ON YASNA 51:16
— referring to Av. maga(van)- and Ved. maghd(van)- —
Gathica XVII(1)

GIKYÔ ITÔ*

In this paper, the author examines Vedic maghd(van)- from a new viewpoint and defines the meaning of Avestan maga(van)-, to come to the conclusion that these words are cognate and therefore of the same meaning.

Ved. maghd- is, as neuter noun as is evident from maghd and maghdâni, both being acc. pl., commonly interpreted as (1) ‘gift (Gabe)’, (2) ‘reward (Lohn)’, (3) ‘wealth (Reichtum)’ and (4) ‘generosity (Freigebigkeit)’. By ‘gift’ is meant what is bestowed from god(s) to men and by ‘reward’ what is given to the priest and his assistant from the donator who as the patron or institutor requests the sacrifice to be performed. Fundamentally therefore the ‘reward’ is the same with the ‘gift’. On the other hand the meaning ‘generosity’ may be said what is deduced from the meaning ‘rich in gifts, generous, liberal’ ascribed to maghd-van-, derivation from maghd-. Scholars’ interpretations seem to rest on the dhanam | dhanavat by which Indian native philologists translate Ved. maghd- | maghdvan-.

Of Av. maga- and magavan-, here may be given all forms, together with their seemingly parallel forms from the Rig Veda in parenthesis, as follows: maga-: magâm acc. sg. (Yasna 53:7; maghâm); magâi dat. sg. (Y. 29:11 [magâi.â]; 46:14; 51:11; in the Rig Veda only maghâya, and not *mâghat); magahyâ gen. sg. (Y. 51:16; 53:7; maghâsyâ) | magavan-: magaônâ acc. pl. m. (Y. 33:7 – cf. p. 15; maghônâh); magavâbyô dat. pl. m. (Y. 51:15 – cf. p. 15; maghâvadbhyôh, substituted by -vant stem). Av. maga-, although generally taken as masculine noun, requires in favour of it *mâgo nom. sg. or *mâgojhê nom. pl. or *mâgêing acc. pl. Therefore maga- can be regarded as neuter noun as well.

As is well known, there are many factors in the Rig Veda which, although of the same origin with Avestan ones, show antagonisms against the latter.
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Among others, people quote Indian devaic deities like Indra, Śarva=Rudra, Nāsatayas=Aśvins who betray themselves as demoniac in Iran (Indra, Saurva, Nāṣṭhayya). Likewise well known is the fact that these deities, of whom the opening two constitute the caste kṣatriya and the third and last the vaiśya, were contending for supremacy with the asuraic deities constituting the brāhmaṇa which strife attained its culmination early in Avestic Iran. In Rig Veda IV 42, the poet makes Varuṇa and Indra boast of the superiority with each other. Generally in the so-called Rangstreitliteratur (rank strife literature), a judge presides over for making the decision. But here the Vedic poet, reconciling the gods, invokes them together by Indrā-Varuṇā. This indicates that the conflict between the asuras and the devas did not attain its culmination in Rigvedic India unlike in Avestic Iran and that the asuraic deities still kept their characteristic features coping with those of devaic deities. The contradistinction between Rigvedic India and Avestic Iran may best be seen in the usage of Ved. maghā(van)- and Av. maga(van)- as the author will reveal it.

In Rig Veda IV 42, Indra is frequently invoked for bestowing maghā-, he himself stating ‘I am maghāvan-’ in § 5 while in Yasna 29: 11 and 51: 16 as is to be explained, Ahura Mazda and King Vīstāspa are referred to as possessors of maga-, hence both of them being as it were magavan-.

As the author has elsewhere(2) made in relief, in Iran the principal god (Mithra for his followers and Ahura Mazda for Zoroaster), as possessor of the heavenly property (išti-), is called arādra- ‘rich, blessed’, and so also the elite followers fit for the future salvation during their life-time in this world. Zoroaster calls his followers as a whole ašāvan- ‘righteous’, that is, one in accordance with the righteousness (aṣa-) in his thought, words and deeds, of whom the elite are arādra- while the remaining are drigu- ‘poor’. Zoroaster’s earnest desire was to make every righteous follower ‘rich, blessed’ for easily crossing over the Cinvant’s Bridge to the Garōmdān (garo domāna-) (cf. Y. 46: 10, 16). But since it is not easy for him to raise all of the followers up to this situation, the drigu- need constantly to be disciplined, not to err from the righteousness (cf. Y. 51: 13; 46: 11). See the author’s articles ‘On the name ‘Zoroaster’ — An Eastern Access to Zarabuṣṭra —’, Misumi 1984, p. 20 and ‘Myōsenjishō ‘Zoroaster’ — Tōhō karano Approach (名謳自性「ゾロアスター」— 東方からのアプローチ—‘Zoroaster’, self-styled title, true to his realization — An Eastern Approach to him)’, Oriento, Vol. XXIX, No. 1 (1986), p. 21 ff. To sum up, in Iran the asuraic deities as well as their specific, elite followers are called
aresdra- ‘rich, blessed’ while the other followers outside of aresdra- are called drigu- ‘poor’. Thus we can easily understand why those deprived of every means of salvation are called draʃʃiʃtō.ema- (superative from the superative degree of drigu-) (3) and that by Sogd. ɟr̥yus(k) is rendered the Pāli bhikkhu- (Skt. bhikṣu-). (4)

On the other hand, in Rigvedic India, the devaic Indra together with his believers are all called ādhrigu- ‘not poor’ among whom there is even a personal name Adhrigu-. Since the term ādhrigu- is a negative of *dhrigu-, equivalent to Av. drigu-, in Iran is evidently observed an original, primitive situation against in India. Another feature to be noticed is that unlike Iran, India makes no differentiation among the followers. Viewed from the Iranian stand-point, among the ādhrigu followers there may be contained those factors untrue to the name ‘ādhrigu-’, only cajoled into donorship by the donatory. The appellation ādhrigu- is a pejorative of aresdra- / Ind. *r̥dhr- applied to asuraic deities: in other words, the appellation ādhrigu- was at times only of empty name.

What the author has thus far mentioned will render a key to solve what is meant by Av. maga(van)- and Ved. maghā(van)-, words grammatically parallel with each other (as for the gender, see p. 1).

In regard to Ved. maghā- and maghāvan-, recent Rigveda translators, as far as I know, interpret them respectively as ‘gift’ and ‘generous’ without submitting them to exact and careful examination. As early as in 1898–99, C. C. Uhlenbeck, (5) although interpreting maghā- n. as ‘gift, offering’ and maghāvan- as ‘rich in gifts, generous’, proposed that the terms derive from an IE base meaning ‘to be able’, with special reference to Av. maga- ‘might’ and magavan- ‘mighty’. Following him and H. Güntert, Der arische Weltkönig und Heiland, Halle 1923, p. 108 f., J. Pokorny (6) interprets maghā- as ‘might, strength, wealth, gift’ and maghāvan- / maghāvat- as ‘strong’ deriving from IE *māgh- / *magh- ‘to be able, to have power, to help’ whence he derives Av. mōyu-, OP magu ‘magi, soothsayer’ without reference to Av. maga(van)-. Against these propositions, M. Mayrhofer (7) although recognizing the meaning ‘gift, reward, wealth’ of maghā- and ‘generous, rich in gifts’ of maghāvan-, regards the terms as of uncertain etymology. He seems to see cognate words in Av. mōyu-, OP magu-, Av. maga- and magavan- with semasiological reservation of the meaning ‘generous’ ascribed to magavan-. More recently H. W. Bailey has proposed a different etymology. (8) According to him, maghā- means ‘payment for service’ and
maghavan- ‘payer for service, i.e. professor and bestower’ corresponding to Av. moṣu- (*magu-, having the professional suffix -u), all forms as well as Av. mimayāṇo deriving from IE *mag- ‘to give what is due, to pay’ with no reference to Av. maga(van)-.

Such being the case, maghā(van)- should be re-examined, in which theoretically it is reasonable to begin with maghā- and then to treat of maghāvān-, but it is convenient for us to begin with the latter and then to define the meaning of the former.

In his Worterbuch zum Rig Veda, Leipzig 1873, col. 971, Hermann Grassmann gives maghā- m. ‘Reichthum (wealth), Fülle (riches, fullness), ‘Geschenk (offering), Gabe (gift)’, adding that both meanings are interchangeable and can hardly be discriminated from each other. He then gives maghāvan- adj. ‘Geschenk od. Lohn gebend (giving offering or reward), reichlich gebend (richly giving), gabenreich (rich in gifts), reich (rich), mächtig (mighty)’ and maghāvān- m. (noun) ‘der reichlich giebt, Geber (who richly gives, giver)’. Although the citation in this Worterbuch does not detail all of the passages concerned,(9) it suffices to know the general feature of the problem now under consideration. Of these meanings, ‘mighty’ deserves our special attention, although the meaning cannot directly be deduced from those ascribed to maghā- in the Worterbuch: ‘wealth, riches; offering, gift’. The meaning ‘mighty’ is non the less more adequate for the contexts than any other one ascribed to maghāvan-. Out of 81 cases in which Indra is modified by maghāvan- according to the Worterbuch, Grassmann translates(10) it by ‘rich’ in 12 cases, by ‘rich in gifts’ and ‘giver (Geber)’ in one case respectively whereas in almost all other cases(11) he adequately renders it by ‘mighty’ or ‘strong (stark)’. This dilemma indicates us that the etymon maghā- does not mean what has been thought to imply.

Here let us quote the passages where Indra is referred to as maghāvan- which however is translated by Grassmann either by ‘mighty’ or by ‘rich’. RV I 82: 1-6:

1) úpo sū śṛṇvati gītra māghavan mātathā iva | yaddā nāḥ suṣṭāvataḥ kāra ād arthāyāṣa tāt yājā nu Indra te āhṛ || Mayest thou listen to (our) invocations rightly, O maghavan, don’t be like one not nodding assent (to us)! When thou wilt make us graceful (to thee), then thou shouldst also comply with (thy) object. Now, O Indra, I will harness for thee the two bay horses (to the chariot).

2) āksannaṁ dīṃvadantaḥ hy āva priyā adhūṣata | āstōṣata svā-bhānavo vitṛṇā nāviṣṭhayā mati yājā nu ... || They (Maruts) have eaten (and) become intoxicated indeed,
they, the beloved (companions) have come down. They, self-luminous, inspired ones have been praised with the newest hymn. Now O Indra ....

3) susan̄draśaṃ tuā vayāṃ maghavan vandīṣimahi | prā nūndāṃ pūrṇā-vandharah stutō yāḥ vāśāḥ ānu yōjā nu .... || We want to celebrate thee possessing pleasant face, O maghavan. Now mayest thou drive hither according to (thy) desires, thou having the chariot-seat filled (with booty), thou being praised! Now O Indra ....

4) sā ghā tām uṣṭāṇo rātham ādhi tiṣṭhati govaṃ | pra nunam purna-vandhurah stuto yahi oasam anu yoja nv...|| We want to celebrate thee possessing Pleasant face, O maghavan. Now mayest thou drive hither according to (thy) desires, thou having the chariot-seat filled (with booty), thou being praised! Now O Indra ....

5) yuktās te astu dākṣiṇa utā saavyāḥ śatākrato | tēna jāyām īta priyāṃ mandānō yāhy āndhaso yōjā nu .... || Let thy right [horse] be yoked and the left [one], O a 100-fold-powered one! With it mayest thou drive to (thy) beloved consort, thou being intoxicated with the soma juice! Now, O Indra, ....

6) yunājmi te brāhmaṇā kēśinā hāri īta prā yāhi dadhiṣē gābhastoyoh | īta tuā sutāso rabhasā amandisuh Pūṣanān vajrīnt sām u pātnyāmadah || I harness the maned bay horses for thee with the prayer. Mayest thou drive forward; thou graspest (the rein) in (thy) hands. The strong juices have rejoiced thee. O thunderer, accompanied by Pūṣan, thou hast rejoiced together with (thy) consort.

In § 1 maghavan (voc. sg.) is translated by Grassmann by ‘mighty’ unlike in § 3 where the same term (voc. sg.) is rendered by him as ‘rich’. His translation by ‘rich’ must be due to the chariot filled with riches, but the very riches can only be captured by Indra ‘possessing a 100-fold (spiritual) power’ as is referred to in § 5. maghavan- referring to Indra in § 3 means ‘mighty’ like that in § 1. With the same reason, maghavan- in §§ 1 and 3 should not be interpreted as ‘generous (freigebig)’. When Indra looks like ‘generous’, it is due to his bravery with which he smites the enemies, captures the cities and deprives them of their properties to distribute among the followers of his own. His so-called generosity is only of peripheral importance in view of his bravery and courage. maghavan- should not be rendered at pleasure by ‘mighty’, by ‘rich’ or by ‘generous’ but always by ‘mighty’. Now the problem is not whether maghavan- means ‘mighty’ or otherwise, but of what sort is the ‘might’ implied by maghava- n. But the problem will be discussed later on and here may be examined RV VI 27 composed of two praises, one to Indra for the victory (§§ 1–6) and the other to the reward accepted by the priest (§§ 7–8). In § 3 we read:
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Because we do not know yet thy (Indra’s) whole greatness, O magnavan, nor (thy) divine-poweredness, nor (thy) perpetually new every grace. O Indra, no one has ever seen thy great force.

Grassmann rightly translates maghavattva- by ‘might’ (more precisely ‘divine-poweredness’, cf. p. 8) and magnavan (voc. sg.) by ‘mighty’—rightly, just because the stanza has the terms mahimân- ‘greatness’ and indriyâ- ‘great force’ as qualities belonging to Indra and, what is more, the whole chapter (sûkta) makes mention of the triumph under the protection of the same god. No need exists to interpret, because of the succeeding radhas- ‘grace, gift, favour’, maghâvan- as ‘rich’ or as ‘generous’ and accordingly magnâ- as ‘wealth’ or as ‘generosity’.

Apart from Indra, there are some deities or objects possessing maghâvan- as attribute. According to the Wörterbuch of Grassmann they are as follows (added figure indicates the respective frequency): Indra 82, Soma 3, Agni 6, Aśvins 3, Aśvins’ chariot 1 (cf. n. 12), Maruts 2, Indra+Agni 1, Indra+Soma 1, Indra+Brahmaṇaspâti 1, Pûṣan 1, Viśvâkarman 1, various deities 4 (of whom, +Indra 1, +Indra+Varuṇa 1), Rbhus 1, Uṣas 19 (magnâ- f.: almost all are translated inadequately by ‘rich’ by Grassmann), Uṣas+Nakt 1 (uṣâsâ-nâktâ magnâ nom. du. f.: Dawn Goddess and Night Goddess), dakṣiṇâ 1 (magnâ- f.: reward or present to priest).

From this survey, it is evident that the sacred beings qualified by maghâvan- (magnâ- f.) are all belonging to the devaic deities (see p. 2) or to those closely connected with them. Soma is an intoxicating drink for Indra’s heroic exploit; Agni leads gods to the sacrifice or brings the offering to the gods and as such may well be connected with Indra. Maruts, also called Rudrâh ‘sons of Rudra’, are minor but very active deities under Rudra-Śarva and act very often with Indra. Aśvins-Nâsatyaḥ, as I have noticed above (p. 2), constitute the divine caste vaśya among the tripartite gods and deities and reasonably have also the attribute maghâvan- (magnâvâną nom. du.) which is naturally enough to be transferred to their chariot. According as the donator or donatory desires, sometimes but not so often Indra is united with Agni or Soma, or other deities—other deities including curiously Varuṇa (cf. p. 2), the head of the asuraic divine beings!—, when they are all together called maghâvan- (magnâvānâh nom. pl. m.) as well. When Uṣas is called magnâ-, we can readily understand it
from the Indra-myth that he begets the sun and the goddess Usās (cf. also I 48:12), because he makes the dark sky clear by releasing the heavenly water enclosed by Vṛtra. The goddess’ epithet maghōṇi- is almost always rendered as ‘rich’ by Grassmann and as ‘generous’ by recent translators. In RV I 48 we find oft-repeated descriptions of the good fortune the goddess bestows so that at first sight it seems quite natural to render the epithet by ‘rich’ or by ‘generous’. Let us quote for instance § 8:

visvam asya nānāma cāksase jāgej jyōtis kṛnoti sūndari | āpa dvēṣo maghōṇi duhitā
divā Uṣā uchad āpa srīdhah || All of the living beings have bowed down in her face. The beautiful goddess creates the light. May Usās, maghōṇi, daughter of the heaven drive away the enmity and the deviant by (her) brilliance!

Here the meaning ‘rich’ or ‘generous’ seems adequate for the light creating goddess, who however is also a ‘mighty’ one, driving away the enmity and distress. No need exists to translate maghōṇi by ‘rich’ or by ‘generous’.

The inconsistence Grassmann shows in his interpretation of maghāvan- / maghōṇi- as epithets of sacred beings is seen in case of maghāvan- referring to the donator. The donator in payment of the reward must be ‘rich’ or ‘generous’ but it does not justify the very interpretation of the epithet as such. In spite of his frequent interpretation as ‘rich’ or as ‘Fürst (lord, patron)’ and ‘Opferherr (sacrifice-institutor)’, still in a few cases we come across with his ‘mighty’. The frequency of the former (‘rich’+‘lord, sacrifice-institutor’) numbers as many as 65 cases against the latter (‘mighty’) only 10. The sacred beings invoked or worshipped at the donator’s request according to the Wörterbuch are as follows (figure shows the respective frequency): Indra 31, Soma 5, Rudra 1, Agni 23, Indra+Agni 1, Āsvin 3, Mitra+Varuṇa 1, Agni+Mitra+Varuṇa 1, Agni+Mitra+Varuṇa+Indra 1, Angi+Vasus+Maruts 1, Mitra+Varuṇa+ Aryaman 1, Uṣas 4, Viśvakarman 1, Bṛhaspati 1, Sarasvat 1, indefinite+uncertain 3. The figures clearly show the majority of cases occupied by the devaic deities and allied beings among whom Indra and Agni are surpassed by none — a situation, quite similar to that given on p. 6 (see also p. 9).

Here the author quotes two passages RV VII 81:6 and VIII 65:10 where maghāvan- referring to the donator is rendered by ‘mighty’ and by ‘rich’ respectively.

VII 81:6: śṛdvah śurībhya amītam vasuvanam vājāh asmabhyaṃ gomātah |
codayitri maghōṇah sūṇṭāvaty Uṣā uchad āpa srīdhah || [May she (Uṣas)
grant] to (our) donators the immortal fame (and) wealth, (and) to us the reward rich in cattle! May Uśas exhorting the mighty ones (maghónah, acc.pl. rather than gen.sg.), she abundant in grace, drive away the deviant by (her) brilliance!

**maghóvan-** here Grassmann translates by ‘mighty (one)’. Since the donators are rich, the term may seem better to be rendered by ‘rich’ or by ‘generous’. But the donators, though indirectly, are besought to endow with many cows as the prize of victory and therefore they are, or are to be, ‘mighty’. Although the author is afraid to be hasty in his conclusion, according as the patron goddess Uśas is maghóni- ‘mighty’ (cf. p. 7: RV I 48:8), the donators as her worshippers accept the very epithet and themselves become ‘mighty’. The same is true to RV VIII 65:10:

*dātā me pṛsatānāṁ rājā hiranyavānāṁ | mā devā maghāvā riṣat ||* The king, bestower of dappled [mares or cows] covered with golden decorations to me — May he, maghāvan-, O gods, not suffer injuries!

The passage is a benediction for the Indra worshipping king. In spite of Grassmann’s rendering of the epithet maghāvan- by ‘rich’ or another’s by ‘generous’, seemingly adequate either, because of the king’s donation of mares or cows, the king is, or is to be, mighty enough to bestow them as well. To him is transferred the very epithet maghāvan- from Indra.

Thus maghāvan- means always ‘mighty, strong, powerful’ and not ‘rich’ nor ‘generous’. This linguistic fact leads to the proposition that the derivation with suffix from maghā- subsists to maintain the proper meaning, ‘might, power’ of maghā- as is also shown by maghauvattvā- (RV VI 27:3, above cited on p. 6) and that it is transferred to the very epithet maghāvan- from Indra.

Thus maghāvan- means always ‘mighty, strong, powerful’ and not ‘rich’ nor ‘generous’. This linguistic fact leads to the proposition that the derivation with suffix from maghā- subsists to maintain the proper meaning, ‘might, power’ of maghā- as is also shown by maghauvattvā- (RV VI 27:3, above cited on p. 6) and that not only derivations but also compounds do so as follows:

(1) maghátīti-(13a) (<*maghā-dātī-*) ‘the giving of the power’ (IV 37:8; V 79:5; VIII 24:16; 45:15; 70:9; X 156:2); (2) magha-duya- ‘ditto’ (VII 67:9; X 42:2); (3) śvā-magha- ‘mighty in horse’ (VII 71:1); (4) krātvā-magha- ‘having vigorous power’ (V 33:9) (cf. (7) and (8)); (5) gō-magha- ‘powerful in cow, cattle, milk’ (VI 35:3–4; VII 71:1); (6) citrā-magha-(14a) ‘possessing excellent power’ (I 48:10; VII 75:5; 77:3); (7) tuva-magha- ‘possessing daring power, daring-powered’ (V 33:6); (8) tuva-magha- ‘ditto’ (I 29:1–7; V 57:8; VIII 61:18; 81:2; 92:29); (9) sūtā-magha- ‘possessing a 100-fold power’ (VIII 1:5; 33:5; 34:7; IX 62:14); (10) sūtā-magha- ‘having renowned power’ (VIII 93:1); (11) sahāsrā-magha- ‘having a 1000-fold power’ (VII 88:1).
Of these terms, (1) occurs in connection with Uşas, except in IV 37:8 with Ṛbhubus and in X 156:2 with Agni; (2) in conn. with Aśvins and Indra respectively; (3) refers to Aśvins; (4) refers to the horses of Marutāśva; (5) refers to Indra (§ 3), to the nourishments possessed by Indra, and to Aśvins (§ 1); (6) refers to Uşas; (7) refers to Indra; (8) refers to Indra, except in V 57:8 referring to Maruts; (9) refers to Indra, except in IX 62:14 referring to Soma; (10) refers to Indra; (11) refers to Varuṇa. Almost all of these terms (1)-(10) evidently occur together with the devaic deities or with their allied beings. Here let us quote VIII 61:18.

\[ \text{prabhāngī śūro māghāvā tūt-māghāh sāṃmīślo vīryāya kāṃ | ubhā te bāhū vīṭanā āśakrato ni yā vājram mimikṣatuh} \]

He (Indra) is crushing, valiant, mighty, daring-powered, armed himself to the heroic deeds. Thy both arms are vigorous, O a 100-fold-forced one, which hold tight the thunderbolt.

The meaning ‘mighty, strong’ of māghāvan- has thus become clear, but it is not certain in what way a māghāvan- being is strong. In this respect, the meaning has not precisely been defined by us, although by māghā- is meant some sort of strength.

Now reserving the precise definition of māghāvan- for later treatment, let us examine the deities who keep, grant or are besought to grant this māghā-(figure shows the respective frequency, disregarding the number sg. or pl. taken by māghā-): Indra 20 (of which, +Aśvins 1), Agni 4, Aśvins 1 (=Indra+Aśvins), Maruts 1, Uṣas 1, Mitra+-Varuṇa 1, various deities 1, Sarasvati 1.

In regard to the situation given in this table, no newly repeated explanation seems necessary. Here too almost all of the deities concerned with māghā- are the devaic gods and allied beings. And what is more, not only deities, but also human beings as donators are concerned with the māghā- transferred to them from the sacred beings. This sort of māghā- means likewise ‘might, strength, power’ and not ‘gift’ nor ‘generosity’. The deities worshipped by the donators who have acquired the māghā- are: Indra 2, Agni 2, Aśvins 1, Mitra+-Varuṇa 1, uncertain 1. In this case, māghā- makes its appearance in the concrete such as in horse, mare, cow and other properties. The donators here may actually be called māghāvān- and therefore it is desirable to add these figures to those given on p. 7: Indra 31+2=33, Agni 23+2=25, Aśvins 3+1=4, Mitra+-Varuṇa 1+1=2.

Now turn to the treatment of Iranian situation. The forms attested of
maga- and magavan- corresponding respectively to Ved. maghā- and maghāvan-
have been given together with their passages on p. 1. Among others, Yasna
51:16 is of decisive importance for the definition of what is meant by maga-

tam Kava Viśtāspō magahyā xṣādrā ṇ̥ṣaṭ
vaṭ̪hiṣ padebis manaṭ̪ho ṇ̥ṣā ṇ̥ṣaṭim ašā mantā
spentō Mazda Ahūra aḥā ṇ̥ṣa sazdyāi uṣṭā
That divine vision attained Kavi Vištāspa through the rulership of
magā-
with (his) limbs of good thought (or of Vohu Manah) which (vision)
according to the Righteousness had thought of
the beneficent Mazda Ahura. (Followers’ appeal:) ‘May He make us
so at His pleasure!’

Concerning maga-, Chr. Bartholomae, Altiranisches Wörterbuch, Strassburg
1904, col. 1109, regards it as m. ‘Bund, Geheimbund’, specially referring to
‘the Zoroastrian society’. As he has pointed out, the Pahlavi Yasna translates
it by maṃtiḥ (mkyh) with the commentary abezagih ‘unpollutedness, purity’ or
abezag wehih ‘pure goodness’ while in the Sanskrit version it is rendered, when
translated, by uttamatvam ‘supremacy’ or by mahatvam ‘greatness’ with the com-
mentary nirmalam ‘unpollutedness, purity’ or uttamatvam ‘supremacy’. In his
opinion, maga- of uncertain etymology is hardly identified with maghā-.

Various interpretations proposed before and after him are summarised by
Giuseppe Messina, Der Ursprung der Magier und die zoroastrische Religion, Roma
1930, p. 67 f., he himself being of the opinion that maga- to be identified with
maghā- ‘gift’ is a technical term representing the dēn or the teaching of Zoroaster
as the divine gift(15) (p. 73). Worthy to be noticed is that C. de Harlez has
‘la possession de la puissance’ (Y. 51:16) and C. C. Uhlenbeck gives Av.
maga- ‘might’ and magavan- ‘mighty’.(17) But they both did not dwell upon this
problem so that their proposition was not followed. The identity had been
recognized earlier by F. C. Andreas + J. Wackernagel, ‘Die erste, zweite und
fünfte Gāthā des Zura*thuštḥro (Josno 28. 29. 32). ....’, Nachrichten von der
König. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philol.-historische Klasse, 1913,
p. 376 (Yasna 29: 11 maṇḍi magā.ā ‘die grosse Gabe’). Here may be quoted
some recent translators. Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin, Zoroastre, Paris 1948,
agrees with AirWb when he translates maga- by ‘sacrament’. Helmut Hum-
bach, Die Gathas des Zarathustra, Heidelberg 1959, translates it by ‘Gabe’ but
specially in Yasna 51:16 by ‘Opfergabe’. See Bd. I, Einleitung, p. 66 f. and
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Bd. II, p. 18. Almost of the same opinion is M. Mayrhofer who identifies maga- and magavan- with maghd- 'gift' and maghᐃvan- 'generous' with a semasiological reservation in regard to the interpretation of magavan- as 'generous (freigebig)'. Somewhat different is Walther Hinz, Zarathustra, Stuttgart 1961: 'Opfergabe' for Yasna 29:11 and 'Bund' for Y. 46:14; 51:11; 51:16 ((Gottes-)Bund); 53:7. According to him (p. 209, note to Y. 29:11), either of the interpretations is tenable, because with him by 'Bund' is meant the union with God and the like union is nothing but a Gabe for the man united. And moreover in his note to Y. 51:16 (p. 238), he has preferred '(Gottes-)Bund (union (with God))' rather than 'Opfergabe (offering in the sacrifice)' by Hambach whose interpretation of xšaṛrā (instr. sg.) as 'Schirmherrschaft (protecting rulership)' he has highly appreciated. Yet another opinion is seen in Stanley Insler, The Gāthās of Zarathustra, Acta Iranica 8 (1975). According to him (p. 157 f., note to Y. 29:11), maga-, difficult to be identified with maghd- n. 'generosity', means 'task, enterprise', for which a prize (miẓda-) is awarded (cf. Y. 53:7) and accordingly magavan- 'one sharing the task, adherent, follower'. The interpretation as 'task, enterprise' is seen, though not sufficiently grounded, earlier with C. de Harlez and M. Mills (see Messina, op. cit., p. 67). Not sufficiently grounded as he is, C. de Harlez does not hesitate in interpreting maga- in Y. 51:16 as 'puissance' (see p. 10, n. 16).

With the recent interpreters, Vedic magh- undubitably means 'gift', 'wealth' or 'generosity' and maghᐃvan- 'rich in gifts, generous'. Without examining these Vedic terms much problematic as I have noticed, their identity with Av. maga- and magavan- has merely been approved or rejected only to no effect. In this respect, as far as Av. maga-/magavan- are concerned, their interpretation as 'might/mighty' proposed, although only etymologically and not philologically, by C. C. Uhlenbeck should not have been ignored, because, when the meanings are more exactly defined as 'divine power/divine-powered', those of Vedic magh- /maghᐃvan- will reveal themselves as of the same implication.

As I have pointed out, aṛḍra- /dṛigu- were employed concerning the asuraic deities and their followers (followers divided into two: aṛḍra- 'rich, blessed' and dṛigu- 'poor') while Vedic āḥṛigu- 'not poor' was applied to both the devaic gods and their followers, and in this respect an original, primitive situation is retained in Iran against in India. With the addition of this situation, Yasna 51:16 (see p. 10) allures our renewed attention. In its Pahlavi version we read thus:

\[
\text{ān 'ān Kē Wīṭāsp mkyh-iz r̥y ((abēzag̥t̥ r̥y)) ̣pad xwadāyih arzānīg ((Jud-}
\]
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"خمای یا بارماند) " پادمان این وحیمان پدیح ((فرارون تاخیریهای رای یشتار)) که فرازاغانگ "پادمان این اهلاییه پایمان "(که فرازام این تیس پادفرارونهای ادون چیون abayed دانیستان ودنده) "abzonig اهرمزد ادونات ام‌ام‌های رای سازیشن نیکیه 

He who (is) Wistasp owing to (his) mkyh only ((owing to (his) purity (abezagih))) is worthy to the rulership ((even if not by inheritance)) because of (his) lordship belonging to Wahman ((because of his just rulership)) — who (is) aware of the standard in the righteousness ((that is, he knows, just as one should know (it), the end of (all) things (shall be) in justice)).

O beneficent Ohrmazd, mayest thou prepare happiness for us in such a way!

A mass of misinterpretations phonological, morphological or syntactical in this version have made the text desperately obscure, but I have quoted it nevertheless, because the Pahlavi rendering of Av. maga- (magahya) by mkyh is suggestive as to a decisive interpretation of Yasna 51:16.

mkyh (magi) is an abstract noun from mow/mag 'magi'<OP magu- (Av. magu-) of the same origin with Av. maga- as is to be explained below. Since the main function of mow is to perform, or prside over, the sacrifice, mkyh is rightly glossed with abezagih 'unpollutedness, purity' which however does not suit the king himself as a layman. magahya xšāhrā 'through the rulership of maga-, by the ruling power of maga-', 'through the effective strength of maga-' reveals maga- as a dynamic, potential and active physico-mental substance or strength, a conception far from abezagih 'purity'. The reasoning seems inevitable that mkyh had long been inherited down to the day when the Pahlavi Yasna was composed in which it was glossed irrelevantly with abezagih, its original meaning having fallen into oblivion. mkyh as a relevant and pertinent substitute for maga- and accordingly maga- itself mean something like 'divine power, supernatural strength'. maga- as such has its field like a magnet, because maga-through its ruling power enabled King Viştäspa to attain, 'with (his) limbs of good thought or of Vohu Manah', the divine vision which beneficent Ahura Mazda had thought of, that is, which Ahura Mazda had attained through meditation, according to the righteousness (Y. 51:16, see p. 10). The passage 'with the limbs of good thought or of Vohu Manah (vayhuš padedib manayho)' has hitherto been irrelevantly translated by 'by/along the paths of good thought/
thinking’, ‘zusammen mit/auf (den) Pfaden (des) Guten Denkens’ or ‘sur les chemins de la Bonne Pensée’. *pad-* does not mean ‘path’ but is to be identified with Rigvedic *pád-*/pád- m. ‘foot’, *padbhist*, instr. pl. (*-padbhiiḥ*) meaning ‘with hands and feet, with the limbs’. By ‘with the limbs of good thought or of Vohu Manah’ is meant some posture of which we cannot lay down any sufficient definition but which suffices for us to recall for instance the Zenists or Zen Buddhist monks while sitting in the approved posture, with crossed legs, folded palms, straight back, regular breathing, eyes slightly opened. By *padbhist* is meant in all likelihood a posture while sitting with hands and feet in an approved gesture. In Y. 50:8 we find *padais ... izaya* which is to be interpreted as with the foot-steps (called those) of * İzâ- * and different from * nayhous padbhist manayhô*. Anyhow king Vîštâspa attained in this way the divine vision.

In this respect, we have an interesting account of the prediction by the Magi (Magians). In his *Twenty-third Book* Sotion (*Zoroiw*) who wrote about 200–150 BC mentions, according to Diogenes Laertius, that ‘they (the Magi) practise divination and prediction, and that the gods speaking appear to them, and also that the air is full of forms which, rising in exhalations of vapour, are visible to the eyes of the sharp-sighted’. And in his *De specialibus legibus* III 100, Philo Alexandrianus says: ‘Now the true magic, the science of vision by which the workings of nature are presented in a clearer light, …’. From these texts we know that the Magi were able to hear the words of the gods and were introduced into the future in a sort of mystic condition. Here we have referred to them, because OP *magu-*, as we shall explain it below (p. 15, p. 14), derives together with Av. *maga*(van)- from one and the same base IE *mägh-*/mägh- ‘to be able, to have power’: *magu-* means ‘divine-talented (man)’.

In Yasna 29:11, Ahura Mazdâ and other sacred beings are implored by Zoroaster to get the followers to be acquainted with (i.e. to be introduced to) the great *maga-* (*mazôi magâi.â*) for enabling them to know where are the Righteousness, Vohu Manah and the Kingdom while in Y. 46:14 Zoroaster in response to Ahura Mazdâ says that Kavi Vištâspa is an ally (*urvaða-*) to the great *maga-* (*mazôi magâi*). Zoroaster looks for an ally who as an upright one has been introduced to the *maga-* (*magâi*) of Vohu Manah (Y. 51:11). By the ‘ally’ is meant one who has been introduced to the *maga-* (Y. 51:11) which, although belonging to Ahura Mazdâ and other deities (Y. 29:11), can be attained by Zoroaster or his followers and enables them to know the *mênôg* things (Y. 29:11). In Yasna 51:16, the apparent priority of the attainment of *maga-**
by the king may be logical only. If so, he must have attained 'with the limbs of Vohu Manah' maga- itself as well as the divine vision. It is interesting that among the six Buddhist divine abilities (vikurva-/vikurvana-, 神通) is found a divine sight (divina caksus/divina-caksus-, cf. also p. 18). The divine sight having been attained, the king must have entered into the Teaching: The king is now called ally to the great maga- (Y. 46:14). *(25)*

Although none of these passages gives us any key to know precisely in what way clearer and more detailed maga- can be attained or in favour of what behaviour maga- can be bestowed, such a reasoning is untenable that one can attain it by mere oral recitation of the manthra, because with the prophet Zoroaster the manthra exists for recitation to bring about what is recited, or for proclaiming to make man bring about what is proclaimed. The author is quite uncertain whether maga- as such should be compared to the Buddhist vikurva/vikurvana 'supernatural ability', but he is quite certain that maga- is evidently a divine power not only from what we have dwelt upon but also from the etymological point of view. The word together with Engl. might, German Macht, Goth. mahts f. (<*mahti-*), Russ. močb, etc., OSlav. mošt (all meaning 'might, force'), derives from IE base *māgh-/*mēgh- 'to be able, to have power' whence also Engl. may (aux. verb), German mögen, Goth. magan, OSlav. mogo, mošti (all meaning 'to be able'). Cognate words are мъчарь 'means', Dor. мацър (>Lat. máquina). Considering however Lat. mactus 'honoured' (ppp. of *magere)* *(26)* and Ved. mah- 'to glorify', we can suppose that the IE base must have functioned also as tr. 'to strengthen, to vivify, to glorify, to honour'. And moreover from OIr. *mangā- 'vivifying' (>MP mang 'hemp') and Ved. māṁh- 'to give (with semantic development from 'to give strength')*, we can propose as Indo-Iranian base *mangh-/*magh- which will explain Av. mimarzō 'mayest thou seek to glorify' (Y. 45:10 — desider. 2nd pers. sg. active, injunctive [<imperfect]) *(27)* on the one hand and on the other Ved. citrá-mahas- (see n. 14) as well as Ved. māṁhiyas- 'more generous' (RV IX 66:17), māṁhiṣṭha- 'most generous' (passim), māṁhiṣṭha-rāti- (I 52:3), māṁhayād-rayi- 'bestowing wealth' (IX 52:5; 67:1), māṁhane-ṣṭhā- (X 61:1), māṁhayū- (IX 20:7). maga- with its ruling influential efficacy makes man foresee the heavenly properties as the prize (mižda-) for the conversion, so as to let him promptly enter into the Religion (as is the case with king Viśtāspa) or to let him fasten his belief.

*magavan- ‘possessor of maga-*, keeper of divine power, divine-powered’, another expression of ‘ally to maga-’, has variously been interpreted in accord-
ance with the varying interpretations of maga-: AirWb, col. 1111: ‘Bündler’; J. Duchesne-Guillemin: ‘les hommes du Sacrement’; H. Humbach: ‘die Opfer-teilnehmer (Y. 33:7), die Opferer (Y. 51:15); W. Hinz: ‘die zum (Gottes-) Bund gehören; S. Insler: ‘those sharing the task, adherents, followers (see p. 11). Generally speaking, magavan- has been interpreted as ‘one belonging to Zoro-aster’s society, adherent’ or as ‘participant of the sacrifice’. It is not therefore without reason that M. Mayrhofer, as the author has shown above (p. 11), doubted whether magavan- means ‘freigebig (generous)’, although its morphologically equivalent maghavan- is generally so interpreted.

In our opinion, magavan- does not imply any meaning proposed by these interpreters. By the term is meant the limited members among the Zoro-astrians that have been endowed with, or have arrived at, the maga- ‘divine power’. magavan- one as such is capable of knowing the supernatural phenomena (Y. 29:11, see p. 13). When in Y. 33:7, Zoroaster looks forward to be heard beyond (i.e. outside) the magavans (parā magaonā, see p. 1), by ‘outside the magavans’, he means, not ‘the non-Zoroastrians in general’ nor ‘the misers (<outside the generous)’, but ‘those who among Zoroastrians cannot see the validity of his teaching by their own vision’. He desires to have his teaching heard and believed by those incompetent followers. In Yasna 51:15, Zoro-aster promises to the magavans (magavabyō, see p. 1) the reward or prize (mizda-) placed in the Garōdmān. Here Zoroaster must have said most probably like this: “I promise you the reward that you see in the Garōdmān. Ahura Mazda rewards your conversion.” All things considered, maga- brings the reward round to the very followers. From the word ‘prize’ does not accrue the meaning ‘task, enterprise’ implied by maga- (see p. 11).

From the base IE māgh- / māgh- also derives OP magu- m. (agent noun in -u), etymologically meaning ‘man of ability, one having divine talent, divinetalented’. Our etymological supposition seems to be supported by a Magian name 翁域麻 (tiē-p‘uon-i) representing MP tuwanig ‘able’. The name is found in Fragment of topographical texts written in AD 885 and brought by A. Stein from Turfan. ‘The magi so called is in the Zoroastrian temple in Hami who had come over to the Chinese capital (長安) before the country of Kao-ch’ang (高昌) was defeated, and himself, conjuring down the Zoroastrian god for help, drives a sharp knife into his own belly to let the edge come out of it on the other side .... He spends a week out of breath (only) to regain his old condition.’(28) magu- is a sort of Median equivalent of Av. magavan-.(29) The magi,
true to their appellation, wan world-wide renown by their ‘magical’ practices (see p. 13), but at the same time many literatures ascribe them various practices or performances, untrue to the ‘magi’ in the truest acceptance of the term.\(^{(29)}\) In Chinese literatures, the ‘magic’ or ‘miracle’ is often represented by 良 or 幻 (huan). The ‘men skilful in huan’ (善莓人 shan-huan-jên) from Li-hsüan (黎軒, Ragâ) were presented to Wu-tî (武帝 who reigned 141–87 BC, in the Former Han Dynasty) and entertained the guests from abroad by their skill, so tells the Shih-chi (史記) in its vol. 123 (entitled Ta-yüan Lieh-chuan 大宛列伝). The matter seems to have taken place after the second Expedition (116–115 BC) of Chang Ch’ien (張騫, ?-114 BC) who had heard of the country of T’iao-chih (條支) with the men skilful in huan (國善莓 kuo shan-huan) during his first Expedition (138–126 BC). By t’iao (條) in its ancient pronounciation deu is represented MP Jō/Jō\(^{(31)}\) referring to any stream such as river, channel or canal, while chih (枝) — written also as 枝 chih ‘branch’ — means ‘to branch off’ or ‘branch’. Therefore T’iao-chih evidently refers to the district where the bough-like (two) rivers flow, that is, Mesopotamia meaning ‘the district between two rivers’. T’iao-chih is a sort of another expression of Mesopotamia. In his First Expedition, sometime about 129 or 128 BC, Chang Ch’ien had heard of the place name ‘Li-hsüan’ but none of the shan-huan-jên from there. From BC 539 onward, the Achaemenid Persia entered formally too into the direct contact with Mesopotamia. The highly developed culture extended its strong impact upon the Iranian world. Although I cannot literally nor philologically prove it, the huan playing must have been introduced into Ragâ, so that among the shan-huan men from Ragâ were probably found Chaldaeans containing Aramaeans or people from Syria. Cf. Acts of the Apostles 8:9–11.

The magi thus were apt to be regarded as men of shan-huan. In this respect much instructive is the Pahlavi literature. In the Kârnâmâg i Ardaxšîr i Pâbagân, the mowbedn-mowbed, against the King’s order, saved the life of his beloved and accordingly that of King’s son Šâbuhr (the later the First) but the future prospect by the mowbed does not concern with astrologer (axtar-mâr), augur (murw-nîš) nor oneirocritic (xwamn-wîzâr). Most probably these foretellers too with the Arsacid king Ardawân must have been mowbeds, because the magi were well noted for their divinations in various ways. That the Kârnâmag lets the foretellers act with Ardawân only comes from the idea to show clearly the distinction between the two dynasties, but non the less we can perceive an original nature of mowbed peeping through it. In this respect,
most interesting is the Ayādgār i Zarērān in which the predictions are all given by the wise Jāmās, mow-mard ‘the magi’ being referred to as guardians of Fire and Water, free from military service. But according to the Zoroastrian tradition, Jāmāsp (Av. Jámāspa, minister of King Vištāspa) was married to Purucistā, the youngest daughter of Zoroaster and after the death of the father-in-law became the head of his community, that is, mowbedān mowbed. Jāmāsp as such, although in the Gāthās there is no mention of him as magavan- nor as magu-, may be taken for a divine-powered or divine-talented one. In Yasna 51:18, he is said to choose for himself the divine sight or vision (čistim ... vorntē). From these accounts we know that the true magi are religious priests who, when predicting, do not always concern with astrology, dream-interpretation, oral taking of hemp, etc., but are foretold by the gods or introduced into the future by themselves. That the magi are connected with those originally unrelated fields comes from the fact that they in later times came to enter into these fields or that they were taken for the Chaldaeans. The account of the three magi from the East told in the Matthew 2:1–12 contains three interesting Iranistic problems: one is that the magi — if they were magi — seem to be astrologers, and the second is the relationship between the Messiah and the Iranian belief in a saviour in the eschatological sense of the term. These both problems however are not problematic, because we find a reasonable solution in Prof. G. Widengren’s research. According to him, ‘there once existed an Iranian theologoumenon according to which the birth of the (Iranian) saviour was announced by the appearance of a remarkable star for which the Magians were waiting year by year .... The ancient site of Šiz in Ādhurbaijān is assumed to have been the actual place of the mythical drama of the saviour’s miraculous birth .... There once was found both a textual and an iconographic tradition according to which the newborn saviour was presented by the Magians with the gift of crowns, a trait completely at variance with the Christian Gospel relation.’ — a trait completely at variance with, but occurring previous to, the Relation. As regard to the idea of ‘saviour-king’, man may refer to the fact that it goes as far back as to the Achaemenid period, because the tale told by Herodotus III 86 signifies the Mithra’s descent for making himself incarnated in Dārayavahu (Darius) — incarnated, represented by āskāra in the post-scription āskāra 3°naṭ x of the Aramaic inscriptions on the ritual objects unearthed from Persepolis. And the third and last problem — problem here to be taken up in our present article as an important subject — is that the Magians’ ar-
rival at (and retreat from) Bethlehem can better be understood when they are capable of walking with high speed, not only shown iconographically but also recognized by a Chinese text, Ch’ao-yeh chi’en-tsaI (朝野佥載) of Chang Chuo (張鴻, 660?-?)
the writer in the T’ang period. He says: “As regard to a Zoroastrian temple in Liang-chou (梁州) in the present T’ang Dynasty: ... When the day of praying comes, the Magian there drives from above his own forehead a sharp nail into his body which goes through to the arm-pit. He then goes out of the door of the temple, proceeds nimbly like flying and covers several hundred li (里) in an instant, to reach the front of the Zoroastrian God in the West where he dances to an air, and comes back to his own temple to drive off the nail without any single harm. He keeps himself lie down (only) for ten and odd days to regain his former condition.”(32) The Magians’ quick movement is also supposed by Odoric the Portenone (the latter half of 13. century-1331) when he says in his Travels: “From this city (Cassan, now Kāšān) to Jerusalem, (whither the Magi found their way, not surely by human strength but by Divine strength working by miracle, seeing how quickly they went), is a good fifty days journey.”(33) The Magians as ‘divine-talented’ as the author asserts it are only those who are capable of such a quick movement. One may refer to the Buddhist rddhi-prātihārya, a capacity of flying over to wherever wanted, divine flight, one of the six divine abilities (see p. 14).

When the Christians desire to make the Eastern pagan world submitted to themselves, the Magians are fit and suitable representative of the East.

Be that as it may, concerning maga- and magavan-, of great importance is that the terms are always centering the asuraic god Ahura Mazda. Here let us call attention to what we have elucidated in regard to ‘aredra- and drigu-, and adhriigu-’ (p. 2 f.). From the application of these terms (aredra-applied to asuraic beings whereas adhriigu- to devaic ones) we know that with Iran, and not with India, is retained an original, primitive situation. And now, in regard to maga(van)- and maghá(van)-, in Iran the former cooperates with the asuraic god Ahura Mazdâ (pp. 13-15) whereas in India the latter with devaic deities (Indra and others); and moreover magavan- as well as maghavan- are, or are to be, applied to gods and men as well. The meanings ‘divine power’ of Av. maga- and ‘divine-powered’ of magavan- as we have defined may justly be applied respectively to Vedic maghá- and maghavan-, derivations from IE māgh- ‘to be able, to have power’. maghá- thus cannot etymologically mean ‘gift, reward, generosity or wealth’ nor maghavan- ‘generous’. Even
when, and moreover very often, such meanings seem rather adequate, by maghá- is meant something of divine power, divine-powered thing, incarnation of divine power or divine thing and by maghávan- ‘divine-powered one’. In favour of our supposition, here may be given for instance three passages as follows:

RV VIII 88: 6: nākiḥ pārīṣṭir maghavan maghāsya te yād dāśūse daśasyādi | asmākāṁ bodhy ucāṭhasya coditā māṃhiṣtho vājasālaye || There is no hindrance, O divine-powered (Indra), to thy divine power (maghāsya te), when thou dost favour to (thy) worshipper. Mayest thou be the promoter of our praise, thou the most generous one, for (our) winning of reward!

RV I 11: 3: pūrṇaṁ Indrasya rāṭeyo nā ut dasyanty āṭeyah | yādī vājasya gūmataḥ stotṭhyo māṁhate maghām || Abundant are the graces of Indra, (his) helps do not waste away, when he bestows to the praisers the divine-powered thing (maghām) of the booty rich in cows.

RV VII 30: 4: vāyaṁ tē ta Indra yē ca devā stāvanta śūra dādato maghānī | yāḍchā sūrthaḥ upamāṁ vārūthaṁ svābhūvo jaraṇāṁ aśnavanta || We (want to be) thine, O Indra, and those, O god, who are praised as offerers of the divine-powered things (maghānī), O valiant one. Mayest thou bestow the supreme protection to the donators! May they attain the old age sound and safe!

Of the three maghá-, the second makes us still perceive a thing of divine power — so much so that vājasya gūmataḥ maghām ‘the divine thing of the booty rich in cows’ may be paraphrased into maghām vājaṁ gūmantam ‘the divine power i.e. the booty rich in cows’ in which the booty is seen as a concrete representation of the divine power. The third (maghānī acc. pl.), too, is not free from the conception of divine power, because, if the priest-singers are divine-powered (maghávan-), their offerings may also be regarded as ‘things of divine power’ (maghānī).

As we have shown (p. 14), MP mang ‘hemp’ derives from OIr. *mangā-, lit. ‘thing vivifying’. The Iranians knew that the oral taking of the mere hemp is not so effective; they absorbed its vapour(34) or took it together with hōm (haoma-). The Dēnkard (VII 4, 84 ff.) has the account of King Wištāsp that he took hōm together with mang and fell in deep sleep from which he awaked to have his consort call in Zoroaster for listening to his teaching ‘dēn’. The ‘hōm and mang’ is called food for making his spiritual sight clearer to see the
menāg world.\(^{(35)}\) In the Arda Wirāb Nāmag, Arda Wirāb took the mang of Vištāsp and hōm which derives through the account in the Dēnkard from Yasna 51:16. But to interpret maga- there as a reduced form of *manga- (>mang) 'hemp' is hardly possible, because Y. 51:16 shows no symptom of coma: Vištāspa did not fall in coma even by the ruling power of maga- but attained in his right senses as indicated by the passage 'with the limbs of good thought or of Vohu Manah' the very divine vision. If the maga- were *manga- (mang) 'hemp', the Pahlavi rendering of it by mkyh would have been superseded.

Notes

(1) Gathica XVI is to be published in the Festschrift in honour of Prof. Jes P. Asmussen.

(2) Gikyō Itō, Zoroaster Kenkyû, Tokyo 1960, p. 204 ff.

(3) G. Itō, op. cit., p. 209.

(4) G. Itō, loc. cit.


(9) Man can also utilize, K. F. Geldner, Der Rig-Veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt..., Viertel Teil, Namen- und Sachregister zur Übersetzung... von Johannes Nobel, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1957.

(10) H. Grassmann, Rig-Veda. Übersetzt und mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen versehen, Leipzig 1876.

(11) In one case by ‘gewaltig (poweful)’ and in 4 cases by ‘Held’.

(12) In I 157: 3, the chariot of Āsūns is referred to as maghātavan-.

(13) H. W. Bailey, loc. cit., interprets maghātīti- and magha-dyau- as ‘paying the magha-’.

(14) citrā-mahas- (X 122: 1) referring to Agni is to be taken as ‘receiving excellent glorification, excellently glorified’. For mah- in ‘mahas’, see p. 14.


(17) See p. 3 and n. 5.

(18) See p. 3 and n. 7.


(20) With the soles of the feet turned upwards, in which the right foot comes up and between the calf and thigh of the left leg.

(21) With the palms turned upwards, in which the left comes up the right and the stretched thumbs slightly touch with each other by their tips.

(22) Cf. qmnrn- in Yasna 45: 10.

(23) De vita philosophorum, Proemium I 7: ἀσκείν τε μαντικὴν καὶ πρὸφητικὴν, καὶ αὐτοτί-
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The Gāthā chapters are not always chronologically ordered.

Differently A. A. Walde und J. B. Hoffmann, Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg 1972, zweiter Band, p. 4 f. who derive Lat. mactus (<*magere 'augere') from IE *meg(h)- 'large, great' whence Lat. māgnus, mégaς, megálη, méga, Skt. mah-ánt-, Av. maz-ant- 'large, great'.

Differently H. W. Bailey. See p. 3 f. and n. 8).

Differently H. W. Bailey. See p. 3 f. and n. 8).

For the original full text, see Toyohachi Fujita, “Tai-shin to Reiken (Ta-ch'in and Li-hsian)” (The same author’s Tōzai-kūbushī no Kenkyū, Vol. II, Tokyo 1943, compiled by Hiroshi Ikeuchi, Tokyo 1943), p. 487; Namio Egami, “Genjin to Kada (Huan-jén and Hua-ta)” (The same author’s Tōzai-Kūbushī Shiwa, Tokyo 1985), p. 232. This article Egami’s had earlier been published in the Ishida Hakase Hōju-kinen Toyoshi-Ronsō, Tokyo 1965.

In the Avesta too moγu- is attested, but only once in moγu.βiβi- ‘hostile to the magi’ (Yasna 65: 7: nō āγō ... mā moγu.βiβi ... friβāiti ‘You, O you the Waters, should not hand over us to the magi-enemy!’).

That the Iranian SW dialect entered in its medeaeval stage at least in as early as the beginning of the 3rd century BC has been certified by the author: Zoroaster Kenkyū, p. 410 ff. ḣō < OP *yauδa- (OIr. *yauza-, Av. yaoza-) ‘agitation, revolt’ from base OP yauδ- (OIr. *yauz-, Av. yaoz-) ‘to be in commotion, to revolt’. Against ḣō, NP-yōz ‘desirous of ...’ belongs to Parthian.


Cf. Herodotus, IV 75.