Does The 'Devil' Exist ?

Does the 'Devil' exist?   Not in Zarathushtra's mind. The authors of certain later Zoroastrian texts (written many centuries after the Gathas) did indeed believe in the 'devil' as an entity, a living being.

The Christian notion of the 'devil' is that of an angel (not God's equal) who sinned and fell from grace.

Long after Zarathushtra's time, the Zoroastrians of the later texts started with Zarathushtra's premise that the Divine is all good, and therefore were puzzled to account for the existence of evil, because an all good deity could not, by definition generate or create anything that was evil. So they surmised the existence of an uncreated all-evil being who is (for a period of time) the adversary of the uncreated all-good being, Lord Wisdom, Ahura Mazda. Zarathushtra answers this question (regarding the origin of evil) from an entirely different perspective, which is discussed in another chapter.[1]

The 'devil' or 'all-evil uncreated entity' is called Angra Mainyu in later YAv. texts. The actual words mean an 'inimical, harmful, pain-causing, hate-filled [*aŋgra-*] way of being [*mainyu-*]'.   And in the later Pahlavi texts he is called Ahriman, which means roughly the same thing.

But it is worth noting that even when these later texts were written, there was a difference of opinion about whether such a thing as the 'devil' existed in Zoroastrian thought. The Sixth Book of the Dēnkard (a Pahlavi work written a couple of centuries after the Arab invasion of Iran) is said to be a collection of the words of ancient Zoroastrian sages. We find there, faithfully recorded, the opinions of certain Zoroastrian sages (notice the plural 'they'),

>"They held this too: Ahreman never existed and does not exist." [2]

Sages after my own heart !

Which raises the question: What did the originating sage ~ Zarathushtra ~ think? There is no clear reference to any devil entity in the Gathas ~ not as an uncreated adversary or co-equal of Wisdom (*mazdā-*), not even as in inferior entity, and not as the 'creator' of the 'evil' creation as he appears in the later texts. If Zarathushtra had believed in such an Evil Entity he surely would have made some clear reference to so important a component of any theology or philosophy. He does not.

There are those who contend that this omission can be explained by the fact that the surviving Gathas are a very small corpus, and perhaps Zarathushtra did mention the all-evil 'god' in Gathas that have not come down to us. This argument does not hold water. Yasna 32 is devoted to many of the evils generated by the deities (*daēva-*) of Zarathushtra's culture, whose followers were making life a torment for the people who lived in those times, but this song (Y32) makes no mention of an all Evil Entity (Angra Mainyu). Throughout the Gathas, the deities (*daēva-*) of Zarathushtra's culture are clearly referred to in the plural but are never named. He mentions and names of his new envisionment of the Divine ~ the all-good deity Wisdom (*mazdā-*), Lord (*ahura-*) ~ in almost every verse of the Gathas, but Angra Mainyu does not appear even once as the name of an all-evil 'god' or 'devil'. If he had believed in one all-evil competitor of Wisdom (*mazdā-*) it is incredible that he would not make even one clear mention of him in Yasna 32 or any of the other songs (Gathas) that have come down to us.

Unfortunately ~ reading the Gathas through the spectacles of later texts, and perhaps the dominant religions of today which believe in a 'Devil' ~ some scholars have interpreted certain words of

Updated 2025

Zarathushtra's to mean the Evil One, the Devil.   The inconclusive nature of these interpretations becomes evident when we see that these translators do not agree even amongst themselves, as to whether in a given verse, the reference is to an evil human being, or evil as a concept, or a 'devil' entity. We have (contradictory) opinions. We have (contradictory) speculations. But no direct (or even circumstantial) evidence.

Let us start with the meanings of the two names 'Ahriman' (in Pahlavi) and 'Angra Mainyu' (in Avestan). Avestan (a much older language) and Pahlavi are related languages in the Indo-European family of languages.[3] And both names ~ Angra Mainyu (Av.) and Ahriman (Pahl.) derive from an ancestral Arya word *asrá, which comes from an original word *ans, which means 'hate-filled, harmful, hostile, inimical' when used as an adjective, and 'hater, harmer, enemy' when used as a noun.[4] Let us start with Pahlavi 'Ahriman'.

Ahriman

Taraporewala (citing Bartholomae, one of the early giants whose scholarship combined a knowledge of Old Persian, Avestan, Vedic Skt., and other ancient Indo-Europoean languages), tells us that the Old Persian word arika (*ahrika) means inimical, and derives from the Arya word *asrá, (*ans) which has the same meaning. Taraporewala points out (citing Moulton) that the arch-enemy of mankind is untruth, *druj* (*drauga*) in both the Gathas and in the Old Persian Behistan Inscriptions of the Achaemenian King, Darius I (the Great).[5] In the Behistan Inscriptions, Darius states that "Auramazda" has blessed him and has advanced him, because 'neither a hater [arika], nor a deceiver, was I'.[6]

Over time, Old Persian evolved into Middle Persian (Pahlavi), and the Old Persian arika (*ahrika), joined with the word *man-* (from *manyu-*, Av. *mainyu-*), a 'way of being', became the Pahlavi (Middle Persian) word Ahriman,[7] meaning 'inimical, harmful, hate-filled, way of being'.

Angra Mainyu.

In a parallel linguistic development:
aṇgra- is an Old Avestan adjective which also derives from the Arya *asrá (*ans), and has the same meaning ~ 'hate-filled, harmful, inimical (when used as an adjective).[8] The Vedic cognate of *aṇgra-* is an adj. *asra-* 'causing pain, hurting'.[9]
mainyu- means a 'way of being (some translators prefer 'spirit' or 'mentality').
These two words (which refer to concepts) when used together mean a 'hate-filled, harmful, pain-causing, hurtful, inimical way of being' and they became the Younger Avestan personal name Angra Mainyu (*aṇgra- mainyu-*) ~ an all-evil entity ~ the Devil.

But in the Gathas, Angra Mainyu does not appear as the name of any entity ~ not even as an allegory. And if we look at the ways in which Zarathushtra uses the component parts of this term, we see that a way of being (*mainyu-*) that is *aṇgra-* (Y45:2) is simply an inimical, harmful, pain-causing, hate-filled, wrongful way of being ~ the (asymmetrical) opposite of a more-beneficial (*spanyah-*) way of being.[10]

2

In the Gathas.

Let us now turn to the evidence of the Gathas. In Avestan script, there are no capital letters such as might assist in identifying whether a given word is the personal name of the Evil One, or describes a wrongful person, or wrongfulness as a concept.

The Old Av. word *aṇgra-* appears in the Gathas in four verses Y43:15, Y44:12, Y45:2, and Y48:10, each of which is discussed below The different endings for the stem *aṇgra-* in these verses simply reflect different grammatical inflections, Gathic Avestan being a language of inflection (like Latin).

Y43:15

In Y43:15, referring to deceitful persons, Zarathushtra says "...for they [the deceitful persons] say that the truthful are all bad [*aṇgrāṇg*]." Insler 1975. Here, Insler has translated *aṇgrāṇg* as "bad", Taraporewala and Bartholomae as "enemies",[11] and Humbach as "harmful persons".[12] Since *aṇgrāṇg* is plural, and refers to human beings, it is clear that this reference cannot be to a Devil, like the YAv. Angra Mainyu, or the Pahlavi Ahriman.

Y44:12

Here is the Insler 1975 translation
Line a: "This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord...
Line c: Is this one evil [*aṇgrō*] or is that one evil [*aṇgrō*]?...
Line e: is it that such a person ~ not this one ~ is considered evil [*aṇgrō mainyetē*] ?"
Insler translates *aṇgrō* as "evil" in all three places ~ referring to a human being. He translates *mainyetē* as a verb "is considered".

Bartholomae translates *aṇgrō* as "enemy" in all three places, referring to human beings, and he translates *mainyetē* as a verb "to be thought of".[13]

Humbach 1991 translates *aṇgrō* as "harmful" in all three instances, and translates *mainyetē* as a verb "intends".   But he expresses the opinion that the verse refers to Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu.[14] The Humbach/Faiss 2010 translation is not materially different from that of Humbach 1991.

Taraporewala's 1951 translation is interpretive in all three instances. In line c. he thinks that the first *aṇgrō* is a "victim~of~evil", and the second *aṇgrō* a "Doer~of~Evil". In line e, he interprets *aṇgrō* as referring to "the Evil One". The word *mainyetē* he translates as "thinks".[15]

As you can see, any reference to the Evil One (as in the Devil) in this verse is not specified in the language itself, but is an interpretation personal to the translator.

Y45:2

In the famous Y45:2, referring to the two ways of being (*mainyu-*), Zarathushtra says,

"Yes, I shall speak of the two fundamental [*mainyū*] of existence, of which the virtuous one [*spanyå* 'more-beneficial (one)'] would have thus spoken to the evil one [*aṇgrəm*]..." Y45:2, Insler 1975.

Insler translates *aṇgrəm* as "evil one" referring to the previously mentioned *mainyū* (which in 1975 he translated as "spirit", but has since changed his mind).[16] Humbach 1991 (and Humbach/Faiss

2010) translate *aŋgrəm* as "harmful one";[17]   Taraporewala 1951 as "Evil One"; Bartholomae as "enemy".[18]

In light of the fact that the good *mainyū* in this verse is *spanyå* 'more-beneficial' ~ the comparative form of *spəṇta-* 'beneficial', these two could not refer to the two uncreated 'gods' of the later texts, because here, while the bad one is 'harmful, inimical', the good one is only comparatively more beneficial, as detailed in another chapter.[19] So once again, any conclusion that the *mainyū* in this verse, which is *aŋgra-* is a reference to the Evil One, rather than to an inimical, harmful way of being, is a personal interpretation of the translator.

Y48:10

Finally in Y48:10 Zarathushtra complains to Wisdom that the priests and bad rulers of the lands "...torture our (good) intentions in an evil way [*aŋgrayā*]" Y48:10, Insler 1975. Here Insler translates *aŋgrayā* as an adverb "in an evil way",[20] (literally 'evilly'), ~ not as an Evil Entity ~ as other eminent translators also have done: Bartholomae ("with fell purpose"); Taraporewala ("in an evil manner", "with evil intent");[21] Humbach ("harmfully").[22]

In short: In all of these verses, the use of *aŋgra-* throws light on Zarathushtra's understanding of the nature of 'evil' (as 'inimical, harmful'). In none of these verses does *aŋgra-* refer clearly to an Evil Entity ~ the all-bad uncreated 'Devil Entity' of the later texts, or even an inferior demon of some sort. All references to a 'Devil' or 'Evil One' in these verses are the interpretive conclusions of a given translator.

duš.sastiš

There is an unrelated word *duš.sastiš* in Y32:9 and Y45:1, which Insler 1975 translates as "one of evil doctrine" and in footnotes, he expresses the opinion that this is a reference to the evil spirit,[23] (presumably as in the 'Devil').

On the other hand, Taraporewala 1951 translates the word as "False Teacher" and "Evil Teacher" respectively. Taraporewala is much given to using initial capital letters for persons and concepts that he thinks are important ~ not restricted to personal names. But in his commentary he translates the word "a teacher of false doctrines" (without initial capitals), so his interpretation seems to be that *duš.sastiš* is a human being who teaches false doctrines.[24]

Humbach 1991 translates the word as "blasphemer" in both verses. He says its literal meaning is "a person of bad announcement", and believes the word refers to the legendary ruler Yima (a human being) in both verses.[25]

Moulton 1912 translates *duš.sastiš* as "The teacher of evil" in Y32:9 and as "false Teacher" in Y45:1.[26]

The key to the identity of *duš.sastiš* "the one of evil doctrine" in the first line of Y32:9 is contained in the first line of the very next verse Y32:10. Here they are in the Insler 1975 translation.

"The one of evil doctrine [*duš.sastiš*] has ruined the (true) words [*sravå*]. ..." Y32:9, Insler 1975,

"Each such man has ... ruined Thy teachings [*sravå*]..." Y32:10, Insler 1975.

4

There is nothing other than *duš.sastiš* in verse Y32:9 which would account for "Each such man" in Y32:10. The full verse Y32:9 is footnoted so that you can see this is so.[27]

In the Gathas, the evil spirit (as in the Devil, instead of an evil way of being) is conspicuous by its absence, and *aŋgra- mainyu-* is not used as a name in any verse. By contrast, Zarathushtra frequently complains (especially in Yasna 32) about human beings who do evil ∼ primarily people in positions of secular and religious power ∼ including priests whose job it would have been to make pronouncements regarding the desires and intentions of the local gods, in whose name these priests demanded extravagant rituals and sacrifices, and tried to control people's behavior through tyranny and fear ∼ in general making people's lives a misery.[28] ("By reason of that teaching with which they deflected men from the best action [*vahištāṯ šyaoϑanāṯ* 'from the most-good action'] ... the rich Karpan [a type of priest] chose the rule of tyrants and deceit rather than truth." Y32:12, Insler 1975).

I therefore think that in Y32:9a (quoted above), Zarathushtra is simply referring generically to this type of priest ∼ one who makes bad pronouncements in the name of the local gods; 'the one of evil teaching' may not be (linguistically) the most exact English equivalent for *duš.sastiš*.[29] But 'the one of bad pronouncements' would not convey the intended meaning, which here is to contrast such 'pronouncements' with the teaching of Wisdom, which is the freedom to choose, the search for truth ∼ the path of truth, the path of the qualities that make a being divine.[30]

The choice of 'the' instead of 'a'.

In Avestan, there are no articles ('the', 'a' or 'an'). But to make an English translation fluent, we often have to insert such articles before various nouns and the choice of 'the' instead of 'a' reflects the interpretation of the translator, and can make a big difference in meaning. Here is one example. "Whom hast Thou appointed as guardian for me, Wise One, if the deceitful one [*drəgvå*] shall dare to harm me?..." Y46:7, Insler 1975.

Insler footnotes the words "the deceitful one" as follows: "The evil spirit."[31] But there is no article 'the' in GAv. So if a translator were to choose 'a' instead, you can see that 'a deceitful one' would be a human being bent on harming. And as we know from the Gathas, there were indeed many human beings bent on harming Zarathushtra ("To what land to flee? Where shall I go to flee? They exclude me from my family and from my clan..." Y46:1, Insler 1975). The word *drəgvaṇt-* is an adjective,[32] 'deceitful' or 'untruthful', which can also be used as a noun which has the qualities of the adjective ∼ a person ('deceitful (one'), concept, activity, or thing ('deceitful (thing)' or '(what is) deceitful'). The word *drəgvå* in Y46:7 (quoted above) is the nom. sg. form of *drəgvaṇt-* (Skjaervo's Old Avestan Index). In short, a translator's selection of 'the' suggests the 'devil', whereas choosing 'a' suggests a human being who engages in harmful actions (actions that are not in accord with the true order of existence). An interpretive choice by the translator. And there are other such verses as well.[33]

It is true that in certain later texts we do have the notion of Cosmic Dualism ∼ two uncreated Entities, One all good, and One all evil ∼ in which paradigm the Lord Wisdom (*ahura- mazdā-*) created all that is 'good' in existence, whereas the Evil One created all that is 'evil'. But even in some YAv. texts, the allegorical nature of the 'devil' and his helpers is suggested by a more literal translation. The *Zamyad Yasht*, a YAv. text says,

> "...The Evil Spirit [*aŋgra- mainyu-*] sent forth his messengers Bad Thinking [*aka- manah-*] and Rage [*aēšma-*], whose attack is cruel..." Yt. 19:46, Hintze translation.[34]

Here, Hintze translates YAv. *aŋgra- mainyu-* as "The Evil Spirit" ~ the initial capital letters indicating her opinion that these two words refer to a living entity. An interpretive choice. But *aŋgra- mainyu-* can also be translated as a harmful way of being ~ a way of being which generated ("sent forth") bad thinking and rage, anger.

Indeed in the later texts, we have hordes of demons who assist the chief demon. But a look at some of their names indicates that the existence of such demons started out as allegories. For example, we have the following demons in the later texts.

The demon *Aeshma* (Pahl. Khashm),   which means anger, fury, rage,

The demon *Mitokht*   which means false word,

The demon *Arashk*   which means malice

The demon *Aaz*   which means greed,

The demon *Friftaar*   which means deceiver,

The demon *Spazhg*   which means slander,

The demon *Araast*   which means 'untrue'   et cetera.[35]

And of course the arch demon was Av. Angra Mainyu, (Pahlavi Ahriman) which means 'hurtful, pain~causing, inimical, hate-filled, way of being'.

If we look past the image of 'demon' to the name of the demon, it is easy to see that these 'demons' are in fact images (or allegories) of various wrongful and harmful choices ~ bad thinking lies, anger, malice, greed, deceit, slander, etc cetera.

Indeed, after enumerating the names of many of these 'demons' the Pahlavi *Bundahishn* (endearingly) tells us that

> "Various new demons arise from the various new sins the creatures may commit, and are produced for such purposes...",[36]

indicating that 'demons' originally were just images (allegories) of wrongdoings, of harms, both existing ones, and new ones yet to be thought of by inventive minds.

And in Dēnkard 6, (said to be a collection of the sayings of Zoroastrian sages), we see even more clearly that these sages (or at least some of them) understood that the Chief Devil (Ahriman/Ahreman) is simply an allegory for human wrongdoing.   Referring to unnamed Zoroastrian sages, this text states,

> " **264.** This they held too: It is possible to put Ahreman out of the world in this manner, namely, every person, for his own part, chases him out of his body, for the dwelling of Ahreman in the world is in the body of men. When he will have no dwelling in the bodies of men, he will be annihilated from the whole world; for as long as there is in this world dwelling even a single person to [sic? 'with'?] a small demon, Ahreman is in the world."

> " **265.** ... For when Ahreman is put out of the body of men he is annihilated from the whole world, ..." Dēnkard 6, *Sasanian Sages*, Shaked 1979, p. 103.

Conclusion: In the Gathas, there is no specific (as distinguished from interpretive) mention of any Devil Entity called Angra Mainyu (or Ahriman). There are references to plural deities (*daēva-*) who were said to be a mix of good and evil qualities. But none of them is mentioned by name, nor is

there any one Evil Entity or Devil named, nor is any evil entity mentioned as creating an evil material creation parallel to the good material creation of Wisdom, as we find in the later texts. In the Gathas, nothing in the material existence is mentioned as 'evil'.

The more-good and bad *mainyu-* in the Gathas are two alternative ways of being that have existed since the beginning (whatever the 'beginning' might have been) in thought, word and action ~ the bad and the more-good (Y30:3), the harmful and the more-beneficial (Y45:2) ~ man's (mixed) way of being. And in the Gathas we also have Wisdom's (all good) way of being (*spəṇta-/spāništa-* and *vohu-/vahištā-*).

The only descriptive references to evil in the Gathas, describe the products of wrongful choices ~ dishonesty, violence, murder, hatred, theft, cruelty, rage, tyranny, bondage, et cetera ~ all that is the opposite of the wholly good, true order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*).[37]

In the Gathas, good and evil are concepts. The concept of evil is brought to life, given substance, by wrongful choices in thought, word and action ("...Since they chose the worst thought, they then rushed into fury, with which they have afflicted the world and mankind." Y30:6, Insler 1975).

In the same way, the concept of goodness is brought to life, given substance, by choices that are in sync with the true order of existence ~ truth, generosity, lovingkindness, compassion, friendship, justice, et cetera.

"... the beneficent have correctly chosen..." Y30:3, Insler 1975.

"...Through its actions [*ārmaiti-*] gives substance to the truth [*aša-*]..." Y44:6, Insler 1975. In my view, *spəṇta- ārmaiti-* means the true order of existence embodied in beneficial thoughts, words and actions.[38]

So we see that the evidence of the Gathas is entirely consistent with the opinion of those later Zoroastrian sages who held,

"... Ahreman never existed and does not exist."

* * * * * * *

---

[1] See *Part One: The Identity Of The Divine;* and *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation* and the chapters cited therein.

[2] Dēnkard VI, § 278, translated by Shaul Shakhed 1979, in *Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages,* p. 109.

[3] Old Persian and Avestan are two separate, but related, languages. Both are in the Iranian language family. I have been informed that Old Persian and Gathic Avestan both have the same Proto-Iranian ancestor language, but Old Persian is at least 500 years later than Gathic Avestan. The closest language to Gathic Avestan is Vedic Sanskrit. The two are cousins of approximately the same age ~ they share Indo-Iranian as a common ancestral language.

Old Persian evolved (through various stages) into Middle Persian (Pahlavi/Pazand), which has evolved (through various stages) into modern Persian.

Gathic Avestan evolved into archaic Younger Avestan, and then Younger Avestan.

Gathic Avestan, Vedic, and Old Persian have come down to us from an ancestral hypothesized Proto-Indo-European (PIE) language, (see *Part Four: Ancient Origins & Homelands*).

Darmesteter's Introduction, Part 1, SBE 4, p. xxv has additional details.

7

[4] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 500 - 502 citing Bartholomae. Taraporewala's transliteration is *asrá-. Kent's is *asra- as discussed in a ft. below.

[5] We see throughout the Gathas, that the enemy is not another tribe, or religion. The enemy is untruth ~ all that is not in accord with the true order in the existences of matter and mind. That this idea was well understood by Zoroastrians ~ even many centuries after Zarathushtra's time ~ is shown in a YAv. text which identifies the enemy to be conquered as follows,

> "...that I may stand victorious on earth, conquering in battles, overwhelming the assaults of hate, and conquering the lie." Yy 9:20 (2d half), Mills translation SBE 31, p. 237.

Even though this statement (and many similar ones) is made in a YAv. text ~ in this case addressed to Haoma, a pre-Zarathushtrian deity after the syncretization of Zarathushtra's religion with the worship of pre-Zarathushtrian deities ~ it is significant that this teaching of Zarathushtra's ~ that the 'enemy' is untruth ~ was remembered and expressed as part of the syncretized religion that Zoroastrianism became in YAv. times.

[6] Taraporewala 1951 ibid. But Kent & Emeneau 1950 *Persian Grammar,* translate (and transliterate) this statement in the Old Persian part of the Behistan inscription slightly differently from Taraporewala (who cites Moulton). And Kent translates *arika* as 'hostile'.

> "... *naiy : arika : āham : naiy : draujana : āham : naiy : zūrakara : āham :...*" Kent & Emeneau, 1950 lines 63 - 64, p. 129.

> "... I was not hostile [*arika*], I was not a Lie-follower [*draujana*], I was not a doer of wrong [*zūrakara*]..." Kent & Emeneau, 1950 § 63. 4.61 ~ 67, p. 132.

In their Lexicon, Kent & Emeneau show *arika* as an adj. of *asra-*, GAv. *aṇgra-* and Pahlavi Ahriman (citing Bartholomae). They show that the pAr. root *ans- is later seen in the Avestan word *ąsta-* 'hate, enmity', and (YAv.) *aŋgrō mainyuš* (nom.), p. 170.   Skjaervo's Old Avestan *Glossary* shows *ąsta-* 'misery'.

[7] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 500 - 502; Kent & Emeneau 1950 p. 170. I have been informed that the *man-* in Pahlavi Ahriman comes from the Persian equivalent *manyu-* Av. *mainyu-*, although on the grounds of phonology it cannot be ruled out that it may have derived from **manah-* 'mind'.

[8] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 500 - 502.

[9] Karl Hoffmann, Vedica 2. *asra-*, *Munchener Studien zum Sprachwissenschaft 41, 1982, p. 62.* I am indebted for this reference to Professor Elizabeth Tucker.

[10] In Y32:5 Insler 1975 has translated *akascā mainyuš* as "...and the evil spirit himself..." But if we translate *mainyu-* as a 'way of being' then the translation would be "...and a bad way of being itself...". The noun *mainyu-* is a grammatically masc. noun (there is nothing intrinsically masc. about a 'spirit' or a 'way of being'). In English, pronouns for only intrinsically masc. nouns (boy, man, father etc.) are translated as 'he'; the pronouns for *grammatically* masc. and *grammatically* fem. nouns are translated as 'it'. The difficult *mainyu-* has been variously translated by linguists and non-linguists. Based on the ways in which Zarathushtra uses the word in the Gathas, I think it means a 'way of being'. Detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[11] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 453, 455.

[12] Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 145 without linguistic explanation; Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 2010 p. 119, also without linguistic explanation.

[13] Taraporewala 1951, p. 503.

[14] Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 160, Vol. 2 p. 156, without linguistic explanation; Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 2010 p. 124, also without linguistic explanation.

[15] Taraporewala 1951, p. 503.

[16] See Insler's essay *Human Behavior & Good Thinking,* in *An Introduction to the Gathas of Zarathushtra,* No. 1, 1989, which now may be viewed on Shahriar Shariari's website, www.zarathushtra.com.

[17] Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 166 without linguistic explanation; Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 2010 p. 128, also without linguistic explanation.

[18] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 537 - 538.

[19] And the same is true of Y30:3 in which one *mainyu-* (way of being) is described as *vahyō* 'more good' (the comparative degree of *vohu-* 'good'), while the other *mainyu-* (way of being) is called *aka-* 'bad'. See *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[20] In his commentary on Y48:10 Insler 1975 states his agreement with Bartholomae that *aŋgrayā* is best taken as an adverb "in an evil way", giving Vedic parallels, (p. 291).

[21] Taraporewala 1951 p. 687.

[22] Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 178.

I am not sure how the word *aŋgrayā* is translated in Humbach/Faiss 2010 (p. 144), and no linguistic explanation is offered.

[23] Insler 1975: for Y32:9, p. 47, ft. 8; and comment on p. 205, where he states this is probably *aŋgrō mainyuš* (his interpretation), and for Y45:1 p. 75, ft. 1.

[24] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 278 - 279, 533, 536.

[25] Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 83; Humbach/Faiss 2010 also translate the word as "blasphemer" in both verses (pp. 93, 129).

[26] Moulton 1912, pp. 357, 370.

[27] Here is the full verse Y32:9, and the first line of Y32:10 so that you can see there is nothing other than *duš.sastiš* in verse Y32:9 which would account for "Each such man" in Y32:10.

"The one of evil doctrine [*duš.sastiš*] has ruined the (true) words. He has ruined the intention of life by his own teachings. He has robbed the esteemed power which really belongs to good thinking. I lament these words of my spirit (to Thee), Wise One, and to truth ~ to all of you!" Y32:9, Insler 1975.

"Each such man has (also) ruined Thy teachings..." Y32:10, Insler 1975.

[28] See *Part One: The Nature of the Divine.*

[29] Skjaervo's Old Avestan Index sees the stem *duš.sasti-* as an adj. meaning 'who makes bad announcements', deriving from *saŋh-* 'to announce'.

[30] See *Part One: A Question of Reward & the Path.*

[31] Insler 1975 p. 83, ft. 7.

9

[32] The word *drug-/druj-* is a noun (Skjaervo's Old Avestan Index). It has been variously translated as 'lie', 'deceit', 'that which is false', 'untruth'. The word *drəgvaṇt-* is an adj. derived from *drug-/druj-* and means 'possessing untruth' or 'untruthful', 'deceitful'.   But like so many Av. adjectives, it can also be used as a noun *'untruthful (one)',   'deceitful (one)'*.   In the Gathas, *drəgvaṇt-* is frequently used for human beings who do untruthful things ~ things that are not in accord with the true (correct) order of existence. But with equal linguistic accuracy, *drəgvaṇt-* also can be used for a concept *'(that which is) deceitful'* or thing *'deceitful (thing)'*. For a more detailed discussion, see *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant.*

[33] Here are a few more examples of how choosing to add *'the'* suggests the deceitful one (the Devil) whereas choosing to add *'a'* turns the meaning into an untruthful human being. I have placed the words *'the'* and *'a'* in red font, to highlight the difference.   Insler 1975 translates *drəgvaṇt-* words as 'deceitful (rather than 'untruthful').

"... The truly speaking man has never expounded alliance with the deceitful one [*drəgvatā*] ..." Y49:9, Insler 1975. Insler's ft. 7 explains "the deceitful one [*drəgvatā*]" as "The evil spirit." p. 97. But choosing 'a' instead of 'the' makes the phrase 'A truly speaking man has never expounded alliance with a deceitful one [*drəgvatā*] ..." ~ making *drəgvatā*] an untruthful human being.

"Likewise, I ask about which payments shall be (for him) who shall promote the rule for the deceitful one [*drəgvāitē*] of evil actions, Lord, for that one who finds no means of living apart from harming the cattle and men of the undeceiving pastor." Y31:15, Insler 1975. Insler' ft. 10 explains "the deceitful one" as "The evil spirit." p. 41. But choosing 'a' instead of 'the' makes 'a deceitful one [*drəgvāitē*]' an untruthful human being.

"Yes, the deceitful one has guarded the draft oxen of truth ..." Y46:4, Insler 1975; but choosing 'a' instead of 'the' makes this an untruthful human being.

[34] Hintze 1994 *Zamyad Yasht*, p. 25.

[35] *Bundahishn*, E. W. West translation, Ch. 28, §§ 7 and 14, SBE 5 pp. 106 - 111 and the fts. therein.

[36] *Bundahishn*, E. W. West translation, Ch. 28, § 43, SBE 5, p. 113.

[37] Detailed in *Part One: Good & Evil.*

[38] Detailed in *Part One: Beneficial-Sacred Embodied Truth, Spenta Mainyu.*