

Avestan *kauui-* and the Vocabulary of Indo-Iranian Institutions

Martin Schwartz

The Avestan term *kauui-* (strong stem *kauuāi-/kauuai-*) is one of a number of problem-words in the vocabulary of ancient Iranian institutions.¹ From a diachronic perspective, reference to a primary priestly function is shared by the cognates Vedic *kaví-*, Lydian *kaveś*, and Greek *κοίης*, *κόης* (the latter “priest of the Kabeiroi in Samothrace” according to Hesychius). The etymological connection with Vedic $\sqrt{kū}$, Greek *κοέω* “perceive,” and the fact that *kāvryá-* “poetry” is the adjectival derivative of Vedic *kaví-* affirms the basic sense in Indic as “an inspired/sagacious poet-priest.”

However, the tradition of the Avestan *Yašts* is that there was a dynasty of *kauuis* who ruled over early (pre-Zarathushtrian) Iran; they are named, and the feats of some of them are mentioned. Moreover, one person bearing the title *kauui-*, *Vīštāspa*, the patron of Zarathushtra (*Zarathuštra*), is treated in post-Gathic texts as ruler (cf. Middle Persian *Wištāsp Šāh*). Consequently, the view that *kauui-* referred to a ruler came to dominate Iranian studies, with such prestigious advocates as Bartholomae and Christensen.²

With a view to the meaning of Vedic *kaví-* and its cognates, an Iranistic movement against the earlier consensus began with Barr,³ who saw in *kauui-* a ruler combining priestly and worldly authority. Next Gershevitch,⁴ arguing against Christensen, took *kauui-* as basically meaning a kind of priest. A similar conclusion was reached by Kellens, who expanded Dumézil’s attack on the historicity of a dynasty of *kauuis*.⁵ For Kellens, the *kauuis* were never rulers, and were only a category of priests.

Contra Kellens, H. P. Schmidt has recently argued for the possibility that the *kauuis* were

priest-kings, as against the view that they were priests only, as per Kellens⁶ shows that *xšaθra-*, associated with these early *kauuis*, must indeed mean “rule”; that in the Rig Veda (RV.) Indra (among others), who has no obvious priestly function, is simultaneously *rājan-* “king” and *kavi-* “poet” (7.18.12), an idea expressed by various different terms in other passages; and that an abundance of evidence attests that Persian kings of the entire pre-Islamic period had priestly functions; thus “a priestly title of kings is nothing extraordinary in Iran and that accordingly the Avestan *Kauuis* may well be considered priest-kings.”⁷

The fact is, however, that the Avesta does not provide evidence for the priestly function of *kauuis*. It is conceivable that one or more *kauuis* had used their priestly authority to gain a great measure of secular power, thus founding a dynasty. In addition, *kauui-* “priest” may have gone into disuse under the pressure of the abundance of inherited terms for priests (including poet-priests): Avestan (Av.) *zaotar-* (Vedic *hótr-*), *āθrauuān-* (Vedic *átharvan-*); *ərəši-* (Vedic *ṛ́śi-*); and *mąθrān-* (Vedic *mantrín-*).

Possibly Gathic *karapan-* was an old term for priestly oral performers; note that *karapan-* is grouped with *usij-* (Vedic *uśij-*) at Y. 44.20c. Since the collocation with *kauui-* will prove important, some remarks on *karapan-* are relevant here. It is generally regarded as a neologism in view of Henning’s connection of Khwarezmian (Khwar.) *krb-* “to moan, to mumble.”⁸ However, a further connection with a Vedic series of words indicates that at least the etymon is traditional and not pejorative. For *karapan-* */karpan/, comparison with Khwar. *krb-* (vocalized *kirba-*) allows the latter to be derived from an Indo-Iranian stem *kṛpá-* “make a plaintive sound, implore,” attested (alongside *kṛpáya-*) in Vedic. It is found as an action of poet-priests, RV. 10.114.16 *kṛpámāṇam kavím*; 4.1.14 *cakṛpánta dhībhis*. Furthermore, 8.39.4 *kṛpanyáti* “implores” is glossed by Naighaṇṭuka 3.14 as *arcati* “sings hymns”; similarly Bṛhaddevatā 2.27,

which also gives *krpaṇyú-* “poet” parallel to 2.37 *íśi-*. For the formation cf. *ukṣaṇyá-* “raise the voice like a bull” and *ukṣaṇyú-* “bull-voiced singer” from *ukṣán-* “bull” among other instances of *-yá-* verbs and *-yú-* nouns from stems in *-an-* discussed in Renou.⁹ Thus we may posit alongside the “hysterodynamic” stem **krpan-* a “proterodynamic” stem **/kárpan-*, i.e. *karapan-*.

In the two instances in which an individual *kauui-* is mentioned in the Gathas, the contextual issue is patronage. The instances are phraseologically similar but contrastive:

Y. 46.13 a *yē spitāməm zaraθuštrəm rādanhā*

b *marətaēšū xšnāuš huuō nā frasrūidiīai ərəθβō*

Y. 46.14 a *zaraθuštrā kastē aṣṣuuā uruuathō*

b *mazōi magāi kē vā frasrūidiīai vaštī*

c *aṭ huuō kauuā vīštāspō yāhī*

Y. 46.13 a–b Whoever among mortals satisfied Spitamid Zarathushtra

hospitably with solicitude, that man is fit to become famed.

Y. 46.14 a–c Zarathushtra, who is thy righteous ally

for great largesse? Or who wants to become famed?

That’s Kauui Vīštāspa in the race!

Y. 51.11 a *kē uruuathō spitamāi zaraθuštrāi nā mazdā*

b *kē vā aṣṣā afraštā ...*

c *kē vā vaṇhāuš mananḥō acistā magāi ərəšwō*

Y. 51.12 a *nōiṭ tā īm xšnāuš vaēipiīō kəuuīnō pərətō ...*

b *zaraθuštrəm spitāməm ...*

c hiiat̄ hōi īm caratascā aodərəščā zōišənū vāzā

Y. 51.11 a–c What man is the ally for Spitamid Zarathushtra, O Mazda?

Or who has consulted with Rightness? ...

Or who of Good Mind, lofty, has shown acknowledgement as to largesse?

Y. 51.12 a–c Not so did the *kauuian* pederast at the ... bridge satisfy

Spitamid Zarathushtra with hospitality ...

but he (gave) him his two horrid “treats”¹⁰ of wandering and cold.

In both passages, the status of the patron or non-patron as a *kauui-* is phonically emphasized (Y. 46.14 *kas-tē ašauuā* */artawā/, *kā vā* */kah wā/, *kawā*; Y. 51.11-12 *kā uruuathō* */kah wraθah/, *kā vā* [*bis*], *kəuuīnō*). In both passages, the key words are *xšnāuš* “satisfied with hospitality,” *maga-* “the patronly gift of largesse,” and *uruuaθa-* “someone committed via alliance.” In the context of patronage, *kauui-* is far more likely to refer to a ruler than to a (poet-) priest. If Vīštāspa was a ruler, as post-Avestan texts (including Pahlavi texts based on lost Avestan biographies of Zarathushtra) indicate, his patronage would have been the decisive factor in Zarathushtra’s success. Usually poet-priests would compete for the favor of a powerful patron, who alone could provide wealth and prestige; the like would not ordinarily be sought from another (poet-)priest, even one who did not feel threatened by the talents of another member of his profession.

In institutional terms, the early (Indo-)Iranian situation, like that of archaic Greece, was one of reciprocity, i.e., gift-exchange (Greek **ksenw-ía*, cognate of Av. $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$, see Appendix) between two peers. The relationship of host to guest is the model for that between the wealthy patron and the poet(-priest). The poet’s reciprocation to the patron is abiding fame (Greek *kléos*,

cognate with Vedic *śrávas*, Avestan *srauuah* and Y. 46.13-14 *fra-sru-*). In the instance of the (poet-)priest, his counter-gift to the patron includes recommendation to the god(s). In the Gathas, the reciprocity for patronly hospitality or lack thereof is respectively guestship in heaven or in hell.

In the Gathas, the favorable reference to Kauui Vīštāspa, against a hostility toward *kauuis* as a generic group, is understandable if *kauui-* referred to one of chieftains exerting power over a small territory. Vīštāspa was the one such local chief to patronize Zarathushtra, after rejection by the *kauuis* of other localities (e.g., the aforementioned *vaēpiiō kəuuīnō*, who held sway over a certain bridge). Those other *kauuis* continued to patronize poet-priests (and their gods, whom Zarathushtra calls *daēuuas* “demons”). These priests who are opposed to Zarathushtra are variously called “the wrongsomeness teachers of the land” (Y. 46.1d *daxiiēuš yōi sātārō drəguuan tō*); “having bad invocations” (Y. 46.4c *dužazōbā*); “having bad proclamations” (cf. Y. 32.9a *dušsastiš*), etc.

The Gathas depict an interaction of corrupt sacral and secular authorities, expressed through an alliterative pairing. The *karapans*, in league with the power-wielding *kauuis*, exploit the rest of society.

Y. 46.11 a *xšaθrāiš yūjēn karapanō kāuuaiiascā*

b *akāiš šīiaoθanāiš ahūm mərəṅəidiiāi mašīm*

Y. 46.11 a–b By means of their domination, the *karapans* and *kauuis*, through evil deeds, yoke the mortal(s) for the destruction of existence.

The stanza goes on to doom these evildoers to be “guests in the House of Wrong” (hell)

forever. This stanza, in the phraseological reverse recycling of Y. 46 (46.19–46.6) as 32.7–16, yields 32.13. Here are the relevant verses, with the related nearby material:

Y. 32.12 c *yāiṣ grāhmā aṣāṭ varatā karapā xšaθrəmcā īsanəm drujim*

Y. 32.13 a *yā xšaθrā grāhmō hīśasaṭ acištahiiā dāmānē manəḥhō*

b *aḥhəuṣ marəxtārō ahiiā ...*

Y. 32.14 a *ahiiā grāhmō ā.hōiθōi nī kāuuaiiascīṭ xratūṣ nī dadaṭ*

Y. 32.15 a *anāiṣ ā vī.nānāsā yā karapō.tāscā kəuuītāscā*

b *auuāiṣ aibī yəḥg dainṭī nōiṭ jiiātəuṣ xšaiiamnəḥg vasō*

c *tōi ābiiā bairiiāntē vaḥhəuṣ ā dāmānē manəḥhō*

Y. 32.12 c Through these things, with oppression,¹¹ the *karapan* chooses—instead of Rightness—the domin(at)ion of the mighty,¹² and Wrongness.

Y. 32.13 a–b Through which domin(at)ion, (their act of) oppression ties¹³ the destroyers of this existence to the House of Worst Mind ...

Y. 32.14 a Through oppression (**grāhmā*) of this (existence), the *kauuis* indeed have put their intelligence into ensnarement.

Y. 32.15 a–c Through these things *karapandom* and *kauuidom* are disappearing together with those whom they have put into harness.

The latter, with the former two (groups), shall not be brought unto those Who rule at will, in the House of Good Mind.

In the backwards recycling of lexico-phraseological elements of Y. 32 (32.16–12) in 48.7–12,¹⁴ 32.14 (with its elaboration in 32.15) is the basis of 48.10 (note e.g. the

correspondences 32.14 *vīśāntā*: 48.10 *vīśāntē* “enter into, commit themselves”; 32.14 *jaidiīāi*: 48.10 *ajān*; *√jan* “strike, smite”; and 32.14 *xratūš*: 48.10 *xratū* “intellects”). In the compositional sequence, 46.11a *karapanō kāuuaiiascā* “the *karapans* and *kauuis*” > 32.15a *yā karapō.tāscā kāuuītāscā* “*karapandom* and *kauuidom*,” whence 48.10c–d *yā karapanō ... yācā ... dušəxšaθrā daxiiunqm* “the *karapans* and the misrulers of the lands,” with parallelism of “misrulers of the lands” and *kauuis*.¹⁵ The latter phrase, “the misrulers of the lands,” has its contrast in 48.12a”, *saošiiantō daxiiunqm* “the benefactors of the lands” who have been established as expellers of Fury (48.12d *tōi zī dātā hamaēstārō aēšəm.mahiiā*). In its contrast with 48.12, 48.10c–d *yā ... karapanō ... yācā dušəxšaθrā daxiiunqm* is paralleled by 44.20c–d *yāiš gām karapā ... aēšəmāi dātā yācā kauuā*, “by which the *karapan* ... delivers the Cow to Fury and the *Kauui* ...” in which the context matches the association of respectively the *karapan* and the *kauuis* with injury to the Cow at 32.12 and 32.14; cf. contrastively 48.11: the advent of (good) rule/dominion (*xšaθra-*), with peacefully pastured dwellings free from gory violence. From these parallels we see that in 48.10 *dušəxšaθrā daxiiunqm* “the misrulers of the lands” is indeed a substitutive designation for the evil *kauuis*, the final evidence that the *kauuis* are rulers of localities.

The desire that good rulers, and not bad rulers hold sway (48.5 *huxšaθrā xšāntqm / mā dušəxšaθrā xšāntā*), juxtaposed with the theme of peaceful dwellings (48.6) and the arrest of Fury, i.e., violence (48.7), all again at 48.11 c–d 12, underscore that the *kauuis* of the proximate passages are men of force (cf. 32.11a–b “the wrongsomeness who show themselves off with ‘greatnesses,’ the miladies and milords, by robbing the property of inheritance”).

For the martial nature of *kauuis*, Schmidt¹⁶ brings a variety of evidence from the Yašts, in which both Kauui Haosrauuaḥ and Kauui Vīštāspa are portrayed as warriors powerfully armed

and striking down fierce and formidable enemies. In addition, Avestan onomastics provides a precious and decisive piece of evidence for a martial denotation of Av. *kauui-*: The Fravardīn Yašt names as a righteous ancestor in an early generation (the listing shortly precedes that of Zarathushtra’s family) one Kauuārasman (Yt. 13.103 gen. *kauuārasmō* for **kauuārasmanō* through haplological influence of the immediately following *ašaonō*) orig. “Having a phalanx of *kauuis*” (Bartholomae “der eine Phalanx von Fürsten hat”). Poet-priests do not expectably form battle formations (*rasman-*), but warriors do. The name confirms that *kauui-* amounts to a martial local ruler, a warlord, or, with a positive semantic “spin,” a champion or hero.

The Avestan personal name in *kauuā-* shows that the MĪr. meaning “martial, hero,” etc. is not based on a remote legendary history, but is a linear semantic development of the OĪr. word. Pahlavi shows two developments for the reflex, *kay*: (1) The dynastic title, attested *kd* on coinage as part of a late Sasanian “Kayanid” revivalism, cf. the royal names *Xusraw* and *Kawād*; (2) The meaning “hero,” attested for /*kay*/ with synonym /*yal*/ “hero, champion” in Greater Bundahišn 75.15 and 177.10 *kd’n Wyl’n*.¹⁷

In Manichean West Iranian, *kāw* (*k’w*) is a calque of Syriac *gañbārā* (/gabbārā/) “giant,” via the basic meaning of the word, “hero.” MPer. *kāw* “hero” is the source of NPer. *kāv* “brave, martial” (attestations in *Borhān-e Qāte’*, ed. Mohammad Mo‘īn, vol. 3 (Tehran: Editions Ebn-e Sina, 1979), vol 3, p, 1581), cf. also NPer. *dirafš-e kāwiyān* “the dynastic flag of Iran, the banner of the *kays*.” MPer. *kāw* may have been borrowed from the Parthian heroic literature. Perhaps *kāw* < **kāwiya-*; cf. Vedic *kāvya-* = *kaví-* as epithet of Uśanā, and note OAv. *kāuuaiiscī*, *kāuuaiiscā*. Manichean Sogdian *kw-*, *qw-* “giant” is again a calque of the Syriac. In Christian Sogdian the word is found in a fragment of Psalm 24, where *kwy* (in Sogdian script) corresponds to Syr. *gañbārā* “hero.” Christian Sogdian also has (in Estrangela script) *qwy’q* “heroism.”¹⁸

An onomastic trace of the Khwarezmian cognate is found in the name of the general of the Khwarezmian troops of the Khazar garrison, Maḥmūd ibn Kūy, whence Khwar. **kūyāw* “of the Khwarezmian people” > *Kujawa* /kuyáva/ > *Kiev* (an etymology I owe to Omeljan Pritsak). Khwar. **Kūy* *‘‘hero, champion’’ is obviously the name of a member of a military family.

In conclusion, Avestan *kauui-* refers not to a priest, but to a local ruler or warlord, whence its Middle Iranian cognates meaning ‘‘champion’’ or ‘‘hero.’’¹⁹

Appendix: On Two Terms of Hospitality

I. Avestan $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ ‘‘to satisfy expectations, give in reciprocity’’ and Archaic Greek $\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{FO}\zeta$ ‘‘host, guest, guestfriend’’ (later ‘‘guest,’’ then ‘‘stranger’’) taken together suggest an etymology, which had been lacking for each. The forms are semantically complementary: The Iranian base is also the word for ‘‘give hospitality,’’ as is inescapably clear from Pursišnāh 39, Vidēvdād 9.39, and Y. 60.2, while the Archaic Greek word occurs alongside words for ‘‘exchange, be mutual’’; both reflect the Indo-European institution of gift-exchange as token of hospitality (and cultic offerings).

An original meaning ‘‘reciprocity, exchange, mutuality’’ was also demonstrated by Benveniste,²⁰ in his discussion of the gift-exchange aspect of Indo-European hospitality, *inter alia* for Per. *mehmān* and Lat. *hostis* ‘‘guest.’’ The latter word cannot be related to Av. $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$, which has stems *kuxšnu-* and *cixšnu-*, irreconcilable with PIE **g^hosti-* (**g^hs-* > Ir. **γž-*). Rather, I take $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$, $\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{F}$ - from a PIE root *ksen* ‘‘to exchange,’’ attested in Y. 29.9a *xšqmānē* ‘‘instead’’ (which cannot be related to Ved. *kṣam-*, Pashto *zyām-* < PIIr. $\sqrt{gžam}$ ‘‘to endure, put up with’’), Ossetic (*æ*)*xsæn* ‘‘common, mutual’’, OIrish *ar son* ‘‘in exchange for.’’ **ksen-u-* (whence Gr. **ksenw-*) > **ksneu-*, as root **d^heb^h*- (OAv. *dābāiia-* ‘‘to deceive,’’ etc.) > **d^heb^h-u-* (Hitt. *tepu-*

*“diminished, small” [cf. OInd. *dabhrá-*, Av. *daβra-* “small”, *daiβi-* “midget”]) > **d^hb^heu-*, cf. Hitt. *tepau-* “to diminish”, Ir. **db^hau-* “deceive” (< **“harm”*), in OAv. verb stem *dbāuuaiia-*, noun *dbaoman-*, and nasal-infixed verb stem *dābanao-*.

From phrases like Y. 68.9 and Yt. 10.32 *surunuiā ... xšnuiā* “mayst thou hear and comply,” OPer. **çun(a)u-* ... **xšn(a)u-* resulted in the OPer. present stem *āxšn(a)u-* (athematic after **çau-* = Av. *srao-*) “to hearken, hear” > MPer. *āšnaw-*, *ašnaw-* “hear.”

In Indo-Iranian, there was homophony of forms from roots **kšnu* “to satisfy in reciprocity” and “to sharpen” (both meanings are represented in Av. *xšnūta-* “satisfied” and “sharpened”). In Vedic, where the continued by √*śā* “to sharpen,” whence “to satisfy in reciprocity, to treat hospitably.” Thus in first meaning had become obsolete for √*kṣṇu*, a play on the homophony was Vedic √*śā* is used in requests to the gods to requite worship; note especially RV. 2.39.7, “sharpen (*śiśītam*) our praises as with a whetstone (*kṣṇotrēṇeva*),” in which *kṣṇotrā-* is formally comparable with Av. *xšnaoθra-*, Arm. *šnorh* “gratification.” In Vedic √*śā* thus frequently has object *rāyās* “riches.” With reference to hospitality/cultic offerings, note √*śā* with object *ātithim* “guest” RV. 6.16.42 and 5.2.5. With regard to propitiation of the gods, Agni, “the dear/intimate (*priyá-*) guest” was the ideal object of cultic “sharpening,” in view of his blade-like flames (*téjas-*, etc.) and his being stoked (*ni* √*śā*); alongside the cult of Agni the “sharpening” was applied to other gods, e.g., Indra (cf. RV. 8.40.10–11).

In the Gathas hospitality to Zarathushtra is constantly indicated to be reciprocated in the afterlife, in the House of Song (paradise), and inhospitality to Zarathushtra required by guestship in the House of Wrong or House of Worst Mind (hell). These reciprocities are Mazdā’s eschatological *xšnut-* “hospitality-gift.”²¹

II. For *vāza-* “gift of hospitable nurture,” cf. most recently Humbach²² where Vedic *vājá-* “strengthening, nourishment” and *vāzišta-* adj. of “guest” (*asti-*) are compared. Further cognates, discussed by Schwartz are Sogd. *ēwpāzē* and Khwarezmian *bəwāzək* (**api-wāza-ka-*), Ossetic *iūāzæg* (**wi-wāza-ka-*), and Vedic *vājáya-* and *vājáyá-*.²³ The latter verbs, “to nourish, feed, invigorate” is a denominative from *vājá-* (but RV. 8.74.1 *átithiṃ vājáyantaḥ purupriyám* “nourishing the very dear guest”); RV. 6.5.7 *aśyāma vājám abhi vājáyanto* “may we obtain nourishment as we nourish [Agni]”; similarly RV. 6.22.2 *abhi vājáyantaḥ* (obj. Indra); and 1.4.9 *vājeṣu vājínam vājáyāmaḥ* (*figura etymologica* with *vāja-* and *vājáyá-*). The tight contextual relationship between these words of the hospitality sphere shows that the root for all has PIIr. **-ǵ-*, not **-ǵʰ-*. The PIE root is obviously *weg̃* (*ǵeg̃-*, under which Lat. *vegeō*, OPer. *vazrka-*, and Germ. *wacker* are noted *inter alia*²⁴).

Apart from the Sogdian, most of these forms were united by Schwartz²⁵ in which I proposed **wažna-* “vigor” as source of OPer. *vašna-*, expanding Szemerényi’s view of the latter by adding OAv. *vasnā* instrum., cf. OPer. *vašnā*, as perhaps combining will (*√vas*) and power (*√vaz* “to invigorate”); phonologically OAv. *vasna-*: *yasna-* as OPer. *vašna-*: **yašna-* (Per. *jašn*, *√yaz*).²⁶ To these I now add Vd. 9.37 seq. Av. *vazī* “suckling (of a cow).”

Perhaps *uštā* “Heil, Wohl” (abstract *uštātāt-*) is from *uštā* (instrum. of *ušta-*?) “(with) vigor, health,” whereby *uštāna-* (*uštana-*) “vitality” becomes explainable as **uštā-āna-* (or **ušta-āna-*) “breath(ing) with vigor.” Thus in Y. 33, which I analyze as built up from a concentrically concatenating proto-poem 33.2–10, the obligatory parallelism of the last stanzas of the final poem and the proto-poem (preceded by the other Gathic poems which I have identified as having similar structural histories²⁷), 33.16a *tanuuascīṭ ... uštanəm* “the vitality of (his, Zarathushtra’s) body” parallels 33.10c *uštātanūm* “vigor as to (Thy) body.” Here we have a

probable pun on *uštā* (loc. of *ušti-*, \sqrt{vas}) “in (Thy) wish,” 33.10b *zaōšē* “in [Thy] favor.” Cf., in rich concatenation, 43.1 (with foregrounded *uštā*) vis-à-vis the final stanza 43.16 (with *uštāna-*); as at 33.10, the ambiguity of *uštā* is brought out in 43.1 by *vas-* “to wish” ($\sim uštā < ušti-$, \sqrt{vas}) and *utaiiūitī tēuuīšīm* “potency with perpetuity” ($\sim uštā$ “with vigor”):

Y. 43.1a *uštā ahmāi yahmāi uštā kahmāicīt*

b *vasē.xšaiiqs mazdā daiiāṭ ahurō*

c *utaiiūitī tēuuīšīm gaṭ.tōi vasēmī*

d *ašəm dərəidiiāi taṭ mōi dā ārmaitē*

e *rāiiō ašiš vaṇhēuš gaēm manañhō*

Y. 43.16 a *at ahurā huuō mainiiūm zaraθuštrō*

b *vərəntē mazdā yastē cišcā spēništō*

c *astuuat ašəm hiiāṭ uštānā aojōṇhuuat*

d *xvāṅg darəsōi xšaθrōi hiiat ārmaitiš*

e *ašīm šīiaoθanāiš vohū daidīṭ manañhā*

Y. 43.1 May there be vigor for him, whosoever Mazdā Ahura,
who rules at His wish, would grant (it) in (accord with His) wish.
I wish that there come potency with perpetuity.

May Thou, O Ārmaiti, grant me this: Rightness, that it be upheld,
and may Reward (grant) riches, a life of Good Mind.

Y. 43.16 Mazdā Ahura, this Zarathushtra here
chooses that very Spirit which is Thy Holiest.

May material Rightness be powerful with vitality,

may Ārmaiti be in the Dominion in sight of the Sun,
and may She grant reward through deeds with Good Mind.

1. It is a pleasure to dedicate this article to Dasturji Kotwal. In recognition of his important publications and clarifications of texts dealing with Zoroastrian ritual matters, and also in pleasant recollection of hospitable reception at his Bombay home in 1989, I offer this article touching on both priesthood and hospitality in ancient Iran.
2. Christian Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Strassburg: Trübner, 1904), pp. 147–147; Arthur Christensen, *Les Kayanides* (Copenhagen: Andr. Fred. Høst & Son, 1932), p. 9 seq.
3. Kaj Barr, *Avesta* (Copenhagen: n.p., 1954), pp. 24–27 seq. and 206 seq.
4. Ilya Gershevitch, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. 186–187.
5. Jean Kellens, “L’Avesta comme Source Historique,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 24 (1976), pp. 37–49; Georges Dumézil, *Mythe et Épopée II* (Paris: Gallimard, 1971), p. 213 seq.
6. Kellens, *op. cit.* Schmidt, “Zaraθuštra and his Patrons,” pp. 358–359.
7. Hanns-Peter Schmidt, “Zaraθuštra and his Patrons” in *Ātaš-e Dorun, The Fire Within: Jamshid Soroush Soroushian Memorial Volume*, ed. Carlo Cereti and Farrokh Vajifdar (Bloomington, Indiana: 1st Books, 2003), pp. 357–358.
8. Walter Bruno Henning, *Zoroaster: Politician or Witch-Doctor?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 45.
9. Louis Renou, “Dénominatifs du Ṛgveda en *-aryati*, *-anyati*,” *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 37 (1936), p. 17 and esp. pp. 31–39.
10. For *vāza*- “nourishment of guest,” see Appendix.
11. For *grāhma*- (var. *gārāhma*-), the context points to the meaning “oppression, oppressiveness,” with closest cognate Lith. *grėsmė* “threat, compulsion, prohibition,” with Baltic verbs in *gras*- and other derivatives of PIE **g^hres* “to vex, to cause disgust” (Toch. B. *krās*-, Arm. *garšem*). I now question my earlier comparison with Vedic *grāsate* “devours, is voracious” (gluttony being at best tangentially relevant to the context) and reject comparison with MPer. and Parth. *grāmag*, Sogd. *γrāmē* “wealth,” which I adopted from Henning (OIr. **-ahm-* > MPer. *-ahm-*, not **-ām-*, e.g., *sahm*, *dahmag*).
12. *īšanqm* gen. pl. of **īšan-* “endowed with might,” < *īš-* + *-an-* adj. suff. (PIE **-He/on-*), nom. *īšā* in 29.9b” *īšā.xšaθrīm*. With contraction of vowels, */xšaθram-ca īšna[am]/* gives the expected nine-syllable second

hemistich; thus also for 32.9c *mazdā ašāicā* and 30.7c *yaθā aīiaṅhā ādānaiš*. Vocalic elision does not seem metrically operative in other poems of the Ahunauuaitī Gāthā or elsewhere in the Gathas, but (as I discuss in footnote 18 below) had this role in the pre-Zarathushtrian octosyllabic prototype of Yasnas 9–10, elision of vowels may have been adopted in Zarathushtra’s send-up of the latter text in Y. 32, of which poem 32.1–8 is compositionally reflected in 30.1–8; cf. see Martin Schwartz, “How Zarathushtra Generated the Gathic Corpus, Intertextual and Inner-textual Composition,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 16 (2002 [appeared 2006]), p. 52.

13. The spelling *hīšasaṭ* (disyll.) represents */hišat/ (= Vedic *siśát*); see further Martin Schwartz, “The Ties that Bind: On the Form and Content of Zarathushtra’s Mysticism,” *Proceedings of the First Gāthā Colloquium*, ed. Farrokh Vajifdar (London: World Zoroastrian Organization, 1998), pp. 135, 144–147, 175–178; Schwartz, “How Zarathushtra Generated the Gathic Corpus,” p. 58; Martin Schwartz, “Lexical Cruces of Yasna 29 and the Serial Cross-textual Composition of the Gathas,” in *Ancient and Middle Iranian Studies*, ed. Maria Macuch, et al. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), p. 221, chart 10. The model is 31.4b *išasā* “I seek” (stem *išasa-* < aor. *iša-* × inchoative *isa-*) which similarly is in the environment of *xšaθrəm ... drujəm* and *-išta- ... manəḡh-*. */hiša-/ is an aor. them. stem (alongside athem. *hiša-* in 45.4e” *vīspā.hišas* “all-binding,” cf. Varuṇa as an indeceivable “binding” or “snaring” god) of *√hāy* “to tie up,” whence *haēθa-* “snare” (in the parallel to 32.13a, again with *grāhma-*) 32.14a *hōiθōi* “in the snare,” textually < 46.6b” *dāməm haēθahiiā* “the cords of the snare,” cf. OInd. *dāman-* “tether, rope,” Per. *dām*, Sogd. *dām*, Khot. *dāma-*, Pashto *lūma* “snare, trapline,” etc.
14. Schwartz, “The Ties that Bind,” pp. 138–144, 146, 184–189.
15. Cf. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, p. 147.
16. Schmidt, “Zaraθuštra and his Patrons,” p. 369.
17. Cf. Gershevitch, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*, p. 186.
- ¹⁸. For the trisyllabic scansion */kāwiya-/ see now Martin Schwartz, “The Gathas and Other Old Avestan Poetry,” in *La Langue Poétique Indo-Européenne*, Actes du Colloque de Travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes, eds. G.-J. Pinault and D. Petit (Leuven–Paris: Peeters, 2006), pp. 495–496.
19. For the close connection between priesthood and rulership, cf. the survey of E. O. James, “The Sacral Kingship and the Priesthood” in *The Sacral Kingship, Studies in the History of Religions IV*, Supplement to *Numen IV* (Leiden: Brill, 1959), pp. 63–70.

Av. *kauui-* “perceptive (sagacious) ruler could have been an Iranian semantic development of an equivalent of Vedic *kaví-* adj. “perceptive.” For OIr. $\sqrt{kū}$ “to perceive,” note e.g., Sogd. *wicāu* “witness.”

After the present article was submitted, the author received a publication with similar conclusions from complementary data: Iris Colditz, “Altorientalische und Avesta-Traditionen in der Herrschertitulatur des Vorislamischen Iran,” in *Religious Themes and Texts of Pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in Honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli*, eds. Carlo Cereti, Mauro Maggi and Elio Provasi (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2002), pp. 61–77. Note especially p. 73 mentioning Persian *kou* (*kau*) “intelligent, wise, talented.”

20. Emile Benveniste, *Les Mages dans l’Ancien Iran* (Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve, 1938), pp. 76–82.
21. The etymology of Av. $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$, Greek *ζένοϛ*, etc. was discussed in detail in Martin Schwartz, “Scatology and Eschatology in Zoroaster” in *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), pp. 487–488, 495. I now reconstruct the initial consonant of the ultimate root as PIE **k* and not **kʷ*. With regard to *maga-* (pp. 476–478, 481–483, 496) for 48.10, I now read *mada-* not *maga-*, and I no longer hold that the *maga-* “gift, largesse” involves reciprocity. I affirm the etymological connections given on p. 496, but find problematic the connection with Av. *moγu* – “tribe,” Median *magu-* “(*member of the priestly) Tribe”; see Benveniste, *Les Mages dans l’Ancien Iran*, p. 20. Finally, I also abandon an Iranian root **ag* “to make taboo” (492–6), taking 48.10 *ajān* from \sqrt{jan} . In the same article I discuss *kauui-* and *karapan-* with some of the same arguments presented here.
22. Helmut Humbach, *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and Other Old Avestan Texts* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1991), part II, p. 229
23. Martin Schwartz, “Hospitalities and Formalities (\sqrt{waz} , \sqrt{braz}),” in *Papers in Honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), pp. 200–202.
24. Julius Pokorny *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern: Francke, 1959) vol. 1, pp. 1117–1118.
25. Schwartz, “Scatology and Eschatology in Zoroaster,” p. 486 seq. and Martin Schwartz, “Coded Sound-patterns, Acrostics, and Anagrams in Zoroaster’s Oral Poetry” in *Studia Grammatica Iranica: Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*, ed. Rüdiger Schmitt and Prods Oktor Skjærvø (Kitzinger: München, 1986), pp. 327–392, esp. 387 with n. 15.
26. In his “Truth and Deception in Ancient Iran” in *Ātaš-e Dorun, The Fire Within: Jamshid Soroush Soroushian*

Memorial Volume, ed. C. Cereti and F. Vajifdar (Bloomington, Indiana: 1st Books, 2003), pp. 383–434, Prods
Oktor Skjærvø states that he is unconvinced by Insler’s (1996) arguments that Av. *vāzišta-* = Vedic *vāhistha-*
“most respecting” > “most respectful,” and notes that “a close reading of his [Insler’s] article shows that the
meaning “invigorating” or similar fits all the occurrences equally well, if not better...” Skjærvø does not
mention my articles related to this subject at all although he agrees with my translation of *vāzišta-* as “most
invigorated” and the like, against Insler’s article. The latter in fact is specifically and overtly throughout
directed against my articles on this matter, which follow Humbach’s views on *vāzišta-*, *vāza-*, and Vedic *vāja-*.

27. See Martin Schwartz, “Gathic Compositional History, Y. 29, and Bovine Symbolism” in *Paitimāna, Essays in Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*, ed. Siamak Adhami, (Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers, 2003), pp. 196–197, 222, 238–240.

27. Since this article was completed, there appeared Stephanie Jameson’s monograph, *The Rig Veda between Two Worlds/Le Ṛgveda entre Deux Mondes: Quatre Conférences au Collège de France en Mai 2004* (Paris: de Boccard, 2007). Chapter/Lecture 4, “Poetry: kauui kavi kāvya,” contains much which is relevant, but undiscussable here.