



BRILL



brill.com/ic

The Demonic ‘Sub-Humanity’ of the Bears in the Mazdean Framework and Other Remarks

Antonio Panaino | ORCID: 0000-0002-5179-9903

Department of Cultural Heritage, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

antonio.panaino@unibo.it

Abstract

Ancient Iranians knew well “bears”, in spite of the fact that they are not frequently mentioned in the oldest literature of the Zoroastrians. Despite the classification of bears as wild and demonic beasts, their common name was not particularly affected by strong and unexpected changes due to linguistic taboos, at least in the earlier phases. The present article investigates the position of bears within the Pahlavi literature and discusses some aspects of their denomination within the Iranian linguistic area with special care for the Mazdean traditions in which bears were considered as having descended from the civilizing hero ǰam and a demoness.

Keywords

bears – animal classification – ǰam – Avestan and Pahlavi Literatures – linguistic taboo

The few details concerning the bears in Middle Persian Zoroastrian literature are mostly concentrated in chapter xivb of the *Bundahišn*. Together with the “monkeys” (*kabīg*), the “bears” (*xīrs*) descend from the most important civilizing hero of the Iranian Mazdean world, ǰam (Av. Yima; Ved. Yama), and his sister, ǰamīg (attested only in Vedic as Yamī). This couple, before committing incest (a sexual union regarded positively within the Zoroastrian context), had demons as their respective sexual partners. The following generation of these wild animals is framed within a mythological phase occurring after the ǰam’s loss of the divine support, symbolically embodied by the beaming *xwarrah* (Av. *xʷarənah*, or “light of glory”), which assumes a significant relevance in the Iranian ideology. Despite these details, the account in the *Bundahišn* is not clear as to

whether the bears in particular descend directly from the line of Ĵam or from that of Ĵamīg. We can only deduce that monkeys and bears are presented as beings whose nature is half human and half the fruit of a monstrous outcome deriving from a sexual union with a demonic creature. This doubt is finally solved only thanks to the Pahlavi *Rewāyat* to the *Dādistān ī Dēnīg*, VIIIe9. There, the text specifies that the bears (with monkeys, etc.), uniquely descend from the union of Ĵam with a demoness. Thus, they are half-human and half-animal creatures, whose father was Ĵam.

The present contribution will discuss their position within the classification of the animal world within the pre-Islamic Iranian framework, analyzing their name and other minor problems connected to their demonic status.

We start with the classical passage from *Bundahišn* XIVB,1 (Indian *Bundahišn* XIX §§), which follows the large chapter "About the Nature of Men" (XIV) and the (much shorter) "About the Nature of Women" (XIVB):

abar čiyōnīh kabīg ud xirs

XIVB.1: (*ēn-iz*) *gōwēd kū Ĵam ka xwarrah aziš bē šud bīm ī dēwān rāy dēw-ēw pad zanīh grift ud Ĵamīg ī xwahar pad zanīh ō dēw-ēw dād. u-šan kabīg ud xirs dumbōmand ud abārīg wināhišnīg sardag aziš būd.* (Pakzad 2005: 196–197)

"About the nature of monkeys and bears"

XIVB.1: "It also says: When Glory departed from Ĵam on account of his fear of the demons, he took a demon for a wife and gave a demon to his sister Ĵamīg to wed. The monkeys and the bears, the tailed forest-dwellers, and the others sinful races descend from them. His line did not continue". (Agostini/Thrope 2019: 80)

This textual position simply confirms that here the compiler of the *Bundahišn* considered monkeys and bears not as just animals, but as a hybrid creature, whose origin must be found in the crossbreed between humans and demons. Actually, bears are previously presented in *Bundahišn* XIV, 36 (Pakzad 2005: 192; Agostini/Thrope 2019: 79) as descending from the primordial twenty-five human species from the seed of Gayōmart, although they are "forest-dwellers with tails and fur on their body [like animals you call 'bears']" (*ud wešagīg ī dumbōmand kē mōy pad tan dārēd [čiyōn gōspandān kē xirs gōwēd]*).

The *Pahlavi Rewāyat* VIIIe9 (Williams 1990: 1/54–55, 11/12), as previously observed, clarifies the fact that animals, such as bears and monkeys, directly descend from the union of Ĵam with a "witch" (*parīg*). Other demonic animals, on the contrary, were born from Ĵamīg and a male demon.

*ud az jam ud ān pariḡ xirs ud *kabīg ud gandarw ud gōšwar zād.* (Williams 1990: I/54–55)

and from Jam and the witch bears, monkey, Gandarw and gōšwar (?) were born. (Williams 1990: II/12)

The birth of these animals is connected again with a crossbreed with a demoness. From this classification we deduce that the Zoroastrian people attributed a special position to monkeys and bears, who are put in the same category of the Gandarw (*Av. gaṇdarəuuu-*; *Ved. gandharva-*). They correspond to a primordial Indo-Iranian demonic force, whose human brave and violent behavior is normally emphasized in the context of Indo-Iranian literatures (see Panaino 2000: 267–269). In short, the bear is a half-human being, in whom the human part derives from Jam (and ultimately from Gayōmart), while the animal component is demonic, and this derogative mark can be seen in the presence of a tail and the fur. The fact that bears live far away, afar from the proper domain of humans, i.e., towns and villages, and stay in the forests or mountains, only further emphasizes their wilderness and inevitable separation from the human sphere. On the other hand, something in their nature, probably in their aspect and behavior, does not break from the traces of a human background, which, if not positive, is a point certainly worth of consideration.

In this presentation of the bears the Iranian classification follows a widespread pattern, as shown by Pastoureau (2008: 68–69, *passim*) who lists all the similarities that influenced Western Medieval human observers in their perception of this wild animal. In reality, as said scholar well emphasized (*ibid.*: 69–100, *passim*), three animals in antiquity were considered strictly connected with the human race: these were monkeys, as already noted by Aristotle (*Historia Animalium* II, 8) and Plinius (*Naturalis Historia* VIII, 54), then bears and the pigs (in particular for the disposition of the inner organs). Of course, as a sort of totemic animal, the “bear” had also some positive characteristics, and his force or bravery might be associated with human prowess, particularly in the military or warrior sphere. Certainly, the frequent mention together with the monkeys, whose closeness to human beings was considered most suspicious and embarrassing, if not openly demonic, enormously impressed many different cultures, so that the Zoroastrian approach does not deviate from a more general standard. The tail and the fur strongly (as remarked in *Bundahišn* XIV, 36) distinguish bears from humans, who for the rest seem much closer than most of the other animals (with the exception of monkeys, of course).

In this framework, we must also observe that the Indo-Iranian name of the “bear,” Avestan *arša-* (cf. Bartholomae 1904: 203; Blažek 2017: 157–158),¹ Vedic *ṛkṣa-* (see also the patronymic *ārṛkṣá-* in *ṚV*, *ārṛkṣa-* in epic literature; cf. Mayrhofer 1979: 1/38; cf. also the discussion in Mayrhofer 1956: 1/119; idem 1992: 1/247–248), Khotanese *arrä* (Bailey 1979: 8), Khoresmian *hrs* (Henning 1956: 421–436, in particular 432; Benzing 1968: 44; idem 1983: 321), Ossetic *ars* (see Abaev 1959: 1/69),² has for certain an Indo-Europaeian background (cf. Gr. ἄρκτος; see Beekes 2010: 1/133; Chantraine 1999: 110; Frisk 1960: 1/141–142), Lat. *ursus* (see de Vaan 2008: 645; earlier literature in Ernout/Meillet 2001: 755), Arm. *arj* (see Martirosyan 2010: 143; cf. Blažek 2017: 158, etc.). In the framework of Avestan onomastics it is possible that the proper name *Aršauuant-* (*Yt.* 13, 109) (see Malandra 2018: 107, 158, 209) is related to the stem *arša-*, “bear”, meaning something like *ursinus*, and Mayrhofer (1977: 2, 27) suggested that it could be connected with the Vedic mountain name *ṛkṣavant-*.

The existence of a patent Hittite cognate *ḫartakka-* or *ḫartagga-* (<*ḫar-tág-ga-aš*> (see Kloekhorst 2008: 316, 708; cf. also the detailed discussion offered by Blažek 2017: 159–161), “bear” (or another wild animal), suggests the reconstruction of an Indo-European stem, such as **H₂ṛtko-* (see Schrijver 1991: 56, 68–69, 71–72; cf. the chapter dedicated to **h₂ṛtko-*, “Bär”, by Wodtko in Wodtko/Irslinger/Schneider 2008: 342–345; for the metathesis in Greek, see Mayrhofer 1986: 115–117; about the possible reconstruction of an alternative stem **H₂éṛtko-*, see Lipp 2009: 133–159), or **H₂ṛdko-*, m. (also f., as, e.g., **H₂ṛtkih-*; cf. Ved. *ṛkṣī-*).³ As already noted by de Vaan, the cluster **-rs-* must be the outcome of the Proto-Indo-European group **-ṛtk-* (cf. de Vaan 2008: 645). Then, the Indo-Iranian stems derive from **H₂ṛsa-* via **H₂ṛta-*, with the relevant difference that in Vedic the cluster *-tk-* > *-ṣ-* (on this matter, see the discussion by Lipp 2009: 5–15, *passim*). The semantic implications deriving from this Indo-European etymology are debated: recently, Lipp (2009: 174) has proposed an explanation of **H₂ṛtko-* as “durch Scharren charakterisiertes Wesen” with explicit reference to Latin *rādō*, “to shave, scratch,” and Vedic *rādati*, “to scratch, scrape, bite.” Recently, Blažek (2017: 148–192) has offered a wide-ranging conspectus of the previous studies about the name of the “bear” in Indo-European and other linguistic families, suggesting that even **H₂ṛtko-* (or eventually **H₂ṛdko-*) may also repre-

1 This stem is attested in the *Aogamadaēcā*, 79; see JamaspAsa 1982: 43 (text), 76 (translation), 100, 118. Avestan *arša-* is translated in Pāzand as *xars*, but in Sanskrit as *siṃha-*, “lion”.

2 Paolo Ognibene will treat the Ossetic lexicon more in detail within the framework of another article.

3 We must also consider in Vedic the proper name *ṛkṣā-*, see Stüber/Zehnder/Remmer 2009: 51, 189.

sent in their turn an innovation, which replaced a hypothetical earlier primary term, reasonably for similar taboo reasons.

One open problem within the Iranian linguistic context is the potential connection of the name of the mythical Iranian archer, Avestan *Ḫrəxša* (about the saga of this hero, and its development in the Parthian and Sasanian periods until the Islamic period, see Panaino 2019: 19–66; idem 2021a: 15–42; idem, 2021b: 19–46.), with that of the bear.⁴ Actually, we should expect a stem such as **arəša-* or *arša-*, so that it is quite probable that *ərxša-* might have another origin. But a certain overlap between these words, and the possible evocative reference to the image of the bear's force in the name of an extraordinary archer remains in the background (about the reference to bears in the Indo-European onomastics, see Solmsen 1922: 177 and n. 1). Certainly, we cannot forget that, e.g., in the Celtic domain, but in other traditions as well, the name of the “bear” (e.g., *Mir. art*) meant also “hero, warrior” (see Matasović 2009: 42–43, sub voce **arto-*; cf. again de Vaan 2008: 645; cf. also Lipp 2009: 180–181; Blažek 2017: 166–167),⁵ and that this kind of designation would be pertinent in the heroic cycle of this archer.

The ambiguous position of the bear is also confirmed by the unique and clearly attested mention of its name in the context of the *Aogəmadaēcā* 78, a funerary source, in which we find a series of dangerous situations which one might hope to escape, but not that “which belongs to merciless Vaiiu” (*yō*

4 The most serious formal problem lies in the fact that, in Young Avestan, we should expect only a simple *-š-* from Indo-Iranian *-xš-*, exactly like in Young Avestan *arša-* (*Aog.* 79) “bear,” which is a *hapax legomenon*. On the contrary, in the spelling of the name of *Ḫrəxša* we are compelled to admit (if we want to save the direct comparison with Vedic *ṛkṣa-*) a phonetic exception, with the preservation of the (earlier) outcome *-xš-*, as it was already supposed by Bartholomae. In reality, the German scholar (Bartholomae 1904: 349) hesitated about the etymology, but in the *Grundriss* (1895: 1, 22) he maintains that *-xš-* instead of *-š-* is an older outcome (Mayrhofer 1978: 1/38, number 114). As I have already noted (Panaino 2019: *passim*), “the best specialists of Iranian onomastic maintain a prudent reservation about the etymology of this Avestan stem, and there is indeed no real advantage in risking a precipitous solution such as the assertion of a direct link between the two stems *ṛkṣa-* and *ərxša-*. One may think that the reference to the name of one of the most dangerous animals, namely the “bear”, was due to the influence of a “linguistic taboo”; perhaps this phenomenon can justify the occurrence of an archaism such as the preservation of the cluster *-xš-*. But, as noted earlier, this would be a far-fetched solution, and it is more prudent to leave the problem open”.

5 A special problem, which I discussed in Panaino 2019, *passim*, concerns the relation, direct or via a popular etymology, of the name of the bear and the denomination of the Arsacid family. I must call reader's attention to the debate concerning the etymology of the name of King *Arthur* (but see the prudent treatment in De Felice 1986: 78, who implicitly excludes the link with the Celtic name of the “bear”) and to that of the English hero *Beowulf*, “Bear-wolf”. Cf. again Blažek 2017: 150.

vayaōš anamarždikahe), a statement meaning that we cannot escape death. In § 79, it is the bear, which is introduced as a very dangerous, but still avoidable obstacle, as evidence of the fact that this beast was considered formidable, but also surmountable, probably with cunning and prudence. We can quote *in extenso* the Avestan text (see again JamaspAsa 1983: 43 (text), 76 (translation); cf. Blažek 2017: 156–157):

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <i>pairiθβō bauuaiti paṅtā</i> <...> | Passable will be the path <...> |
| <i>yim aršō pāiti axšaēnō</i> | which a bear, brown <...> |
| <...> <i>anamarždikō</i> | (and) unmerciful, bars, |
| <i>hāu diṭ aēuuō apairiθβō</i> | but (it is) indeed unpassable that one |
| <i>yō vaiiaoš anamarždikahe.</i> | which belongs to merciless Vaiiu. |

This text simply shows that the wild character of the bear was noted, but that it was not considered as an unavoidable danger, a statement perhaps implying a vague sympathy toward this animal.

With regard to the Pahlavi name of the “bear”, *xirs*, we must note that it shows the presence of a prothetic *x-* (see the discussion by Asatrian, in his forthcoming *Etymological Dictionary of Persian, sub vocibus xirs*, and *xām*; about the *x-* prothesis in Persian, see already Hübschmann 1895: 265, § 162), which appears also in New Persian (*xirs*) خرس, and deserves to be marked. The alternative reconstruction of a Proto-Iranian stem such as **(H)ṛθsa-*, as suggested by Cheung (2002: 153), seems to be unnecessary,⁶ as well argued by Asatrian (ibid.). Furthermore, Asatrian (ibid.) again explains the final *-s-* of *xirs* and other modern Iranian names referring to the “bear” (e.g., SKurd. *hirs*, Tal. *hərs*, etc.), owing to “some extralinguistic factors—expressive nature of the word, tabooistic distortion, etc.”

It is useful to recall that, in his turn already Edelman (2003: 121–130, in particular 124) assumed, even in the Iranian domain, the “disentangling” influence of a linguistic taboo on this family of words concerning the name of the bear. Of course, the impact of this phenomenon here has not been so relevant as in the Germanic (see Kroonen 2013: 59–60, *sub voce beran* 2) and Balto-Slavonic areas (see Emenau 1948: 56–63; cf. also Pastoureau 2008: 52–55), where the common Indo-European name of the bear has been lost and/or reshaped. A clear substitution of the inherited name under the force of a taboo occurs in

6 The old suggestion advanced by Hübschmann 1900: 153–178 (in particular 164–165) in order to explain MP and NP *xirs* from an Indo-European *Nebenform*, such as IE **ṛkʷo-* (Gr. ἄρκος = NP. *xirs*) and not from **ṛkʷo-* (Gr. ἄρκτος = Av. *arəša-*, Ved. *ṛkṣa-*), is out of date, as we have already remarked after the identification of the cognate stem *ḫartagga* in Hittite.

the name of the “bear” by means of the introduction of foreign terms, but also by means of descriptive references, such as Waxi *noyor-dum*, *nəγər-dúm* (etc.), which, according to Edelman (2003: 124; cf. again Blažek 2017, *passim*), would mean “round-tail,” assuming the influence of the Persian word for “tail”, *dum(b)* (cf. also Morgenstierne 1938: 531; idem 1974: 103). On the contrary, Steblin-Kaminskij (1999: 248) suggested a direct comparison with Tibetan *dom*, “bear”, so assuming the presence of a loanword.⁷ He has assumed that the proto-Iranian form was **ršša-* > **rša-* > Old Iranian **arša-* (Av. *arəša-*), remarking that it found a wide dissemination among the Pamir and Hindukush languages, as in Shugni *yūrč* (Morgenstierne 1974: 106), Rushani *yurč*, Bartangi *yūrč*, Yazgulami *yūrč*, Yigda *yarš*, Pashto *yaž*, *iž* (“bear” [masc.]; from **rša-* via **eš-* > **ež* > *yaž*) (see Morgenstierne 1927: 101, No. 194),⁸ as in Persian and Tajik *xirs* (where we register the already mentioned phenomenon of the prothetic *x-*). This outcome was also borrowed by Yaghnobi *xirs*, and Waxi *xirs*, and Munji *xərs*, Pashto *xərs*. With regard to the Yaghnobi lexicon, we must actually recall that, in fact, the genuine Sogdian name of the “bear” was ’ššh [ə(š)ša?], presumably from an OIr. **rša-* (Gershevitch 1954: 22, § 155; Gharib 2004: 70, no. 1770). Thus, it is clear that we find in Yaghnobi only the reflexes of the same stem, but it arrived via a Western Iranian language, such as Persian.

Acknowledgments

I must thank for their help in the preparation of this study, Garnik Asatrian, Paolo Ognibene, and Jeffrey Kotyk.

Bibliography

- Abaev, V.I. (1959), *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar’ osetinskogo jazyka*, tom 1, Moskva-Leningrad.
- Agostini, D./Samuel Th. (2019), *The Bundahišn: The Zoroastrian Book of Creation. Edited and translated*, Sh. Shaked (preface), G. Stroumsa (afterword), Oxford.

⁷ It is interesting to observe that the Indo-Iranian name of the “bear” seems to have played a certain influence in the Uralic linguistic domain (see Katz 2003: 114–115).

⁸ The new edition of Morgenstierne’s *Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto* (2003: 100) registers: “*yəğ*, m. *y’ə/eğ* f., Wan *yirž*(’a) m., *y’iržə* f. ‘bear,’” with reference to **r(k)ša-*, Av. *arša-*, Skt. *ṛkṣa-*, Pers. *xirs*, Oss. *ars*, Kurd. (Suleimaniya) *wurč*.

- Asatrian, G./Buyaner, D. (forthcoming), *Etymological Dictionary of Persian* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series), Leiden.
- Bartholomae, Chr. (1895), "Vorgeschichte der Iranischen Sprachen", W. Geiger/E. Kuhn (eds.), *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, Erster Band, 1. Abteilung. Straßburg: 1–151.
- Bartholomae, Chr. (1904), *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg.
- Bailey, H.W. (1979), *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge.
- Beekes, R. (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, 10/1–2), Oxford.
- Benzing, J. (1968), *Das Chwaresmische Sprachmaterial einer Handschrift der »Muqaddimat al-Adab« von Zamaxšarī*. 1. Text, Wiesbaden.
- Benzing, J. (1983), *Chwaresmischer Wortindex*, H. Humbach (die Einleitung), Z. Taraf (der Herausgeber), Wiesbaden.
- Blažek, V. (2017), "Indo-European 'Bear'", *Historische Sprachforschung/Historical Linguistics* 130: 148–192.
- Chantraine, P. (1999), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots. Avec un Supplément*, Sous la direction de A. Blanc et al., Paris.
- Cheung, J. (2007), *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 2), Leiden–Boston.
- Cheung, J. (2020), *Studies in the Historical Development of the Ossetic Vocalism* (Beiträge zur Iranistik 21), Wiesbaden.
- De Felice, E. (1986), *Dizionario dei nomi italiani. Origine, etimologia, storia, diffusione e frequenza di oltre 18.000 nomi*, Milano.
- de Vaan, M. (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 7), Brill, Leiden–Boston.
- Édelman, Dž. (2003), "Some Taboo-Words in Iranian Languages of Central Asia", Brigitte L.M. Bauer/Georges-Jean Pinault (eds), *Language in Time and Space: A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs Volume 144), Berlin–New York: 121–130.
- Emenau, M.B. (1948), "Taboos on Animal Names", *Language* 24/1: 56–63.
- Ernout, A./Meillet, A. (2001), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. (Retirage de la 4^e édition augmentée d'additions et de corrections par J. André), Paris.
- Frisk, Hj. (1960), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band 1: *a-Ko*, Heidelberg.
- Gershevitch, I. (1954), *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian* (Publications of the Philological Society), Cambridge (reprint 1961).
- Gharib, B. (2004), *Sogdian–Persian–English*. Addenda and Corrigenda to Second Printing, Tehran (first edition 1995).
- Henning, W.B. (1956), "The Kwarezmian Language", T. Heyeti (ed.), *60. doğum yili münasebetiyle Zeki Velidi Toga'na Armağan. Symbolae in Honorem Zeli V.V. Togan*

- (“Studies in Honour of Zeki Velidi Togan in occasion of his 60th Birthday”), Istanbul: 421–436.
- Hübschmann, H. (1895), *Persische Studien*, Strassburg.
- Hübschmann, H. (1900), “Zur persischen Lautlehre”, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 36.2: 153–178.
- JamaspAsa, K. (1982), *Aogamadaēcā. A Zoroastrian Liturgy* (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Band 397. Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik, Band 11), Wien.
- Katz, H. (2003), *Studien zu den älteren indoiranischen Lehnwörtern in den uralischen Sprachen*, P. Widmer et al. (eds.), Heidelberg.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5), Leiden–Boston.
- Kroonen, G. (2013), *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5), Leiden–Boston.
- Malandra, W.W. (2018), *The Frawardīn Yašt. Introduction, translation, text, commentary and glossary* (Ancient Iran Series 7), Irvine.
- Martirosyan, Hr. K. (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 8), Leiden–Boston.
- Matasović, R. (2009), *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 9), Leiden–Boston.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1956). *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary*, Band 1, Heidelberg.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1977), *Die Avestischen Namen*, Wien.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1979), *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*, Band 1, *Die altiranischen Namen*. (Iranisches Personennamenbuch 3/3), Wien.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1986), *Indogermanische Grammatik*, Band 1,2, Halbband. *Lautlehre*, Heidelberg.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1992), *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, Band 1, Heidelberg.
- Mayrhofer, M. (2003), *Die Personennamen in der R̥gveda-Saṃhitā. Sicheres und Zweifelhafte*, (Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 2002, 3), München.
- Morgenstierne, G. (1927), *An Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto* (Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo 11. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1927, No. 3), Oslo.
- Morgenstierne, G. (1938), *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*. Vol. 11: *Iranian Pamir Languages (Yidgha-Munji, Sanglechi-Ishkashmi and Wakhi)*, (Institutet for Sammenliggende Kulturforskning, Series B: Skrifter), Oslo.
- Morgenstierne, G. (1974), *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Morgenstierne, G. (2003), *A New Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto*, J. Elfenbein et al. (eds.) (Beiträge zur Iranistik 23), Wiesbaden.

- Pakzad, F. (2005), *Bundahisn. Zoroastrische Kosmogonie und Kosmologie*, Band I: *Kritische Edition*. (Ancient Iranian Studies Series 2), Tehran.
- Panaino, A. (2000), "Gaṇdarəβa-", *Encyclopædia Iranica*, E. Yarshater (ed.), vol. x, 3: *Fruit—Gāvbāzi*, New York: 267–269.
- Panaino, A. (2019), "Symbolic and Ideological Implications of Archery in Achaemenid and Parthian Kingships", A. Bencivenni et al. (eds), *Philobiblos. Scritti in onore di Giovanni Geraci*, Milano: 19–66.
- Panaino, A. (2021), "Ḙrəxša's self-sacrifice: Tradition or Innovation?", *Historia i Świat* 10/1: 15–42.
- Panaino, A. (2021b), "Ḙrəxša's Death or Self-sacrifice: The Ancient Iranian Saga of the Archer", N. Norozi (ed.), *Come la Freccia di Ārash. Il lungo viaggio della narrazione in Iran: forme e motivi dalle origini all'epoca contemporanea (Atti del v CoBran, 22–23 ottobre 2020)*. (Indo-Iranica et Orientalia, Series Lazur 24), Milano–Udine: 19–46.
- Pastoreau, M. (2008), *L'orso. Storia di un re decaduto* (Saggi Einaudi 897. Italian translation by Ch. Bongiovanni Bertini. Torino; original title of the book: *L'ours. Histoire d'un roi déchu* [La Librairie du xx^e siècle. Paris 2007]).
- Reiner, L. (2009), *Die indogermanischen und einzelsprachlichen Palatale in Indogermanischen*. Band II: *Thorn-Problem, indoiranische Laryngalvokalisation* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Dritte Reihe), Heidelberg.
- Steblin-Kamenskij, I.M. (1999), *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' vaxanskogo jazyka*, St. Petersburg.
- Schrijver, P.C.H. (1991), *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 2), Amsterdam–Atlanta.
- Solmsen, F. (1922), *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*. Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von E. Fraenkel (Indogermanische Bibliothek, Vierte Abteilung: Sprachgeschichte. Zweiter Band), Heidelberg.
- Stüber, K./Zehnder, Th./Remmer, U. (2009), *Indogermanische Frauennamen* (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Dritte Reihe), Heidelberg.
- Voigt, W. (1937), *Die Wertung des Tieres in der zarathuŕtrischen Religion* (Christentum und Fremdreigionen. Religionswissenschaftliche und religionsphilosophische Einzeluntersuchungen, Heft 5), München.
- Williams, A.V. (1990), *The Pahlavi Rivāyat Accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg*, Part I: *Transliteration, Transcription and Glossary*. Part II: *Translation, Commentary and Pahlavi Text* (Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 60:1), Copenhagen.
- Wodtko, D./Irslinger, Br./Schneider, C. (2008), *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon* (Indogermanische Bibliothek, Zweite Reihe), Heidelberg.