

HUNAS IN AVESTA AND PAHLAVI

BY J. J. MODI

The writer of the article on the Huns in the Encyclopaedia Britannica¹ says that the authentic history of the Huns in Europe practically begins about the year A.D. 372, when Balamir or Balambir led a westward movement from their settlements in the steppes on the north of the Caspian sea. A side issue of this movement was the downfall of the Gupta dynasty in India, regarding which Mr. Vincent Smith² in his History of India says —

The Golden age of the Guptas comprised a period of a century and a quarter (A.D. 330-455), covered by three reigns of exceptional length. The death of Kumaragupta I, which can be fixed definitely as having occurred early in 455, marks the beginning of the decline and fall of the empire..... When Skandagupta (455-480 A. D.) came to the throne, in the spring of 455, he encountered a sea of troubles. The Pusyamitra danger had been averted, but one more formidable closely followed it — an irruption of the savage Huns, who had poured down from the steppes of Central Asia through the north-western passes, and carried devastation over the smiling plains and crowded cities of India. Skandagupta, who probably was a man of mature years and ripe experience, proved equal to the need, and inflicted upon the barbarians a defeat so decisive that India was saved for a time.

The Bhitari³ stone pillar inscription of Skandagupta takes a note of this victory over the Huns.⁴

Then there were fresh inroads between A.D. 465 and 470. Skandagupta was succeeded on the throne by his son Puragupta (480-485), who was succeeded by his son Narsimhagupta Baladitya. In or about 484, there were other stronger and further inroads of the Huns under their king Toramana, who had established himself in Malwa (500 to 510). This Toramana was succeeded by Mihiragula or Mihirkula.

The above-mentioned Baladitya was the king of Magadha at this time and Yasodharman (Vikramaditya) was the ruler of Malwa in Central India. Round the names of these two kings there rages a conflict of opinions among scholars, as to which of these two Rajas, defeated Mihirkula and put an end to the Huna supremacy in India. Dr. Rudolf Hoernle⁵ says it was Yasodharman. He rests for his authority on epigraphical, numismatic, and literary evidence, of which the first is the most important. The inscriptions of Yasodharman on his two *rana-stambhas* or "Columns of Victory in War," commemorate this victory.⁶ The second column, which is much mutilated, is, as it were, a duplicate. Jr. Vincent Smith⁷ on the other hand, advocates, that it was Baladitya who defeated the Huna king. He rests for his authority on the statement of the Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsang⁸ who represents Baladitya as defeating Mihirkula.

This question has been also indirectly touched by Professor K. B. Pathak⁹ and Babu Manmohan Chakravarti.¹⁰ In the solution of this question, the Persian history of the Sassanian times has also been appealed to. I do not wish to enter

into the controversy, but simply say that, on weighing the arguments on both sides, I am inclined to believe that the credit of the defeat of the Huns belongs to Yasodharman. The authority of the Chinese traveller is second-hand and late. His statement that Mihirkula, the Huna king who is the hero of this controversy, lived 'some centuries ago'¹¹ should make one pause before taking him as an authority. By that statement, he carries the date of Baladitya also 'some centuries ago' which is against chronological facts. Thus, the authority of a pilgrim-traveller who speaks in later times, and that on second-hand hearsay information, and whose statement on the fact of the date of a king is incorrect, must be set aside, when placed by the side of the contemporary evidence of the inscriptions of the king who claims the victory. If Yasodharman had not been the real victor, he would not have dared to get that inscription put up. He ran the risk of being taken for a braggart or a boaster by his contemporaries, — princes and peasants alike. The court-poet, while preparing the inscription verses, may praise the king and even make a god of him if he liked, but he would not dare, and his royal patron himself would not allow him to dare, to attribute to the king, in the inscription, a feat or a deed which the king did not do. Exaggeration in praise is one thing but a false statement is another thing. The latter would lower the king in the esteem of his people who knew all the contemporary events.

The above Hun kings, Toramana and Mihirkula, speak of themselves on their coins, as "Shahi" kings. We learn from Firdousi, that the king of the Heatalite Huns, who helped Firuz, was spoken of as the Shah of Haitcal.¹² He is also spoken of as the Chagani Shahi.¹³ So, I think, the term "Shahi," used by the Hun kings of India, refers to the title which they had assumed, and that the Huns who settled in India were of the same tribe as those who invaded Persia.

Though the above historical references and the epigraphical evidence speak of the inroads of the Huns in the 5th and 6th centuries after Christ, looking to the history of this great nation of the Huns, who had a running history of about 2000 years, it appears, that there were inroads of these people in times much anterior to these later times of the Guptas. According to M. Deguignes the history of the Huns is the history

"of a nation almost ignored which established at different times powerful monarchies in Asia, Europe and Africa. The Huns, who, later, bore the name of 'Turks', natives of a country situated in the North of China, between the rivers Irtush and Amur, made themselves, by degrees, masters of the whole of the great Tartary. Since 200 B.C. several royal families have successively reigned in their vast countries. They had empires more extensive than that of Rome, some illustrious emperors, some legislators and conquerors, who have given rise to considerable evolutions."¹⁴

The Huns in their long history of about 2000 years, and in their distant marches of more than 2000 miles, one way or another in the East or in the West, in the North or in the South, were known under a dozen different names at different times and different places.

The history of Persia, the history which one may perhaps like to call comparatively the pre-historic history of Persia, points to the existence of the

Huns centuries before Christ. The Avesta writings clearly show this. These writings show that the name of the Huns, by which these people are known, is a very old name of times long anterior to Christ; and this further confirms the views of M. Deguignes in the matter.

The Huns are spoken of in the Avesta as the *Hunus*. We find the following references to them.

I. We read thus in the Aban Yasht —

(53) Tarn Yazata takhmo Tuso rathaestaro baresaesu paiti aspanam zavare jaidhyanto hitaeibyō dravatatem tanubyō pouru-spakhstim tbsayantam paiti-jaitim dusmainyavanam hathranivaitim hamerethenam aurvathanam ibisyantam. (54) Aat him jaidhyat avat aiyapteam dazdi me vanguhi seviste Ardivisura anahite yat bavani aiwi-vanyau aurva *Hanavo* vaeskaya upa dvarem khsathrosaokem apanotemen kanghaya asavanayayatha ayem nijanani Tuiryanam dakhyunam pancasagnai satagnaisca satagnai hazangragnaisca hazangragnai baevaregnai ahankhstagnaisca. (55) Dathat ahmai tat avat ayaptem Ardivisura anahita hadha zaothro barai aredrai yazemnai jaidhyantai dathris ayaptem.

Translation: —(53) The brave warrior Tusa invoked her (Ardivisura) riding on horse-back and praying for strength to his horses, strength to [his own] body, great watchfulness over those who annoyed him, power to strike his enemies, power to run down his foes, adversaries and annoyers. (54) Then he asked of her:

O good beneficent holy Ardivisura! give me this gift, that I may be the overcomer of the brave *Hunus* of Vaesaka¹⁵ at the gate of the lofty [fort of] Khsathrosaoka of the high and holy Kanga¹⁶ [and] that I may kill the fifties and the hundreds, the hundreds and the thousands, the thousands and the ten thousands [and] the ten-thousands and the innumerable [the people of] the country of Turan. (55) Holy Ardivisura granted the desire of him who carried offerings, gave gifts made invocations [and] sought the fulfilment of desires.

II. We further read in the Aban Yasht:

(57) Tarn yazenta aurva *Hunavo* Vaeskaya upa dvarekhsathro-saokem apanotemem Kanghaya bererezantya asav naya satee aspanam arsnam hazangre gavam baevare an mayanam. (58) Aat him jaidhyan avat ayaptem daz no vanguhi seviste Ardivisura anahite yat bavama aiv vanyau takhmem Tusem rathaestarem yatha vaem nij naraa airyanam dakhyunam pancasagnai salagnais satagnai hazangragnaisca hazangragnai haevaregnais baevaregnai ahankhstagnaisca. (59) Noit aeibyascit dathat tat avat ayaptem Ardivisura anahita.

Translation: —(57) The brave *Hunus* of Vaesaka invoked her (Ardivisura) at the gate of the lofty [fort of] Khsathrosaoka of the high and holy Kanga, with one hundred horses, one thousand oxen, [and] ten thousand lambs. (58) Then [thus invoking] they asked of her:

"O good beneficent holy Ardivisura! give us this gift; that we may be the overcomers of the brave warrior Tusa [and] that we may kill the fifties and

the hundreds, the hundreds and the thousands, the thousands and the ten-thousands, [and] the ten-thousands and the innumerable of [the people of] the country of Iran."

(59) Holy Ardivisura did not grant this gift to them.

We gather the following facts from the above passages of the Aban Yasht on the *Hunus* : (1) Vaesaka was one of the brave leaders, or rather the family of the leaders, of the *Hunus*. This Vaesaka of the Avesta seems to be the same as Visak of the Pahlavi Bundehesh (chap, xxxi, 16, 17)¹⁷, one of the ancestors of the Turanians, an uncle of Afrasiab¹⁸ and the father of Piran, the Turanian Nestor. He is the Viseh of Firdousi's Shah-nameh. (2) An Iranian hero Tusa¹⁹ was a great enemy, or rather Tusa's family and descendants were great enemies of Vaesaka or of Vaesaka's family and descendants. We learn from Firdousi, the special reason why these two families were so very hostile. In the war between the Iranian Naodar the father of Tusa, and the Turanian Afrasiab the nephew of Viseh, Barman, a son of Viseh was killed. Naodar was killed by Afrasiab in revenge.²⁰ (3) The head-quarters of this Hun hero Vaesaka and his tribe was, at that time, at a place called Kanga, somewhere in Central Asia. It is the Kangdez, i. e. the Fortress of Kang of the Shah-nameh. (4) The time of this war between the Iranian Tus and the Turanian Hun Vaesaka or Visa, was long anterior to that of king Vistasp, who, according to later Pahlavi writers, lived, at least, about seven centuries before Christ. Thus, we see from the Avesta, that the *Hunus* or the Huns appear first in history as fighting with the Iranians long before the 7th century before Christ.

III. The next reference to the Hunas in the Avesta is in the Meher Yasht (x- 113) where we read as follows —

Tat no jamyat avanghe Mithra Ahura berezanta yat berezem barat astra vacim aspanamca srika khsufsan astrau kahyan jyau nivaithyan tigraungho astayo tadha Hunavo gouru-zaothranam jata paithyaunti fra-varesa.

Translation: —May the great Mithra and Ahura come to our help there where the weapons of war jingle (lit. raise loud noise), the hoofs of horses rattle, the daggers clink, [and] bows shoot forth sharp arrows. There [by the arrival of Mithra and Ahura for assistance] the *Hunus*, the malafide offerers of sacrifices, go about smitten and with dishevelled hair.

The word *Hunu* in the Avesta also means a son. It is used for bad or wicked sons. It is the Sanskrit *sunu*, Eng. son. So, Darmesteter, Kavasji E. Kanga, Harlez, Spiegel and others take the word here as a common noun in the sense of 'sons' or 'descendants.' But, I think, there is here a clear reference to the battles with the *Hunus* or Huns.

In the present passage there is an invocation to Mithra and Ahura for help in the battle field, so that, with their help, certain persons may be smitten. These persons, all the translators take to be the descendants or sons (*hunu*) of some evil-minded persons. I would ask: Why are Mithra and Ahura invoked for smiting the children of the evil-doers and not the evil-doers themselves? One cannot admit the justice of such an invocation. So, I submit that it is clear that it is the

evil-doers themselves, the *Hunus*, against whom the invocation is made. We are not in a sure and certain position to determine the time of this reference to the Huns.

IV. We read as follows in the Jamyad Yasht about a great Iranian hero Keresasp —

41. Yo janat *Hunavo* yat pathanya nava *Hunavas*-ca Nivikahe *Hunavas* ca Dastayanois.

Translation: —Who (Karesaspa) smote the *Hunus*, the nine highway men, the *Hunus* of the Nivika, the *Hunus* of the Dastaya tribe.

Other translators like Kanga, Darmesteter, Spiegel, have taken the word *Hunu*, which occurs thrice in this passage, as a common noun for 'sons or descendants.' West²¹ and Harlez have taken the word in its first place, as a proper noun for the *Hunas*, and in the next two places, for common nouns. I think that it is a proper noun in all the three places and refers to a fight with the *Hunus*.

Harlez gives the following note over the word *Hunas*:

"Personages legendaires incounu. Les legendes rocueillies dans les Shahnameh parlent aussi de brigands tues par des heros et de brigands au nombre de cinq ou sept."²²

Harlez supposes this name to be legendary, but it seems to be a reference to the Huns. The time of this reference seems to be well-nigh the same as, or even a little anterior to, that referred to in the Aban Yasht. The Haoma Yasht (Yacna IX 6-13) places Keresasp's time long before Zoroaster. The Aban Yasht (Yt. V, 37) places his time somewhat before that of Afrasiab, the nephew of the Vaesaka or Visa above referred to. The Ram Yasht (Yt. XV, 27) also places him before Zoroaster.

Keresasp was a great Iranian hero who is more than once referred to in the Avesta. Some of his exploits are referred to in the Zamyad Yasht. One of these exploits was, as said above, that of smiting the *Hunus*. It seems that these exploits were described at some length in the Sudgar Nask, one of the lost books out of the twenty-one books of the Avesta that are believed to have been extant at one time. Though almost all the Nasks have been lost, we know from the ninth book of the Dinkard what their contents were. Similarly, we find therein, in brief, the contents of the Sudgar Nask.²³ In the contents of the fourteenth Fargard Ad-fravakhsya we find the exploits of Keresasp. Therein, we find that the above-mentioned exploit with the Huns, referred to in the Zamyad Yasht, is described thus —

"When the Vesko progeny who (were descendants) of Nivik [and] Dastanik [were] slain by him."²⁴

Here in the Pahlavi passage, we do not find the word *Hunu* repeated as in the Zamyad Yasht with the two proper names Nivika and Dastayana, i.e. the word for 'son,' as understood by the different translators, has not been given. Dr. West has himself added the word 'descendants.' This fact seems to me to show that the word *Hunu* in the Zamyad Yasht is used as a proper noun for the *Hunus* or Huns

in all the three places and not as a common noun in the sense of 'sons.'

The Pahlavi legend is also preserved in the Pahlavi Rivayet accompanying the Dadistan-i-Dini.²⁵ Therein, where the particular exploit of Kerasasp in connection with the *Hunus* mentioned in the above passage of the Zamyad Yasht is referred to, we do not find the name *Hunu* but we find that the persons whom Kerpsasp smote are spoken of only as *racdar*,²⁶ i.e. highway men, which is a Pahlavi equivalent of the Avesta 'Pathan.'

In the Persian Legend of Keresasp, which is the rendering of the above Pahlavi Revayats, we find the word *rah-dar* which is the same as Pahlavi *racdar*.

These Pahlavi and Persian renderings of the original exploit show, that the *Hunus* or Huns, with whom Keresasp fought, were by profession, as it were, highway men. The Avesta Zamyad Yasht, gives the number of their leaders as nine (*nara*). The Pahlavi Revayat gives no number. But the Persian Revayat has reduced the number to seven.

Now, what was the time of this fight of the Iranians with the Huns referred to in the Zamyad Yasht? From the fact that this war or battle was led by Keresasp, we may properly conclude that it referred to times long anterior to king Vistasp and Zoroaster, i. e. long anterior to at least about B.C. 700.

V. The next references to the Huns are in the Farvardin (xiii 100) and Zamyad (xix 86) Yashts, where we read thus about king Vistasp (Gustasp) —

Yo him statam hitam haitim uzvazat haca *Hunu-nvyo*.

Translation: —Who (King Vistasp) separated it (i.e. the Zoroastrian religion referred to in the preceding para), strong holy-existing from [the influence of] the *Hunus*.

Darmesteter, Spiegel, Harlez and Haug very properly take the word *Hunu* in this passage for a proper noun, but Kanga takes it for a common noun.

In the Farvardin and Zamyad Yashts, king Vistasp or Gustasp, the patron of Zoroaster and of the Zoroastrian religion, is spoken of, as said above, as separating the religion of Iran from the influence of the *Hunus*. In the Gos Yasht²⁷ Vistasp prays for overcoming eight foreign kings or chiefs. Among them, one is Khyaona Arejataspa, who is spoken of in the Pahlavi Aiyadgar-i-Zariran (Memoirs of Zarir) as Arjasp-i-Khyonan Khudai²⁸, i.e. Arjasp the king of the Khyaonas. We find a similar prayer in the Asisvang Yasht.²⁹ Vistasp had to fight three wars with the Turanian king Arjasp. Firdousi refers to these at some length. The wars were due to the appearance of Zoroaster as a prophet in the court of Vistasp. According to Firdousi, Zoroaster advised his royal patron to free himself from the yoke and influence of this Turanian king. So, taking the above passage of the Farvardin Yasht in connection with the passage of the Gos Yasht above referred to and with the Pahlavi writing of the Aiyadgar, it seems that Arjasp the Turanian with whom Vistasp fought, and his tribesmen the Khyaonas, were all Huns.

From the passages of the Yashts, at least of the Farvardin and Zamyad Yashts, we find that the *Hunus* or Huns lived in the time of king Vistasp and Zoroaster,

which, if not anterior to, was at least not later than, that of the 7th century before Christ.

These *Hunus* seem to have belonged to the same group of hostile tribes to which the Varedhakas and the Khyaonas belonged. King Vistasp, the patron king of Zoroaster, who is represented as opposing the *Hunus*³⁰ is also represented as opposing the Varedhakas³¹ and the Khyaonas.³²

According to Darmesteter, the Varedhakas referred to in the Avesta as a hostile tribe like the *Hunus*, may be the later Vertae. Similarly the Khyaonas were the Chionitae. They lived somewhere on the western coast of the Caspian.³³

From this rather long examination of the Avesta passages we find that the *Hunus* were known in Persia as a wandering and pillaging nation or tribe before the 7th century of the Christian era.

Among the several passages of the Avesta which we have examined we find that there is some difference about the meaning of the word *Hunu* in some passages. But there are some for which there is no difference, especially the passages referred to in the Aban Yasht and which referred to the war between the Iranians of Tusa and the *Hunus* of the Turanian Vaesaka.

The early Huns, i.e. the Huns of the times of the Avesta, seem to have professed well-nigh the same religion as that of the early Iranians. We see this from the ceremonial form of their prayers, referred to in the Aban Yasht (Yt. V 53, 58). We see, from the passages of this Yasht given above, that both the Iranian Tusa and the *Hunus* of Vaesaka invoke Ardivisura with the same ceremonial offering. They both offer 100 horses, 1000 oxen and 10000 lambs. Secondly, we learn from the Pahlavi Aiyadgar-i-Zariran that Arjasp raised a war against Vistasp because the latter acknowledged the new religion of Zoroaster. Why should he have done so had they professed different religions? Though hostile and though differing in the details of their belief, they seem to have followed a common religion, a religion the main elements of which were the same. Had it not been so, there was no special reason for Arjasp to declare war for the sake of religion. We read in the Pahlavi Aryadgar:

"Arjasp, the king of the Khyaonas, had the startling news that king Vistasp had, with his sons, brothers and family, chiefs and equals, accepted from Oharmazd this holy religion of the Mazdayasnans. Thereby he was much distressed."³⁴

Further on, we read the following message of Arjasp to Vistasp:

"I have heard that Your Majesty has accepted from Oharmazd the pure Mazdayasnan religion. If you will not think of it, great harm and unhappiness may result to us from that (religion). But if it please Your Majesty, and you give up this pure religion, and be of the same religion with us, then we will pay homage to you as a king."³⁵

These passages show that Arjasp resents Vistasp's forsaking the common ancestral religion and adopting the new Mazdayasnan one of Zoroaster. Again,

according to the Iranian tradition, recorded in the Pahlavi Bundelesh, the Iranians and the Turanians at first belonged to the same group. They had a common ancestor. This fact also shows that they had well-nigh the same religion. We find from the above passages of the Farvardin (100) and the Zamyad (86) Yashts that with the help of king Gustasp, Zoroaster separated the good elements from the bad ones, and rejecting the latter purified the old religion. That was his great work of reform. Firdousi (Calcutta ed. III. p. 1548) represents even the later Huns as praying in fire-temples with *baz* and *barsam*, the sacred requisites of Zoroastrian worship. According to Firdousi, king Behramgore sent the queen of the Khokan of the Hunnic Turks to the fire-temple of Azor Goushasp as a state prisoner to serve there.

We also learn from Indian history based on epigraphical numismatic, and literary materials that Mihirakula was a foreign Hun king whom the Indian king Yasodharman, or as said by Mr. Vincent Smith, both Yasodharman and Baladitya combined, defeated. Rajatarangini³⁶ the history of Kashmir by Kalhana, refers to this Mihirakula at some length. We learn the following facts from this work about Mihirakula. (1) He founded the temple of Mihiresvara and the city of Mihirapura. (2) He allowed the Gandliari Brahmans, a low race, to seize upon the endowments of the more respectable orders of the Hindu priesthood. (3) These Gandliari Brahmans of Mihirakula had the custom of the next-of-kin marriages among them.³⁷ (4) A number of flesh-devouring birds followed the army of this king.³⁸

The very name Mihirakula is, as said by Dr. Stein, Iranian. The names of the temple and city founded by him are Iranian. The marriage custom attributed to him is the matriarchal custom alleged to be tribal with some Persian people.³⁹ The reference to the flesh-eating birds points to the Iranian custom of the disposal of the dead. All these facts and references point to an inference that the religion of this Hun king, Mihirakula, had many elements which were common to the religion of the early Iranians.

According to the Iranians of the Avestic⁴⁰ times, the people of the then known world were divided into five groups: (1) the Airyas, (2) the Turyas, (3) the Sarimyas or the people who dwelt in Syria, (4) the Saini, or the Chinese and (5) the Dahae. Of these five stocks, the first three are traced from the three sons of king Faridun, the Thraetaona of the Avesta. These three sons were Salam, Tur and Irach. From Salam descended the stock of the Sarimyas, from Tur that of the Turanians and from Irach that of the Iranians. Vistasp came from the stock of Irach and Arjasp from that of Tur.

Vaesaka, the typical Huna or Hun, and Tusa, the typical Iranian, descended, according to the Pahlavi Bundelesh, from a common ancestor. The following geneo-logical tree, prepared from the account of the Bundelesh, gives their descent from Gayomard, supposed to be the first king of the countries, of which Airyana Vaeja or Iran formed a part.

* * *

Editor's note:

We have received an image file titled, *Hunas in Avesta and Pahlavi*, by J. J. Modi. The file begins with what appears to be a scanned copy of page 65 from a book and ends with page 80. We do not have access to the original work and must, therefore, refer to Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, *Asiatic Papers*, Part III, Bombay, 1927 for source information. On page 203, Dr. Modi states:

'In my paper on "The Hunas in Avesta and Pahlavi" in the R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume (pp. 65-80)'

The material appears as pages 65-80 of an electronic version of *Commemorative Essays* presented to sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, published by Shripad Krishna Belvalkar, Poona, 1917.

It seems reasonable to conclude, that the image file is an excerpt from that work. We converted the image pages using OCR software, supplemented by visual reading, as needed. All text characters have been converted to their basic English alphabet equivalents. We apologize for this unavoidable alteration.

(Footnotes have been converted to endnotes. Original footnote page and number is shown in brackets)

- 1 (p. 65, 1) Ninth Ed. Vol. XII. p. 381.
- 2 (p. 65, 2) Third Edition (1914) pp. 308 ff.
- 3 (p. 65, 3) A village in the Sayyidpur Tahsil of the Ghazipur district in the N. W. Provinces.
- 4 (p. 65, 4) Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, Inscriptions of the Early Gupta kings and their successors, by John Faithful Fleet, (1888), Inscription No. 13, Plate VII, pp. 52-56. 9 [Bhandarkar Com. Vol.]
- 5 (p. 66, 1) Journal, Royal Asiatic Society, 1909, pp. 88-144.
- 6 (p. 66, 2) Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, No. 33 and 34, pp. 142-50.
- 7 (p. 66, 3) History of India, 3rd edition (1914) pp. 318-21.
- 8 (p. 66, 4) Si-yu-ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World, by Samuel Beal Vol. I, (1884) pp. 165-71.
- 9 (p. 66, 5) Journal, B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XIX, pp. 35-43.
- 10 (p. 66, 6) Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1903, pp. 183-86.
- 11 (p. 66, 7) Beal's Buddhist Records, Vol. I, p. 169.
- 12 (p. 67, 1) Mecan's Calcutta edition of the Shah-namek, Vol. III, p. 1589.
- 13 (p. 67, 2) Ibid.
- 14 (p. 68, 1) I give my own translation from "Historie General des Huns, des Turcs, des Moguls, et des autres Tartares, occidentaux etc., avant et depuis Jesus Christ jusqu'à present," par M. Deguignes (1756), Tome I, Patrie I, Preface, p. V.
- 15 (p. 69, 1) Dr. West is wrong in translating Hunavo Veaskaya as Hunus Vaeska and thus taking Vaeska to be the name of a place (Legends relating to Keresasp Pahlavi Texts Part II -- B. .E. XV p. 371 n.4)
- 16 (p. 69, 2) Firdousi places the fortress of Kang (Kaangdez) at about a month's distance from China. Masoiudi (II, p.131, ch.21 also places it (Kenkeder) in China.
- 17 (p. 70, 1) Vide my Bundelesh p. 169.
- 18 (p. 70, 2) According to M. Gabriel Bonvalot, travellers are, even now, shown at Samarkand, a place known as that of the Cemetery of Aprosias (Afrasiab). The present ruins of Samarkand include the ruins of Afrasiab and are known as the city of Afrasiab (Through the Heart of Asia by M. Gabriel Bouvafot, translated from the French by Pitman, Vol. II, pp. 7 and 31). For further particulars about him, vide my Dictionary of Avesta Proper Names, p. 130. Vide also Tarikh-i-Rashid by Elias, pp. 286-7.
- 19 (p. 70, 3) It is this Tus that is said to have been the founder of the city of Tus, the birth-place of the great Firdousi Tusi.
- 20 (p. 71, 1) Le Livre des Rois, par M. Mohl. Vol. I, p. 422.
- 21 (p. 72, 1) Legends relating to Keresasp, Pahlavi Texts Part II, 8, B. E. Vol. XVIII, p. 370.
- 22 (p. 72, 2) Le Zend Avesta, p. 546, n. 5f.
- 23 (p. 73, 1) For the Pahlavi Text, vide Dinkard compiled by Mr. D. M. Madon, Vol. II, pp. 802-803 and West's .Dinkard (S. B. E. XXXVII, Pahlavi Texts Pt. IV, pp. 197-99) Bk. IX, Ch. XV. Vide also West's legend relating to Keresasp in the S. B. E. Vol. XVIII (Pahlavi Texts, Pt. IT, pp. 370-72). For the Persian rendering of the legend, vide the Saddar Bundelesh (Chap. XX, pp. 86-92), edited by Ervad Bomanji N. Dhabhar. For the translation of this Persian legend, vide Ervad Edalji Kersaspji Antia's Paper "The Legend of Keresasp," in the Spiegel Memorial Volume edited by me (pp. 93-98).
- 24 (p. 73, 2) West S. B. E. XXXVII p. 198, XVII, p. 372.
- 25 (p. 73, 3) For the Text of this, vide "The Pahlavi Rivayet accompanying the Dadistan-i-Dinik," edited by Ervad Bomanji N. Dhabhar (1913) pp. 65 to 74, No. XVII. 10 [Bhandarkar Com. Vol.]
- 26 (p. 74, 1) Ibid p. 69, i. 7.
- 27 (p. 75, 1) Yt. IX. 31, 32.
- 28 (p. 75, 2) Vide my "Aiyadgar-i-Zariran, Shatroiha-i-Aيران and Afdiya va Sahigiya-I-Seistan" (1899) p. 5.
- 29 (p. 75, 3) Yt. XVII, 49-50.
- 30 (p. 75, 4) Farvardin Yasht 100.
- 31 (p. 75, 5) Gosh Yasht, 31; Asisavang Yasht 51.
- 32 (p. 75, 6) Ibid and Zamyad Yasht 87.
- 33 (p. 75, 7) Darmesteter, S. B. E. Vol. XXIII, p. 117 n. 6, Yasht, IX, 100 n. 6.
- 34 (p. 76, 1) Vide my Aryadgar-i-Zariran etc. p. 3.
- 35 (p. 77, 1) Ibid p. 5.
- 36 (p. 77, 2) Bk. I, stanzas 306 et seq., Troyer's French Translation of 1840, Vol. I, pp. 33 et seq. Vide also Sir Aurel Stein's Text and Translation and Wilson's Essay on the Hindu History of Kashmir in the *Asiatick Researches*, Volume V (pp. 1-11), n. 23.
- 37 (p. 78, 1) The stanza referring to this custom is omitted in Dr. Stein's Text but is found in Troyer's Text, p. 38. Dr. Stein refers to this omission in the foot-note. As to Mihirkula, Dr. Stein also thinks that the name is Iranian.
- 38 (p. 78, 2) Raj., stanza i. 201.
- 39 (p. 78, 3) For this custom see a Paper on "Royal Marriages and Matrilineal Descent" by Miss Margaret Murray (Journal of the Anthropological Institute of England, July-December 1915.)
- 40 (p. 78, 4) Farvardin Yasht, Yt. XIII, 144.