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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 important 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. The recasting of elements of the Old Avestan [!] prototype of the Homa-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:

30.1a at tā waxšyā īśantah yā mazdāh yat-cit widušāi
   b staʊt-cā ahurāi yasniyā wahauš manahah
   c humanzdāi artāya-cā yā raucabbiš darsatā wrāzā

30.2a srauta gaušāis wahistā ā wainata sucā manahā
   b āvaranāi wicahāya naram naram hwaḥyāi tamāi
   c parah mazah yahah ahmāi sadyzāi boudantah pati

30.3a at tā manyā parwiya yā yamā hwaфан āsruwātam
   b manahāi-ca wacahi-ca šywénai hi wahyah akam-ca
   c dās-ca huda'ahah ṛś vṛ ṣyata 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.

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,’ wahistā, compactly scrambled in 30.1a’ at tā waxśyā isantaḥ and 30.1’ yā raucahlībī darsatā vratā. The word wahistā 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  add-zī awa drujiḥ  bu’ati skandah spāyaṭahya  
        b  at āsištā youjantai  ā huṣitaś wahauś manahah  
        c  mazda’ah atahya-ça  yai zazanti wahau sırawahi

30.11a  yat tā vratā saṣyata  yā mazdāh dadat mariyāhah  
        b  hu’ti aniti  yat-ça dargam drugwadbyah rārah  
        c  sawa awawabahy  at apī tāś ahāti uṣā

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’ sauta ‘hear ye’ and 30.3a’ aṣuvāṭam ‘the two [Spirts] 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 (wī vēi: 30.2b’ wicṭahya, 30.3c wī śyata < wī *cyata) between the opposed principles.

We may now consider the Spirits reported as heard via a dream, 30.a’ hwāfna- (vulgate <x’afna-;) unquestionably means ‘dream.’ 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. xwamdidān. Pers. x’āb didān ‘to see a dream’ = ‘to dream’). However, manyu- ‘spirit’ is not an object of sight, since it is not a thing (cf. Yav. mai-niṣewa- ‘inmaterial’), but a causational 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 attributed 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 phraseology and contents, both have introductory at ṛaṭā waxśyā ‘Lo! I shall speak [out] about [the]...’; the address to seekers (iśa-); the appeal to understanding (verb mazdā-) with clarity; the two Spirits at the beginning (manyu-pairwīyaḥ), their different natures; and their contrast as to choice (vār) and as to mentality (mazdah-), speech (vācā), and action (śyantā). The Malign Spirit is represented in 45.1 by daśasti- ‘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 abram, anticipating the myth, known from later Avestan and Pahlavi sources, in which the Malign Spirit ruins Mazda's first creation. Simultaneously duśasti- designates the Malign Spirit's poet-
priest, whose utterances 'destroy existence' [vmark + abhu-] 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 srāuta
   b yai-ca asnāt yai-ca dūrāt išaŋa
   c nū im wiswā cītara-zī mazdāhawam
   d nait dbitiya duśasti abuma mnśyāt
   e akā waraŋ drugwāh hizu'ā úvṛtāh

45.2a at fra waxšyā abašs manyū parviyaŋ
   b yayāh swanyāh uti mwatw yam abram
   c nait naḥ manāh nait saŋhū nait xratawaŋ
   d nait dhaŋ nait uxaŋ nait syañuŋ
   e nait dayanāh nait ru'ānāh hacanāi

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 enviousments, 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 mwataw 'will tell, is to tell.' The 'this' [im] of 45.1c, masculine in gender [as also cītara 'clear'], announcing something to be heard and understood, refers to the mantra, the poetic verbal formulation, mentioned explicitly at 45.3c [im...mantram]. The mantra itself is given at 45.7 [as a climactic summing up of 45.3-6].

45.6a at fra waxšyā wiswāna'am mazištam
   b stawas artā yah hund'až yai hijati
   c swantā manyū xrauta mazdāh abranah
   d yahyā wahaŋ wahaŋ fراši manahā
   e alyā xratū fra mā sāstu wahištā

45.7a yahyā sawā iša'anti rāḍahāh
   b yai-zi jīwā āhur-ca bā'anti-ca

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/wahu-manyu- 'Holy/Good Spirit'), frames the mantra at 45.6.
c amṛtāti artaunah ruṭa aviṣah

d utāyuṭā yā nṛnś sādūm drgyvanah

e tā-ca ṣāṭrā mazāḥ dūmī ahunah

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 manōa and the two
stanzas which enclose it will help establish the
relative chronology and other details of the relation-
ship between Y 30 and Y 45. In 30.1a waxṣyā
. . . wihūṣai 'I shall speak . . . to the knowing'
represents an Indo-European formula, with essen-
tial 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 γοναίνα συναίνον 'having sounds for
those who understand' in Pindar’s Second Olym-
pian Ode, 92, introducing a scrambling encryp-
tion,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 waxṣyā iṣa-
tah . . . wihūsai, is especially designed to encrypt
wahīṣṭā. A similar phraseology is found at 45.1,
at fra waxṣyā . . . iṣaṭa, minus the traditional
wihūṣai 'to the knowing' and without an attempt
to encrypt wahīṣṭā or any other immediately
collocated material. When Y 45 does encrypt
wahīṣṭā at 45.7a [immediately after the overt
wahīṣṭā at the end of 45.6e], the encryption is
unsignalled and drawn on the precedent of Y 30
even in its details, since 45.7a sawā iṣaṭaṇti in
effect combines forms used to encrypt wahīṣṭā
in Y 30, i.e., iṣaṭaṇah in its first line, and sawā in
its last. Finally, the passage in Y 30 is empha-
tically reported as a dream-revelation, while the
equivalent in Y 45 lacks such notice. In addition
to this conventional Indo-European cryptic de-
dvice, we shall presently see Zarathushtra’s tech-
nique of encryption through initials, to which
the introductory formula 'be vocal to the know-
ing' 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 manyā jasaitam parwiyaṃ dazdai

b gayam-ca aiyitiṃ-ca yat-ca ahat apamom ahūs

c aciṣṭah drugwaṭ'am at artaunai wahīṣṭam 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... jasaítam* 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... jasaítam*) 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* adverbal, as sometimes Vedic *sam*. Our text uses the stem *jasa-* to describe the comings of each: 30.6 states that 'Deception' (*dhuamán*) came upon (*d... upa jasa*) the daíwás 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  *ahmá wávēra jasa it manáh wáhít artá-ca*
30.7b  *at krapam utáyuti dádat aramatiś anna*
30.7c  *aśa'am tai á ahat ádánsiś parviyáh*

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 [afflicters], [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-spāram from the lost Avestan Špand Nāsk] describe in detail as Zarathushtra's first visionary encounter with Good Mind. Our first text, which represents the vision itself, consists of 45.8 plus 45.3-4:

45.8a  *tam náh stautáš namáh á wiwarshá*
45.8b  *nú zí it cašmání wi á darsam*
45.8c  *waháus manyáus śyuvůmáha ușáhýa*
45.8d  *widus artá yam mazdá'am ahuram*
45.8e  *at hai wahmánu đmánsí garah ni dáma*

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 wáxšýā ahaus áhya parviyém*
45.3b  *yam mání widwáh mazdáh wauca táhura*
45.3c  *yai im wah nait iwa manhorá manwénti*
45.3d  *yá dá im(mai) máná-ci wauca'á-ca*
45.3e  *ahyáh ahaus awai ahat apamám*

45.4a  *at fra wáxšýá ahaus áhya wafšítám*
45.4b  *artár hacá mazdáh wáidá yah im dát*
45.4c  *ftaram wahauš wárzayántah mahanáh*
45.4d  *at hai dagdá huśyauñi ašramatíś*
45.4e  *nait dūžádyái wiswahíñáh ahura*

45.3  Lo! I shall speak out about this existence's first thing, which the Lord Wisdom, the Knowe, told me—
those of you who do not put this thing into effect, this munāra, 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-deeded 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.1] to yield the iconicistic aspects of 45.3–4, which will presently be discussed at length: We start with the penultimate words in 30.4, parviyām ‘first,’ apamām

30.4a” parviyām > 45.3a” ahaṃ ahāya parviyām
30.4” ahāt apamām ahāṣ > 45.3e ahauṣ . . . ahāt apamām
30.4c” wahiṣṭam > 45.4a” ahūṣ ahāya yahiṣṭam

For its part, 45.3a at fra wahiṣṭā ahauṣ ahāya parviyām parallels 45.4a at fra wahiṣṭa ahauṣ manyā parviyāi, cf. 30.3a” manyā parviyāi and 30.4a manyā . . . parviyām. Again with parviyām ‘first,’ the alliterative of the closure 30.7c aśāṃ tat ā ahāt ayāha ādāṇaḥ parviyāḥ (in which parviyām via 30.7a “ahūṣ” refers back to 30.6c “ahum ‘existence’ acc.) is perfected in 45.3e aḥyāḥ ahauṣ awai ahāt apamām.

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 ahauṣ [...] 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 coordinated beginning with the relative pronominal base ya-, and in these three lines are four two-word phrases with initials m and w[maɪ widwah, māzdah waucaṭ, māṇaham waɾ̩̃hanti, maṇī-cə waucaṭ]-ca]. The repeated initials m-w- encrypt maṇah- wahu-, the occasional variant of wahu- maṇah- ‘Good Mind’ [also called wahiṣṭa- maṇah- ‘Best Mind’].

With the four m- w- phrases decrypted as the initials symbolizing maṇah- wahu- [the occasional variant of wahu- maṇah- ‘Good Mind,’ also called wahiṣṭa- maṇah- ‘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 retributions 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 wahiṣṭa . . . maṇahā ‘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 decrptive 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 manātra.

45.3–4 contains a gestaling, 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 intermedialion 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 template 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” parwiya” vs. e” apaăm” or treated in terms of its various aspects. Thus 45.3a” parwiya” is alternatively ‘for the first [time of existence]’ vis-a-vis 45.1d’ dbitiya” for the second [time in existence],’ cf. 45.2a” parwiya” ‘in the beginning,’ grammatically contrastive with 45.3a” parwiya,” or 45.3a” parwiya” as ‘foremost,’ parallel to 45.4a” wahistam ‘best’ (both referring to ‘thing’ or manātra). [4] The theme of abu–‘existence,’[5] Wisdom the Lord is not only Creator [vđč, noun dâmi-, cf. 45.4b” with 45.7c”], but progenitor. Finally [6] Atamati (Regular Thought) is personified in a juridical or arbitrative role.

The Vision in Y 31

These are the relevant stanzas of Y 31:

31.4a yâdâ artam sau’iyam ahan mazdâs-ca aburâhah
    b arti-ca aramati wahištā išā manahā
    c mabya xšōram awajwât yahya wâdâ wanaîna drujam

31.5a tat maì wi cidyâi waucâ yat maì artâ dāta wahyâh
    b widwâi wahū manahâ man-ca dâdyâi yahya mâ ršîš
    c tâ-cit mazdâ ahura yâ nait-wâ ahat abatî-wâ

31.6a âhmâi ahat wahistam yah maì widwâh waucâ’at hâhram
    b manâram yam harwâtâh artahy aurtâtas-ca
    c mazdâ’ai awat xšôram yat hai wahâ waxšat manahâ

31.7a yas-tâ manâ parwiya” raucabhiś nainwân hu”dhrâ
    b hau xacwâ dâmišt artam yâ dârayat wahistam manah
    c tâ mazdâ manyâ xšyâh yah â nîram-cit ahura ēhâmah

31.8a at ōwâ manhi parwiya” mazdâ yazum stai manahâ
    b wahauš ftram manahâh yat ōwâ ham cašmani ahram
    c hâhram artahy aúrûm abahuš ahuram šyawnaîśu

31.9a ōwâi as aramati” ōwâh â gauš tašâ aŭxanuš
    b manâyuš mazdâ 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 may defeat Wrong.
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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 mantra of Righteous 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 Righteousness, 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 Righteousness, 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 štaram manahah ‘Father of Good Mind’ = 45.4c štaram wahauš . . . manahah; and 31.6a–b’ [after ahat wahistišam, cf. 45.4a ahašō ahaš wahištam] yah mai widwah waucat . . . manah, cf. 45.3b yam mai widwah . . . waucat . . . manahah.7 The difference between (45.3) ‘the Knowing One’ who tells Zarathushtra the mantra, and (31.6 the ‘knowing’ initiate who ‘will tell’ it back to him, is based on the threefold reference of widwah ‘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:

31.17 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 mantras and doctrines of the wrongsome one . . .

31.19a–b He has listened to Righteousness, 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 dayana i.e. Envisionment] fashioned by the Holy Spirit.8 The combination is resumed at 31.12 [again with contrast of poet-priests]. Here the arbitrative aspect of Aramati is manifest:
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. 51.6, where "knower" refers once to the divinity and once to the initiate, and, as in the other passages encrypting Good mind, mantra-is mentioned, and there is a decrptive hint in the immediately preceding phrase manah wahū sanhai 'for proclaiming with Good Mind'. 31.17 seq. underscores the difference in emphasis between 45.3 [the "knowing" divinity transmits the mantra to Zarathushtra for him to transmit it] and 31.6 [the "knowing" initiate repeats the mantra 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 hemistic in each of the two stanzas has vima 'think' + parviya- 'first'; in detail, Mazdā as the first to think out the world scheme, whereby he creates Righteousness, and "holds" Best Mind, is matched by Zarathushtra, who first thought out the fact of Mazdā being the Creator of Righteousness, and [in his vision/eye] "grasps" Him as Father of Good Mind. Syntactically, manbi parviyam could have parviyam 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 45.5–6, which, with accompanying stanzas, supplies the most detailed account of the vision:

43.4a at thwā manahāi taxnam-ca swantam mazdā  
  b yat tā zastā yā tu bafūi awā'ah  
  c yah dāh artiš drugwatai arataucai-ca  
  d thwahya gamā̄i awā'ah arta'auriiah  
  e yat ma ti wahauš hazah jamat manahah

43.5a swantam at thwā mazdā manbi ahura  
  b yat thwā ahauś zanhai darasam parviyama  
  c yat dāh šavyahā maštewān yā-ca uxbā  
  d akam akāi wahwām arim wahwāi  
  e thwā humarā damaiš wraisai apamai

43.6a yahmi swantā thwā manyā jasah  
  b mazdāx šāthra ahmi wahū manahā  
  c yahya šyauwāǐi gašāh arta frādantai  
  d ahbhah raťiš sanhatai aramatiš  
  e thwahya xiatuš yam naat-cīš dabayahat

43.7a swantam at thwā mazdā manbi ahura  
  b yat ma wahū pari jasat manahā  
  c prsat mā cīš ahi kahya ahi
43.4 'And I will think Thee valiant and holy, O Mazda, when Thou shalt help with the hand in which Thou maintains those rewards which Thou hast established for worsometh and righteous through the beat of Thy Fire, which is mighty with Righteous, 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 requits, 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 Righteous. 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 ðwā manhi parwiym mazdā . . . yat ðwā ham cašmani ġrabam mazdā is 43.5 swantam at ðwā mazdā manhi . . . parwiym 'Holy I did 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 wî ò darsam]. Here again parwiym may refer to Zarathushtra and/or to Mazda; 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 ahuš . . . parwiym and finale in apama-'last,' and contentwise 43.6d-e juxtaposes the anthropomorphized Aramati 'Regular Thought' with Mazda's indeceivability (naît + vaâb), like 45.4d-e.

Within Y 43, swantam at ðwā mazdā manhi (cited above from 43.5 and compared with 31.8) has a dynamic role. 43.4a at ðwā manhâi . . . swantam mazdā 'I shall think Thee Holy, O Wisdom. . . .' culminates in 43.4e 'when the seizing force of Good Mind comes unto/upon me' (Av. hažah- 'seize, 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 wcal . . . 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 ahuš 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 Mazda's Holy Spirit and its coming with Good Mind [43.6a-b swantā . . . manyā . . . jasah . . . xšārthā . . . wâhû manahā, cf. 30.7a-b xšārthâ jasat manahâ wâhû] which are celebrated in the expansion of 43.5a swantam at ðwā mazdā manhi ahuš 'I did think Thee holy,' etc. by 43.7b yat mā wâhû 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 . . . ðwā . . . manhi 'I did think Thee holy' are formally related to 43.6a swantā ðwā manyā '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:
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We may now return to the ambiguity of parwiyam 'firstly,' 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 hāi aviti zarathūshrāh parwiyam
   b hozyāh dwāsiḥ yat īsāyāh drugwatai
   c at arīndunai rafnāh hyāh’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.] Maḥābhārata 13 app. 3, 2003 post. ko’sī kasyāśi. In contrast the Skt. passage where kasya asi means ‘whose descendant art thou?’, the meaning of the OAv kahiī āhī is ‘whose partisan art thou?’” For the latter, Humbach compares Y 10.16 <aśoṇāh ahmi drumaṭō nōṅ ahmr>. But the latter usage would apply only to ‘whose art thou?’, isolated from the first question.

In fact, one hears the expected zarathūshrāh ‘paraveswahya ‘Zarathushtra, son of Pourushasp’ up to zarathūshrāh parw-, but the surprise resolution of the latter form as parwiyam ‘firstly’ replaces the awaited representation of the father'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 karpons, Pourushasp had come to fear the child Zarathushtra and made various attempts to murder him [detailed in Denkard VII, 3]. A basis of these accounts in an actual antipathy of Pourushasp would explain why Zarathushtra avoided naming his father.

Taking the ambiguous parwiyam following zarathūshrāh 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  ahyā fraṣāṁ kahānāh vi wīdwai wasī
d  āda ṣwahūnāh aḥkā rātānī namahah
   c ārāhōya mā yawat īsālī manya’āi

43.10a  at tu mai daśī artai yat ma zauaumī

43.9c-e I addressed His question, “As belonging to whom dost thou wish to be distinctly known?” “To (Thcc and) Thy Fire, as an offering of reverence.” So long as I am able shall I think of Righteousness.

43.10a And Thou didst show me Righteousness, 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 Righteousness.’ But another occurrence on parwiyam in Y 43 broadens the interpretation of the word.

43.11c yat xinā-uxośōš didānha parwiyam
d  sāṭāh āi sans māriyāsu mazdātīš
c  tat wṛzadyāï yat mai mṛaṭātawahiṭām
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 parviyan and wahistam 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 sadra ... martiayisä ... wrzydyä ... yat mai nuauta wahistam, which brings together the statements in Y 45 that a grievous situation [45.7d" sadrã] will befall those that do not put into effect [45.3b warṣantî, ñware] what Mazdã told Zarathustra was the best for mortals [45.5a"–b" yat mai nuaut ... martabhyah wahistam]. Since in 45.3a" and 45.4a" parviyan and wahistam 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 into effect [43.11c' wrzydyā!] 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' owē manhi parviyan, ‘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 parviyan at line-ends in 43.5, 8, and 11 (the midmost, 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 Mazdã is applicable at 45.5, 8, and 11, albeit in ambiguous constructions. Given Zarathushtra’s placement of parviyan where his father’s name would ordinarily have been indicated, we may see in zarabsēh parviyan part of Zarathushtra’s self-identification in terms of his “firstness” in an affiliation to, and adoption by, Mazdã which took place in the beginning of time, where Zarathushtra visionarially witnessed Mazdã [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 Mazdã’s justice, that Zarathushtra manifests his adoptive affiliation, as indicated by 43.9, which, with 43.8 [containing zarabsēh jux- tapos with the local parviyan] 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 Zarabsēh- occurs in the poem’s centermost position, followed by avahwat raśta ‘mighty support’ and dwaisēh ‘emetics,’ which are recontextualized in 43.8. In the original 8-stanza form of Y 28, amongst concentric ring-compositional concatenations of word-forms, the original two central lines form a continuity:

28.4c sayaw iṣāi τawā-ca awat xa’ai aiṣai aṭahyāa
28.5a  atra kät óvā darsāi ā...
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 Righteousness is treated as having been granted. It is also noteworthy that in the final version of Y 28, in which zarathustra-is at the center, the outer stanzas concatenate through the words manyauš and parwiya:-

28.1b manyauš mazda parwiyan swantahya ... syaunā
‘First of all, through action of the Holy Spirit, [shall I approach Thee], O Wisdom ...’

28.11b manyauš hacā ōva ḍhā yiś abū parwiyan bu’at
From [Thy] Spirit, with Thy mouth, [teach me to speak] the [words] through which existence will come as it was at first.

Here we have as framing elements, Holy Spirit with parwiyan as ‘first of all,’ referring to Zarathushtra’s action, and parwiyan, 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 Ahūra, in both 45.3 and 43.6 is associated with the ‘indeceivable’ Mazdā Ahūra, and with good deeds, and rewards them (43.6 with 43.16, cf. 43.1; at 43.6 aramati-proclaims ‘norms’ [ratu-] of judgment, and has an arbitrating capacity [31.12]. The role of Aramati in the visionary texts is reminiscent of that of Dīkā ‘Justice, Right’ who appears in Parmenides’ vision as a figure assigning requisals.

The anthropomorphic appearance of Aramati fits her background as a goddess, a status reconstructible for Proto-Iranian and even Indo-Iranian religion, since Aramati is a female divinity in the RgVeda and in post-Greek 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 deities, the daiwās, 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 Righteousness 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 Gothic 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 daiwās are not to be worshipped. Zarathushtra’s prohibition of daiwā-worship is crucial in understanding his religion, although the old scholarly model of a background contrast of two Indo-Iranian categories of gods: *daiwās and *asarmās, has been definitively refuted from different directions. For Zarathushtra’s idea of what daiwās 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 Gothic attestations, nor is a derived concept of ‘humility’ very persuasive for any of the occurrences in the
Gathas. Skjærvø 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* < *taras mastra* and *tarah manyanta*, from *tarah + vman* ‘think improperly, think out of correct measure;’ cf. the YAv. canonical contrast of *irmaiti*- with *taras mastriti*- ‘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 Skjærvø postulates “genius of the earth.”

44.6c *aram śywānāś dbanztā aramatiś*

d *tobyah xšāwēm wāhū cinos 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-, vár ‘to fit, be fitting’), which includes cosmic order, is materialized by Aramati in the physical domain over which Mazdā rules.

30.7a *ahmāi xšāwē jasat manahā artā-ča*

b *at ktpam utūyutiś dadat aramatiś anma*

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.

Aramatī 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: *izāh youštayah fiaštayah* ‘energizations, vitalizations, refreshments’ and then *aramatayah*, which, following the other fem. pl. abstracts in -tavah, may be appositional, in effect adjectival (‘which manifests Regularity’). Just as 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 brtah ‘welcome’ in the Gathas (44.7, 48.6, 34.9). Cf. YAv. *bros-, borsjih*- specifically associated with hospitable reception; I compare as cognate Irish *brígh* ‘generous host.’
Note also 49.5, where, in a hospitality context aramati- occurs with the libations/energizations iżā- and ażīni- as at YH 38.2.

The Aramatī 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 along the proper designations of the Earth (cf. Sogd. zāy spandārmat, Pahl. spandarmad zamīg), and thereby be equated with the Earth itself, which so embodies natural regularity. Perhaps the YAv. for <armacati- > [which replaced *aramati- in the Vulgate text of the Gathas] shows remodeling [via <armacati- adj.] with the element *är- [in Sogd. āḏār 'plot of land'] = *'containing earth?'], cf. PIE H₁er- [Gr. ἔρης etc.] 'earth' or PIE H₂er- [Lat. ārō, 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 μῆνος, instructively likewise 'wrath,' esp. of gods, and fiery in its action. Note the parallelism of Vedic manyāṁ vṛtī and Hom. μῆνον ναῶεν 'to stem [stop] the wrath.' Note also that in the lidād μῆνος [acc. μῆνν], the first word of the epic, is the cause of all that transpires there. The meaning of manyu- reflects PIE *vneu [stem: *vneH2], 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'; Olnd. mánas occasionally 'sexual drive'; Gr. νοῦς 'resolve force, rage, activity, resolution,' μαῖνειν 'act wildly, madly,' μαίνει 'madness,' etc. Only via 'resolve, deliberateness' did vneu 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 ışmīn-, a rambunctiously energetic quality of heroes and gods vs. ır. aiśma- '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 (āhra-), which "choose" between the polar aspects of being, arta- and drut-. 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 Vairu- was divided into a Better Vāri-, presiding over vital breath, and a Worse Vāri-, presiding over destructive storms and an aspect of death. In addition, the demonization of manyu- is broadly comparable with the semantic development of μῆνος in some modern Greek island dialects, in which μῆνος (minis) amounts to 'devil' in the phrases 'may the m. take you!' [on Cos and Symi] and 'go to the m.' [on Calymnos] with μῆνος 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 Mazda creates, which is supported by a sufficient number of Greek and post-Greek passages. However, it is noteworthy that, whereas the entities Good Mind and Rightness, which, as aspects of Mazda, form a canonical divine triad with Him, the Holy Spirit does not figure with these. And if, as usually assumed, Mazda "stands over" or "stands behind" His subsidiary aspect the Holy Spirit, with (as universally interpreted) 47.3a having Mazda 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 Mazda 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 = āzan- ‘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 = fd ‘father!’] Thou art the swanta-[Holy/Productive One]of that Spirit.’

The problematics in the meaning of manya-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 I:
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 “Hôm-Yâxt.”

The mutually sequential correspondences between 32.1–8 and 30.1–8 are as follows: Nouns for ‘bliss’ from vívāz [32.1b “wrâzma, 30.1c” wrâz]; forms from vívar ‘to opt, to choose,’ [32.2c “warmandi, 30.2b’ ñwarandi]; moz- ‘great’ [32.3b “mâš, 30.2c’ mozah]; asrun in past passive of ‘hear’ [32.2c “asrunwâram, 30.3a” asrunwâtâm]; acistā ‘worst things’ object of verbs ‘to accomplish’ [32.4a “acistā dantah, 30.5a” acistā wrzyah], -yātī- ‘life’ [32.5a “huiyâtāš, 30.4b’ aiyātīm]; manyâs ‘spirit’ [32.5b”, 30.5b’]; ydbaw ‘to deceive’ [32.5a’ dbanauta, 30.6a” dbana]; maritiyam/martñah ‘mortal[s]’ [32.5a’, 30.6c”]; daiwā [in pl.] [32.5b” daiwânh, 30.6a” daiwa];[13] wahišta- manah- ‘Best Mind’ [32.6b” vs. acistâmanah- ‘Worst Mind’ [30.6b”]; xšadra- ‘Dominion’ [32.6c’ xšadrai, 30.7a’ xšadru]; aya[h] ‘via metal’ [32.7b”, 30.7c”]; aistâ’ām aina[h]ā’ām ‘of those violations’ [32.7a”, 30.8a], and aistâ’ām ‘of these’ + ā + vâh ‘be’ [32.6c” aistâ’ām ā ahmi, 30.7c” aistâ’ām . . . ā abah]. 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 wrâzma and 32.12 wrâz 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 vívar ‘to hear’ [sârwi, asrunwâram]. The unprecedented Gothic allusion to legend at 32.8, ‘Yima [the son] of Vivahvani[ti],’ begins a series of adversarial transformations of the Old Avestan hymn to Hauma [the prototype of Yasnás 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” yamās-cit wiyahushing, cf. 9.28–29; 32.8a” aina[h]- [completing concatenation with 32.16c’ aina[.]., cf. 9.28–29; 32.10a’ “haumā [cryptic pun via hav mà], cf. 9.27 seq. and 9.30; 32.10a’-”b wainahai . . . gâm ásibya, cf. 9.29; 32.10a”-”b wâdar waiždat arata[ui, cf. 9.30–31; 32.12b wrâš (and 32.1b wrâzma), cf. 10.8, 32.14b” wisan[tai, cf. 10.9, 32.14c” gâšâ, cf. 10.20; 32.14c” du- raušam, cf. 10.21.

Thus it unexpectedly emerges that the words for ‘bliss,’ 32.1b” wrâzma [acrostically at 33.2c] and thereby 30.1c” wrâz [cf. 49.8a”-”b wrzšis-tām arathi[y]a . . . saam],[14] all presented [with en
cryptive 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 [\"wrāzmānā \> 10.8 \langle urumāśmana\>]. 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 ‘twini|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 daivas 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 tarm nāb and a desiderative phrase pertaining to worship, the whole amounting to ‘I am seeking to . . . Him for us via . . .’

Each of the two mini-poems has a ring-compositional form: 45.1 and 7 share iša- ‘seek’; všaur ‘hear’; and drugwah ‘wrongful’. 45.2 and 6 share the base *swan- ‘holy’ + manyu- ‘spirit’ and xratu- ‘intellect’; 45.3 and 5 both state that Mazdā/ The Most Holy One Spoke [wanacat/mraut . . . wacah] to Zarathushtra [mai ‘to me’], continued by the reported reaction, yai ‘(and) they who . . .’, 45.4 and 45.3 share mazdāh + včwād ‘to know’; 45.4 and 1 share wšwā ‘all’, im ‘this’, and nait ‘not’; and 45.4 and 7 share mazdāh + vih ‘to create’; 45.4 and 5 share wahištam and vihā. 45.8 and 11 share dināna-/dam- ‘house [of Mazdā]’, with terminology of cultic hospitality/cut and family status found in 45.9 and 11, and as equivalent of the divine house, the xšahta- ‘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 wariānā; 45.3–4 share abaršt ahya and derivatives of the two homophonous and semantically associative roots warrz, resp. ‘to act upon, enact’ [45.3 warsanṭi] and ‘to nourish, strengthen, energize, activate’ [45.4 warzavart = Vedic urjāyant-]; 45.5 and 6 všaur ‘hear’ and wahišta- ‘best’; 45.6 and 7 vih ‘to be’ in 5th pers. sg.; 45.8 and 9 derivatives of homophonous roots warrz; 45.10 and 11 dam- ‘house’, and ara- ‘ari- 
ght, conforming, normative’ + vman ‘to think’), and then concentrically concatenate in criss-cross: 45.1 and 10 všaur ‘to hear’; 45.2 and 11 da-yana ‘envisionment’ and *swan- ‘holy’; 45.3 and 8 *wriša- *warrz ‘to enact’; 43.4 and 9 warrz ‘to strengthen’; 43.5 and 48.7 amrtāt- ‘immortality’ and vihā ‘to establish, cause, create’; 45.5–7 as above; 45.6 and 1 všaur ‘to hear’ and manyu- ‘spirit’; 45.6 and 11 swahtā ‘via holy . . .’. In addition, 45.7–11 [which are enclosed via všt ‘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 kšahta-] together with Good Mind [wahu- manah-] and Rightness [arta-]. Regular Thought [armanāt-], reverence [namah-] and nourishment [warrz/wazdah-/izād/azātī-.

Notes
1. Henceforth I shall use a reconstructive transcription for the Gathic text similar to that of R. S. Boeckx. 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 45.5–6, 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 45.5–6 see pp. 9–10.
3. In Avestan, as in many languages, the words for ‘sleep’ and ‘dream’ are the same (so Pers. xšab). ‘Sleep’ is hwxna-. (<xša-na>) in Gathic (44.5c”) and in YAv., in which xša-na- gives axša-na- ‘unsleeping,’ axšaffi- ‘id.’ > ‘attentive [in combat].’ ‘Dream’ is also attested for YAv. at Y1 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] xša - 'dream,' daša - is not 'omen' but 'apparition, specter' [cf. N. Pers. dēs 'shape,' Oss. dēs 'marvel,' < 'spectacle'], ēštē 'dellir- ium tremens, convulsion' [cf. Yt 5.61 vijra-, not 'wise' but 'tossed about, buffeted,' adj. of the sailor [navāzē = Sogd. nawāz, Parth. nāwāz] Pavuruma [= Vedic Pāura], who was divinely rescued from the sea. Av. vijra- retains the basic Indo-Iranian meaning 'shaken up' from vijrip 'to agitate,' whereas in Vedic vipra- [maintained as an epithet of Pāura] became the common term for 'ecstatic seer.' Finally pariškā [pariškā, WMbr. parṣā], etymologically 'she who surrounds' is best explained as *pariškāma, 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 acūsa śvēcāda 'I sing for those who can understand,' has been traced by M. L. West to the Protopanos Theogony, which is, inter alia, reflected in both Pindar's eschatological dicrosis 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 Phoenissae 1506.

5. For 30.7c cf. 28.11c māyauā hacā ... ā dhā pariwayiḥ '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 hātyaṃ māṃstram, cf. Vedic satyam mantrām, hātya- [ < PIE *H₂-gat-y-o-] 'real, true' recapitulates its etymological sense 'corresponding to what is,' cf. 31.5 vacca ... ya ... abhāti.

8. Cf. 31.11a gaṇās-ca tāsah dayānās-ca 'Thou hast fashioned material beings and environs,' 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.


10. Razmjou 2001 has in effect demonstrated Old Persian *Azmāzi-, 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 daityas who deceive mortals.
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