The second International Congress of Mithraic Studies, Tehran, September 1975

Ugo Bianchi

The Congress took place in Tehran from the 1st to the 9th of September, 1975, thanks to the munificence and through the sponsorship of the Imperial Pahlavi Library and the combined organizing effort of this body and the staff of the International Association of Mithraic Studies. High patron of the Congress was H.I.M. Farah Pahlavi, the Shahbanou of Iran, who graciously addressed the members of the Congress with a message, and received them at the Imperial Residence. Honorary President of the Congress was H. E. Shojaeddin Shafa, Managing Director of the Pahlavi Library; President, Sir Harold W. Bailey, of Cambridge, Secretary General, Mr John R. Hinnells.

Like the preceding one (1971, see Hinnells, 1975), the Congress was characterized by an interdisciplinary approach to the multifarious documentation concerning Mit(h)ra(s) in cultures as different as Vedic India, Iran (including peripheral Iran and related countries such as Mesopotamia, Armenia, Commagene, etc.), and the Roman Empire. No doubt, the very fact of the cult of a god of this name in such different cultures itself justified a 'Mithraic' congress, being a unique occasion for the encounter of scholars in such disparate disciplines as Graeco-Roman and Oriental archaeology, linguistics, the history of religions, Iranology, Parsi tradition – an occasion which was more than a pretext. On the other hand the practical problems raised by this encounter and the difficulty of finding a common basis for discussion, though they were, to a certain extent, due to the differing epistemological assumptions of the participants, were also a symbol of the objective difficulties located in the study of a problem of intercultural transmission. This is particularly so, as the traditional views of Cumont about an extensive continuity between Mazdean Mithraism and Roman Mithraism are being increasingly challenged.

The papers presented at the Congress can be divided into two roughly equivalent groups. Some thirty papers were concerned with the 'Eastern' Mit(h)ra, and another thirty with the 'Western' one. As for the first group (I) we can distinguish (a) papers on the Indo-Iranian (or Indo-European) and the Indian Mitra, (b) papers on the Iranian Mithra, (c) papers on the connections between the Iranian Mit(h)ra and Oriental regions other than Iran. The second group of papers (II) concerned (a) origins and diffusion of Roman Mithraism, (b) topics concerning the mysteries' organization and beliefs, (c) Mithraism and other religious movements in the West. Since it would prove impossible to give in a few pages a detailed account of each of these papers – or even to mention all of them – we shall try to concentrate on the subjects which arose most frequently during the Congress, as an indication of the main direction and scope of actual research.

Journal of Mithraic Studies Volume I No. 1 pages 77–94

I a

The papers and discussions concerning this item were largely linguistic (etymological and philological-semasiological). Is Mit(h)ra basically connected with 'contract' or with 'friendship' and the maintenance of *ṛta*, or with 'piety' and 'loyalty'? In H. P. Schmidt's opinion we have to choose 'alliance': 'The prime aim of a mitra in Indo-Iranian times was the establishment of peace which guaranteed life and prosperity. This accounts also for quite a number of the functions of the deity personifying the concept.' Here already the historian of religion has to raise the question of the relation between linguistic analysis concerning a 'concept' and properly religious-historical research concerning a deity – and in particular a Vedic deity. What kinds of 'contexts' (syntactical and 'philological' only or mythical, doctrinal and 'ethical' too?) are to be primary for an interpretation? Is there really a complete continuity between the name and the basic *Gestalt* of a god – of *this* god? Again, in the present state of historical and phenomenological research on religions, is the very word 'personification' of any conceivable utility? Finally, is the substitution of an ethical attitude (friendship, loyalty) or of a social institution (contract, alliance) for a natural entity (Sun, light, heaven, fertility) enough to exclude the objection raised by historians of religions against the old procedures of Max Müller and the first (but also, to an extent, contemporary) Indo-Europeanists?

But one distinction, taken into consideration by M. Mayrhofer, does mark an advance, that between a 'personification' understood as a mere transition from the appellative noun to the name of the god Mit(h)ra and a 'coexistence of personal and impersonal representations of the same idea' (as Gonda put it). It may be granted, as Mayrhofer remarked, that in this second possibility also 'die nähere Bestimmung des Appellativs bietet uns den Schlüssel zur semantischen and vielleicht sogar zur etymologischen Deutung des Namens *Mitrá-'. But, in our opinion, the idea permits more adequate discussion of the religio-historical problem of the figure of the god, and at the same time allows us to study the particular relation between *this* god and the appellative noun – in comparison with other relations between noun and divine name such as those concerning Bhaga, Vṛtra, Venus, Moira, Dike, etc. In other words, the religio-historical problem about Mit(h)ra's name is not only that of its 'referent' in the realm of worldly phenomena (whether 'contract' or otherwise), but also, and more important, that of the kind of relation between the particular deity and the phenomenon. Is Mit(h)ra's, not so much 'personification' but rather 'personality', of the same kind of, say, that of Vṛtra or Moira? Is the difference between these in the realm of religious typology due only to the difference of referent (the semi-personal character of 'apportioned destiny' or the 'obstacle on a cosmic level' in contrast to the immediate effectiveness of human alliances)? Or, on the contrary, are we to admit a greater distance, a more *qualified* relation, between Mit(h)ra and the phenomenon whatever it is, than between Moira and individual destiny,[1] – a distance which also implies a 'space' acccounting for Mit(h)ra's other natural and ethical referents (light, sun, fertility, friendship) as well as for Mit(h)ra's *dvandva* relation with Varuṇa or Ahura? If we do admit this we no longer need to deduce all aspects of Mit(h)ra from the one we have selected as primary on the sole basis of linguistic analysis.

Of course, linguistic analysis remains essential, as is clear from an interesting remark of G. Bonfante: in the case of Mit(h)ra there is no reciprocity in friendship between man and

the god. Rather he is the patron of men faithful to *ṛta* and to contract. In Bonfante's opinion 'the cause of the etymological affinity, nay identity of *Mitráḥ* (the god), *mitráḥ* ('the friend'), *mitrám* (the 'contract') becomes now clear: *mitrám* is the oldest word, which by personification and duplication (. . .) became the god *Mitráḥ* . . .', whilst the meanings 'protector' and later 'friend' for *mitraḥ* should be considered, as regards India, secondary in relation to the name of the god, and in Iran 'the personification of the god who was much more important than in India (. . .) went so far as to replace the ancient neuter *mitrám* with the masculine *miθrō* which took over the meaning of *mitrám* 'covenant' . . . .' (as for *mitrám*, in later times, it assumed also the meaning friend). Now this reasoning seems to us more valid in denying an original Mitra 'friend' than in positing a process of mere 'personification', understood as a transition from a neutral appellative to the masculine name of a personal superhuman being. Another remark of Bonfante is noteworthy in this context: in the ' "divinization" (which includes of course sexualization) of the concept of "contract", of righteousness, of loyalty (. . .), of truth, we can see the most characteristic feature of the Iranian people . . .'. This is important not only as regards Herodotus I, 146 (the Persian habit of veracity), but as a way of assigning a place, in religious phenomenology, to such divine hypostases as the Amәsha Spәntas or a god like Mithra's companion, Sraosha ('Obedience').

Puhvel's argument seemed to point somewhat in this direction, notwithstanding his acceptance of the concept of 'personification', which he shares with the linguists present at the congress. In his opinion Varuṇa could 'personify' Oath, 'the magical *pendant* and reinforcement of the Contract', Aryaman being something analogous to 'Aryanhood' (cfr. Dumézil), whilst 'the Vedic *mitrá-*, common noun and deity alike, seems to entail a specific sense of "peace-compact" or "peace-giver" in a rural communal context'. In Puhvel's opinion 'this is a probable newer feature which Indo-Iranian and Slavic share and which is at variance with the more "heroic" Western Indo-European notions of the Trothkeeper and the Peacemaker' (a figure incorporating, according to Puhvel, among the Romans and Celts, and possibly the Germans, a 'Western "Mithra" type', whose actual connection with the historical figures named Mit(h)ra(s) I fail to see). But surely Varuṇa is much more than a personified Oath, whether or not we are prepared to accept some recent interpretations by Burrow, revalidating the god Asura and Dyaus as expressing the old Indo-European figure of the High God. Anyway, Puhvel's historical setting of the problem of Mit(h)ra is interesting. As for the other, 'Dumézilian', approach (structural-ideological, not necessarily specifically sociological), F. Nariman raised interestingly the problem of communication of attributes between the members of a *dvandva*. Considering Coomaraswamy's Mitravaruṇa as Counsel vs. Power, Sacerdotium vs. Regnum, he pointed out that 'generally speaking, in the Iranian *dvandva*, Miθra's part is that of the Regnum', which does not exclude the notion that he 'seems to perform priestly functions as well'.

P. Thieme's paper, though dedicated to the old Iranian Mithra, was also important, as could be expected, for a qualification of the linguist's concept of personification and 'poetical' elaboration of divine figures such as Mit(h)ra. 'Analyzing the Mihr-Yašt means rearranging by trying to bring the details into a systematic order, and it means to separate religious conceptions and poetic imagery, or, in other words, to find the postulates of religious logic behind the creations and conceits of religious imagination.' Thieme goes

so far in this direction as to contrast Mithra, who 'distributes blessings and calamities according to *one* strict principle' (that is on the basis of 'an easily understood ethical centre'), with Anāhitā, who is 'a benefactress of mankind' when appropriate sacrificial homage is paid to her. She does not punish, as she does not represent in the way Mithra does, a socio-ethical conception. From that 'centre', in Thieme's opinion, all the characteristics of Mit(h)ra were historically deduced, with the help of 'poetical imagination' and imagery. These, Thieme maintained, are not 'half-understood traits of a past mythology, but rather poetry created germs of a potential future mythology: it is mythology in the making.' But such a formulation, that poetry (or imagination) creates mythology, which presupposes a distinction between religious logic and religious imagination, suffers from the methodological limitations of the classical theory of Max Müller, for whom 'disease of language' and poetic 'metaphor' created (at the mythological level of inborn human religiosity) gods and myths. This, in our opinion, is a shortcoming comparable to the idea mentioned earlier of 'personification' in the context of etymological (or at least linguistic) reduction; a shortcoming facilitated, to be sure, by the 'poetical' nature of the hymns of the *ṛṣis* and the Mihr Yašt. After interpreting in this way Mithra's 'broad cattle pastures' ('that is pastures where cattle can safely and freely graze without fear of treacherous attacks and robbery': which already seems 'reductive'), Thieme acknowledged that 'besides, Mi*θ*ra is made responsible for further blessings, which are not the immediate effect of the safety of peace. . . . He creates prosperity in its widest sense, replenishing the waters, he lets the waters rush and the plants grow' (so, in the Rigveda, Mitra and Varuṇa are celebrated 'as the bringers of the monsoon thunderstorms'). We should not forget that at the Indo-Iranian stage, Mitra, as a god of a polytheistic pantheon, and, more generally, as a god, should not be reduced necessarily to one function (as for 'polytheism', see Brelich, 1960). This is particularly so if his capacities are multifarious and imply a 'distance' between the god and the phenomenon (see above). Similarly, it would be impossible to interpret Zeus without taking into consideration the religio-historical (not only Indo-European) type of the heavenly High God. On this point A. Lang's criticism of Max Müller's merely linguistic comparisons are completely justified. Moreover, even if Mit(h)ra 'is' the contract, he is the 'divine' contract, the owner of a divine force implicit in this phenomenon. Thieme asked himself why Mithra is not mentioned in the Gāthās. In his opinion this is due to the fact that Zarathushtra's system is 'a system of a moral order, arranged according to the rules of *moral* logic', whilst 'as a god, Mithra is a product of *religious* logic . . . not so much the object of moral decision, but an object of religious fear and hope'. But in that case it follows that 'personification', which is present also among the moral entities of the Gāthās, is not specifically religious, nor a matrix of gods and myths or a specifically religious 'logic'. Nor could the difficulty be bypassed by admitting a 'magical' character of Mithra.

The present writer also touched upon the fact that Mithra is not mentioned in the Gāthās. Notwithstanding this Gathic silence, the different fates of Mithra and of, say, a *daēva* like Indra, in the Zoroastrian tradition, prompted me to underline some heroic but also demiurgic-trickster aspects of the Indian Indra which could account for his being excluded from a religion which insisted on piety and so concentrated all creative activity in Ahura Mazdā. Instead, the absence of Mithra (neither a creative nor a demiurgic deity) in the Gāthās could be explained by the fact that these hymns and the religion they express

are addressed to the Deity as a creative agency which supports the world by means of its hypostases, the Amәsha Spәntas. This point of view incorporates an important observation by Mary Boyce, that the Gāthās are hymns directed to Ahura Mazdā.

I b

1 Some further papers in addition to Thieme's were specifically concerned with the *Mihr Yašt*. According to J. Kellens a distinction in the series of the yašts should be drawn: Yt. 10 (Mihr Yašt) 8 (Tištriya), 14 (Vərәthraghna), 13 (Fravašis) vs. Yt. 5 (Anāhitā), 9 (Druvaspa), 15 (Vayu). . . . The differences concern both phraseology and religious conception. In principle, allusions to the mythical history of Iran are proper only to the second series; moreover, worship is expressed in Yt. 5 by the imperative *yazata*, in Yt. 10 by the present *yazamaide*. So, 'Miθra n'est pas un dieu mythologique, mais un dieu moral et actuel'; we can speak with S. Wikander of two religious systems independent from each other, centred respectively on Mithra and Anāhitā. Both, Kellens maintained, were integrated into Zoroastrianism, but at different times and to different degrees: the connections of the Mithra-system with Zoroastrian theology and demonology were more intimate; Mithra's dependence on Ahura Mazdā was specifically underlined. Another peculiarity of the Mihr Yašt was insisted upon at the Congress by S. Wikander. This yašt seems to imply a purely masculine society, just like the Roman mysteries. This, in Wikander's opinion, could not authorize a historical connection, but only a phenomenological one (the type of the *Männerbund*).

Like those of other Parsi scholars, Fr. K. Bode's interpretation was primarily synthetic, pointing to the poet's religious intention. In the yašt, hymns were woven together and the author 'was trying to uphold Zarathustrian ideals, mingled with the Indo-Aryan and the Indo-Iranian concepts of Miθra, together with the post-Zarathustrian worship of Miθra which was prevalent during the period when he wrote'. But the ideas used by the yašt cannot be reduced to a 'core' (Mithra is seen as 'celestial eternal light and giver of life' on the ethical, psychological and material planes) as in Bode's rather speculative interpretation (*yazatas* not gods or angels – with this last term Bode departed from the terminology adopted by other Parsi scholars – but Ahura Mazda's attributes and principles, Mithra not being a 'person'). The 'political' aspect of Mithras in mysteries can be explained by the Roman contribution, a position shared also by J. C. Katrak in a previous publication. It may be observed, however, that this 'political', 'official' or 'power' aspect in the Roman mysteries (which was raised several times during the Congress) is probably due to a misunderstanding, based on an insufficient distinction between the Roman Mithraic religion of the conventicles (including some emperors) and Roman state solar theology (see below, Simon). Katrak's paper criticized theories of an allegedly Iranian origin of the slayer of the Roman Mithraic bull, with an equally extreme and polemical denial of ancient Iranian animal sacrificial customs, whilst S. A. A. Hakim, though maintaining that 'Ahriman, not Mithra, kills the Bull *aevo-data*', affirmed that 'the interpretation of the Indo-Iranian Mithra with his epithet Vouru-Gao-yaoitim' was the foundation of the European Mithraic mysteries, and that in the Bundahišn the bull's ' "blood" or vital energy activates all living vegetable, animal and human forms on earth',

with reference to a 'profound Indo-Iranian teaching' – in the context – it is true – of a *symbolic* and initiatory, theurgic, conception of the slayer of the two Bulls. Both Katrak and Hakim opposed the 'Western' translation of the basic Gāthā text Y. 32, 8 concerning Yima and the bull. Another paper, by J. K. Wadia, definitely tended towards an interpretation in a rather theosophical and, in a sense, 'Indianizing' style. Hvare and Mithra, Wadia maintained, are 'projected Divinity' to be reabsorbed in Ahura Mazda, whose 'Divine Consciousness' is the 'Consciousness of Oneness', whilst 'the principal function of Angre Mainyu is to create ego-consciousness or the consciousness of separate individuality', that is, as Wadia pointed out in another context, to allow creation to (provisionally) subsist: this might be called a 'Plotinian' interpretation, and is coupled, at a lower 'level', with a strikingly scientistic-naturalistic interpretation of doctrinal elements (not unusual, in this connection, in other Parsi writers), with a symbolist hermeneutics of descriptive elements in the yašt and with an anti-ritualistic and anti-clerical outlook. A marked contrast was provided by H. Dhalla's recorded and soberly commented 'Parsi Gujarati songs to Meher'. We may finally note E. Esteller's detailed philological analysis of the Vedic hymn to Mitra aimed at rebuking later, ideological, alterations in the text.

2 The archaeological side of research on Iranian Mithra was treated by D. Stronach, R. Ghirshman, R. N. Frye and others. Stronach spoke on the excavations at Tepe Nush-i Jan, a site 60 km. south of Hamadan connected with the rise of Media. A fire altar, 'the oldest so far found on the Iranian plateau', in the context, it would seem, of a Zoroastrian cult, was paralleled by another, contemporary, shrine, dedicated probably to another deity. As for Cyrus and Pasargadae, Stronach was cautious in interpreting the disk or sun on the king's grave; more positive conclusions were offered on the typology of the Median and Achaemenian fire altars. Ghirshman illustrated the sanctuaries found at Masjid-i Solaiman and Bard-è Neshandeh. His archaeological-historical outline of the vicissitudes of these sanctuaries was suggestive for the history of the cult of Mithra, though his use of Zurvanism may surely be seriously criticized (the contemporary cult of the four deities Ahura Mazdā, Mithra, Anāhitā, Vərəthraghna, was interpreted as a Zurvanite tetrad). The temple of Athena, built by the Greeks on a second terrace at Masjid-i Solaiman, was rebuilt in Parthian times in honour of Anāhitā and Mithra. In Ghirshman's opinion this is the first instance in all Iranian religious history of a temple of these two deities (Berossos' Ahāhitā temples being specifically related to other historical circumstances in Syria). Both at Masjid-i Solaiman and at Bard-è Nashandeh there were representations of the two deities in the temples.

Frye's paper was a critical review of 'Mithra in Iranian archaeology'. He rejects the caves at Marageh (Azerbaijan: also the subject of a paper by P. Vardjanand), and the rock reliefs at Qizkapan and Tang-i Sarwak, and explains the odd presence of Mithra (not Zarathuštra!) on the relief of Ardashir II at Taq-i Bustan as owing to a particular dynastic situation implying a *compact* concerning succession. As for Takht-e Solaiman (N.W. Iran) in Parthian times, a Mithraic interpretation of one of the remains was suggested by S. J. Emam Jomeh (see II b).

3 The vicissitudes of Mithra's cult in ancient Iran and related countries were treated by G. C. Cameron and R. Schmidt. While not accepting Bowman's theory of a *haoma* and a

Mithra cult as attested in the Persepolis Aramaic ritual *texts*, the former wondered what significance the very existence of this category of relevant objects might have. R. Schmidt studied the diffusion of the cult of Iranian Mithra by looking at the occurrences of the old Iranian form of the name. The only firm conclusion was that the worship of Mithra started from a region outside Persis (he remarked also that 'Mithraic' proper names do not occur in pre-Achaemenian Akkadian sources of the ninth to eighth centuries). As for Baga and Mithra in *Sogdiana*, A. Dietz contended that there are no reasons for admitting a Sogdian god Baγa, more or less equivalent to Mithra (though Baγakānic is the seventh month in the local calendar). The study of Sassanian art in the *Caspian* region (which was known as a region of *daiva*-worshippers, i.e. those faithful to the ancient Indo-Iranian tradition, with a penchant for eschatology), prompted A. Mahboubian to a theory on Mithra and Yima as twins (both were solar in character; there are connections between Yima, wine and the bull) though this *méthode combinatoire* raises serious doubts in the present writer. As for *India*, H. Humbach considered 'the Iranian Mithra as having been borrowed, in his function as a Sun-god, from the Iranians by Indian Sun-worshippers much later, in the historical period'. Two stages he maintained are to be distinguished here: (a) Mitra as substituted for Mithra in Sanskrit; (b) Middle-Persian Mihir became skr. Mihira, Sun. The first stage was connected with *maga* immigrants, who were identical with the Magi owing to 'that Zoroastrian tradition which had its centre in Persis during the later Achaemenian period and which apparently dominated throughout the Persian Empire'. As for the properly Indian Mitra, according to A. H. Dani, he did not survive in India. Having mentioned that 'in the Kushana period the concept of the Sun-god has whirled round that of Miiro or Mithra', he observes that in the Mahabharata (II, 3) Maitreya is one of the 108 names of the Sun-God, so that 'in the epic tradition at least the solar concept was the chief component of Maitreya'. As for *Buddhism* and the Bodhisattva Maitreya, in Dani's opinion the messianic concept of Maitreya, neither universal nor original in Buddhism, could have had some connection with the West. The *Manichaean* use of the name and the attributes of Mithra was studied by W. Sundermann. Having recalled that Mithra, in the form of Mihr-yazd, was identified with two Manichaean figures, the *Spiritus vivens* ('the main god of the second evocation, in the Middle-Persian tradition') and the *Tertius legatus* (in the Parthian tradition), Sundermann discussed a Middle-Iranian Manichaean text from Turfan (M 867 and M 3845). Mihr-yazd, the *Spiritus vivens*, is described as an eschatological fighter against evil, identified with the 'dark *enthymesis*', who may be identified with Az and the 'death's *enthymesis*' of the Coptic texts. With reference to the Coptic Manichaean psalm 223 Sundermann affirmed the original Manichaean character of this function attributed to the *Spiritus vivens*; this allows us 'to discard once for all the assumption of the development of the above described eschatological myth by way of any secondary influence from the Iranian side'. This does not prevent us from comparing both traditions on the basis of the eschatological Zoroastrian Mihr of the Zand-i Wahman Yašt and the Menok-i Xrat. But only documents other than the Pahlavi versions can allow us to argue for the dependence of the Manichaean version on the Zoroastrian one.

I c

As for Mithra in the Asiatic fringe-territories west of Iran (Syria, Armenia, Commagene, Mesopotamia) there were a number of contributions of interest to the student of both Iranian and the Roman cult of Mithra. Discussing the problem of so-called 'Iranian-Mesopotamian syncretism', H. J. W. Drijvers could not accept that an Iranian (Parthian) influence is documented at *Hatra*, where only Arab and Mesopotamian gods, besides Western Semitic gods were worshipped, as at Palmyra and Edessa, and particularly Šamaš, Sun.

The symbols in the 'Nergal' Hatra relief were interpreted by Drijvers against a Mesopotamian background; they did not exert any influence on Roman Mithraism, nor does the Hama relief show Mithraic characteristics. However, typological similarities between (Roman) Mithraism and some Palmyrene or Hatrene cults are not therefore excluded: they could have made it easier for Palmyrene soldiers to adhere to the Mithraic mysteries.

Three communications were devoted to the *Commagenian* cult of Mithra. According to J. Duchesne-Guillemin, Antiochus was consciously mingling Greek, Iranian as well as Commagenian tradition; but his gods are Greek gods in Iranian clothes; only the *post-mortem* perspective of the king, as well as his Tyche (*xvarnah?*), could be understood as Iranian elements. If that is so, why did Mithra's name correspond to more than one Iranian divine name? In this case, Duchesne-Guillemin suggests, the Iranian god was primary (as with Artagnes at Nemrud Dagh). As for general eschatology he did not agree with Dörrie that the relevant formulations in the inscriptions are merely conventional. In this he seems to be right (compare the Achaemenian allusions to the blessedness in the other life for the *artāvān-*). In my opinion, one could speak of a 'diffused Iranism' in the general religious style of the inscription. Fr. K. Dörner asked himself 'what was the role of Mithras in Commagene, and what was the role of Commagene in the diffusion of the Mithras cult beyond?' At Arsameia the god was represented in Persian dress. Another relief showing Mithras presents the scene of *dexiosis*, but in another *dexiosis*, discovered 'in dem Hinterland von Berni' in Sofraz Köy in an early *temenos* of the Commagenian royal cult, the radiate god's name is *Apollo*; his attribute is not the *barəsman*, as with Apollo-Mithras-Helios-Hermes on Nemrud Dagh and Mithras-Helios-Apollo-Hermes at Arsameia. This means that 'Graeco-Persian religious syncretism' was not yet complete under Antiochus I. As for the 'Felsenhalle' with 'Felsenkammer' mentioned by Dörner, it seems forced to interpret it as a prototype of the *mithraeum*. Theresa Goell, referring to the ancient Anatolian background of the scene of Antiochus and Mithra on Nemrud Dagh, remarked that whilst the Hittite king became a god only after his death, 'on Nemrud Dagh, king Antiochus, who was a god in his life-time, is shown in the *dexiosis* relief under the protection of Mithra, and symbolically being received into the heavenly sphere' (this is to be compared with the distinction made by Mithradates I Kallinikos at Arsameia between his body, consecrated to the earth, and his soul, destined, because of its essence, to the eternal dwellings of the gods – as well as Antiochus' words 'the birth of my body' which, as Duchesne-Guillemin pointed out, implied the pre-existence of his soul). The (oriental) Mithra's connections with eschatology were also stressed by A. D. H. Bivar's interpretation of some funerary vases of *Apulia* (southern Italy): Mithras may be

represented here arising from a floral scroll as a god of the other world (so in the Hippolytus vase of the 'painter of Darius', fourth century B.C.). This seems highly speculative. Speculative too is the cautious guess of H. R. E. Davidson that (Roman) Mithraism had 'a ready appeal to the German people', thanks to 'existing resemblances between the cult of Mithras and that already associated with a warrior élite, the cult of Wodan' (one could also have mentioned here the 'otherworldly' connections of Wodan). In addition, the iconological comparisons she discusses in this context seem quite vague and hypothetical.

As for *Armenia*, J. A. Boyle, after recalling the adoption by the pre-Christian Armenians of the Parthian pantheon (note especially the Mithras temple at Bagayarič) discussed a heroic eschatological figure Mher from Armenian folklore. Mher survives with his horse in a cave, where he turns the wheel of destiny and from which he will emerge in the last days. After re-examining the complete version of the tale, as published by Tchitouny, Boyle was not able to opt decidedly for a ('Roman') Mithraic interpretation of its details (tauroctony?, raven).

II a

We come now to 'Roman' Mithraism. The question of *the origin and diffusion* of Roman Mithraism was discussed in several papers. According to P. Beskow we should not look to Asia Minor, where few traces of these mysteries have been found and then only of late date; instead we find only monuments of Iranian Mithra. The mysteries could have been a new phenomenon, invented somewhere by a religious personality; in other words they could have been a 'founded religion'. In Beskow's opinion the terracottas of *Panticapaeum*, showing a peculiar iconography of the tauroctony (first century A.D.), are not to be interpreted as an Attis-Mithras syncretism, but may tell us something about the geographical origins of Roman Mithraism. (This aroused objection from E. Will, according to whom the partially naked *tauroctonos* figure of Panticapaeum was not to be interpreted as a Mithras.) Beskow directed attention to the *thiasoi* of the Bosporan region: 'the societies had a closed, esoteric character, and the number of members was very limited. The members all belonged to the aristocracy and the soldiers, and women were excluded. They called each other *adelphoi*, and were controlled by a *pater*.' They might be traced back to Iranian origins, and to the type of the *Männerbünde*. The cult could have been imported into Moesia by the troops; Beskow drew attention to the particular characteristics of Mithraism in Danubian areas. The seven grades and the astrological elements are missing here; some elements were common to Rome and to Pannonia, which would imply, in his opinion, that Pannonia was crucial: there was 'a creative process in Pannonia, independent of Rome'. There might also have been other creative centres. Thus, 'at the Parthian border, the mysteries could be supplemented by fresh Iranian traditions' (Dura *Mithraeum* with the word *magus* and the figures identified as *magi*). On the other hand the elements common to Syria and to Rome, Beskow maintained, point to Rome as the receiving partner (initiatory grades with astrology, in a Greek-speaking milieu), but the Palmyrene soldiers could have derived the cult itself from Dacia, where they had stayed (but see Drijvers, also Speidel and Will [below]). So, *Syria*'s significance for the origins of Roman Mithraism was not overrated. Susan Downey, discussing the 'Syrian Images of

Mithras tauroctonos', maintained that the Mithraic documents in this region do not seem to be from an earlier date than the second century A.D. Though the Dura *mithraeum* seems to have originated in the *milieu* of Palmyrene soldiers, one cannot deduce from this a directly Palmyrene origin of the Dura Mithraism since 'there is no unequivocal evidence of the worship of Mithras at Palmyra'; the cult could have been introduced by Roman (including Palmyrene) troops returning to Syria (A.D. 165: Campbell). She also challenged Cumont's and Rostovtzeff's theory that Mithraism was imported directly from Asia Minor to Syria, and that Syrian and Mesopotamian tauroctones constitute iconologically a group contrasted with European types. Specific instances were given in support of this criticism. In sum, 'the various Syrian tauroctones do not exhibit consistent traits which distinguish them as a group from the European tauroctones', which does not exclude local influences (for example the Syrian, not, *pace* Cumont, Iranian connections of the Durene [but not exclusively Durene, cf. Germany!] Mithras *ephippos*). E. D. Francis defended a similar position with his interpretation of the Durene *abros leon* as implying *abros* 'attendant companion'; he argued from Semitic etymology and the Durene iconography of the mounted Mithras and the lion accompanying him. An equestrian statuette (second to third century A.D.) was interpreted by Marcelle Duchesne-Guillemin as representing Mithra; the god's libation near the horse's mane might recall, she suggested, Yt. 10, 11.

It is well known that the painted Magi of the Dura *mithraeum* were interpreted by Cumont as an *Iranian* element. M. Speidel, in his paper on 'Parthia and the Mithraism of the Roman Army', affirmed a 'living continuity between the "two" religions', though distinguishing this from the question of the origins of Roman Mithraism. Mithraic priests could have been members of the Roman army (*hiereus* and *magus* among the Durene 2nd *mithraeum*'s graffiti). Since 'the building of a Mithraic temple . . . in the Euphrates frontier fortress immediately after it changed hands from the Parthians to the Romans certainly was not coincidental', the 'Dura *mithraeum* appears to be part of Rome's attempt to win over the Parthian god to its own side' (a position rather different from those already mentioned on the Durene Mithras cult, as well as from the views propounded by Francis in Hinnells 1975b, 425–431); though 'differences between the Roman and the Parthian way in worshipping Mithras . . . certainly existed'. This rather vague formulation surely risks obliterating the question of the origins and the peculiarity of the Roman mysteries of Mithras as a cult. The same holds for Speidel's hermeneutical comparison between the Tarsus Mithras coins (A.D. 243) and the Mithraic or Solar dedications (Germania Superior, Dacia) in the period of the Parthian campaign of Caracalla. The importance of the dedication by an *eques singularis natione Parthus et ex generosis Meina* to *Sol invictus* quoted *inter alia* by Speidel is exaggerated by claiming it to be 'the long looked-for missing link, a Parthian propagating Mithraism in the West'. It would be rash to conclude that 'the two religions (Iranian and Roman Mithraism) may be seen as one, as they were in Roman times'. But Speidel's argument could be useful in stressing the possibility that 'it was in the best of Roman tradition to adopt the enemies' gods', if not – as Dura would indicate – (the type of) their priests, and without prejudice to the fact, not without importance, that 'Roman Mithraists saw in Mithra an Iranian god'.

Turning to the Danubian regions, Pannonia and Dacia figured largely in the discussion on the diffusion and the geographical divergence of Roman Mithraism, as well as being (in some scholars' opinion) important for its origins.

As for *Dacia*, C. L. Balutza discussed the (very rich) Mithraic epigraphical documentation (*inter alia* the inscr. *CIMRM* II, 2007, concerning 'un *sacerdos* de Mithra . . . qui, investi de cette fonction par une colonie de Palmyriens de Macédoine, fut accueilli, à son arrivée en Dacie, comme hôte du temple de Mithra à Apulum . . .'). Generally speaking, no recognizable ethnic basis can be discovered for this Oriental 'fashion'. The Apulum iconographical Mithraic documentation was discussed by A. Popa, who made use of Will's hypothesis that the 'reliefs à trois régistres' originated in Dacia. As for *Pannonia*, the Mithraic cult at Intercisa (where Syrian troops and other Oriental elements were stationed) was discussed by I. Tóth and Zs. Vísy. Some characteristics of a particular tauroctony (early third century) seem to link Italy with Western Pannonia (as opposed to the Rhine region, the Balkans or Dacia); this was interpreted (contrary to Beskow's epigraphical indications: see above) as a proof of Italian, perhaps Roman influence – though there exist also other typological associations. One has to distinguish at Intercisa between Mithras and *deus Sol* (*Invictus*), this latter being the *deus patrius* of the *cohors Hemesenorum* which had there its camp, notwithstanding attested syncretism between the two in the local private cults of the Severan period.

The general question of the 'origins and the nature of Mithraism' was treated, mainly in iconographical terms, by E. Will. Though admitting the hypothesis of a 'new impulse' (the Armenian wars?), Will would locate the 'when' and 'where' of the birth of future (Roman) Mithraism in Eastern Asia Minor, in the first century B.C. Turning to iconography, Will affirmed that though 'l'image du tauroctone elle-même ne porte pas de date précise', 'l'image composite, celle qui associe à la figure divine toutes sortes d'éléments accessoires, est sans doute plus révélatrice. Elle marque un recul de l'hellénisme, un retour aux traditions plus orientales.' The figured pillars, on which Mithraists could substitute mythical scenes for heads and busts, seem to point to Hellenistic Syria. Moreover, 'la constitution de l'imagerie mithriaque à la fin de l'époque hellénistique ne soulève aucune difficulté'. Though I cannot understand Will's point that painted Mithraic artefacts ('le tableau mithriaque appartient au domaine des arts graphiques plutôt qu'à celui de la plastique') must have been destroyed in the course of time (what about the *mithraea* themselves?), he properly warns us that 'il faut en tout cas éviter de se laisser impressionner par la rareté des monuments mithriaques en Orient . . . Chaque fois . . . que les fouilles s'étendent en Orient, Mithra apparaît.' The *mithraeum* at Dura, was prompted by people coming from the West, though not a West located overseas. After some sociological considerations, Will went on in his oral exposé to some interesting iconographical remarks on the tauroctony: this – he maintained – was not a sacrifice, but an execution. It was not an *égorgement* (cutting of the throat), typical of sacrifice, but the execution of a vanquished enemy. But I fail to see how this could be hermeneutically conceived of; moreover in some tauroctonies the bull is equipped with a sacrificial band.

II b

To turn to topics concerning Roman Mithraism itself, one of the main items of standard Mithraic iconography, the *dexiosis* of Mithra with Sol in the Atonement and the Apotheosis

scenes was treated on an extensive comparative basis by M. LeGlay. After a religio-historical introduction on the relevant symbology, he drew attention to the *dexiosis* of the Palmyrene gods in the Rome stele (Malakbel, a god of vegetation and of a soteriological character, in Palmyrene dress, who was assimilated to the divine Sun, with Aglibol, the lunar god in Roman military dress – a *dexiosis* implying mutual engagement or compact). He posited an analogy, as regards both the nature of these gods and the meaning of their act, with 'Mithra, le dieu tauroctone, qui vainct les forces du mal [I fail to see this character in the bull: see above], et Sol qui apporte la renaissance et le salut'. LeGlay also made some suggestions concerning *dexiosis* in the actual procedure of Mithraic initiation. In the present writer's opinion they may have been integrated with the *poignée* of Mandaean ritual and Manichaean imagery, implying salvation, but in the essential context of communication.

H. Lavagne studied the Mithraic cave in the West. This was particularly characteristic of Rome and Italy. In Mithraic epigraphy, the term *spelaeum* prevails in Italy, *templum* in the provinces. As chronology shows, this does not imply that in the mysteries of Mithra there was a trend towards the acquisition of an official (exoteric, public) character; on the other hand, this Italian predilection cannot be explained merely on the basis of the use of the architectural types of the *nymphaeum* and the *cryptoporticus*. A good instance of the latter is the newly discovered mithraeum in the *horrea* of the port at Caesarea Maritima, discussed by R. J. Bull. A peculiar radiate wooden structure is evidenced in this sanctuary, its function being architectural (-ritual), to distinguish two zones in the sanctuary, as well as symbolic (Sun). There were two small rectangular shafts in the vault, one of them eccentric, apparently to direct light-beams: 'late in the month of June it was noticed that the shaft of light from the eastern scuttle as it progressed from west to east did so each day nearer the altar'. A little medallion with a tauroctony, and regrettably very decayed paintings representing 'scenes from the life of Mithra or scenes of rites undertaken by members of the cult of advanced grade' were also mentioned, including a *dextrarum iunctio* over a flaming altar. Eleonore Dörner commented on the *deus pileatus*. Is there any connection between the Roman social meaning of *pileus* and the Mithraic usage of it?

The social dynamic of the Mithraic initiation grades was discussed by R. L. Gordon, as regards the grade of *pater* and *pater patrum* and the function of *sacerdos* ('to be *sacerdos* was the practical aspect of occupying the grade *pater*'; Gordon distinguished between mithraic groups and *collegia* whose patron god could have been Mithras). As for the *pater*'s career ('there could be only one *pater*' in the group) and its connection with astral symbolism and the attainment of final salvation, i.e. the transit to and through the highest sphere, I do not feel inclined to accept the complete parallelism of the two as formulated by Gordon: '. . . why should Heliodromi not reach the orbit of Saturn? . . . The institution which provided the desired degree of social control and dominance of adherents' lives was also the institution which impeded the logic of Mithraic salvation'. It seems to us highly improbable that the logic of the mysteries implied that only one person among thirty or forty, the *pater*, could hope to attain complete salvation. In Gordon's opinion, the multiplication of the relatively small *mithraea* could have solved this problem (the method of 'hiving off'; though, we may add, the widening of some existing *mithraea* is also attested, e.g. at Rome and at Ostia, so that one could wonder whether their relatively small size – at Ostia, a little town, they are smaller than in Rome – was not caused by the

intrinsic necessities of communal cult, meal, etc.). 'Another method of absorbing pressure from ambitious adherents was to coopt them as fellow-*pater*' (the epigraphically attested coexistence of two *patres* in one and the same group), a third possibility being, in Gordon's opinion, that *pater* was considered to be, so to speak, an 'open' role, with a 'senior Father' promoted to *pater patrum*. (Emerita; there was also the further possibility, attested at Dura, of the coexistence of two *patres patrum*.) For Gordon the *pater* was 'above all concerned with wisdom'. As for the 'social description' of the *patres* the information is scanty; he discusses some relevant documentary evidence.

Some papers were dedicated to such central topics of Mithraic iconography and doctrine as the *tauroctony* and the *lion-headed god*. S. Insler concentrated on 'an explanation of the central cult image of Mithraism . . . framed entirely in terms of attested iconographic data from within the cult'. The iconographical stability of the tauroctony (where also lion and krater were occasionally inserted) is a *syntagma*, in the sense of an icon of astral character; the meaning of the *syntagma* and its components (Taurus, Scorpio, Hydra, Canis minor, Krater, Leo, Corvus) is also astral. So 'on one level the central cult picture expresses the death of winter, symbolized by the bull, and the approach of summer, symbolized by those constellations of spring and summer which participate in its death'; 'if any dualism exists on a theological level in the cult of Western Mithraism, it has been transformed into a fundamental contrast between winter and summer', whatever the meaning of this opposition could have been. On another level, it was a horoscope intended to fix the date of a feast. This could have been an April Mithrakana, for the period 150 B.C.–A.D. 300, since in terms of the history of astronomy 'the standard iconography of the tauroctony cannot be older than the first century B.C.'. The killing of the bull was also treated by J. C. Katrak (see above), S. A. A. Hakim and S. J. Emam Jomeh (the planetary, Mithraic, interpretation of a building at Takth-e Solaiman mentioned above; but the word *mithraeum* cannot but designate, in the present state of knowledge, the cult-building of the mysteries as we know them from the 'Roman' materials).

The lion-headed god (as well as the human-headed demon) was discussed by H. von Gall. The lion-headed figure cannot be interpreted as evil. On the other hand the York monument must have been lion-headed and the object of religious offerings. In his opinion the lion-headed figure stood in close connection with the grade of *leo* and had some connection with fire. His name was Arimanius, whose new, positive meaning was in connection with the soteriological character of the mysteries. As to the human-headed figure (see the relief *CIMRM* 335 and the Barberini painting *CIMRM* 390), this was higher in rank than the other and connected with the higher grades. His name (any more than that of the lion-head) cannot be Aion or Zurvan. But one wonders at this point whether the true distinction was not rather between the imposing figure (whether leontocephaline or not) of a great cosmic, zodiacal god (such as the two figures at Ingresso S. Anna in the Biblioteca apostolica, Vatican, *CIMRM* 312, 545) and the less impressive, 'archontic' type of the Arimanius at York and analogous figures, conceived of as that of a 'porter' through the lower spheres (see Bianchi in Hinnells 1975b: 457–465 and below here).

J. R. Hinnells' discussion of the lion-head was introduced (like Gordon's paper) by methodological considerations. Having stated that 'starting with external parallels exposes one to the danger of reading into the evidence', Hinnells presented a statistical diagram of

the occurrence of various attributes which are found on undisputed figures. On this basis he could affirm that 'there were certain ideas which were central or basic to the concept and (that) around these were a number of peripheral ideas which might be modified or were not necessarily accepted by all'. But this methodological programme needs more qualification: one has to distinguish between ideas (peripheral or central) and iconographical attributes. So for example in the case of the lion-head, the religio-historical importance of the attributes of the key and of the globe (and *a fortiori* of the two together) is not proportional to their statistical frequency in the monuments (that is, it is greater than this); not knowing directly the ideological presuppositions of the statue, we moderns – it seems to me – probably need more accumulation of symbols than the ancients. Another point touched upon by Hinnells was 'the obvious importance of Rome and its surrounding areas'; in this case 'there appears to be a distinctive Roman iconographic form for the figure. In the capital city this figure is usually naked, stands more stiffly and the snake is coiled round it more tightly. In the provinces it typically wears a loin cloth, stands less hieratically and the snake is draped more loosely' (with exceptions, of course). He also noted that different Mithraic symbols could have been used for one and the same idea, and *vice versa* (the case of the lion) and that there might have been different levels of interpretation of the iconography according to the initiate's level and in different regions (this last indication we accept only with reserve, because of the standard character of Mithraic symbolism which Hinnells himself underlines when distinguishing between complexity and incoherence). After drawing attention to the serpent-lion-krater complex as associated with the lion-head, Hinnells reaches the general conclusion that 'the lion-headed figure represents the supernatural being who has authority over the soul's ascent through the planetary spheres . . .'. Moreover, 'the grade of lion was the earthly equivalent of the cosmic being represented by the lion-headed figure' (quoting the Konjica relief), both being connected with fire (one could quote here also the hammer and pincers at the feet of CIMRM 312). Hinnells adheres here to my 'gnostic' interpretation, which – it must be noted – I propounded specifically for the York *kleidouchos*, be it leontocephaline or not. For this reason I need not object to his further statement that gnostic dualism nevertheless remained extraneous to the lion-head. As for the York figure I think I have demonstrated that the reading *arimani*[*o*] being impossible, we should probably read *arimaniu*[*m*], an accusative depending on an expressed *d.d.* or an unexpressed verb of dedication, this accusative being naturally the name of the figure represented (for instance 'X.Y. dedicated a Mars', i.e. a statue of Mars, no matter to what divinity). The iconographical identification of the *deus Arimanius* seems to me to be settled.

Finally, Hinnells rightly emphasizes the popularity of Oriental mysticism, gnostic or not, in the city of Rome during the second and the third centuries A.D., which could explain the popularity this symbolical figure enjoyed there.

II c

As for gnosticism and Mithraism, E. M. Yamauchi discussed a particular passage in the gnostic *Apocalypse of Adam* where an allusion to the rockbirth of Mithras could theoretically be seen. This brought him to a general assessment of the chronology and the geography

of Mithraic monuments as well as, indirectly, of the *Apocalypse*. Now, that chronology does not begin positively before the middle of the second century A.D.: the Mithraic rock-birth was 'not much earlier than the dispersion of Mithraism through the Roman Empire, rather than an original element of Mithra's Persian background' (the dating proposed by Campbell for Mithraic cult at Dura, A.D. 80 or 85, being too early), while 'the one region where the rockbirth motif is well attested and where we also know of the presence of Gnostics is Italy'.

Finally, on Christianity and Mithraism, M. Simon made some very pertinent remarks on the religio-historical setting of Mithraism in the Roman world, and in relation to pagan official cults. Mithras was a newcomer on the imperial scene; in the eyes of the ancients he seems never to have enjoyed privileged position among the Oriental deities, though we know from Justin that at least in Rome, which seems to have been the essential 'point d'appui' of this cult, its main characteristics were known outside the narrow circle of initiates. The fortunes of Roman Mithraism, Simon maintained, are due to the identification of Mithras as Sol-Helios, which was yet far from total. With such emperors as Elagabalus, Aurelian, Constantius Chlorus and Julian a solar, but not properly Mithraic, theology supports the regime, whilst the Mithraic devotion of some emperors was mostly private in character. Moreover, such celebrations of solar theology as those of Symmachus and Macrobius do not even mention Mithras and are based primarily upon Roman national tradition or what was incorporated into it in relatively ancient times. As for Mithraism, its true followers were the initiates only. Under these conditions, he concluded, it is not likely that Mithras could have been at any time the most serious rival to Christ.

Concluding remarks

The time has come to risk some generalizations on the direction of research on Mit(h)ra(s). I welcome the present tendency to question in historical terms the relations between Eastern and Western Mithraism, which should not mean obliterating what was clear to the Romans themselves, that Mithras was a 'Persian' (in wider perspective: an Indo-Iranian) god. Of particular interest today, as earlier, is the study of the western-Asiatic non-Iranian fringe territories and cultures, especially Armenia and Asia Minor – in themselves and in relation to the Roman mysteries. As for these, their characterization in terms of religious typology is a continuing task for research, in the context of both their general historical setting, including the sociological aspect, and a systematic comparison with other Oriental cults in the Roman world. Three particular features seem to have emerged from the Congress: (a) the rather intriguing lines of diffusion of the mysteries, suggested mainly by the epigraphical documentation (e.g. between the Danubian regions and Syria, eastwards, as it seems); (b) the geographical distribution and the special affinities between different areas (those between Rome and Pannonia and between Rome and Syria were particularly emphasized); (c) the relevance of the city of Rome (with Ostia) to the problem of the basic elaboration of the mysteries.

Turning to the east, as far as the Eastern Roman Provinces are concerned, Will's warning that progress in the excavations there often means the discovery of new *mithraea* is important. This was an obvious encouragement to archaeologists, but also a caution

against over-hasty deductions drawn by historians about the geographical distribution of Western Mithraism.

Progress in archaeological research is also vital for territories bordering Iran, where we find forms of Irano-Hellenistic syncretism and of acculturation to Iranian patterns. As for the Iranian regions proper, the hitherto scanty archaeological evidence for the cult of Mithra, though not inconsistent with the old aniconic tendencies, could be increased by discoveries at sites such as those indicated by R. Ghirshman. As for linguistic research, some of its limits from the point of view of religio-historical research have been indicated in this report; but one must be more hopeful as regards a philology open to comparative-historical thematization.

To make a final point about international Congresses of Mithraic Studies, and this second one in particular, it seems to me that in this 'post-Cumontian' situation the obvious internal fragility of a (so to speak) 'pan-Mithraic' problematic (not to speak of over-general approaches to the problems of continuity or global interpretation) did not impede fruitful interdisciplinary confrontation – rather was the reverse true. Our English colleagues' emphasis on a pertinent and a more complete thematization is therefore meritorious. The tireless activity of scholars dedicated to systematic preliminary research and to the editing and interpretation of Mithraic monuments remains essential, as well as that of archaeologists working on today's new discoveries. The complex problems discussed at the Congress constitute a field of first importance for all those, both in the West and in the East, willing to contribute to the progress of research.

Rome — Ugo Bianchi

Notes

1 As for Vṛtra, nothing of the 'mobility' and the mythological complexity of a Mit(h)ra is to be found in him. Vṛtra is fixed in his rather passive function of an 'obstacle' (as it is demonstrated by the Iranian Vərəthaghna, whose name does not imply a reference to a personified or mythical Vṛtra).

Bibliography

Bianchi, Ugo. 1975. Mithraism and Gnosticism. In Hinnells 1975, II, 457–465.
Brelich, Angelo. 1960. Der Polytheismus. *Numen* 7, 123–136.
Francis, E. D. 1975. Mithraic Graffiti from Dura-Europos. In Hinnells 1975, II, 424–445.
Hinnells, J. R. 1975. (Editor) *Mithraic Studies: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Mithraic Studies.* 2 vols. Manchester.

Appendix

Papers presented to the Second International Congress of Mithraic Studies, Tehran, 1–8 September 1975.

C. Balutza	Le mithriacisme dans l'épigraphie de la Dacie.
H. Beikhbaghban	Le culte du soleil chez les Ahl-é-Hakk.

P. Beskow	The expansion of Mithraism: some considerations.
U. Bianchi	Mithra and the question of Mazdean monotheism.
E. L. Bieri	Le culte de Mithra et ses mystères.
A. D. H. Bivar	Apulian Mithras: an unsolved problem in the western progress of Mithraism.
F. A. Bode	The spiritual and ethical philosophy of Mithra in the Mithra Yašt.
G. Bonfante	Mitrah, Miθrō.
J. A. Boyle	Raven's rock: a Mithraic *spelaeum* in Armenian folk-lore?
R. J. Bull	Excavations in the Mithraeum at Caesarea Maritima.
G. C. Cameron	Mithra and the *haoma* ritual in Achaemenid times.
A. H. Dani	Mithraism and Maitreya.
R. A. Dart	A Persian presence in Africa south of the Limpopo.
B. Dhalla	Songs to Mithra.
A. Dietz	Baγa and Miθra in Sogdiana.
S. B. Downey	Syrian images of Mithras *tauroctonos*.
E. Dörner	*Deus pileatus*
F. K. Dörner	Mithras in Kommagene.
H. J. W. Drijvers	Mithra at Hatra.
J. Duchesne-Guillemin	Sur le syncrétisme gréco-iranien de Commagène.
M. Duchesne-Guillemin	A new figure of Mithras on horseback.
H. R. Ellis Davidson	Mithras and Wodan.
H. Esteller	The text-critical basis of Mitra in the Ṛgveda.
E. D. Francis	Syrian maids and Mithraic Lions.
R. Frye	Mithra in Iranian archaeology.
H. von Gall	The lion-headed and the human-headed monster in the mysteries.
R. Ghirshman	La religion de l'Iran du VIIIe siècle a.n.è. à Islam.
T. Goell	Apollo-Mithra, a tutelary deity of Antiochus I of Commagene at his hierothesion in SE Turkey.
R. L. Gordon	The grade *Pater* in the mysteries.
S. A. E. Hakim	A Zarathuštrian speaks on the mysteries of Mithras.
J. Hansman	A suggested interpretation of the Mithraic lion-man figure.
J. R. Hinnells	Reflections on the lionheaded figure in Mithraism.
H. Humbach	Miθra in India and the hinduized Magi.
J. Imam Jomeh	In search of a Mithraeum at Takhti-Soleiman.
S. Insler	A new interpretation of the bull-slaying motif.
J. C. Katrak	Mithra in the Avesta and Mithra on the Roman reliefs.
J. Kellens	Caractères différentiels du Mihr Yašt.
S. Khodabakhshi	History of Mithra.
H. Lavagne	Importance de la grotte dans le mithriacisme en Occident.
M. LeGlay	La δεξίωσις dans les mystères de Mithra.
D. M. MacDowell	The place of Mithra among the deities of the Kushans.
M. Mahboubian	Mithra and Jama – Mehr and Jamshid.
M. Mayrhofer	Die bisher vorgeschlagenen Etymologien und die ältesten Bezeugungen des Mithra-namens.
I. Melikoff	Les vestiges du culte de Mithra en Anatolie.
M. Moghaddam	Mithra the man.
F. Nariman	The emanations of spiritual authority and temporal power from Mithra-ahura/Mitravāruṇā.
A. Popa	L'iconographie mithriaque d'Apulum.

J. Puhvel	Mitra as an Indo-european divinity.
H.-P. Schmidt	Indo-iranian Mitra-studies: the state of the problem.
R. Schmidt	Die theophoren Eigennamen mit altiranisch *Miθra-.
N. Shah-Hosseini	The influence of Mehr in Hafiz' poetry.
M. Simon	Mithra, rival du Christ?
M. P. Speidel	Parthia and the Mithraism of the Roman army.
D. Stronach	The religious monuments of the Medes and Persians *c.* 750–500 BC.
W. Sundermann	Some more remarks on Mithra in the Manichaean pantheon.
P. Thieme	The old-iranian Mithra.
I. Tóth & Zs. Vísy	Das grosse Kultbild des Mithraeums und die Mithrasdenkmäler von Intercisa.
P. Vardjavand	Temple inédit dédié à Mithra connu sous le nom de Imam-Zadeh Ma'ascum Vardjouvi.
J. K. Wadia	Mithra or Mehr parasti.
S. Wikander	Remarks on the Mihr Yašt.
E. Will	Origines et nature du mithriacisme.
E. M. Yamauchi	The Apocalypse of Adam, Mithraism and pre-Christian Gnosticism.
M. Yektai	Mithra and Soshyans in the oriental sources.