In the Dēnkard we read Jam’s 10 precepts and those of Azdahāg in opposition to them thus:

1. to think, say (and) stand steadfast in it that the creator of the world is not the injurer of the world.  
2. And one (is) not to worship dew(s) on account of whatever prosperity (of the world).  
3. One (is) to uplift the law among human beings (and) to keep (it) steadfastly.  
4. One (is) to arrange moderation over every matter and to avert from it excess and deficiency.  
5. One (is) to eat-and-drink brotherly «like brothers».  

In the Dēnkard we read Jam’s 10 precepts and those of Azdahāg in opposition to them thus:

| adar 10 andarz i huramag Jam | o | mardom | ud 10 i dahšin kāhēnīdār Dahāg padīrag | ān andarz wirāst. | az nigēz i weh dēn. |

On the 10 precepts of Jam having beautiful flocks to mankind and the 10 (precepts) which established, against those precepts, Dahāg, the diminisher of creation. From the exposition of the good religion.  

| hād āsn-xrad zahag dām sūd | i weh dēn passand dādār kām. | 10 i andarz i huramag Jam | o mardom. |

Now (here is) an emanation of the innate wisdom, an advantage of the creature, an object receiving the approbation of the good religion, a will of the creator. (That is) the 10 precepts of Jam having beautiful flocks to mankind.  

| ēk dādār i gēhān [menidan] amurnēnīdārih | ḥēhān menīdan guftan padiš āstigān āstādān. |

(1) One (is) to think, say (and) stand steadfast in it that the creator of the world is not the injurer of the world.  
ud ēk | dēw | pad | tis abādīh | nē yastaṭan.  
(2) And one (is) not to worship dēw(s) on account of whatever prosperity (of the world).  
ēk dād māyān | mardomān | mehēnīdan āstigān dāštān.  
(3) One (is) to uplift the law among human beings (and) to keep (it) steadfastly.  
ēk | abar | har | tis paymān | rāyēnīdan ud frehbuṭ ud abēbūṭ azīš ānāštān.  
(4) One (is) to arrange moderation over every matter and to avert from it excess and deficiency.  
ēk | xwardan | brādarwār | «ṭiyūn | brādārān». (4)  
(5) One (is) to eat-and-drink brotherly «like brothers».  
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(6) One (is) to inculcate the desire for keeping house so as to make the children fatherly like father.

(7) One (is this that) he (Jam) advised to gift to the worthy like-to-onself like-whosoever is not sated with gifting to himself.

(8) One (is) to make store in summer for fattening men and cattles against winter expense.

(9) One (is this that) he advised to apportion the canal(s) in favour of things for (sustaining) life goat and sheep have no need of whatever may suffer (them) and larger advantage of men and cattle.

(10) One (is this that) one-should-not slaughter the cattle before (their) coming to the period of pubescence i.e. sheep and goat reach to pubescence with 4 years and (that) the law of pubescence (is this): cattle sheep and goat grow in (their) body during 4 years and with the 4 years the growth of sexual organ comes to its zenith and for 4 years they (cattle) continue to be in pubescence and thenceforth again come to diminution.

ud dām +dahisn zyān Yahūdih [i] kēš [i] dastwar iht) 1 dew kām. 10 i dahišn kāhenidār Dahāg 1 pad petyaraghī i 1 im 10 dāmān sūd andar z i Jam huramag.

And (here is) a harm to the creatures, a custom of Judaean religion, a will of dew(s). (That is) the 10 (precepts) of Dahāg, the diminisher of creation in antagonism to these creature benefiting precepts of Jam
having beautiful flocks.

(1) One (is this that) in opposition to that Jam called the creator of the world the non-injurer of the world, Dahāq called the creator of the world the injurer of the world.

(2) One (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised not to worship the dew(s) on account of whatever prosperity of the world, Dahāq enticed (men) to worship the dews on account of all prosperity of the world.

(3) One (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised to uplift the law among human beings, Dahāq proclaimed law disturbing decision(s) (and) enticed (men) to lay down and institute the injustice in the name of justice.

(4) One (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised (lit. said) to arrange moderation over every matter, Dahāq enticed to throw excess and deficiency into every matter.

(5) One (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised concerning eating-and-drinking, Dahāq inculcated greediness and advised to suppress gifting.

(6) One (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised to inculcate the desire for keeping house so as to make the children fatherly, Dahāq enticed (men) not to inculcate the desire.
(7) And one (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised concerning gifting to the worthy, Dahāg ordered to steal it from everybody.

ud ek 'ān i <Jam> gospand pēš 'az madan i 'ō nazdwarīh 'nē kuştan andarznīd <ud> Dahāg harzag-'kušišnhī i gospandān Yahūd ēwēn hammōxt[an].

(8) And one (is this that) Jam advised not to slaughter the cattle before (their) coming to the pubescence whereas Dahāg inculcated the free slaughter of cattles, a Judaean usage.

ud ek padīrag 'ān i Īam <'īs i gyan> gospand 'ān i 'pad dušwārīh 'andar 'nē abyēd <ud> mardom ud gospand-iz meh südīh rāy ḥāy(8) baxtan andarznīd, [ud] Dahāg šabestān kardan(11) ud mewag mewag i mard <ud> +zan drūdiš<an i> bun(12) andarznīd[an] ēyōn Yahūdān kēš.

(9) And one (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised to apportion the canal(s) in favour of things for (sustaining) life the cattle have no need of whatever may suffer (them) and larger advantage of men and also of cattle, Dahāg advised to set up gynaecium and to brand on every first fruit of man and woman, like the Judaean religion.

ēk padīrag 'ān i Īam 'pad hāmīn zamestān uzēnag rāy hambār sāxtan andarznīd, Dahāg anāmurzīghā kēn 'pad mēnīn hambārdan 'pad-iz 9 āwādog tōxtan guft.

(10) One (is this that) in opposition to that Jam advised to make store in summer against the winter expense, Dahāg enticed to store grudge mercilessly in the mind (and) to revenge even over 9 generations.

'pad 'im 10 dām zyān andar i padīrag 10 i Īam dām sūd andarz āwālidag,(13) nibēg bun kardan <ud> 'andar Ulūšlem dāstān framūd. Fascinated by these creature injuring 10 precepts which (are) in opposition to the creature benefiting 10 precepts of Jam, he (Dahāg) ordered to prepare an original-copy of scripture (thereof) and to preserve (it) in Jerusalem.

ud 'az 'ān 'pas Abrahīm i Yahūdān dastwar kār padiš 'kard <ud> Mūṣag ʾī-š sarādag(14) i Yahūd [ud] 'pad waxšwar 'dārēnd frażāmēntā[an] ud Yaṣūg borzāwand 'ī +'az Mūṣag āšnūd 'būd(15) rawāgēnīd, ġowēnd. ud 'har Yahūd sarādag 'andar 'xweš bahr 'dārēnd ud padiš 'wirrōyēnd. And afterwards, Abrahīm who is Judaeans’ patriarch made use of it
and Moses, his ally, whom the Judeans look upon as prophet, completed, and Joshua the lofty who had heard (it) from Moses, propagated, (so) they say. And all the Judeans treat the ally as a member of their own (fold) and believe in him.

As is evident from the text, Jam’s 10 precepts were invented in opposition to Moses’ 10 Commandments. But it does not mean Jam’s every precept based on no Zoroastrian tradition. It may suffice for instance Jam’s 10th precept, paraphrased, though without reference to his name but in still longer exposition, in the Denkard Book VII, chapt. 9, §§ 8–12 (16) thus:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Asawahist} & \quad \text{az abadar nêmag \ 'abar \ 'bê \ 'xwânêd \ êdôn} \\
\text{gôwêd} & \quad \text{ô mäzôdênân \ 'hêd(18) \ 'mâ} \\
\text{kas êdôn gospand} & \quad \text{bê kustár \ 'bawêd êyôn} \\
\text{ân} & \quad \text{pêš \ 'bê kustár \ 'bûd \ 'hêd.} \\
\text{§8} & \quad \text{andarzênêd waksi'n \ 'pad \ dêd, andarzênêd nazdwarîh \ 'pad \ tan, mäzôdên-êd! gospand \ 'bê kušêd.} \\
\text{§9} & \quad \text{'ân \ 'az \ 'avêšân \ 'bê kušêd} \\
\text{ke} & \quad \text{'ô \ 'êmâh \ ayârênêd,} \\
\text{êkê} & \quad \text{'ô \ 'êmâh \ gôwêd \ 'kû ayarêmêdih} \\
\text{kû} & \quad \text{mäzôdên \ 'hêd!} \\
\text{xwarêd} & \quad \text{man \ 'pad \ nazdwarîh \ 'pêš \ 'az} \\
\text{ân \ 'tâ \ 'ka \ 'man \ gax \ 'udarasag \ 'bê \ 'joyêd.'} \\
\text{§10} & \quad \text{ud \ andarzênêd \ waksi'n, andarzênêd nazdwarîh, mäzôdên gospand \ 'bê kušêd,} \\
\text{ân-iz} & \quad \text{'az \ 'avêšân \ 'kê \ 'ô} \\
\text{avêšân ayârênêd} & \quad \text{'kû \ 'mäzôdên \ 'hêd!} \\
\text{xwarêd} & \quad \text{man \ 'pad \ nazdwarîh \ 'pêš \ 'az} \\
\text{ân \ 'tâ \ 'ka \ 'man \ gax \ 'udarasag \ 'bê \ 'joyêd.'} \\
\text{§11} & \quad \text{hunsandihê mäzôdên gospand} \\
\text{kušêd} & \quad \text{ud \ 'hunsandihê mäzôdên gospand \ 'brinênd.} \\
\text{ud \ hunsand gospand \ 'ka \ ['nê] \ 'brinênd.} \\
\text{ud \ hunsandihê mäzôdên gospand \ 'xwarênd.} \\
\text{ud} & \quad \text{hunsand \ 'gospand} \\
\text{ka-š} & \quad \text{xwarênd.} \\
\text{§12} & \quad \text{ud \ 'êg \ 'ka \ 'mënôgân \ 'bawêd \ hamboyst \ kustár \ ud \ 'kê-iz-îs \ kušênd} \\
\text{ud \ 'bridör \ ud \ 'kê-iz-îs \ 'brinênd} \\
\text{ud} & \quad \text{xwardâran \ ud \ 'kê-iz-îs \ xwarênd.}
\end{align*}\]

Then Asawahisti will call out to the Mazdayasnians from the higher region and speak to you who are Mazdayasnians thus: ‘let no one (of you) become such a slaughterer of cattle as the slaughterers you have been before. (9) Judge the growth by the age, judge the pubescence by the body, you who are Mazdayasnians! Slaughter the cattle. Slaughter those of them which give you assistance, that speak to you i.e. (that) speak to you on account of your helpfulness’ thus: “You who are Mazdayasnians! Eat me who am in pubescence, in prior to that the snake creeping on its belly devours me.” (10) Then judging the growth, judging the pubescence, the Mazdayasnian(s) will slaughter the cattle(s), (they will slaughter) those indeed of them which give them assistance, saying ‘You who are Mazdayasnians! Eat me who am in pubescence, in prior to that the
snake creeping on its belly devours me.' (11) Contentedly the Mazdayas-
ian(s) will slaughter the cattle and contentedly the Mazdayasnian(s) will
sever the cattle. And contented are the cattle when they sever (them).
And contentedly the Mazdayasnian(s) will eat the cattle. And contented
are the cattle when they eat them. (12) And when they (all) become
heavenly entity, then the slaughterer(s) and whatever they slaughter, and
the severer(s) and whatever they sever, and the eaters and whatever they
eat (, — they) are (all) comrades.

In so far as my knowledge goes, scholars have seldom referred to these pas-
sages in favour of their interpretations of Yasna 32:8 ab. For better understand-
ing of the text, we must recognize several premises: (a) no tradition identifies
Yima / Jam with ox; (b) no tradition has accused him as guilty concerning cattle
(rather the reverse is suggested by his 9th and 10th precepts in the light of the
paraphrase given above; cf. also Pahlavī Yasna 9:1 Commentary, that does not
condemn but rather praises Jam as bestower of flesh to eat, for men to live a
longer life, if not eternal; and DkM 838: 2–9 (IX·32·12) treated by M. Molé:
Culte, mythe et cosmologie dans l'Iran ancien, Paris 1963, p. 225 ff.); (c) he was ac-
cused of his ungrateful mentality towards the creator. In view of these
circumstances, the Gathic passage may be interpreted thus (Y. 32:8 ab):

\[
aēṣəm aēnaŋəm \quad Vīvahvoō sīvī Yimasṣīt
\]

\[
yə məlyŋ ēixnušō ahmāŋāng gāuš bagāflows xəärmnō
\]

Of these infringements (guilty) was heard even Yima (Jam), son of Viwah-
vant,

who (was-)used-to-eat (xəärmnō) (the flesh of cattle), (saying) ‘Desirous-
of-satisfying (ēixnušō) our human beings (is) the ox (gāuš) by the dis-
tribution (of its own flesh).’

The text refers to the ox, and not to Yima, as desirous of satisfying human
beings — a conception as is reproduced in the exposition of Jam’s 10th precept.
The target of the reproach given by Zoroaster (Yasna 32:12) is the capricious or
freely slaughter of ox like that by karpan and usig — slaughter prepared for
instant occurrence as occasion demands, irrespective of the age and growth of
the victims. In my opinion, therefore, Yasna 29 is a chapter on soothing the
(spirits of) ox, by making it aware of its own cosmogonical situation.

In his review, Dr. Yutaka Iwamoto (岩本裕), professor of Sōka (創価)
University, criticizing my work ‘Zoroaster Kenkyū (ゾロアスター研究)’, Tokyo
1979 (first edition), on the authority of the truism that the Gāthā is the
first-rate source for the study on Zoroaster and his work, said that the Zoroastrian traditions contained in the Denkard (Book VII and others), and accordingly their Japanese rendering by me, are of no help for the study on Zoroaster and Zarathustrianism. His least knowledge, well-nigh to ignorance, in the Iranian linguistics and philology has become the undoing of his criticism—criticism having recourse to slander and ridicule of my work, and, on occasion, even of myself, without any regard to linguistic treatment, and fallen therefore into perdition. Only a few examples can be given here. When he refers to my treatment of the Zoroastrian 6th seasonal festival, Hamaspaśmaēdaya, with its Middle Persian appellative Frawardīgān, he, cutting up unreasonably my proposal that the original form of the term ‘U-ra(n)-bon (盂蘭盆)’—a sort of Sino-Japanese Frawardigan—is *Hufrāwardan, maintains that it came from Sogdian ṛrw’n ‘soul’, claimed by him to be read *uruwân. In his assertion, Prof. Iwamoto ignored three facts. First, no Middle Iranian languages know such a form as *uruwân, but only ruwân or arwân (ຽိန္). Secondly, *uruwân requires, not ṛrw’n, but *uruw’n as is evident from the Sogdian transcription ṛwp of Sanskrit upa. Is he the last to laugh out of court, if there were an Iranist who asserts perversely to read upa what is written a pa in Devanagari script? The alleged form *uruwân cannot theoretically be justified, because non etymological is, against his pretence, the initial u- of Av. urvan- m. ‘soul’ in distinction to that of Av. urvarā- f. ‘plant’ with u- to live on in Middle Iranian urwar. And thirdly, the pre-Islamic Iranian tradition looked upon fravāšis, save with a few exceptions, as visitant to this world during the Frawardīgān festival. Likewise deteriorates his statement into ravings that the term Frawardīgān continues into New Persian Farwardin ‘the first month’ (<MP Frawardin!).

Prof. Iwamoto, so smattering in Iranistics but non the less robust and undaunted, has shown himself unworthy to criticize my linguistic production. I am much afraid that the readers at home and abroad of his feigned review may look upon it as a realization of the present day Iranian studies in this country and that the young university students, unaware of Iranian linguistics, may be infused with absurd knowledge by his criticism already set forth in print but also eventually passing his own lips.

Notes
(1) For Pahlavica I, see Orient, Vol. XV, 1979, pp. 55-63, of which errata are given here: p. 56, l. 32 filiation → filiation; p. 60, l. 28 Iranian → Iranian, l. 34 Pērōz, → Pērōz‘;

(3) < > means added by me.
[ ] means omitted by me.
* = means the part taken by me for the original commentary.
( ) means explanatory part in my translation.
+ means emended by me.
(5) DkD and DkM yw w d of which the initial yw came from Pazand J, hence yw w d is to be read Jōy ‘canal, canal-water’. The ‘canal’ here means most probably ‘kaharēz, kahas’ i.e. qanāt. Concerning the legendary tradition referring to Jam and the canals, see Jos. Markwart: “Das Naurōz. Seine Geschichte und seine Bedeutung”, Dr. Modi Memorial Volume, Bombay 1930, p. 736.
(6) Here a contamination lies, it seems, between ̄p̄ād ̄and̄ar hāmīn hambār ... sāxtān ‘to lay hand on summer store’ and ̄and̄ar hāmīn hambār ... sāxtān ‘to make store... in summer’. See p. 176 l. 19.
(7) The reading after Menasce, p. 284 ‘(pour) engraisser (frapthišn)’.
(8) DkD and DkM yw w d of which the initial yw came from Pazand J, hence yw w d is to be read Jōy ‘canal, canal-water’. The ‘canal’ here means most probably ‘kaharēz, kahas’ i.e. qanāt. Concerning the legendary tradition referring to Jam and the canals, see Jos. Markwart: “Das Naurōz. Seine Geschichte und seine Bedeutung”, Dr. Modi Memorial Volume, Bombay 1930, p. 736.
(9) Viz. ‘with the 4th year’.
(10) The paragraph wholly reconstructed by me.
(12) mewag mewag i mard ud ̄zan drōšidan i bun ‘to brand on every first fruit of man and woman’ means ‘to circumscribe’.
(13) awālīdāg (‘w’lytk|), ppp. of awālīdan, came from Old Persian *ā-vard- (Old Iranian *ā-varz-, Sanskrit ā-orj- ‘bring into possession of, procure of, appropriate’). ̄p̄ād ̄im 10 ... and̄arz ... awālīdāg is a participial construction, meaning ‘(having been) occupied by, or fascinated by these 10 precepts’. Menasce, p. 285, construes differently and translates: +āraytak nipik bun kart ‘il inaugura le Livre de la Loï’.
(14) Mūlag ̄i-s sarādāg ‘Moses, his ally (viz. ally of Abrahām)’ sarādāg (slytk|), with -y- intended perhaps to reproduce s (cf. Av. sarōda-), may be identified with sarādāg (slytk|) ‘sort, kind’. Menasce, p. 285, inconvincingly translates it ‘Moïse, le troisième’. In that the history of Jewish patriarchs fails to suggest such an interpretation, I owe much to my friend Mr. Naomichi Jin (神直道).
(15) Yaśūg *borzawand *i *i aza Mūlag a∫nūd ̄būdd ‘Joshua the lofty who had heard from Moses’ is my emendation of Yaśūg blywwd (of which -yw-=Pazand J) ̄būdd, which Menasce, p. 285, interprets: ‘Josué bar Nun qui fut le disciple de Moïse (viz. Yašūk ̄bun *Nun *i *avè Māšāk *hāwiš *būdd’).
(17) The description refers to what is to take place in the 5th century of the millenium of Uṣēdar, when the winter of Malkōs passes away and Jam’s Enclosure is opened.
(18) 1ō māzdēn 1ḥēd, or else to be emended to *1ķū māzdēn 1ḥēd ‘You who are Mazdayasnians! (Let no one ...)

(19) Cf. Yašt 19: 34. Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg (ed. by B. N. Dhabhar, Bombay 1913, pp. 101–102), XXXI, 1, §§ 9–10, says: Ohrmazd said ‘By me the Revelation was first made to Jam from among corporeal beings. When he should have been wiser, he stood on the way of Ahreman and dēws. (10) And he said thus “The water I created. The earth I created. The plants I created. The sun I created. The moon I created. The star(s) I created. And the sky I created. The cattle(s) I created. The human being(s) I created. All of the corporeal creatures I created.” ... And with that false telling, the kingly xᵛ aranah was taken away from him ....’ See also (p. 103) XXXI, 3, §§ 4–6.

(20) bagā, instr. sg. of *baga-, n. ‘distribution’. ‘by distribution’ means ‘by having (its own flesh) distributed (among human beings)’. Or bagā instr. sg. of baga- m. (cf. Skt. bhaga- m.) ‘welfare’, and the text may be interpreted thus: ‘Desirous-of-satisfying our human beings (is) the ox with welfare (i.e. by giving them welfare with its own flesh, in other word, by bestowing them life as long as possible, if not eternal).’ In regard to my former interpretation, see my work above referred to (p. 178), pp. 314, 329. S. Insler: The Gāthās of Zarathustra (Acta Iranica, Vol. 8) (1975), pp. 47 c. n. 7, & 204 interprets bagā as nom. sg. of baga- f. ‘goddess’, which is, however, not probable.

(21) 悛樓羅 (Karura, Skt. Garuda), No. 1, Kyoto 1980, pp. 3–16.

(22) Meaning ‘(festival) of the honourable deceased’. The form is liable to be construed differently through metanalysis as hufrawar-dān, with a last member meaning ‘container, tray’. 闩 ‘tray’ is a half transcription abbreviated of -wardān and a half translation of -dān. In fact, up to at least AD 627–649 when Xuan-ying (玄奘)* pointed out the error of the folk etymological interpretation, 孟蘭盆 had for a long time been interpreted as a festival in which trays called 孟蘭盆 of food and others are offered to the fravāşis. In my opinion, such a prevailing belief rather points to the fact that an original form of 孟蘭盆 must have involved an ingredient apt to be taken for ‘tray’ as I have proposed. For further details, see my work above referred to (p. 178), pp. 296–307.