



Revelations, Theology, and Poetics in the Gathas

MARTIN SCHWARTZ

This article is devoted to a close comparative examination of several hitherto underevaluated passages in the Gathas in which Zarathushtra reports his experiences of revelations of the divine realm and its plan for mankind. This examination will treat the close relationships, as to both form and content, between the relevant passages, which are in Y(asnas) 30 (revelation through a dream) and 45, 43, and 31 (revelation through a vision). In addition, the main revelatory portion of Y 30 will be shown to have an impor-

tant influence on the phraseology and thought of the first half of the non-revelatory text of Y 32. My exegesis will include sections on Zarathushtra's self-identification; the role of Aramati (Regular Thought), and related issues of monotheism/polytheism in the Gathas; the Two Spirits and the origin of Zoroastrian dualism, and related issues of Zarathushtra's theology. Gathic recasting of elements of the Old Avestan (!) prototype of the Hōm-Yašt (Y 9–11) will also be demonstrated.

Revelation through a Dream

This is Zarathushtra's account of how the two Spirits were revealed to him in a dream:¹

- 30.1a *at tā waxšyā išantah yā mazdāōā yat-cit wīdušai*
b *stautā-ca ahurāi yasniyā wahauš manahah*
c *humanzdrāi artāya-ca yā raucahbiš darsatā wrāzā*
- 30.2a *srauta gaušāiš wahištā ā wainata sucā manahā*
b *āwarnāu wiciōahya naram naram hwahyāi tanu'ai*
c *parah mazah ya'ahah ahmāi sazdyāi baudantah pati*
- 30.3a *at tā manyū parwiyai yā yamā hwafnā asruwātam*
b *manahi-ca wacahi-ca šyauθnai hi wahyah akam-ca*
c *a'ās-ca huda'ahah rš wi šyata nait dužda'ahah*
- 30.1 Lo! I shall speak, O you who seek, about the things to be understood, indeed, by the knower, with Good Mind's praise and worshipfulness for the very Wise Lord and, for Rightness—the things to be seen with/in bliss amidst the lights.
- 30.2 Hear the best things with your ears, look with your mind in brightness at the two options of choosing [sides] which, man by man, personally, consciously, must be declared to Him before the great [chariot race-] contest.²
- 30.3 Lo! The twin Spirits at the beginning were heard through a dream, the better and the bad one in mind, word, and deed, those (two) between whom also the beneficent choose rightly, but not the maleficent.

The directive to see [i.e. visualize, contemplate, distinguish] is accompanied by a directive to 'hear the best things with the ears,' which, in addition to the obvious reference to listening to the boons announced in what follows, is esoterically an instruction literally to hear the sounds of the eschatologically associated term for 'best

things,' *wahištā*, compactly scrambled in 30.1a' at *tā waxšyā išantah* and 30.1' *yā raucabhiš darsatā wrāzā*. The word *wahištā* is similarly encrypted in the final stanza-pair of Y 30, which returns to the dualized metaphor of the two sides in a chariot race:

- 30.10 *adā-zi awa drujah bu'ati skandah spāyaōrahya*
 b *at āsištā yaujantai ā hušitaiš wahaus manahah*
 c *mazdā'ah artahya-ca yai zazanti wahaū srawahī*
- 30.11a *yat tā wratā sašyata yā mazdāh dadat martiyāhah*
 b *hu'iti anitū yat-ca dargam drugwadbyah rašah*
 c *sawā artawabyah at api tāiš ahati uštā*

30.10 Then will smashing befall the yoking-device of Wrong, but the swiftest ones will stay yoked at the fine dwellings of Good Mind and Wisdom and of Rightness, and will be those who will win in good fame.

30.11 When you have learned the mandates which Wisdom has delivered, O mortals, the easy passage and the impasse, and how for the wrongsome will be long ruin, but boons for the righteous, then thereby will all things be as wished.

In view of the linkage between 30.2a' *srauta* 'hear ye' and 30.3a' *asruwātām* 'the two [Spirits] were heard [in a dream],' I suggest that the decryption of the scrambled sounds (30.2) offered initiates a kind of experiential parallel to Zarathushtra's hearing spirit-voices in a dream state (30.3). The overt message of 30.2 generalizes, at the level of human action, what was revealed in the dream concerning the primordial Spirits, the correlation being the choice [*wi ũci*: 30.2b' *wiciōahya*, 30.3c *wi šyata < wi *cyata*] between the opposed principles.

We may now consider the Spirits reported as heard via a dream. 30.a' *hwafna-* (vulgate <x'afna->) unquestionably means 'dream'.¹³ Zarathushtra's account of his dream of the twin Spirits does have one apparent problem: usually dreams are said to be seen [e.g. MPers. *xwamn didan*, Pers. *xwāb didan* 'to see a dream' = 'to dream']. However, *manyu-* 'spirit' is not an object of sight, since it is not a thing (cf. YAv. *mainiiaua-* 'immaterial'), but a causal force, an impulse, impetus, or proclivity (this will be further discussed toward the end of this paper); nowhere is either Spirit described visually in Zoroastrian texts, although the Spirits are at-

tributed thought, action, and speech. It is well known that dreams were commonly cultivated as a source of knowledge in the ancient world, and the Pahlavi transmissions of Zarathushtra's biographies show him having prophetic dreams.

Y 30 and Y 45

Zarathushtra's other account of hearing the two Spirits occurs within the first two stanzas of Y 45, in which he reports the words of the Holy Spirit in conversation with the Malign Spirit. 45.1-2 parallels 30.1-3 in many details: both passages agree in phrasing and contents, both have introductory *at fra/tā waxšyā* 'Lo! I shall speak (out) about (the) . . .'; the address to seekers [*iša-*]; the appeal to understanding (vcrb *mazdā-*) with clarity; the two Spirits at the beginning (*manyū parwiyai*); their different natures; and their contrast as to choice (√*war*) and as to mentality (*manah-*), speech (√*wac*), and action (√*yau-ōna-*). The Malign Spirit is represented in 45.1 by *dušsasti-* 'whose proclamations are evil' (which belongs to a series of pejoratives which avoid the suppressed proper name **ahra- manyu-*; cf. the

paraphrase in 45.2 *manyū* . . . *yam ahrām*, anticipating the myth, known from later Avestan and Pahlavi sources, in which the Malign Spirit ruins Mazda's first creation). Simultaneously *dušsasti-* designates the Malign Spirit's poet-

priest, whose utterances 'destroy existence' (*vmark + ahu-*) as at 45.1d; see 32.9 with 13 seq., 31.1 and 18, and 46.11). Similarly ambiguous is 45.1e *drugwāh* 'the wrongsome one.'

45.1a *at fra waxšyā nū gušadwam nū srauta*
 b *yai-ca asnāt yai-ca dūrāt išaθa*
 c *nū im wiswā ciθrah-zi mazdāhadwam*
 d *nait dbitiyam dušsastis ahum mršyāt*
 e *akā warnā drugwāh hizu'ā āwrtah*

45.2a *at fra waxšyā ahaus manyū parwiyai*
 b *yayāh swanyāh uti mrawat yam ahrām*
 c *nait nah manāh nait sanhā nait xratawah*
 d *naida warnā nait uxθā naida šyauñā*
 e *nait dayanāh nait ru'anah hacantai*

45.1 Lo! I shall speak out; now hear, now listen,
 you who seek from near and from far.
 Now, understand all this, for it is clear. He whose proclamations are evil should not destroy
 existence for a second time, having been elected, the Wrongsome One, via the tongue, through
 bad choice.

45.2 Lo! I shall speak out about the two Spirits at the beginning of existence, when the Holier was
 to say thus with regard to the Malign one:
 "Neither our minds, nor our speech, nor intellect
 nor choices, nor words, nor deeds
 nor envisionments, nor souls are in accord."

45.2a 'At the beginning of existence' indicates the point at which Zarathushtra places himself in reporting his revelation. Since from this perspective of absolute origin the events were about to occur, he uses the subjunctive *mrawat* 'will tell, is to tell.' The 'this' (*im*) of 45.1c, masculine in gender (as also *ciθrah* 'clear'), announcing something to be heard and understood, refers to the *manθra*, the poetic verbal formulation, mentioned explicitly at 45.3c (*im* . . . *manθram*). The *manθra* itself is given at 45.7 (as a climactic summing up of 45.3–6).

A prayer that there be made manifest 'the best things' (*wahištā*, itself likely coming as a climax after two other forms in *wah-*), introduces 45.7, which begins with another scrambling encryption of *wahištā*. 45.7 itself serves as transition to 45.8, which alludes to the vision which is the basis of 45.3–7 and begins the second part of the poem, and also, via its correspondences with 45.6 (*stau-* 'to praise,' *wahma-* 'eulogy,' *swanta/wahumanyu-* 'Holy/Good Spirit'), frames the *manθra* at 45.6.

45.6a *at fra waxšyā wiswāna'am mazištam*
 b *stawas artā yah huda'ah yai hanti*
 c *swantā manyū srautu mazdāh ahurah*
 d *yahya wahmai wahū fraši manahā*
 e *ahya xratū fra mā sāstu wahištā*

45.7a *yahya sawā iša'anti rādahah*
 b *yai-zi jiwā āhur-ca bu'anti-ca*

c *amrtāti artaunah ru'ā aišah*
 d *utāyutā yā nrnš sādṛā drugwantah*
 e *tā-ca xšaθrā mazdāh dāmiš ahurah*

- 45.6. Lo! I shall speak out about the greatest of all things,
 praising with Rightness Him Who is beneficent to those who are.
 May Wisdom the Lord listen with the Holy Spirit.
 May he in Whose eulogy I have consulted with Good Mind
 teach me, through His intellect, the best things!
- 45.7 For those who are alive, who were, and will be,
 will seek to thrive from his solicitude.
 The soul of the righteous will be mighty in immortality,
 but grief will befall wrongsome men in perpetuity,
 and through such dominion is Wisdom, the Creator, Lord.

Digression: Encryptions in the Reports of the Revelation

An examination of this *manθra* and the two stanzas which enclose it will help establish the relative chronology and other details of the relationship between Y 30 and Y 45. In 30.1a *waxšyā . . . widušai* 'I shall speak . . . to the knowing' represents an Indo-European formula, with essential elements a verb 'be vocal' plus 'to the knowing,' which is meant to alert the initiated audience that cryptic language is present; cf. in Greek φωνάεντα συνετοίσιον 'having sounds for those who understand' in Pindar's *Second Olympian Ode*, 92, introducing a scrambling encryption,⁴ and RV 4.19.10, introducing a riddle [which I intend to discuss elsewhere]. Further examples of the formulaic introduction to cryptic language will be given below.

With regard to the relative chronology of our passages in Y 30 and Y 45, various facts suggest the priority of Y 30: At its outset, Y 30 introduces linguistic crypticism, providing the most basic and full formula-type I have just described, in whose specific wording here, *at tā waxšyā išantah . . . widušai*, is especially designed to encrypt

wahištā. A similar phraseology is found at 45.1, *at fra waxšyā . . . išaθa*, minus the traditional *widušai* 'to the knowing' and without an attempt to encrypt *wahištā* or any other immediately collocated material. When Y 45 does encrypt *wahištā* at 45.7a (immediately after the overt *wahištā* at the end of 45.6e), the encryption is unsignalled and draws on the precedent of Y 30 even in its details, since 45.7a *sawā iša'anti* in effect combines forms used to encrypt *wahištā* in Y 30, i.e., *išantah* in its first line, and *sawā* in its last. Finally, the passage in Y 30 is emphatically reported as a dream-revelation, while the equivalent in Y 45 lacks such notice. In addition to this conventional Indo-European cryptic device, we shall presently see Zarathushtra's technique of encryption through initials, to which the introductory formula 'be vocal to the knowing' is extended.

We may now return to our comparison of Y 30 and Y 45. 30.4 continues the dream-revelation of the two Spirits:

30.4a *at-ca yat tā ham manyū jasaitam parwiyam dazdai*
 b *gayam-ca aiyātim-ca yat-ca ahat apamam ahuš*
 c *acištah drugwata'am at artaunai wahištam manah*

- 30.4 And when the Spirits came together in the beginning, they established life and not-living, so that at the end the existence of the wrongsome would be the worst, but for the righteous, Best Mind.

In *ham . . . jasaitam* the injunctive is, as usual, ambiguous as to whether it refers to a narrative past or narrative present, but the translation as present follows the formal pres. mid. dual *daz-dai* 'they establish, they determine.' The present tense is used here in the dream's perspective of events at the beginning, when their end was also determined. Cf. my remarks on 45.2b below. 'They came together' (*ham . . . jasaitam*) may be taken as both 'they came into encounter,' cf. the

confrontational remarks of the Holy Spirit at 45.2, and 'they came at the same time' with *ham* adverbial, as sometimes Vedic *sam*. Our text uses the stem *jasa-* to describe the comings of each: 30.6 states that 'Deception' (*dbauman-*) came upon [*ā . . . upa jasat*] the *daiwas* as they were deliberating, so that they opted for Worst Mind and rushed into wrath, whereby mortals afflict existence. In contrast to this is the advent of the Holy Spirit:

- 30.7a *ahmāi xšaθrā jasat manahā wahū artā-ca*
 b *at kṛpam utāyutiš dadat aramatiš amma*
 c *aiša'am tai ā ahat ādānāiš parwiyah⁵*

- 30.7 To that [existence] He (the Holy Spirit) came via Dominion, with Good Mind and with Rightness. Endurance gave body, and Regular Thought (gave) breath. Through the requitals of those [afflictors], [that existence] will come about for Thee [as it was] first.

Revelation through a Vision

I shall now discuss what the Pahlavi biographies of Zarathushtra (chiefly in *Dēnkird* II and *Zād-spram* from the lost Avestan *Spand Nask*) describe in detail as Zarathushtra's first visionary

encounter with Good Mind.⁶ Our first text, which represents the vision itself, consists of 45.8 plus 45.3–4:

- 45.8a *tam nah stautāiš namahā ā wiwaršah*
 b *nū zi it cašmani wi ā darsam*
 c *wahauš manyauš šyauθnahya uxθahya*
 d *widuš artā yam mazda'am ahuram*
 e *at hai wahmanh dmānai garah ni dāma*

- 45.8 Him am I wishing to affect, with praises in reverence, for His favor, for just now I have gazed upon Him in a vision of deed and word from the Good Spirit, having seen, with Rightness, Him Who is Wisdom the Lord—so let us deposit eulogies for Him in the House of Song!

- 45.3a *at fra waxšyā ahaus ahya parwiyam*
 b *yam mai widwāh mazdāh waucat ahura*
 c *yai im wah nait iθa manθram waršanti*
 d *yaθa in(am!) manāi-ca wauca'ā-ca*
 e *aibyah ahaus awai ahat apamam*

- 45.4a *at fra waxšyā ahaus ahya wahištam*
 b *artāt hacā mazdāh waida yah im dāt*
 c *ftaram wahauš warzayantah manahah*
 d *at hai dugdā hušyauθnā aramatiš*
 e *nait diþžadyāi wiswahišas ahurah*

- 45.3 Lo! I shall speak out about this existence's first thing, which the Lord Wisdom, the Knower, told me—

those of you who do not put this thing into effect, this *manōra*,
just as I think it and shall tell it,
the word “woe” will be their existence’s last thing!

- 45.4 Lo! I shall speak out about this existence’s best thing
in accord with Rightness — Wisdom, who created it — I know
as Father of energetic Good Mind,
and His daughter is good-deceded Regular Thought.
Not to be deceived is the Lord Whose ties reach everything.

Dream to Vision: Form and Content in the Revelatory Accounts

In contrast with the relationship between 30.1–3 and 45.3–4, 30.4 [seq.] and 45.3–4 are very different with regard to the information each passage communicates. However, a close formal relationship emerges through a plastic rearrangement of the phraseology of 30.4 [seq.] to yield the iconistic aspects of 45.3–4, which will presently be discussed at length: We start with the penultimate words in 30.4, *parwiyam* ‘first,’ *apamam*

‘last,’ and *wahištam* ‘best,’ retaining with the midmost word, *apamam*, the flanking words which alliterate, with it, i.e. *ahat* ‘will be’ and *ahuš* ‘existence.’ From these we then derive the last words of 45.3a, 45.3e, and 45.4a with their preceding phrases, 45.3a and 45.4a *ahauš ahya* and, alliterating with these, 45.3e *ahauš . . . ahat*:

30.4a”	<i>parwiyam</i>	>	45.3a”	<i>ahauš ahya parwiyam</i>
30.4”	<i>ahat apamam ahuš</i>	>	45.3e	<i>ahauš . . . ahat apamam</i>
30.4c”	<i>wahištam</i>	>	45.4a”	<i>ahauš ahya wahištam</i>

For its part, 45.3a *at fra waxšyā ahauš ahya parwiyam* parallels 45.4a *at fra waxšyā ahauš manyū parwiyai*, cf. 30.3a” *manyū parwiyai* and 30.4a *manyū . . . parwiyam*. Again with *parwiyā*- ‘first,’ the alliteration of the closure 30.7c *aiša’am tai ā ahat ayahā adānaiš parwiyah* (in which *parwiyam* via 30.7a” *ahmāi* refers back to 30.6c” *ahum* ‘existence’ acc.) is perfected in 45.3e *aibyah ahauš awai ahat apamam*.

In itself, 45.3 is constructed to have line-end emphasis of ‘first/beginning’ in the first line, ‘last/end’ in the last line, these first and last lines matched through shared *ahauš* [. . .] *ah-*, in which the last line has its inexorable finality dramatically emphasized by total *a-* alliteration, and internal assonances *ai*, *aha*, and *au* (each twice). Contained within this frame are three lines, all coordinatedly beginning with the relative pronominal base *ya-*, and in these three lines are four two-word phrases with initials *m* and *w* (*mai widwāh*, *mazdāh waucat*, *manōram waršanti*, *manāi-ca wauca’ā-ca*). The repeated initials *m-w-* encrypt *manah-wahu-*, the occasional variant

of *wahu-manah-* ‘Good Mind’ (also called *wahišta-manah-* ‘Best Mind’).

With the four *m-w-* phrases decrypting as the initials symbolizing *manah-wahu-* (the occasional variant of *wahu-manah-* ‘Good Mind,’ also called *wahišta-manah-* ‘Best Mind’), 45.3 is an iconic representation of the central role of Good Mind in the framework of the scheme whereby the beginning of things was constituted so there would be justice through requitals at the end. This foregrounded representation is comparable with the emphasis achieved through the surprise ending of 30.4: The Spirits coming together in the beginning has the result that ‘the existence of the wrongsome is the worst, but for the righteous, [the] Best Mind’ [against expected ‘the best [existence]’]; for the eschatological reference of Best Mind, cf. 30.2a *wahištā . . . manahā* ‘the best things . . . with the mind . . .’ or ‘with Best Mind.’ 30.4c” ‘Best Mind’ has its actual contrast in 30.6b”, the choice of ‘Worst Mind.’

Apart from the decryptive hints of the context, the presence of an encryption is signaled by 45.3b

mai widwāh mazdāh waucat 'Wisdom, the Knower, told me,' a variant of the formula-type involving speech to 'the knowing' and exemplified earlier in the poem by 45.1 *fra waxšyā . . . im . . . mazdāhadwam* 'I shall speak out . . . understand it [or: show it wisdom],' with 45.3 and 45.1 associated through shared *im* 'this, it,' at 45.3 referring to the *manθra*.

45.3[-4] contains a gestalting, via a coordination of phrasal and symbolic phonic features, which represents, in a single "bird's eye" glance, the broad scope of the revelation: The Lord Wisdom, through His Spirit, so established things at the beginning of existence via the intermediation of Good Mind, such that everything will have a just resolution at the end of existence. The details of 45.8 plus 45.3-4 have correspondences in 31.6-9 and 43.56, details which, as 43.7 seq. shows, represent what Pahlavi literature describes as the first visionary revelation received by Zarathushtra. As an assemblage of these details, 45.3-4 plus 45.8 may be regarded as a tem-

plate of this vision. Within the template of 45.8 + 45.3-4, the following further details are contained which are variously recast in passages of Y 31 and Y 43: (1) Good/Best Mind is emphasized through some dramatic feature of style. (2) The Holy Spirit figures in some connection with Good Mind. (3) Firstness (*parwiya-*) is prominent, either in relation to lastness (in 45.3, *a' parwiyam* vs. *e' apamam*) or treated in terms of its various aspects. Thus 45.3a' *parwiyam* is alternatively 'for the first [time of existence]' *vis-à-vis* 45.1d' *dbitiyam* 'for the second [time in existence]'; cf. 45.2a' *parwiyai* 'in the beginning,' grammatically contrastive with 45.3a' *parwiyam*; or 45.3a' *parwiyam* as 'foremost,' parallel to 45.4a' *wahištām* 'best' (both referring to 'thing' or *manθra*). (4) The theme of *ahu-*'existence'; (5) Wisdom the Lord is not only Creator (*vḍā*, noun *dāmi-*, cf. 45.4b' with 45.7e''), but progenitor. Finally (6) *Aramati* (Regular Thought) is personified in a juridical or arbitral role.

The Vision in Y 31

These are the relevant stanzas of Y 31:

- 31.4a *yadā artam zau'iyam ahan mazdās-ca ahurāhah*
 b *artī-ca aramati wahištā išā manahā*
 c *mabya xsāθram aujahwat yahya wrdā wanaima drujam*
- 31.5a *tat mai wi cidyāi wauca yat mai artā dāta wahyah*
 b *widwai wahū manahā man-ca dadyāi yahya mā ršiš*
 c *tā-cit mazdā ahura yā nait-wā ahāt ahāti-wā*
- 31.6a *ahmāi ahāt wahištām yah mai widwāh wauca'at haθyam*
 b *manθram yam harwatātah artahya amrtātas-ca*
 c *mazdā'ai awat xsāθram yat hai wahū waxšat manahā*
- 31.7a *yas-tā manta parwiyah raucahbiš raiθwan hu'āθrā*
 b *hau xraθwā dāmiš artam yā dārayat wahištām manah*
 c *tā mazdā manyū uxšyah yah ā nūram-cit ahura hāmah*
- 31.8a *at θwā manhi parwiyam mazdā yazum stai manahā*
 b *wahauš ftaram manahah yat θwā ham cašmani grabam*
 c *haθyam artahya dāmim ahauš ahuram šyauθnaišu*
- 31.9a *θwai as aramatiš θwah ā gauš tašā ašxratuš*
 b *manyuš mazdā ahura*

- 31.4 When Rightness is to be invoked, Wisdom and the other Lords are present, with Reward and Regular Thought. With Best Mind I seek mighty dominion for myself, through whose growth we can defeat Wrong.

- 31.5 Tell me that which has been brought forth for me, so that it may be discerned as that which is better, and that I may know, and there be comprehended through me, that of which I am the seer — (tell me) what things will not be, and what will be.
- 31.6 The best thing will be for him, who, knowing, will tell me the real *manθra* of Rightness' Integrity and Immortality. For Wisdom, dominion is such that one may increase it through Good Mind.
- 31.7 He Who first thought (out) easeful spaces to be mingled with the lights, He, through intellect, is creator in respect to Rightness, by which He holds Best Mind. Thereby He is to be increased through Spirit, yet until now indeed (is/art) the same, O Lord Wisdom.
- 31.8 And I first thought Thee, O Wisdom, to be youthful through (my/Thy) mind, and the Father of Good Mind, once I grasped Thee in vision—(Thee,) the real Creator of Rightness, and the Lord of existence amidst actions.
- 31.9a-b' Unto Thee was Regular Thought; Thine the Fashioner of the Cow, that Spirit, full of intellect, O Lord Wisdom.

Close correspondences with 45.3–4 + 45.8 are 31.8b' *cašmani* 'in a vision'; 31.8b' *wahauš ftaram manahah* 'Father of Good Mind' = 45.4c *ftaram wahauš . . . manahah*; and 31.6a–b (after *ahat wahištam*, cf. 45.4a *ahauš ahya wahištam*) *yah mai widwāh wauca'at . . . manθram*, cf. 45.3b *yam mai widwāh . . . waucat . . . manθram*.⁷ The difference between [45.3] 'the Knowing One' who tells Zarathushtra the *manθra*, and [31.6] the

'knowing' initiate who 'will tell' it back to him, is based on the threefold reference of *widwāh* 'knower, knowing' to divinity, intermediating poet-priest, and initiate. The last two figure in another passage of Y 31 in which the initials of *wahu- manah-* are emphasized alongside the overt form in a decryptive hint:

- 31.17a *katāram artāwā-wā drugwāh-wā wrnuwatai mazyah*
 b *widwāh widušai mrautu mā awidwāh api dbāwayat*
 c *zdi nah mazdā ahura wahauš fradaxštā manahah*
- 31.18a *ma-ciš at-wah drugwatah manθrans-ca gušta sāsnās-ca*
- 31.19a *gušta yah manta artam ahumbiš widwāh ahura*
 b *ržuxθai wacaha'am xšayammah hizu'ah wasah*
- 31.17 Whom should one believe more — (is it) the righteous or the wrongsome one? Let knower tell knower, and let not the unknowing one deceive. Be for us, O Lord Wisdom, the revealer of Good Mind!
- 31.18a Let none of you listen to the *manθras* and doctrines of the wrongsome one . . .
- 31.19a–b He has listened to Rightness, having thought upon it, O Lord, a healer of existence, a knower, endowed with control over his tongue at will for right utterance of words.

Good/Best Mind figures in every stanza of 31.4–8, and is prominent in 31.4 and 7 as agency which increases the divine dominion. The combination of Aramati and Holy Spirit is found in 31.9 (with the theme of the "Cow" = the Good

dayanā i.e. Envisionment) fashioned by the Holy Spirit.⁸ The combination is resumed at 31.12 (again with contrast of poet-priests). Here the arbitrativ aspect of Aramati is manifest:

- 31.12a *athra wācam barati miṭahwacāh-wā ršwacāh-wā*
 b *widwāh-wā awidwāh-wā ahya zrdā-ca manahā*
 c *ānušaxš aramatiš manyū prsātai yaθra maiθā*

31.12 There, where one brings forth speech, be he false-speaking or true-speaking, knowing or unknowing, with his heart and mind, Regular Thought, consulting with Spirit, brings accord where there is indecision.

The foregoing illuminates 31.17 seq., which will also clarify 31.6–8.

The “knowing” and “unknowing” poet-priests are again the subject of 31.17 (seq.), but here there is also reference to the “knowing” initiate. These terms serve in the initials *w- m-* symbolizing Good Mind, which is also named overtly at 31.7c (as that which is to be revealed!). Cf. 51.8, where “knower” refers once to the divinity and once to the initiate, and, as in the other passages encrypting Good mind, *manθra-* is mentioned, and there is a decryptive hint in the immediately preceding phrase *manahā wahū sanhai* ‘for proclaiming with Good Mind’. 31.17 seq. underscores the difference in emphasis between 45.3 (the “knowing” divinity transmits the *manθra* to Zarathushtra for him to transmit it) and 31.6 (the “knowing” initiate repeats the *manθra* back to Zarathushtra). 31.7b shows the same variant of *w- m-*, i.e. *w- w- m- m-*, as 31.5c (where the overt *wahu- manah-* are the central words).

Zarathushtra’s account of Mazdā in 31.7 is matched by his self-description in 31.8. The first hemistich in each of the two stanzas has *√man* ‘think’ + *parwiya-* ‘first’; in detail, Mazdā as the first to think out the world scheme, whereby he creates Rightness, and “holds” Best Mind, is matched by Zarathushtra, who first thought out the fact of Mazdā being the Creator of Rightness, and (in his vision/eye) “grasps” Him as Father of Good Mind. Syntactically, *manhi parwiyam* could have *parwiyam* as a masc. acc. instead of an adverbial, hence referring also to Mazdā’s firstness as that which Zarathushtra perceives.

The Vision in Y 43

Closely related to both 31.8 and 45.3–4 is 43.5–6, which, with accompanying stanzas, supplies the most detailed account of the vision:

- 43.4a *at θwā manhāi taxmam-ca swantam mazdā*
 b *yat tā zastā yā tū hafši awa’ah*
 c *yāh dāh artiš drugwatai artaunai-ca*
 d *θwahya garmā āθrah artā’aujahah*
 e *yat mai wahauš hazah jamat manahah*
- 43.5a *swantam at θwā mazdā manhi ahura*
 b *yat θwā ahauš zanθai darsam parwiyam*
 c *yat dāh šyauθnā miždawān yā-ca uxθā*
 d *akam akāi wahwim artim wahawai*
 e *θwā hunarā damaiš wraisai apamai*
- 43.6a *yahmi swantā θwā manyū jasad*
 b *mazdāh xšaθra ahmi wahū manahā*
 c *yahya šyauθnāiš gaiθāh artā frādantai*
 d *aibyah ratūš sanhatai aramatiš*
 e *θwahya xratauš yam nait-ciš dābayati*
- 43.7a *swantam at θwā mazdā manhi ahura*
 b *yat mā wahū pari jasat manahā*
 c *prsat mā ciš ahi kahya ahi*

- 43.4 'And I will think Thee valiant and holy, O Mazdā, when Thou shalt help with the hand in which Thou maintainest those rewards which Thou hast established for wrongsome and righteous through the heat of Thy Fire, which is mighty with Rightness, so that the seizing force of Good Mind will come unto/upon me.
- 43.5 And holy I did think Thee, O Lord Wisdom, when I saw Thee first at the birth of existence, when Thou didst establish words and deeds to have requitals, evil for the evil one, good reward for the righteous one, through thy skill at (all) creation's last turning point.
- 43.6 In the turning point at which Thou didst come via Thy Spirit, (being) Wisdom, through Dominion, there/I am with Good Mind, by whose actions material beings are prospered through Rightness. For those Regular Thought proclaims the judgments of Thy intellect, which no one can deceive.
- 43.7 And holy did I think Thee, Lord Wisdom, when He approached me with/as Good Mind, and asked me, 'Who art thou? Whose art thou?'

Corresponding to 31.8a–b at *θwā manhi parwiyam mazdā* . . . *yat θwā ham cašmani grabam mazdā* is 43.5 *swantam at θwā mazdā manhi* . . . *parwiyam* 'Holy did I think Thee, O Wisdom, when I saw Thee first . . .', in which 'I saw' is the equivalent of 'grasped in a vision' (for both cf. 45.8b *cašmani wi ā darsam*). Here again *parwiyam* may refer to Zarathushtra and/or to Mazdā; the latter taken as 'first [at the birth of existence]' would better bring out the equivalence to 'Father.' Formally, 43.5 compares with 45.3 *abauš* . . . *parwiyam* and finale in *apama* 'last,' and contentwise 43.6d–e juxtaposes the anthropomorphized Aramati 'Regular Thought' with Mazdā's indeceivability (*nait + vđab*), like 45.4d–e.

Within Y 43, *swantam at θwā mazdā manhi* (cited above from 43.5 and compared with 31.8) has a dynamic role. 43.4a *at θwā manhāi* . . . *swantam mazdā* 'I shall think Thee Holy, O Wisdom. . .', culminates in 43.4c 'when the seizing force of Good Mind comes unto/upon me' (Av. *hazah* 'seizure, force that seizes'), the "rapture" whereby Good Mind transports Zarathushtra to the supernal realms [providing the experiential basis for 43.3b–d, 'would teach . . . the straight paths of weal . . . to the true realms of being, where the Lord dwells']. The conditions of 43.4 are satisfied as per the theophany of 43.5–6, so that the vow of 43.4a is "fulfilled" by 43.5a 'and Holy I did think Thee, O Wisdom.' The hoped-for advent of Good Mind is expressed in 43.6a–b 'Where Thou didst come via Thy Holy

Spirit . . . there/I am with Good Mind,' in which the ambiguous *ahmi* both supplies the correlation to *yahmi* 'there, at that . . .' and 'I am,' which suggests that Zarathushtra is together with Good Mind at this turning point in history.

It is the agency of Mazdā's Holy Spirit and its coming with Good Mind (43.6a–b *swantā* . . . *manyū* . . . *jasah* . . . *xšāθrā* . . . *wahū manahā*, cf. 30.7a–b *xšāθrā jasat manahā wahū*) which are celebrated in the expansion of 43.5a *swantam at θwā mazdā manhi ahura* 'I did think Thee holy,' etc. by 43.7b *yat mā wahū pari jasat* 'when He/It (the Holy Spirit) approached [*came beside me] with/as Good Mind,' together forming a refrain, which like a mechanical device which has been switched on, recurs as the first two lines in every second stanza from 43.7a–b onward (43.9a–b, 11a–b, 13a–b, and 15a–b). It is this stylistically unique stratagem which emphasizes the role of Good Mind in Y 43.

The same device, albeit less explicitly, also emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit, and leads up to the culmination in the final stanza, 43.16a–b 'And, O Lord Wisdom, Zarathushtra chooses that very Spirit which is Thy Most Holy One.' Furthermore, in the first line of the refrain (43.5a etc.) *swantam* . . . *θwā* . . . *manhi* 'I did think Thee holy' are formally related to 43.6a *swantā θwā manyū* 'via Thy Holy Spirit,' this relationship implying that the Holy Spirit is a modality of special perceptivity which operates in conjunction with Good Mind. Cf. 43.2c–d:

43.2c *θwā cicθwā swaništā manyū mazdā*
 d *yāh dāh artā wahauš māyāh manahah*

43.2c-d Perceiving, through Thy Most Holy Spirit, Good Mind's craftfulness which Thou bringest about with Rightness.

Digression: Zarathushtra's "Firstness"

We may now return to the ambiguity of *parwiyam* 'first[ly],' noted for 31.8 and 43.5. In 43.7 the two questions put to Zarathushtra together

represent a formula, the usual Indo-Iranian way of asking someone for his name and his father's. But Zarathushtra names only himself:

43.8a *at hai auji zaraθuštraḥ parwiyam*
 b *haθyah dwaišāh yat isayā drugwatai*
 c *at artāunai rafnah hya'am aujahwat*

43.8a-c And I declared to him, "Zarathushtra,; firstly,/, I would be a true enemy to the wrongsome one, were I able, but to the righteous I would be a mighty support."

The absence of the father's name has usually been treated as per Humbach 1991, 138 "[cf.] *Ma-hābhārata* 13 app. 3, 2003 post. *ko'si kasyāsi*. In contrast the Skt. passage where *kasya asi* means 'whose descendant art thou?,' the meaning of the OAv. *kahiiā ahī* is 'whose partisan art thou?.' For the latter, Humbach compares Y 10.16 <*ašaonō ahmi druuatō nōiḥ ahmi*>. But the latter usage would apply only to 'whose art thou?,' isolated from the first question.

In fact, one hears the expected *zaraθuštraḥ* **paruša'aswahya* 'Zarathushtra, [son] of Pourushaspa' up to *zaraθuštraḥ parw-*, but the surprise resolution of the latter form as *parwiyam* 'firstly' replaces the awaited representation of the fa-

ther's name, which is otherwise absent from the Gathas but well attested in later Avestan. I would connect this circumstance with the originally Avestan reports of how, under the influence of *karpans*, Pourushaspa had come to fear the child Zarathushtra and made various attempts to murder him (detailed in *Dēnkird* VII, 3). A basis of these accounts in an actual antipathy of Pourushaspa would explain why Zarathushtra avoided naming his father.

Taking the ambiguous *parwiyam* following *zaraθuštraḥ* in 43.8 as 'firstly' in reference to the first question, 'who art thou?,' we may see 43.9c-d as a "spin" on the unanswered second question 'whose art thou?,' treating it in isolation:

43.9c *ahya frasām kahmāi wi widwai waī*
 d *āda θwalmāi aθrai rātām namahah*
 e *artahya ma yawat isāi manya'ai*

43.10a *at tu mai dāiš artam yat ma zauzaumi*

43.9c-e I addressed His question, "As belonging to whom dost thou wish to be distinctly known?" "To [Thee and] Thy Fire, as an offering of reverence." So long as I am able shall I think of Rightness.

43.10a And Thou didst show me Rightness, which I continue to invoke.

43.9 hearkens back to the longed for token of Good Mind's rapturous force, 43.8d 'the heat of Thy Fire, mighty with Rightness.' But another

occurrence on *parwiyam* in Y 43 broadens the interpretation of the word.

43.11c *yat xsmā-uxθāiš didanhai parwiyam*
 d *sādrā mai sans martiyaišu mazdātiš*
 e *tat wrzadyāi yat mai mrauta wahištam*

43.11c-e When (at) first I was instructed by Your words, my faith in mortals seemed grievous as to there being done what you told me was (the) best (thing).

In the most obvious interpretation, Zarathushtra is recording initial doubts about the reception of his preaching, but he may also be referring to

this having been the first time a mortal man was thus instructed:

43.11c-e When for the first time I was taught by Your words, my faith in mortals seemed grievous as to there being put into effect, what you told me was best.

The position relationship between the line-end words *parwiyam* and *wahištam* reflects the same words coordinated at line-ends in 45.3a" and 45.4a", and the connection with the first part of Y 45 is confirmed by 43.11d-e *sādrā . . . martiyaišu . . . wrzadyāi . . . yat mai mrauta wahištam*, which brings together the statements in Y 45 that a grievous situation (45.7d" *sādrā*) will befall those that do not put into effect (45.3b *waršanti*, *√warz*) what Mazdā told Zarathustra was the best for mortals (45.5a"-b" *yat mai mraut . . . martaiyah wahištam*). Since in 45.3a" and 45.4a" *parwiyam* and *wahištam* refer to the *mantra*, the same reference is implied for 43.11c seq.: 'when I was taught that that foremost thing [principle = principal *mantra*] with Your words . . .'. Indeed, the theme of hearkening of revealed words by their being put in to effect (43.11c' *wrzadyāi*) is echoically contained in 43.12c *uz rdyāi* 'may I rise up' [via the revealed words to be hearkened], which leads up to 43.14d-e, where *uz rdyāi* is repeated, with conclusion 'together with all those who repeat Thy *mantras*,' which further compares with 31.6 ('the best thing' for him who says the *mantra* . . .).

The latter passage leads us back to the ambiguous 31.8a' *θwā manhi parwiyam*, 'I thought Thee (to be) the First One' and/or 'For the first time (it was) I (who) thought (i.e. mentally conceived) Thee,' of which we saw the latter alternative the more importantly operative. In Y 43 the fact that there are three instances of *parwiyam* at line-ends in 43.5, 8, and 11 (the mid-most, 43.8, equally separated from 43.5 and

43.11 by the interval of two stanzas) seems to be purposeful.

The meaning 'for the first time (in history),' with reference to Zarathushtra's unique relationship to Mazdā is applicable at 45.5, 8, and 11, albeit in ambiguous constructions. Given Zarathushtra's placement of *parwiyam* where his father's name would ordinarily have been indicated, we may see in *zaraθuštrah parwiyam* part of Zarathushtra's self-identification in terms of his "firstness" in an affiliation to, and adoption by, Mazdā which took place in the beginning of time, where Zarathushtra visionarily witnessed Mazdā (via the Holy Spirit) as Father of Good Mind at the birth of existence; cf. the last stanza, 43.16a-b 'so, O Lord Wisdom, this Zarathushtra chooses that which is Thy most Holy Spirit.' It is via his ritual dedication to Fire, the visible token of Mazdā's justice, that Zarathushtra manifests his adoptive affiliation, as indicated by 43.9, which, with 43.8 (containing *zaraθuštrah* juxtaposed with the focal *parwiyam*) form the two central stanzas of Y 43, which constitute Zarathushtra's elaborate self-identification.

The centrality of Zarathushtra's self-identification in 43.8-9 is based on Y 28. At 28.6 *zaraθuštra-* occurs in the poem's centermost position, followed by *anjahwat rafnah* 'mighty support' and *dwaišāh* 'enmities,' which are recontextualized in 43.8. In the original 8-stanza form of Y 28,⁹ amidst concentric ring-compositional concatenations of word-forms, the original two central lines form a continuity:

28.4c *yawat isāi tawā-ca awat xsa'ai aišai artahya*

28.5a *arta kat θwā darsāni . . .*

28.4c-5a As long as I can and am able, so long shall I look in search of Rightness. Rightness, shall I see Thee . . . ?

These lines form the basis of 43.9c-10a, in which the hoped-for vision of Rightness is treated as having been granted. It is also noteworthy that in

the final version of Y 28, in which *zaraθuštra* is at the center, the outer stanzas concatenate through the words *manyauš* and *parwiya*:

28.1b *manyauš mazdā parwiyam swantahya . . . šyauθnā*

'First of all, through action of the Holy Spirit, [shall I approach Thee], O Wisdom . . .'

28.11b *manyauš hacā θwā āhā yāiš ahuš parwiyah bu'at*

From [Thy] Spirit, with Thy mouth, [teach me to speak] the [words] through which existence will come about as it was at first.

Here we have as framing elements, Holy Spirit with *parwiyam* as 'first of all,' referring to Zarathushtra's action, and *parwiyah*, referring to the first existence; cf. 31.7-8.

Aramati- 'Regular Thought' and the Problem of Polytheism

One of the contents of the "template" of Zarathushtra's vision is called *aramati*. In 45.3 *aramati* is 'daughter' of Mazdā Ahura, in both 45.3 and 43.6 is associated with the 'indeceivable' Mazdā Ahura, and with good deeds, and rewards them [43.6 with 43.16, cf. 43.1; at 43.6 *aramati* proclaims 'norms' (*rātu*-) of judgment, and has an arbitrating capacity [31.12]. The role of Aramati in the visionary texts is reminiscent of that of Dikē 'Justice, Right' who appears in Parmenides' vision as a figure assigning requitals.

The anthropomorphic appearance of Aramati fits her background as a goddess, a status reconstructable for Proto-Iranian and even Indo-Iranian religion, since Aramati is a female divinity in the RgVeda and in post-Gathic Iranian material ranging from texts composed in Elamite for Achaemenid Persepolis, from late Avestan, and from Khotan. Thus it must be admitted that Zarathushtra allowed at least one deity from the ancient pantheon into his religion.

Although Zarathushtra excluded the worship of earlier divinities, the *daiwas*, and promoted Mazdā Ahurā, one should not speak of him as a monotheist. Hitherto the question of whether Zarathushtra was a monotheist has been confused by a theoretically dubious opposition between monotheism and dualism [one can conceive of a monotheistic dualism; cf. the Cathars, etc. Furthermore, strictly speaking, it is the Holy Spirit, not Mazdā, who is dualistically contrasted

with the Malign Spirit, but see below.) A further theoretical complication, whether the conception of Good Mind and Best Rightness as divinities goes against monotheism, or whether, being aspects of Mazdā and different from older gods, they may be included in monotheistic worship, becomes irrelevant with the Gathic presence of a demonstrably old divinity (namely Aramati, to which problem I shall return after a digression).

The very question of Zarathushtra's monotheism is in fact conditioned by the monotheistic backgrounds of the scholars debating the issue. In monotheistic systems—Judaism and Islam furnish the clearest examples—the singularity and uniqueness of God is not only a fact of the system, it is what is foregrounded, emphasized, and ritually reaffirmed as the central fact of the theology. Zarathushtra's dualism differs from monotheism not in posing two supernatural powers, but in that it is dualism that he foregrounds, while never providing a recommendation of monotheism. All he says is that the *daiwas* are not to be worshipped. Zarathushtra's prohibition of *daiwa*-worship is crucial in understanding his religion, although the old scholarly model of a background contrast of two Indo-Iranian categories of gods: **daiwas* and **asuras*, has been definitively refuted from different directions. For Zarathushtra's idea of what *daiwas* were (or rather, were not), the case of Aramati provides the decisive key.

P. O. Skjærvø (2002, 403-8) has the merit of calling to our attention the fact that Aramati was an Indo-Iranian goddess. He is quite correct in marshalling Iranian evidence for Aramati as an earth goddess,¹⁰ a conception with which RV 10.92.5, mentioned by Skjærvø, is not inconsistent. However, *aramati*- as earth goddess does not fit the majority of the many Gathic attestations, nor is a derived concept of 'humility' very persuasive for any of the occurrences in the

Gathas. Skjærø wrongly challenges the derivation of *aramati-* from *aram + vman* ‘to think in correct measure.’ In 32.2 the word clearly represents a moral trait of sincere mortals, and is dualistically contrasted with 32.3 *parimati-* ‘contempt,’ clearly containing *mati-* ‘thought’ < *vman*. The instance of *aramati-* at 45.10 is elaborated by 45.11 *aram manyata* ‘thinks in correct measure,’ this contrasting there with *tarah mansta* <*tarō.mąšta*> and *tarah manyanta*, from *tarah + vman* ‘think improperly, think out of correct measure’; cf. the YAv. canonical contrast of *āramaiti-* with *tarō.maiti-* ‘thought gone wrong, thought beyond proper measure.’

A definition ‘thought which is in correct measure’ actually reconciles the Gathic abstraction as a divinity and as a human quality, and the extra-Avestan (and Vedic) reflexes of *aramati-* for which Skjærø postulates “genius of the earth.”

44.6c *artam syauθnāiš dbanzati aramatiš*
d *tabyah xšāθram wahū cinas manahā*

44.6c–d Regular Thought, through [her] actions, makes Rightness solid, to Thee, with Good Mind, she commits dominion.

The Mazdā-created principle of Rightness (*arta-*, *var* ‘to fit, be fitting’), which includes cosmic order, is materialized by *Aramati* in the physical domain over which Mazdā rules.

30.7a *ahmāi xšāθra jasat manahā artā-ca*
b *at krpam utāyutiš dadat aramatiš amma*

30.7a–b To this [existence] He [the Holy Spirit] came with Good Mind and Rightness; then endurance gives body and Regular Thought gives breath.

Aramati is also associated with birth and plant growth, but in metaphorical application at 48.5–6 (cf. my remarks in Schwartz 2003, 230–36, where I compare 44.9–10 and 46.19).

In Old Avestan outside of the Gathas, in YH 38, dedicated to the earth, nourishments, and waters, *aramati-* again represents the regularity of nature. YH 38.1 designates for worship the earth (*zam-*) and its ‘women,’ and then the ‘women’ are designated *separately* for worship. These are named in a series of plurals at YH 38.2: *ižāh yauštayah fraštayah* ‘energizations, vitalizations, refreshments’ and then *aramatayah*, which, fol-

As ‘Regular/Proper Thought/Thinking,’ *aramati-* would apply to both the mental and physical planes. In the latter domain, *aramati-* is explicable as the hypostasis of “minding” the regular rhythms of the natural world.

The one Gathic poem which much involves this natural regularity is Y 44. In 44.3–5 it is asked, in traditional rhetorical diction, who the Father of Rightness is, who established the course of sun and stars, the waxing and waning of the moon; who it was that maintains the earth (!!! *zam-*) below and keeps the heavens from falling, maintains waters and plants, drives the wind and clouds, is creator of Good Mind, and is the craftsman who brought about light and dark, sleeping and waking, morning and night. The answer, ‘Mazdā with the Holy Spirit, Creator of all things,’ is given in 44.7. But at 44.6, just after the questions about nature, comes the statement:

Another object of physical regularity is breath:

lowing the other fem. pl. abstracts in *-tayah*, may be appositional, in effect adjectival (‘which manifest Regularity’). Just after comes, at the beginning of a series of terms for libations and oblations, *artim* ‘reward’ and *išam* ‘invigoration’; cf. the Gathic 28.7a–b, where *artim* and *išam* occur in an address to *Aramati*. It may be in connection with regular provision of nourishment (on the exchange model of hospitality) that *Aramati* has the epithet *brxθā* ‘welcome’ in the Gathas (44.7, 48.6, 34.9). Cf. YAv. *bərəj-*, *bərəjīia-* specifically associated with hospitable reception; I compare as cognate Irish *briugu* ‘generous host.’

Note also 49.5, where, in a hospitality context *aramati-* occurs with the libations/energizations *ižā-* and *āzūti-* as at YH 38.2.

The Aramati is connected with rewards (43.1 and 43.16, etc.), declaration of norms of judgment (43.6), and arbitration (31.12). As a human trait in the Gathas, *aramati-* ‘Proper Thought’ includes piety and sincerity, from which follows the association with *namah-* ‘reverence, homage’ in 49.10, which is parallel to 49.5.

Outside the Gathas, *aramati-* could easily have been used adjectivally alongside the proper designations of the Earth (cf. Sogd. *zāy spandārmāt*, Pahl. *spandarmad zamīg*), and thereby be equated with the Earth itself, which so embodies natural regularity. Perhaps the YAv. for <*aramaiti-*> [which replaced **aramati-* in the vulgate text of the Gathas] shows remodeling (via <*ārmaiti*> adj.?) with the element **ār-* (in Sogd. *ārδār* ‘plot of land’ = *‘containing earth?’), cf. PIE *H₁er-* (Gr. *ἔραζε* etc.) ‘earth’ or PIE *H₂er-* [Lat. *arō*, etc. ‘to plow’].

What is important is that Zarathushtra “admitted” an old goddess into his pantheon. This pantheon, however, consisted of purely abstract principles or hypostases (Wisdom, [Best] Rightness, Good Mind, etc.) and excluded material conception of divinity. This distinguishing trait of Zarathushtra’s religiosity goes with his highly mentalistic outlook. It did not prevent Zarathushtra from anthropomorphic theophanies, as we see from both Good Mind and Aramati in his visionary accounts.¹¹

On the Two Spirits

First, the origin of the idea of the twin Spirits. In Indo-Iranian, *manyu-* had a range of meanings from ‘impetus, energy that sets in motion, initiates’ to ‘wrath.’ In RV 10.83 and 84 *manyu-* is a divinized hypostasis, the fiery punitive wrath particularly of Indra. Cf. the cognate Homeric *μῆνις*, instructively likewise ‘wrath,’ esp. of gods, and fiery in its action. Note the parallelism of Vedic *manyūm vīmī* and Hom. *μῆνιν πάειν* ‘to stem [stop] the wrath.’ Note also that in the Iliad *μῆνις* (acc. *μῆνιν*), the first word of the epic, is the cause of all that transpires there. The meaning of *manyu-* reflects PIE *vmen* [~*v̥mneH₂*], which originally referred to a very dynamic force, an energy which put the body [and other objects] in motion, which had, at its extreme, wildness; cf.

Germ. *munter* ‘energetic, lively’; OInd. *mānas* occasionally ‘sexual drive’; Gr. *μένοξ* ‘resolute force, rage, activity, resolution,’ *μείνομαι* ‘act wildly, madly,’ *μανία* ‘madness,’ etc. Only via ‘resolve, deliberateness’ did *v̥men* come to mean ‘think.’ For Zarathushtra the notion was problematic, since it could refer to creative energy as well as to destructive force (cf. Vedic *iṣṣmin-*, a rambunctiously energetic quality of heroes and gods vs. Ir. *aišma-* ‘wrath, chaotic fury,’ which had become demonized). Zarathushtra’s solution was to conceive *manyu-* as “twinned” in its irreconcilable aspects, one productive [swanta- “holy”], and the other fruitless, destructive, and malign (*ahra-*), which “choose” between the polar aspects of being, *arta-* and *druj-*. This conception of Zarathushtra’s thus gave rise to the polarity becoming systematically foregrounded as a dualism.

As a parallel to this development, cf. the independent division, attested in Pahlavi texts, whereby the Avestan atmospheric god *Vaiiui-* was divided into a Better *Wāy*, presiding over vital breath, and a Worse *Wāy*, presiding over destructive storms and an aspect of death. In addition, the demonization of *manyu-* is broadly comparable with the semantic development of *μῆνις* in some modern Greek island dialects, in which *μῆνις* (*mīnis*) amounts to ‘devil’ in the phrases ‘may the m. take you!’ (on Cos and Syml) and ‘go to the m.!’ (on Calymnos) with *μῆνις* masc. after *διάβολος*.¹²

The conceptual genesis of the two Spirits as polar aspects of a single *manyu-* provides the background for Zarathushtra’s application of the term ‘twinned’ to them (see Addendum 1). The initiative and creative nature of the Holy [swanta-, *‘numinously productive’] Spirit fits the consensus view that it is this entity through which Mazdā creates, which is supported by a sufficient number of Gathic and post-Gathic passages. However, it is noteworthy that, whereas the entities Good Mind and Rightness, which, as aspects of Mazdā, form a canonical divine triad with Him, the Holy Spirit does not figure with these. And if, as usually assumed, Mazdā “stands over” or “stands behind” His subsidiary aspect the Holy Spirit, with (as universally interpreted) 47.3a having Mazdā as the Father of the Holy Spirit, should symmetry not imply that some being (perhaps unnamed for its very horror) “stands over” or “stands behind” the Malign Spirit? Furthermore, if (as Y 30 makes clear) the

Holy Spirit arose spontaneously (from an undifferentiated Spirit) by choosing Rightness, how did Mazdā originate?

I suggest that these problems which have dogged Zoroastrianism are in large measure due to the monotheism in the intellectual background of Western scholarship. According to 30.5, by choosing Rightness ‘the most Holy Spirit clothes Himself in the hardest stones,’ i.e. He became embodied in the heavens (*asman-*, also = *asan-* ‘stone’) and tangible matter in general; as the stanza further indicates, the right choice is then made by those who gratify Him, Wisdom the Lord, through true actions (cf. 31.8c). Elsewhere I shall argue in detail that according to 47.2 ‘the Best Thing of that Holy Spirit’ is the Rightness it has chosen; this is brought into tangible manifestation via this Spirit’s Wisdom (*mazdā-*), through which realization Wisdom becomes [Best] Rightness’s Father. The next stanza starts (47.3a) ‘Through that (foregoing) fact (tā demonstrative, not *<ptā> = *ftā* ‘father!’) Thou art the *swanta-* (Holy/Productive One) of that Spirit.’

The problematics in the meaning of *manyu-* thus ultimately lay behind the doctrine of the twin Spirits (and thereby the catalyst for the Jewish accusing angel Satan becoming the Devil) and was the motivating factor whereby the mere banal polarity of Right vs. Wrong (including Order vs. Chaos) was elevated to a focal, foregrounded, systematic dualism.

Addendum 1: Y 30, Y 32, and the Old Avestan Hymn to Hauma

The phraseology of 30.1–8, including the theme of bliss in 30.1 and the “twinship” of the Spirits in 30.3, is influenced by 32.1–8, whose wording in turn reflects a relationship with what now must be reconstructed as the Old Avestan prototype of the presently extant “Hōm-Yašt.”

The mutually sequential correspondences between 32.1–8 and 30.1–8 are as follows: Nouns for ‘bliss’ from *√wrāz* (32.1b” *wrāzma*, 30.1c” *wrāzā*); forms from *√war* ‘to opt, to choose,’ (32.2c” *warmadi*, 30.2b” *āwarnāu*); *maz-* ‘great’ (32.3b” *maš*, 30.2c” *mazah*); *asru-* in past passive of ‘hear’ (32.c” *asrudwam*, 30.3a” *asruwatām*); *acišta-* ‘worst things’ object of verbs ‘to accomplish’ (32.4a” *acištā dantah*, 30.5a” *acištā*

wryyah); *-jyāti-* ‘life’ (32.5a” *huyjātaiš*, 30.4b” *ajyātim*); *manyuš-* ‘spirit’ (32.5b” , 30.5b’); *√ābaw* ‘to deceive’ (32.5a” *dbanauta*, 30.6a” *dbaumā*); *martiyam/martānah* ‘mortal[s]’ (32.5a’ , 30.6c”); *daiwa-* (in pl.) (32.5b” *daiwanh*, 30.6a” *daiwā*);¹³ *wahišta-* *manah-* ‘Best Mind’ (32.6b”) vs. *acišta-* *manah-* ‘Worst Mind’ (30.6b”); *xšaθra-* ‘Dominion’ (32.6c” *xšaθrai*, 30.7a’ *xšaθrā*); *ayahā* ‘via metal’ (32.7b” , 30.7c”); *aiša’am ainaha’am* ‘of those violations’ (32.7a’ , 30.8a); and *aiša’am* ‘of these’ + *ā* + *vah* ‘be’ (32.8c” *aiša’am ā ahmi*, 30.7c” *aiša’am . . . ā ahat*). Oddly enough, all the words involved in the foregoing correspondences (counting 32.1–2 and 32.12–13 as unities, as is indicated by other considerations, so that 32.1 *wrāzma* and 32.12 *wrāš* concatenate) serve among the concentric lexical concatenations which show that 32.1–3 represents the first compositional stage of Y 32. Note that 32.7, as central stanza in the scheme, has no concatenations.

What makes the compositional priority of Y 32 clear is the role of 32.8 and 30.3 *yama-* ‘twin,’ whose parallelism is further shown by each having as predicate verb a past passive of *√sraw* ‘to hear’ (*srāwi*, *asrudwam*). The unprecedented Gathic allusion to legend at 32.8, ‘Yima (the son) of Vivahvan(t),’ begins a series of adversarial transformations of the Old Avestan hymn to Hauma (the prototype of Yasnas 9 and 10). Other transformations of the OAv. Hauma hymn are also found in the beginning and second half of Y 48, which text also has a compositional basis in Y 32, as I shall discuss in detail elsewhere.

For present purposes, I shall merely note the words and phrases in 32.8–14 whose basis in the OAv. Hauma-hymn can be traced through mutually sequential correspondences in Y 9–10: 32.8” *yamas-cit wiwahušah*, cf. 9.28–29; 32.8a” *ainah-* (completing concatenation with 32.16c’ *ainah-*), cf. 9.28–29; 32.10a’ **haumā* (cryptic pun via *hau mā*), cf. 9.27 seq. and 9.30; 32.10a”-b’ *wainahai . . . gām ašibya*, cf. 9.29; 32.10a”-b’ *wadar waiždat artūnai*, cf. 9.30–31; 32.12b *wrāš* (and 32.1b *wrāzma*), cf. 10.8; 32.14b” *wisantai*, cf. 10.9; 32.14c” *gāuš*, cf. 10.20; 32.14c” *duraušam*, cf. 10.21.

Thus it unexpectedly emerges that the words for ‘bliss,’ 32.1b” *wrāzma* (acrostically at 33.2c) and thereby 30.1c” *wrāzā* (cf. 49.8a”-b’ *wrāzištām artahya . . . saram*),¹⁴ all presented (with encryptic embellishments) as the reward for pious behavior, have their ultimate textual motivation

in a riposte against the OAv. Hauma-hymn's assertion that *hauma's* intoxication is accompanied by bliss (**wrāzmanā* > 10.8 <*uruuśmana-*>). Even more surprisingly, it now appears that merely the meaning of the name Yama (YAv. Yima) 'Twin' (which the legendary figure had from Indo-Iranian times in reference to his twinship with his sister *Yami) suggested an adjective 'twin[ned]', in 30.3, to characterize the two differentiated aspects of *manyu-* 'spirit.'

I see in the relevant Gathic verses an ironic attack on the worship of Hauma, who is the specific exemplification of the *daiwas* of Y 32.1 and 3-5. Y 32 (with Y 48) thus furnishes uniquely detailed proof that Young Avestan compositions which are syncretistically Zoroastrianized hymns to deities of the oldest Iranian pantheon may retain extensive textual cores which antedate Zarathushtra.

Addendum 2: The Construction of Y 45

The construction of Y 45 has hitherto lacked a systematic analysis. Each section is compositionally a complete mini-poem (showing the construction more extensively illustrated by Y 44: a sequence of stanzas, each of which has the same opening except for the last stanza, which provides the concluding moral). In Y 45, stanzas 1-6 begin with *at fra waxšyā* 'I shall speak out,' and stanzas 8-11 begin with *tam nah* and a desiderative phrase pertaining to worship, the whole amounting to 'I am wishing to . . . Him for us via. . .'

Each of the two mini-poems has a ring-compositional form: 45.1 and 7 share *iša-* 'seek,' *vsrau* 'hear,' and *drugwant* 'wrongful.' 45.2 and 6 share the base **swan-* 'holy' + *manyu-* 'spirit' and *xratu-* 'intellect'; 45.3 and 5 both state that Mazda/The Most Holy One spoke (*waucāt/mraut* . . . *wacah*) to Zarathushtra (*mai* 'to me'), continued by the reported reaction, *yai* '[and] they who . . .'; 45.4 and 45.3 share *mazdāh* + *vvaid* 'to know'; 45.4 and 1 share *wiswā* 'all,' *im* 'this,' and *nait* 'not'; and 45.4 and 7 share *mazdāh* + *vdā* 'to create.' 45.4 and 5 share *wahištām* and *vdā*. 45.8 and 11 share *dmāna-/dam-* 'house [of Mazda],' with terminology of cultic hospitality/cut and family status found in 45.9 and 11, and as equivalent of the divine house, the *xšaθra-* 'Dominion' linking 45.9 and 10 (note also, with the latter, the rare

hai 'to Him' in 45.8, 10, and 11). The stanzas of the entire (joined) poem are paired in each direction [45.1-2 share *warānā*; 45.3-4 share *ahauš ahya* and derivatives of the two homophonous and semantically associable roots *warz*, resp. 'to act upon, enact' [45.3 *waršanti*] and 'to nourish, strengthen, energize, activate' [45.4 *warzayant-* = Vedic *ūrjāyant-*]; 45.5 and 6 *vsrau* 'hear,' and *wahišta-* 'best'; 45.6 and 7 *vah* 'to be' in 3rd pers. sg.; 45.8 and 9 derivatives of homophonous roots *vwarz*; 45.10 and 11 *dam-* 'house,' and *ara-* 'aright, conforming, normative' + *vman* 'to think'], and then concentrically concatenate in criss-cross: 45.1 and 10 *vsrau* 'to hear'; 45.2 and 11 *dayanā* 'envisionment' and **swan-* 'holy'; 45.3 and 8 [-]*warša-* [*vwarz* 'to enact']; 43.4 and 9 *vwarz* 'to strengthen'; 43.5 and 48.7 *amrtāt-* 'immortality' and *vdā* 'to establish, cause, create'; 45.5-7 as above; 45.6 and 1 *vsrau* 'to hear' and *manyu-* 'spirit'; 45.6 and 11 *swantā* 'via holy . . .'. In addition, 45.7-11 [which are enclosed via *vsū* 'to benefit, to save'] elaborate the same inventory as the originally concatenating pair 49.10 and 49.5 as to how, through good 'envisionment' (*dayanā*) 'the souls of the righteous' are, as required, to be in the divine house (*dam-*) and/or dominion (*xšaθra-*) together with Good Mind (*wahu-* *manah-*) and Rightness (*arta-*), Regular Thought (*aramati-*), reverence (*namah-*) and nourishment (*warz-/wazdah-/ižā/āziti-*).

Notes

1. Henceforth I shall use a reconstructive transcription for the Gathic text similar to that of R. S. Beckes. The vulgar spelling of Gathic words will be given in angled brackets: <>.

2. For the translation of *ya'ah-* as race-contest and for racing imagery, see Schwartz 2003b, in which the word is discussed. Note there also my discussion of racing imagery, which also figures in 43.5-6, on pp. 9-10 in the present article. In the present article in this volume I also discuss the racing terminology of 30.10 on p. 2, and for 43.5-6 see pp. 9-10.

3. In Avestan, as in many languages, the words for 'sleep' and 'dream' are the same [so Pers. *x'āb*]. 'Sleep' is *hwafna-* [-*x'afna-*] in Gathic (44.5c") and in YAv., in which *x'afna-* gives *ax'afna-* 'unsleeping,' *ax'afniia-* 'id.' > 'attentive [in combat]'. 'Dream' is also attested for YAv. at Yt 13.104 as first in a series of four terms each preceded by *aya-* 'bad,' the other three of which, when properly explained, belong to the same

semantic field: Following [bad] *x'afna-* 'dream,' *daēsa-* is not 'omen' but 'apparition, specter' (cf. MPers. *dēs* 'shape,' Oss. *dēs* 'marvel' < *'spectacle'), *ōifra-* 'dclirium tremens, convulsion' [= Yt 5.61 *vifra-*, not 'wise' but 'tossed about, buffeted,' adj. of the sailor [nauuāza- = Sogd. *nawāz*, Parth. *nawāz*] *Paouruua* [= Vedic *Pāura*], who was divinely rescued from the sea. Av. *vifra-* retains the basic Indo-Iranian meaning *'shaken up' from *√vip* 'to agitate,' whereas in Vedic *viprā-* [maintained as an epithet of *Pāura*] became the common term for 'ecstatic seer'. Finally *pairikā* [*'parikā, WMLr. *parig*], etymologically 'she who surrounds' is best explained as *'nightmare, succubus,' whence 'witch/demoness.' I hope to present a variety of evidence for this interpretation elsewhere.

4. Cf. Schwartz 2003b. The Pindaric phrase is of Orphic origin. As I shall elaborate elsewhere, the Orphic Frag. 334 Kern *ἀείδω ξυνετόισι* 'I sing for those who can understand,' has been traced by M. L. West to the Protoponos Theogony, which is, *inter alia*, reflected in both Pindar's eschatological digression O. 2.83–91, and in Euripides' fragmentary *Hypsipyle*. I see variants of the Orphic phrase in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* 1092; *Iphigenia in Aulis* 466, and *Phoenissæ* 1506.

5. For 30.7c cf. 28.11c *manyauš hacā . . . ā ahuš parwiyah* 'in accord with (Thy) Spirit, existence will come about (as it was) first.'

6. The accounts conflate the Gathic passages pertaining to the vision with 30.3 seq., for which the Pahlavi translators did not realize that a dream was involved. The conflation is based on the similarity between 30.3–4 and 45.1–3.

7. 31.6 *haḅyam manōtram*, cf. Vedic *satyām mantrām*; *haḅya-* {< PIE **H₁snt-yo-*} 'real, true' recapitulates its etymological sense 'corresponding to what is,' cf. 31.5 *wauca . . . yā . . . ahati*.

8. Cf. 31.11a' *gaiḅās-ca tašah dayanās-ca* 'Thou hast fashioned material beings and envisionments,' continued at 31.9b'–11 in terms of the "Cow" choosing the pasturer, i.e. the good poet-priest Zarathushtra, against the non-pasturer, i.e. the deceitful poet-priest.

9. See my forthcoming article in the proceedings of the Societas Iranologica Europaea Conference in Iranian Religious Texts, held in Copenhagen May 2002.

10. Razmjou 2001 has in effect demonstrated Old Persian **Aramati-*, attested in Elamite, as an earth-goddess.

11. Cf. in Jewish mysticism Ezekiel's vision, the anthropomorphism of the Shi'ur Qomah, and the kabbalistic Adam Qadmon.

12. Shipp 388.

13. As per both 32.5 and 30.6, the Evil Spirit deceives *daiwas* who deceive mortals.

14. Cf. Schwartz 2003b for the history of *√vrāz* and the role of its derivatives in the mysticism and stylistics of the Gathas.

Bibliography

- Gershevitch 1975 I. Gershevitch. "Die Sonne das Beste." In *Mithraic Studies*, ed. J. R. Hinnells, vol. 2, 68–89. Manchester.
- Humbach 1991 H. Humbach, *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra*. Heidelberg.
- Razmjou 2001 S. Razmjou. "Des Traces de la déesse Spenta Armaiti à Persépolis." *StIr* 30: 7–15.
- Schwartz 1998 M. Schwartz. "The Ties that Bind: On the Form and Content of Zarathushtra's Mysticism." In *New Approaches to Interpretation in the Gāthās*, *Proceedings of the First Gāthā Colloquium [Croyden, 5th–7th November 1993]*, ed. F. Vajifdar, 127–97. London.
- Schwartz 2003 ———. "Y 29 and Gathic Bovine Symbolism." In *Paitmāna* [Festschrift for Hanns-Peter Schmidt], ed. S. Adhami. Costa Mesa.
- Schwartz 2003b ———. "Encryptions in the Gathas: Zarathushtra's Variations on the Theme of Bliss." Forthcoming in a Festschrift for Gherardo Gnoli.
- Shipp 1979 G. P. Shipp. *Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary*. Sydney.
- Skjærvø 2001 P. O. Skjærvø. "Rivals and Bad Poets." In *Philologica et Linguistica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80 Geburtstag*, ed. M. G. Schmidt and W. Bisong, 354–76. Trier.
- Skjærvø 2002 ———. "Ahura Mazdā and Ārmaiti, Heaven and Earth in the Old Avesta." *JAOS* 122.2:399–410.