar to the actions of the zôt at the fire altar before the proper beginning of the LL, as we can see in this comparison of the version in M49, the one in K7 and the beginning of the LL e.g. in ms. 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M49</th>
<th>K7</th>
<th>LL (ms. 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xšnaôdra. ahurahe. mazdá.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YAV 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xšnaôdra. ahurahe. mazdá.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>namas. tâ. ātarš. mazdá.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>namas. tâ. ātarš. mazdá.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahurahe. hudâ. mazišta. yazata.</td>
<td>ahurahe. hudâ. mazišta. yazata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35: To be completed with vahnomca. aôjasca. zauauarca. âfînâmi.

36: This is standard closing that consists of the translation of the first words of the Ašam Vohu.
The actions run as well parallel in K7 and in the fire introduction to the LL. First the priest washes his hands with pādyāb, recites the namah for the fire and the Frauuarâne. Then he goes around the fire-altar and cleans it. In the LL, he then goes into the direction of the zōtgāh and, in the Nêrang ī ataxš abrōxtan, fans the fire three times with the recitation of (probably three) Ašām Vohū.

Next, he recites Nêrang ātaxš 2 while stirring the ashes. He does not move around the fire-altar, but simply stirs the ashes successively in different directions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>moves the ladle towards...</th>
<th>while reciting...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in his direction</td>
<td>ādžā. ādram. gāraiemi. vanhōuš. manaŋha. zaoθrābiō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ādžā. ādram. gāraiemi. vanhōuš. uxaŋhe. zaoθrābiō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ādžā. ādram. gāraiemi. vanhōuš. šīaŋθnahe. zaoθrābiō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>sūkāi. manaŋhahe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>sūkāi. vacaŋhahe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>sūkāi. šīaŋθnom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The priest’s position while stirring the ashes is not explicitly mentioned. He is probably on the south side when waving the fan, then he goes to the north and takes the ladle facing the south. Accordingly, when he begins, he is on the north side looking towards the south, and the first movement of the ladle is towards the north. The movements of the ladle can be represented as follows:

---

37. M49 does not mention explicitly that they are three, but this is very likely.
Accordingly, the ashes are stirred three times on each axis, albeit with a non-symmetrical distribution: twice towards the south and east, but only once towards the north and west. After stirring the ashes, he recites Y33.11. Next, he places a piece of firewood and sandalwood on the fire, while reciting Y35.2. When the flames of the fire are visible, then he recites Y33.12.

The recitation of the proper Ataxš Niayišn of the Yasna (Y62.1-10) now begins. At the end, he recites one Ašam Vohu and three Ahuna Vairia. During the recitation of the first one, the priest draws a furrow in the ashes around the fire. Therefore, the ceremony itself ends and the standard closing formulas follow, being extended with a namō for the fire and the recitation of at. ā. ūšmānāi. ašre. rātām. namājho. (Y43.9b).

**Fire, water and haoma**

The Nērang i ātaxš abrōxtan “Ceremony for (re-)kindling the fire” as described by Rōstam Mihrābēn in ms. K7 is a longer variant of the Ātaxš Niayišn. The main difference between Ātaxš Niayišn and Nērang i ātaxš abrōxtan is that only the latter includes an Avestan text (NērangĀtaxš 2) before the recitation of the proper Niayišn i Ātaxš of the Yasna. The action performed during the recitation of Nērang Ātaxš 2 is also exclusive of the Nērang i ātaxš abrōxtan: the stirring of the ashes to allow air through to the embers below the ashes and to facilitate combustion when new firewood is put on the fire during the recitation of Y35.2. Previously the priest has fanned the fire three times. The Avestan text makes explicit reference to this double action (fanning and stirring the ashes) through the expression ā ūšā ādram gārāiemi “I awaken you, the fire” so that there should not be much doubt that the text has been composed for the performance of the ritual of awakening the fire. Since the Avestan text of Nērang Ātaxš 2 is basically correct (but for the use of ādram instead of the expected ātrim which is likely just a transmission error), the logical conclusion is that at a time when it was still possible to compose a correct Avestan text, there was a ritual for awakening an “eternal fire” that lay dormant under the ashes.

The use for the ceremonies for awakening the fire and for its feeding of the Ātaxš Niayišn of the Long Liturgy and of the stanzas linked to the squeezing of the haoma-twigs points out to a connection between these ceremonies and the Long Liturgy. Furthermore, the textual link between Nērang Ātaxš 2 and Y68.3-4 highlights the parallelism between the fire and water ceremonies. Accordingly, the analysis of the Nērang i ātaxš abrōxtan should not be independent from the analysis of the fire and water ceremonies performed at the end of the LL.

The ceremonies for fire and water were conceived fundamentally as parallel and complementary, as it appears already in the description of these ceremonies by Strabo (Geography, 15.3.14). Thus, the double recitation of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti in the greater ceremonies is understood by the Young Avestan arrangers respectively as a fire and water ceremony (see Cantera 2020b, 270 ff.). Furthermore, the fire and water ceremonies at the end of the LL proceed basically in parallel (A. Cantera 2020b, 273 ff.). In both the

---

38- In the modern performance, Sanjana priest draw one furrow and Bhagaria two during the recitation of the two Īst Ahuna Vairia (Modi 1922: 225, Kotwal 1985: 373). Modi must also be referring to this drawing of the furrows when he mentions the furrow at the end of the first Ātaxš Niayišn. It seems quite clear that what Modi calls the first Ātaxš Niayišn is the continuation of the Nērang i ātaxš after Nērang i ātaxš abrōxtan 2. 39- Because of the poor transmission of this ceremony in the manuscripts (ādram is only attested in ms. K7), no conclusion should be drawn from this. 40- See de Jong (1997, 133:125 f.)
quotations of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti play a central role, so that they appear as the counterparts of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti in the last section of the LL.

The parallelism between the ritual cycles of fire and water is further emphasized in the modern practice by the fact the fire is kindled for the ceremony exactly at the beginning of the Nērang i zōhr griftan, the section of the Paragāṇā during which the priest takes the water from the well and brings it to the ritual area (A. Cantera 2020a, 84; A. Cantera 2020c). According to the description of the Rivāyat of Ǧāsā (1516), after having taken the twigs for the barsom, the milk and the bull’s hair, the priest kindles the fire and afterwards, he consecrates the water brought from the well so that the profane water becomes the ritual water, ahurānī.6 This is the first time that the second person singular pronoun is used in the liturgy and it refers to Āhurānī, as it will do again at the end of the liturgy. Thus, the ritual fire appears in the ritual scene immediately before the consecration of the water, but it will get its ritual status a bit later, at the very beginning of the LL through the consecration of the water, āhrangī.6

Furthermore, they also have in common respective ḫāoma-offerings. From the beginning of the comparison between the Avestan and the Vedic liturgies, a fundamental difference between the Vedic and Avestan use of ḫāoma-/soma in the rituals has been noticed. Already M. Haug (1862, 239) noticed:

“The Parsee priests never throw anything of the juice into the fire, but the Brahmans must first offer a certain quantity of the intoxicating juice to different deities, by throwing it from variously shaped wooden vessels into the fire, before they are allowed to taste “the sweet liquor.”

G. König (2018: 37ff.) has recently stressed the importance of this difference and has recognized in this “minimal” variance the beginning of a process of “spiritualization” (“Vergeistigung”) of the cult that will

---

41- In the Indian performance, it happens at a similar moment, immediately before the prufication of the urwēsgāḥ that precedes the zōhr griftan (Redard and Daruwalla 2021, 38). Of course, the shared evidence of the Iranian and Indian tradition is not enough for assuming that the fire appeared in the ritual space as well at this moment, but this is as well as likely possibility. It enters the scene as the last of the elements that has to been brought from outside.

42- This first section of the Yasna preceding the frastruiē is considered as part of the Paragāṇā. However, the correspondence of this Frauuarāne in the afrināmi for the fire at the end of the liturgy (Y72.8) shows that this is already part of the LL and not of the preliminaries.

43- The use of the pronoun of the second person singular in the lips of the offiicating priest in the Young Avestā sections of the LL is mostly directed to the fire along the liturgy until the end when it is again directed to Āhurānī. In the Hōm Stōm is also used for ḫāoma. Furthermore, it is used a few times for Ahura Mazda at the beginning and end of the liturgy (Y1.22, 71.10), once for Vaiū (Y72.19 and in the dedicatories, when he appears there) and for Aṣa Vahišta in a passage that is repeated several times (Y60.14, 71.33). The referent of Y71.13 is unclear.
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to the gods (and among them also Agni, the Fire), in the Avestan LL the haōma-juice prepared during the liturgy and mixed with milk is offered to the waters and the squeezed haōma- and pomegranate-twigs are offered to the fire in the ceremonies to the fire and the water that culminate the liturgy. The climax of the Ātaš Niyāyīn is, indeed, the last offering to the fire of the whole liturgy (according to the Iranian liturgical manuscripts) at the recitation Y62.9. It does not consists of ēsm and/or bōy, like all the other previous offerings to the fire, but of the pounded and squeezed twigs of haōma and pomegranate (Cantera 2019, 31). This creates a certain symmetry between the fire and water ceremonies.

The status of this offering to the fire is not completely clear. It could be understood not exactly as an offering, but as the elimination in the fire of the sacred residue of haōma. However, the significant moment of the offering, at the end of the Ātaš Niyāyīn and during the explicit mention of an offering to the fire (Y62.9 āaṭ yezišē ēm baraiti aēšmōm vā ašaia bārstam barāsma vā ašaia frastārastam uruwarq vā hašnāēpatq) points rather to an offering than to a liquidation of the residue. The relevance of the offering of haōma to the water and the fire in the LL, though, is not comparable. First, the Avestan text of the Āb-zōhr mentions explicitly the libations containing haōma (Y66.2, 9, 19, 20, 68.1), but this is not the case for the offerings to the fire. Y62.9 mentions the offerings to the fire and they include wood, the barāsman and pomegranate, but not haōma. Second, the litanies at the beginning of the Srōš Drōn set the attribution of the different offerings to the corresponding recipients, see e.g. Y3.1-4. Different offerings are dedicated to different gods: the solid offering (miiaizd-) to Sraōša; the haōma- and para.haōma- to the frauwaši of Zarathustra (meant is the parahaōma that is going to be drunk by the priest at Y11.11); aēšma- and baōši-, to the fire; haōma-, the water for haōma-, the milk and the pomegranate, to the waters; the barāsman-, to the Amāša Spāntas; the good words, deeds and thoughts to the spiritual gods and one’s soul. Thus, haōma is specially linked with the libation to the waters, but not with the offerings to the fire. This could invite us to postulate a later datation for the offering of the haōma to the fire at the very prominent position of Y62.9. However, the first stanza of the Ātaš Niyāyīn links the final ceremony with the pressing of haōma, while presenting the one who performs the ceremony to the fire as having in his hands, among others, the mortar for the preparation of haōma:

usta buiiat anjai naire yasa.δβα bāḍa frāiazaite.
aēšmōzastō barāsmanōzastō gaō.zastō hauuanō.zastō

May uṣṭā be for the man who offers you a yasna with wood in his hand, with the barāsman in his hand, with meat (or milk) in his hand and with the mortar in his hand.

44 Some manuscripts mention at Y62.9 only the offering of pomegranate (mss. 2005, 2007, 2102, 2104, 2109 and 5020), although the vašt majority of manuscripts of the Yasna and the Vidēvdād, but also some Visperad (ms. 2030, 2040, 2101, 2102, 2106) mention both hōm and urwarqām as offerings and refer explicitly to the fact that they are the ones that have been pounded before.
Although this might be read just as an indication that the Ātaxš Niyāyišn was originally conceived only as part of the Long Liturgy, it rather establishes a connection between the care of the fire and meat and haōma offerings to the fire.

The Old Avestan quotations accompanying the text of Y62 in the Ātaxš Niyāyišn and Nērang i ātaxš abröxtan were, in any case, included at a time when the squeezed haōma-twigs were already offered at the fire in the LL. The recitation of Y33.11 and 12 with the intercalation of Y35.2 in the Nērang and the recitation of Y33.12-14 in the Ātaxš Niyāyišn seem to point in this direction. As Kellens has shown, the hāiī Yašāišē, Y33, describes a parallel ritual action to the Hōm Stōm (Kellens 2013: 62). The last pressing of haōma of the standard LL does, indeed, take place between Y31 and 33 (Cantera 2014: 264, Cantera 2016: 153 ff.). It is at the end of Y33.11 (at the recitation of pāiī) that the priest squeezes the twigs of haōma and pomegranate. The special connection between Y33.11-14 and the haōma squeezing is highlighted in the arrangement of the LL through its recitation at the end of the Hōmāst, where its accompanies as well the last squeezing of the haōma with the fingers. Thus, the recitation of even these strophes in the Nērang i ātaxš and the Ātaxš Niyāyišn clearly points to a connection between the awakening of the fire and its feeding and the haōma offering. The link is confirmed as well by the Waršmānsar Nask that in the commentary of Y33.12 says (Dk9.33.9):

.ud ūn-īz kū ka ātaxš abröze ēn gōwišn frāz gōw us.mōi tā wačīst sar

“And this means as well that when you kindle the fire, you should recite this prayer: us.mōi until the end of the stanza (=Y33.12)”

Both the daily care of the fire and the water ceremonies, celebrated independently of the LL, might have involved offerings of haōma. Probably, the complex ceremonies mentioned in the Nērangestān, like the Dah-Hōmāst or the Dawāzda-Hōmāst, were intended to the production of big quantities of haōma as dried twigs and as juice that could be used later respectively for the care of the fire and for the water ceremonies.

In the Avestan liturgy, the only recipients of the haōma prepared during the liturgy are the fire and the water. They are not the intermediaries, but the beneficiaries. Perhaps this different conception of the function and role of the plant and its juice has led to the different way of offering it, as a dried residue and not as the “hardly burning” (dūrāoša-?) juice. In fact, the substitution of the haōma-offerings to the gods through the mediation of the fire by its offering to the ritual fire and water fits perfectly in the general structure of the LL. The climax of the LL is frequently seen in the animal sacrifice offered in the Antiquity during the recitation of the Old Avestan texts and later, after the abandonment of the animal sacrifice, in the very recitation of these texts. However, the LL seems to have two fundamental movements after the acquisition by the priest of his sacred condition: the meat offering to the fire during the Yasna Haptahāhīt and the offerings to the fire and the waters at the end of the liturgy. The liturgy, especially after the abandonment of the animal sacrifice, moves, indded, towards a final climax: the invigoritation of

45 Y32.14 yē dūraošm saōcaiāt could be read in this way, despite the difficulties (Jean Kellens 1988, 2.260).
the ritual fire and the ritual water before the ceremony ends and they return to their profane nature. The Zand i Wahman Yašt makes evident the shift of the focus towards the fire and water. There, the ceremonies (including some greater performances of the Long Liturgy) at the end of the time are described as liturgies “for fire and water”, see ZYW7.19:

\[
ed pišišōtan i bāmig frāz raw ŏ ēn ērān dehān i man ohrmazd-dād ud ātāxš ābān frāz yaz hādōx̚t
dwāzdah-hōmāst hād pad ātāxš ābān frāz yaz ān i pad ātāxš ābān paydāg
\]

“Go forth, brilliant Pišišōtan to the countries of the Ērān that were created by me, Ohrmazd, and celebrate the fire and the waters, the Hādōxt and the Hōmāst liturgies, that is, celebrate (the liturgies) for the fire and the waters, the ones that are revealed as for the fire and the waters.”

and also ZYW7.22:

\[
uł rawēnd pad humad ud hūxt ud huwaršt ud ātāxš ud ābān frāz yazēnd hādōxt ud bayān yasān
frāz stāyēnd man Ohrmazd abāg amahrspandān
\]

“They will go forth and with good thought, good words and good deeds, they will celebrate (the liturgies) for the fire and the waters, that is, the Hādōxt and the Bayān Yašt.”

Invigorated in the ceremony, fire and water are expected to bestow to the ritual community the reward for it. Both of them, fire and water, are the addresses of respective requests by the officiating priests (A. Cantera 2020b, 275 ff.). In the case of the ritual water, ahurānī, the wife of Ahura Mazda, the ritual water, is invigorated so that the world waters, Arāduzi Anāhitā, bring the expected reward to the community. This is clearly seen in the modern Indian practice (F. M. Kotwal and Boyd 1991, 128 f.; Redard and Daruwalla 2021, 129). After the end of the proper liturgy, the ritual water is returned back to the stream or well from which it has been taken and thus invigorates and satisfies the running waters (as opposed to standing waters of the sacrifice, Ahurānī) that will be responsible for the well-being of the ritual community. When both priests have left the ritual area, the zōt enters it again, picks up the mortar, pours a portion into a cup and walks to the fire and offers a piece of āsm ud bōy. Then, he proceeds to the well, from which the ritual water was taken at the beginning of the ceremony. Once there, he libates the contents of the mortar to the well while reciting one Ahuna Variia and one Ašam Vohū and a namah- for Arāduzi, similar to the one used for the fire at the beginning of the liturgy (namas̲t̲ē ātarś mazdā ahurahe hudā mazišta yazata....):

\[
namas̲t̲ē. āś̲a̲um sāwāišt̲e arāduzi sūra anāhite āś̲a̲õne
Āš̲a̲m Vohū 1
yēm arāduzi sūrm anāhīt̲m āś̲a̲wān̲m āś̲a̲he ratūm yazamaide
Āš̲a̲m Vohū 1
huwarx̲šāēt̲m. amās̲m raēm āruwxt̲m. asp̲m yazamaide.
Āš̲a̲m Vohū 1
māng̲h̲m gaōcĩṛ̯m āś̲a̲wān̲m āś̲a̲he ratūm yazamaide
\]

Ahurani, the ritual water that has got the offerings of haōma and milk during the Āb-zōhr now returns to the worldly water, to Arāduzi.
The process of the returning of the water to the natural cycle seems to have been a different one in Iran. Most manuscripts include at the very beginning of Y71.1 an instruction prescribing the pouring of all ritual water on the *barsom* at the end of the Āb-zōhr: *ēn gyag hamāg āb abar sar i barsom rēzīdan* “at this passage, (the zōt) should pour all the water on the *barsom*”. It is a symbolic irrigating of the vegetal element with the invigorated ritual waters. In which way the ritual water came back to their profane function in the Antiquity remains unclear.

The same applies to the fire. We do not know what happened with the fire at the end of the liturgy. Kellens and Redard (2013, 7 ff) deduce from the structure of the LL, with the Āb-zōhr following the Ātaxš Niyāišn, and from the role of Apāṃ Napat in the Āb-zōhr that the fire was originally extinguished at the end of the liturgy. Alternatively, I have ventured the hypothesis that the fire might have abandoned the ritual area and brought back to the house from which it was, supposedly, brought for the performance at the beginning of the liturgy (Cantera 2019). Although I still consider the second possibility more likely, no definitive arguments can be advanced for any of them. One point is, however, quite clear. The destiny of the ritual fire at the end of the liturgy is to continue burning in the house of the humans, as explicitly said in Y62.2-3:

*dāiṭiio.aēsni buiiā dāiṭiio.baoiši buiiā dāiṭiio.pišši buiiā dāiṭiio.upasaieni buiiā poranāiūš.harōrī buiiā ānjiiauš.harōrī buiiā ātarī pu dra ahurahe mazdā saōci.buiiē amjiia nmāne maṭ.saōci.buiiē amjiia nmāne raōcahi.buiiē amjiia nmāne vaxšaši.buiiē amjiia nmāne darzγomciț aipi zruanagan upa sūrqm frašo.karōtim haža sūraiia vānjiuiia frašo. karōtīt.*

You might receive the wood you deserve according to the prescriptions; you might receive the aromatic wood you deserve according to the prescriptions; you might receive the nourishment you deserve according to the prescriptions; you might receive the bed you deserve according to the prescriptions; you might receive the protection of an adult you deserve according to the prescriptions; you might receive the protection of an expert you deserve according to the prescriptions, o Fire, son of Ahura Mazdā, so that you burn in this house; so that you might burn forever in this house; so that you illuminate this house; so that you grow in this house for a long time until the powerful time of the Frašō.karāti and in the time of the powerful Frašō.karāti.

According to my hypothesis, the invigorated ritual fire was removed from the ritual area and brought back to the house from which it came. According to Kellens and Redard’s hypothesis, the continuity between the house fire and the ritual fire is not a physical direct one, but created through the mediation of Apāṃ Napat. The result is, however, the same.

---

46 Two rituals about the *barsom* mentioned in the Nērangeštān might be connected with this final invigoration of the *barsom*. According to N83, three *barsom*-twigs (probably already consecrated in a LL) should be tied in a field where someone sows corn. N82 describes a rite consisting in the dropping of *barsom*-twigs in to a hole of a tree trunk or in a cavity on the ground. Both seem to attribute some fertility powers to the consecrated *barsom*-twigs.

47 Perhaps we could interpret in light of the difference found already in the Nērangeštān concerning the different way of addressing the fire, when the ceremony takes place in a fire temple or in a private house (A. Cantera 2019, 39). When the liturgy was celebrated in the house, the ritual fire was the “eternal fire” and open-air there was simultaneously two fires: the “permanent fire” that keeps burning in the house and the ritual fire that gets the offerings during the LL. This might be reflected in the duplication of the fire, when addressing it (*āzrō ahurahe mazdā pu dra taiwa ātarī pu dra ahurahe*).
Summing up, the Avestan text of the Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan mentions explicitly the action of awakening the fire that is performed during its recitation in modern times and confirms thus the existence of the notion of an “eternal fire” and of specific rituals for its awakening and feeding at the time of the composition of the Avestan texts. Furthermore, the textual constellation of the rituals for awakening and feeding the fire establishes clear links between these two ceremonies and the LL and the offerings to fire performed there. In fact, the LL and these ceremonies seem to fulfill a similar function: the nourishing the fire so that he might continue burning eternally and bestowing the expected reward to the community. The transformation of the profane fire and water into a ritual fire and water for their invigoration during the liturgy and their return, invigorated, to their profane state for granting benefits to the ritual community seems to be one of the fundamental treads of the LL.

A reconstruction of the Avestan text of the Nērang ātāxš based on ms. K7

The text cited here is a reconstruction of the ceremony as it appears in K7, albeit completing the abbreviated parts. A similar attempt is to be found in TITUS, based on the text edited by Westergaard.

| NērangĀtāxš 1.1 | nōmāsā. tō. ātārš. mazdā. ahurahē. huđā. mazista. yazata. |
| NērangĀtāxš 1.2 | ašm vohū 3x |
| NērangĀtāxš 1.3 | frauwarāne. mazdaiāsnō. zaradauštriṣ. vidaeuiuō. ahurā.ṭkaešō. |
| | [ratu] hāuwanē. aṣaone. aṣahe. raẓ̌e. yasnāica. vanjāica. xšnaoṭrāica. |
| | frasastaiāicas. sauwanjhe. visiāica. aṣaone. aṣahe. raẓ̌e. yasnāica. vanjāica. |
| | xšnaoṭrāica. frasastaiāicas. |
| | [šnūman] aḥrō. ahurahē. mazdā. puṭra. tuaa. ātārš. puṭra. ahurahē. |
| | mazdā. xšnaoṭra. yasnāica. vanjāica. xšnaoṭrāica. frasastaiāicas. |
| | aḥā. ratuś. aṣaṭc̣iṣ. haca. frā. aṣaawu. viūuā. mraōtī. ašm. vohū. |
| NērangĀtāxš 1.4⁴⁸ | ašm vohū 3x |
| NērangĀtāxš 2.1 | ā. ṣ̣hā. aṭrome. gāraie. mane. mazdā. zaoṭrābū̄. |
| | ā. ṣ̣hā. aṭrome. gāraie. mane. mazdā. udpē. zaoṭrābū̄. |
| | ā. ṣ̣hā. aṭrome. gāraie. mane. mazdā. zaoṭrābū̄. |
| | sūkā. mane. mazdā. |
| | sūkā. vacanje. mazdā. |
| | sūkā. šuarnē. |
| NērangĀtāxš 3.1 (=Y33.11) | yā. səwuišṭō. ahurō. mazdāscā. ārmaitiścā. |
| | ašmcā. frādat. gaže. manascā. vohū. xšaṭrēmcā. |
| | sraotā. mo. moṭaredatā. mo. adai. kahiiāi. paitī. |

⁴⁸ A version in extenso of the text of the Nērang ātāxš abrōxtan is also to be found in TITUS. They complete the texts abbreviated by Westergaard. However, at some passages they do so in a slightly different way than I do here.

⁴⁹ M49 and Modi (1922: 235) add the recitation of humata hāxša huwarātā. According to M49, it is recited during the washing of the stone-slab. According to the information provided by Modi, it is, by contrast, recited while placing small pieces of firewood on the fire after the washing of the stone slab and before the recitation of any two.
<p>| Nêrangâtaxš 3.2 | xšnaôdra, ahurahe. mazdâ. |
| Nêrangâtaxš 3.3 (=Y35.2) | humatanqâm. hûxtanqâm. huwarštanqâm. iïadacâ. aïniïadacâ. vorziïmanqâmçâ. váuwarzanqâmçâ. mahi. aïdi.jarstârô. naënaestârô. yaândâ. voñonqâm. mahi. humatanqâm. hûxtanqâm. huwarštanqâm. iïadacâ. aïniïadacâ. vorziïmanqâmçâ. váuwarzanqâmçâ. mahi. aïdi.jarstârô. naënaestârô. yaândâ. voñonqâm. mahi. |
| Nêrangâtaxš 4.7 (=Y62.7) | vispëiçûô. sastîm. barâtî. âtarô. mazdâ. ahurahe. yâëbiôô. aëm. hqm. pacûai. xûûfîmca. sûûrîmca. vispëiçûô. haca. izûieite. huborôtim. uštâ.barôtimca. vaôa.barôtimca. spîtômca. |
| Nêrangâtaxš 4.8 (=Y62.8) | vispanqâm. paracaronçqm. âtarô. zasta. ãïðaiia. cîm. haxa. hañê. barâtî. frâçàrbôô. armaë saië. |
| Nêrangâtaxš 4.9 (Y62.9) | ãôô. yô.sû. aëm. barâtî. aësmôm. vâ. ašaïia. hoçô. barasôm. vâ. ašaïia. frastaratôm. uruçûarôm. vâ. haçûnæpatqâm. ãêe. pasçëa. frûîtî. âtarô. mazdâ. ahurahe. xûûnô. aßôïô. hauûqûfûôm. |
| Nêrangâtaxš 5.1 | aôôm vohô 1x |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NērangĀtaxš 5.2</th>
<th>yaḏā. aḥū vairiiō. 1x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NērangĀtaxš 5.2</td>
<td>yaḏā. aḥū vairiiō. 2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NērangĀtaxš 5.4</td>
<td>yasnṃeca. vanṇṃeca. aōjasca. zauuarōca. āfrināmi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[śnūman] aōrō. ahurahe. mazdā. puṭra. tuaa. ātarš. puṭra. ahurahe. mazdā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NērangĀtaxš 5.5</td>
<td>aṭ. ā. ṣṃaṃjāi. āōrē. rāṭṃ.ṇṃayḥō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=Y43.9d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NērangĀtaxš 5.5</td>
<td>anjāi. raēsca. x’arənasca. anjāi. tanuvō. druutatōṃ. anjāi. tanuvō. vazduuarō. anjāi. tanuvō. vərəṭrəṃ. anjāi. ištūm. pouruš.x’āthrəm. anjāi. aṣnqmcit. frazauntīm. anjāi. darzyqəm. darzyojītim. anjāi. vahiştir. ahūm. aṣaṅqmt. raōcaṇjhəm. visp. x’aṭhrəm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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