

a false image of the Sasanian memory of the Achaemenids, certainly we cannot deny that the Jews whose leadership was in close contact with the court would not have reminded them of the past history of Persia and the Achaemenids and their benevolence towards the Jews. When the Sasanians left their inscriptions on the structure at Persepolis or rock-reliefs at Naqsh-e Rostam, it meant that they saw the former structures as important and their own as their successors.

It is more of an issue for modern scholars to identify correctly the builders of the structures with the Achaemenids than it was for the Sasanians, since whoever they were, be it Achaemenids or others, they were now to be identified as Kayānid monuments according to the new historiography. The fathers of the Sasanians and their forefathers *ny'kn W hsynkn* who were remembered and blessed, were the same people who built these structures which we know in modern times to have been the Achaemenids. But for all practical purposes by the time of Šābuhr II, the Sasanians saw their fathers and forefathers to have been the Kayānids.⁴⁶

Then for this reason by the late Sasanian period Persepolis was called *Taxt ī Jamšīd* (Yima's throne).⁴⁷ From the time of Šābuhr II, history had become sacred and written or memorized in a new light. The Sasanians saw themselves as the heirs to the Kayānids who held the *xwarrah* "glory" and were rulers of *Ērān-šahr*. This memory was what was to be emulated by the king of kings who was from Persis, where the Achaemenids were from, but who had now adopted an "Avestan" outlook. With the spread of Zoroastrianism in its institutional form and perhaps other forms, the Kayānid legends were spread and the Sasanians claimed to be from their lineage in order to legitimize themselves. This was the reason for which the Achaemenids were omitted, or better said, pushed aside from the official history / collective memory which was a sacred history created in Late Antiquity in Persia. The formation of communal identity was a major development in Late Antiquity which affected not only a single religious community's behavior towards people of other confessional religions, but also affected the way in which they perceived their past history and their heritage. For this very reason, the Sasanians who had risen from the same province as the Achaemenids, chose to connect themselves to the Kayānids who were the rulers of *Ērān*, and let the Romans keep the history of the Achaemenid kings.

46. M. Back, *Die Sassanidischen Staatsinschriften*, Acta Iranica 18, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1978, p. 326; G. Gnoli, suggests that the Sasanians saw the Achaemenids as their forefathers, *The Idea of Iran: An Essay on Origins*, Rome, 1989, p. 119; *idem.*, "L'inscription de Šābuhr à la Ka'be-ye Zardošt et la propagande sassanide," *Historie et cultes de l'Asie Centrale préislamique*, P. Bernard and F. Grenet, eds., Paris, 1991, pp. 57-63.

47. I. Gershevitch, "An Iranianist's View of the Soma Controversy," P. Gignoux and A. Tafazzoli, eds., *Memorial Jean de Menasce*, Louvain, 1974, p. 53.

STUDIEN
ZUR
INDOLOGIE UND IRANISTIK

herausgegeben von

Georg Buddruss, Oskar von Hinüber
Hanns-Peter Schmidt, Albrecht Wezler
und Michael Witzel

Band 22

Dr. Inge Wezler
Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen
Reinbek 1999

Kāve the Black-Smith: An Indo-Iranian Fashioner?*

TOURAJ DARYAEE, Los Angeles

The epic cycle of the *Šāhnāme* begins with the story of Farīdūn, the hero king, and his revenge of Jamšīd's murder at the hand of Zahhāk. Jamšīd was the ruler of the Golden Age, when men never saw death and were unacquainted with toil and hardship. This Golden Age came to an end when he gathered the courtiers and proclaimed: "I recognize no lord but myself," and as soon as he had made this speech, his farr (glory) departed from the king. The Iranian knights turned to Zahhāk, a man from the desert whom Ferdowsī calls a Tāzīg, to replace him.¹ Jamšīd was then captured and according to the epic, he was cut in two by Zahhāk.² During Zahhāk's rule, evil fell upon the people and each night two young men were killed and their brains were served to the snakes who had grown from his shoulders.

A certain black-Smith by the name of Kāve plays an important part in this story. Kāve the blacksmith had eighteen sons, seventeen of whom had been killed in order to feed the snakes of Zahhāk. When his eighteenth son had been taken, he rebelled, cried out for justice and took to the road to find Farīdūn. He raised a banner, made from his apron and instigated the masses to rebel against the evil ruler. He found Farīdūn, the hero equipped with a bull-headed mace, who defeated and bound Zahhāk to the mountain of Damāwand.

The story is one of the most well-known episodes in the *Šāhnāme*, and the identities of the hero and the villain are quite clear. In this myth, it is only Kāve's identity that remains enigmatic. While the Avesta and Pahlavi texts provide a plethora of information on Farīdūn and Zahhāk, the hero and the villain, there is no mention of Kāve in them. Arthur CHRISTENSEN had already seen a connection between Kāve

* I would like to thank Hanns-Peter Schmidt for his comments and suggestions.

¹ For the latest study on Tāzīg see, W. SUNDERMANN, "An Early Attestation of the Name of the Tajiks," *MEDIOIRANICA*. Proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990, eds. W. Skalmowski and A. Van Tongerloo, Peeters, Leuven, 1993, p. 163-172.

² In the Avesta (Yašt 19.46) it is Spitiura who cuts Yima into two at the instigation of *aṅra mainiiu*.

the black-smith and the Vedic deity Tvaṣṭr. He stated that it was possible that an original Indo-Iranian deity manufactured the weapon that would kill Zaḥḥāk in Iran and Vṛtra in India.³ He further observed that the story that appears in the Šāhnāme about Kāve and the banner (*drafš ī Kāvīyān* which really meant the "Kayānian banner") was mistakenly attributed to Kāve. This misconception came about "in the course of the Sassanian period, and it (Kāve's legend) had rapidly become popular, so popular, that one of the seven great noble families, who were the holders of certain hereditary high offices, viz., the family of Kārēn, which had played a role already under the Arsacides, and to which among others the so powerful Sōkhrā belonged, who lived during the reign of king Kavādh (488-96 and 498-531), had taken him for its founder."⁴ Zabih-Allāh Safa followed the same line of reasoning but believed that due to the absence of the figure of Kāve in the Avestan and Pahlavi texts, he was fabricated in the Sāsānian or as early as the Pathian period and he had no ancient precedents.⁵

There is, however, some evidence unknown to these authors which tends to confirm CHRISTENSEN's suggestion and shows that Kāve is a figure of Indo-Iranian origin. In the Šāhnāme, Farīdūn is equipped with the bull-headed mace (*sar-e gāw meš*) which according to the text was requested by him (ed. Khaleghi-Motlagh, Vol. I, p. 71, 257-263):

بیارید داننده آهنگران	یکی گرز فرمای ما را گران
چو بگشاد لب هر دو بشناختند	به بازار آهنگران تاختند
هر آن کس کز آن پیشه بد نامجوی	به سوی فریدون نهادند روی
جهانجوی پرگار بگرفت زود	وزان گرز، پیکر بدیشان نمود
نگاری نگارید بر خاک پیش	همیدون به سان سر گارمیش-
به پیش جهانجوی بردند گرز	فروزان به کردار خورشید برز

³ A. CHRISTENSEN, "The smith kāveh and the ancient Persian imperial banner." *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*, Vol. 5, pp. 32-33.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27; *Les kayanides*, Copenhagen, 1931, p. 43; *idem*, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, Copenhagen, 1944, p. 502f.

⁵ Z. SAFA, *Hamāse Sarā-ē dar Iran*, Amir Kabir Publishers, Tehran, 1969, p. 208.

Bring skilled smiths to fashion for me a heavy mace,
when he opened his lips, they both recognized,
they rushed to the bazaar of the black-smiths,
whoever was famous in that profession, came forth to Farīdūn,
the world conqueror quickly took a compass,
and showed them the design of the mace,
he drew a figure in the dust, in the likeness of a bull's head
they brought forth the mace of the world conqueror,
luminous, in the likeness of the size of the sun.

While this is the common story that appears in the literary remains of the Islamic period, there are some other sources which need to be considered in regard to the fashioner of the mace. These are some of the oral versions of the same myth which have come to us. The *gōsāns* / *huniyāgar* (minstrels) played an important part in Parthian and Sāsānian society, where they sang about ancient heroes and gods.⁶ The last known *gōsān* is the famous Rūdakī, who gained access to the court of Naṣr b. Aḥmad Sāmānī in Xorāsān.⁷ By this period, the different aspects of the *gōsān*'s were adopted by the *naggāle-xāns* and eulogists. The *naggāle-xāns* or *Šāhnāme-xāns* are known in the Medieval period as well, where during the Timurid era they were required to have an excellent memory and voice in order to serve at the court.⁸ In the Islamic period the *naggāle-xān*, the modern descendants of the *gōsāns*, carried the tradition and related these stories in towns and villages.

A major resource for Ferdowsī's *Šāhnāme* is an official Sāsānian history called the *Xwadāy-nāmag*. The *Xwadāy-nāmag*, a compilation of stories written in the Sāsānian period, were probably completed in 555 A.D., during the reign of Xusrō I.⁹ As for Ferdowsī, we certainly cannot place him in the ranks of these wandering *gōsāns* of the medieval period, since he belonged to the educated *dehgān* class (landed gen-

⁶ M. BOYCE, "The Parthian Gōsān and Iranian Minstrel Traditions," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1957, pp. 10-45; "Middle Persian Literature," *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Iranistik, E. J. Brill, Leiden/Köln, 1968, pp. 55-57.

⁷ Dj. KHALEGI-MOTLAGH, "Hamāse Sarāie Bāstān," *Gol Ranjhā-ye Kohan*, ed. A. Dehbāstī, Naṣr-e Markaz, Tehran, 1993, p. 25.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁹ A. Sh. SHAHBAZI, "On The Xwadāy-Nāmag," *Iranica Varia: Papers in Honour of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*, Acta Iranica 30, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1990, p. 223.

try) and was not a wandering poet.¹⁰ But even in the Sāsānian period, some of these stories existed in oral form, and depending on the environment and the reciter, the tales were susceptible to manipulation.¹¹ This means that a story such as the Indo-European dragon-slaying myth¹² may have been a simple story, but as time went on, it became a well-structured narrative and was elaborated upon by the storyteller. This makes it difficult to point to one version of the story as the "correct" or "original" version.¹³ An example in regard to the different versions of a myth or tale can be found in the work of Zoroastrian priests and court chroniclers. In Iran, Gayōmard was the first man, whose origin can be traced to the Indo-Iranian period,¹⁴ but in Middle Persian texts, Gayōmard is both the first man and the first king.¹⁵ As for the story of Kāve, Farīdūn, and Zahhāk present in the *Šāhnāme*, other versions exist in the oral tradition.

One of the famous naggāle-xāns, Abbās Zarērī, who was born in Isfahān in

¹⁰ KHALEGHI-MOTLAGH, *op. cit.*, p. 32; A. TAFAZZOLI, "Dehqān," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. E. Yarshater, Vol. VII, Mazda Publishers, 1996, pp. 224-225.

¹¹ O. DAVIDSON has stressed the oral poetic tradition of the *Šāhnāme*, *Poet and Hero in the Persian Book of Kings*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1994; M. OMIDSALAR has been the main opponent of such view, "Unburdening Ferdowsi," *JAOS*, Vol. 116, No. 2, 1996, pp. 235-242. It should be mentioned that indeed from the ancient times as early as the sixth century B.C., Dinon mentioned that during the Median period there existed court poets who composed epics which must have been from an oral tradition. T. DARYAE, "National History or Keyanid History?: The Nature of Sasanid Zoroastrian Historiography," *Iranian Studies*, Vol. 28, 1995, p. 131. This of course does not imply that in the Eleventh century A.D. the situation was the same.

¹² C. WATKINS, *How To Kill A Dragon*, Aspects of Indo-European Poetics, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1995.

¹³ Albert B. LORD, *The Singer Resumes the Tale*, ed. Mary L. Lord, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1995, p. 4.

¹⁴ K. HOFFMANN, "Mārtānda und Gayōmart," *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, XI, 1957, pp. 85-113.

¹⁵ K. M. JAMASP-ASA, *Aogōmadaēca*. A Zoroastrian Liturgy, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1982, passage 85, pp. 46-47. The Pahlavi version of the text calls Gayōmard *gilsāh* "king of clay," while the Pazand has *garšāh* "king of the mountain," and the Sanskrit version simply has *mahārājā*. According to the *Bundahišn* (Anklesaria, p. 45) Gayōmard was not only the first man but also the first king. G. WIDENGREN, "The Death of Gayōmart," *Myths and Symbols Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*. The University of Chicago Press, 1969, p. 186. CHRISTENSEN mentioned that the reading *gilsāh* is erroneous and opts for *garšāh* as the original version, *Les types du premier homme et du premier roi*. Archives d'études orientales, Vol. 14, Stockholm, 1917, pp. 45-46. The Islamic sources such as the *Fārsnāme* know Gayōmard also as *gilsāh*, p. 9. KHALEGHI-MOTLAGH, indicated that Gayōmard was considered a king by the time of the *Xwadāy-nāmag*, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

1909, followed a line of famous *Šāhnāme* reciters. Late in life he put onto paper many of the stories. Early in life he traveled from city to city and by using his craft, he sustained a living. Among the unpublished materials of his work, there is a version which stated that Kāve was involved in the design of the mace.¹⁶ In this version Hōm (Avestan Haoma) called upon Farīdūn and placed the crown and garment of Jamšīd upon him.¹⁷ When Farīdūn and Kāve appeared before Hōm, he instructed Farīdūn to tie Zahhāk to a well on Mt. Damāwand. Then Hōm put his mouth close to Kāve's ear and instructed him to remember his orders that one of them was to fashion for Farīdūn a bull-headed mace.¹⁸ D. J. DUSTKHĀH comments on the story in detail and more importantly observes Kāve's supernatural ability, his ties to the deities and his connections to the other world.¹⁹ This is important when establishing this story's connection to the Vedic deity, (Tvastṛ), discussed below. A single attestation of course does not suffice to establish that Kāve was indeed the fashioner of the mace. There are, however, other versions of the story in addition to *Šāhnāme* that corroborate this assumption. One of these oral stories regarding the *gorz* of Farīdūn is told by a man from Šahsawār:

می گویند گاور فریدونی یکی از جمله وسائل
حربی بود که در زمان سلطنت شاه فریدون
بوسیله امیر کاپوه کاربانی با یک مهارت و
استادی مخصوص ساخته شد، بطوری که کاره
دو سال تمام وقت صرف ساختن این اسلحه
افسانه ای کرد و فریدون شاه با همین گاور
به جنگ ضحاک واردش رفت و او را شکست داد

¹⁶ Dj. DUSTKHĀH, "Kāve-ye Ahangar be Ravāyat-e Naggālān," *Iran Nāme*, Vol. X, No. 1, WINTER 1922, p. 133 & 138.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 133 & 138; see also "Kāve," *Loghat Nāme Dehxodā*, Letter K, Tehran, 1973, pp. 294-295 which also assigns the fashioning of the mace to Kāve according to other sources.

¹⁹ DUSTKHĀH, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

"They say that gāw-sar ī Farīdūn was one of the instruments of battle which was fashioned with dexterity and skill during the rule of king Farīdūn by Amir Kāve-ye Kāvīānī, in a way that it took two whole years for him to fashion this mythical weapon and King Farīdūn with this bull-headed (mace) went to battle the snake-shoulder and defeated him."²⁰

Other interesting details in this story indicate that the fashioning of the mace required special knowledge, since it was made from a unique metal, and that only some of the heroes knew how to use this weapon.²¹ The only heroes who used this weapon are said to have been Farīdūn, Garšāsb, Rostam, Farāmarz and Farāmarz's son Adūr-Burzēn, who after defeating Bahman, caused the mace to disappear. The appearance of these stories are not particular to a single region and their attestation from two different areas of Iran makes it plausible that the story was not the fabrication of a single naggāle-xān.

Kāve's characteristics in this tale have close parallels with the Vedic artisan or craftsman-god Tvaṣṭr, cognate of Avestan ōwōrəšta-. The word Tvaṣṭr is derived from the verb *tvakṣ*, meaning "to fashion, to cut." In the Veda he engages in such activities as sharpening the ax for Brahmanaspati (X.53.9). Tvaṣṭr's most important work as an artisan was the making of Indra's *vájra* (Persian *gorz*) (I.32.2):

tvāṣṭāsmāi vājram svarīyam tatakṣa

"Tvaṣṭr fashioned for him (Indra) the humming bolt."

Indra's most important function in the Veda is the liberation of the waters, and secondly the release of the cows from the hold of a monster. When Tvaṣṭr made the (I.85.9) *sūkṛtaṃ hiranyāyam sahasrabhr̥ṣṭin* "well-made, golden thousand-edged" *vájra* for Indra, Indra was able to strike Vṛtra, the demon of darkness and drought. In the Veda there is another form of this myth that follows the same pattern but with different figures. In this version, it is Trita Āptya, who slays the three-headed monster, Viśvarūpa (all shapes), who is the son of Tvaṣṭr, at the instigation of Indra.

²⁰ FERDOWSÍ-NÁME, ed. S. A. ANGAVÍ-ŠIRÁZÍ, vol. 3, Ilmī Publishers, Tehran, 1358, p. 35; also another version in which Kāve builds the mace, *ibid.*, p. 35.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

²² (X.8.8):

*sá pítiryāni āyudhāni vidvān
indreṣita āptiyó abhy āyudhyat
triśīrṣānam saptāraśmim jaghanvān
tvāṣṭrāsya cin niḥ sasrje tritó gāḥ*

"Trita Āptya, knowing the paternal weapons and urged on by Indra, combated the three headed, seven bridled being, (and), having killed him, released the cows of the son of Tvaṣṭr."²³

In Iran, the same myth exists, but the task is assigned to another hero. In the Iranian tradition it is not Trita Āptya, (Avestan Ōrita Āθβīia, Persian Ābtīn) who is the hero, but his son Ōraētaona. Although there seems to be generational differences in the Iranian myth, both have been understood as the reflexes of an earlier *Trito "the third" who must have been a mythic hero.²⁴ In the Šāhnāme Farīdūn is also the youngest of three children (ed. Khaleghi-Motlagh, Vol. I, p. 27,253):

برادر دو بودش دو فرخ همال ازو هردو آزاده مهتر بسال

He had two brothers, both blessed in the same way, both older than him.

In the Avesta it is Ōraētaona > Middle Persian Frēdūn > Persian Farīdūn, who with his mace, Avestan *wazra* > Middle Persian *wazr* > by metathesis *warz*, Persian *gorz* strikes the three headed serpent, Avestan Aži Dahāka²⁵ (Yt. 19.37):

²² H. OLDENBERG, *The Religion of the Veda*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1988, p. 78; he believed that originally Trita alone was the slayer of the monster; LINCOLN, however, believes that there is a consistent relation of assistance and dependence between Indra and Trita in slaying of the monster, B. LINCOLN, *Priests, Warriors, and Cattle, A Study in the Ecology of Religions*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1981, pp. 105-106, where further evidence is cited.

²³ K. F. GELDNER, *Der Rigveda*, Vol. 4, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1951.

²⁴ LINCOLN, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

²⁵ Avestan Aži Dahāka, dragon/serpent > Middle Persian Dahāg > Persian Zahhak. Aždahā in Persian literature is imagined as a large snake which possesses two wings which are like the wings of an eagle and the tale of a snake; for a description of the dragons in Persian literature see Dj. KHALEGHÍ-MOTLAGH, "Aždahā II. In Persian Literature," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, p. 199; M.

yō janat ašim dahākəm θriṣāfanəm
θrikamərəδəm xšuuāš.ašim hazarṣrā.yaoxštīm
aš.aojarḥəhəm daēuuīm drujim

"(θraētaona) who slew the three mouthed,
 three headed serpent Dahāka, with six eyes,
 thousand perceptions, the very powerful deceiving demon."

Thus what Tvaṣṭṛ does for Indra and for Trita in the Veda, is identical to what Kāve does for Farīdūn in the Šāhnāme. Both Tvaṣṭṛ and Kāve are artisans and fashioners. Here the Indo-European vocabulary may suggest a relation between the two. Indo-European words for "forging" and "smith" are almost identical, since the primary function of a smith was fashioning, striking, and forging. The word for smith may be derived from the Indo-European verb **kāu*, "to strike," or "to forge"; Old Church Slavonic *kovati* "forge," Lithuanian *kóviau* and *kauti*, Russian *kovat'*, Serbo-Croatian *kóvati*, Czech *kovati*, Russian *kovat'*.²⁶ The problem is that this root is only attested in Slavic languages and not in Indo-Iranian languages and so it becomes suspect.

RASTEGĀR, *Azdahā dar asāfire Iran*, Shiraz University Press, Shiraz, 1986, p. 35. This is in accordance with Zoroastrian animal classification of the beast, where *mār ī pad parr* "serpent with wings" is classified as an evil mythical creature, see H.-P. SCHMIDT, "Ancient Iranian Animal Classification, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, Heft 5/6, Reinbek, 1980, p. 210; in modern Iranian languages this creature, *Azdahā* came to mean strictly a dragon, with perhaps the exception in Yidgha and Munji (y)īž > Av. Aži "serpent." In all other Iranian languages and dialects, *mār* replaced the word for serpent, perhaps derived from Sanskrit *marōtra*- "killer" see G. MORGENSTIERNE, "An Ancient Indo-Iranian word for 'dragon,'" *Irano-Dardica*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1973, p. 24; P. O. SKJÆRVØ, "Azdahā I. In Old and Middle Iranian," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, p. 191. The explanation given by the Zoroastrian commentators show that they did not know the exact meaning of the word and took the name to mean "ten defects," taking the word as a compound of *dah* "ten" with *ak* "evil or harm", *Dārāb Hormazyār's Rivāyat*, Vol. II, Bombay, 1922, p. 83. This explanation can also be seen in the oral versions regarding this creature, "they say that Zōhhāk's name in reality was Dah-hāk, meaning ten deformities," *Ferdowsī-nāme*, ed. S. A. Angavī-Širāzī, Vol. 2, Ilmī Publishers, Tehran, 1978, p. 301; is *ak* related to Avestan *axti*, Vedic *āgas*- "sin requiring expiation," Greek *āgos* "sin or fault,"? see M. SCHWARTZ, "Scatology and Eschatology in Zoroaster: On the Paronomasia of Yasna 48.10 and on Indo-European H₂EG "To Make Taboo" and the Reciprocity Verbs *K₁SEN(W) and *MEGH," *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce, Acta Iranica* 25, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1985, pp. 492-493.

²⁶ F. MIKLOSICH, *Dictionnaire abrégé de six langues Slaves*, Libraire de la société, St. Pétersbourg et Moscou, 1885, pp. 485-486; C. D. BUCK, *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principals Indo-European Languages*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, reprint 1988, pp. 606-608; J. POKORNY, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, Francke, 1959 under *kāu*.

Etymologically, the Iranian word *kāve* may be related to Indo-European words for forging and smith. While in India, Tvaṣṭṛ remained the artisan god, his name was forgotten in Iran by the time of Šāhnāme, but his function as fashioner, remained. Since the meaning of *kāve* was forgotten in Iran, his epithet as a blacksmith reflected his real function. The reason for Tvaṣṭṛ's omission in the Old Iranian world as a fashioner / artisan god may be because of Zoroaster's theological reforms. GERSHEVITCH has proposed that Avestan *θwōrəštar*- was also the name of the creator god in pre-Gathic times, but Spənta Mainyu took over the function in the new religion.²⁷ As Spənta Mainyu became prevalent *θwōrəštar*- as a creator god was forgotten. The Šāhnāme, however, seems to show that while his name was forgotten, his function as fashioner / artisan was preserved in the latest period of the epic Iranian mythological times.

This period in the Persian epic is neither historical, nor really heroic, but as WIKANDER has stated, is the time of the descent of the gods on earth that marks the end of the myth and the beginning of the Heroic epic.²⁸ Thus the mythical dragon / snake becomes an evil king with snakes growing from his shoulder; Farīdūn becomes a king and Tvaṣṭṛ / Kāve who was the black-smith of the gods became a real black-smith who made the ultimate weapon for Farīdūn. There seems to be a close correspondence between the villain and the hero of the mythic era and the evil and good ruler of the epic period, as having a connection to the relationship of Tvaṣṭṛ and Kāve. Further, the linguistic evidence may also support the notion that Kāve is the successor to the fashioner deity, Tvaṣṭṛ.

²⁷ I. GERSHEVITCH, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, The Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1959, pp. 56-57; contra see BOYCE who believes that GERSHEVITCH forces the issue to make a point of Zoroaster's monotheism, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, Volume One, The Early Period, E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, København, Köln, 1989, p. 82, n. 411; also KELLENs finds several difficulties with GERSHEVITCH's hypothesis, "Qui est GĒUŠ TAŠAN?" *Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies*, eds. B. G. Fragner, C. Fragner, G. Gnoli, R. Haag-Higuchi, M. Maggi and P. Orsatti, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Roma, 1995, p. 349, n. 7.

²⁸ S. WIKANDER, "Indo-European Eschatology in Myth and Epic," *Internationaler Kongress für Religionsgeschichte*, 11.-17. September 1960 in Marburg/Lahn, N. G. Elwert Verlag, Marburg, 1961, p. 140.

Indo-Iranian Correspondence

	Slayer-Hero	Enemy	Weapon	Artisan
(Veda)	Trita Āptiya	Ahi (three-headed)	vájra (bolt)	Tvaṣṭr (artisan-god)
(Avesta)	Θraētaona	Aži Dahāka (three-headed)	wazra (mace)	*Ōwōrəštar- (pre-Z. arti- san god)
(Dēnkard)	Farīdūn	Dahāg (winged)	wazr (mace)	—
(Šāhnāme)	Farīdūn	Zahhāk (king with two serpent heads)	gorz (mace)	Kāve (smith)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANJAVI ŠIRĀZI, S. Abu'l-Qasem, *Ferdowsī-nāme*, Vols. 2 & 3, Ilmī Publishers, Tehran, 1358.
- ANKLESARIA, B. T., *Zand-Akāsīh*, IRanian or Greater Bundahišn, Bombay, 1956.
- IBN BALXI, *Fārsnāme*, eds. G. Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1921.
- BARTHOLOMAE, C., *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1961.
- BENVISTE, Emile and RENOU, Louise, *Vrita et Vrθragna*, Paris, 1934.
- BOYCE, Mary, "The Parthian Gōsān and Iranian Minstrel Traditions," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1957, pp. 10-45.
- "Middle Persian Literature," *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Iranistik*, E. J. Brill, Leiden/Köln, 1968, p. 32-66.
- *A History of Zoroastrianism*, Vol. I, The early Period, E. J. Brill, Leiden/Köln, 1989.
- BUCK, Carl-D., *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principals Indo-European Languages*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago-London, reprint 1988.
- CHRISTENSEN, Arthur, *Les types du premier homme et du premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens*, Archives d'études orientales, Vol. 14, Stockholm, 1917.
- "The Smith Kāveh and the ancient Persian imperial banner," *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*, Vol. 5, pp. 22-39.
- *Les Kayanides*, Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser XIX, 2, København, 1931.
- DARAYEE, T., "National History or Keyanid History?: The Nature of Sasanid Zoroastrian Historiography," *Iranian Studies*, Vol. 28, 1995, p. 129-143.
- DAVIDSON, O., *Poet and Hero in the Persian Book of Kings*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1994.
- DHABHAR, B. N., *The Persian Rivayats of Hormazyar Framarz and Others*, E. B. N. Dhabhar, K. R. Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay, 1932.
- DUSTXĀH, Djalil, "Kāwe-ye Ahangar be ravāyat-e naggālān," *Iran-Nāme*, Vol. 10, No. 1, winter 1370/1991, pp.
- FERDOWSI, Abu'l-Qasem, *The Shahnameh*, ed. D. Khaleghi-Motlagh, Vol. 1, Bibliotheca Persica, New York, 1988.
- GELDNER, Karl, *Avesta: the sacred books of the Parsis*. Text with introduction, 3 vols., Stuttgart, 1896.
- *Der Rigveda*, 4 volumes, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1951.
- GERSHEVITCH, Ilya, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra. With an Introduction Translation and Commentary*, The Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1959.
- HILLEBRANDT, A., *Vedic Mythology*, Vol. II, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1981.

- HOFFMANN, K., "Mārtānda und Gayōmar". Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, XI, 1957, pp. 85-113.
- KAMASPASA, K. M., *Aogomadaēca*, A Zoroastrian Liturgy, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, 1982.
- KELLENS, J., "Qui est GĒUŠ TAŠAN?" Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies, eds. B. G. Fragner, C. Fragner, G. Gnoli, R. Haag-Higuchi, M. Maggi and P. Orsatti, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Roma, 1995.
- KHALEGHI-MOTLAGH, Djalāl, "Azdahā II. In Persian Literature," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, pp. 174.
- "Mahāse Sarāie Bāstān," *Gol Ranjhā-ye Kohan*, ed. A. Dehōāšī, Našr-e Markaz, Tehran, 1993, pp. 19-52.
- KEITH, A. B., *Religion and Philosophy of the Vedas and Upanishads*, Harvard Oriental Series, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1970.
- LINCOLN, Bruce, *Priests, Warriors, and Cattle. A Study in the Ecology of Religions*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1981.
- LORD, A. B., *The Singer Resumes the Tale*, ed. Mary L. Lord, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1995.
- MACDONELL, A. Anthony, *A Vedic Reader for Students*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, 1992.
- MIKLOSICH, F., *Dictionnaire abrégé de six langues Slaves*, Librairie de la société, St. Péterbourg et Moscou, 1885.
- MORGENSTIERNE, George, "An ancient Indo-Iranian word for 'dragon,'" *Irano-Dardica*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1973, pp.
- OLDENBERG, Hermann, *The Religion of the Veda*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1988.
- OMIDSALAR, M., "Unburdening Ferdowsi," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 116, No. 2, 1996, pp. 235-242.
- POKORNY, Julius, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, Francke, 1959.
- PUHVEL, Jaan, *Comparative Mythology*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, 1989.
- RASTEGĀR, M., *Azdahā dar asāīre Iran*, Shiraz University Press, Shiraz, 1986.
- Rig Veda* *Rig Veda*, A Metrically restored Text with an Introduction and Notes, eds. Barend A. Van Nooten and Gary B. Holland, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England, 1994.
- SAFA, Zabih-allah, *Hamāse Sarā-ē dar Iran*, Amir Kabir Publishers, Tehran, 1369.
- SCHMIDT, Hanns-Peter, "Ancient Iranian Animal Classification," *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, Heft 5/6, Reinbek, 1980, pp. 209-244.
- SCHWARTZ, Martin, "Scatology and Eschatology in Zoroaster: On the Paronomasia of Yasna 48.10 and on Indo-European H₂EG 'To make Taboo' and the Reciprocity Verbs *K^sSEN(W) and *MEGH," *Papers in Honor of Professor Mary Boyce*, Acta Iranica 25, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1985, pp. 473-496.

- SHAHBAZI, A. Sh., "On The Xwadāy-Nāmag," *Iranica Varia: Papers in Honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*, Acta Iranica 30, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1990, p. 209-228.
- SKJÆRVØ, Prods O., "Azdahā I. In Old and Middle Iranian," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, pp. 191-199.
- SUNDERMANN, W., "An Early Attestation of the Name of the Tajiks," *MEDIOIRANICA*, Proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990, eds. W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo, Peeters, Leuven, 1993, p. 163-172.
- WATKINS, Calvert, *How To Kill A Dragon*, Aspects of Indo-European Poetics, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1995.
- WIDENGREN, Geo, "The Death of Gayōmart," *Myths and Symbols Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1969, pp. 179-193.