ON THE COMPLAINT OF THE OX-SOUL

by

J. Duchesne-Guillemin
University of Liége

THE JOURNAL OF INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES
Volume 1 SPRING, 1973 Number 1

ON THE COMPLAINT OF THE OX-SOUL

J. DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN

University of Liége

It is of considerable mythological importance to identify the speaker in *Yasna* 29, 8. Lommel's suggestion that it is the Wise Lord who replies is rejected, and the identification of the speaker with Good Mind is defended. Such an interpretation would serve to substantiate Dumézilian theory.

Lommel's translation of the gâthâs, published posthumously as *Die gâthâs des Zarathustra* (Lommel, 1971) does not on all points represent progress. In particular, Lommel rejects Andreas-Wackernagel's identification of the speaker of *Yasna* 29, 8 with Good Mind, suggesting that Andreas-Wackernagel was 'perhaps dependent on Bartholomae' (Lommel, 1971, 30). Now it is important to know who utters this stanza, since this question decisively determines the interpretation of the entire hymn.

Certainly there is no reference to Good Mind in this gâthâ prior to stanza 7, until which time no solution to the predicament of the ox is in sight. However, the situation abruptly changes when, in response to the mention of that name, someone says in stanza 8: 'he has found Zarathustra, who will put things aright'. But who speaks? Is it not Good Mind, whose providential role would then contrast with Right's aloofness? Why does Lommel refuse to attribute stanza 8 to Good Mind?

Lommel advances two arguments to justify his position. In the first place he claims that since it is Wise Lord who is addressed at the end of the preceding stanza (*kastē*, 'whom hast thou'), it must be the Wise Lord who replies. Secondly, if it were Good Mind who speaks in stanza 8 instead of the Wise Lord, then Good Mind would have been specifically designated by name, like the ox-soul in stanza 1, and the Fashioner of the Ox in stanza 2. But this is not always the case. For example, in stanza 5 it is only from the context that we can tell that the ox-soul is speaking. Furthermore, why should we assume that the Wise Lord would personally answer a question addressed to him?Why could not Good Mind step in, since the mention of his name, however we construct it – either directly, relating *vohū manaŋhā* to *kastē* and the implicit copula or, less

likely,[1] by joining it to the second hemistich – seems to challenge him?

Lommel is not the first scholar to have rejected Bartholomae's attribution of stanza 8 to Good Mind. Gershevitch quoted two such scholars, Maria Smith and Paul Thieme approvingly, when he wrote: 'M. Smith and P. Thieme (Altheim, 1949; 264 sq.) have seen that the speaker in stanza 8 is more likely to be Ahura Mazdā' (Gershevitch, 1952; 174).[2] But this solution, which is the same as Lommel's, encounters a serious difficulty. If Ahura Mazdā is the speaker, *mazdā* in line 2 can no longer be a vocative. One would expect a genitive, and this is the way Lommel translates it, although he admits the lack of any documentary support.

Thieme found another way out of the impasse, taking *mazdā* as the appellative and constructing it with *hō vašti carəkərəθrā srāvayeŋhē*: 'he wishes **with wisdom** to recite hymns', a rather improvised solution, which severs Mazda's frequent association with *aša* in phrases such as *vā mazdā ašāicā*. There have been studies, since the publication of Altheim's book, by not fewer than three scholars – Humbach (1959:36), E. Risch, (1964:51-56) and Renée Zwolanek (1970). All three come to the conclusion that *mazdā* is a vocative: Risch and Zwolanek both adopt Humbach's translation: 'Er will uns, O Kundiger (Mazdā), und der Wahrhaftigkeit ... ', and declare (Risch, 1954; 63. n. 2: Zwolanek, 1970: 56) that the speaker is Good Mind.[3]

This makes perfect sense and I should like to correct my latest translation (Dumézil, 1965:26) as follows: 'C'est lui qui veut nous faire entendre des chants de louange, O Mazdā, et à Aša. It is he who will sing to us songs of praise, O Wise One, and to Right'.

Since Good Mind is addressing the Wise Lord, it is particularly appropriate that Right should also be explicitly mentioned –

1. The fact that the care of the ox falls with Good Mind, as appears from several passages quoted by Lommel, *Die Religion Zarathustras,* 1930 p. 123 sq. does not compel us, as Lommel would have it (*Die Gâthâs* p. 30, n. 1), to sever the name of the entity from its immediate connection in the first hemistich. Therefore: 'Whom hast thou as (*or:* through, *or:* with) Good Mind, who ... '

2. Maria Smith can be eliminated in this context, since although she attributes stanza 8 to the Wise Lord, she interprets its second word, *moi,* as designating him 'under the aspect of good purpose' (her translation of *vohu manah*) *(Studies in the Syntax of the gâthâs,* 1929, p. 68), which amounts to recognizing Good Mind's prominent role.

3. Humbach, p. 83, attributes the stanza to Wahrhaftigkeit (Aša) for no apparent reason, unless by error, for this entity occurs there in the dative.

not simply implied in *nā*, 'to us' – so that all three members of the Triad are present. Thus we could paraphrase: 'he will sing to thee (the Wise Lord) and me (Good Mind) and to the other entities, especially to Right ... '

The story of an ox complaining to a god has been shown by Dumézil (1965; 23) to have parallels[4] with other peoples and he feels prone, in conclusion, to admit the existence among the Indo-Iranians of a folklore drama in which a typical bovine, or a mythical representative of the bovines, or the mythical mother of the bovines, complained to a great god about the fate inflicted upon their kind and obtained from him some comfort, some help. Consequently, Zarathustra did not invent the entire plot of *Yasna* 29 but borrowed this from an older tale on which he grafted his own conception of the social contract and his own justification of his mission. In his dramatization the ox-soul complains to the entities (*Xš-maibyā*, 'to you ... '), but neither the Fashioner of the Ox nor Right is able to help. Only Good Mind – when personally appealed to in stanza 7 – answers positively, offering Zarathustra's aid.

Dumézil has studied reflexes of this drama in the later Iranian tradition, Budahišn, Dēnkart, etc., which always connected it with the murder of the Primal Bull, and has shown that this connection was secondary, since it does not appear to have existed in Zarathustra's conception or before him.

One would expect this old folklore tale to have left a trace in the Avesta, aside from the gâthâs. I think such a version does exist, and that in fact it has been staring us in the face ever since Gershevitch's edition of the *Mithra Yašt* (1959). We read there, stanzas 84 to 87, in his slightly modified translation: 'Mithra of the wide pastures whom we worship, whom we invoke for assistance, with outstretched hands, sometimes the head of the country ... of the tribe, ... of the clan ... of the house, sometimes she (viz. the cow) who longs to be milked as she feels the pain of swelling, sometimes also the pauper ... deprived of his rights; the lamenting voice of the latter, even though he raises his voice reverently, reaches up to the (heavenly) lights, makes the round of the earth, pervades the seven climes; so does the voice of the cow, who being led away

4. One might also mention the passage in the Slavic Enoch, Chapter 58 (Charles), 'For the soul of no animal created by the Lord will be shut until the great Judgment, and all souls will accuse man, etc.', a passage compared to our gâthâ by Rudolph Otto (*Reich Gottes*, p. 163) and quoted by myself, perhaps unduly, as a borrowing from Iran (*Ormazd et Ahriman*, 1952, p. 84).

captive, calls at times for assistance with outstretched hands, longing for the herd: 'When will Mithra of the wide pastures, the hero, driving from behind, make us reach the herd, when will he divert to the path of Right we who are being driven to the estate of Lie?'

Then Mithra of the wide pastures comes to his or her assistance ... Does not this 'voice reaching up to the heavenly lights' seem to be a forerunner of the ox-soul complaining to the entities in *Yasna* 29?

As for the motives of the complaint – the counterparts of the 'fury, violence, cruelty and tyranny' in the gâthâ – the *yašt*, stanza 38, describes them in detail: 'the cow, accustomed to pastures, is driven along the dusty road of captivity, dragged forward in the clutches of treaty-infringing men as their draught-animal; choking with tears, they stand, slobbering at the mouth.'

That the cow should address her prayer to Mithra is most significant in view of the fact that, in the gâthic version, she is heard and helped by Mithra's substitute, Good Mind – an unsolicited vindication of Dumézil's analysis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altheim, Franz
1949 Zarathustra als Dichter. *Paideuma,* 3:257-278
Dumézil, Georges
1965 A propos de la plainte de l'Ame du Boeuf (Yasna 29), *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique,* Classe des Lettres, 5e serie, tome Li, p. 23-51
Gershevitch, Ilya
1952 J. Duchesne-Guillemin, The Hymns of Zarathustra, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* pp. 174-177
Humbach, Helmuth
1959 *Die Gâthâs des Zarathustra.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter
Lommel, Hermann
1971 *Die Gâthâs des Zarathustra.* Stuttgart: Schwabe
Risch, Ernst
1964 Avestisch *mazdā ašāicā* und Verwandtes, MSS 17
Zwolanek, Renee
1970 Vāyav índraśca, MSS Beiheft 5, n. F.