

Pre-Print IRANICA

Gathic †*mānarōiš*: A Hapax Expatiated Compositionally

MARTIN SCHWARTZ, Berkeley

In this paper, as a demonstration of two innovative compositional approaches to the *Gathas*, Yasna 48.10" *mānarōiš* will be shown to be an error for *mādrāiš*. This exposition will lead to a new discussion of pejorative allusions to *haoma* in Yasnas 32 and 48. Along the way the semantics and/or etymology of the following words will be treated: Middle Iranian **wiyākā*- 'place', Old Avestan *hīšasa*-/*hīša*-, *aṅhaiia*-, *vafu(š)*-, (*m*)*īza*-, *duuaēdā*, *āiḍi*-, and *wrūpaiia*-.

It is a great pleasure to dedicate this article to Almut Hintze for her important Iranistic scholarship, including her study of the *Gathas*.

First the focal problem. Here is the line in which *mānarōiš* occurs (the rest of the stanza, which is of no help for understanding this word, I leave for discussion after treating *mānarōiš*).

48.10a *kadā mazdā # mānarōiš narō vīsəntē*
 'When, O Mazdā, will men position themselves...?'

This context for *mānarōiš* sheds no light on the meaning. The word has chiefly been guessed at via etymological assumption of a stem *mānari*- from an underlying form **mamri*- (i.e. *(*h*)*mamri*-), which is compared with the rare formation *caxri*- (Y 34.7b" *caxraiio*) from √*kar* 'make, do'; thus HUMBACH (1959, II, p. 79). Since √(*h*)*mar* means 'to keep account of, count, remember, rehearse', *mānarōiš* has been translated accordingly with a range of meanings like 'announcement, message, reciter, believer (= observer), observance' etc.

Differently, INSLER (1975, p. 92) translated 'murder' (i.e., as from √*mar* 'to die'), rendering the line as 'When, Wise One, shall men desist from murdering?', taking *vīsəntē* not as has become usual, '(they) undertake, take (up) position (for), become ready (for)', but rather 'desist', comparing Vedic *nī vīsate* 'ceases, desists'. For this Insler offers two suggestions, both unlikely: (1) the *n*- of *narō* which precedes *vīsəntē* has the effect of **nī*-; (2) **nī* in stanza 10 carried over from 7c' as an example of "the continuation of the force of a previously mentioned preverb without its direct repetition". Such a repetition in Y 48 depends on INSLER's unconvincing emendations: 7a' *nī aēšəmō *dātəm*, INSLER 'let fury be stopped'; and 11c *kōi drəguuō.dəbīš xrūrāiš *rəməm dāntī*, INSLER 'Which ones shall stop the cruelty (caused) by the deceitful?', both with √*dā* taken as 'to stop'.

In fact, unemended Y 48.7a' *nī aēšəmō <nī> diiātəm* (with <nī.> as repetition for Young Avestan grammatical explanatory purposes) 'may wrath/fury

be tied down' is confirmed by the Vedic stem *dya-* 'to tie', with cognates 7d' *dāmaṃ* 'bonds, ropes' (Vedic *dāman-* 'rope, tether'); note Y 46.6b" *dāmaṃ haēḍabhiā*, '(into) the cords of the snare', Sogdian *ḍām*, Middle Persian *dām* 'trap'. In the same Y 48.7 other words of this semantic field are *hiḍāuš* 'ally, **alligatus*', *dīdrayžō* 'wishing to hold fast', and *viiam* 'encompassment, enclosure'¹. Unemended again, *kōi drəguuō.dəbīš xrūrāiš rāmaṃ dāntē* means simply 'which ones will establish peace as regards the gory wrongsone ones?'

In the Vedic examples given by INSLER, the influential preverb is in the same stanza, and not at a distance, as in his alleged example in Y 48. While INSLER's interpretation must be rejected, it is the only one which takes into account the seeming ablative/genitive syntagm of *maṇarōiš* with *vīsantē*.

It somehow has evaded general notice that the text's *maṇarōiš* was challenged by the young Walter Bruno Henning, as recorded by LOMMEL (1935, p. 132), "*maṇarōiš* zweisilbig. Ob Fehler für **maḍrōiš*? (Henning); Instr. pl. vokalisiert wie Dat. auf -*ōibyō*?".

Reserving for later another explanation of *-ōiš* along with a suggested scenario for the origin of *maṇarōiš*, I now propose correction to **maḍrāiš* (instrumental plural of *maḍra-* 'charged poetic formulation') which I shall now prove by employing the two relevant compositional principles.

Each principle to be now described was first adumbrated in SCHWARTZ 1991, pp. 128–132 (on the ring-composition of Y 50 as typical of, in effect, all the poems of the Gathic corpus), and p. 143 with p. 161 (Y 32.7 forwards to the end, stanza by stanza, based lexemically on the backwards recollection of Y 46 from its end [stanza 19] to stanza 6). It was only in SCHWARTZ 2002 [2006] that, in addition to giving an expanded and systematic account of Gathic complex ring-composition (pp. 53–54), including an exposition of first-stage and second-stage ring-composition, I showed (pp. 55–63), with a series of charts, how the kind of intertextual relationship I had demonstrated in SCHWARTZ (1991) for Y 46 and Y 32 in fact extends to pairs of poems throughout the Gathic corpus. I continued this latter demonstration with many more charts in SCHWARTZ 2003a [2007]; 2009; 2015; 2017; 2018; 2019, pp. 265–266.

As for the first principle, I now call it, in reference to requisite individual word-correspondences within a concentric ring-compositional arrangement of stanzas, by the iconizing acronym SOLOS = "Stanzaically organized, lexemically obligated symmetry". For the second principle, I shall continue the acronym introduced in SCHWARTZ (2018, p. 217), SCRIM = "Serially correspondent recursive intertextual mechanics". The acronym also serves for comparison of a *scrim* cloth, whose opacity is dispelled by a light shining through, to a pile of transparent sheets each of which charts the consecutive correspondences in the vocabulary of two paired poems, whereby the cumulative superimposed transparencies would constitute an opacity

1 Excellently explained at length in HUMBACH 1991, II, p. 201 (6). I add that from the idea of 'circumscribed or enclosed area', *(i)yā-kā- > Sogdian *wiyāk*, Parthian *wiyāg*, Middle Persian *gyāg* 'place', Khwarezmian *wy'k* 'house'.

which would become clear as they are individually examined. I note that the correlations in both SOLOS and SCRIM are lexemic, i.e. they may be at the levels of completely inflected words; or stems; or roots; or, alternatively, near-homophones.

The large total number of SCRIM charts is *inter alia* due to their multidirectionality, with regard to the beginning and end of each of the paired lists, and to the fact that the charts are both of first-stage compositions (proto-poems) and second-stage compositions (final poems), as determined by SOLOS. In this article I shall present only a small sample of SCRIM charts (as also of SOLOS charts), sufficient to confirm the emendation of *mānarōiš* to *mādrāiš*. This limitation in scope goes along with my having to postpone for another publication the reasons for my sequencing of the Gathic poems. I shall give for the first time a brief summary of my thoughts on the functional role of the SCRIM principle, this summary complementing my earlier observations (cf. SCHWARTZ 2009).

Since *mānarōiš* occurs in the midst of the proto-poem Y 48.7–12, it is from the latter that we must proceed. Y 48.7–12 became the second half of the final Y 48 (the first half, Y 48.1–7, which was formed by the SOLOS principle from Y 48.7–12 and by SCRIM from Y 30,² itself shows the same SOLOS structure of Y 48.7–12). Here is the SOLOS structure which shows Y 48.7–12 is formally a poem in its own right:

Chart I

48.7a'	<i>aēšəmō</i>	'fury, wrath'
48.8a''	<i>xšaθrahiiā</i>	'might, dominion'
48.9a'	<i>kadā</i>	'when?'
48.10a'	<i>kadā</i>	'when?'
48.11b'	<i>xšaθrā</i>	'might, dominion'
48.12d''	<i>aēšəm.mahiiā</i>	'fury, wrath'

Flanking of the central stanza pair:

48.8b'	<i>ašōiš</i>		48.9d''	<i>ašiš</i>
		'reward'		
48.10a''	<i>dušaxšaθrā</i>		48.11b'	<i>xšaθrā</i>
		'might, dominion'		

Chiastic correlations of the central with the outlying stanzas:

48.9a'	<i>saošiiqas</i>		48.12a''	<i>saošiiantō</i>
		'future weal-holders'		
48.10a''	<i>narō</i>		48.7c''	<i>nā</i>
		'man'		

2 SCHWARTZ 2014, where in the SCRIM chart for Y 30.1–11: Y 48.1–12, add Y 30b 10b'' *bušitōiš*: Y 48.11b' *bušitiš*.

Before proceeding to our first SCRIM chart evidencing *mānarōiš* for *mādrāiš*, and involving Y 32.13c from the second part of Y 32 (which part will prove important for Y 48.7–12 in its relationship to *haoma*), where the correspondence for *mānarōiš* is *mādrānō* from *mādrān-* */manḍra'an-/ 'someone who delivers a *mādra-*', it is relevant to provide SCRIM charts for final poems, which have straightforwardly attested forms of /manḍra'an-/ and /manḍra/ in correspondences. The next chart, which has many precise correspondences, features Y 32.13c' *mādrānō*, which will again figure importantly below as evidence for Y 48.10a" *mānarōiš* < *mādrāiš*. In addition, another SCRIM chart will be given, again with Y 32.13c' *mādrānō* corresponding to an inflected form of *mādra-*; here the comparison will be between two proto-poems.

Chart II

32.16c"	<i>drəguuatō</i>		45.1d"	<i>drəguuā</i> ^o
		'wrongsome'		
32.15b"	<i>nōiṭ</i>		45.2c'	<i>nōiṭ</i>
		'not'		
32.14a"	<i>xratū</i>		45.2c"	<i>xratauuō</i>
		'intellect'		
32.13c'	<i>mādrānō</i>		45.3c"	<i>mādrəm</i>
		' <i>mādra-</i> (+)'		
32.13a'	<i>hīśasat</i>		45.4c"	<i>vīspā.hīśas</i>
		√'tie' ³		
32.12a'	<i>srauuayhā</i>		45.5b'	<i>srūidiiāi</i>
		√'hear'		
32.12a"	<i>marətānō</i>		45.5b"	<i>marətaēibiūō</i>
		'mortals'		

- 3 *hīśasat* (perhaps via analogy with Y 31.4 *iśasā*) < **hiśa-* = Vedic *siśá-* 'tie'. Note the parallel cognate phrases Y 32.13a' *grēhmō hīśasat* and Y 32.14a' **grēhmā ā hōiḍōi* (on which see SCHWARTZ 2015; 2017). Y 32.13a' *hīśasat* correlates by SCRIM with Y 29.1b ā ... *hīśāiā* 'has tied up', and by connection in the coda with Y 32.16c" *ayhaiiā* < */ā hāyayā/ 'I may tie up', cf. Chart IV, *ayhaiiā*: *hīḍāuš* 'ally, *alligatus*'. Our *-hīśas* is nom. athematic pres. ptc. **hiśat-*. The stem **hiś-* would be from Proto-Indo-European **si-sh₂-* alongside **si-sh₂-e-* > Vedic *siśá-*, Av. **hiśa-*. Cf. KELLENS-PIRART 1990, p. 329, *hiśat-*. Y 45.4e *nōiṭ diβžaidiūāi vīspā.hīśas aburō* 'not to be deceived is the all-tying Ahura' is archaic, representing a god like the Vedic Varuṇa with his snares/fetters. The latter lines, plus Y 32.16c *aēnaḥhē drəguuatō* ... *ayhaiiā* 'may I capture/fetter the wrongsome for their violation/violence', compare with an address to Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, in a hymn to the Āditya-s, RV 8.67.7c–8a:

ādityā ādbhutasah
mā nah sētuḥ siṣed ayām ...

- 'O Adityas, undereceived (*ādbhuta-*, cf. Y 45.4e' *nōiṭ diβžaidiūāi*) as to offense (*énas-*, cf. Y 32.16c"), may that fetter (*sētu-*, cf. Y 32.14a' *haēḍa-*) not tie (*siśa-*, cf. Y 32.13a' **hiśa-*, Y 45.4c" *-hiś-*) us...' For Y 32.16c" *ayhaiiā* < */ā hāyayā/, see Chart VI below.

32.11c''	<i>vahištāt</i>		45.6e''	<i>vahištā</i>
		‘best’		
32.10b''	<i>drəguuatō</i>		45.7d''	<i>drəguuatō</i>
		‘wrongsome ones’		
32.9c''	<i>mainiūēuš</i>		45.8c'	<i>mainiūēuš</i>
		‘of spirit’		
32.8b'	<i>cixšnušō</i>		45.9a'	<i>cixšnušō</i>
		‘wishing to gratify’		
32.7b''	<i>srāuuī</i>		45.10b''	<i>srāuuī</i>
		‘was heard’		
32.6c'	<i>xšaθrōi</i>		45.10d'	<i>xšaθrōi</i>
		‘in the dominion’		
32.5b''	<i>daēuuēng</i>		45.11a'	<i>daēuuēng</i>
		‘demons (acc.)’		
32.4b'	<i>mašiiā</i>		45.11a'	<i>mašiiāscā</i>
		‘mortals’		
32.3b''	<i>pairimatōišca</i>		45.11b'	<i>tarē mainiūāntā</i>
		√‘think’		
32.2c'	<i>ārmaitīm</i> (*/aramatim/)		45.11c''	<i>arēm mainiūātā</i>
		‘harmoniously √‘think’		
32.2c'	<i>spəntəm</i>		45.11d''	<i>spəntā</i>
		‘holy (fem.)’		
32.1b''	<i>ahurahiiā ... mazdā</i>		45.11e''	<i>mazdā ahurā</i>
		‘Mazdā Ahura’		

The next two SCRIM charts, each of which provides independent correlations of /manθra-/ and /manθra'an-/, are noteworthy for the bidirectionality of one SCRIM series vis-à-vis the other series, and for the featuring of Y 50, which will prove of further importance for this study. The shared collocation of /manθra-/ ~ /manθra'an/ with *zaraθuštra-* in the absolute center of both Y 28 and Y 50 is part of a shared overall compositional scheme bringing together the middle portion with the first and last stanzas, and highlighting the reciprocal relationship between Mazdā as Zarathushtra's aider/supporter, and Zarathushtra as His spokesman.

Chart III

28.1e''	<i>uruuānəm</i>		50.1a'	<i>uruuā</i>
		‘soul’		
28.1c''	<i>gəušcā</i>		50.2a''	<i>gam</i>
		‘cow’		
28.2b''	<i>dāuuōi</i>		50.2d''	<i>dāhuuā</i>
		√‘give’		

28.3c'	<i>varədaitī</i>		50.3c''	<i>varədaiiaētā</i>
		'increase'		
28.4d''	<i>aēšō</i>		50.4c''	<i>išō</i>
		'might'		
28.5c'	<i>mąđrā</i>		50.5b''	<i>mąđrānē</i>
		'mąđra-(+)'		
28.6b''	<i>zarađuštrāi</i>		50.6b'	<i>zarađuštrā</i>
		'Zarathushtra'		
28.7b''	<i>maibiiācā</i>		50.7d''	<i>mahmāi</i>
		'to/for me/my'		
28.8b'	<i>narōi</i>		50.8d''	<i>hunarətātā</i>
		' <i>vir(tus)</i> '		
28.9c''	<i>išō</i>		50.9e''	<i>išaiias</i>
		√'have might, energy'		
28.10c'	<i>xšmaibiiā</i>		50.10d''	<i>xšmākāi</i>
		'to/for you'		
28.11c''	<i>aṅhuš</i>		50.11c'	<i>aṅhūš</i>
		'existence'		

Chart IV

38.11b''	<i>ḍβahmāt</i>		50.1c''	<i>ḍβatcā</i>
		'of Thine/Thee'		
28.10c''	<i>dāḍəṅg</i>		50.2d''	<i>dāḍəṃ</i>
		'lawful'		
28.9c''	<i>xšađrəmcā</i>		50.3b'	<i>xšađrā</i>
		'power, dominion'		
28.9b''	<i>stūtəṃ</i>		50.4a''	<i>stauuas</i>
		√'praise'		
28.8a''	<i>ašā vahištā</i>		50.4b	<i>ašā vahištācā</i>
		'with Best Rightness'		
28.7c''	<i>mąđrā</i>		50.5b''	<i>mąđrānē</i>
		'mąđra-(+)'		
28.6b''	<i>zarađuštrāi</i>		50.6b''	<i>zarađuštrō</i>
		'Zarathushtra'		
28.5c''	<i>hizuuā</i>		50.6c''	<i>hizuuō</i>
		'tongue'		
28.4a''	<i>vohū ... manəḥā</i>		50.7c''	<i>vohū manəḥā</i>
		'with Good Mind'		
28.3d''	<i>jasatā</i>		50.8b''	<i>pairī.jasāi</i>
		'come'		

28.2a'	<i>vā</i>		50.9a'	<i>vā</i>
		'You (acc.)'		
28.1b"	<i>šiiāoḏanā</i>		50.10a"	<i>šiiāoḏanā</i>
		'actions'		
28.1b"	<i>ašā</i>		50.11b'	<i>ašā</i>
		'with Rightness'		

In the next SCRIM chart, of two proto-poems each proceeding backwards, allowance (*) is made for the independently necessary rearrangement, for reasons of SOLOS, of Y 31.15 as & 31.*13, and Y 31.13–14 as Y 31.*14–*15; see Schwartz 2002 [2006], p. 54 (left column). Further, again for reasons of SOLOS, whereby the present Y 32.7c" *irixtəm* 'left over, remainder' must correspond to the cognate Y 32.11b" *raēxənaḥbō* 'of inheritance', and other SOLOS correlations, Y 32.6b *hātā.marānē aburā* # *vahištā vōistā manahā* has been reconstructively changed to **yaēšqmcīt tū irixtəm* # *vahištā vōistā manahā*, and Y 32.7c *yaēšqam tū aburā irixtəm māzdā vaēdištō abī* similarly becomes Y 32.*7b' **hātā.marānē aburā* # *tuuəm māzdā vaēdištō abī*, and Y 32.7b *yā jōiā sənghaitē* # *yāiš srāuuī x'vānā aiianhā* is moved down to become Y 32.7*c. These modifications are confirmed by SCRIM.

Chart V

32.13c"	<i>māḏrānō</i>		31.18a"	<i>māḏraścā</i>
		'māḏra-(+)		
32.12c	<i>ašāt ... drujəm</i>		31.17a	<i>ašāuuā vā drəguuā vā</i>
		'Right (-)' vs. 'Wrong (-)'		
32.12c	<i>varatā</i>		31.16c"	<i>vərənūuaitē</i>
		√'opt for, believe'		
32.12a"	<i>šiiāoḏanāt</i>		31.*15b"	<i>yā.šiiāoḏanāścā</i>
		'action'		
32.11c'	<i>ašaonō</i>		31.*15b"	<i>ašaonō</i>
		'righteous (acc. pl.)'		
32.11a"	<i>drəguuāntō</i>		31.*15c'	<i>drəguuō.dəbiio</i>
		'wrongsome (pl.)'		
32.10a'	<i>vaēnaḥbē</i>		31.*14c"	<i>aibī.vaēnabī</i>
		'see'		
32.9b'	<i>apō ... <apa>ūiantā</i>		31.*14b"	<i>aiiamaitē</i>
		√yam 'grasp'		
32.9a'	<i>jiiātəuš</i>		31.*13b"	<i>jiiōtūm</i>
		'life'		
32.8a'	<i>aēnaḥbəm</i>		31.*13b'	<i>aēnaḥbō</i>
		'violation'		
32.7c"	<i>vaēdištō</i>		31.12b'	<i>vīduuā</i>
		'knowing'		

32.7*c"	<i>sāṅghaitē</i>	31.11c'	<i>sāṅghascā</i>
		√‘proclaim’	
32.7*b'	<i>hātā.marānē</i> ⁴	31.19c	<i>humarətōiš</i>
		√‘keep account’	

The remaining Gathic attestations of *mādra* and *mādrān-* all correspond via SCRIM, as shown in the charts below involving the proto-poem Y 48.7–12. In the SCRIM charts below I shall maintain Y 48.10a" *mānarōiš* without emending it to **mādrāiš*, but shall indicate its erroneous nature by a dagger: †*mānarōiš*.

The next chart features the remarkable extensive correlation of Y 32.16b' with Y 48.9a"–b, and of (Y 32.14b", Y 48.10a") the only Gathic occurrences of verb *vīsa-*.

Chart VI

32.16c"	<i>aṅhaiiā</i>	48.7c"	<i>hiṣāuš</i>
		√‘tie’ ⁵	
32.16c"	<i>išiiāṅg</i>	48.8c"	<i>išiiā</i>
		‘to be sent’	
32.16b	<i>xšaiiṣ mazdā ahurā # yehiiā mā aiṣiścīt duuaēḍā</i>		
48.9a"–b	<i>xšaiiāḍā ## mazdā ... # yehiiā mā aiṣiścīt duuaēḍā</i>		
		‘have control over whoever is my (to me) dread and consternation’ ⁶	
32.15c"	<i>vaṅhāuš ... manayhō</i>	48.9c"	<i>vaṅhāuš ... manayhō</i>
		‘of Good Mind’	
32.14b"	<i>vīśāntā</i>	48.10a"	<i>vīśāntē</i>
		‘move into position toward’	

- 4 The hypermetrical *hātā.marānē* is an error in early written transmission for **hāta.marānē*, the correct form underlying Yašt 1.8 *hāta.marāniš*. As ‘Accounter of what is earned or deserved’ (*hāta-* from √*han(H)*), cf. Pahlavi *pad wināh ud kirbag āmār kuned* ‘makes an account of sin and piety’. The wrong *hātā.marānē* should therefore not be compared in form with *vouru.cašānē* Y 33.13, but rather with e.g. Av. *fšaoni-* < √*fšau*, Vedic *vābhi-* < √*vah*, etc.
- 5 Y 32.16c" *aṅhaiiā* ‘that I might capture/fetter’ < */āhāyayā/ (with late insertion of *ṅ*, or, less likely, via **āṅhāiiā*), cf. INSLER 1975, p. 210, with parallels for the contraction. The word satisfies the obligatory final-stanza connection to the central portion of the poem, with *hāitīm* taken as ‘linkage, (*concentrically concatenating) Gathic poem’, and it obligatorily connects with the cognate Y 32.13 *hīśasat* (on which see above) in forming a coda to the proto-poem; see SCHWARTZ 2002 [2006], pp. 53, 58.
- 6 /āṣi-/ only occurs in these two passages. It is a “Caland system” variant of */aḍra-/ which became /āṣri-/ via /āṣi-/; thus *āṣri-* Y 46.8b", cf. Pahlavi *’hr*, ‘dread’. In Schwartz (1990, p. 203) I proposed the latter words to be cognate with Latin *atrōx* ‘dreadful’, in early collocation with ‘*incerta, instabilis*’, which points the way to the underlying meaning of the Iranian. Note the pairing with *duuaēḍā* *‘twoness’, i.e. ‘being of two minds’, Pahlavi gloss *gumāniṅ(ih)*, referring to the indecision of sudden panic. These details do not appear in the interesting and relevant discussion of *duuaēḍā* by BENVENISTE (1976, p. 294), in which the latter word and Proto-Indo-European **ḍwey* ‘to fear’ are illuminated in terms of twoness at Hom. *Iliad* IX.229–230.

32.13c'	<i>māθrānō</i>	48.10a"	† <i>mānarōiš</i>
			‘ <i>māθra</i> -(+-)’
32.13a'	<i>xšaθrā</i>	48.10b"	<i>xšaθrā</i>
			‘with domination’
32.12a	<i>šūiaoθanāṭ</i>	48.12e'	<i>šūiaoθanāiš</i>
			‘action’

In the next SCRIM chart, Y 48.10a" †*mānarōiš* is again part of a reception from an earlier-composed poem. The chart features correlation of the only occurrences of *vafu(š)*- ‘(cosmic) pattern/design (which shows the future)’.⁷

Chart VII

29.1b'	<i>aēšəmō</i>	48.7a'	<i>aēšəmō</i>
			‘wrath, fury’
29.2b"	<i>xšaiiantō</i>	48.8a"	<i>xšaθrabiiā</i>
			√‘rule’
29.3b'	<i>šauuaitē</i>	48.8d"	<i>šūiaoθanəm</i>
			√‘agere’
29.4a"	<i>yā zī</i>	48.9a"	<i>yezī</i> */ <i>yazi</i> /
			‘rel. + *zi’
29.5c"	<i>arəžəjiūi</i>	48.9c'	<i>ərəš</i>
			‘correctly’
29.6a'	<i>vaocat</i>	48.9c'	<i>ūcam</i>
			√‘speak’
29.6a"	<i>vafūš</i>	48.9c"	<i>vafuš</i>
			‘(prognostic) pattern’
29.6a"	<i>vīduuā</i>	48.9d	<i>vīdiiāṭ</i>
			√‘know’
29.7a"	<i>māθrəm</i>	48.10a"	† <i>mānarōiš</i>
			‘ <i>māθra</i> -’
29.8b"	<i>mazdā ... ašāicā</i>	48.11 a	<i>mazdā ašā</i>
			‘Mazda ... Rightness’
29.9b"	<i>īšā.xšaθrīm</i>	48.11b'	<i>xšaθrā</i>
			‘power(-)’

7 The meaning of *vafu(š)*- involves knowledge of the future. Accordingly derivation directly from √*vaf* ‘to weave’ gives the basic semantics ‘a weave/weft (of a carpet) > ‘design/pattern (of destiny)’, cf. ONIANS 1968, pp. 349–351 “The Weaving of Fate”. A stem *vapuš*- ‘(*weaving) design/pattern’ allows possible connection with Vedic *vāpus*- ‘form (as in *go-vāpus*- ‘cow-shaped’), beautiful shape, marvel’, from **vābhus*- with conceivable influence of Vedic *vāpati* ‘shears, shaves’, which may have been used for the trimming of textiles. Cf. SCHWARTZ 2003b, p. 210.

29.10b''	<i>hušaitiš</i>	48.11b''	<i>hušaitiš</i>
			‘good dwelling’
27.13b'' ⁸	<i>šiiāoθananam</i>	48.12c'	<i>šiiāoθanāiš</i>
			‘actions’

In the next two SCRIM charts, Y 48 is donor to the subsequent poem, Y 44. Thereby, as per Charts VIII and IX, in the second part of Y 44 *māθra-* occurs twice, i.e. at Y 44.14 and at Y 44.17. Interestingly, these two attestations of *māθra-* are in stanzas which stand, as per SOLOS, counter to one another, the two flanking the central stanza-pair of the proto-poem Y 44.11–20 (i.e. the second half of the final Y 44), Y 44.15–16, the latter two stanzas united by each having *pōi* ‘to protect’ as second word of the b'' hemistich, in the context of victory of the righteous over the wrongsome, via divine word. The two occurrences of *māθra-* which are positioned counter to one another are also thematically opposed in accord with the dualism at hand:

Y 44.14b–d: ‘How may I deliver Wrongness into the hand(s) of Rightness, so as to sweep it (Wrongness) down and away via the *māθra-*s of Thy proclamation, to make a strong breach among the wrongsome?’.

Y 44.17c–e: ‘[Having from You] an associative nexus with You, that my voice be mighty for there to be brought about Integrity and Immortality in a union via that *māθra-* which constitutes an adhesion in association with Rightness?’.

Chart VIII

48.7c'	<i>aēšəmō</i>	44.20c''	<i>aēšəmāi</i>
			‘wrath’
48.8a'	<i>xšaθrahiiā</i>	44.20a''	<i>huxšaθrā</i>
			‘domination’
48.9c'	<i>ərəš ... ūcam</i>	44.19c''	<i>ərəžuxdā</i>
			‘speak correctly’
48.10a'	<i>kadā</i>	44.18b'	<i>kaθā</i>
			‘(interrog.)’
48.10a''	<i>†mānarōiš</i>	44.17e'	<i>māθrāiš</i>
			‘māθra-’
48.11b'	<i>jimat</i>	44.16d'	<i>jaṇtū</i>
			√‘come’
48.12c	<i>θβahiiā ... sānghahiiā</i>	44.16b''	<i>θβa ... sānghā</i>
			‘Thy proclamation’

8 For Y 27.13 shown by SOLOS to have been the original final (11th) stanza of Y 29, see SCHWARTZ 2003b, pp. 215–217.

Chart IX

48.12"	<i>ʒβahiiā ... mazdā</i>	44.11c'	<i>mazdā ...</i>
			‘O Mazda, Thy’
48.12a"	<i>saošiiantō</i>	44.12d'	<i>sauuā</i>
			√‘have weal’
48.11d'	<i>vanhēuš ... manayhā</i>	44.13e"	<i>vanhēuš... manayhō</i>
			‘of Good Mind’
48.10a"	<i>†mānarōiš</i>	44.14c"	<i>mādrāiš</i>
			‘mādra-’
48.9a"	<i>xšaiiaḏā</i>	44.15b"	<i>xšaiiahī</i>
			‘rule, control’
48.8 (3x)	<i>kā</i>	44.15c'	<i>kahmōi</i>
			‘who?’
48.7d"	<i>ḏam</i>	44.16c'	<i>ḏam</i>
			‘in the house’

Charts VI–IX make it clear that *†mānarōiš* corresponds via SCRIM to forms based on *mādra-*, and given the termination *-iš*, the emendation to **mādrāiš* is clearly indicated. Some confirmation is shown in Chart IX, in which Y 48 is lexemic donor to Y 44. Y 48.10" gives as its correspondent Y 44.14c" *mādrāiš*, which occurs in the proto-poem Y 44.11–20 as the first of the two correspondents to *†mānarōiš* (the second being Y 44.17e' *mādrā*, as per Chart VIII). In fact, Y 44.14 shows a general parallelism to Y 48.10. Omitting the recurrently fixed incipit at Y 44.14a, we have Y 44.14b beginning with *kaḏā* ‘how?’ with continuation at 14c, *nī hīm mərəždiiāi # ʒβahiiā mādrāiš sēnghahiiā* ‘to sweep it down and away with *mādra*-s of Thy proclamation’, cf. Y 48.10a' *kaḏā* ‘when?’ and following *mānarōiš*, 10b *kaḏā ajēn* ‘when will one beat (down/away)...’. The phrase *ʒβahiiā ... sēnghahiiā* ‘at Thy proclamation’ seen at Y 44.14b also occurs at the end of Y 48 (12c"), with regard to the actions whereby (12a") *saošiiantō daxiiunam* ‘the weal-givers of the lands’ will be (12d) those who expel wrath.

The final stanza is linked to Y 48.10 compositionally through 10d" *dušəxšadrā daxiiunam* ‘the misrulers of the lands’ (= the *kauii*-s), paired with 10c ‘the *karapan*- (priests)’. This linkage implies connection of 10a" *mānarōiš* (**mādrāiš*) with 12c" *ʒβahiiā mazdā sēnghahiiā* ‘of Thy proclamation, O Mazda’.

In Y 44.20, the *kauii*- and *karapan*- are again mentioned as connected with wrath. The thematic relationship between Y 48.7–12 and the last stanzas of Y 44 accord with the formal relationship shown by SCRIM, whose charting completes that already given for Y 48.7–12 vis-à-vis Y 44.10 seq.:

Chart X

48.12e	<i>dātā ... aēšəm.mabiiā</i> ⁹	44.20c"	<i>aēšəmāi dātā</i>
	‘wrath’ + ‘assign’		
48.11b'	<i>xšaθrā</i>	44.20a"	<i>huxšaθrā</i>
	‘rule’		
48.10a'	<i>narō</i>	44.19c"	<i>nā</i>
	‘man’		
48.9c'	<i>ərəš ... ūcəm</i>	44.19e"	<i>ərəžuxδā</i>
	‘speak correctly’		
48.9b'	<i>ašā</i>	44.18b'	<i>ašā</i>
	‘with Rightness’		
48.8d'	<i>īštiš</i>	44.17c"	<i>aēšō</i>
	‘might(y)’		
48.7a"	<i>dəm</i>	44.16c'	<i>dəm</i>
	‘in the house’		

A further SCRIM chart of Y 48 as donor to Y 44 also extends to lexemic material in and past the first half of Y 44. The donations include an instance in which Y 48.10c" †*mānarōiš* gives as correspondent a form phonically like, but not identical, to *māθrāiš*.

Chart XI

48.12a"	<i>səṅghabiiā</i>	44.1c"	<i>saxiiāt</i>
	√‘proclaim’		
48.12b"	<i>hacāntē</i>	44.1d"	<i>hākurənā</i>
	√‘associate’		
48.12b	<i>vohū manayhā</i>	44.1c"	<i>vohū ... manayhā</i>
	‘with Good Mind’		
48.12a"	<i>saošiiantō</i>	44.2c'	<i>sūidiiāi</i>
	√‘have weal’		
48.11d'	<i>kəng</i>	44.3d'	<i>kē</i>
	‘who?’		
48.11c"	<i>dəmiš</i>	44.4c"	<i>dāntē</i>
	√‘establish’		
48.11c'	<i>kōi</i>	44.4c", d'	<i>kē</i>
	‘who?’		

9 The odd spelling *aēšəm.mabiiā* for expected **aēšəmbiiā* (with *aēšəmV-* as in *aēšəmō* Y 29.1, Y 48.7; *aēšəməm* Y 29.2, 30.6, Y 49.4; and *aēšəmāi* Y 44.20) is explained in SCHWARTZ 2019, pp. 265–266 (with SCRIM chart) as being like Y 44.20 *hīm mizən* for *hīm + izən* with gemination to *mm* in final line, in accord with other instances reflecting “dragging” recitations in final lines.

48.10a"	† <i>mānarōiš</i>	44.5e'	<i>manaodriš</i>
	√‘think’; - <i>dr-</i>		
48.9d'	<i>aḥbat</i>	44.5b"	<i>haiḍiiā</i>
	√‘be’		
48.8d'	<i>mainiiēuš</i>	44.7e'	<i>mainiiū</i>
	‘spirit’		
48.7c'	<i>spəntō</i>	44.7e"	<i>spəntā</i>
	‘holy’		
48.6d'	<i>aḥbēuš</i>	44.8d"	<i>aḥbēuš</i>
	‘of existence’		
48.5c'	<i>yaoždā</i>	44.9b"	<i>yaoš ... dānē</i>
	‘impart vitality (to)’ ¹⁰		
48.5a	<i>huḥšaḍrā ... dušəxšaḍrā</i>	44.9d"	<i>xšaḍrā</i>
	‘dominion’		
48.4b'	<i>daēnaḡm</i>	44.10c'	<i>daēnaḡm</i>
	‘envisionment (f. acc.)’		
48.3a"	<i>vahištā</i>	44.10b"	<i>vahištā</i>
	‘best’		
48.2b'	<i>ḡimaitī</i>	44.11b"	<i>vījāmiāt</i>
	√‘come, go’		
48.1b'	<i>qasašutā</i>	44.12c"	<i>aḡraḡm</i>
	√‘injure’		

A phonic relationship between *māḍrāiš* /*manḍrāiš*/ and *manaodriš* /*manauḍriš*/ is obvious. It is likely further that *manaodri-* ‘reminder’ was associated with *māḍra-* through √*man* ‘to think’, of which **manau-* ‘to remind’ is a regular derivative verbal stem with suffix *-dri-*, cf. *barəḍrī-* ‘bearer (f.)’. Thus the correspondence of *manaodriš* may be added as “circumstantial evidence” to the SCRIM charts which prove that †*mānarōiš* is for **māḍrāiš*.

It may now be suggested how Y 48.10a" *mānarōiš* came about as an error for **māḍrāiš*. The primary fact is that at Y 48.10a †*mānarōiš* replicates within itself the following word, *narō*. Secondly, Y 48.10b" *mūḍraḡm* follows closely nearby. The situation allows this explanation: proceeding from **māḍrāiš narō ... mūḍraḡm*, with regard to a very early manuscript: *narō* was accidentally omitted, and then supplied above **māḍrāiš* and was viewed by a second scribe as a correction of **māḍrāiš* (itself visually dissimilated, as it were, by the *m-dr-* of *mūḍraḡm*). Thereupon *narō* was inserted into **māḍrāiš*, yielding *mānarōiš*; then *narō* was restored on the basis of another manuscript, or recollection via oral tradition, whereby *mānarōiš narō* continued in subsequent texts.

10 ‘Impart vitality to’ (*yaoš* gen. to *āyu-* + *√*d(h)ā*, cf. *məḡḡ + √*dā*, māzdā-*) as at Y 46.18 *yaoš ... daiditā*. The ritual meaning ‘to purify’ in later texts amounts to making something belong to the realm of life and not death. See further SCHWARTZ 2003b, pp. 228–234.

As for Y 48.10 as a whole, I plan to discuss the passage in great detail in a study on the *Gathas* and *haoma*. For now, some brief remarks will serve to introduce my translation and textual annotations. The proto-poem Y 48.7–12, which figures importantly in our SCRIM charts, is, as seen from Chart VI, the continuator of the second part of Y 32 (Y 29, cf. Chart VII, was composed before Y 32, and is probably the oldest Gathic poem¹¹). Now, Y 32.7 seq. is chiefly a riposte to the Old Avestan prototype(s) of the Haoma-hymns Y 9 and Y 10, as is shown cumulatively *inter alia* by Y 32.8 (rebuke of Yima and his father, the mythical founder of the Haoma cult); Y 32.10, which begins with *huuō mā* = /hau mā/, cryptic paronomasia for /haumā/ = *haomā* ‘via *haoma*’; and then has *vaēna-*, *gam ašibiūō*, *vadarē*, *vōižda-*, and *ašāunē*, all found in Y 9.29–30; and Y 32.14c” *dūraosā-*, epithet of Haoma at Y 9.19 (and Y 9.2).¹²

The rebuke of Haoma, with allusions to material found at Y 9 and Y 10, continues in Y 48.7–12, in the central part of which we find Y 48.10 as a riposte to what is to be reconstructed as the Old Avestan octosyllabic verses which yield Y 10.8:

*/vispai zi anyai madahā
aišmā hacantai xru’idrū
at hai yah haumahya madah
artā hacatai vrāzmanā/¹³
‘For all other intoxications
are accompanied by wrath whose-club-is-gory,
while the intoxication which is Haoma’s,
it is, via Rightness, accompanied by bliss.’

The vocabulary of the foregoing is reflected, as per the lexematics of SCRIM (and SOLOS), in Y 48.10–12: */madahā/ ~ */madah/ > 10b” *madabiiā*; /xru’i-/ > 11c” *xrūrāiš*; /haca(n)tai/ > 12b” *hacāntē*, and /aišma-/ yields an iconic frame of beginning and end as a kind of magic limitation of the effects now attached to Haoma/*haoma* itself, as implied in the focal Y 48.10: Y 48.7a’ incipit *nī aēšəmō (nī.)diiātəm* ‘may fury/wrath be tied down’ and Y 48.12d” finale *hamaēstārō aēšəm.mabiiā* ‘the expellers of fury/wrath’. The latter refers to those appointed to implement the actions (12c” *šbahiiā mazdā sēnghabiiā*) ‘of Thy proclamation, O Mazda’, made explicit by Y 44.14c *mərəždiiāi šbahiiā mašrāiš sēnghabiiā* ‘to sweep it down (and away) with the *mašra*-s of Thy proclamation’, which we have seen takes us back to Y 48.10 and its interpretation:

Y 48.10a *kadā mazdā # *mašrāiš narō vīsəntē*
b *kadā ajən # mūšrəm abiiā madabiiā*

11 See SCHWARTZ 2010.

12 Cf., for the foregoing and other matters of allusion to Haoma in Y 32, the detailed expositions in SCHWARTZ 2006a; 2006b; 2006c, pp. 475–483.

13 The attribution of ‘bliss’ as a benefit of the Haoma-cult was countered by Zarathushtra’s multivarious insistence that ‘bliss’ was Mazda’s reward for piety, as discussed at length in SCHWARTZ 2018.

c *yā aṅgraiiā # karapanō urūpaiieintī*
 d *yācā xratū # dušəxšaθrā daxīiunəm.*

‘When, O Mazdā, will men position themselves for (Thy) *māθra*-s? When will one beat down the fecality of the intoxication by which harmful (plant) the *karapan*-priests bring about (visceral) seizures, as also, through that (weak) intellect, the misrulers of the lands (bring about seizures of goods)?’

Y 48.10b’ *ajān* < */ā jan(t)/ is comparable with Vedic *ā + han* ‘to beat at, beat in’, Delijani *ājenī* ‘to beat (on the ground)’, and *mūθrəm* means ‘feces’, as per Widēwdād 6.7 and 20. The stanza becomes clear as referring to the intoxication of harmel-extract, which according to the arguments of FLATTERY/SCHWARTZ (1989, pp. 3–102) was originally used as *haoma* alongside ephedra; I now maintain that it was Zarathushtra’s opposition to harmel-intoxication which gradually brought about the exclusive ritual use of ephedra (which was not intoxicating when used by itself) as *haoma*; the Indo-Iranian antiquity of ephedra in the rite is shown by **sauma*- giving most Iranian and Indic words for ephedra.

Two frequent effects of harmel-intoxication are vomiting and diarrhea (FLATTERY/SCHWARTZ 1989, pp. 26, 32–33). Zarathushtra, from his earlier activity as a *zaotar*-, must have been personally acquainted with *haoma* intoxication and its adverse physical side-effects (for which see FLATTERY/SCHWARTZ 1989, pp. 33–34). The *mūθrəm* accordingly refers to the diarrhea of *haoma*-consuming priests. The vomiting induced by the priests’ harmel consumption would also be indicated by one meaning of *urūpaiia*- ‘to seize’, cf. Vedic *√rup* ‘to suffer racking abdominal affliction due to intoxicating beverages’; see in detail HUMBACH (1991, II, p. 203). By *šleša, urūpaiia*-, with the meaning ‘seize’ = ‘rob’, cf. Khwarezmian *rwbj*-, Middle Persian *rubāy*- ‘id.’, then refers to the *kauii*-s, the ‘misrulers of the lands’; cf. on the depredations and extortions by the *kauii*-s (including the perverse slaughter of the cow), Y 32.11–15. Juxtaposed with the second mention there of slaughtering the cow (Y 32.14c) is *dūraošəm saocaiiat auuō* ‘burns *dūraoša*- as/for help’, i.e. performs the apotropaic ritual still practiced as a folkloric ceremony by Iranians today, called in Persian *esfand sūxtan* ‘to burn harmel’ (FLATTERY/SCHWARTZ 1989, pp. 48–49, 62–66).¹⁴

14 This suggests that in Y 9 the juxtaposition of *haoma* and *dūraoša*- goes back to reference to the use of harmel as an extract and as a substance which is burned. Thus perhaps */*duraūša*-/ ‘harmel which is apotropaically burned’ is from **dura*-’*uš*-*a*- ‘that which burns up affliction’. For **dura*- ‘affliction, pain’, I see an ablaut variant in **daura*- > Balochi *dōr* ‘pain, illness, wound’, and I take AV *durasyāti* ‘will harm’ as based on RV *irasyāti* ‘id.’ via influence of **dura*- rather than of *duš* ‘bad, evil’. I relate **dura*- to the words for ‘pain, woe, suffering’ listed by MAYRHOFER (1992, p. 708) under Vedic **dōman*-, i.e. Gr. *δέυη* and Albanian *dhunë*, which MAYRHOFER derives from a Proto-Indo-European root ‘to burn’. The Alb. form and Indo-Iranian **durá*- may go back to a PIE *-*r/n*- derivative. With disappearance of **dura*-, Av. *dūraoša*- underwent folk-etymology as ‘that which keeps destruction (*aoša*-) far away (*dūra*-), while Vedic *durōša*-, which reflects the original vocalism, became semantically obscured due to the desuetude of *soma*

Accordingly, in Y 48.10, *angraiiā* is instr. of a noun **angrā* ‘harmful/beneficial plant’, tabuistically replacing **spəntā* ‘holy/benign plant’, cf. Pashto *spānda*, Oroshori *səpān*, Vafsi-Ashtiyani *esbanda* (all < **spantā*) = Pers. *esfand/isfand*, *sepand/sipand*, etc., all ‘harmel’.

To return to *mądra-* (and *manaođrī-*), I plan in future to show how phonetic similarity inspired the poetic paronomasia Y 50.6a' *mądra*: Y 50.1b" *mā.nā đrātā* (*/mana đrātā/*) ‘my protector’, via SOLOS, and Y 50.6a' *mądra*: Y 34.5b *manayhā đrāiiōidiūi* (*/manahā đrāyadyāi/*) ‘protect via Mind’, via SCRIM.

Finally: with regard to SCRIM and SOLOS, for which †*mąnarōiš* = **mądrāiš* has been a showcase, it will be evident, even from the small number of charts given in this article (this accords with my study of many more such charts), that the same words tend to appear in SCRIM charts which are related to SOLOS charts. This correlation I take to complement phenomena which together have a mnemonic role in Zarathushtra’s generation of the Gathic corpus.

I thank David Flattery, Kian Kahrom, Jean Kellens, Agnes Korn, Nathan Levine, William Malandra, Nicholas Sims-Williams, and Michael Weiss for their help with the preparation of this article.

Bibliography

- BENVENISTE, É. 1976: *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris
- FLATTERY, D./M. SCHWARTZ 1989: *Haoma and Harmaline: The Botanical Identity of the Indo-Iranian Sacred Hallucinogen “Soma” and its Legacy in Religion, Language, and Middle Eastern Folklore*. Berkeley.
- HUMBACH, H. 1991: *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the Other Old Avestan Texts, in collaboration with Josef Elfenbein and Prods O. Skjærvø*, Part II: *Commentary*. Heidelberg.
- INSLER, S. 1975: *The Gathas of Zarathustra*. Leiden (Acta Iranica Textes et Mémoires Volume I).
- KELLENS, J./É. PIRART 1990: *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Wiesbaden.
- LOMMEL, H. 1935: “Gāthās des Zarathustra: Yasna 47–51. Mit Benützung der Entwürfe von F. C. Andreas† übersetzt und erklärt von Prof. H. Lommel.” In: *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft – östliche Kulturkreise, Neue Folge* 1.4. Göttingen, pp. 121–69.
- MAYRHOFER, M. 1992: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* I. Heidelberg.
- ONIAN, R. B. 1968: *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate*. Cambridge.

rites involving harmel. The laryngeal originally intervening in **duraHauša-* was lost as an elsewhere attested phenomenon in compounds.

Finally it must be noted that the popping of the harmel seed-capsules as they burn is homologous to the destruction of the evil eye believed to cause affliction, and thereby burning harmel amounts to the burning up of affliction; cf. the wording of the three folk-verses translated in FLATTERY/SCHWARTZ 1989, pp. 49–50 (main text).

- SCHWARTZ, M. 1990: "Hospitalities and Formalities." In: *Papers in Honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*. Leiden (Acta Iranica 30), pp. 200–207.
- 1991: "Sound, Sense, and 'Seeing' in Zoroaster: The Outer Reaches of Orality." In *K.R. Cama Oriental Institute International Congress Proceedings (5th to 8th January, 1989)*. Bombay, pp. 127–163.
- 2002 [2006]: "How Zarathushtra generated the Gathic corpus." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, New Series* 16, pp. 53–64.
- 2003a [2007]: "Women in the Old Avesta: Social position and textual composition." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, New Series* 17, pp. 1–6.
- 2003b: "Gathic Compositional History, Yasna 29, and Bovine Symbolism." In: S. ADHAMI (ed.): *Paitimāna: Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*. Costa Mesa, pp. 215–260.
- 2006a: "On Haoma and its liturgy, in the Gathas." In: A. PANAINO/A. PIRAS (eds.): *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europaea* 1. Milan, pp. 215–224.
- 2006b: "The hymn to Haoma in Gathic transformation: Traces of Iranian poetry before Zarathushtra." In: A. PANAINO (ed.): *The Scholarly contribution of Ilya Gershevitch to the development of Iranian Studies*. Milan, pp. 85–106.
- 2006c: "The Gathas and Other Old Avestan Poetry." In: G.-J. PINAULT/D. PETIT (eds.): *La langue poétique indo-européenne*. Leuven/Paris, pp. 459–498.
- 2009: "Pouruchista's Gathic wedding and the teleological composition of the Gathas." In: W. SUNDERMANN/A. HINTZE/F. DE BLOIS (eds.): *Exegisti monumenta, Festschrift in honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Wiesbaden, pp. 429–448.
- 2010: "Lexical cruces of Y 29 and the cross-textual composition of the Gathas." In: M. MACUCH/D. WEBER/D. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST (eds.): *Ancient and Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the 6th European Conference of Iranian Studies*. Wiesbaden, pp. 205–218.
- 2014: "Gathic composition and lexicology." In: *Iran Nameh* 29.2, pp. 20–28.
- 2015: "On an Achaemenian and Sasanian position: **grastapati*-, Old Avestan *grābma*-, and Proto-Indo-European \sqrt{g}^{bres} ." In: *ARTA: Achaemenid Research on Texts and Archaeology* 005, pp. 1–8. Available online: http://www.achemenet.com/document/ARTA_2015.005-schwartz.pdf [Last accessed 12.06.2018].
- 2017: "On an Achaemenid position and Gathic composition: OPers. **grasta(pati)*-, OAv. *grābma*-, and PIE \sqrt{g}^{bres} ." In: E. MORANI/E. PROVASI/A. V. ROSSI (eds.): *Studia Philologica Iranica: Gherardo Gnoli Memorial Volume*. Rome, pp. 427–433.
- 2018: "A Preliterate Acrostic in the Gathas: Crosstextual and Compositional Evidence." In: *Dabir* 6, pp. 116–124.
- 2019: "An Early Trait of Gathic Performance." In: A. PANAINO/A. PIRAS/P. OGNIBENE (eds.): *Studi iranici ravennati III*. Milan (*Indo-Iranica et Orientalia, Series Lazur*, 17), pp. 261–268.

