



Pahlavi kīrrēnīdan: Traces of Iranian Creation Mythology

Author(s): Bruce Lincoln

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 117, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1997), pp. 681-685

Published by: American Oriental Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/606450>

Accessed: 29-12-2016 10:38 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/606450?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

*Pahlavi kīrrēnīdan: Traces of Iranian Creation Mythology**

The occurrences of this etymon are examined for the light they throw on the Iranian mythologies of creation.

Pahlavi contrasts two of the verbs it uses for acts of creation along familiar dualistic lines. The ahuric term, *brēhēnīdan*, replaces Avestan *dā-* and means “to create,” “to destine,” and “to decree.”¹ Generally, it implies that creation takes place by divine fiat, for which no prior material or spiritual being is necessary, save only Ohrmazd himself.² In similar fashion, the daevic term, *kīrrēnīdan* carries two different senses.³ The first of these implies the preexistence of material substance, and conforms to the semantics of its cognates throughout the Indo-European family: Sanskrit *kṛt-*, *kṛntāti*, “cut, split, rend”; Homeric *κείρω*, “shear, clip, cut short (esp.

hair)”; Old Norse *skera* “cut, slaughter, carve”; Old High German *scrinden* “divide, split up”; Russian *крою*, *кроить* “cut out (esp. cloth)”; and Old Irish *scara(im)* “separate, remove, cut off.”⁴ The verb’s second semantic domain is unique to Iran, where it also denotes acts through which the Evil Spirit brought loathsome, destructive entities into the world as antagonistic counterparts to Ohrmazd’s good creation.

When he saw the light of Ohrmazd, intangible and shining forth, due to his envious nature and desire to smite, [the Evil Spirit] made an attack to destroy it. Then he saw bravery and triumph that were greater than his own, and he scurried back to the darkness. He (mis-)created [*kīrrēnīd*] many demons, a creation of destruction that was needed for battle. (*GBd* 1.16–17)⁵

Out of material darkness, which is his own body, the Evil Spirit (mis-)created [*kīrrēnīd*] his creation in the form of blackness, the color of ashes, worthy of darkness, false like the most evil-bringing vermin. (*GBd* 1.47)⁶

The Evil Spirit, in the quality of the adversary, among the chief demons (mis-)created [*kīrrēnīd*] first Akoman,

* I would like to acknowledge the extraordinary collegiality of William Malandra and P. O. Skjærvø, whose numerous suggestions substantially improved this paper. Any remaining infelicities are, of course, my own.

¹ D. N. MacKenzie, *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971), 19; H. S. Nyberg, *A Manual of Pahlavi* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974), 2: 49. Although there is no commonly accepted etymology for *brēhēnīdan*, Professors Malandra and Skjærvø have both suggested to me the possibility that, like Pahl. *brīdan*, it may be derived from Indo-European **b^hr(e)jH-* “to cut off” (Avestan *pairi.brīnaṅha*, Sanskrit *bhrīnāti*, Russian *брызть*, etc.), conceivably by way of Avestan **brōiθra-*, attested in the compound *brōiθrō.taēza-* “with sharp blade” (personal communications, January and February 1997). See further, Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1992–), 2: 282; idem, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1956–76), 2: 532–33; and Herman Lommel, “Kleine Beiträge zur arischen Sprachkunde: Arisch *bhrīnāti*,” *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 50 (1922): 271–75.

² H. W. Bailey, *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 96.

³ MacKenzie, 51; Nyberg, 2: 118; and the glossary to A. V. Williams, ed., *The Pahlavi Rivayat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy, 1990), 1: 315.

⁴ T. V. Gamkrelidze and V. V. Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995), 1: 612; Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*, 1: 315–16. The reconstructed root is PIE **sk^her-*, which may be modified by nasal and other suffixes.

⁵ TD² MS 4.9–14: *ka-š did ān ī ohrmazd rošnīh agrīfār ud frāz-payrōg zadār-kāmagih arešk-gōhrih rāy pad murnjēnīdan tag abar kard. u-š pas did cērih ud abarwēzih ī frēh az ān ī xwēš abāz ō tom dwārist. kīrrēnīd was dēw[ān] ān dām ī murnjēnīdār niyāz ō ardikkarih*. With one exception (*frāz-payrōg* for his *frāz padirōt*), I have followed the text established by R. C. Zaehner, *Zurvān: A Zoroastrian Dilemma* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955), 279, with notes at pp. 290–91.

⁶ TD² MS 11.10–12: *ganāg mēnōg az gētīg tāriḡih ān ī xwēš tan [i] dām frāz kīrrēnīd pad ān ī kirb ī syāih ī ā durestar- *gōn ī tom-arzānīg druwand ciyōn bazag-adēntar xrafstar*.

then Indra, Saurva, Nahaithya, Taromand, Taric and Zaric, then the other demons. (*GBd* 1.55)⁷

Since Yima withstood terror, distress, and trouble, for that reason his soul is worshiped and invoked for resistance to demon-created (*dēwān-frāz-kirrenid*) drought antithetical to the pasture and terror and trouble that moves in secrecy. (*ZS* 32.2)⁸

In the Avesta, the verb *kart-*, from which *kirrenidan* is derived, usually denotes simple acts of cutting.⁹ On one occasion, however, it describes an act of demonic creation, when Aži Dahāka is named “the very most powerful lie the Evil Spirit created (*kərəntat*) against the embodied creation, for the destruction of the creations of truth.”¹⁰

Here, as in the case of Avestan *taš* and *θbarəs-*,¹¹ an Iranian verb most concretely associated with acts of scission expands its semantic range into the field of creative action, a development that presumes a view of creation as a cutting of sorts: conceivably an artisanal, sculptural, surgical, martial, or sacrificial act. Vedic evidence could support the last two of these alternatives, since the verb

krt- is twice used for heroic deeds with cosmogonic aspects, and once for the dismemberment of animals.¹² The latter occurrence holds particular interest.

What dereliction, O Agni, what fault did you commit among the gods? Now, I unknowing, ask you.

In order to eat, the golden, toothless one—playing and not-playing—cut apart [*vī . . . cakarta*] [the wood] limb by limb, just as a knife [cuts apart] the ox.¹³

Here, it is worth noting that the kind of knife specified—Vedic *asī-*, cognate to Latin *ensis*, “sword”¹⁴—is not usually a ritual instrument.¹⁵ Indeed, at times it appears to be the very antithesis of the tools that by their purity recode the violence of sacrifice as a sacred action. Thus, the passage just quoted playfully describes the way fire splits wood as a kind of ritual fault (*éna-*). More striking still is a verse addressed to the sacrificial horse just prior to its offering.

Let not your own self torment you as you enter, let not the axe cause harm to your body.

⁷ TD² ms. 15.7–10: *ganāg mēnōg pad ān petyāragōmandih az kamāligān dēwān nazdist akōman frāz kirrenid pas andar ud pas sāvul pas nāhagih pas tarōmad pas taric ud zeric pas abārigān dēwān.*

⁸ *ciyōn jam. abāz-dārišnih i sahm ud tangih (ud) sēj rāy ruwān i ōy yazihēd ud xwānihēd pad abāz-ēstišnih (i) dēwān-frāz-kirrenid hēz-iz (i) *awāstar (ud) sahm ud sēj-iz i nihān-rawišn.*

⁹ Thus, for example, it is used for cutting in a surgical context at Vd. 7.37–38; in a martial context in Yt. 10.72 and 14.62; and in the context of post mortem punishments in Vd. 4.50.

¹⁰ *aš.aojastamam druim fracā kərəntat anrō mainyuš aoi yam astvaitim gaēθam mahrkāi ašahe gaēθanam.* Christian Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961), col. 453, took Vd. 22.1–2 to contain two cosmogonic usages of *kart-*, once (with the preverb *ā-*) for an Ohrmazdean act of creation, and once (with *frā-*) for its Ahrimanic counterpart. This has been rejected by Jean Kellens, however, who takes these as instances of *kar-* (“to make”), rather than *kart-*, *Le verbe avestique* (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1984), 171, nn. 4 and 5. As Kellens observes elsewhere (p. 17, n. 4), careful analysis is made particularly difficult by the fact that “toutes les formes de *kart* sont corrompues et la tradition manuscrite n’ouvre la voie à aucune correction.”

¹¹ See the discussion of Manfred Mayrhofer, “Über Kontaminationen der indoiranischen Sippen von ai. *takṣ-*, *tvakṣ-*, **tvāṣ-*,” in *Indo-Iranica: Mélanges présentés à Georg Morgenstierne* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964), 141–48.

¹² Eight occurrences of *krt-* are listed in Hermann Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964 [rpt.]), 346, most with the preverbs *vi-* or *niṣ-*. Two combine martial and cosmogonic resonance, describing Indra’s liberation of sun and waters from mountain fastholds (*RV* 1.57.6 and 10.67.5).

¹³ *RV* 10.79.6: *kīm devēsu tyāja énaś cakarthāgne pṛcchāmi nū tvām avidvān / akriḍan kriḍan hārir āttave ’dān ví parvaśás cakarta gām ivāsiḥ //*

¹⁴ Comparison to Avestan *aṅhū-* is still advocated by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, 643, and by older reference works, but is difficult to reconcile with William Malandra’s identification of the *aṅhū-* as a bow, not a sword, “A Glossary of Terms for Weapons and Armor in Old Iranian,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 4 (1973): 268–69. As a result, it has been abandoned by Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoiranischen*, 1: 145, in contrast to the position he took in *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, 1: 64.

¹⁵ There is only one *RV* occurrence in which *asī-* appears in a ritual context, and even that exceptional case is revealing, for the sacrifice in question is something of an anti-sacrifice: the offering of a large forest animal (*pārasvān-*, identified as a donkey by Grassmann and a rhinoceros by Lüders) in the wild, as a means of redressing a *brahmacarin*’s breach of chastity (*RV* 10.86.18, on which see Geldner’s note, *Der Rigveda* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1951], 3: 276–77). *AV* 9.5.4 is also relevant.

Let not a hasty, unskilled dismemberer proceed
incorrectly and do wrong to your broken limbs with a
knife [*así-*].¹⁶

Although Pahlavi sources do not use *kirrēnidān* for deeds of a heroic and cosmogonic nature, there is a passage where it appears not just in the general context of sacrifice, but in a sacrifice marked by grave faults regarding the dismemberment and distribution of the victim's body.

The god Haoma makes a curse on a person. He says: "May you have no child, and may you have an evil reputation and other evils of your own, you who do not order that a sacrifice be made to me with the portion my father, Ohrmazd, assigned to me: that is, the jaw, together with the tongue, and the left eye of all animals and animal species. You do not sacrifice; rather, you just gobble it up. He who does not offer the portion Ohrmazd assigned to me, but gobbles it up, let not a priest, warrior, or herdsman-pastoralist be born in his house. People of the line of sorcerers will be born in his house. He damages Ohrmazd's creation, that *kirrēnidār* who destroys things." (PRDD 26.4)¹⁷

¹⁶ *mā tvā tapat priyā ātmāpiyāntam mā svādhitis tanvā a tiṣṭhipat te / mā te gr̥dhnūr aviśastātihāya chidrā gātrāny asinā mīthū kah //*

On this verse, see the notes of Louis Renou, *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, vol. 16 (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1967), 87. It should be understood as the negative counterpart of the proper sacrificial procedures described in RV 1.162.18, where the *así-* is strikingly absent.

The axe arrives at the thirty four ribs of the horse, the steed bound to the gods.

Put the unbroken limbs in order. Dismember them, proclaiming their names joint by joint.

cātuṣtriṅśad vājīno devābandhor vānkrīr āśvasya svādhitih sām eti /

āchidrā gātrā vayūnā kṛṇota páruṣ-parur anughūṣya ví śasta //

¹⁷ *ud hōm yazad ō kas rāy nīfrin kunēd. gōwēd kū-t frazand ma bawād u-t dusrawih ud abārig anāgih xwēš bawād kē man andar yazišn kār nē framāyē ud sūr ī pid ohrmazd be ō man dād ērwārag abāg uzwān ud cašm ī hōy ī hamāg gōspand ud gōspand sardagān. nē yazē bē jōyē kē ān sūr ī pid ī man ohrmazd be ō man dād nē yazēd bē jōyēd andar mān ī ōy nē zāyēd nē āsrōn nē artēštār ud nē wāstaryōš. ud andar mān ī ōy zāyēd nē mardōm ī cīhr ī jādūgān ud wināhēd dahišn ī ohrmazd kirrēnidār ī tis tabāh kunēd.* This passage follows the Avestan of

Here, the agent noun *kirrēnidār* denotes a man who, like the Greek *μαγειρός*, has the ritual responsibility of dismembering the sacrificial victim's body and distributing its pieces.¹⁸ The *kirrēnidār* in question, however, is guilty of a ritual error so serious that it transforms his status from a blessed, righteous, and truthful man (Pahl. *ahlaw*) into the opposite: a cursed follower of the Lie (*druwand*). His error consists of failing to give the god Haoma his rightful portion, the significance of which becomes apparent when one realizes that jaw, tongue, and eye are the organs of speech and vision, defining powers of the priestly class. Consigning these pieces to Haoma confirms his status as priest of the gods,¹⁹ while failure to do so is not only a slight to his dignity, but a threat to all priests and the sacrifice itself. The god's curse on [mis-]sacrificers who short him in this fashion thus disrupts reproduction of the proper social order within their family line, and gives them a progeny that is the very antithesis of a priest's: "Let not a priest, warrior, or herdsman-pastoralist be born in his house. People of the line of sorcerers [*cīhr ī jādūgān*] will be born in his house."

Beyond its social dimensions, proper sacrificial practice is also expected to renew the cosmos, translating matter from the victim's body into corresponding portions of the physical universe. And within the system of homologies connecting micro- and macrocosm that is familiar from other Pahlavi sources, the specification

Y 11.4–6, but the phrase *kirrēnidār ī tis tabāh kunēd* corresponds to no Avestan original. Rather, it reflects the Pahlavi gloss to Y 11.4, where Av. *mūrakāca* is interpreted as *mūdāg-kardār*, *kū tis tabāh be kunād* ("maker of destruction; that is, he makes things ruined").

¹⁸ On the *mageiros*, see Guy Berthiaume, *Les rites du mageiros: Études sur la boucherie, la cuisine, et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982). One is particularly reminded of the "bad *mageiros*" described by Plato, *Phaedrus* 265e, who provides a negative model for the science of dialectics by dividing the sacrificial victim in a clumsy and destructive manner, breaking its bones instead of severing them neatly at the joints. Further on the significance of sacrificial dismemberment in classical antiquity, see the essays collected in Jean-Pierre Vernant and Marcel Detienne, eds., *La Cuisine du sacrifice* (Paris: Gallimard, 1979); and Cristiano Grottanelli and Niccola Parisi, eds., *Sacrificio e società nel mondo antico* (Rome: Laterza, 1988).

¹⁹ Mary Boyce, "Haoma, priest of the sacrifice," in W. B. Henning *Memorial Volume* (London: Lund, Humphries, 1970), 62–80.

that Haoma receives the left, but not the right eye, suggests a broader set of associations.²⁰

Left eye : Right eye
Moon : Sun
Haoma : Fire

Under this logic, the conjunction of Haoma and fire, the two chief items of Zoroastrian ritual, restores the primordial unity that was sundered in acts of sacrificial/cosmogonic cutting. Not only does it create the mixture necessary for the sustenance of creation, joining fire's heat to Haoma's moisture,²¹ it also unites categories of time and space (sun plus moon, day plus night), and establishes the basis for a wisdom that is synthetic, balanced and whole (right eye plus left), instead of analytic, partial, and fragmented.

One last piece of information helps us make sense of how *kirrenīdan* became a verb of creation and miscreation. This is the identity of the mythic figure who consistently appears as the verb's object.

[In pursuit of Yima's glory], they sent forth whoever was fastest. The Beneficent Spirit sent forth Good Mind, Best Truth, and Fire, the son of Ahura Mazda. The Evil Spirit sent forth Evil Mind, Wrath of the bloody club, Aži Dahāka, and Yima-cutting [*yimō.kərəntəm*] Spityura.²²

²⁰ See, for example, *GBd* 28, *ZS* 30.4–11, *PRDD* 46. The connection of the two eyes to sun and moon is made at *GBd* 28.4. On the association of *haoma* and moon, see Herman Lommel, "König Soma," *Numen* 2 (1955): 196–205; idem, "Mithra und das Stieropfer," *Paideuma* 3 (1944–49): 207–18; Gherardo Gnoli, "Questioni sull' interpretazione della dottrina gathica," *Annali dell' Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 31 (1971): 353–55. Also implicit is a homology sun : moon :: humans : cattle, which I treat in "Once Again the Bovine's Lament," in *Psychanodia: Études dédiées à la mémoire de Ioan Culianu*, ed. Ara Sismanian et al. (Louvain: Editions Peeters, forthcoming).

²¹ Two paired categories are theorized here: hot and cold, moist and dry. In each pair, the former member is understood as life-sustaining, the latter as life-negating, and the latter is simply the absence of the former. Fire is thus coded as +heat/–moisture and Haoma as –heat/+moisture. When the two are ritually united, the positive categories obviate their negative counterparts, resulting in an ideal mix: +heat/+moisture. See further, Bruce Lincoln, *Death, War, and Sacrifice* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1991), 219–31; and such texts as *Dk* 3.105, 3.194; *GBd* 26.127 and 27.52.

²² *Yt* 19.46: *adāt aete fraṅharəcayāt āsište katarascit. spəntō mainyuš aetəm fraṅharəcayāt vohuca manō ašəmca vahištəm atrəmca ahurahe mazdā puθrəm. aṅrō mainyuš aetəm fraṅharəcayāt akəmca manō ašəmca xrvī.drūm ašimca dahākəm*

Together with [Až] Dahāg, Spityura was the one who cut apart [*kirrenīd*] Yima. (*GBd* 35.5)²³

Yima showed contempt for Ohrmazd, saying "Astwihād [i.e., death] will not come for me." And as a result of that contempt, demons and men cut him apart [*kirrenīd*]. (*PRDD* 47.8)²⁴

When he makes the dead stand up, (then) those who violently and secretly cut apart [*kirrenīd*] Yima and gave him wounds and injuries, they all die, and for three days they lie dead. (*PRDD* 48.66)²⁵

When they cut apart [*kirrenīd*] Yima, the Farnbag fire saved his glory from the hand of [Až] Dahāg. (*GBd* 18.10)²⁶

When the liars are brought up from hell, those who cut apart Yima [*jam-kirrenīdārān*] will fall back to hell in the form of frogs, and be in that place three [days]. (*ZS* 35.46)²⁷

The name Yima, as has long been known, means "twin" or "double" and is cognate to Vedic Yāma and Old Norse Ymir, being also closely related to the names of other mythic figures who appear in myths of crea-

spityurəmca yimō.kərəntəm. Dk 9.21.2 states that the twentieth fargard of the lost Sūdgar Nask told how Dahāka took power from Yima when the latter was cut in two. On Spityura and his role in these narratives, see Arthur Christensen, *Le premier homme et le premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens*, 2 vols. (Uppsala: Archives d'études orientales 1917, 1934), 2: 52, 79; and R. von Stackelberg, "Bemerkungen zur persischen Sagengeschichte," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 12 (1898): 230–48, esp. pp. 245–46.

²³ TD² MS. 228.12: *spitur ān bawēd kē abāg dahāg jam kirrenīd*.

²⁴ *jam ohrmazd tar menīd kū-m *astwihād nē rasēd uš pad ān tarmēnišnih ēg-išān be kirrenīd dēwān [ud] mardōmān*.

²⁵ *ud ka rist ul ēstēnēd awēšān kē-šān jam kirrenīd ud rēš wizēnd wēn-nihān *anāštihā bē kunēnd ud awēšān hamāg bē mirēnd 3 rōz murd nibayēnd*. This passage is quite unclear, particularly in the phrase I read as *rēš wizēnd wēn-nihān *anāštihā*. Both Williams and H. K. Mirza, *The Pahlavi Rivāyat Preceding the Dādestān ī Dinik* (Ph.D. thesis, London University, 1942) made numerous—and quite different—emendations, and the former went so far as to drop Yima's name, which is attested in all manuscripts.

²⁶ TD² MS. 124.15–125.1: *ka-šān jam bē kirrenīd xwarrah ī jam az dast ī dahāg ādur *farnbag bōzēnid*.

²⁷ *ka druwandān az dušox abar āwurd hēnd jam-kirrenīdārān wazaγ-kirbiha abāz ō dušox ōftēnd ud 3 ān gyāg bawēnd*.

tion through sacrifice (Latin Remus, Germanic Tuisco).²⁸ Accordingly, scholars since Hermann Güntert have suggested that in pre-Zoroastrian Iran, it was Yima who played the role of first man, first king, and also first victim in narratives that describe a process of creation through sacrifice; only later was he supplanted by Gayōmard and others.²⁹

²⁸ Tacitus, *Germania* 2, names Tuisco (manuscript variation: Tuisto) as the earth-born god (*deum terra editum*) whom the Germans' ancient songs celebrated as father to Mannus (Proto-Germanic *Manwaz, cognate to Skt. Manu- and the first element in Avestan *Manuš.ciθra-*) and their primordial ancestor. His name means "twin," and is built on the number two; cf. Old Saxon *twisc*, Old High German *zwisc* "binus, geminus," Anglo-Saxon *twist* "forked branch; doubled thread." The names Yama and Yima also mean "twin," and are derived from **yemo-*, which yields *geminus* in Latin, with mutation of the initial consonant. Elsewhere I have argued that a different mutation, produced by assimilation to the names of Romulus and Roma, gave rise to the name of Remus, one of Rome's primordial twins. See, however, the critical views of T. P. Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), a book I hope to treat more fully elsewhere.

²⁹ Hermann Güntert, *Der arische Weltkönig und Heiland* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1923), 315–43. The large body of relevant literature includes Christensen, *Le premier homme et le premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens*, esp. vol. 2; Aram Frenkian, "Puruṣa—Gayōmard—Anthropos," *Revue des études indo-européennes* 3 (1943): 118–31; R. N. Dandekar, "Yama in the Veda," in *B.C. Law Volume*, ed. D. R. Bhandarkar (Calcutta: Bhandarkar Oriental Series, 1945), 1: 194–209; A. W. Macdonald, "A propos de Prajāpati," *Journal asiatique* 240 (1953): 323–28; Walter Burkert, "Caesar und Romulus-Quirinus," *Historia* 11 (1962): 356–76; Hoang-son Hoang-šy-Ŷuy, "Le mythe indien de l'homme cosmique dans son contexte culturel et dans son évolution," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 175 (1969): 133–54; Alfred Ebenbauer, "Ursprungsglaube, Herrschergott und Menschenopfer: Beobachtungen zum Semnonenkult," in *Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert*, ed. M. Mayrhofer et al. (Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 1974), 233–49; Jaan Puhvel, "Remus et Frater," *History of Religions* 15 (1975): 146–57; Cristiano Grottanelli, "Cosmogonia e sacrificio," *Studi Storico-religiosi* 4 (1980): 207–35, and 5 (1981): 173–96; Geo Widengren, "Macrocosmos-Microcosmos," *Archivio di Filosofia* (1980), 297–312; Jean Kellens, "Yima, magicien entre les dieux et les hommes," *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984), 267–81; idem, "Yima et la mort," in *Languages and Cultures: Studies in Honor of Edgar Polomé*, ed. M. A. Jazayery and W. Winter (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1988), 329–34; Shaul Shaked, "First Man, First King:

Such a view finds support in and helps to explain the peculiar semantics of *kirrēnidan*, a verb that denoted cutting, carving, or splitting apart with a blade, and could be used for sacrificial dismemberment within the context of ritual practice and/or that of creation myths. When these myths and practices fell into disfavor, however—conceivably as a result of Zarathustra's denunciation of Yima (Y 32.8)³⁰—the cosmogonic tradition was reformulated in various ways. Sometimes Yima was forgotten, in which case the Evil Spirit became the subject and focus of a creative action that was condemned as monstrous and marked by a verb—*kirrēnidan*—that acquired a strongly pejorative sense: "to dismember in a cruel or clumsy fashion; to mis-create." Other texts retained Yima as their center of interest, but refashioned the narrative, transforming the cosmogony into an account of primordial regicide, atrocity, and usurpation, in which various "demons and men"—most notably Aži Dahāka and Spityura—became the subjects of the brutal cutting.

BRUCE LINCOLN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Notes on Semitic-Iranian Syncretism and Iranian Mythological Transformations," in *Gilgul: Essays . . . in the History of Religions Dedicated to R. J. Zwi Werblowsky*, ed. S. Shaked et al. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987), 238–56; and my own works, *Priests, Warriors, and Cattle* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1981), *Myth, Cosmos, and Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986), *Death, War, and Sacrifice* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1991).

³⁰ For various interpretations of Y 32.8, see Helmut Humbach, "Zur altiranische Mythologie," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 107 (1957): 362–71; idem, "Methodologische Variationen zur arischen Religionsgeschichte," in *Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert*, ed. M. Mayrhofer et al. (Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 1974), 193–200; Marijan Molé, *Culte, mythe, et cosmologie dans l'Iran ancien* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1963), pp. 222–26; Ilya Gershevitch, "Yima's Beef-Plea," in *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dicata*, ed. G. Gnoli and L. Lanciotti (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il medio ed estremo Oriente, 1977), 2: 487–99; Stanley Insler, *The Gāthās of Zarathustra* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 204–5; and Jean Kellens and Eric Pirart, *Les textes vieil-avestiques* (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1988–91), 3: 86–87. More broadly, on the topic of animal sacrifice in Zoroastrian practice, see Helmut Humbach, "Zarathustra und die Rinderschlachtung," *Wort und Wirklichkeit: Studien zur Afrikanistik und Orientalistik* (Meisenheim: Anton Hain, 1977), 2: 17–29.